T H R O N E S P E E C H

DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

MR G P LLOYD CMG CVO

AT THE OPENING OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

ON FRIDAY 1 MARCH 1985

Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly

The Throne Speech always marks the opening of a new Session of the Legislature. Every fourth year, following a General Election, it coincides with the Budget Session. This is such a year. I shall therefore speak quite briefly, and shall concentrate on outlining the Government's policies and legislative programme.

No serious problems arose during either the registration of voters or the General Elections themselves last year. The need for a few amendments to the new Elections Law, which had been enacted in 1983, was nevertheless noted; and I have invited all Members of the present Legislative Assembly to report any others they may have noticed, so that suitable arrangements can be made to consider how the Law should be amended as a result of the experience gained when operating it.

Following an Order-in-Council made early last year, the Islands' own Court of Appeal was constituted in September. I should like to place on record our gratitude both to the distinguished Justices who accepted appointment and to the Governments of Jamaica and of the Bahamas which agreed to allow some of those concerned to serve. Certain amendments to the Court of Appeal Law are still needed, and a Bill providing for them will consequently be introduced during this Session.

The number of public officers rose from 1,225 in 1983 to 1,293 in late 1984, due to demands for improved services. Although further

/demands

demands must be expected, continuing rapid growth would be a matter of legitimate concern to many people as it could cause serious imbalance to the economy. Appropriate means of limiting it will have to be found. Now that the Civil List has been computerised and can thus be updated regularly, better statistics should facilitate the necessary monitoring.

Revised Personnel Regulations are being drafted and should take effect during 1985. It is also intended to amend the Public Service Regulations so that the Commission can be strengthened and become more fully responsible for recruitment.

Major emphasis is being placed on the development of locally based courses for Civil Servants. In 1985 particular importance will be placed on Middle Management training. It is hoped that this and overseas training will aid localisation. As scholarship students return from overseas universities with degrees, they are placed in Departments to utilise their training.

The movement of Departments from the Government Administration Building to the Tower continues, with physical changes in the former building being made to accommodate staff growth in Departments remaining there. This should be completed by mid-1985.

Steps to strengthen the Police continued. The year saw the commencement of an extensive in-Force training programme with the arrival of a number of senior expatriate officers with skills in special areas; more are to follow this year. Alongside this programme positive steps were taken to develop the careers of local officers and in the last few months of 1984 20 local officers were promoted to senior and other supervisory posts and this phase which is directed towards localisation within the Force whilst raising professional standards through intensive training will continue.

The end of the year saw a change in command of the Force, and a local officer was appointed Deputy Commissioner.

/The Prison

The Prison population grew from 72 on 1 January 1984 to a peak of 101 on 29 December 1984. This placed a strain on both staff and facilities. The site for another building, to accommodate female prisoners, has been prepared and fenced. Construction should soon start, and cannot safely be delayed. But ways of halting, and if possible reversing, the growth in the number of prisoners must be explored. One is to provide the Courts with wider powers to make Community Service Orders as an alternative to imprisonment. Another is to remove some of the present provisions for mandatory minimum sentences. Bills for these purposes will be introduced, although emphasis will also be placed on programmes designed to prevent potential offenders from turning to crime.

In the case of immigration, the most significant development in the last twelve months was the passing of the Caymanian Protection Law 1984. Considerable progress has been made in drafting the Regulations and formulating the guidelines necessary to enable it to be brought into effect. This should then help ease the position for people with Caymanian connections. In the case of other people, it should permit suitable individuals to be given greater security of tenure without grants of status, which will be made only to a small number annually. The issue of identity cards to gainful occupation licence holders will assist both employers and the authorities in reducing illegal employment.

The Government also now proposes to abandon quota restrictions for imported labour, instead ensuring that employers have to be meticulous in satisfying the Caymanian Protection Board that a genuine need exists and that no Caymanian can be found to fill a position by recruitment or promotion. Where it can be demonstrated that no Caymanian is available, preference will have to be given to persons already legally resident in the Islands.

Radio Cayman has continued to be a commercial success, earning more in revenue than its services cost to provide. Moreover it provided a number of new services during 1984. Everyone standing as a candidate in the General Election was for the first time given an opportunity to broadcast a statement outlining his platform. And broadcasts of most of this Assembly's proceedings became a regular feature. They were so

/popular

popular that a Bill will be introduced to provide for them on a permanent basis.

I have, so far, been speaking about matters which are Constitutionally my own responsibility or which fall within the portfolio of the First Official Member. I can be far more brief now that I turn to the Second and Third Official Members. For you are soon to hear the Budget Speech and I do not want to cover - or, indeed, to trespass on - the ground which the Financial Secretary will be covering. But one point should be recorded and another made. Let me, therefore, note for the record that the Cayman Narcotics Agreement was signed in July 1984 and that legislation to implement its principal provisions was enacted the following month.

Some of these provisions were controversial. This is not the right time - and I am not the right person - to debate their merits. I hope you will nevertheless allow me to express the personal view that we should all be grateful to the members of the UK and Cayman teams who conducted a difficult series of confidential negotiations with patience, skill and wisdom under circumstances made the more difficult because they were precluded from reporting publicly on progress. Which brings me to the point I wished to make. Under the terms of the Agreement, the Government is obliged to enter into further negotiations later this year. When it does so, account will be taken both of views expressed and advice given by members of the financial community here, and of the experience gained to date as a result of implementing the new procedures for which the 1984 Agreement provided. But it will again necessarily be precluded from providing the public with detailed information whilst it negotiates: to do so would prejudice the outcome.

I turn next to the Portfolio of the four Elected Members of Executive Council. A number of changes were made at the time of their appointment. Thus, for example, the Member for Communications and Works again became responsible for District Administration; the re-titled Portfolio of Development and Natural Resources took on water, sewage and housing; responsibility for all tertiary education was concentrated in the Health, Education and Social Services Portfolio; and so on. The intention was to ensure that responsibilities were distributed in the

/most

most effective way.

Now that this redistribution has taken place, the 8865 Portfolio will give particular attention to the development of the Community College. With more than six hundred students enrolled in forty-five courses, it is already providing a popular and valuable service. But plans are being made for it to become an institution in its own right by September 1985, offering day as well as evening classes and incorporating the Hotel, Marine and Building and Trade Schools.

Continuing emphasis will be placed on the development of special education programmes designed to help all children realize their full potential.

Preliminary steps were taken during 1984 to address the provision of mental health, drug and alcohol abuse, services. These areas of health care will remain a high priority. So will care for the elderly ill, as evidenced by the recent opening of a ten-bed medical wing at "The Pines" as an extension of the George Town Hospital.

In the field of environmental health, work will centre on water quality surveillance, meat inspection, solid waste management and rodent control.

The Department of Social Services will be further strengthened during 1985, to enable it to meet growing demands.

At Bonaventure House and the Frances Bodden Girls' Home there will be independent professional reviews of the effectiveness of their operations.

The Juveniles Law is to be revised; and a Bill amending it will be introduced during this Session.

Additional units will be added to the one already completed in the new low-income housing project at Eastern Avenue.

/The south

The scale of Cayman Airways' losses - which averaged about 3.5 million dollars annually during the four year period from mid-1980 to mid-1984 - caused widespread and serious concern. Moreover the United States' undertaking not to licence any additional airline to operate between Miami and Grand Cayman lasts only until April 1985. Against this background the Airline's Board, in consultation with the Tourism, Aviation and Trade Portfolio, commissioned a comprehensive independent professional report on it so that informed decisions can be taken about its future policies and management.

The new Terminal Building at Owen Roberts International Airport has been completed and put into operation, offering a greatly improved facility to the travelling public. Government will arrange for the Cayman Islands Corporation, which is responsible for operating this Airport, to function on lines similar to the Port Authority. The design of the proposed new Terminal and Apron at Cayman Brac is now under review. As soon as the review has been completed proposals will be submitted to the EDF for final approval. Work is scheduled to commence on this project later this year.

The tourism industry continued to show increases in 1984, and predictions are that 1985 will also be a very successful year. Government will take steps to ensure that the services being offered to our tourists are maintained to a high level.

The Fire Service sub-station at Frank Sound was completed in late 1984, offering a quick response to calls in the Eastern Districts of Grand Cayman. Possible means of establishing a Domestic Fire Service in Cayman Brac are being studied.

The Labour Office will continue to provide assistance to employers and employees, where possible. Consideration is being given to the introduction of labour legislation during 1985.

As I said earlier, District Administration has been returned to the Communications and Works Portfolio. With regard to it, most of the

/infrastructure

infrastructure necessary to economic development is now complete in Cayman Brac: an efficient port, a resurfaced airfield, a reliable telephone service, an improved and expanding electricity supply and so on. Attention will therefore be focussed on attracting developers and visitors alike to the Sister Islands, to help their economies expand and to generate employment.

Plans to relocate the present Post Office in George Town to a new, more modern building will be pursued, a particular study being made of the viability of incorporating a multi-storey car park which should relieve traffic congestion by enabling on-street parking to be restricted.

In addition to a full programme of maintenance, the Public Works Department will construct a number of buildings and continue various new road works during 1985.

The Port Authority is expected to continue to operate profitably for the eighth successive year. Plans are well-advanced for the placing of permanent moorings for cruise ships.

In 1984 the (then) Portfolio of Agriculture, Lands and Natural Resources conducted negotiations aimed at getting the United States' ban on products from our Turtle Farm lifted.

The negotiations involved two delegations visiting Washington and one visiting Brussels last year. All those visits were preparatory: the decisive meeting will be held in Argentina during April this year. It will be a full CITES meeting - CITES being the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species. In further preparation for it, experienced and professional counsel have been appointed to represent our interest in Washington. And the Honourable Member responsible for the Portfolio will lead the Cayman team which attends the meeting.

The plans for Marine Parks are now being explained to the public before Regulations are finally brought into effect. The importance of

/establishing

establishing them without further delay cannot be over-stressed. For one thing, the growth of conch and lobster in their own particular habitats will be assisted. For another, the marine life which has made Cayman the leading destination in this hemisphere for divers will be protected. So the proposed Park system is vital both to local fisherman and to the continuing growth of our whole tourist industry.

The Portfolio will also be engaged on several other major projects in 1985.

Sewerage is regarded as a top priority because of the danger to public health - and the potential repercussions on the tourist industry if the present situation is not given attention. The Seven Mile Beach area will be tackled first, to provide a sound economic basis for the further extensions planned. The order of cost of the completed system is $20 million, making this the largest public project yet contemplated.

Emphasis will be placed on agriculture. An Agricultural Development Committee has been established to assist. It is intended to obtain the services of an adviser to upgrade the Demonstration Farm.

A Building Code which has been under consideration for quite some time will be pursued with the assistance of a Committee recently established.

Because of the growing demand for water, well fields are being developed at East End which should be in operation shortly. Other methods of producing water are under investigation.

The Housing Development Corporation is actively pursuing a search for funds to meet demands. Money raised from local financial institutions in 1984 was spent before the end of the year. Policies will be reviewed in order that future transactions relate to the true purpose of the scheme.

May I in conclusion pay tribute to Members' accustomed standard of conduct and courtesy. This eases my tasks of maintaining order and of ensuring a fair hearing for all. I am confident that with such help,

/they

they will not become burdensome.

I pray that Almighty God may bless and guide our deliberations throughout the coming Session.

STATE OPENING & FORMAL MARKING UP OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(FRIDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1985)

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR G PETER SLOAN, CMG, OBE - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON LEONARD M FOSTER, OBE, ISO, JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J BRADLEY, QC, LL.B	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS G JEFFERSON, OBE	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
FOR SESSION & REMARKS	MINISTER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON N NORMAN BOSDEN, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES I KIRKCONNELL	MINISTER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND ISLANDS ADMINISTRATION
HON VESSEL C JOHNSON, OBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND MARINE ENVIRONMENT

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR K MCKEEVA HICKS	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MRS DALPHNE L WHITTAKER	FIFTH ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MR LEOPOLD A FRANCOM, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CAYMAN BROWN
CAPT MARK S KIRKCONNELL	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SISTER ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF THE LESSER ISLANDS
MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR C HALE BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D BERNARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN B MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING AND BUDGET MEETING OF THE 1985 SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(FRIDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1985)

1. STATE OPENING (SEE PROGRAMME ATTACHED)

HOUSE RESUMES

2. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS & REPORTS

DRAFT ESTIMATES OF REVENUE & EXPENDITURE OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS FOR THE YEAR 1985 - TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE HONOURABLE THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER.

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(a) MOTIONS:-

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO.2/85 - REGULARISING OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE.

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER

(b) BILLS:-

THE APPROPRIATION (1985) BILL 1985 - FIRST READING

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER - SECOND READING

HOUSE SUSPENDS

SPECIAL SESSIONS

FIRST & SECOND READINGS

(i) THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(ii) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 46(1) & 49

BE IT MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER SO ENABLE ALL STAGES OF THE BILLS TO BE TAKEN THE SAME DAY.

COMMITTEE STAGES

(i) THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(ii) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

RECORDS/WARRANT

(i) The Customs (Management) Bill, 1985

(ii) The Excise (Management) Bill, 1985

SEIZED GOODS

(i) The Customs (Management) Bill, 1985

(ii) The Excise (Management) Bill, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	2
DESCRIPTION AND USE OF FUNDS	3
U.S. DOG CONSERVATION TRUST FUNDS	8
DRAFT APPROPRIATIONS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR DOG AND DOGGIES - DOLLAR OUT TABLE	9
AMENDMENT NOTICE NO. 2 - ORGANIZATIONAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE ASSEMBLY PROCEDURES	8
THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1985 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	9
THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985 - FIRST READING	40
SPECIAL DEBATES	41
COMMITTEE STAGE	62
REPORT STAGE	84
THIRD READING	95
ADJOURNMENT	99

STATE OPENING OF THE FIFTH ASSEMBLY

DEVOTIONAL SERVICE

BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR.C.P. SMITH, C.M.G.

FRIDAY 1ST MARCH, 1968. 11.00 a.m.

PROCESSION

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Excellency the Governor!

The Clerk, Mrs. E.Kay Jackson, followed by the Deputy Clerk, Mrs. Wendy Brooks, the Serjeant-at-Arms, His Excellency the Governor, Mrs. Lloyd and A.D.C.

H.E. THE GOVERNOR, on reaching the dais bows to the right and to the left and says

The Assembly is in Session.
I will invite the Rev. Edgar Gration to say Prayers.

REV. GRATION: O Lord Our God, grant this moment that being humbly in gratitude to confess our sins, make it a real experience for each one of us in this place as we call upon you for guidance and help.

You are the Lord Jesus and Enable us in the practical experiences of worship in church. Help us now to feel your nearness in the holiness of this day, this chosen Member of this Assembly, Present and coming.

Most through these men and women, we pray O Lord, that what they say and what they do may be in accordance with your will for this land that we love so much.

We pray for the Queen and members of the Royal Family and we also pray for His Excellency the Governor Grant them wisdom, strength and discernment for the heavy burden you lay upon their shoulders.

Lastly, Father, we pray for the peoples of these Islands that they might be obedient to your will and Lastly honour and uphold Your Name.

And these our prayers we ask through Jesus Christ Our Lord, who taught us to pray the Lastly prayer -

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name. Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who 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, Amen.

H.E. THE GOVERNOR: Please be seated.

THE QUEEN: PROCLAMATION NO. 8 OF 1982

BY HIS EXCELLENCY GEORGE PRAIS SMITH COMPANION OF THE MOST DISTINGUISHED ORDER OF SAINT MICHAEL AND SAINT GEORGE COMMANDER OF THE VICTORIAN ORDER, COMMANDER OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

Whereas, by sub-section (1) of section 56 of Schedule 2 of the Cayman Islands Constitution Order, 1972 it is provided that the Sessions of the Legislative Assembly shall be held at such time and place as the Governor may from time to time by proclamation appoint

NOW, THEREFORE, under and by virtue of the powers vested in me by the aforementioned order I, GEORGE POLAR SMITH, Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George Commander of the Victorian Order, Governor of the Cayman Islands, do hereby proclaim and make known that a Session of the Legislative Assembly of the Cayman Islands shall be held at the Legislative Assembly Building in George Town, Island of Grand Cayman, at 10 a.m. on Friday first of March, One thousand Nine hundred and eighty-five

Given under my hand and the Public Seal of the Cayman Islands at George Town in the Island of Grand Cayman, this proclamation by of February in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighty-five in the Thirty-first year of the Reign of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II,

God Save The Queen.

MR SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN: The Throne Speech,

Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly -

The Throne Speech always marks the opening of a new Session of the Legislature. Since fourth June, Nineteen Hundred Eighty-one it coincides with the Budget Session. This is most appropriate.

I shall therefore speak quite briefly, and shall commence by outlining the Government's policies and legislative programme.

As Members possibly notice there is a new face on the Government Benches since last year. The most significant change is the retirement of Mr. Vassel Johnson from the Executive Council and the Legislative Assembly to pursue his duties as Minister of Tourism, Trade and Development. I am sure that Members will join me in wishing him success in his new responsibilities and I have invited his Members of the present Legislative Assembly to express any views they may have regarding the possible arrangements that may be made to complete the unexpired term of office of Mr. Johnson's seat. Nominations for Member-in-Council made early last year, the Falmouth and Court of Appeal was established in September. I should like to place on record our gratitude both to the Administration who accepted appointment and to the Government of Jamaica and of the Bahamas which agreed to allow some of their personnel to serve. Certain amendments to the Court of Appeal Law were passed, and I will provide for them will consequently be introduced during this Session.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (CONTINUING): The number of public officers rose from 1,825 in 1963 to 1,969 in late 1964, due to demands for improved services. Although further demands must be expected, continuing rapid growth could pose a serious problem of legislative approval as many people can be paid extra salaries for the economy. Appropriate means of checking it will have to be found. Now that the Civil List has been computerized and can thus be updated regularly, better statistics should facilitate this necessary monitoring.

Revised Personnel Regulations are being drafted and should take effect during 1965. It is also intended to amend the Public Service Regulations so that the Commission can be strengthened and become more fully responsible for recruitment.

Major emphasis is being placed on the development of locally based courses for Civil Servants. In 1965 particular importance will be placed on middle management training. It is hoped that this and overseas training will also localization. As scholarship holders return from overseas institutions with degrees, they are placed in Departments to utilize their training.

The movement of Departments from the Government Administration Building to the Lower Secretariat, with physical changes in the former building being made to accommodate staff growth in Departments remaining there, should be completed by mid-1965.

Steps to strengthen the Police are planned. This goes with the commencement of an intensive in-service training programme with the arrival of a number of senior experienced officers with skills in special areas. Some use is to follow this year. Although this programme position steps were taken to develop the system of local officers until in the last few months of 1964 20 local officers were promoted to senior and other supervisory posts, and nine others to Sergeant Interpreter ranks while they have gained professional standards through intensive training until now.

The end of the year saw a change in command of the Force, and a local officer was appointed Deputy Commissioner.

The Indian population rose from 78 on 1 January, 1964 to a peak of 101 on 30 September, 1964. This rise, a strain on both staff and facilities, who also for another building to accommodate family reunions, has been reversed and passed. Immigration should soon start, and cannot safely be delayed. But use of existing, and of possible overcrowding, the growth in the number of permanents may be resisted. One is to provide the Courts which might reduce to make Immediate Removal Orders as an alternative to imprisonment. Another is to remove some of the present penalties for expiration by minimum sentences. Bills for these purposes will be introduced, although emphasis will also be placed on programmes designed to prevent potential offenders from starting in crime.

In the area of immigration, the most significant development in the last twelve months was the passing of the Immigration Protection Law 1964. Considerable progress has been made in drafting the Regulations and formulating the guidelines necessary to enable it to be brought into effect. This should both ease the position for people with Immigration problems. In the case of other people, it should provide suitable machinery to be given greater security of tenure without grants of status, which will

THE SECRETARY FOR OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT: We made only by a small majority. The issue of security cannot be quickly ascertained. Strong actions will assist both employers and the authorities in ensuring illegal employment.

The Government also has proposed to provide more information for intending immigrants, including the requirement that employers have to be notified in advance the Immigration Service Unit's general area and that no illegality can be found to fall in practice by harassment or prosecution. Where it can be demonstrated that no alternative is available, prosecutions will have to be given to pursue wholly unreasonable employment in the industry.

Mr. K. Clarke has undertaken to do a ministerial meeting more on reasons than the services need to provide. However it provided a measure of new evidence during 1994. Secretary recently as a candidate to the Council. Minister was for the first time given an opportunity to broadcast a statement explaining his objection. The broadcasts of most of this Assembly's proceedings became a regular feature. They were so popular that a fifth will be introduced to provide for them on a permanent basis.

I have, as you know, been thinking about matters which are consequentially my own responsibility in full within the Portfolio of the Chief Official Member, I can be for more brief now that I have to the Second and Third Official Members. For you are used to hear the budget speech; and I do not want to cover on Indeed, as you was all - the reason which the Financial Secretary will be moving. But one point should be accepted and explained. Let me, therefore, note for the record that the Sugar Industry Agreement was signed in July 1964 and that legislation to implement the provisional provisions can amended the following month.

Some of these provisions were over-ambitious. This is not the right time - and I am not the right person - to debate that matter. I hope you will nevertheless allow me to express the personal view that it should all be quite fit to the welfare of the UK and Cyprus alike to conclude a difficult series of confidential negotiations with patience, skill and where circumstances made the very difficult because they were practically from registering publicity or progress. Which brings me to the point I wished to make. Under the terms of the Agreement, the Government is obliged to enter into further negotiations later this year. When it does so, account will be taken both of views expressed and action given by members of the financial community here, and of the experience gained to date on a number of matters including the new provisions for which the 1964 Agreement provided. But we will again necessarily be guarded from providing the public with confidential information similar to what we have given in the past, as we would prejudice the outcome.

I turn next to the Portfolio of the Four Elected Members of Executive Council. A number of changes were made at the time of their appointment. Thus, for example, the Member for Communications and Works again became responsible for Electrical Administration; the re-titled Portfolio of Development and Natural Resources took on water, mining and geography; responsibility for all secondary education was concentrated in the Social, Education and Social Services Portfolio; and so on. The intention was to ensure that responsibilities were distributed in the most

<u>THE EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR CONTINUED:</u> effective way.

Now that the rehabilitation has taken place, the HSSC Portfolio will give particular attention to the development of the Cheshunt College. With more than six hundred students enrolled in forty-five courses, it is already providing a popular and valuable service. But plans are being made for it to become an institution in its own right by September, 1982, offering day and night evening classes and incorporating the Hotel, Service and Building and Trade Schools.

Continuing emphasis will be placed on the development of special education programmes designed to help all children realize their full potential.

Psychiatric wards were taken during 1981 to address the problem of mental health, drug and alcohol abuse, amongst. These areas of health care will remain a high priority. We will care for the elderly, as evidenced by the recent opening of a new 150-bed medical ward at "Lisa Manor" as an extension of the Scarborough Hospital.

In the field of environmental health, work will centre on water quality surveillance, waste management and animal control.

The Department of Social Services will be further strengthened during 1982, to enable it to meet growing demands.

As Conservative Power and the Premier Sudbury Wide Plans will be implemented during this session.

Additional units will be added to the one already authorized in the new Two-Tiered housing project at Burlington Downs.

The grant of Ontario Housing - which averaged about 2.5 million dollars annually during the five year period from mid-1977 to mid-1982 - proved widespread and various complex. Moreover the Metro Centre' undertaking here to provide any additional subsidies to operate housing after Ontario Grant Funds only until April, 1986. Against this background the Minister's Board, in consultation with the Housing Advisory Committee, commissioned a comprehensive independent professional report on it so that informed decisions can be taken about its future policies and arrangements.

The new Terminal building at Greater Hamilton International Airport has been completed and put into operation, offering a greatly improved facility to the travelling public. Agreements will continue for the Ontario Lakeside Commuter, which is responsible for operating this Airport, to function on these similar to the Port Authority. The design of the proposed new Terminal complex at Dundas Road is now under review. As soon as the Master Plan has been completed proposals will be submitted to the CDC for final approval. Work is scheduled to commence on this project later this year.

The tourism industry continued to show increases in 1981, and predictions are this year will also be a very successful year. Agreements will take effect to ensure that the exemptions being offered to our tourists are maintained at a high level.

The Fire Service sub-station at Stone Road was completed in late 1981, offering a quick response to calls

HTS Insurance and Governance Committee in the Eastern Province of Central Country. Benefits range from [illegible] Remedial Services in Country Base are being studied.

The Actuary Officer will continue to provide calculations on employee and employer, where possible. Consideration is being given to the introduction of Income Legislation during 1995.

As I said earlier, Disabled Administration has been reduced to the Communications and Works Portfolio. With regard to the rest of the infrastructure necessary to accommodate Government as now explained in Queen Town as Office-part, a reconfigured Cafeteria, a reliable telephone service, an improved and appealing electricity supply and so on. Circulation will therefore be increased on alternative Wednesdays and Fridays for the Blaine Islands, to help their economic appeal and to generate employment.

Plans to relocate the Census Post Office in Upper Town as a new, more modern building will be pursued, a provisional study being made of the feasibility of incorporating a multi-storey car park which should maximise benefit compatible by enabling unwanted premises to be rationalised.

In addition to a full programme of maintenance, the Public Works Department will implement a number of building and conservation schemes now most urgently [illegible]

The Port Authority is allocated to [illegible] in Queens particularly for the capital expenditure plans. Plans are well-advanced for the [illegible] of permanent moorings for ocean ships.

In 1995 the Ministry Portfolio of Agriculture, Lands and Natural Resources considered negotiations [illegible] the United States Bank on purchase from [illegible] Parish Lake Island.

The negotiations, [illegible] the [illegible] Washington and the Multiple Dramatic Lake Lease, [illegible] State Department [illegible] Pacific Rim Project. In [illegible] preparation for its, experienced and professional [illegible] to represent our interests in Washington. [illegible] the Honourable Member responsible for the Portfolio will [illegible] Upper Town [illegible] the meeting.

The plans for Marine Parks are now being explained to the public before Regulations are finally brought into effect. The importance of establishing them without further delay cannot be over-emphasised. For one thing, the growth of coral and [illegible] in their own particular habitats will be [illegible]. For another, the marine life which [illegible] the learning destination in this hemisphere for divers will be protected. So the Ministry [illegible] to [illegible] local fishermen not to take coral [illegible] of our whole marine [illegible]

The Portfolio will also be engaged on several minor [illegible] in 1995.

Responsibility is removed [illegible] the [illegible] to private health - and the potential [illegible] in the [illegible] of the present [illegible] not [illegible]. The Sewerage Rate [illegible] will be [illegible] to provide a [illegible] for the Pension [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] to [illegible] making this the [illegible] [illegible]

HIS EXCELLENCY THE SPEAKER (CONTINUED): Emphasis will be placed on agriculture. An Agricultural Development Corporation has been established to assist. It is intended to obtain the services of an adviser to upgrade the Demonstration Farms.

A Building Code which has been under consideration for quite some time will be imposed with the assistance of a Committee recently established.

Because of the growing demand for water, well fields are being developed at Lear and which should be in operation shortly. Other methods of procuring water are under investigation.

The Housing Development Corporation is actively pursuing a project for funds to meet demands. Money raised from local financial institutions in 1984 was about $2m before the end of the year. Policies will be reviewed in order that future transactions relate to the true purpose of the scheme.

[illegible] the Commissioner pay tribute to Members' concerns and sensitivity. This comes by virtue of maintaining order and of ensuring a fair hearing for all. I am confident that with such help, this will be [illegible] business.

I pray that Almighty God may bless and guide our deliberations throughout the coming session.

MR. JAMES M. KINCAID: BE IT RESOLVED that the Honourable Legislative Assembly accords its grateful thanks to His Excellency the Governor for the Address delivered at this meeting

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Debate on the Address delivered by His Excellency be deferred until Wednesday the 6th day of March, 1985 at 10 a.m.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE SPEAKER: The question is BE IT RESOLVED that the Honourable Legislative Assembly accords its grateful thanks to His Excellency the Governor for the Address delivered at this meeting

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the debate on the Address delivered by His Excellency be deferred until Wednesday the 6th day of March.

Is there a seconder?

MR. WINSTON SCOTT: I second the motion, Sir.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE SPEAKER: I will put the question. All those in favour please say Aye, those against No. The Ayes have it.

QUESTION AGREED

THE CLERK, THE DEPUTY CLERK, THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS, HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MRS. ELDER, M.B.E.

THE CLERK RETIRES TO HIS CHAMBER.

THE CLERK: The House will now adjourn for half an hour.

AT 10.55 A.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED FOR HALF-AN HOUR

THE HOUSE RESUMED AT 11.15 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Before I move to Item 2 on today's Order Paper, Presentation of Papers and Reports, perhaps I should just say that it has been brought to my notice that by a slip of the tongue I may have created some confusion about the time we finish the debate on the Throne Speech to day to take place. It is in fact Wednesday of next week, I think I made the wrong date. The Motion of the Motion I think I got it right and I misspoke that, but so there should be no doubt in any body's mind Wednesday is the day that was intended and I shall request the motion be kept back so counsel that we proceed on Wednesday.

Presentation of Papers and Reports.

DRAFT ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1995 AND SUPPLY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the 1995 Draft Estimates, together with an order.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE NO. 2

MR. M.E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Government Notice No. 2 standing in my name, to read as follows: -

> In accordance with Standing Order 24 (1) the Honourable Minister Official Member I will today move the motion -
>
> In accordance with Powers and Privileges conferred upon the Legislative Assembly of the Cayman Islands Constitution Order 1972, the Immunities, Powers and Privileges Act (Revised) and other enactments have as at present enjoyed. This Motion Cayman Brac is Resolved thereby Section appointing within the Cayman Islands by the Government of the Cayman Islands is hereby Authorised to Proceedings of the Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly as are hereby after named -
>
> 1. Throne Speech and Opening Statement
> 2. The Budget Address and Debate Thereon
> 3. Question Time
> 4. Presentation of Papers, Reports of Committees, Speeches thereon
> 5. Debate on Second Reading of all Bills and Item for the Adjourning Commencing on the Third day of March, 1995
> 6. Debate, if any, on Government Motions
> 7. Debate, if any, on Private Members' Motions

MR. SPEAKER: The question to that Government Motion No. 2, the text of which has just been read by the Clerk, should be passed. Does any Honourable Member wish to speak? If not I will put the question. All those in favour please say aye. Those against, say the same sign.

I declare the motion passed.

MR.PRESIDENT: Item 2 (b) - Bills

THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1985

CLERK: THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

MR.PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled the Appropriation Bill, 1985 is deemed to have been read a first time and to be set down for second reading.

CLERK: THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1985

SECOND READING

HON.J.C.THOMPSON: Mr.President, I am honoured to join you, Sir, on this occasion, when the Throne Speech and Budget Address are presented in this Honourable House on the same day. The Budget Address, this year in particular, is presented with the distinction of conveying to this Honourable House and the people of the Cayman Islands a detailed accurate account of the financial affairs of Government and the state of the economy. It is my pleasure, Mr.President, to present the financial statement in support of the Appropriation Bill, 1985, which is now in the process of its second reading.

Mr.President, although the Cayman Islands have passed through perhaps the most heavily contested general election ever held, resulting in a major change in the membership of this Honourable House, there has been no major change in the Country's economic development policies. I suggest to all Honourable Members that we should all welcome as the preservation of these fundamental tenets of our development over the past twenty plus months, politicial stability, maintaining our good financial position, prudent control of Government spending and balanced budget. Nevertheless we must all know ways to put the shoulder to wheel to make the economy, I mean, Mr.President, we should turn our attention to the hard decisions required to provide the services to the people of these Islands. This should be a part of working order, that is, re-examining our Government philosophy of running these Islands. We should not try to emulate or mimic procedures which operate in other countries, but recognize from lessons of time and only change the procedures when events in these Islands and the international business world requires it.

The Cayman Islands have also experienced, during 1984, the establishment of the Honourable Government and perhaps Governmental procedures exist. In my view, Mr. President, no country should hesitate to co-operate in the re-evaluation of persons involved in processes. For example, it is an understatement still capable of destroying every fibre of any society. Mr.President, there is little evidence of any drug money in the Cayman Islands today. The news are being examined, relate to the former half of the 1970's. As I said while debating the Immigration Bill last year, the signing of such Agreements is a step forward for the future development of these Islands.

MR. T. O'DONNELL (CONTINUING): As an offshore financial centre, the prosperity of the Cayman Islands Government and Electorate is inextricably tied to government expenditure and Government will continue to do all in its power to ensure that the benefits remain. We are convinced that the future lies in having a stable and well regulated financial industry.

I. The Economy (Mr)

The economy of these Islands, which is based mainly on the financial industry and tourism, continues to be a very fragile economy, because it is largely influenced by external factors over which we have no control. However, internal factors play a significant role as well, and I would suggest that we are all responsible for it. Therefore, Mr. President, care should be exercised in the steps we project to the international world.

a) Financial Sector

(i) Banking and Trust

Despite the known unemployment during 1981 in the financial systems in the United States and elsewhere, there appear to have been relatively few knock-on effects through the Cayman banking sector, although the continuing problems surrounding the serious indebtedness of a number of Latin American countries have inevitably affected the operations of the banking business which predominate in the sector. Figures for the total accountancy assets of the banks in Cayman (our most important of offshore banking activity) are not yet available for 31st December, 1981, but we might be mistaken to expect any great increase on the 1980 figure of US$161 billion, which is estimated to account for about 5% of the total eurocurrency market.

During 1981 we saw further evidence of the consolidation of the banking institutions offered by Cayman. Most notably, of course, has been dominated by the US banks, mainly because of the presumptive penalty, but also (less positively) because of Cayman's lack of investibility further afield. The last two or three years have seen this change significantly. As I explained in my last address, three quarters of the banks licensed in 1980 came from outside the United States, and this has been reversed in 1981. Of the new licences granted last year, more are from banks based in Europe and Asia as diversification by the Middle East banks. Although the US banks must always be a very important element in a thriving banking industry, the Cayman Islands naturally become far more cosmopolitan as our financial institutions. The diversification and greater international acceptance of the sector can only be welcomed, adding to the confidence and general recognition of the stability and strength of our financial industry.

At the end of 1981, there were 456 banks and trust companies on the register, a net increase of seven over the previous year. However, this latest figure hides the fact that 58 new licences were issued, substantially to the branches and subsidiaries of major overseas banks. The relatively high number of 21 cancelled licences, a large number, also reflects the restructuring and merging of certain foreign banking groups, which has sometimes resulted in a duplication of the new company's representation in Cayman. However, a number of banks did close their Cayman operations, having taken advantage of the original concessionary, and we were obliged to revoke their licences for various reasons. In line with our policy of the last

SOME PROBLEMS/CONSIDERATIONS: The growth, expansion of the banking system has been further enhanced during 1993 by the introduction of some unsophisticated supervisory requirements for new banks. Contrary to what some people may believe, such a development is generally welcomed by the industry, since it safeguards and contributes to preserving the integrity of the international system rather than adding burdens on the banking sector as a revenue earning tool.

Because of the severely restricted availability of office accommodation in Georgetown, we are now able to give land to a larger number of institutions which wish to establish a physical presence on the Island, rather than rely on the traditional agency services. There are currently 20 banks or banks combined with statutory offices here, with the prospects of two or three coming shortly [illegible]. While we personally encourage local, since it is generally through the development, the depth of local services and expertise, that the financial market will continue to grow. Naturally such developments provide an impetus to the local economy through additional employment, rentals and capital expenditures etc. although, as regards employment, it must be accepted that the majority of the newly-established institutions will tend to rely, initially at least, on expatriate management. Nevertheless, at the end of 1992, the latest date for which figures are presently available, [illegible] of the 870 persons directly employed in the banking sector were Guyanese. On the same year, total expenditure in Guyana by the banks and trust companies totalled G$42 million, of which G$16.6 million were accounted for by income from, the remainder by salaries, rentals, [illegible] and general operating costs. During 1992, following the decrease in income tax announced in my last Budget Address, [illegible] paid in Government totalled G$8.5 million.

(iii) Agricultural and Industrial Development Bank

The Agricultural and Industrial Development Bank continues to provide much assistance to the small business operators in the agricultural and industrial sectors of the economy. The demand for loans in these two sectors increased steadily, with a total of G$113,000 disbursed in 1992, increasing the total loans outstanding at year end to G$280,000. As applicable funds in the two sections are almost exhausted, any loans of which are now being obtained from the Caribbean Development Bank.

With the rehabilitation of [illegible] of the present clientele, the Statutory Board, AID has recommenced to the Portfolio of Finance and Development.

(iv) Guyana Defence Currency Board

The total assets of the Guyana Defence Currency Board as at 31st December, 1992 were G$19.9 million. The Currency Board continues to perform the important function of the issue and redemption of Guyana Defence notes and coins. As at 31st December, 1992, currency in circulation stood at G$19 million. Additional notes released and subsequently destroyed in 1992 amounted to G$25.6 million.

The Board's funds are held primarily in the form of US Treasury bills and fixed deposits both with local banks and joint banks overseas. As at 31st December, 1992 Treasury Bonds amounted to G$7.4 million, and fixed deposits

NEW INCORPORATIONS (CONTINUED): Close of year position.

Although no corporate entity has ceased in 1984, the Cayman Islands Register has gained four 1983-and one 1982 registrations by subscribers only (no locations).

In 1984, the Board terminated 57 of the 1982 and 1983 entities in the Government's General Revenue.

(iii) Continuous Modernization

As in previous years, Companies, Shipping, Records and Trade Marks continued to be the most important areas of the Registry, both in terms of work in the office and in monetary returns.

For the period 1st January to 31st December, 1984, our Bankers had handled well nearly four (3,844) new companies incorporated in the Cayman Islands, generating $768,800 additional income in comparison with the previous year and eighty-four (1,164) new companies and $232.8 million for the same period in 1983.

An analysis of the new companies incorporated in the Cayman Islands is detailed below:-

Exempt	- 3,152
Ordinary	- 512
Mutual	- 180
	3,844

Jurisdiction

The companies registered in the Cayman Islands are distributed on the Government computer, which enables the Registry easily to recall information to assist in various workings in the office. In addition, the computer is being used to help with companies on the Register, and to follow up the payments due to Government. Pictures of the developments in the company before should show the Register

A statistical summary of the companies registered on the Cayman Register on 31st December, 1984 is as follows:-

	EXEMPT	ORDINARY	MUTUAL	TOTAL
NO. OF COMPANIES ON REGISTER (DECEMBER 1983)	8,780	2,204	418	11,512
NEW REGISTRATIONS 1984	3,151	512	84	3,844
CHANGE STATUS DEC 1984				1,844
NUMBER OF COMPANIES AT 31ST DECEMBER, 1984				17,180

In 1984 we have been advised by the Registrar that the total revenue sum of $12½ million would be collected from company registration, but this amount has not been achieved and the general feeling in the private sector is that there is to be a general levelling off (if not registrations), especially with companies from many developing offshore financial centres and it may not therefore be appropriate to anticipate this general levelling off continuing in all future periods.

(iv) Accounting Firms

Another international accounting firm made the decision to operate in the Cayman Islands in 1984. It is one of the top ten accounting firms in the world. Three additional

[illegible] In the financial sector can only add to the attractiveness and profitability of these islands. Arrangements are envisaged to the smooth functioning of an offshore financial centre and which incentive is direct expenditure is US$1.4 million and by employing 137 staff. Employment from 108 of the staff will be from overseas. Training of 20 local staff is being considered in a variety of ways. Some students are being sponsored for full-time courses leading to qualifications. Others are being involved on the job. These students are due to qualify as follows:

1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
2	4	6	4	4	2

(iii) Company Management

The business of providing the services of Company Management has originated much attention during 1984, with the Companies Management Law 1982 (Law 12 of 1982) being enacted. Government is now in a position to administer this type of business which has caused some concern in the past.

Total employment of these companies is 78 of whom, 54 are Caymanians and direct and indirect expenditure is approximately US$1.5 million.

(iv) Legal Firms

Legal firms employ 106 staff and contribute $1.5 million in direct expenditure to the economy and are approximately 11 cruise ships to the Port Richey. The school, which was established in 1982 at a cost of $60,000, cost $81,710 in 1983.

It is hoped that the legal profession will work hand in hand with Government to keep down the operating costs of the school and assist in its funding.

(v) [illegible]

As foreseen and mentioned in the previous Budget Address, 1984 was a period of consolidation for the Insurance Section of Finance and Development.

At the end of the year, there were 371 'B' Insurance Licensees (including 33 running off) and 58 'A' Class Licensed Insurers.

There are now 154 Caymanian controlled locally in the market, one of whom are Caymanian. The business also includes a large number of employees who work for local companies, legal and banking companies. We have estimated that the offshore insurance market also generate about 2,500 visitors to the Islands each year, many of whom pay to many attractions and itineraries of the companies.

The Insurance industry, world wide, has been undergoing as a loss over the past six or seven years, and these losses have assumed very significant proportions during the last two years.

Less is being seen as the beginning of a turnaround for the market, and it is possible many more Insurers will be promoted in offshore companies during this period. Plans were and Development through the Insurance Section to organise by a Seminar at the end of May to help promote the Islands as a base for Association type Captive Insurance Companies.

Revenue to Government from the issue of Insurance Licenses remains steady at just [illegible] of CI$1 million. Expenses are estimated at $1 for each of this figure.

(24) Tourism (continued):

b) Tourism sector

1984 proved to be another year for the tourist industry in the Cayman Islands, as the best ever for the 1964 recession discovered. Cruise ship arrivals reached the mark of 400,588, up 12.2% over 1983. Air arrivals totalled 166,884, an increase of 13.9% over the previous year, and hotel occupancies have begun to increase again during the year. It is estimated that direct revenues from our visitors amounted for at least $184 million in earnings for our economy.

The re-introduction of Pan Am to the United States will no doubt have a positive affect similar to those Islands. All available indications in North America point to a good year for 1985 and optimum bookings reported by our hotel industry would seem to confirm our predictions.

At the beginning of 1985, the Department commenced the operation of a new computerized hotel reservation system. While fully operational, this system is expected to provide a great assistance to the travel trade in the U.S., by making hotel rooms in the Cayman Islands more available for sale than ever before. This new system, coupled with entirely successful promotional efforts, should provide us with an increase of visitors of over 10% in 1985. This will be a positive achievement, when one considers that almost no new accommodations will be available this year.

The Government of Canada has achieved a new administrative agency and just will shortly be coming a whole new foreign and consular approach in the presentation of our tourist throughout the world. Not only our advertising, but our brochures and sales material will reflect this new approach, and it is expected this will have a positive impact on our marketing effort.

The employed labour force of the Islands, which includes hotels, condominiums and restaurants is 7181 staff with Caymanians representing 68%. The contribution to the economy in the form of direct expenditures is $131.2 million.

Utilizing another formula, the total impact on the economy is $184.2 million, which includes lodging, ground transport, food and beverage, shopping and recreation.

c) Construction Sector

Activity in the Sector was down slightly this year.

The major projects were continuations on Seven Mile Beach, Phase II of Treasure Island Hotel and the Cayman Islands Yacht Club, a handsome building visible, which will serve the recreational mobile unit.

Employment in the Sector of 1407 workers was the contribution to the economy of $1988 million.

The C.I.E.A. held 37 meetings in 1984, an increase of two over 1983. A total of 401 applications were processed, a decrease of 21.1% from 1983. Applications for major developments totalled 38%, which represents a decrease of 7.3% from 1983. Minor developments were down 19% from 1983. Revenue generated by applications was up 15% over 1983 to CI$175,381.

The value of fully approved developments dropped from $63 million in 1983 to $41.6 million in 1984 - a decrease of 33.9%. The greatest sector decrease, next to Government was in hotel development (40%); the greatest sector increase was in industrial development (200.0%).

SUB-SECTORAL PROGRAMMES:

(i) Agriculture and Fishing Sector

Projects specialized in the area of agriculture in 1984 were (1) the purchase of mini-rotavator models to open up previously inaccessible land for cultivation; (2) the importation of a number of Jersey cows to improve the quality of herds; (3) the commencement of a new Head of Department of Agriculture; (4) the arranging of delegations to the Royal Agricultural Show in England who the Florida State Fair to provide modern farming techniques and equipment on well as valuable data on swine husbandry and (5) securing the services of Agricultural Consultants from Jamaica to provide advice on banana, avocado pear and mango crops. The thrust of the Government activity envisages to be primarily the importation of certain agricultural products to supplement local production and supply. Progress in this area during 1984 was encouraging, as was the farmers' crop projections for 1985. Local farmer exports to Barbados - 50 thousand avocado pears in 1984, and during 1985, banana harvest peaked at 27,500 pounds per week. Sweet Potato has currently supplies 90% of the local demand, producing an average of 10 - 12 thousand pounds per month, valued at over $2,000 here. Another farmer currently supplies pineapples, tomatoes, thyme, bananas and other produce to local supermarkets. The factory in Savannah employed 600 persons of hardy to the local market.

The Department and the Agricultural Society assist farmers in finding local outlets for their produce by advising the supermarkets as to the harvest dates and quantities available, negotiating the various crops given local markets in general co-operate exactly in buying higher grade products.

The Department of Agriculture also works closely with the Agricultural Society, the activity encouraging and assisting local farmers in crop production. To this end, both the Lower Valley Farm and the South Coast station will be developed as experimental bases, to test plant varieties, fertilizers, etc. Successful plants will then be recommended to private farms for larger scale implementation. Farmers can be assured that it is the Government's policy to provide both them in the production and marketing of their products, but wishes to support private production and stimulate new ventures.

In 1985, 210 Dutchrabbit animals were imported and stamped by the Department to ensure that meat quality for marketplace was obtained. The cattle dip at Lower Valley was repaired and 805 tons of cattle feed was imported and resold to farmers.

The Department undertook a farm and cattle census, which revealed that there are over 350 active farmers and 8,500 head of cattle on the Island. Imports consisting of plant and animal importation was strengthened. 2,000 watermelon plants and 784 private plants have imported and 18 boats. During 1985, it was necessary to impose a ban on the importation of all commercial animals due to a cattle outbreak in Jamaica. The Department's strictions applied in this matter was not on other countries, as a cattle outbreak on the Island would have been disastrous for both the product and the human population.

It is hoped that, in 1986, more cattle farmers will take advantage of the certificate incentive scheme to improve the genetic make-up of their animals. Cows from Barbados, Trinidad, Guiana, New York, Montserrat and Nigeria to be stock. It is proposed to build sculpture to farmers' interest, a seven multipurpose mini. The construction of a cattle

BOT.C./Overseas (continued): did not materialise and will not be included in the capital works for 1982.

Detailed meetings involving the Department, the Agricultural Society and farmers were initiated in August of last year, and these will be extended as soon as possible to discussion and the dissemination of information. The Department has developed a close working relationship with the Agricultural Society, which can only improve the climate for agricultural development.

The Mobile Cotton Ginning Equipment is scheduled to be sold in 1982 with private ownership. Last year, many visitors participated at one time in the same as expected. A development such as this is quite beneficial to the 88 planter base elsewhere.

The study was completed, with Government approximately 80% and expenditure of $25.4 million to the economy.

c/ Transport and Communication Sector:

(i) Cayman Airways Ltd.

The Airline maintained operations to the existing routes to Honduras, Kingston, Grand Turk and Providenciales and Miami and has agreed with Cayman Brac to the Grand Cayman/Miami flights twice a week.

Although it may not be an economic freight proposition, the extension of Cayman Brac, as a tourist destination, will be much improved and it will play the dual role of Cayman as the gateway points for rapid economic development.

The Airline Society has met with some years as it proved quite successful to residents and operators. The fleet is now comprised of 2 Twin Otter 200's and the following:

The Cayman Airways Board is continuing with issues of the airline, with the view to carrying costs.

Total employment is 100 persons and the contribution to the economy is $12.5 million.

(ii) Cable and Wireless (W.I.) Ltd.

The Telecommunications Sector dealing, between the Cayman Islands, United States, United Kingdom, Canada, the Caribbean and other European countries has recently a great enhancement in broadening business in the Islands, and the efficiency of the service to quick completions recently noted.

Provision of civil servants to maintain such objectives, as to carry services and providing customer training, which is now involving local technicians and on the job training.

The Company employs a staff of 112 and contributes $7.3 million to the economy.

d) Electricity, Water and Fire Services:

Caribbean Utilities Company, Ltd. continues its efficient investment of electricity in these Islands and has added more generating capacities during the year.

The Company's difficulties and future prospects of keeping pace with the demand for electricity is commendable.

Now I.C.Berrigan(continuing): Cayman Action Company has experienced a cyclone every year with breakdowns to equipment, but all things being equal, it was possible to meet the demand of the customers since Hurricane Mike Dutch. Production of water is 600,000 gallons per day and anticipated to increase by 600,000 gallons per day in March, 1985. The ability to issue the permit depends on the Environmental Health Organization approval.

A survey of the Companies who performed the services listed above, namely that 110 staff are employed, with a $2.4 million contribution to the economy.

g) Local Services

Mr.Speaker, last year I referred to the need for increases which occur to the tourist, capital improvements and duty free shops, to re-examine their opening hours by opening on Friday later and closing one hours later. This will not only offer more convenient service to the tourist and general public, but can help create more employment.

I am pleased that many have examined the suggestion and changed their daily opening hours.

Additionally, they are estimated to employ 200 staff and contribute $20.0 million to our economy.

h) Government Sector

(a) Internal and External Affairs

(i) Immigration

Persons admitted during 1984, reflected a substantial increase over 1983. The 1984 annual revenue for permit application fees, work and business licences and local company licences totalled $1,225,310. Issued 1084 permits for these licences in $1,017,017 - a 50.3% increase over 1983.

It is perhaps not widely known that the Department of Immigration issues visas for some Commonwealth Countries under bilateral agreements, as well as visas for people to return to the Cayman Islands. Figures for the issue of these amounted to approximately 825,250 in 1984. Although this is not a substantial sum, it is increasingly significantly each year.

In addition to revenue, the Department has received, approximately $1.5 million by way of work permits, as financial recognition against repatriation costs, on handling the processing of various applications.

Although the Department of Immigration is moving on increasing localization to Government Services, the basis is very much dependent upon the employment situation in these Islands from year to year and the availability of Caymanians. The change that forms of the new Caymanian Proclamation has revised during 1985, will eliminate a fee for the grant of permanent residence thereby to the spouses of Caymanians thereby having a slight impact on future revenue. However, this quite rightly establishes fair play for the people who

(iii) Police

In previous years, the Police Department plans concentrated on the more physical aspects, such as the provision of police accommodation, including the new Traffic and Licensing Offices, the new Police Station at Jubilee Road and the re-equipping of the Marine and Traffic Departments. With these tasks now in hand, it was possible in 1984 to commence a major phase of in-house and on the job training.

To this end a number of senior and experienced N.C.O.'s/Crews, with skills in specific areas, have recruited in 1983 and a number of sergeants are being recruited on 12 month contracts in 1984. These officers are providing on the job training in CID, Traffic, Scenes of Crime, Administration and Marine policing. Key systems are underway in all these areas are being carefully developed, and as the contractees learn on a phased basis, local officers will assume wider responsibilities as more posts are completed. The main objectives of the force are aimed in this, to allow for a better promotion pyramid, thus enabling long term career development. In the last few months of 1983, 20 local officers were promoted to senior and other supervisory posts, on the first step towards these localisation plans, and this programme, designed to simultaneously improve professional standards and develop the services of local officers, will continue.

In 1983 the Criminal Investigation Department was again successful in combating the growth of serious crime and thereby, the number of crimes reported to the police dropped by 6 against the 1982 totals. The number of drug cases dealt with by the police also dropped during 1983.

Despite a considerable increase in the number of vehicles on the roads in 1984, the number of accidents was less, and the safety of the Traffic Department remains directed towards accident prevention.

(xiv) Personnel

During 1984, there was a slight increase to 1,250 in establishment posts in the Civil Service, and personal emoluments expenditure rose to $20,788,870. This was due to the increase in salaries awarded by the 1984 Review. The cost of providing locally pensions also increased in 1984 to $198,854. We consider it to attract to improve the skills and qualifications of serving officers.

The purchase of the Town Building in 1983 alleviated the overcrowded conditions at the Government Administration Building. Departments now in the Tower are: Social Services, Planning, Police Administration, Pensions, Training Unit, Government Information Services, Law Council, Meteorological and Environmental Health. Those scheduled to move shortly are: Customs, Trading and Excise Branch (Lands and Survey, Department of Commerce and Industries Centre. In the meantime such as this is eventually possible, refurbishment and other office services to make the adjustments functional.

With the accommodation of all departments, it is hoped that the rate of the service will not increase very much in 1985.

(xv) Broadcasting

Radio Cayman's revenue collection has exceeded the expenditure of the station for the last three years, which 1983 realised earnings of $181,000 and expenditure of $308,000. The station provides a good quality broadcast service for 24 hours each day with programmes designed for the entertainment, enjoyment and educational needs of

MOS.T.C.[illegible] the Islands' currency. It opened with a total capitony of 15, 73 of whom are Caymanians.

The first phase of a new air transport system, designed to give full EC coverage to the Lesser Islands, will be established later this year.

(b) Finance and Development

(i) Registry of Shipping

Ship registration in the Cayman Islands showed an unusual increase with 109 vessels being registered in 1985, in comparison with the registration of 207 ships in 1984. Revenue derived from ship registration in 1985 amounted to CI$198,000 in comparison with CI$181,000 for 1984.

The banking registers, although experiencing great activity, produced very modest revenue which is primarily due to the flat fees charged on these registers and many would, no doubt, be to the view of Government that these registers are more lucrative than revenue orientated.

(ii) Savings and Expenditure

1985 for the purposes of a general election year, 1984 is viewed as a reasonably successful fiscal year.

It began with a balanced budget of $82.2 million comprised of $62.8 million in recurrent spending, $11.7 million in locally financed capital spending and $6.9 million in loan financing of capital projects. The revised financial position includes $87.1 million total recurrent and capital expenditure, which includes $7.6 million in capital loan funds. In fiscal 1984 expenditure, $4.4 million, was above General Revenue, $1.5 million approved in the 1985 Budget, $1.6 million to reimburse Current Account with Imprest and $267,000 to fund Cayman Airways, which also appeared on an advance account.

The surplus of $1,000,995, as at 1st January, 1985 was also utilized, and is reflected that the current and with a deficit of $258,537. The revised figures for 1984 may be summarized as follows:

Balance at the beginning of the year		$1,000,995
Revenue Local	- $62,821,589	
Loans	- $ 2,656,074	
Less Expenditure: Recurrent	- $66,506,280	
Capital:		
(i) Local	- $10,090,702	
(ii) Loans	- $ 7,642,924	
Estimated balance at 31st Dec.1984		($258,537)

(iii) Public Debt

The Public Debt stood at $8.1 million at the beginning of the year under review. It was increased by a loan for the Lower Building of $1.8 million and further drew down on the Caribbean Development Bank loan for the Owen Roberts Airport Terminal Building of $3.8 million. Repayments during the year were $10.7 million resulting in a net-total of $16.3 million. An in depth analysis of all loan agreements and repayments indicates that, in the last ten years, when the Local Sterling has been on a decline, those loans guaranteed by the whole of the 1970's conversion rate from Pound Sterling to Cayman Dollars.

(iii) Tax Administration: While the time overlap between the Inland Revenue and Customs Islands is close to one of the criticisms made, the total Public Debt at 31st December, 1984, is $[illegible] million, which excludes the Development Loans.

Most Commercial Banks subscribed to the Grand Cayman Development Bank, one Bank Guarantee $3.6 million, Agricultural and Industrial Development Bank $6.7 million, and has made mortgage loans of $9.1 million, resulting in a total of $19.6 million.

To these arrangements, such as Bank Guarantees, Governments have the back and to subsidized by Bank Guarantees.

(iv) General Reserve

The position at 31st January, 1985, was $19.1 million, interest received shows the same up $1.5 million and an excess distributed, $1.6 million was transferred to general taxpayers to said specific commitments during the year. At year end, the balance was $17.2 million. For the Cayman Islands Loan, the Commercial Secretary has negotiated to Barclays Bank Plc. Legal discussion pursuant with the Bank will not be terminated.

(v) Customs

1984, was a special year for the Customs Department. It is likely that more concessions are being given the exact year have the made during any other period in the history of the Department.

Through the operation of the Statute Revocation Committee, the Customs and Investment Department obtained the concessions of a Customs Training Officer, for the first four months of 1985, with a view to strengthening the effectiveness of the system.

The establishment of customs Control as improvement part of the Advisory function. A four week course for junior officers was held from 21st January to 15th February and completed satisfactorily. All students attended the pass mark in both theoretical and practical examinations, the majority doing well indeed.

A four week management course for senior officers was held from 25th February to 22nd March, and three students came equally successful.

The courses were followed by a series of seminars covering the Collector, Deputy Collector and Assistant Collectors.

One of the Department's Assistant Collectors, Mr. D.S. Lowery, attended a twelve week course in the United Kingdom on Customs Enforcement, devised jointly by the United Nations and Cross Border. The United Kingdom Customs Administration played a major role in the training given on this course.

Action has taken to fully implement the Law relating to Customs Officers and to seriously tighten security in importation. The System can now prevent to investigate the power of arrest and to detain any person found to be in possession of smuggled goods. The Department assumes responsibility for the investigation of the car drug cases and several successful prosecutions have been undertaken.

HOF, P.C. Extension (continued): A Customs Declaration Form, to be completed by all passengers on flights to the Cayman Islands was designed. Collection of revenue from passengers has increased by 22% since its introduction.

The signing of the Cayman Baggage at the Owen Roberts Airport Terminal was re-negotiated and provides increased, in real dollar terms for the Cayman Islands and provides clearance for checking passengers.

The efficiency of the Department is much improved and it is proposed that in the 1982 Budget, provision will be made for an increase in staff complement to provide the necessary man power to cope with the ever increasing demand. Offices are being provided in the Tower Building and should be available in early 1982. While these offices will provide better accommodation, it is hoped that space will be made available at the Bank to accommodate Customs, because to completely operate from the Tower Building may present difficulty.

(vi) Information Systems

All major systems developed for the PDP 11/70 came fully operational during 1981. These included Companies Registration, Trade Statistics, Economic Survey and CIT. Investigation and Control maintenance use of the systems and word processing was implemented in most Government Departments.

Some departments now having the word processor and the installation of small stand alone systems, in addition to Airport Office Bank. Over 75 Government employees were trained in the use of this software in the last year. In addition, the Data Registration Clerk were produced using the word processor, which permitted last minute changes to be made, to ensure the information was as accurate as possible.

Over fifty terminals and printers are installed in various Government departments. As was reported last year, we fully utilized the capacity of our present equipment during 1981. As a result, we were unable to proceed with the development of other major systems. System design and programming of these will be finalized when further computer resources are made available.

Section staff from Information Systems spent three days attending programs for operating the computer facilities. A final examination has been made and, subject to formal approval, an order will be placed, with delivery expected by mid-1982. Additional space has been allocated for the computer room, to accommodate the new equipment and modifications of the space now also for completion prior to the arrival of equipment.

Eighteen were recruited into various Employments, Computer Operators and Data Entry Operator posts for 1981 and it is expected that several Caymanian college graduates will return this year. Advancements have been made in the staffing to accommodate these graduates.

(vii) Legal

During the year 1981, the Attorney General and his professional staff continued to handle an increasing volume of work in the civil, criminal and judicial

[illegible] : Aphorse, some seventy-six (76) boys which have been trained in the Attorney General's Chambers were passed into law by the Legislative Assembly. Included in these were two of the most significant pieces of legislation enacted in recent years, The Corporation Ordinance Law, 1984 and the Narcotic Drugs (Evidence) (United States of America) Law, 1985. The prosecutors' section of Chambers was also busy constantly engaged in Criminal matters in the Summary Court, Small Court and the Court of Appeal. With the coming into force of the U.S./U.K./Cayman Islands Extradition Agreement, the Attorney General is also responsible for the implementation in the Cayman Islands of the terms of the Agreement.

The Law School is now firmly established and the first batch of students have now almost completed the third of the five years. There are presently a total of fourteen students and the graduate assistant assigned for their studies are timetabled to a limited tuition two hours.

(d) Development and Future Directions

After the November, 1984 Elections, the Portfolio's name was changed slightly by replacing the word 'Agriculture' with 'Environment'. This was followed by an increase in its responsibilities but not by an increase in manpower. An Agricultural Development Committee has now been established to advise the Portfolio regarding ways of promoting growth in this sector. It is also planned to bring in a Forestry Officer to assist. Other proposals are that the Conservation Law is to be upgraded and amended, new Conservation personnel for the Department. Generally, agriculture will remain a top priority area.

The National Roads was completed, including the Islands' response mechanism. The National Resources Lab or NRCT was expanded to begin a beaches study, developing contacts long term monitoring of the marine, lagoon and coastal environments. Preliminary studies pursuant were undertaken, to make decisions about the rare plants and plant uses to be removed and taken from the Islands. Also, the upgrading the time of the radio ship Registry's procedures in the Cayman Term Register. The Portfolio also endeavours to monitor the effects of the vessel and, with the assistance of the U.S. Coast Guard and other foreign agencies, the operations proceeded with minimum damage to the marine environment. The well-known gastroenterologist, Dr. D. Gardenhire, visited here in the latter part of 1985, working and collecting samples for the purpose of producing a definitive antomological account of the Cayman Islands from the great amount of data available. In 1986, the Cayman Turtle Farm expanded with additional tanks, in preparation for increasing stock to meet local demand for turtle meat, which is expected to require 2,000 turtles by 1987. The Farm released 2,000 juvenile hawksbill turtles in Cayman waters in 1986. The Portfolio hosted delegations in Washington, D.C. and the Caribbean from the Commission on International Trade in Endangered Species in Brussels, Belgium, where the monitoring programme and enforcement continues to be high for substantial programs in the co-ordinating negotiations for the listings of the Fish in 1986. A programme will be presented at the 6th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES, to be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in April of this year, seeking approval to allow Cayman Turtle Farm to trade with other member countries. The United States has published Notice to allow trade in Cayman Turtle Farm's products, if approval is obtained at the

MOSAIC PROTECTION/WILDLIFE: Should Rivers Conference, if the U.S.market can be re-opened, the Cayman Islands will continue production for selected markets and also active investment research and upgrading of the Agency's facilities. The idea was explored, at this time, of the possibility of introducing shrimp culture along with mariculture. Funds for a pilot project, which the purchase of the Turtle Farm, were allocated in 1984. Dr. Cornelius Mook, aquaculturist and consultant, was brought in to advise on the feasibility of the project,produced a favourable report.

Substantial amounts of funds were provided in 1985 for playing fields and community parks in West Bay, East End and North Side, for the new clinic in Cayman Brac and for the water and sewerage projects. Steps to identify public access to the beach along the West Bay Road were started. A jetty was built on South Sound to accommodate the increased boat traffic during summertime. A seismographic station was established at MIRU to monitor and provide data on seismic activities and to add to the pool of data on the whole Caribbean.

The Water Authority will develop in 1986 two major projects, the West and Bodden and the Seven Mile Beach sewerage system. Also in 1985, the Authority in a joint study with Caribbean Utilities Company, Ltd., will examine the possibility of producing potable water from waste heat from the Caribbean Utilities Company, Ltd. plant. This could be another useful source of water.

Other highlights for 1986 include the continued study of a Building Code by a committee recently formed for the purpose. A study to allow foreign ownership for a post office/multi-agency use part in Seven Mile Beach, to relocate the Post Office and replace unsuitable accommodation. The Housing Development Corporation will be reviewing policies, so that the effectiveness and purpose will improve.

(b) Lands and Survey Department

In the Lands Registry, collections for the year 1985 totalled $1,063 thousand, 1984 totalled $1,237 thousand. The transactions used, 2,258 against 2,317 in 1984. The corresponding numbers for instruments of land were 1,362 (1985) and 1,386 (1984) and charges against property to secure loans numbered 1,126 in 1984 against 1,205 in 1983. Registry fees for 1984 amounted to nearly CI$98,000 against CI$88,000 in 1983. The value of property transferred (including leaseholds) amounted to CI$17.4 million in 1985 against CI$14.7 million in 1984.

The total amount of stamp duty collected amounted to CI$2.2 million from CI$1.7 million in 1984.

Physical Development under the Development Plan Law, there was a 10 percent upward trend in the number of cases registered, up to 220 in 1985 from 200 in 1984. It should be noted, however, that these figures are substantially below those for the boom years of 1982 and 1983 when 327 and 320 cases were registered respectively.

In the Survey and Mapping Office, the number of title boundary determinations was down in 1984, being 101 against 126 in 1983, but more work for Government was carried out than before. Computerization of work and checking of surveys submitted by private surveyors for registration continued to improve under the direction of the Chief Surveyor. A joint control was fixed for 1986 as a datum link from the

(ii) U.K. Hydrographic Office: Headquarters at Taunton.

In the Drawing Office, work followed steadily. In the early part of the year, a hydrographic cutback from the United Kingdom was accommodated so that the organisation of the Drawing Office and reproduction rooms were made as to staff, and new equipment required. In November, a Senior Technical Assistant from the Drawing Office was sent to the United Kingdom for a 6-month course in Cartography and drawing techniques.

The increase in IBUS from Norway and Denmark was much the same as for 1981, being approximately £250,000 against £190,000 in 1982.

The Department is due to relocate to the Lower Building in early 1984.

(iii) Hydrographic Research and Control Unit:

During 1983, as were evidenced by the death of Dr. M.J.B.Baldwin, Mr. Kendall the visit and directed to subsequently for 29 years. By the middle of the year, Mr. Ward had a new Director and other new staff, including the Queenstown electronic engineer, two new Technical Research Assistants and a Marine Biologist to head the Natural Resources Unit.

Overall, acoustic detections were lower in 1983 than any other year since records began in 1966. However, the main past species, the Sperm Whale Physeter, were more numerous than in 1982 and were seen from aircraft in more areas, particularly Norway Deep, Hatton and Rockall. There was a good sampling coverage for the whole right whale and underwater recordings, and most of the main army activity for most of the year. The previously recorded maximum was 261 groups for June 1981, but this is a minimum total capacity than the main playback. The Hebrides Basin-Lewis, where fishes were observed by the engines and Lewis. It was suspended in the United States of America and completed back at the end of November.

To summarise for the Ministry Aircraft, the schools received by engineers carried out are approx - twice as many as in 1982.

Physical research did not extend in 1983, no new ships were built. In the areas of chemical control, following the successful testing of Glutaraldehyde in 1982, the trade is now using this recommended preservative, in place of the very similar but more expensive Glyoxylate. Tests in 1983 and 1984, with the new Biological Processing Unit, were successful enough to warrant the publication of large amounts, to enable large scale testing in 1985.

The complex acoustic propagation problems of the Mediterranean areas of the United were considered in the course of the year, during which a total of 7,683 hours recording were made. A helium diver acoustic detection was used; during the fourth survey in the Bay Ship Bay area one was identified. Four dimensional to permanent modification combined, with 365 hours and 2,113 minutes noise signal during the year.

In the United Islands, Hydrographic Research and Control Unit staff accompanied to Aberdeen Local Director, seven full days Marine Mammal Observers were done of Local Authority. The team necessarily 172 Passing Flights in Daytime Time and 166 on Night Observ-

NOW I.S.SERVICES(INVING): and many not a complete training programme.

(iii) Housing Development Corporation

The Government agency recently changed portfolios and a new board was appointed for 1984. Policies of the Corporation have currently taken review.

Last year, a total of 42 loan applications were received, 11 of which were approved, amounting $788,000.

The two principles of the Corporation are financed by a combination of debentures issue and Government loans. Debentures are the major source of funds, the amount of Government loans being approximately $132,000.

(iv) Planning

A new Head of Department was appointed in early 1984, and recently, the Department has relocated to the Town Building. The Cayman office assisted to the Government Info in 1983 to prepare a program to physical planning, and a United Nations Volunteer.

The revision of the Development Plan 1977 was completed in 1983. The Lands Subdivision Permit introduced. Three amendments to the zoning map and three new zones have been included. This revised is expected to be presented to the Legislative Assembly in early 1985, for its review and approval.

A comprehensive review of the Development and Planning Regulations, 1977 is planned for 1985, to make them more effective. The newly formed Building Code Committee has given the responsibility of studying the adoption of a building code and some recommendations as to the type and content of such a code for the Cayman Islands will be made this year.

(v) Water Authority

During 1984, the Water Authority continued to pursue the long term goal of developing a public water supply and wastewater system.

Total government expenditure during 1983 was CI$188,747 which a capital expenditure of CI$187,341. Revenue for the year was CI$98,956.

1983 saw the first twelve months of continuous operation of the Water Filling Installation, with approximately 19,950,000 gallons of water being sold.

During the last two months of the year, the well field was operating at maximum capacity and was unable to satisfy demand. The high demand was caused by the inability of the Cayman Water Company to supply water to the industry. Water produced at Lower Valley was restricted during the latter part of the year.

Work on the initial well-field development, treatment works and reservoir at East End commenced in 1984. This project, which will produce approximately 300,000 gallons a day, was 80% complete by year end and is expected to be operational by mid-March, 1985. The cost of these works is expected to be less than CI$800,000.

The Authority continued to operate the water reticulation distribution system, with the installation of several pressure gauges on the lower

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT: Valley and East End Towns. Investigations into the extent of the dump problem, with the existing or suspected pollution and data produced indicated that the issue is a very visible source of threat which will probably produce more action than was initially expected.

During 1988, progress was made on the development of the West Bay Road sewerage. A decision was made in June on the location of the site for the sewerage treatment works. Much basic design data had to be collected and analysed, a task which was more difficult than first anticipated. A technical report on the project is nearing completion.

Negotiations took place with the Caribbean Development Bank and, based on a preliminary estimate of approximately US$10.0 million to complete the projects, a loan of US$7.0 million was approved by the Bank. A programme to complete the project by the end of 1991 has been implemented, which involves five phased project preparation and construction. The progress of this project has been much advanced by the arrival of Mr. Ivan Burton, a Digital Mapping expert. Government has also provided three other posts to work on this sewerage project.

The Authority continued to be assisted by the United Nations Caribbean Natural Resources and Development Project. The Authority participates on a joint cost sharing basis. During 1988, the contribution was CI$12,000, for which it received the services of two Associate Experts and some short term consultancy assistance.

It continued to co-operate with the Public Health Department in carrying out solid waste sampling programmes in George Town, Prospect Valley, East End and Cayman Brac. These programmes are ongoing and are carried out in each area at fortnightly intervals.

The Authority also continued to satisfy the statutory obligations in respect of the approval of sanitary facilities provided in new developments. It is hoped that, in 1989, these procedures will be computerised.

Among other staff changes, two young Caymanians joined the Authority, one as Trainee Lab Technician and the other as Trainee Draughtsperson.

Investigations into the use of Caribbean Utilities Company Ltd.'s waste heat to distill water and provide a supply to George Town is planned. The Authority is conscious of the lack of any alternative supply in Cayman Brac and it anticipates start in 1989, plans can be formulated to provide a service similar to that in Lower Valley, providing at least an emergency supply.

With respect to sewerage, the West Bay Road project will continue with an anticipated start of construction towards the end of the year.

(e) Health, Education and Social Services

(i) Health

The total expenditure on the Health Services in 1988 amounted to nearly $16 million. Of this amount, capital expenditure came to about half a million dollars. This was considerably less than expected, mainly because the new kitchen and meeting room facilities, mentioned in last year's address, was not yet fully completed. It is scheduled for completion this year. The dental clinic

[illegible] was presented and a sum for the dental service and purchase of two units [illegible] children [illegible] Grand Cayman. A dental clinic was established and equipped at East End."

The provision of a dental unit greatly improved facilities in the environmental health field. Less than anticipated was spent on medical equipment about $12,000, rather than $18,000, but the acquisition of an attachment to the previously donated operating microscope extended its use from ophthalmic to other specialties and reduced the need for overseas referrals in such conditions. Otolaryngology, urology and dermatology. The end of the year saw the Radiography Department at Grand Cayman and the new equipment, costing $5,931, enabling electrocardiograms and X-rays requiring the expertise of a specialist for interpretation to be transmitted to the United States of America for an immediate reading of the photos sent. As part of the X-ray machine, a modern fluoroscopic image intensifier and photocell was also purchased. This machine was installed in 1981. The recurrent expenditure for the X-ray Department - about $24,350 - was less than expected. It is hardly surprising that, by acquiring 7 additional examination tables, three mobile units of equipment and two persons in all sections of Grand Cayman [illegible] Staff Nurse at the Hospital.

During 1984, preliminary steps were taken to deal with the problem of patients' accounts that remain outstanding. These accounts have been entered into the Government computer system for the years from 1980 to 1983 inclusive. This action has produced knowledgeable data the same and has reduced the backlog of approximately 5,580 letters requesting payments. Given this help, along with better registration procedures and clearer policies with regard to Legal Assistance fees, further action is required, perhaps in 1985 should be given and the number of outstanding accounts fewer.

Recurrent expenditure is much the largest element in the health Services budget. In 1984, it exceeded $5 million. Of this sum, the largest single item was personal emoluments, over $3,700,000. Two Medical Officers were appointed by Junior Medical Officers in recognition of the doctors' expertise. Retirements and the length of Government service.

Three additional Staff Nurses and a Public Health Nurse were appointed and these, with several minor additions, increased the call to an increase in Health Services staff of only seven persons.

Given that all Government doctors carry out general medical duties, as well as fulfil their specialities, their number is kept about right. A second full-time Medical Officer was appointed in Cayman Brac.

Supplies constituted the next largest element in recurrent expenditure, over $700,000. Of that figure, about $220,000 was for drugs. The increase would go in the drugs bill is a constant source of anxiety. I have had talks of this situation many times with the Chief Medical Officer to encourage all medical staff to prescribe cheaper substitutes of the more expensive drugs; revision of a part of the written Internal Formulary so much doctors now have helpful to that

MOH,T,U:CCCC

MULTI-DISCIPLINARY CONSULTATIONS: Hospital medical staff have access to general medicine and also to the specialized fields of obstetrics and gynaecology, dentistry, ear-nose-and-throat diseases, tuberculosis, physiotherapy, child care, family health services, occupational problems and mentally retarded children.

Consultations at Hospital fields were permanently provided by individuals and teaching organizations and included ophthalmic care. Psychiatric services and problems were specialized by the Mental Clinic, and a clinic by Dr. D. Stein on respect of neuro-psychiatric conditions was sponsored by Schools.

The Government expenditure budget includes one item for 'drugs and dispensing'. For the first time a major offensive has been launched on this front, and the programme has been kept in mind including the replenishable warehouse. A workshop was held in June 1974 on the Uganda National Essential Drugs Programme sponsored by the Government and WHO/UNDP. Apart of the workshop, a Council on Mental Illness was established under the chairmanship of the Principal Secretary, Health, Education and Social Services with the Chief Medical Officer and also senior representatives from the Ministry, and Private Practice Organizations. Subcommittees were established under the chairmanship of Principal Administrators - one to study both psychiatric services and the other with drugs and dispensing. Representatives of service clubs and churches in the community were appointed to the two subcommittees to advise on the matters to be taken and to coordinate efforts. Expenditure on 'drugs and dispensing' in 1974 was less than Shs.800,000, mainly because a replenishable revolving account, on the programme had not yet been established. Shs.2,000,000 had been budgeted. The place of this should see the new policy-making developed in the drug and pharmaceutical fields and WHO in particular care.

The Primary Health Care programme for last year was also budgeted. However, the most key Primary facilities were expanded and doctors' visits increased to twice a week. A contractual midwife was employed for community health work.

The Public Health division was closely concerned with assessing the facilities provided in the district plans. The revised third procedure dispensary programme was executed in 1974 in association with Rotary. Three more 500 income was provided throughout of the facility. Special clinics, or maternity wards were established in Gulu Lira Hospital for the outpatient treatment of these conditions. In association with the Gulu Lodwar Medical and Social Society, a Breast Cancer Detection Week and a second Colon Cancer Screening Week were organized. The incidence of mentally retarded children in 1974 has given rise to concern, and the Child Medical Officer has arranged with the society to produce an educational programme in this field early in 1975. It is also worth mentioning that tetanus clinics were revived in 1974.

As appropriate in a Health Service budget, we come to the view of the Ministry, the finances and funding of the Gulu Medical Store are well known to all. In December, however, a 10 bedded maternity unit was established there in an extended part of Gulu Main Hospital. It is intended to maintain provisions of the acute bed shortage in the Hospital and provide accommodation for long-stay patients, plans as well as did, which in why to have been active, not a pandemic work with many unhappy endorsements, but in Rehabilitation Care Units. Work is going to be found in the place about of this long-awaited, much-needed accommodation.

MR. P.C. JEREMIAH (continuing):

(vii) Education

Personnel emoluments, approximately $8 million, account for 72% of the total expenditure on education. This is the level of expenditure on teachers, for the private schools, the problem of staff salaries is one of the most difficult situations they have to face. Fortunately, for many years, staff are motivated by factors of dedication rather than financial reward and this is what helps schools survive. Between 1981 and 1984, Government has allocated $50,000 per annum to the 2 graduate schools established on a pay-as-you-earn basis. The contribution of the private schools should not be underrated, because they provide schooling for more than 1,800 pupils, approximately 10% of the total school population of 2,284.

During the course of the last academic year, the missing units in the secondary schools were provided. The Middle School numbers rose to 814 and the High School to 883. Additional places in the experimental Junior (8) in the Cayman Islands Middle School and 100 in the Cayman Islands High School), it could be in 'scenario' and the unexpected digits that the public education system was probably occasioned by staffing problems because of a parents patron and the phasing out of the secondary system by another. It becomes increasingly clear that Government must consistently monitor the situation and be aware of the present expenditure of resources, any reasonable shift will have most serious consequences upon the government policies which cannot be presently envisaged, should they have them for normal development. Of particular concern is that building will in the Sister High School is 317 from 120 pins. This will necessitate a redeployment of staff before construction practice in unsatisfactory levels.

The total recurring costs are as follows:

Type of School	Population	Recurrent Expenditure, 1985	Annual cost Per pupil
Primary Schools (Grand Cayman)	950	$1,618,852	$1,427.4
Primary Schools (Sister Islands)	157	$ 782,309	$1,610.5
Secondary (CIHS)	858	$1,205,185	$2,290.6
	356	$ 435,720	$2,778.2
	814	$1,105,179	$1,358.4

A number of Members expressed the opinion that the continuing costs of implementation which presently amounts to $1/2 million per annum. One has to accept the commitment of recurring expenditure to the schools, but one questions whether additional expenditure by Government into a computerized system may not be

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (CONTINUED): more beneficial on the long run and form the basis of a sciences-thinking nation.

At Cayenne Jalousie High School, the Department has concentrated on consolidation, but now the time has come to increase the output also from facilities which still consist of modifications to the former administrative offices, which themselves were modifications of a canteen.

It would seem that a double storey block on the top side of the playground, adjacent to the Catholic School, would be an appropriate site. It is planned that the building include - music teaching rooms, a study hall, a reference, a library room and appropriate changing and ablutions. It is intended however by the teaching staff.

Further, it would be appropriate to build one small dorm room for the Nursery group, for which facilities are required; presently, only one of the two 'nursery' groups has a creative-play room.

At the Middle School, improvement in 1986 has been on the waste ground and the labour-force. With the balance of funds, the foundations for a multi-purpose hall were laid. It is hoped that this will be completed during the early part of 1987. It remains for a library to be built to replace the existing classrooms which have been adapted. The 'prefabs', in their present state, are unsuitable as classrooms, and it is hoped that various adaptations will be effected so that they may serve as canteens in the poorer areas of the world. At present, the spaces are unsuitable, but the vagaries of the weather have rendered their effectiveness questionable.

The earthquake in work in the Salem Secondary School is still outstanding. Quite clearly, this problem is one to which we should address ourselves and this is done by offering primarily administrative to those teaching subjects, and by establishing 'workshops' to upgrade teaching skills. The estimate given for this project which is known as Special Education, and includes the Learning Centre, including the services of the Department's trades. The workshops were staffed by United States personnel from various educational establishments in Florida.

Projects funding for 1987:

(i)	Workshops	$ 90,000
(ii)	Special Education	65,000
(iii)	Training of Teachers	80,000
		$371,700

The Teachers' Centre, which is presently being constructed, will be attached to the Youth Building.

(iii) Social Services

Changes with the new appointment of Social Services in 1986.

There are three departments, one being a Deputy Director's post, allowing for a greater emphasis on the administration work of the Department and thereby a strengthening of the infrastructure.

The role of the Department has heightened considerably with the relocation to the Assembly premises.

MR. SPEAKER (HAMILTON): Queen Building on North Church Street, where many of you have taken your undergraduate and graduate work with us.

Queen's University has announced, recently, a most important fund-raising effort in support of its many different types of activity, from student aid to new chairs to all people. This system has also given the total number of students using the Department's services and will allow for more comprehensive planning in 1985. Also in discussions on activity as well as programming.

It also continues on their work, Speaker Harry Hotzel for a point [illegible] Lou Jacobs Housing Scheme. This Scheme would allow the Department to [illegible] some of their housing needs and to this end, one unit was completed in 1984. It is worthy to note that 1984's overall budgetary figure shows a 6% increase over 1983, particularly in the provision of [illegible] services to the public.

As we look forward to 1985, the Department recognizes a clear need for an increase in [illegible] to provide a more comprehensive programme of core work services, specifically in the area of [illegible] and family work.

Additionally, the Department seeks to establish a multi-purpose self help project which will, among other things, increase the skill level of many of the citizens, thereby placing them in the job market and minimizing their dependency on Government.

(f) Tourism, Aviation and Trade

Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on the subject of tourism and have [illegible] points and other details therefore, I will not be repetitious and move directly to the other departments of the portfolio.

(i) Civil Aviation

To serve adequately users, visitors and the general public, the staff of the Civil Aviation Department will [illegible] for the formation of Weather [illegible] Station for clearer briefing and also for [illegible] Security Officers to come with the Larger Terminal Building coming into operation in 1985.

179 arriving people travelled through Grand Bahama Airport and 5,258 more through the Bernard Heigh Airport than the previous year, recording in 306,385 arrivals and 298,372 departures for Grand Cayman and 17,975 arrivals and 18,499 departures for Cayman Brac.

Income was up from $[illegible] to $2,804,210 and expenditure from $[illegible] to $1,151,449.

In addition to scheduled services provided by Cayman Airways, Executive Airlines and Air Jamaica, the Islands continued to be serviced with chartered flights from the United States and other Caribbean Countries. The new jetty [illegible] by Cayman Airways and Cayman Airways were maintained in December, and a new service on the same basis was also introduced from Chicago.

A charter service has also been authorized for flights between Cuba, Honduras, and Grand Cayman. It commenced in September, 1984 and the services is operated by Leeds [illegible] Aviation, utilizing flight crew employed Airways supplemented by LACSA. In this the first operation by Cayman Airways to Cayman Brac was suspended because of necessary

[illegible] ...weeks restrictions, and it was found necessary to grant permits to local people to enable them to travel to Ireland. The last permits were withdrawn on December, 1984, at which time special permits to Irish hotels were withdrawn.

Executive Air Services maintained their pharmacy/flight medical operations including Aeromaintenance BAi and CAA checks for engineers and test flights for training.

Four Air Traffic Control Assistants attended basic ATC training in November during 1984 and are presently undergoing local on the job training, to qualify for local postings at the Civil Aviation Authority Airports. They will replace experienced staff now filling these posts on successful completion of training.

Total traffic handled increased by 11% to 10,888 with only one aerodrome recorded. On 23rd March, 1984, the Tower Commander, assisted by the Aerodrome Manager and Control Unit, crashed on the Aerodrome after take-off with a flock of wild ducks, but no one was injured.

In December, Arch and Godfrey completed the main contract on the new terminal building and handed over the facility to the Civil Aviation Department. The building and the facilities were formally opened on 25th January, 1985.

During 1984, the Terminal Area Terminal Building was expanded by almost 100% to accommodate peak period traffic of 2000-3000 passengers. A programme of runway rehabilitation was introduced in September to resurface the first 6,000 feet of the runway and in November, the first section was reintroduced between Cayman Brac and Grand Cayman and Miami.

The Meteorological Recording Systems were installed during 1984, one at each aerodrome. Every three hours Meteorologists and Air Traffic Controllers watch weather data for dissemination to aeronautical personnel.

It was a good year for civil aviation and will undoubtedly be recorded in history as a significant step forward.

(iii) Fire Service

The year 1984 saw a 29.42% increase in the number of calls for assistance received and attended by the Fire Service. The Department carried out to a total of 222 calls.

Fire personnel in multi-storey office buildings, condominiums, restaurants and other establishments premises. Thankfully, these incidents were brought under control quickly, thereby minimizing damage.

The Department also received a number of persons from unmanned vehicles and assisted the Hospital Ambulance Service when requested.

I am pleased to report that there were no fire related fatalities or major injuries.

Fire Prevention officers have a major part of the service provided by the Brigade and during the year, all major buildings and high risk installations were inspected.

Training continued to play a major role and in addition to local training programmes, two officers successfully completed a course at Fire Fighting and Prevention Centre in the United Kingdom.

MOR P.C.[illegible] (CONTINUED): A new Airport Crash Tender for Seaforth Strip Airport was commissioned in February 1984 and Kirkby Control Airport received a small Fire Fighting Unit.

The Government's Communication System was expanded by the addition of new radios, a paging system and a 150' tower for the placement of antennas and repeaters.

A new Fire Station was opened at Frank Sound during the latter part of 1984 and is now providing fire cover, on a 24 hour basis, to residents of the outer districts.

(iii) Labour

During 1984, two Labour Offices continued to deal with job placements and the handling of minor labour disputes, which were mostly resolved through meetings organized by the office between the employee and employer.

A recent labour survey was conducted throughout Owen Cayman, and Cayman Brac, by visits to the various districts. This survey, the first of its kind, revealed that as of mid February, 1985, there were 856 persons unemployed, the majority of whom were semi skilled labourers. The Labour Office has since been successful in placing some of these persons. Efforts will continue to be concentrated on making the public more aware of the services offered by the Labour Office in its effort to provide employment for those Caymanians seeking jobs.

(g) Communications, Works and District Administration

(i) Postal Services

In January, 1984 was a modest increase in sixth of the postage rates, which has resulted in an increase of revenue over 1983.

This Government is indeed grateful for the services of Mr. Jimmy Ebanks, who put the Post Office on a sound footing during his 2 years term. On 1st March, 1984, Miss Cynthia Stanley assumed the duties of Postmaster General.

Additional post offices have been established for five of the districts, i.e. Bodden Town, North Side and East End. Additional boxes will be installed on West Bay this year. The new Post Offices at both should be operational in March, 1985.

(ii) District Administration

The past year was a significant one for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman with the economy taking a downturn resulting from the cut back in employment by Cayman Energy. Unemployment and the suspension of jet service by the National Flag Carrier, which resulted in many cancellations at the Islands' hotels and a high degree of unemployment. However, with the reactivation of the Seaford Strip early and the building of a jetty in Little Cayman, much needed employment was created.

Capital Works Programme at a cost of CI$2,828,460 was carried out in the two Sister Islands of which CI$1,?20 and CI$?16,?20 were spent on the Seaford Strip runway and the Little Cayman dock respectively. Other projects were:

ROAD CONSTRUCTION (CONTINUED):

a) resurfacing of two miles of road on the south coast
b) reconstruction of sidewalk at the Creek
c) surveying of the Bluff Road
d) additions to three primary schools and the High School Campus.
e) the installation of street lamps and reconstruction of sidewalk at Point Hospital.
f) completion of the High School Auditorium.

The Ports Authority completed the rehabilitation of lighters at the dock, which now enable ships to work at night, if necessary.

The reconstruction of jetty decayed in late December, 1984, is likely to result in increased traffic to Cayman Brac and stimulate the economy.

(iii) Public Works

The recurrent expenditure of the Department totalled $2.9 million while the 1985 capital works programme included roads, civil engineering and reconstruction of new buildings at a cost of approximately $2.3 million.

Roads

Phased reconstruction was carried out throughout the Island at a cost of approximately $255,000. While no new roads were constructed, there was approximately 12,000 feet of sidewalk reconstructed along Walkers Road and the West Bay Road.

Buildings

Reconstruction on the south wooden building and washing room facilities for the George Town Hospital commenced in May, 1984, and is anticipated for completion in May, 1985. The projected cost is $1,334,000 which includes a staff and outpatient's care block.

Renovations to the Dental and Maternity Clinics commenced and will cost approximately $90,000. The buildings should be completed early this year.

Schools

Several buildings, toilet blocks, and shelters, staff rooms, health rooms, changing rooms, playing fields, and perimeters of four primary schools were completed in 1984, at a cost of $510,000.

The additional classrooms plus other improvements to the Lighthouse School, were completed at a cost of $100,000.

Renovations to the High School assembly hall, library, new administrative units and reconstruction of walkways were carried out at a cost of $181,000.

The addition of a music block, two classes and cafeteria rooms at the Middle School completed in 1984. In addition, construction commenced on a primary building, an assembly hall, theatre and recreation facilities in 1985, at a total cost of $600,000 under $215,400 being spent in 1984.

Work commenced on the Sports and Cultural Complex in 1984. As previous, the parking area is 90% complete and the grass pitch and water systems are 80% complete. The amount expended in 1984 was $190,000.

Construction commenced on the new

ANTIGUA-BARBUDA DEVELOPMENT BANK. Seven Antigua delegates attended Governors' meeting in Barbados on 7th August, 1981, which was hosted by the Caribbean Development Bank. Meeting was chaired by Governor of Antigua-Barbuda Development Bank, Mr. Ivor Allen.

Bank's Annual Report for 1980 was presented by Mr. Allen. Report showed that Bank's loan portfolio had increased by 20% during 1980 to EC$11.5 million. Bank's income had increased by 30% to EC$1.2 million. Bank's net profit was EC$0.5 million.

Governors agreed to increase Bank's authorized capital from EC$20 million to EC$40 million. Governors also agreed to increase Bank's membership to include Canada, Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela.

Governors agreed to establish a Special Development Fund for Caribbean countries. Fund will be used to provide soft loans to countries with low per capita income and limited access to commercial sources of capital.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Project Development Facility to provide technical assistance to countries in preparing project proposals for submission to financing agencies.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Export Development Fund to provide financial assistance to countries in developing exports to extra-regional markets.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Multinational Investment Bank to promote investment in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Centre to provide technical assistance to countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Food Corporation to promote production, processing and marketing of food in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Shipping Association to promote regional shipping services.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Meteorological Institute to provide meteorological services to countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Examinations Council to co-ordinate examinations in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute to co-ordinate agricultural research in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Environmental Health Institute to co-ordinate environmental health programmes in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Disaster Preparedness and Response Office to co-ordinate disaster preparedness and response in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Tourism Organization to promote tourism in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Civil Aviation Authority to co-ordinate civil aviation in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Telecommunications Union to co-ordinate telecommunications in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Postal Union to co-ordinate postal services in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Broadcasting Union to co-ordinate broadcasting in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Press Council to co-ordinate press in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Trade Union Council to co-ordinate trade union activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Employers' Confederation to co-ordinate employers' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Chamber of Commerce to co-ordinate chamber of commerce activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Manufacturers' Association to co-ordinate manufacturers' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Farmers' Association to co-ordinate farmers' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Fishermen's Association to co-ordinate fishermen's activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Women's Association to co-ordinate women's activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Youth Association to co-ordinate youth activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Sports Association to co-ordinate sports activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Cultural Association to co-ordinate cultural activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Scientific Association to co-ordinate scientific activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Technological Association to co-ordinate technological activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Engineering Association to co-ordinate engineering activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Architects' Association to co-ordinate architects' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Lawyers' Association to co-ordinate lawyers' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Doctors' Association to co-ordinate doctors' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Nurses' Association to co-ordinate nurses' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Teachers' Association to co-ordinate teachers' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Librarians' Association to co-ordinate librarians' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Archivists' Association to co-ordinate archivists' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Museums' Association to co-ordinate museums' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Zoos' Association to co-ordinate zoos' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Botanical Gardens' Association to co-ordinate botanical gardens' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Parks' Association to co-ordinate parks' activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Forestry Association to co-ordinate forestry activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Wildlife Association to co-ordinate wildlife activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Environmental Protection Association to co-ordinate environmental protection activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Natural Resources Institute to co-ordinate natural resources activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Energy Association to co-ordinate energy activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Association to co-ordinate water activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Waste Management Association to co-ordinate waste management activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Pollution Control Association to co-ordinate pollution control activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Noise Control Association to co-ordinate noise control activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Air Quality Association to co-ordinate air quality activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Quality Association to co-ordinate water quality activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Soil Conservation Association to co-ordinate soil conservation activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Land Use Association to co-ordinate land use activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Urban Planning Association to co-ordinate urban planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Regional Planning Association to co-ordinate regional planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Development Planning Association to co-ordinate development planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Economic Planning Association to co-ordinate economic planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Social Planning Association to co-ordinate social planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Cultural Planning Association to co-ordinate cultural planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Scientific Planning Association to co-ordinate scientific planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Technological Planning Association to co-ordinate technological planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Engineering Planning Association to co-ordinate engineering planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Architects' Planning Association to co-ordinate architects' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Lawyers' Planning Association to co-ordinate lawyers' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Doctors' Planning Association to co-ordinate doctors' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Nurses' Planning Association to co-ordinate nurses' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Teachers' Planning Association to co-ordinate teachers' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Librarians' Planning Association to co-ordinate librarians' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Archivists' Planning Association to co-ordinate archivists' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Museums' Planning Association to co-ordinate museums' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Zoos' Planning Association to co-ordinate zoos' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Botanical Gardens' Planning Association to co-ordinate botanical gardens' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Parks' Planning Association to co-ordinate parks' planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Forestry Planning Association to co-ordinate forestry planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Wildlife Planning Association to co-ordinate wildlife planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Environmental Protection Planning Association to co-ordinate environmental protection planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Natural Resources Planning Institute to co-ordinate natural resources planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Energy Planning Association to co-ordinate energy planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Planning Association to co-ordinate water planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Waste Management Planning Association to co-ordinate waste management planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Pollution Control Planning Association to co-ordinate pollution control planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Noise Control Planning Association to co-ordinate noise control planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Air Quality Planning Association to co-ordinate air quality planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Quality Planning Association to co-ordinate water quality planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Soil Conservation Planning Association to co-ordinate soil conservation planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Land Use Planning Association to co-ordinate land use planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Urban Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate urban planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Regional Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate regional planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Development Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate development planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Economic Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate economic planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Social Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate social planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Cultural Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate cultural planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Scientific Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate scientific planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Technological Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate technological planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Engineering Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate engineering planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Architects' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate architects' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Lawyers' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate lawyers' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Doctors' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate doctors' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Nurses' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate nurses' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Teachers' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate teachers' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Librarians' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate librarians' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Archivists' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate archivists' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Museums' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate museums' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Zoos' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate zoos' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Botanical Gardens' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate botanical gardens' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Parks' Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate parks' planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Forestry Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate forestry planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Wildlife Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate wildlife planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Environmental Protection Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate environmental protection planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Natural Resources Planning Planning Institute to co-ordinate natural resources planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Energy Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate energy planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Waste Management Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate waste management planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Pollution Control Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate pollution control planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Noise Control Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate noise control planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Air Quality Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate air quality planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Quality Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water quality planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Soil Conservation Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate soil conservation planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Land Use Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate land use planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Urban Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate urban planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Regional Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate regional planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Development Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate development planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Economic Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate economic planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Social Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate social planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Cultural Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate cultural planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Scientific Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate scientific planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Technological Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate technological planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Engineering Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate engineering planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Architects' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate architects' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Lawyers' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate lawyers' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Doctors' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate doctors' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Nurses' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate nurses' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Teachers' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate teachers' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Librarians' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate librarians' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Archivists' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate archivists' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Museums' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate museums' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Zoos' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate zoos' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Botanical Gardens' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate botanical gardens' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Parks' Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate parks' planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Forestry Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate forestry planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Wildlife Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate wildlife planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Environmental Protection Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate environmental protection planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Natural Resources Planning Planning Planning Institute to co-ordinate natural resources planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Energy Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate energy planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Waste Management Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate waste management planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Pollution Control Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate pollution control planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Noise Control Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate noise control planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Air Quality Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate air quality planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Quality Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water quality planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Soil Conservation Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate soil conservation planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Land Use Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate land use planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Urban Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate urban planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Regional Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate regional planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Development Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate development planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Economic Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate economic planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Social Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate social planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Cultural Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate cultural planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Scientific Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate scientific planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Technological Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate technological planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Engineering Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate engineering planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Architects' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate architects' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Lawyers' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate lawyers' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Doctors' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate doctors' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Nurses' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate nurses' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Teachers' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate teachers' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Librarians' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate librarians' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Archivists' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate archivists' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Museums' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate museums' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Zoos' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate zoos' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Botanical Gardens' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate botanical gardens' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Parks' Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate parks' planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Forestry Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate forestry planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Wildlife Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate wildlife planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Environmental Protection Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate environmental protection planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Natural Resources Planning Planning Planning Planning Institute to co-ordinate natural resources planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Energy Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate energy planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Waste Management Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate waste management planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Pollution Control Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate pollution control planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Noise Control Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate noise control planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Air Quality Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate air quality planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Quality Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water quality planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Soil Conservation Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate soil conservation planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Land Use Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate land use planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Urban Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate urban planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Regional Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate regional planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Development Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate development planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Economic Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate economic planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Social Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate social planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Cultural Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate cultural planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Scientific Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate scientific planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Technological Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate technological planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Engineering Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate engineering planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Architects' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate architects' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Lawyers' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate lawyers' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Doctors' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate doctors' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Nurses' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate nurses' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Teachers' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate teachers' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Librarians' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate librarians' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Archivists' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate archivists' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Museums' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate museums' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Zoos' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate zoos' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Botanical Gardens' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate botanical gardens' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Parks' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate parks' planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Forestry Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate forestry planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Wildlife Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate wildlife planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Environmental Protection Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate environmental protection planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Natural Resources Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Institute to co-ordinate natural resources planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Energy Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate energy planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Waste Management Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate waste management planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Pollution Control Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate pollution control planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Noise Control Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate noise control planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Air Quality Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate air quality planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Quality Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water quality planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Soil Conservation Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate soil conservation planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Land Use Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate land use planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Urban Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate urban planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Regional Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate regional planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Development Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate development planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Economic Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate economic planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Social Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate social planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Cultural Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate cultural planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Scientific Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate scientific planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Technological Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate technological planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Engineering Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate engineering planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Architects' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate architects' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Lawyers' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate lawyers' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Doctors' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate doctors' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Nurses' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate nurses' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Teachers' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate teachers' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Librarians' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate librarians' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Archivists' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate archivists' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Museums' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate museums' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Zoos' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate zoos' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Botanical Gardens' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate botanical gardens' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Parks' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate parks' planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Forestry Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate forestry planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Wildlife Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate wildlife planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Environmental Protection Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate environmental protection planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Natural Resources Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Institute to co-ordinate natural resources planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Energy Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate energy planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Waste Management Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate waste management planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Pollution Control Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate pollution control planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Noise Control Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate noise control planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Air Quality Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate air quality planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Water Quality Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate water quality planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Soil Conservation Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate soil conservation planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Land Use Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate land use planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Urban Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate urban planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Regional Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate regional planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Development Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate development planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Economic Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate economic planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Social Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate social planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Cultural Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate cultural planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Scientific Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate scientific planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Technological Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate technological planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Engineering Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate engineering planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Architects' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate architects' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Lawyers' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate lawyers' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Doctors' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate doctors' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Nurses' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate nurses' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Teachers' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate teachers' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Librarians' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate librarians' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Archivists' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate archivists' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Museums' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate museums' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Zoos' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate zoos' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Botanical Gardens' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate botanical gardens' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Parks' Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate parks' planning planning planning planning planning planning planning activities in countries in the region.

Governors agreed to establish a Caribbean Forestry Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Planning Association to co-ordinate forestry planning planning planning planning planning planning planning

USA D.C. PROJECTS/ACTIVITIES): planning of permanent housing for Inuvik shops.

Five flour bins are now being designed by an engineering firm from New Zealand. It is planned to place three bins in Bonne Bay and one in West Bay. The project should be completed before this year.

1982 AND BEYOND

Mr. President, the Scotsman Adam Smith once said 'the only good budget is a balanced one'. Mr. President, among this estimates the 1986 budget is a good one; it is $1986.7 million, an increase of $182.8 million over the approved 1985 Budget.

The operational estimates for 1986 is $650.4 million, an increase of $4.4 million, or 8.1% over the 1985 approved budget which provides a $2.8 million contribution from the General Revenue to enable the funding of ongoing and new capital projects. Non-renewable resources provide $1.6 million and loan funds $2.8 million. Locally raised sums of ordinary revenue for 1986 in relation to the level of expenditure indicated a substantial shortfall. It was at this stage that the question was closely examined in all areas of expenditure to determine where Capital Expenditure and New Revenues could be cut, as well as the introduction of new economic measures.

The estimated ordinary Revenue Expenditure is $564 million, an increase of $37.8 million or 6.8% over the 1985 estimates. Estimated Statutory Expenditure is $41.5 million which includes pensions and repayments of loans and interest. New Revenue proposals total $1,411,000 bringing the total to $564.4 million.

Capital Expenditure is estimated at $8.4 million, comprised of Local financing of $1.5 million and loan funds of $6.9 million. This programme of works covers all major services and development projects, primarily those that are ongoing and affords priority to others. It will include:

a) the Water and Sewerage Project
b) the Corner Brook Airport Terminal
c) the Sports and Cultural Centre and Parks
d) Boat End Wharf Centre
e) School Buildings at Middle School and High School in Grand Falls and in Corner Brook

New Revenues

In previous years, the majority of new revenue measures largely affected the affluent citizens and not pensioners. We should always bear in mind that the Cabinet Colleagues have many competitions with other financial claims and cannot continually continue to increase fees, lest we lose our competitive edge.

The imposition of indirect taxation affecting the general public of these Islands, although viewed as an unpopular matter by most who receive only small to the poor and wealthy, served the Cayman Islands well, as the absence of the more equitable taxes. This is almost unanimous since income tax, is most crucial as offshore financial centre here and is, consequently, responsible for the cultivation and growth of the industry.

This year the local revenue has

Motel Licence

Motel licences have been available since 1974 and 1977.

I will briefly outline the new provisions:

Motel Licence

The Liquor Act of 1975 requires establishments currently to operate on obtain a Hotel licence. The fee, which has been in effect since 1974, is to be between which a minimum of $200.

It is proposed to raise the fee to $10 per bedroom and a minimum of $1200.

Stamp Duty

The purchase of land in an agreement in the Capital Territory has caused Governments some concern for some time, because it is possible that the original purchaser can assign the property many times, before it is finally registered and stamp duty paid. It is therefore that there is a loss of public revenue by this loophole in the law.

It is proposed to acquire an assignments be registered whether a transaction to contract for sale or not.

The cost of a stamp has been $.05 since 1975, and it is now proposed to increase it to $.10.

Liquor Licence

Liquor licensing in Canberra differs from other Territories and a hotel's ability can limit the available from $6,000 - $3,000 depending on the size of the accommodation and the location.

It is proposed to change a flat fee of $195 for each agreement. Perhaps consideration should also be given for the fee to apply at the first transfer of the agreement.

The annual renewal fee for a liquor licence has been unchanged for this type of business for many years. Taking into account the present boundary of certain categories and a liquor licence, the following increases are proposed:

a) Distribution for wholesale from $400 per annum to $2,000 per annum
b) Brewers from $300 per annum to $2,000 per annum
c) Restaurant from $200 per annum to $500 per annum
d) Hotel
   Where each hotel has an increase or less from $400 per annum to $2,000 per annum where each hotel has more than seventy bedrooms from $400 per annum to $2,000 per annum
e) Temporary from which the fee for annual licence is $200 per annum
f) Restaurants from $200 per annum to $750 per annum
g) Wine and beer to $500 per annum
h) Issue of occasional licence from $10 per day to $50 per day

Clubs, as at present, should pay fifty percent of a,b,d and f above.

Charges

The postage box in the third schedule of the Charges Act has been $.10 since 1976, and it is now proposed to increase it to $.20.

The duty on the registration of cigarettes has been $2 per 1,000 for some years and it is proposed to increase it to $10 per 1,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY (CONTRIBUTIONS) In 1992, an amendment was made to the Social Security Act (Second Revision), allowing those over 55 years to be imposed duty free. The intention was to allow all those over 55 year working since they were young to qualify for duty free status.

The proposed amendments do not put the matter right.

Manufacturing now charged at the Customs Warehouse, located at Duty Relief Airport, this will then be moved for manufacture, to a number of named, places from the Apia in Kanada, Whitlingy and Pance.

It is proposed to introduce there to be six per week there charged at the Customs Town Hall Warehouse.

We recently in the Use to also removed while making the above mentioned proposals for new revenue.

CONCLUSION

Mr.President, Gibraltar have been throughout history a friendly and hospitable people, where only task is the opportunity to maximise on these talents and for every one to benefit from it.

We should all be cognisant of the social balance in these Islands and devote ourselves to preserving the heavily we all cherish.

There are many who from standpoint should with every effort to maintain the wonderful, social climate in which we live.

Mr.President, acknowledge things is taking place in the international business world, and all of we have to focus on it and almost our total practice, to ensure that the Cayman Islands' future economic development continues. There is no doubt, Mr.President, to turn our attention in any other direction, just the world pass us by.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. President, that the Cayman Islands is one of the most professed offshore financial centres, and as such, in my view, on the threshold of great things for these Islands and our people, but we need to communicate to the world around us, that we have this opportunity.

Mr.President, I recommend the Appropriation Bill, 1995, providing an estimated sum of $87,192,200 to Government, Capital and Development in 1995. Excluded from this bill are the statutory provisions already approved amounting to $2,282,193. The estimated expenditure is, therefore, $80,888,693.

Thank you,Mr. President,

Mr. President, I move that the debate on the Budget Address be adjourned until Monday, 20th March, 1995.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, is it anticipated that the debate on the Throne Speech and the Budget Speech will be one debate? Because if that is so, I would prefer you to Standing Order, I believe it is 28 (1) that deals with the matter of relevancy. They are two separate things, one is a bill and one is a motion and in the Standing Order there are separate provisions for dealing with them and I think we should have separate debates. I would suggest that the motion that the debate on the Budget Address adjourned after the debate on the Throne Speech. The Standing Order to which I refer is ....

HON. [illegible]: So 28 (1) I suppose.

MR. SPEAKER PRO TEM: Yes, Sir.

MR. FRIESEN: I am ashamed that it has been the practice of this House for many years that Private Members' Public Bills are dealt with after Government Business has concluded, to debate them and this has happened four years ago and it happened eight years ago.

The Honourable Member, as you may recall from that the reason that was thought that that was a practice which should be followed again, since, in both cases, the nature of the debate is very wide-ranging and Members who have no desire to raise issues may proceed to do so. I do not, myself, feel that it will shortchange the rights of Members if the two bills are simultaneously debated, provided that is the will of the House.

The Honourable Government House Leader, I think, is due to be back on Monday and there will be an opportunity for Members to consider the matter then but from the moment, I see that housekeeping between now and then is the unanimous Third Official Member intended by moving the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill that ended the speech by moving a debatement of the debate and if I put the question, I see not but some which question I should be putting.

I should then be very receptive the matter if I may that, subject to confirmation when the House considers the Business Committee's Report and recommendation, I anticipate that the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill will take place on Wednesday, which I think is correct the point. I think we both got to carry this morning, and that's satisfactory I will. If I may, adjourn proceedings. I hope you will note that point. Because I have there and some other that need to be taken later on this. Thank you.

HOUSE ADJOURNED 12:45 p.m.

HOUSE RESUMED 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

MR. ATTORNEY-GEN: Mr. Speaker, the Government intends to proceed, Sir, but I might have a Ministerial statement first.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous consent to hear the statement?

MR. MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS: The Minister of Highways.

MR. TRAPP: Order, order.
The Gasoline Amendment Act, 1988, Second Reading.

The Gasoline Amendment Act, 1988

Hon. Minister

MR. CLERK: The Gasoline Amendment Act, 1988.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill was introduced a while for a time to debate the Gasoline and Diesel Fuel Tax Act and it was given Second Reading.

SECOND READING

THE CLERK: The Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

HON. ERSKINE C. SANDISON: Mr.President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled A BILL for a law to amend the Customs Law (Second Revision).

The object of the bill, Mr.President, as outlined earlier in the Budget Address, is to amend and to restrict the penalty in the Law and to increase duty on cigarettes, and package tax from ten cents to fifty cents.

There are small increases, Mr.President and should not cause any great burden to any of our people.

We have, from time to time, made attempts not to increase taxes, but it is inevitable, Mr.President, that the day will come, and it has, that certain taxes need to be raised.

The penalty under the Customs Law is dealing with the cigarettes which traditionally is a quarter of the cigarette to be charged for the cigarette-packing freight charge. This creates many problems administratively for the Customs Department by first having to decide what is the particular size by law and necessary to do the calculations, and that is the calculations.

Perhaps if we take a look at the cost of each cigarette we would find that we should have done this some years ago, Mr.President. The cost of duty - $5 per thousand or $10 per thousand for cigarettes is small and for those who are happy to smoke should not think that too much money for each package of cigarettes.

In regards to the package tax, for cents is so small, Mr.President, that it has very little to any duty of the work such if you have to pay attention. The need it takes a few dollars to give them, even though to the newly stamps in the increase from ten cents to fifty cents is absolutely insignificant in my mind.

I ask the Honourable Members' support of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to Amend the Customs Law (Second Revision) be given a second reading. The question is open for debate. If no Member wishes to speak, I will put the question.

MR. CLAIRE WILSON: Mr.Speaker, I am against the Bill which is before the House simply because the Bill causes to strike at the local population and, in fact, page 21 of the Estimates sets up the position of this Bill very clearly when it says "The Local regulations are being requested to contend with the additional revenue".

The position is that, although it is a very minor piece of legislation, the fact is that since the income direction it seems like every effort has been made to squeeze every penny that can be squeezed out of the local people.

Dealing with the main item of the Bill, I must say that I am totally against this. Clause 2 would delete sub-section (7) of section 21 of the old law, that section was put into the law many years ago when the Belmont first started to import goods by air. The reason why that section was put into the law because it was found that when goods were brought in by air and the consignee or the importer had to pay the duty on the air freight, the cost of the items became so excessive that the items

MR. SMITH (Ocean Township): could not be sold on the local market, that section 27 of the old Act for the purpose of determining the terms of goods whose carriage has been imported by ship, there should be substituted for the actual air freight charged, the freight which would have been charged if such goods had been imported by sea or a sum equal to one-quarter of the air freight whichever is the greater. So that this means that if an article was brought in by air freight and the air freight on that article was $100 the importer would not pay duty on $100 freight, he would simply pay duty on $25 or one-quarter of the air freight, recognizing the air freight was greater than the sea freight, and I think in 99 cases out of 100 you will find that the air freight is always more than the sea freight. While going above, Sir, because with the advent of the Arpels and containers, it was only taken necessary to bring in heavy food items by sea, for example - I have in the shelves merchants were always bringing in potatoes and onions by air freight because at that time the sea freight, shipping, was sometimes irregular, sometimes were delays and so on and in many instances the freight sent was brought by boat would sometimes arrive in poor condition.

In an item such as fishing nets, you find this is like a book of cotton, one may find that the air freight on that item would possibly be as much as the original cost of the item, and we make the same representation with manufacturers brought in by sea the Government of the day, in their wisdom, decided that sub-section 2 put it there in that the merchants or anybody bringing a package in, would not pay the freight duties on the freight, they would simply pay twenty-five percentum of the value of the freight. To remove this from the law would effect every person, every resident of those Islands because so many items are brought in by air, foodstuffs, meats, vegetables, ice-cream and the people who consume these items, which would increase the cost of living and the cost of foodstuffs in the Islands which are brought in by air would rise considerably.

If to each for words of the person had to bring in a small package, because the airlines have minimum rates for packages under a certain weight and if a person brought in a small package as I have seen happening, from a few destinations, like Toronto or Chicago or Philadelphia, you might find that the air freight on a very small package might be $50 or $100 so a minimum rate from one destination to another.

I know what I am talking about because I experience this every day in the package section, and if we get an item from Detroit for which can be had to our nearest wholesale house from Hollywood, the air freight on that little package could well be in excess of $100; if the person was paying an ordinary duty on the basis, he would have to pay $50 duty just on the freight alone, if he paid on the full freight, while, if he paid on only 25 per centum he would pay $25. So this cannot be removed, and I would certainly like to know the reaction of the merchants who today in Newfoundland like airlines and packages and brokers - how they will react if they have to pay the duty on the full freight paid by air. So I cannot agree with the moves the merchants have made in this and should have kept quiet and removed the words duty, because the need for having this section in the Act is much more necessary today than it was back in the nineteen or the seventies when the Act was first introduced. So the removal of this section from the Law which would take the air portion of the freight into the full freight on the carriage brought in by air would have an advantage to the importer in that he would pay duty on the full freight

MR. O'HARA (CONSERVATIVE) : I do not mind saying that it is a fact that sometimes by going in by boat on much of the permeable range on this map, but one has to remember that it is not always possible. Taking for a month's supply because the weather may not have the average and even if we had the average some of these areas do not have very long, particularly these like Durham. If you are going to spend £1 for a hotel bedroom, the taxi-fare extra, and luggage, to get there tomorrow, the atmosphere will have to be very much to continue to have to pay that. What is even more important is that one which the shopkeeper may need is a thing, because the merchant or the person wanting the item might be put to a position where he would have to share some new certain business, if he could not get the item readily.

I appreciate what the hon. Member for Rochdale (Mr. Greenwood) said with the statement of the Budget that they are going to impose anything they can squeeze out of the rural person this hard nosedness - those are the exact words that being explained by socialist, but in fact this is not what is happening. Only the rich are being squeezed to pay, as the President, I think I agree with the remark of Anti-Semitism [?] that section 21 of the Customs Bill, because this would increase the price of living to every person in this Island by a substantial amount.

The part of the Bill is equally as bad. There is an increase of £2 per thousand on cigarettes. Tobacco, like most of daily items is gone thousand up to 21/2. Now I am not going to argue against this increment because it is not a very large one; it will work out to 2d per pack throughout on a pack containing 20 cigarettes, so the actual price would not rise by more than about 2d, if you put on additional 4d. I am concerned about cigarettes because I am told that the Scotch and Welsh Members are here to have a packet published that every year 6,000 people die in the United Kingdom from lung cancer of which many people, who smoke. But, nevertheless, for the fact that there is an increase of 2d per pound, since the departure of the cigarettes will rise. So make him pay it or the part the member will have to make his profit on it and the manufacturer will have to pay the 2d to the Exchequer and be in the only increase in the Bill that I would vote in favour of.

The next amendment in the Bill is perhaps much worse than the one to which the Budget is to be introduced on 11th April and that is the one which will increase the postage from 2½d. to 3d. per hundred pounds, and if one examines the original Act, one will see that the original Act makes it clear that this package tax is not only merely just hundred pounds but it would for a part thereof, as, regardless of how small the package is it would have a cost of, at least 3d. per package, if the package was less than one hundred pounds. And here I wish to deal with small packages because there are many people like any Army friends, Navy friends, that come in packages of one dozen per package and it would on this amendment appear, the result would be that if you complete in a little package something like a woven baby carrier, you would have to increase of 3d. on a dozen packs, which sometimes cannot if you have not to attach it by 12 bill on the cost of one letter basis of 3d. per item, and that is only the cost of the Government's commission, the shopkeeper who brought in the package will have to make his profit on the of that. The criticism is that we would still have to make his profit on the 4½ plus nothing i pounds .... the pounds that the wholesaler would have again you are looking at a cost increase on any little package, one little bubble, one little paper mache or nightdress it may be of 3d. Even again this report quite disturbance of this country, but it does look like waste written. In the Budget today that the local authorities

MR. C. PATE HOLDEN (CONSERVATIVE): being empowered to legislate with the additional powers and duties to be granted, are hardly competent to pay it the consideration it deserves. I entirely agree with that - it seems that most of the Bill and perhaps might not deem too much of your time dealing with Lands Committee.

When there is still another amendment which is equally as complicated as the others I have dealt with and that is the amendment which would remove duties to be paid on lands where Temple Estates have entered under their own powers. Now we have been told by the Minister of the Bill that it was the intention when the original exemption was made that the exemption should apply to those that were in order that the powers only apply to houses of 25 feet or less. But I do not know where he got his information from, the information certainly does not come from the Bill and I imagine he is just expressing his opinion. However, regardless of what the intention of the people who put the first amendment might have been, the present situation is that small houses, houses under 25 feet in length of they were to, are not available, and here the amendment within this Bill proposes would raise ninety-nine per cent of them available, because you will have many few houses 25 feet in length owning to them, making the provisions already there wherever the houses had been brought.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member must speak under 25 feet, that is the effect of the law.

MR. CHARLES BOWEN: The section reads "Houses, houses and such other parts where lengths exceeds 25 feet inclusive from the external corner to the corner and of the terrace and who inclined to the inland under their own power". Those houses exceeding 25 feet would have no exemption if they were under their own power, but if they came on trucks or anything else under the Bill they would have been a different story. As I cannot agree with that I say - it is a bad law. I have there an example shown on the Members of Government L... Instance the Budget and I will be dealing with that on the debate on the Budget, but there are other ways, apart altogether the Bill-inland out of the Inner Harbour. The best way to illustrate that is where or the best way to solve problems is to illustrate the case by that some people come in and there will be no need to investigate with the inconvenience method of collecting taxes. Suppose on going that come by car or boats that come under their own power or a little package of goods. There are other ways of getting the revenue - the purpose of this Bill is to raise revenue - it is not, as I was led to believe on my first reading, that any part of it was simply to remove an anomaly on the Law but the only possible or unfortunate answer - we are not removing an anomaly - this is not an anomaly - this is a necessity to make the goods correspondent with go to Darwin the on other trade. So I submit however this Bill which, in effect, removes completely one anomaly that perhaps was - which it is thought to remove, is more like the tax on importation - it is going to affect every time you purchase them, you will have the pipe and then pay many more times of percentage this same percentage that will apply to every article which you buy. If you thought one hundred articles you would have to pay on all of them, so. Mr. President, I think I have only one more. But that note will be some important this Bill.

MR. [illegible]: ... Mr. President, one thing in addition, and I would like to know the suspension of Standing Order 10 (3), so that we might sometime for a little [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. I imagine you are moving it in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 47 and that the motion be that Standing Order 10 (3) be suspended to enable us to sometime this debate on this Bill and indeed to continue until the time on today's Order Paper have been dealt with.

Does any Member wish to speak to that? The Hon'ble Minister for Water Affairs.

MR. JAMES M. MUTHUTHI: Mr. President, I would like to support the Motion. Today is the first day of the opening of this Parliament and by what I have right now known to attend to, I am sure we will be here for the next five or six weeks. Mr. Speaker Sir has not been to complete anything today. Besides that, I, for one, and I do not know how many others Members, that I just got my papers on these Bills today and I would like a little bit of chance to analyse them in this case of the used and everybody has [illegible] of the House to attend to, I am sure, and I think we should take that consideration before we go on any longer this evening.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think it is the reasonable position of the House and of every other House to deal with previous necessary business before the Budget and to deal with them the same day. If there is an opportunity that can become any matter of they are not dealt with that day.

MR. JAMES M. MUTHUTHI: Mr. President, I am sure we can [illegible] to pass this today, unless you will insist to stay until midnight, because I am prepared, when I get up, to talk very long, if I have to, Sir.

MR. [illegible]: I have a [illegible] which I consulted myself to help tonight. It is one of the members [illegible] on a [illegible] thereby [illegible], and this would affect the schedule of I have to remain here much longer but I would also like to say that today is Friday - it is the end of the week - where one may [illegible] things that one would like to finish off. Today, being the first day of the House, and we are talking as I can't see more ways, I do not see the necessity for sending this Bill, particularly since it has only been presented to us this morning.

MR. F. WAMALWA KISIU: Mr. President, we are here commanding the people's confidence, [illegible] personal business and this other things that we have finished what we have been elected to do. I think that Members will carry on, Sir.

MR. [illegible]: I think I must only be the third [illegible] Member to guide me. If there is indeed no good reason for us to move to complete these Bills today and to take the first, Second and Third Stages, Committee stage and Third, until we know then it may be that Members will decide that there is no need to [illegible] Standing Orders and to continue now, and then the Bills can be dealt with the Order Paper for another day. But if some reason is that for certain reasons it is essential that they be passed today, then I think I must put the question that Standing Orders to suspended and it will, if necessary, be for the House to vote on that question.

SENATOR JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I think in the event of the Chairman will be particular, he is justified to try to finish it off this afternoon.

MR. PRESIDENT: How about the other one?

SENATOR JEFFERSON: The other one, I think, can wait.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, in that case I will put the question from Standing Order 10 (3), if I've got the right Order...

SEN. F.S. JEFFERSON: 10 (3).....

MR. PRESIDENT: 10.....

SEN. F.S. JEFFERSON: (3)

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry.....?.....?

SEN. F.S. JEFFERSON: (3).

MR. PRESIDENT: 10 (3) be suspended to enable the consideration of business connected with the Customs Bill. Will those in favour please say aye?

SOME MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. PRESIDENT: Those against nay?

SOME MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the ayes have it.

SENATOR B. MOSELY: Mr. President, I would like to be assured, I do not want that we have going on later than 4.30 and I have an appointment at five minutes.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any Member who needs to leave should do so.

In that case, I declare that Standing Orders have been suspended and that the Senate may continue.
Does any further Member wish to speak?

SEN. JAMES M. SOUMAH: I would just like to have how long we plan to continue, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think we plan to continue until the Bill has been either passed or defeated, and that means considering through all stages. That is my understanding of the debate which the Chief Opposition Senator gave, and my understanding of the vote is that the Senate has accepted that. Does any Member wish to speak? Then I will invite...

SEN. JAMES M. SOUMAH: Mr. President, we are beginning the debate on the financial provision of this country in this Senate, we also have some Senate Bills that have to be debated, and the little I have seen of it so far, I would refer to this as the round-about budget of 1983.

The budget that is presented to Sierra Leone looking ours - they have objected that the policy of Government in the past which has to make it as easy as possible on the people who inhabit and live in this country.

MR. JAMES M. BOSLEY (CONTINUING): The point might have been really decisive. The point that affects the rest of the street. All of a sudden, we have these people who are going to be chosen by all procedure, and they are presenting a letter which has to be balanced by taking into account of reasons which they told us that there was no money in reserve, and they played every game that might be played with figures. And now it's make it.....

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. The honourable Member must not impute dishonourable motives to others and, in my view, it is unparliamentary to continue that sort of letting pass, which is what I understood him to say. If you said that, it must be withdrawn.

MR. JAMES M. BOSLEY: If you take it that 'pass' is unparliamentary, that is the way they manipulated them, but I mean by the other words to avoid a name.

We have heard every story told and we have seen every figure given in order to create confidence on the part Government and to say that the economy was sound. I will deal with that at an appropriate time when I intend to speak about these things on it. But today we will deal with this so-called economy.

I remember saying that in the days when we were supposed to have no money Government provided the officers of this country that we should have that stop book into power given by and paid out to old Lo that was made to help the people of this country and try to balance the budget by the few measly dollars that they will make in this way.

I can not say whether the company is in agreement to the duty on air-freight or is it the Government of Guyana, but I imagine that the airport do, so that now that the ordinary public will pay duty, not only on the cost of the goods, but also on the full cost of the telephone, plus the insurance cost, and so forth and so on where we will be paying much more duty than possibly in many cases, since the imports will be worth double, because airfreight is fairly expensive. Even second, I am sure the air-freight would be at least 200 per pound.

Many of the road users consumer in this country, Mr.Speaker, have to be people in my view. Even we are having our figures on sounds, Sunday the economy is booming, and yet the people who will have to bring in the necessities, daily foods, their milk products, and their daily groceries in many households, by cars, will now have to pay, not only the duty, but the duty on the full amount of that air-freight, which is going, in many cases, to increase the amount that would have been paid on duty before, by three hundred per cent. Like is going to affect the ordinary public tremendously and shows us no guiding hand that is, Mr.Speaker. People have to suffer to bring goods by air. What would happen to the business industry if the people were to dwindle, so, they are now going to bring the foodstuff anymore by the planes, because of the duty they are going to bring it by boat. How long you think you would have your business?

Yet it is here today that we have wrongful plans to increase taxation - wrongful plans to make it much worse than it ever was before. Yet the final stroke of the pen is to have it.

Now, let us further show that, Mr. Speaker, and look at the little here in the store, where we find the additional penny cut of the air freight charges, it causes us to go to the stores and pay the added amount that he will now have to pay because his

MR TOKYO (Leader of Opposition): Government must be planning, though; they seem trying to put this into the hands of state, this would then stop the work, the way we are doing here.

It is a bit ridiculous and ludicrous Mr. Speaker, sir, how look at this

I am concerned in the approach to the problem that is being made by the present government. In the last eight years our Government took out a lot of duty on foodstuffs; I am certain that before this administration is out they will have to put back all of those duties and may be much more to keep the country afloat of the revenue in this manner.

I am most certain that in the very near future the Government which would be coming another time to the House asking that we put back the duty on foodstuffs like rice, and Sugar that we put back that duty.

What are they prepared to tell the people then? The same hogwash they will tell them this time.

You know I believe that the people in the streets, although they may have had an short sighted view from getting what promised. They may have looked to the manifesto that they made bids, they may have gotten carried away, but I believe they are just beginning awake.

How can a Government in its first sitting months's time change the attitude inside that could have given this Government in the most complete of years, probably several million dollars in the form of the confidence vote? There was no problem in collapsing it, because the two political wings that the people could not split or divide them into two and put, two groups of special interest groups that we have - the people of this country have that wisdom and know we are, having these people come back today dashing in prompt into stuff to put whether you on the working man or the unions. I fail to see how even those explanations can hold in good conscience support these measures.

Before the government could get some relief, he would support his stuff by going out to ask the duty on the foodgift items or what it would have been if it had been included in my Bill. You see it's a problem in which - they are hobbling about a losing position, here they have - during by-elections when they will keep the position from winning because they're now in the future people will help by some increase of by going and I do wonder, Mr.Speaker, whether that is not one of the same arrangements behind this Bill, to increase importation into the Islands by Govt. rather than the necessary efforts to get the benefit of the revenue.

I fail to see where the commitment of these people is, Govt, Mr.Speaker, will be honouring the Bill of the Cayman Islands in the years to come, as the year when Cayman continue to enjoy the possible and the financial ascent locked in and bright. It has always been said in politics in these Islands that we depended on the financial shortcomings in this office financial matters in Guernsey notice, we help share the burden and to ease the burden of the local persons. We have absolutely now complete from this, Mr.Speaker, and what we were doing was the building the poor working man on the street, give food, give clothes we, now we are going to give you a little more burden to carry. This is what we are doing.

I think it is very wrong that an already over prosperous this work load can't. A number of some of our financial guidance have taken the view to figure out what the Government is some of doing these money measures are going to bring about in the Cayman Islands in the next year? I should venture to say

MR. JAMES M. BROWN (CONTINUING): ...that overall, if all of these different taxes are changed, that we are looking for a net-of-living increase of at least ten percent.

How is that anything to boast about that you are going to give to your people in the first year that they have elected you?

Then we go a little bit further in this penny ante financing and maybe we roll the monkey over that you are going to increase the duty on the cigarettes. I do not want this to be taken wrong. I smoke occasionally, I am willing to pay the increase on the tax. I am not speaking for myself, I am speaking for what I think is unjust and unfair. When you tell him that if you increase the tax on his cigarettes, and if he was foolish enough to have a friend of his from Miami, let us say, bringing a box of matches, that you are going to increase the cost on it 400 per cent. Or perhaps tax to get that box of matches out of the customs. You know, where are you going to stop? Are you going to ask the man on the street whether or not the next occasion he has the benefit that comes out of his taxes on the tax that he brought in?

Why can we not have some legislative ideas that are being rendered into the statute, instead of depending on the executive that were not there to do the work for you in 1976, place backing the working man out of employment?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that one an urgent matter, the debate is decided, because as I see the Throne Speech delivered today, we had two Budget Addresses until then we have thrown all of these other papers. Many of us have not had time to go back and research into the past, different ones, which have been and so forth and how they accumulated, and I think that your ruling was very astute as well as the Members of Executive Council.....

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Member please sit down? I must call your attention to Standing Order 35 (2). If you wish to establish a ruling as before, you have to put down a substantive motion. Moreover, I would call, perhaps, for the record, that it is the long-standing practice both here and in many other Commonwealth Assembly that I know of, that matters which are not published until after the Budget Address has been delivered and that they are debated immediately afterwards.

MR. JAMES M. BROWN: Will you or anyone else tell me how much duty you expect to have on that Bell Bureau coal and Sunday morning? But if I had to put a motion (this will come to the vote) I have a lot of things to say on this Session of the Budget and I have just started, Sir.

In the past Governments have been able to import their boats and various equipment that grew with the body duty free, because we have been a developing country. I can agree that negotiations have taken place in this, but I think again there are certain concessions that could have been made, and that more time should have been given by someone to check out the means by which money could have been gotten by the Treasury, in order to meet the expenditures this year.

I was very proud to be a part of a group that might assist to these things and helped to bring the budget forward for eight years and I challenge anyone to show me a piece of legislation like this that we brought forward.

We talked to find ways where the man on the street, the common man, the man who exploits every Government in every country in the world, we tried not to hurt them, but we have financial interest groups that are disturbing the course of this country

MR. JAMES M. COOPER (CONTINUING): ... and it must stop. It must stop - or the people will stop it.

... I am not prejudiced to be a part of any Assembly that will bring in legislation like this when we have already thrown out the legislation that would have brought big money to the country. Not picked the pockets out of the working man's pocket. I really would have liked to have the time to research this and really deal with it as some might, but I do not wish to be repetitious. So therefore, I will conclude, hoping that some of the Members on this side of the House, in addition to my colleague from Eastern Kent will see fit to be against this piece of legislation, and not go ahead in glory with legislation that is going to offset the very people that put them in office, the now of people they promised to protect.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I look over to the opposite of this new Government, I ask myself and the people in the street now asking, where are you protecting the rights of the Cayman Islands or the ambitions of these?

This is unfair legislation, it should be ... and I hope that the Members of this House will have the courageous fortitude to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for Executive Council.

HON. MCKEEVA A. BUSH: Mr. Speaker, we have just heard two very dramatic contributions. But in the case of both the great problem which the Government, that is section 2 of the bill which seeks to remove the problem within the Customs Law to charge the weights equal to the next-lowest or next-higher pay rate of the difference on goods imported.

The first speaker, for example, Mr. Speaker, mentioning the hardships that this could cause an Israeli policeman and advise why he like and I would like to thank the Honourable Member who is of the Second Member to the first that spoke particularly and pointing out that, by that the amendment could not result in any increase in prices of goods that are duty free, and as you go down. I think the Acting Member mentioned wine - that is also duty free so it is not affected by this amendment and as you go down the line of goods that are used by the ordinary person in the average family, this has no effect on those items.

The crux of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that when this commission was given the charges for handling goods at the airport were the same as they are on the dock, but over period the introduction of the new charges at the ports, even though overweight is charged, when the charges at the port are added, there is no intention to bring the people by sea. So, if this amendment goes, what it would really do, in fact, equalize the charges, the total charge on goods coming in by air would by sea.

There seems to be a bit too much duplication with the passage of Hansard, in fact, the first Member who spoke, agreed with that, and there seems to be confusion on the house, Mr. Speaker. The Member seemed to have thought that the boats were duty free; that only applied to boats over 25 feet after the amendments made in 1992, and I do not think that is the argument that the amendment that was made in 1992 caused in favour of the country people. The statement or argument rather does not concern the boat over 25 feet, that is usually for the rank different. The proposed amendment would not remove the possibility of persons bringing in a 20 foot boat on the back of a pick-up and bringing it to the duty free. The only change that is called here is to boats over 25 feet that are ...

MR.PEARSON (CONTINUED): ...acted into the country under the ... own power - there is no other charge being added or imposed. And, as ... Minister said, the penalty arose when the amendment was made in 1963.

The other thing that should be mentioned, Mr.Speaker, is that the package tax does not apply to goods coming ... through the post - it applies to goods coming by through the airport only. If one looks at section 87 sub-section (2), Mr.Speaker, "notwithstanding sub-section (1) no package tax is charged or imposed upon ... discharged at the ports of George Town or Cayman Brac in respect of ... post Establishment". So that the package tax does not apply to goods coming in by any one it would only apply to goods by air. So it would not increase the cost of living on the bulk of goods coming into the country, and this package tax, basically, is designed to replace or substitute for the charges which are made at the post for handling the goods. The warehouse at the airport as the economy is established by Government because of the small handling charge which is imposed on goods.

I have no problem with those amendments, Mr.Speaker, they are not amendments that I feel would be oppressive to the majority of people and I support the Bill as presented and with the amendment of which notice has been given. Thank you.

MR.SPEAKER: Before I call on any other Member to speak, I am told that the tape in within one minute of running out. I will get that checked and then call on a Member. It will take about ten minutes.

MR.PRESIDENT: The motion has been stumped. The Second Elected Member for Rural Area.

MR. F.McKENZIE SISE: Yes, Mr.President, Sir,

I want to say, Sir, that I support the amendments to the Bill. My reasons for supporting the Bill in that one section of it will give a break to those Legislators who want to bring on their own light over all foot. We have many Legislators on the Christian Point Committee and I believe this would take a burden from them. I believe it would help them because many times the houses come in under their own steam, so I believe it would help those people and for that reason I am supporting the Bill.

On the matter of Cigarettes, Sir, it is no more than for health purposes. I give that also my support.

On the other sections of the Law, Sir, quite frankly I would like to have seen the figure that it would produce, the amount of money it would produce in revenue, but Sir, I give the Government the benefit of the doubt, or the Government bench I would say.

The two opposition Members to the Bill dealt with those sections and we heard many things. As someone already said Jeremiah speaking; we heard talk about squeezing the poor people - we heard questions how the merchants will react. Mr. President, the merchants for eight years have been feeling good in this country, because every bit of duty taken off of foodstuffs have not, Mr.President, gone to the ordinary man on the street - it has not helped them. Rice was said, potatoes, onions, chicken, duty has been removed from those items and there is no way of Government policing that section, so the people are not getting the benefit.

I cannot see what great amount of hardship will be put on the people - I do not believe the populace would squabble about a few cents - the population, Mr.President, only a few years recently and they dumped the previous Government - they kicked them out. Why, Mr.President? Because that Government, while they sought to take off duty off those little items, believing that would pacify the man on the street, they sought to strangle him, and that is what they did to the little man.

They thought by going to give certain people in this country rebranded funds, and I still do not know, Sir, whether the amount or any money was paid out, I hope to obtain that later on in this Session too. So do not think that the little men is here, it is the big things that they have done that have hurt the little man.

I say, lastly, Mr.President, Why, I ask the question - why is this Bill being brought to this House? Why here it come, Sir, why? The reason why it has come because of the serious state of affairs in this Country. We collecting today.....

MR.JAMES M.ROWLES (Interrupting): On a point of order, Mr.President, Please. This is entirely incorrect about the financial state. There have been many rumours, ridiculously bold. The plain thing is the last budget Estaff which you are talking, was and a half or ten and a quarter million dollars out of it so balance the budget this year. So why would you think this man to go on like this?

MR.PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member himself stating on this subject,it did not seem it was to be entirely relevant but I could see an argument why, if he did not go on with it for too long, it could be regarded as relevant. An attack to it is relevant too, but the member should not go on too long either.

MR. M.BHOOKAN SINGH: Sounds like a roundabout way to do. Sir, but let me carry on. They are both, Sir, but I believe I am still speaking on merit, and they should be reminded of their duty.

MR.SPEAKER: Mr.President, are we prevented a person or what are the grounds we are saying he cannot?

MR.PRESIDENT: Will the second Elected Member from rural please continue.

MR. M.MUNGRIM SINGH: Yes, Mr.President. As I said, Sir, in my remarks on the Appropriation Bill I have brought because of the bad state of affairs in this country we left by the previous Government, and they do....

MR.SPEAKER: Mr.Secretary, on a point of order, I take strong objection to that because that is an improper statement and you should rule, the hon out of order on it.....

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the Member please withdraw and make unconditionally aspect on genuine points of order, otherwise I shall have to rule him.

MR.M.MUNGRIM SINGH: Thank you very much, Mr.President. I support the Bill, Sir, I do not think it is going to cause too much hardship on any small man in this country. If the Government want to carry, let them carry, but I give it my support. As I have said, I have my reservations - I fully that I would have liked to have seen the figures but I give the Government the benefit of the doubt. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR.SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for George Town.

MR.LENNOX A.DARGAN: Mr.President, I will, in debating the Budget Speech and the Budget Address, make certain observations which I hope will assist a lot of people in this Honourable House and that is why I will endeavour to point by the matters before me.

Mr.President, I regard the reason why I had such a reasonably discourse in the public was because of the people's feeling in me and that I will endeavour to promote the interest of the people.whatever possible.

I personally do not have any strong reservations on these appropriations with the exception of one or two observations which I would like to make.

I would point out here, Mr.President, that I was very pleased by a statement made by the Honourable Chief Secretary when he stated that we should all be cognizant of the social conditions in this country, but my definition, Mr.President, of social balance in the country would have to be compatible with the standard of living of our people in this country.

Mr.President, section 41 (1) of the principal Law which is the Customs Duty (General Provisions) Ordinance - " items shall be subscribed for the actual weights charged the weights which would have been charged if such goods had been imported by sea or the sea route to the quarter of the centweights ascertained in the manner". Mr.President, I believe that there was a reason for this and the reason, as I see it, Mr. President, is that we were providing a facility for those of us who

MR. LINDSAY (Scarborough): ... would not have the sort of cash flow that would enable us to store away big stocks of goods, but perhaps have to be using the assistance of air freight to bring these goods in, perhaps on a weekly, bi-weekly or monthly basis, and that this section of the Act was designed to protect the little people.

I am not going to say, Mr. Speaker, that my only interest would be in the economy of our community or society, but I would make it abundantly clear that I am here to represent all interests, and while protecting the little people, and I believe, sincerely, Mr. President, that the removal of what is quite an anomaly, I do not see it as such, will affect the little people in this country.

I believe, Mr. President, that this is a genuine effort made by the government bench to enable them to secure the necessary revenue to assist us in the development of this country, but I also believe, Sir, that the time has come when we must step away from what I would term, and what is, of course, my opinion, an antiquated system of raising revenue. I believe, Sir, that we have reached the maturity and sophistication in this country where efforts and attention must now be given to harmonizing our economic base. We cannot, much more, endeavour to raise revenue by an indirect form of taxation, because while we appreciate that a direct form of taxation of ourselves that we must keep away from, I believe it is well known that an indirect form of taxation is the most regressive form in the world, and it is a form that affects the little people more than others.

We cannot, Mr. President, continue to make amendments here and there to our existing legislation. I regard this, Mr. President, as just temporary and I hope that I am not out of order in making that observation, but I believe that we must now look at developing a comprehensive economic policy for this country. We cannot continue much more to be increasing indirect forms of taxation. I see my friend, Mr. President, who section 47 (7) should be deleted from this law and I cannot support this.

In this matter, Mr. President, in the increase in the duty payable on cigarettes from 28 per thousand to $10 per thousand. I could not support it more and my support is fundamental one, mainly because of my objection to smoking. I believe that if this is going to be a deterrent to some of my people, who having their lives, or this is going to be a deterrent of them not smoking, well, Mr. President, I think it is a good move and a good movement. But, Mr. President, unfortunately, I do not see this - I see these extra cents being taken away from the budget of a family. I see the smoke in the home squeezing those extra cents and depriving himself, perhaps, the necessary food and clothing he needs to be able to satisfy what is wished not only ... what but I would think is very difficult, I understand, to break.

So, Mr. President, I would have very little representations to support this, but when I look down the list of amendments before me, I notice that that is because the only area in which I could suggest, so it appears as if I will not be able to support this bill in its entirety.

In the meantime, Mr. President, if the increase in the package was just left to die, which is provided in the first schedule to the principal Act, I cannot from the lack of use, see the real purpose in this increase, but I am sure that the Member responsible for introducing this Bill, has given this considerable thought.

A previous speaker, Mr. President, mentioned that one of the other departments from Golden Rock had also undertaken the very purpose of this society and that they thought it reserved to provide what were already duty free. Mr. President, Sir,

MR.SPEAKER A. FISHER (Cook-Minister) _looking here through the Estimates of this year there, I notice a number of items that could affect the little people in this country, items that they would bring in by sea. Many of the small shopkeepers in this country rely the Government to go to Suva, Lami, Vunimoli, to purchase their goods and bring them in. They cannot afford, because of high flow problems, to wait a week or so on the ships to bring in their goods.

Here is, Mr.President, since section 12 (7) states - that small goods had been imported by post the most would be equal to quarter of the difference on the amount that would have been paid had the goods been imported by sea, or the greater - we really I cannot see where bringing those goods in by air the really is major penalty.

Mr.Speaker, I have reservations on the question of removing the duty free exemptions on books in excess of $2 in fact. I do not believe that sufficient thought was given to this amendment. I know of many, many Cyclone who rely on books for their and more for training. These books are used, not only for reading but also for their little children, or whatever and I feel that this amendment is going to have a disastrous effect on these people. I see, Mr.Speaker, a multiplier effect taking place here. I see the imposition or imposing of this duty by the time it reaches the little man, that he is indeed going to have a terrible hold on him.

Leaving the Budget debate, Mr.Speaker, I intend to suggest ways and means that I feel we can follow in our attempt to obtain new revenue in this country, without having to go the normal taxation route. This is a route that we have to bear in mind but we cannot forget that in trying the social problems that can be caused from the approach that is being taken by these extensive amendments, amendments that would tend to squeeze the little people could have a very damaging effect on our economy. It can hurt, create and have the little people in a position that they cannot maintain.

A few days ago, Mr.Speaker, I had the very unfortunate experience of seeing, Mr.Speaker, what can happen to a society that tend to live at an unreal situation - I watched the Hurricane Bebe and I will have more to say on this.

The economic challenges , in advance impact on the little people, could be disastrous, especially those who are trying to make a living by operating their little businesses.

Mr.President the discussion , I hardly have to point out, Sir, that Members need not be given reasons while following a Budget Debate, but somehow, Sir, I believe that if we can make any intelligent contribution to the debate on this Bill, that we should be given sufficient time to study this Bill. It is essential, as I see it, of an urgent amendment to Government Bench, knowing what is coming before the House and what they have had some time to give it some thought, but when these Bills are thrown at us without any notice that we cannot be expected to make any intelligent consideration. I do not know how this matter can be rectified but I would hope that adequate information could be given to this, as I see it, problem.

Mr.President, I realise that there are other Members who would wish to speak on this Bill but on behalf, Sir, I could not thankfully give this Bill my full support in the present form. Thank you, Mr.President.

MR.PRESIDENT: The Hon'ble Elected Member for Suva Central.

HON.P.D.PATEL: Mr.Speaker, Honourable Members, I rise

MOVE W. T. JORDAN (COUNTY-WIDE): ...to support this Bill.

I have heard many comments about it. If I were on the opposition side, perhaps I would listen to many of the statements which were made against this Bill.

We were talking about measures, Mr. President, the total of which would provide this Government with less than one million dollars in revenue.

The measure you have just referred to, Sir, was moved by the honourable Third Official Member. I have been in the position in this House for approximately seven years. I know much of what has transpired here as far as income proposals are concerned.

Over the past eight years, I would say, we have passed many revenue Bills and on the final day of the Budget Address, Mr. President. It is a known fact in this House that revenue Bills were made immediately after the presentation of the Budget Address for certain and obvious reasons, and therefore we are only trying to maintain consistency which we speak of nearly so far, to examine these Bills and finding other measures why they should not be dealt with in an short a time.

Mr. President, I too have been told something material of duty free imported goods, namely imported foodstuffs. I have always had no opinion about this, but nevertheless I have it to individual and therefore there those reasonable cause forward without any opposition.

I remember back in 1964 when the Government removed them among many items, duty free items, the most necessary the prices of basic items rose. I would like to see where did the consumer or did the consumer receive any benefit from that consideration or?

Some people say duty was removed from children and persons - I forget Mr. President, where did the benefit for the removal of duty from those two items go? Into the pockets of the merchants, the hotels, restaurants, guest-houses and those sort. The poor man on the street continues to pay the same price he paid before for those items, but so that to benefit your people, and so we go on and on and on until the removal of duty from these foodstuffs.

Mr. President, it seems to me that everything that this Government will present to this Honourable House whether it be a Bill, a motion or what have you, will be unfair to the opposition.

Mr. President, although the Third Official Member stated that it is the duty opposition to do whether or not

HON. W. G. JOHNSON (CONTINUING): the economic situation is failing. We have seen this, especially over the last year. Had revenues continued to flow as we have seen it over the past, then there would be no need to have these far reaching measures of taxation to the house today.

We want all the revenue that was left that was available to supplement the budget and it is no difference from what else has been done. Revenues were used last year to balance the budget, too.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste time Government. I have no excuse for explaining I have done so far and I think that any of my constituents will come forward and endorse me for what I have done so far. My determination is to work and do everything in my power to support this cause for which I was elected to this House and that I will do.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the subsidiary taxes that will be put into effect. I do not want to go into that aspect of it, so I will close by saying again that I support this measure and I have no excuse for doing so. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for the Sister Islands.

CAPT. MARK R. EBANKS: Mr. Speaker, the will before this honourable House, a Bill for a Law to amend the Customs Law (Second Amendment) I feel is a necessary one. I do not agree with it in its entirety and I must say, in fairness to the people of my Electorate, we have quite different circumstances than I have heard here cited by other speakers this morning, but before going into there, previous speakers have made remarks which must be removed from yesterday the record show up.

I would remind Members here that Members in this Honourable House are elected every four years, during which time of four and five years of responsible rule, Government's mandate, if one is to make a fairly, must be accountable to what is said. I feel the removal of duty free privileges, answering to those has been brought to the people of my constituency and I shall continue to support a measure of that sense which is offered.

I would like to call to the attention of the House, Mr. President, section 5, the amendment to section 11, sub-section (2); this will have very far-reaching effects on the people of my Electorate. We now pay a much higher standing than the people of Grand Cayman, although the Sister Islands are always first hand. We are losing a much higher freight rate, we have no regular shipping service, it is recommended fortnightly, sometimes it is fortnightly, sometimes it is more frequent, sometimes less frequent - therefore many of the items which we enjoy here, used by our relatives and the islands, must come in by refrigerated and if we are to pay duty on the C.I.F. with the refrigerated shipped, there will be a substantial difference.

Therefore I would ask if my suggestion could be made to my Member, that consideration be given by the Honourable Member.

In addition to this, the expenses of packing has to be added? Items, will then add considerably more to the cost.

As I said, I hope the Bill is necessary. I support a balanced budget. I have discussed it with my constituents that we must make sacrifice if we are to get the benefits from our Government that we will need, and I support the Bill, but I would ask the Committee if anything could be done to the amendment to section 11 sub-section (2), that consideration be given. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member for North Hills.

MR. DOUGLAS MILLER: Mr. President, I support the Bill in its entirety, in particularly I support the amendment at 41 (2). Unfortunately I think quite a few speakers before me in dealing about seconds from not looking the whole picture, I have glanced over the first part which concerns the amenity and that is, that any individual who brings in a bus or a package by aeroplane has the option of demanding that the Customs Officials unpackage that would have been the responsibility of the crew.

Further, Sir, I believe that any discretion that individuals have in bringing goods in by aeroplane and only paying transportation per ounce of the private cost, has been greatly abolished simply by the impracticality of aeroplanes in their ministry for whatever reason it has been. For an example, Sir, I brought a box of fish cakes e.g. from Prince, I paid the freight from Prince to Hope and five aeroplanes from Hope to Grand Cayman. So I do not think that the consumers are not receiving any benefits, because the producer pays most, the twenty-five percentage of the actual aeroplane is higher than that to be paid on aeroplanes.

Further, Sir, I believe that there is reasonably freedoms and good safeguards somehow from them - I do not believe that the bulk of perishable items that were personally carried by air is not worthy so, Sir, I can well understand the amendment 41 and I support the removal in its entirety.

I also support section 3 of the Law, Sir, and the increase in duty on cigarettes, because, Sir, the argument is might have on someone could dispense their health. Further, I do not think this argument is a necessity for any person to smoke cigarettes, because, Sir, the argument is might have on someone could dispense their health. Further, I do not think this argument is a necessity for any person

We have heard a lot of talk here today, Sir, about this new Government Legislation to aid the working man. I do not believe, Sir, that any of the persons mentioned in this country from the estates have ever really hated anybody, except the working man, because, in fact the record of the past Government, increasing the charges on the financial agency year after year, has only simply passed the charges on to the working man or the common, whether it was increased countryside charges, increased electricity for lodging, or whatever.

Taxation, Sir, ultimately winds up in the hands of the little man. That is a fact of life.

I also support section 5, Sir, because again I also had experience with the application under the old Law, in bringing in a boat of my own. I think that putting it in this form clearly defines what boats are suitable and what one has to do to qualify for the non-suitable boat.

I also support section 5, Sir, because I think that increasing the package tax is the simplest to fair and equitable, I do not think that Government should be subsidizing the operation. I think it is fair to increase it to build some consideration is given to the charges that are incurred at the port by the Port Authority and I am one of those members, Sir, creating any greater hardship on the little man on the street, which is incurred on a trailer boat or some other form.

I therefore support the Bill in its entirety, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. D. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, I rise to support this Bill,

MR. N. MACLEAN SCOTT (CONSERVATIVE): ...was before this Honourable House, in the amendment, I feel that the deletion of sub-section (2) of section 41 and the effect that it will have on the whole Act has been very much over-played.

It is time this matter was to be passed and I believe that at the beginning of almost every year there has been one measure or another since Confederation to consider to accomplish this.

I am also very pleased to see that the honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) will be moving an amendment at Committee stage to extend Canadian citizenship until June 30th this country, and I believe that the little difference that would be created by the deletion of sub-section (2) of 41 will be more than compensated until this new section which will become a part of the Act.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, give this Bill my support, because I do believe that at this present time and I feel that there is, in fact, very little difference in the total charges to the Customer between whether they decide to through the post or through the airport. Therefore this Bill has my full support, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The United Nations Member of Saskatoon Centre.

MR. CHARLES T. STEPHANSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this Bill, for the amendment. Most people that have been mentioned here, Mr. by the Second Element Member from Moose Jaw on which duty is paid, such as potatoes, melons, milk, etc. and duty free and this Bill is no way affect the cost of these goods.

I think the Hon. Member mentioned when the amendment that people will not smuggle goods into the country because they will be subject to duty. I am sure that the amendment will not affect the cost of these goods.

The purpose of this Bill before this House today, Mr. is essentially threefold, that will presume Bills, and passed the same day for various reasons and this is not the first occasion. I have been in the House now going on nine years and on many occasions several Bills must be passed the same day they are introduced. This is not something new and it is impossible for any Government to know that a measure Bill is all because of the Legislative Assembly. Before it is introduced and passed on the same day. This is done, as I said before, to prevent anyone taking advantage of the situation.

The knowledge that is have heard that this Bill be passed to the Public Men, mostly Mr. when one looks at the measure that is to be passed to be drafted, is between five hundred and five hundred thousand dollars, and the many who will come the Public man. The middle man and the Big man to close as I think. I do not see how one can take that seriously.

A point that was made by the Member, Sir, I do not think it quite fair to say that the duty taken off goods has not been passed on to the Public purchasing. In fact some of the effects of the duty removal, at the same time, be passed over that the goods which were imported at one time and in years ago, Sir, by the time you imported the same item it was up about a two percent and this is why the Public believes that we control the manufacturer's price. We do not control the manufactured price and it is why some the Government Report of the Government that have been passed on to the Public to view.

Almost having no time to study the Bill,

HON. CHARLES L. MCKNIGHT (CONTINUED): We have made considerable of this, Sir, in years gone by. I consider that this is a hardship to other Members on the other side of the House, and we have tried to remedy this. Unfortunately we could not give this Bill to the Members on the other side of the House before it came right to be passed.

Resolutions are made of the Government benches who are now making the Government, Sir, it is not long if difference has made to me as being a financial genius - I do not consider myself a financial genius - but what I do know, Sir, is that I can manage my own money.

It is time that the country's eyes are being opened and I am afraid before this Session is completed, the eyes of all members of this Assembly will be opened at that time.

I believe the people of this country do not yet realize what we have to contend with and what is have to suffer and that they cannot keep on demanding from Government without contributing back to Government. Governments can only give to the people what it takes from them and the Government is not a monster out there, Sir, we are only the representatives of the Government, the people are the Government. They have put us here to represent them, so are the electoral representatives but we are not the Government. And if they continue to ask for different privileges, different improvements, we must all be prepared to pay for these improvements.

Mr.President, I think enough has been said on the Bill, I believe everybody wants to get home, so I will not delay the Bill and I give this Bill my full support.

MR.SPEAKER: Mr.President, just on a point of order. I did not want to interrupt the Member but only three minutes to the package tax. Since that one duty free like potatoes, will pay the package tax and I think the Members of Executive Council

MR.PRESIDENT: I do not think that was the point that was being made; I think the point that was being made was that they do not pay the duty and therefore the change in the arrangements about air and sea-freight do not affect them. That was my understanding of the point made.

MR.CLIVE M.BOSTON: I think that was said, Sir, and that that will - it did not specifically say where part of it - but what was said, I think, by the Members was that this Bill would not affect those items, which is necessary.

MR.PRESIDENT: That was not my understanding of what was said, but as any rate the matter has been clarified, no doubt, Unless any other Honourable Member wishes to speak I will invite the Third Official Member to exercise his right of reply, if he wishes.

HON. T.C. GREENSON: Mr.President, on any country there comes a time when additional revenue must be found. The Bill before the House today, as in all other cases, has previous measures brought a great deal of debate.

But, Mr.President, I am delighted that this immediate Bill will cause no great hardship to any normal citizen of the Cayman Islands.

The question dealing with air-freight, as most members, Mr.President, that duty is imposed on cost, insurance and freight, and then a percentage is taken of that value, and the

SEN.J.S.JEFFERSON(CONTINUING): ...objections of the previous here, in my mind, should create no real hardship to anyone.

As previously stated, Mr.President, I'm not back as a consumer of stamp coming through this here the duty paid. The post charges paid and the charges paid on the airplane, this bill really hardly should always be a somewhat conservative position.

It is my intention, Mr.President, to move an amendment to the bill to allow privileged and donations under, provided under that is important into this country, to be free of duty.

It is also my intention, Mr.President, to propose an amendment to section 6.

MR.PRESIDENT: The question before the House is shall a Bill entitled a Bill for a law to amend the customs law relating to power & postal handling, will those in favour please say aye?

SOME MEMBERS: Aye.

MR.PRESIDENT: Those against, no.

SOME MEMBERS: No.

MR.PRESIDENT: I think the ayes have it.

MR. JAMES H.DOYLE: Could we have a division, Sir?

MR.PRESIDENT: Certainly.

D I V I S I O N

AYES	NOES
HON. D. W. MORRIS	MR. LEONARD J. FITZPATRICK
HON. MICHAEL BRADLEY	MR. JAMES H.DOYLE
HON.J.S.JEFFERSON	MR. D. ROSS ROBERTS
HON. HERBERT S.HICKMAN	
HON. WINCHESTER MORRIS	
HON.CHESTER L. MACDONNELL	
HON. MICHAEL JOHNSON	
MR. M. MORRISON HUNT	
CHIEF: HARRY A. MACDONNELL	
MR. FRANCIS MCLEAN	

30 8

HON. MICHAEL BRADLEY: Mr.President, Sir, may the name of the honourable Member from East End called?

MR.PRESIDENT: Yes, the honourable Member for Port Morris.

HON. MICHAEL BRADLEY: I really think it should be called.

MR.PRESIDENT: Well, also the Third District Member from West Bay be also. I think you are probably quite right, they should be called, even though they are not here, as they....

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the Clerk announce the number of those who voted for and against?

CLERK: 20 Ayes, 3 Noes.

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare that the motion has carried, Suspension of Standing Order 47, I think it is.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 47 (1) AND 47

REV. TREVOR D. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I move under Standing Order 98 the suspension of Standing Order 47 (1) and 47 to allow the Third Reading to take place on the Customs Amendment Bill, 1985.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 47, Standing Order 47 (1) and 47 be suspended in order to enable those readings of the Customs Bill to be taken today.

I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. SUSPENSION UNDER 47(1) AND 47 SUSPENDED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the Clerk announce the number of those who voted for and against?

CLERK: 20 Ayes, 3 Noes.

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare that the motion has carried, Suspension of Standing Order 47, I think it is.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 47 (1) AND 47

REV. TREVOR D. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I move under Standing Order 98 the suspension of Standing Order 47 (1) and 47 to allow the Third Reading to take place on the Customs Amendment Bill, 1985.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 47, Standing Order 47 (1) and 47 be suspended in order to enable those readings of the Customs Bill to be taken today.

I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. SUSPENSION UNDER 47(1) AND 47 SUSPENDED.

MR. TEMPLETON: We will now go into Committee to study a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Customs Law.

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

CONSIDERATION IN DETAIL

CLERK: CLAUSE 1, SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

MR. JAMES H. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would propose that we strike out section 5 of the proposed Bill, Sir, as it has been relevant to what we should be trying to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want to make a motion to that effect you can make known to do so when we come to Clause 5, that at the moment sir the Clause 1 stands as was discussed.

If there is no debate on Clause 1 I shall put the question that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. Abstraction of section 41 of the principal Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You do your choice.

MR. JAMES M. NDIRITU: Mr. Chairman, I beg leave of the House, I do not know what Standing Order exactly covers it, to move a motion that section 2 of the proposed Bill be deleted from the Bill entirely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you have to do is to seek my leave under Standing Order 68 (2) to move an amendment of which no notice has been given, and in view of the circumstances under which this Bill is being taken, that you had no opportunity of giving two days' notice of an amendment, should certainly accord you leave. Your amendment is to the effect that clause 2 be deleted?

MR. JAMES M. NDIRITU: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anybody else who would like to speak to the amendment? We shall please, if I may just remind Members of the Committee, that the amendment, after this has been disposed, we will on the amendment and then there is a possibility of further debate on the clause as amended, as if the amendment has been defeated, on the substantive clause.

HON. MICHAEL KAMOTHO: Mr. Chairman, Sir, could I seek your guidance on this, since the effect of the proposed amendment by the Honourable Nominated Member for Nyeri Town simply has the same effect as defeating the motion in front of us, namely that clause 2 of the principal part of the Bill is the action that clause 2 of the principal part of the Bill is deleted, then the clause is deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that is quite right. Actually you know, I should have been quicker to spot this point.....

MR. JAMES M. NDIRITU: But, Mr. Chairman, I still think that by allowing the motion we got a chance to debate it, and I think in view of the urgency of this Bill and the way it has been urgently put before the House, and like I heard one Member making a contribution saying we should be quick that it would be impossible to advertise the public elected Members of the Senate of the legislation of this sort, I think if you were going to call a Member like the one out of order I think that is where you should have called him up. Because we are all elected to this House and are supposed to be men and women of honour, and are supposed to be people looking out for the welfare of the country. I do not think that this amendment should be used on the minor details of the scheme. So, therefore, in view of this and in view of the many other things that this Bill affects, I have made a contribution I would like to make on this and I think we should be able to debate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think also the point that the Second Nominated Member was making was that you had, without needing to seek my leave to move an amendment up to move an amendment as such, you had an opportunity to debate it and to make the points that you wished because you are fully entitled to argue all Members to vote against the clause standing part of the Bill. You do not actually need to move an amendment that the clause be deleted; you can just speak explaining to Members why they should vote against it.

HON. MUSTAFA KHALIF: Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I also with respect draw your attention to Standing Order 68 (7) which says the Chairman

HON. MITCHELL SHARP (CONTINUING): ...may rather to put an amendment which appears to him to be intended to vary the very substance of a clause, if he has spoken the proper course is to negative the clause and propose a new one, which I think.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that one would work like that, I think the point that you've made already with the last speaker, and he would have to produce the matter further, but we have to be clear to the House Elected Member for Ruhbul Dzuk that he is fully entitled to argue the case why, in his view, Members should vote that clause 8 do not stand part of the Bill.

MR. JAMES M. BALFOUR: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going for instance on them, we don't sell it cheap, beans, potatoes, whatever you may want to call it, that you bring in by airfreight just about. The import tariff, now this would only be if you just brought one pack of it or one fifty pound weight, please remember now that the freight would be much higher on this because it would be a minimum charge, so that if a person had a consignment of several items of fifty pounds each, for which this parliamentarian disagrees, contributed a part of the total weight, just might the aeroplane would probably be, on a fifty pound package, somewhere in the neighbourhood of twelve shillings. Now the aeroplane at that same comparable weight, I have to phone who may have better about the freight rates than me, but I can assure that the freight rate would not be more than about six dollars and fifty cents. Therefore we have a difference of nine dollars and fifty cents and let me say that basically 60 twenty percent on that item, whatever it may be, would be unnecessary, about, anything. That means that this consignment fifty pound weight from new Delhi would be eighty dollars and ninety cents more to receive duty than you would be paying now. If you take it on another argument - let us say that steel brought by Cyprus Airways from Moscow, now on the Soviet freight rate your freight cost would probably be somewhere between twenty and twenty-five dollars for that item.

Anybody like any body would probably be five dollars any from Moscow, you are looking then at an additional import duty of four dollars on that particular fifty pound weight ... you would be paying in the future, that you are not paying at the same time. So it is a bit foolish I think to complain this does not add and that it does not affect people, because you know a dollar money is a dollar money, notwithstanding what it is somewhere money, it is still a dollar money. I think that this whole thing is very politically motivated, particularly in view of the recent comments, which I hope we will get plenty of time to debate here tonight, that have been placed by the Minister of Finance in regard to that we take the duty off of canned vegetables and so forth, which we have tried here in the House before when it was defeated, and before he does that I wish that he would presume to this House the figures on what he expected in revenue from these new measures, like - whether one or another but, I think he should presume to the figures as estimate of what he thinks Government will move in the coming year, that this year, 1969, by changing this new tax.

I think there are a lot of unanswered questions here that need to be answered; before we can intelligently decide. Some people may be well over-dressing already, but those of us who would have our Liberals off would like to have the relevant figures to be able to figure whether or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Member has just moved an amendment of a charge of twenty-five dollars on any one package of ... heard by me, but he can...

MR. JAMES M. BALFOUR: I do not think I made myself

MR. CHARLES H. WILSON: ... an allocation the president may be, or thereby be... There is a minimum bill of lading charge by sea, which is substantially more than the figure he has quoted, plus the fact when it comes in by air, there are no port charges to be added to that. When it comes in by sea there are port charges to be added on both. So it is more expensive if you bring it in simply because by sea that is by air.

MR. JAMES H. QUILLEN: Mr. Chairman, when I originally my comments or observation on this point, I did make it clear that I was not referring to one specific item because there would be a variation always. I said let me assume that this item of fifty items weighs in as a part of a shipment of one hundred and fifty pounds, because I am quite aware that you have a minimum charge on the ships, as well as you have a minimum charge on the airlines.

But really, you are fighting the one head here by Mr. Dr. Duncan Hansen in the air and to have opened the pressure which they think they can do, even on the other hand you are saying let me take the express charge from you, because, I may not impose all on this point today, that did go quite a bit to effect the amount of stuff that is brought by airfreight on the future.

MR. DAVID WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the member has expressed fully-argued evidence his case on probably one question I do certainly relevant to discussing revenue to Government from the figures that he has presented.

MR. CHARLES H. WILSON: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the point. The point is that I would appreciate if the Member pressing this point, and I think as the Legislative Members should have a right to ask this, what is the amount of revenue that this country plans to receive, in the year, if any, which I of this bill is passed

HON. T. D. MACDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I have not known just the amount of revenue to be raised specifically another by section, but the estimate of the overall taxation legislation that the additional revenue to be raised by the passage of this bill is between four hundred and fifty a million dollars.

MR. JAMES H. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, that is one reason for me to possibly pay attention to this if it is going to affect the small man the average man, but I would think that when you are presenting a Bill of this magnitude to the House, and certainly if we did not know any reason to oppose, I think there is a good reason to ask for an explanation how do that these figures can be presented to the House that we may intelligently decide what to do with this Bill.

MR. CHARLES MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the point I tried to make in my debate was that this is no simple amendment, this will take out a substantial chunk out of the revenue of the country. The member from North Side is seeking to give us one instance where he felt brought in a package by air and the total freight was eighteen dollars and fifty cents - I do not remember the exact figure he used, but for argument sake, that the total freight was eighteen dollars and fifty cents, which the man considered he could pay twenty-five dollars import duty plus on the freight alone. If the member is right in his old bill, twenty-five dollars he would only pay six dollars and fifty cents. So there is a difference of nineteen dollars and fifty cents on one small package, and if that package contained a cheap article, let us say a baby's dress that only cost twenty dollars.

MR.G.BAIN HOGBEN (Scarborough): Because of the duties on the air-freight under this proposed Bill the most of the items which nearly double in bulk to pay an extra nineteen dollars and fifty cents just on the freight alone.

I must say that I hope the Government Members take the opinion of the Honourable Member for Port Dalhousie when I looked at the Estimates since I previous then, I was wondering if they were going to duplicate the number of Inspectors that are just exactly necessary to produce the substantial sums shown in the Estimates. So this Chairman Bill is no small item and is going to mean, as the Member pointed out, this Bill has just gone into the Government in 1965, some four hundred thousand dollars just on this one item, and I must say that I am more convinced than ever that this section of the original Act should not be changed but should remain as it is, because it is going to mean that of the population, for example, because they do exist of the legislation, if they pay on extra five hundred thousand dollars and on that they have their normal profit of, say, twenty per cent, or whatever it is they would charge, the consumer will be paying one hundred thousand dollars in 1966 more for his necessary goods.

So it will increase the cost of living substantially and the first step straight from small businesses where the oil spreads, and since the determination of this Provision in the Act, it is now open however to speak the original provision in the Act so that the duties can be paid at seventy-five percent of the value of the refrigerator, rather than one hundred per cent of the refrigerator.

While a few Members already in their debate mentioned Newfoundland as supplement this amendment, I think in light of the whole situation which has come to the House today more definitely re-consider their stand on this Bill and realize that if Canada is to prosper in the form in which it was created in this Act, they will be saddling the consumers with - this hundred thousand dollars cost-of-living bite , with a portion in the end of 1965, and forever thereafter as long as it remains as it is. And of course if Newfoundland refuses to pass, as undoubtedly they will, we will find that most people they will also have an increase in the cost-of-living index attributable to the amendment which we are passing here so lightly today.

So, Mr.Chairman, I would hope that others will rise to speak. I understand the problem which was highlighted by the Member from North Side where. ..

MR.STARR (Hamilton): Mr.Chairman, I think there is another area of the room which the Member from Scarborough has not taken cognizance of - the figures I gave some used - while I am not sure I cannot deny his argument - the other side of the coin is that people brought in by air, the airlines, because of the size restrictions in the aircraft, are usually of more expensive goods, because if he is going to use first class the freight from Europe is cheaper on unit as of one item. Persons in Miami people who are not going to bring stuff in by air-freight, so there is going to be a tremendous volume in the importation of air-freight and therefore the revenue will seem to bring in, as I have shown, and am not belaboring all of my point.

MR.MACDONALD (Kingston): Well, I wonder if that was not the purpose of this Bill?

MR.CHAIRMAN: It would hardly be the purpose of the Bill...

MR. P.G.QUIRINO: Mr.Chairman, this Bill, the merits of it have already been debated in joint session. We are in committee now looking at the Bill clause by clause. A motion has put to delete clause 2; in my opinion there has been sufficient debate on that motion and I would recommend that the question be put at this stage.

MR. JAIME B. ECHIVERI: Mr.Chairman, please, we have had eleven amendments put on the floor during the last Meeting, and I have no one participating to argue it in the last Meeting or back a still does do so important.

If the Member has a contribution that will add to what we are saying by saying it then let us come up with something that may be good out of it, it is alright, but this is not a chance at this time. I think we still have freedom of speech, or at least, I think so.

MR. LINDLEY A. PIMENTEL: Mr.Chairman, Mr. Chairman - may I?

MR.PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. LINDLEY A. PIMENTEL: Mr.Chairman, my question on this Bill is basically supported by the Chinese Association. I think it is right to bring in people we refer to as the little people in the Philippines, and I think this is somewhat supported by this figures that have just presented to us by the Chief Official Number, that the Bill could bring about fifty hundred to fifty hundred thousand citizens in duty.

MR.P.G.QUIRINO: Mr.Chairman, just on a point of clarification, I am not against what I said, but some of the things I was looking for was what I intended to say. In indicating the total value to be gained on the local revenue to be estimated by this Bill, I said five hundred to half a million dollars, for it will not specifically for the chinese.

MR. LINDLEY A. PIMENTEL: Mr.Chairman, I was referring to this section here and I feel that a substantial amount of that five hundred to five hundred thousand would apply to section 2, but in the absence of any statistic by the Chief Official Number. I am unable to say exactly how much of that five hundred to five hundred thousand would apply to section 2. But I assume that in due course he will provide this information.

Mr.Chairman, I have to make it known that I do not think we are here recommending or saying to create more Chinese in Guam, in fact, should this Bill be here we intend to stop the movement thereof. This is not my position, or I have said I do not put myself to be opposing for opposition sake - I am here to represent my people, Mr.Chairman, and if there is something that I feel that is not in their best interest, I am definitely going to speak on it and I do not think that the amendment to section 41 (1) of the Organic Act (Inaudible) to the answer to our problems and this is why I would like to see section 2 of this Bill deleted, because I do not see any major benefits that it will bring to our people.

MR. JAIME B. ECHIVERI: Mr. Chairman, I would have to echo some of those sentiments. I was elected by the people of my district of Southern Guam and I think I am elected, although the opposition I noticed that them, just mine sometimes against my willingness and my will, to still work with a great majority and I am here to represent these people. These people are part of the electorate and part of the community people and this Bill should not be taken as frivolously as

MR. JAMES H.SCOTTOW (CONTINUING): Unfortunately many people do this because they think, because of the explosion, we should have an unfavourable ratio so we could get the proper figures to be able to immediately dismiss this. But between this entire Bill might benefit Government $600,000 to the good 100%. If we assume that the Cayman Islands have 20,000 people, including men, women and children, and multiplied them, then we are looking at this being a sum of $30 on every person in the Cayman Islands that we would be taking away if we took this Bill. If we look further at that and assume that there are 4,000 breadwinners in the Cayman Islands out of the 20,000 total population, then we are looking at $60.00 in taxes that we are putting on every breadwinner, every man in this already and a woman who is the head of the house-hold, who is working in this community.

If we assume that the average household is going to get a $30 increase on this $600,000 that he is going to pay Government in duty in order to get the money back with a profit, we are then looking at a population where every man, woman and child in this country is being taxed having based $30 per head of it in the breadwinners, every breadwinner in this country is being taxed $60.00 for this year of 1974. I take it that's a ridiculous Bill. I mentioned to the gentlemen who were speaking their reasons that I was hoped of this Bill that it was really constructive and that is why I feel that it should be the duty of the House to ascertain what the actual figures on this will be determined that each one of these things could be implemented in the House and help to be of use to a chance of most of the members changing their minds, because this Bill is very appealing to this Bill.

HON.D.O.EVANS: Mr.Chairman, Sir, I think we have passed the Second Reading of this Bill and it was very clear then that it had a majority in favour of it. Those against it should be able to see that they are going to be defeated, Sir, and I do not see why we should punish.....

HON. JAMES M.SCOTTOW: Mr.Chairman, that is not.....Unless...

HON.D.O.EVANS: You are not going to.....

HON. JAMES M.SCOTTOW: No, no, if England had felt that way we would be under German rule today, because are not.whipped, if you can imagine that putting her out.

HON.MICHAEL E.GILLETTE: Mr.Chairman, taking the same argument...

HON. JAMES M.SCOTTOW: This is an absurd to all dimensions when it are applied to be in here for.....

HON.CHARLES L.WHITTAKER: The Hon. elected Member from Bodden Town just now that this increase, since to the total increase of $600,000 having his own figures, he left out a completely important factor in that to the computation by our visitors. You cannot figure on 60,000 and then subtract it from be house-holders. What about the 200,000 tourists people that are coming here? Are they not complaining or they could also have to be taken into account, Sir. When you take it that it will be quite simplistic - I have not your passion for tax, particularly revenue - this is what we are talking about.

HON.V.G.ROBINSON: Mr.Chairman, I think important point is that the Members who belong right of two is that Government's expenditure as proposed in the budget is $33 and I am sure that the larger part of their budget is being spent in this country, electricity, gas,

MR.E.G.PERCIVAL (CONSERVATIVE): 80,000 then they are talking about which is, perhaps, a determination of those thousand who will choose to work one. So.....

MR.JAMES M.DOUGAN: Look.

MR.SPEAKER: It would be as well that we.....

MR.E.G.PERCIVAL: As Hansard have said I mean, the Government is receiving a lot of revenue here but it is going back to the people in different form.

MR.JAMES M.DOUGAN: But, Mr.Chairman,that is, I must say, a bit of an invalid argument to take because if we are going to give back that kind of expenditure which the budget is about among the people and distributed and so forth we have a long, long argument ahead of it.

But as now standing with specifically what is before us to take note. The Minister yesterday also will have told this House about its projections in Government revenue of these four hundred thousand to five hundred thousand dollars. We have not been able to specifically supply to take minute what, I think, should have been supplied as to what each individual item will specifically or be expected to yield, as you have 80,000 people in this country, now we are not talking like numbers, because you know on the one you give you are not going to have many of that anyhow - but you have to deal with this and then of the 80,000 people or 75,000 or whatever it is we are officially outside says you have, and they are the people we are going to pay this bill and it is going to be distributed among them. So there is no way you will please us then.

I am not trying to waste the time of the House, although I believe many times in debating form an argument. But Mr.Chairman, I must once more say to this House that this is not a minor matter - half a million dollars in Cayman Islands currency is not a minor matter.

MR.E.G.PERCIVAL: Mr.Chairman, is it standing that that can subject your objections....

MR.CHAIRMAN: Well, I think.....

MR.JAMES M.DOUGAN: It seems that you have neglected many of that also.

MR.M.MASSIAH ADAM: Mr.Chairman....

MR.CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR.M.MASSIAH ADAM: Mr.Chairman...

MR.CHAIRMAN: Order, I am speaking, please do not interrupt me. And I was going to say that I think that we have covered from the individual issues and that we have had a very full discussion of this minute and that I now propose to put the question in respect of it. Will those in favour please say aye?

SOME MEMBERS: Aye.

MR.CHAIRMAN: Those against, no?

SOME MEMBERS: No.

MR.JAMES M.DOUGAN: Mr.Chairman, I would just like to ask whether

MR. JAMES M. BURNS (CONTINUING): On that score, you have heard the witnesses against me....

MR. CRAIGHEAD: No....

MR. JAMES M. BURNS: In fighting this,

MR. CHAIRMAN: So nobody used the pleasure. I put the question, sir....

MR. JAMES M. BURNS: Could we have a division, sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You asked a division? Certainly you could.

We will have to wait for a moment before we do. So, we could do the division....
Sorry, the tape has run out, but we can do the division without the tape....

MR. JAMES M. BURNS: Could we propose a coffee break while they fix the tape, sir?

MR. CRAIGHEAD: It only takes about thirty seconds.

VOICES: (INAUDIBLE)

DIVISION

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis D. Deaton	Mr. Crawford C. Pearson
Rep. Michael J. Dunphy	Capt. Mabry S. Kirkconnell
Hon. Thomas C. Jeffreson	Mr. James M. Sydnor
Hon. Frances O. Lawrence	Mr. G. Alex Sinkler
Hon. W. Norman Scruggs	
Hon. Capt. Charles S. Sinkwerda	
Hon. Vincent G. Johnson	
Mr. A. Marshall Rush	
Mr. S. Edward Miller	
9	4

MR. CRAIGHEAD: I declare the motion carried. Please be seated part of the bill.

ASSEMBLY OF ASSOCIATES: CLAUSE 2 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE....

MRS. NICOLLE C. HAMILTON: Could I just ask for an small typographical error. "Dean" of the first line should be capitalized.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2, PROHIBITED OF PRACTICE CONTRARY TO THE SUBSIDIARY LAW.

MR. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move an amendment which Standing Order 11(8) leave of the Chair being waived for and granted under Standing Order 41(7), the following amendment....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think what you should do is to start by asking the leave of the Chair to move an amendment. You read the Clause under Standing Order 52(1). So if I may I will take it that what you did was to seek my leave under Standing Order 52(1). That I am prepared to grant. Now you may move the amendment.

MR. THOMAS C. HERRINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that Section 2 of the Bill be renumbered as subsection 2 of section 3, and that immediately preceding the newly renumbered subsection 2 of section 3, that the following new section be inserted:

> "(1) The First Schedule to the principal Act is amended by Chapter IX thereof, by the addition, immediately following item 9.03, of the following new item:-
>
> | | | |
> |---|---|---|
> | 9.04 | Electrical, mechanical and natural engineers - other than articled clerks | $100." |

MR. JAMES M. BOGGEY: Mr. Chairman, I object to...

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I could just make one point please before you speak, Mr. Boggy. What we have just done, that is, inserted the amendment in the amendment. If it were to be carried we would then subscribe the Clause as amended. If you are objecting to the amendment, you certainly carry on.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGEY: No, I was objecting to being given the floor, because it is difficult to understand this. Here we are trying to put the people out of existence, and then on the other hand now we're going to take the duty off entirely. You want to know what I'm up to try to explain?

MR. DENNIS R. RIGBY: It is because we have a discipline now, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGEY: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the Opposition is what the Government had been so moved by prior representations that they decided to resolve something.

HON. ISAAC G. STANBURY: An embodiment of good intention, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGEY: The proof to suit is proved that way too, Mr. Chairman, again I go back to my old argument in stating what I feel that the House should criticize instead of dealing with the relevant figures in respect to these amendments. The Member has told us that this will yield between $400,000 and $500,000....

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect, we are debating an amendment which will yield nothing. It may lose some revenue.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGEY: No, but just move with me until I get my point across. This will be expected to yield $400,000 to $500,000. I would like at least at this point to know the Member responsible for the amendment which he has just put on should go through. When we will know what the net "big effect of this bill will yield to the country.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS (CONTINUING): I would like to know why at this particular time when there are many other items which we could probably take the duty off, we are taking the duty off lumber. Is it because the Honorable Second Elected Member of Executive Council lost his contract last year to put duty on lumber? Are we really playing politics? If we are going to play politics I should really ... Let's be honest because I like to play that game. It could be....

HON. W. ROBERT RIDLEY: People seem to be playing a lot of politics in here all the time. I guess this might be part of it.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: It certainly must be because when there are many other things duty should be taken off to assist ordinary people to live down here and appear to put in a $200,000 cut in one attack of the pen on the people of these Islands and then on the next stroke to take that off. I do not know whether the Members are trying to support an idea, lifting the duty off lumber. I would like to hear what amount of duty is expected to be.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. Chairman, I responded many years ago, Sir. There is no account here to respond.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: Well would the Member respond and tell us what is the amount of duty we would lose by these persons.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. Chairman, the amount of duty is so low as to be negligible.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: Yes. But that is not an answer....

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: In previous years we have.... This is nothing new, Mr. Chairman. Last year, if my memory serves me correctly we took duty off kerosene, whereas this year we are taking duty off lumber. Certainly while the situation in this country over the last three or four months, it would seem to justify in my mind that duty should be removed from water provided it is not going to have a detrimental effect on the revenue of this country, and it is not.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: We took the duty off kerosene but we also took it off many items then kerosene. However, I feel that we should move the amount in this House because the Member also argued this case on the radio when the matter came before the House before, and he had some figures on it. I would like the figure to be made aware of what is the anticipated loss of revenue if this motion goes through. If we are going to put $500,000 on one hand and we are going to take away $50,000 on the other, then we should know whether it is $50,000 or $100,000 or whatever it is.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. Chairman, this is a minor modification that removes duty from imported foodstuffs, but we say that we hardly do not on concessions to poor persons, because in the case of water it is the poor people of these Islands who use a lot of that water. Regardless of what the amount of duty may be it is work to be a relief to poor people as well.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: But I would....

HON. ROBERT G. RUSSELL: So Mr. Chairman, because of duty from all the other things which some put forward have seen to have been just politics.

MR. JAMES M. HODGES: This must really be....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think.....

MR. JAMES M. HODGES: .....what we are playing now because, Mr. Chairman, following on what he just said, the Government Board and the supporters have been saying in this meeting all day that what we take the duty off the people do not get any benefit from it. That is what I have heard all afternoon. Now they are coming back with another argument. How do they expect the people are going to be any different on the water when they have been nothing on beginning based : whatever else it was?

MR. D. RICARD MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think in this case they are encouraging the merchants to stock it because it is a shortage. They are not necessarily going to pass the savings on to the poor people.

MR. GERALD A. LANDRY: Mr. Chairman, I cannot help what the Assembly does I can only vote the proper. What is to much down the duty otherwise which the duty was removed from. (Laughter).

MR. LEONARD J. FONTAINE: Mr. Chairman. ..

MR. JAMES M. HODGES: There will never be any duty taken off again I do not think in this administration. So we must bother to make to give them the water.

MR. LEONARD J. FONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, my contribution to this is mainly on view of my interest in my people. I also accept that we are operating under the democratic principle. I am totally in favour of duty being removed from water but as I said earlier, I totally oppose section 8 which was passed. Now as I am not here to appeal for opposition's sake, I have my reasons for any decisions of this that I oppose, because I can see where certain areas of this might be detrimental to my people. The removal of duty on drinking water I do not see as being detrimental. So I should have no reservations, support that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have had quite a full discussion on this we will.....

MR. G. GALE ROBERTS: The only thing is, Mr. Chairman, that I have not been allowed to say anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How unkind,

MR. S. NEIL ROBERTS: The Executive Council Members would not let me get a word in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you may have a word now. Take enough.

MR. G. GALE ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This session encompassed amendments which we are discussing, which is to take the duty off water, highlighted the confusion which exists on the Government's mind. We have before us a Bill which wishes increase Government's revenue from customs by half a million dollars or a figure in that area. One budget which has been presented this evening reflects this,

REP. G. HALE BROOKS (CONTINUING): How can this Government at this date have so flagrantly stuck a gun...? You know the little game people play, "I move to Jack's house and shoot mice to mice". How can we by hook pushing a bill to increase the revenue when we are tapping on to it a little amendment which will reduce the revenue. What does the Government want to do with this Bill? Do they want to increase the revenue or do they want to reduce it? I cannot understand this amendment but it has made it clear to me that there is something fascinating the Government with this amendment. Perhaps they were so surprised as I have been to learn that this little Bill will bring such a phenomenal revenue to Government. The lowering of duty on water is not significant at all because it is only a very small amount of water which is imported.

I have my feelings on this. The Government Bench have not been able to say that they ignore so many millions of pounds and the duty taken off would be so many billions. They are groping in the dark as much as we are, and this is good reason for adjourning this Bill until Monday morning so that the Government can find out what it is doing and end the state of confusion. I would suggest that we defer dealing with this amendment until the Government gets its act together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you....

REP. THE HONOURABLE E. LEVERMORE: Mr. Chairman, the Member who just spoke, Sir, has a remarkably short memory. If he would go back and I challenge him to do this, and look in the Hansard, he would see that when other Members Bills were introduced by this House there were also resolutions made by duly constituted Members on certain items on the paper. So this is nothing new.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you....

REP. THE HONOURABLE P. DOUGLAS: A question, Sir....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I would like to put the question on the amendment because we have had a very full discussion on it. Remember after we deal with the amendment we still have to come back to the Clause either as amended or otherwise.

MR. JAMES M. BROOKS: Is this on section 2 or 3, Sir, because with the amendment that this Bill is being put through this House I do not have all the necessary papers?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we are now putting the question on is whether the amendment to section 2 of the Bill proposed by the Honourable Chief Official Member should stand as part of that Bill.

MR. JAMES M. BROOKS: I have an amendment which I want to put....

MR. CHAIRMAN: That comes later....

MR. JAMES M. BROOKS: ....with your leave to section 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We must first deal with this amendment. If you have an amendment you can move it after we have dealt with this one.

MR. JAMES M. BOOKER: So, I just want to be sure, Sir, that we do not get voted out here without a good fight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, we go back to Clause 3 after we have dealt with this amendment so you are quite right. The question is that Clause 3 be amended as proposed by the Honourable Third Official Member. In other words the question is that the proposal must appear be included in the Clause.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. JAMES M. BOOKER: I voted against it before, Sir, and I am going to vote against it now. I just wanted the ruling of the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. ...

MR. M. MORRISON BUSH: I just want it recorded, Sir, that I voted no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry?

MR. M. MORRISON BUSH: I just want it recorded, Sir. I did not think it was clear. I voted for that amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want to vote again....

MR. M. MORRISON BUSH: Could I have a division, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolute.

QUESTION

AYES	NOES
Hon. Donald F. Foster	Mr. M. Morrison Bush
Hon. Thomas C. Maffey	Mr. James M. Booker
Hon. Ronald G. Sharpe	Mr. G. Roy Reid
Hon. M. Norman Haddad	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Blackmore	
Hon. Daniel G. Johnson	
Mr. Lanford A. Seaman	
Capt. Ruby E. Blackmore	
Mr. E. Ronald Miller	
8	3

MR. CHAIRMAN: I therefore the Amendment carried.

AGREED BY MAJORITY: AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 3 PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So now what we are doing is....

MR. JAMES M. BOOKER: Shall now just the amendment to put it before the House. My still have not had the discussion on that. We now still further discuss that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid you have taken the words out of my mouth. What I was going to say next that what we now include in Clause 3 as amended. It is permissible to seek permission to move further amendments to the clause.

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: Will I beg permission, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you beg permission to....

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: Under section 3, subsection (2) I would like to propose $9 where $15 is proposed now.

MR. D. SCOTT MACKAY: The Member has to ask leave of the House under Standing Order 34.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So strictly, then you may have permission under section 34(1) of Standing Orders to move an amendment. Secondly, I take note that your proposed amendment is that the figure "nine" be substituted for the figure "fifty" in the first line of the clause. Is it the first time in fact?

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The effect, so that everybody understands, is that the increase in the duty on cigarettes should be $5 per thousand....

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: Instead of $15.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to speak to your amendment?

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: Yes, Sir. First of all, Sir, I want to make clear that I am not doing it particularly for specific reasons I have. I do not want it to be misunderstood.

MR. WILBERT G. STRICKER: Mr. Chairman, he gave himself away. He has a special interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he is entitled to elucidate on his remarks.

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: I should only probably smoke two each if we could get the duty increased to maybe $200 per thousand it might be better for me personally. However,....

MR. S. HAZARD MITCHELL: Is that an amendment, Sir?

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: On the merits of it, Sir, I feel that the increase is too much and I am generally against this Bill anyway. I could be persuaded readily to vote in favour of the "$10.00" the way it stands but personally I am against most of the items in this Bill because I feel as I said in the beginning that it is a very unfair Bill, and we should have been supplied with more information. So therefore I do stand in opposition to that way. I do not know whether anybody else is going to help the public very much in view of the other heavy taxes which have been put on lately and the heavy burden the people will have to carry. However, those who smoke might appreciate to get an extra dollar to do. So therefore I beg your leave to put my amendment to section 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I gave you the house already. You are now....

MR. JAMES M. BOGGES: I was just doing it again to be sure you....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are urging Members to vote for your amendment?

MR. JAMES M. BOGGES: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what is now before the House is a further amendment to Clause 4, the effect of which would be to replace the figure "ten" in the last line of the clause with the figure "nine".

MR. J. HALE ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, I speak in favour of the amendment just proposed by the Hon. Elected Member for Rankin Town. The effect would be to increase the duty on cigarettes by two cents a pack, rather than the four cents per pack of twenty which had been proposed in the Bill before the House. This seems like a small figure to be dealing with but as I mentioned in my remarks, an increase of four cents would mean the Government must put on five cents. The retailer would then probably just another one cent on the cost so that the packet would retail by retail means cents a pack. The amendment which is before the House now would mean that the increase in the price of a pack of cigarettes would be three to four cents a pack. In the long run this would not be quite a lot of money because those people who smoke usually smoke one, two or three packs a day and it can mean a substantial difference to a person who is on a limited budget.

Let us say the common labourer who is maybe working by the week is going to buy his cigarettes at the weekend even if they must seven cents more. In this case either I have still suffer. While it is true that cigarettes smoking is not good for health, if a person is in the habit he is going to smoke just like the person who drinks. If we increase the price of the drink he is still going to buy it.

The effect of raising the import tax on cigarettes simply means that we have increased the cost of living because to the smoker the cigarette is part of his living. We have increased the cost of living to that family. If it is the man who smokes and he is the breadwinner he is going to buy cigarettes and maybe the child will not get the same cents candy that he would have had. So whether smoking is morally right or morally wrong, it is not for us to act in judgement here. We have to consider the economic effect on the whole family of increasing the price of the cigarettes.

I am looking forward to the day where smoking will be banned from all coffee rooms where I go for my coffee and so on, but this really has nothing to do with the amendment. What we must decide here is whether we can rightfully increase the cost of living to that family by three and a half cents or by seven cents as proposed in the original Bill before the House. I would say, Sir, to make the increase by two cents a pack to $2 per thousand would be a reasonable increase. Remember it is not just two cents a pack. That is two cents for every pack which a person smokes. It is a habit which I understand ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the honorable Member has made his point. I think everybody will be aware what it is. Thank you.

HON. MARGARET C. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much that the increase as recommended here will be affecting too many people, because the position in town now is that there are two large supermarkets in the centre of Hamilton selling cigarettes at $5 or $5 cents a pack, while all other establishments around town are selling them at $5 per pack. If we go to the hotels and elsewhere we find that cigarettes are being sold at over a dollar per pack. So there is confusion with persons in town. The story is that just across a road here is not going to affect too many people because those people who are selling at $4.90 cents and $5 cents per pack-size going to be very cautious of the increase which they put on a pack of cigarettes.

MR. JAMES M. DUNKLEY: I am obliged, Sir, at the way the Honourable South Pembroke Member of Executive Council is speaking and suggested that he do not come up to date with local prices that he is because if he wants to go to Queen-Street he can buy them for seventy five cents a pack.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you for the enlightening information about cigarettes....

MR. JAMES M. DUNKLEY: No, no! ....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we now will put the question on the First Elected Member for Pembroke South's amendment, which is noting Members in favour say aye of them are in favour of forgetting to that Clause 3 should be amended in such a way that the figure $10,000 in the first line thereof ($5,000).

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that the mover of the amendment voted on his own amendment, but....

MR. JAMES M. DUNKLEY: Yes, I was considered, Sir. (LAUGHTER). I was waiting for them to vote you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But you have to say aye if you were in favour of your amendment.

MR. JAMES M. DUNKLEY: I was waiting for them to vote first. Sir, so that I could....

MR. E. GERARD GUTTERY: We have lost the chance, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid you have lost your chance.

MR. JAMES M. DUNKLEY: Could I have a division, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alright, you get it. Mark them.

RECORD

AYES	NOES
Mr. James M. Madden Mr. G. Kerr Seiden	Rep. Dennis E. Hastert Rep. Thomas C. Jaffarson Rep. Samuel D. Shimkus Rep. W. Norman Seidel Rep. Capt. Charles E. McConnell Rep. Russell C. Johnson Mr. E. Kenneth Black Mr. Lindford A. Pearson Capt. Henry S. McConnell Mr. D. Edward Miller
2	10

MR. JAMES M. MADDEN: I call that a good committee vote.

MR. W. NORMAN SEIDEL: Did the Member say committee? You do not know that is what somebody is being sued for now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, order. I declare the amendment

ADOPTED BY MAJORITY: AMENDMENT TO HOUSE BILL 1 SECOND AMENDMENT ADOPTED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the question that Clause 3 be amended in the way already proposed should stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. T. EDWARD HOSKE: Mr. Chairman, may I have a division please?

RECORD

AYES	NOES
Rep. Dennis E. Hastert Rep. Thomas C. Jaffarson Rep. Samuel D. Shimkus Rep. W. Norman Seidel Rep. Capt. Charles E. McConnell Rep. Russell C. Johnson Mr. E. Kenneth Black Mr. Lindford A. Pearson Capt. Henry S. McConnell Mr. D. Edward Miller	Mr. James M. Madden Mr. G. Kerr Seiden
10	2

MR. DENNIS E. HASTERT: Now is the time to put the next phrase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I confirm that Clause 3 stands part of the Bill.

AGREED BY MAJORITY: CLAUSE 3 AS AMENDED AGREED.

CLERK: CHANGE 4. AMENDMENT OF SECOND SCHEDULE TO THE PRINCIPAL ACT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I put the question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO. CLAUSE 4 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 5. AMENDMENT OF FIFTH SCHEDULE TO THE PRINCIPAL ACT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill.

HON. THOMAS O. MBOTHWA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, nonetheless with Standing Order 68(3) I seek leave of the House to move a Committee Stage amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is actually Standing Order 68(2), but leave is granted.

HON. THOMAS O. MBOTHWA: Yes, Sir.

"That Section 5 of the Bill be amended -

(a) by the deletion of the word and numeral "Item 2" appearing in line 2 thereof and the substitution therefor of the word and numerals "Items 2 and 3"; and

(b) by the insertion immediately before the words to be substituted item 2 of the following Item -

"3. Ocean to passenger - Per package 1.50"
for each 100 lbs or part thereof;"

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have given leave. Do you wish to speak to your amendment to explain it?

HON. THOMAS O. MBOTHWA: Mr. Chairman, this basically deals with the first schedule of the Customs Act, particularly on charges both in the ocean to passenger, as well as unaccompanied goods.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would I be right to say that your amendment, and it is also with the amendment alone which follows, is simply to add passenger goods to unaccompanied goods.

HON. THOMAS O. MBOTHWA: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody wish to speak to the amendment? I will then put the question that the amendment stands part of Clause 5.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 5 PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now is that Clause 5 as amended stand part of the Bill.

HON. C. KATO MOSES: Mr. Chairman. Before you put the question I would like to beg leave of the House to move an amendment to this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN. If I may remind you, you do not beg leave of the House. You seek my recognition under Standing Order 8(2). It has been the practice in respect of this particular Bill I am perfectly prepared to grant it in principle. Can you tell me what the amendment is?

MR. C. KITT HOUSE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The amendment I would like is that the figure "0.50" be changed to "0.60".

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is both places where the figure of "0.50 appears, because it will not appear in two places?

MR. G. RATE SCOTT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So your amendment is that in Clause 6 as amended.....It says "Weighs 0.50" but it also says fifty cents also it after it says "Weighs"?

MR. C. KITT HOUSE: It should be fifty cents.

MAJ. THOMAS D. PETERSON. It should be as it is stated, Mr. Chairman. It is taken from the First Schedule of the Customs Tax regarding unpackaged goods.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 0.50 refers to ninty five ml? That is my question.

MAJ. THOMAS D. PETERSON- Fifty cents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Although it does not actually say cents in this Bill, when one gets it know the tax is in cents that is the cents.

MR. G. RATE SCOTT: Yes, in the Memorandum of Objects and Reasons it says that it was being changed from one cents to fifty cents. My amendment would mean that it would change from one cents to twenty cents. In other words it will increase by just 100 per cent rather than 500 per cent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that clear?

MR. G. RATE SCOTT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then the amendment proposed now is - Clause 6 is that in both cases where the figures "0.50" mentioning fifty cents appear, they should be changed to "0.60" meaning twenty cents.

MR. G. RATE SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to that amendment, it seems unreasonable to increase the package tax by such a large percentage. I understand that this particular tax has remained at the same for a long time, and perhaps it is reasonable to have a slight increase. However, I think that the increase fifty cents would be excessive and should not be allowed. I therefore would ask the Members to support my amendments to make the increase to twenty cents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I will put the question. I think all Members know what it is.

MR. CLYDE H. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, can we speak on that amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member has spoken out...

MR. JAMES M. SCOTTEN: Well, no one else has had a chance to speak on it, Sir. I would like to speak on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alright.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTTEN: I would like to go back to my previous question, Mr. Chairman, and see if the Honourable Third Opposition Member could give us any estimate as to the amount of revenue which we are hoping to receive from this item, and what we can reasonably raise. If we increase $10,000 more, if we only pass up 500 per cent then we will receive $50,000. Do we have any estimate of it?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that it will raise $60,000.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTTEN: With the increase or without the increase?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: With the increase.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTTEN: So we must be...

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: With the increase to fifty cents.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTTEN: So we must be receiving then about $25,000 more.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Exactly.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTTEN: Well, I am personally against this increase, Mr. Chairman. A 500 per cent increase on one item seems to be a very large amount and this Legislature would like to be looked on as being a responsible Legislature I am sure. I could go along with the increase because I understand the reason why it should be increased. I could go along with an increase from ten to twenty cents but I could not go along with an increase from ten to fifty cents. I think that is really too large and I would have to amend anything to get fifty cents. I am very much in favour of the ten twenty cents and I would hope that the Members of the Assembly oppose the motion for that, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless any other Members wishes to speak I will...

HON. ROBERT G. POMEROY: Mr. Chairman, because the ten cents has not been in long enough, that is one reason why the proposed increase to fifty cents is badly necessitated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that has already...

MR. JAMES M. SCOTTEN: Sure, Mr. Chairman, that is the very reason I think we should not even be considering it. It is so recent. It has been in for only so long. It is looked on as such a really quite light of legislation that I really do not expect that the Members would not come up with something else which might produce their budgets rather than coming up with items like this. A 500 per cent increase is really too much.

MRS. MARGE G. SCHERER: Put the question, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was trying to put the question earlier. I will put the question that the amendment proposed by the Second Ranking Member for Rubber Duck to Clause 5 of the Bill be made.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. G. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, may I have a division please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DIVISION

AYES

Mr. Lincoln C. Thomson
Mr. James M. Holden
Mr. G. Craig Sanders

NOES

Hon. Dennis M. Foster
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson
Hon. Ralph O. Starke
Hon. M. Norman Walker
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkconnell
Hon. Robert J. Johnson
Mr. M. McKenzie Beck
Capt. Henry D. Kirkconnell
Mr. D. Edward Miller

MRS. DENISE M. FOSTER: Excuse me Lester....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I must declare the amendment lost, I...

MRS. MARGE G. SCHERER: He nearly beat it.

CLERK AT REGISTRY: AMENDMENT TO AMENDMENT DEFEATED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That amendment has been beat. You will remember that Clause 5 was earlier amended. The amendment moved by the Honourable Second Official Member was rejected. So the question now is whether Clause 5 as amended should stand part of the Bill.

MR. CLARE M. ROBERTS: Amended to what, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I am not sure whether you have shown me the Bill where was an amendment carried and it was voted on, and....

MR. DENISE M. FOSTER: Did we give away something while I was not here....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may have done. So I will put the question that Clause 5 as amended stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

SEN. JAMES M. JEFFORDS: Mr. Chairman, could you tell me what it was again. I do not have a copy of any amendment to Clause 5.

SEN. D. RICK SCHAUER: Mr. Chairman, I would like a division for the approval of the other Members

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us take a recess and the Clerk will show the Members what the....

DIVISION

AYES	NOES
Sen. Dennis S. Proctor	Mr. Clifford A. Pierson
Sen. Thomas C. McPherson	Mr. James M. Holden
Sen. Duncan O. Pringle	Mr. G. Mary Bodine
Sen. R. Norman Holden	
Gen. Chas. Charles F. Kirkconnell	
Sen. Robert G. Johnson	
Mr. F. Wyllowie Dean	
Capt. Mabry S. Kirkconnell	
Mr. D. Gordon Miller	
9	3

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill.

CLERK OF PARLIAMENT: CLAUSE 5 AS AMENDED AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION (CABINET REVISION).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Preamble Clause stand part of the Bill.

CLERK OF PAR: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall resolution passed-Hope in Committee on a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Supreme Law (Cabinet Revision). The House will resume.

ROSE MACHES

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Reports.

THE SUPREME LAW(CABINET) BILL, 1995

REPORT RECEIVED

HON. THOMAS C. MCPHERSON: Mr. President, I have to report that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Supreme Law (Cabinet Revision) was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed with no amendments.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill is accordingly read third time.

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

SECOND READING

CLERK: The Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1985

HON. JAMES E. FERGUSON: Mr. President, I move that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Customs Act (Revised Statutes) be given a Second Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Customs Act (Revised Statutes) be given a Second Reading and passed.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Mr. President, I am of the opinion that to raise this into the Second Reading today, the Member piloting the Bill would have to ask for suspension of the standing Orders.

MR. PRESIDENT: They have been suspended already.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: What?

MR. PRESIDENT: When you were out. (Laughter) So I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

MR. V. ALEX BRADLEY: Mr. President, may I have a division please?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes.

DIVISION

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis M. Foster	Mr. James M. Scott
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	Mr. C. Kelly Bodden
Hon. Vincent O. Rumple	
Hon. W. Norman Bodden	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkconnell	
Hon. Manuel C. Johnson	
Mr. W. McKeeva Bush	
Hon. Lindford A. Pierson	
Capt. Henry G. Kirkconnell	
Mr. V. Alexander Bradley	
10	2

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried as the Bill has been read a third time and passed.

AGREED BY MAJORITY: BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING AND PASSED.

Adjournment

SEN. DENNIS R. ROSTEN: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 a.m., Monday, 6th March, 1972.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m. on Monday, 6th March, 1972.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO. AT 7.37 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., MONDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1972.

STATE OPENING & BUDGET ADDRESS OF THE [1995] SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MONDAY, 4TH MARCH, 1995

(SECOND DAY)

SPEAKER PRAYS:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, SIR C PETER LLOYD, GBE, KCB - PRESIDING

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS R FOSTER, BVSC, CPE, JP FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER: REPRESENTING FOR INDUSTRIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

HON MITCHELL J ROBINSON, QC, LL.B SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION

HON THOMAS G JEFFERSON, JP THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER REPRESENTING FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

HON BARBARA M MEAGHER SENIOR MINISTER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

HON R SCHARR BSOCSCI,MDEV MINISTER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

HON CHARLES T KINGSMILL MINISTER FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

HON MICHAEL A JOHNSTON, CMG, JP MINISTER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR W MACKINTOSH SLOAN SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY

DR LEONFORD A MYLVAGNAM, JP ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN

CAPT MALCOLM A MISKELWHEETE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF THE EASTERN ISLANDS

MR JAMES M SCOTT FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE

MR G HAIN GODDEN SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN

MR D BERNARD MCLEAN SECOND MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE

MR JACOB A WARNER ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUM SND

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STOCK EXCHANGE & BUDGET MEETINGS OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MONDAY, 4TH MARCH, 1985

SECOND DAY

1. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS & REPORTS

(a) BUSINESS COMMITTEE REPORT

(Meeting held 27th February, 1985)

TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER, CHAIRMAN OF BUSINESS COMMITTEE.

(b) FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

(Meeting held 19th December, 1984)

TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER, CHAIRMAN OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

(c) ACCOUNTS OF CAYMAN AIRWAYS LIMITED AND CAYMAN AIR BOOKINGS LIMITED FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1984

TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE HONOURABLE ARNOLD SELKIRK MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

2. QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 1: WOULD THE HONOUR STATE THE AMOUNT OF REVENUE COLLECTED FOR THE MONTHS OF JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1985, AND HOW DOES IT CONTRAST WITH THE SAME MONTHS FOR 1984?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FOURTH ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 2: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE HOW MANY MORTGAGES HAVE BEEN ISSUED BY THE HOUSING CORPORATION AND WHAT ARE THE QUALIFICATIONS AND CONDITIONS FOR THE TERMS OF THE LOANS?

NO. 3: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS HOUSING CORPORATION IS?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 4: WILL THE MEMBER STATE THE COST OF THE SECOND OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE NEW AIRPORT TERMINAL?

THE SOUTH ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 5: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER ANY GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS WERE HYPOTHECATED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BANK OVERDRAFT AT 31ST OCTOBER, 1984, AND IF SO COLLATERAL BACKING FOR THE LOAN TO PURCHASE THE PAPER OUTLETS?

THE SECOND PRINCIPAL MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER REPRESENTING THE FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 6: IN VIEW OF THE CONFLICTING VIEWS GIVEN OF THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF GOVERNMENT AS AT 31ST OCTOBER, 1984, WOULD THE MEMBER STATE THE CURRENT BALANCES AT THAT DATE?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE NEWLY ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 7: WILL THE MEMBER GIVE A DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO PEOPLE AND ANSWERS WHICH EXCLUDED QUESTIONS AS TO WHETHER THEIR FAMILIES WERE USING DRUGS AND ALCOHOL, AND THE AUTHORISED BANK?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 8: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT PROGRESS, IF ANY, HAS BEEN MADE TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPORTS COMPLEX?

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(a) BILLS:-

(1) FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 66(1) AND 67

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER TO ENABLE ALL STAGES OF THE BILL TO BE TAKEN.

COMMITTEE STAGE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

REPORT STAGE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(4) FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(1) THE LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE DEFAMATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (EMOLUMENTS, PENSIONS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(5) THE AIR NAVIGATION (OVERFLIGHT) BILL, 1985

COMMITTEE THEROOM

(1) THE LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(2) THE IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(3) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(4) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(5) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(b) MOTION:-

COMMENCEMENT MOTION NO. 1/85 - ASSENTING COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Report of Business Committee - Laid on the Table	2
Report of Business Committee held on 28th November, 1994 - Laid on the Table	3
Accounts of Cayman Airways Limited and Cayman Airways Holdings Limited for the year ended 30th June, 1994 - Laid on the Table	5
Questions	8
The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1995 - First and Second Readings	17
Adjournment	44

MONDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1995

10.15 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

If I may I will express the regret of the staff of the House for the fact that the Orders of the Day were so late in reaching Members, with the result that we are neither fit for starting this morning. There was a problem as a result of which the Orders had to be re-typed at the last moment. Subject to Members' concurrence, since we are ten minutes late in starting I would propose to allow questions three to continue until 11.15 this morning. I am sure that I shall be told by the honourable Second Official Member that some notice is necessary for this purpose but maybe my watch will run slow.

Item 1, presentation of Papers and Reports.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE REPORT

HON. DENNIS H. FOSTER: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Agriculture Committee's Report.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Finance Committee Report of 10th December, 1994.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the Meeting held on 7th December, 1994 approved a total supplementary expenditure of $176,780.00. A breakdown of that total, Mr. President, is as follows:-

(1) HEAD 10 - FINANCE
SUB-HEAD 10-001 - CONSERVATION $16,380.00
Funds required for compensation to Mr. Marlon Davies for crops.
The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town voted against the supplementary appropriation.

(2) HEAD 18 - JUDICIAL
SUB-HEAD 7-084 - COURT OF APPEAL $81,400.00
Funds required to meet expenses of the Court of Appeal to year end.
The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town voted against the supplementary appropriation.

(3) HEAD 19 - AGRICULTURE
SUB-HEAD 99-018 - FARM IMPROVEMENT (Add.,000)
ADD 7-018 - FARMERS AND APPRENTICES (Add.,000) $78,000.00
Funds required to clear the outstanding bills incurred by the previous Chief Agricultural and Veterinary Officer.
The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town voted against the request.

MR. HOWARD C. ANDERSON (CONTINUING):

(1) HEAD 16 - HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
SUB-HEAD 08-002 - HOMES OF MENTAL VIEW.....$10,000.00
Funds requested to implement the remedial measures at the Mona Retirement Home in your seat.

(2) HEAD 16 - HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
SUB-HEAD 08-020 - OVERSEAS MEDICAL CASES.....$25,000.00
Funds required to pay the medical expenses of the late Master Williams.

(3) HEAD 45 - CAPITAL
SUB-HEAD 1-8 - VEHICLES.....$ 6,000.00
Funds required to provide a van for the police drug dept.

CI$175,000.00

There was a statement requested on this? during that Meeting, Mr. President, but the request was withdrawn pending a detailed proposal for the establishment of District Fire Brigades, to be presented by the Honourable Minister at the forthcoming Budget Meeting of the Legislative Assembly.

Other reasons which arose was the need for the Chairman to show funds for the re-construction of the Lands court at the Cayman Brac High School.

The Appropriation, Mr. President, the Minutes of that Meeting indicate that the Second Elected Member for West Bay, was not present. In fact, Mr. President, he was not an apologies for the error.

There was also, Mr. President, a minority report given by the Second Elected Member for Western Town dealing with the Cayman Brac Fire Service previously mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 27(4), this House is deemed to have agreed to the motion.

ADOPTION OF CERTAIN LEGISLATIVE PAPERS AND PAPERS NOT LAID

HON. M. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, I lay on the table of this Honourable House the Audited Financial Statements of Cayman Airways Limited and Cayman Air Holdings Limited for the financial year ended 30th June, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

HON. M. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, as provided under Standing Order 18 I have already laid my statement on these statements until I am debating the Budget Address and the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Have copies of the statements been distributed to Members, or will copies be made available as well as the copy laid on the table?

HON. M. NORMAN BODDEN: They will be made available, Sir. They are here in the House at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Clerk could put the Statement to Distribute them in due course.

Item 8, questions. The Elected Member for North Side.

QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE JUNIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 1: Would the Member state the amount of revenue collected for the months of January and February, 1985, and how does it compare with the same months for 1984?

ANSWER: Revenue collected during the period 1st January, 1984, to 29th February, 1984, was $13,538,213.84 compared with 1st January, 1985, to 28th February, 1985, of $12,066,700.78.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless there is any Member wishing to ask a supplementary I will invite the Elected Member for North Side to ask question No. 2.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE JUNIOR ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND FINANCE

NO. 2: Would the Member state how many mortgages have been issued by the Housing Corporation and what were the qualifications and conditions for the terms of the loans.

ANSWER: Since the Housing Development Corporation became operational in August, 1984, 35 mortgage loans have been approved out of a total of 49 applications. Twelve of these 35 are shared loans and 2 are guaranteed loans.

The basic qualifications and conditions for the terms of the loans are as follows:

(1) Borrower Qualifications

(a) Satisfactory credit history
(b) Steady employment - the gross minimum income presumption or related capacity
(c) Maximum Ratios of GDS, TDS etc.
(d) Monthly mortgage payments (principal, interest and insurance) cannot exceed 25 per cent of borrowed earnings
(e) Total monthly payments including mortgage payments and any other revolving monthly repayments cannot exceed 35 per cent of borrowed earnings
(f) Applicant must be Belgrade or have Belgrade status

(2) Property Qualifications

(a) Employment must be adequate for usual-determined needs - conventional family dwelling
(b) Minimum Income: $6,500 min. gr., adequate for $5,000 eq. fr. semi-attached
(c) Vehicular access to public road
(d) Necessary Improvements: water, e.g., Public Health, Central Planning Authority
(e) Conditions: market appeal, general appearance
(f) Adult/dependents: unestablished
(g) Minimum 1 bedroom, 1 bathroom.

(3) Loan Conditions
(a) Maximum loan amount = $12,000
Minimum = $5,000
(b) Minimum term = 5 years
Maximum term = 25 years
(c) Interest ranging from 5% to 8% per annum 2 per cent, depending on income. Base rate adjusted every 6 months announced at Press Release Home - Book Office Notice for 6 months thereafter
(d) Insurance to maintain on both the property and the policyholder's life, the latter in at least the full amount of the loan borrowed
(e) Property must be maintained in such a condition as to protect the mortgage market value, and failure to do so would be considered as a default in the terms of the mortgage.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. D. EDMUND WILLIS: Supplementary, Mr. President, would the Minister state under the borrowing qualifications if any consideration is given to the value of assets which an individual might own rather than just his income of up to $12,000. In other words, suppose somebody has assets which are worth $250,000 but only an income of $8,000 could they still qualify for a loan?

MR. MARCUS G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, unfortunately we have not been able to understand one another by the Opposition simply because there are no funds. However, from the schedule of applications which I am in the process the net worth of each applicant is stated and these range from anywhere in the vicinity of $40,000. to over $100,000. So the net worth of the applicants is also taken into consideration.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary question I will invite the Member for North Side to ask Question No. 5.

THE PLACING MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR GOVERNMENT OWNED HOUSES OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEPARTMENTS AND MINISTRY PERSONNEL

NO. 5: Would the Member please state the financial position of the Cayman Islands Housing Corporation in?

ANSWER: The financial position of the Housing Development Corporation as at 31st December, 1965, showed a deficit of $72,809 of which $16,188 were income from the year ended 31st May, 1965. The Corporation showed the receipts on the 5th August, 1965. The accumulated deficit has created because the Corporation's income is not easy until its commitments to the end of construction and cannot therefore meet the loan repayments given at an average level. Secondly, the Corporation came into operation without a capital allowance to assist its financially in the early days of its operations.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. LIONEL A. FERNAND: Supplementary, Mr. President. We have heard the deficit position. Could the Member state what efforts are being made through the Portfolio to obtain the necessary funds for the Housing Corporation?

HON. VICTOR C. JOHNSON: Mr. President, the Board of the Corporation has instructed me to write to Government, which I have already done. The correspondence was addressed to the Honourable Financial Secretary, asking whether it was possible that the loan made by Government in the sum of $117,000 would not be capitalized in order to put the accounts of the Corporation on a much better financial position. A letter has already been forwarded to the Honourable Financial Secretary and I am now awaiting a reply.

MR. LIONEL A. FERNAND: Mr. President, just a clarification of that. Is the Member stating that $117,000 has been removed from Government and that that will be put into the Housing Corporation's funds? I was not quite clear on that point.

HON. VICTOR C. JOHNSON: Sorry, Mr. President. The $117,000 is a loan made to the Corporation further back years to assist it in the gathering of funds for current funding. We are asking that that loan be now converted into the capital of Government in order to have sufficient funds to meet this deficit and the development of the Board.

MR. E. PEARCE MILLER: A supplementary, Mr. President. In the answer the Member stated that the revenue is only until the completion to the end of construction. If the revenue from the Board cannot cover the expenses what efforts is being made to reduce expenses, that is both in terms of personnel emoluments and accommodation now occupied by the Housing Authority?

HON. VICTOR C. STEVENS: Mr. President, in terms of staffing I do not think that we can reduce what is there now; beyond the two members, the manager and a secretary. As far as the accommodation is concerned we have also requested that the offices in which the Corporation now operates, which is at the airport, formerly the Freight offices of Cayman Airways for which a rental of $12,000 per annum is being paid, be transferred to the Tower building. That they would be later used as rentals. As far as the financial position of the Corporation is concerned it is anticipated that that will not increase to sufficiently cover overhead and other expenses until the loan portfolio has reached approximately the sum of over $3 million.

MR. C. RAY JORDAN: Mr. President, may I ask if it is a fact that there would be no deficit if the banks had purchased the bonds?

MRS. MARGARET H. FINNEGAN: Mr. President, that is not so because the banks purchasing bonds are held as loans and not revenue. Revenue can only arrive if there is a surplus of money deposited and the interest goes to the Government. However, without any money there there is no deficiency either.

MR. JAMES M. BOSTON: Mr. President, a parliamentary. Based on what the Member has just said I might assume that if an increased allowance by the Federal government on the basis of 5 per cent on it is in the loan possible, and that money had been put on deposit at whatever the amount rate is, or had been loaned out on mortgages to help the middle income people of the country, would it not have provided quite a substantial income?

MRS. MARGARET G. FINNEGAN: Mr. President, that is correct. I have said just now that when the loan principle reaches a level of approximately 50 billion in money when it comes sufficient income from those investments, then it will be able to meet its commitments. If the banks had substantial large sums of money the same would happen. There would be sufficient money to re-lend and it not to build on deposit. There would generate an income as well.

MR. JAMES M. BOSTON: Will the lady yield to the Second District Member for Dallas County for interest to inquire?

MRS. MARGARET G. FINNEGAN: Please repeat the question.

MR. JAMES M. BOSTON: In view of what you have just explained was the answer you gave to the Second District Member on the Dallas County on his previous comment or statement?

MRS. MARGARET G. FINNEGAN: I cannot remember the question read by the Second District Member for Dallas County. Will you please repeat it?

MR. C. RAY JORDAN: The question I asked was, is it not a fact that the banks people who bonds that the Commission should not now be in a deficit problem?

MRS. MARGARET G. FINNEGAN: It all depends on how many bonds they bought. To answer the loan buying bonds would make record the title.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think there might have been some slight confusion....

MR. JAMES M. BOSTON: Let me ask it this then, Mr. President. We have, as indicated in the budget speech, I think approximately 600 thousand banking institutions in the country and when the Government comptroller....

MR. E. EDWARD HILLIS: Point of order. The Member is making a statement, Sir. He has not asked a question.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am hoping that he is coming to his question. He must not make too long a statement.

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: If you please I will not take the question. I am quite familiar with the standing orders of the House. I do not need to be taught by you.

MR. SPEAKER: You may address your remarks to the Chair, not to other Members.

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: Certainly, in future I will then. My question, Mr. Speaker....well if no other words then, he should not have said it. You should have been the one to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: No, he did rise on a point of order but anybody speaking rises address the Speaker.

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: The idea of these brief one sentence questions followed on the Government and Opposition sides respectively, of each of them had submitted to the manner in which it was understood that they could subscribe, would there not have been sufficient money in the Consolidated Fund on the 31st December for the interest mentioned, that there would have been no deficit.

MR. WILBERT C. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with what the Member has said. If all of these 400 jumps and big insurance companies had made contribution to the Housing Corporation as required, we should have had sufficient funds, unfortunately, however, they did not.

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: What attempt is being made at the present time to ensure that we get contribution from these financial institutions?

MR. WILBERT C. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, we are now in the process of negotiating with the banks again, and not only with the banks but with the general public for contributions towards the needs of the Housing Corporation. There have been indications that will that there be confidence in the Government again, which we did not unfortunately enjoy....

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Member is deputy that there was no lack of confidence in the previous Government, and I for one would have thought that you would have brought that out immediately and would have stopped him.

MR. SPEAKER: I think he was saying that there was not right, not "no" lack of confidence and I think that he is entitled to do that. I do not think that that is unparliamentary.

MR. WILBERT M. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, if those are a task in the last administration, indeed I seriously doubt the wisdom of the programme which this meeting made, I think time will certainly tell you that there will be a terrible look on it this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is the end of the point of order. I think the Member was still answering the question. Am I right? When the first Minister took over he was on a point of order and I think that you were still negotiating your reply as a supplementary. You were saying that there is an indication that the public have confidence in the Government....

MRS. VALERIE C. JENNESS: See, I was saying that we are now in the process of approaching not only the banks and trust companies, but the public in general for support for the needs of the Housing Corporation.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: Well, in view, Mr. President, of the complete lack of confidence at the present time in the trustee administration, would the Member explain how he plans to approach the financial institutions in order to raise funds?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that that is really an unanswerable supplementary because it contains a statement of opinion on the beginning of the supplementary. If you omit the statement or expression of opinion then it would be admissible.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: Well, Mr. President, I think I will let my question stand as it is because in view of your ruling how can one possibly give a reply?

MR. PRESIDENT: Because there is a perfectly plausible answer under which rebuttal expressions of opinion is questions. That plausible answer does not extend to rebuttal.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: Could the Member state how much money was available in the Corporation's funds as at 31st December, 1956, and how much is available now?

MR. MACGILLIVRAY: I do not think that is really a supplementary that arises directly out of this question. I rather think that the Member has put that question already.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: I did not have the key change one year here. I thought my questions may have been taken out the view of this new policy of which one question. However, I would think that it would follow this because the question is, "Would the Member state what the financial position of the Citizen Interests Housing Corporation was as at 31st December, 1956?" My question is then how much money was at hand on 31st December, 1956? If one knows what the financial condition is now one must know what the financial condition was on 31st December, 1956.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that it is reasonable to expect the Member to be able to specify on some particular point date or a whole range of transactions what the financial condition was without having been informed beforehand that he is going to be asked that. This question asks not what the financial condition is now. If you want to know what it was on 31st December, or 31st June or whatever date it may be, then I think that constitutes a plausible question. I think that the question which you have just put will be answering later.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: Mr. President, I thought that was the ordinary purpose of asking questions. You anticipate the supplementary questions which will be asked and have the answers available.

MR. PRESIDENT: That above opinion is, indeed reason. The supplementary must arise out of the answer given to the original question. We have strayed a little far already but I do not think that we should stray further. Now the Elected Member for North Side. We have been waiting for a long time..

MR. D. RICHARD HOLMES: Could the Member state what the salaries are of the two officers of the Corporation.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that that is an administrative matter either. If you want to have information on specific matters you must put down a specific question.

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: Could the Member tell us how much money has been loaned by the Corporation since 21st November, 1934.

MR. PRESIDENT: Again I think....

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, all the loans which were made by the Board or approved by the Board were made before that date. All the loans have not been finally negotiated or loaned as yet but they have been committed and I gave the answer here from the question which was asked. No new loans have been made since that date.

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: Mr. President, I am sadly sure how much was loaned out committed before 21st November, 1934. He has really answered my question by saying that there have been no loans since that date. However, I would like to have another question. If the Member would advise the Legislative Assembly how much has been collected from the sale of debentures since 21st November, 1934.

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I understand that a commitment has been made recently by a banking institution but as far as I am aware those monies have not been collected yet. So, from the date the Member is mentioning there, no loans have been collected.

MR. PRESIDENT: No debentures have been collected?

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: A supplementary, Sir. If my memory serves me correct, in the short time that the Housing Corporation was in existence in 1934 before the election there was probably close to B.D.$550,000 sold in debentures. Since 21st November, 1934, there has been no further sale of debentures. Would that not give an indication that there is a complete lack of faith in the administration, as no attempt has been made to collect any money?

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir, it is coming forward from dates previous to the one the Member is mentioning, 21st November, 1934.

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: No, but my question is, in view of the large amount of money which has been collected in past effort months, would it not show a lack of confidence in this administration if none has been sold since this administration was taken over?

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I agree that there were quite a number of loans made to the Corporation shortly last year. However, from the period shortly after the middle of the year no further loans were made to the Corporation and the reason for it is not known. I am sure that when new efforts to sell the remaining of funds for the Corporation loans will be made again. As far as confidence in this Government is concerned that is not questionable at this stage, Sir. There is plenty of confidence in this Government.

MR. JAMES M. RODGERS: Just as a matter of opinion, I would like a clarification, Mr. President, as what the Member just said. Did he say that there had been no allowable amount of debentures sold since the middle of last year? What I have reference on that?

HON. PAUL G. JOHNSON: I said debentures were issued last year, but during the latter part of the year there were none. I am not too sure of the reason for that.

MR. JAMES M. RODGERS: Would the Member state whether there are any debentures issued in the Corporation or if it was that the money is derived from the sale of debentures?

HON. PAUL G. JOHNSON: Whatever use would have to be. If they are debentures issued by the Corporation, debentures are payable on income. There is actually any difference between one and the other.

MR. JAMES M. RODGERS: Could the Member state what industries have been made with the financial institutions where the Member planned to assure that they place their trust and confidence in this Government by buying more debentures in order to finance the housing industry?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Member has already realized that the Housing Corporation was constantly both the public and the banks and other institutions. So I think that really has been answered already. I also think that unless we have the other questions absolutely we shall run out of time. So I will invite the Elected Member for East End to ask his next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK HIS SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION REGARDING THE EXPENDITURE INCURRED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBILITY FOR TOURISM, INDUSTRY AND TRADE

NO. 4: Will the Member state the cost of the second official opening of the new airport terminal?

ANSWER: The cost of the supplemental opening of the new terminal building at Owen Roberts International Airport was $6,047.90

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES M. RODGERS: Could the Member state what this covers; whether this was for food and drink and so forth, or what?

HON. NORMAN RANKIN: There were various expenses; food, printing, public address system, a plaque, flower and the cost of a band.

MR. JAMES M. RODGERS: Would this cover the cost of the security and at fourth also?

HON. N. NORMAN RANKIN: I do not have that there were any additional expenses incurred for security at this time. I have no record of any expenses for security.

MR. JAMES M. RODGERS: The Member did mention about a plaque, Mr. President, so in view of that I think that I should be entitled to ask the following question. There was a plaque presented at the first official opening of the terminal building from the residents of Cayman to the people of the Cayman Islands. I do not think

MR. JAMES M. HODGES (CONTINUING): What plaque has ever been put up and I wonder whether the Speaker intends to have it put on the walls of the terminal building?

MR. PRESIDENT: I take the Member's point but even if I do not identify which that is a proper supplementary. It did a perfectly proper question and if you right to put it does it can be accepted to be taken. However, it is not really a supplementary which arises out of this.

MR. JAMES M. HODGES: I agree with you finally, but in view of the fact that he mentioned it I thought that it could arise no latitude. I know this is the appropriate place to deal with it will be in the budget speech and I will merely direct there and ask it, Sir.

MR. JOHN M. MCCARTHY: Mr. President, a supplementary. Will the Member say why a second official opening was necessary?

HON. M. MICHAEL HOGGINS: Mr. President, in my view an official opening ought on occasion when a public building is declared open for public use. The terminal was not available for public use until 26th January and as far as I am concerned that is when the official opening took place.

MR. S. WALTER HOOSEN: Mr. President, as this has never happened before can the Member say why was it necessary to associate with a Government building? What is the relevance of question, when a bank is opened there is an official opening. The next week or the next day or the month when the staff begin work in it there is no operational opening. Why was Government's money wasted for an operational opening?

MR. PRESIDENT: The supplementary cannot contain an explanation of opinion. You cannot ask why was Government's money wasted. You can ask why Government's money was spent if you wish.

MR. S. WALTER HOOSEN: Mr. President, why was Government's money spent for an operational opening?

HON. M. MICHAEL HOGGINS: Because it was considered important by Government that the date on which the building was put into use should be marked with a special occasion.

MR. D. EDWARD MITCHELL: A supplementary, Mr. President. Since both speakers have been mentioned, I wonder if I could ask the Member how the cost for the second official opening compares to the cost of the previous opening of the other building. (Laughter).

MR. PRESIDENT: By acquiescence of silence. (Laughter).

MR. M. MICHAEL HOGGINS: Mr. President, the cost of the first ceremony referred to was $17,507.15.

MR. M. MICHAEL HOGGINS: What a waste of money Hyde.

MR. JAMES M. HODGES: Mr. President, it is funny that the Member has it down to the cents for this cause it is supplementary question, when before things of a similar nature could not be answered. However, Mr. President, I think that the explanation has

MR. JAMES M. ROSSOW (CONTINUING): ...judge the opening of the bankers' building and hearing will call the results. Mr. President, the Chair might be in order for the second opening. I did not intend but from some sources which I heard it was an elaborate or more elaborate than the first one. I wonder if some time in the future the Marker could provide like Rules or circulate to the Members the breakdown of the cost of each one of the ceremonies in lieu of the having to present such a distorted view to the Rules.

MRS. M. JANICE MCCORD: Mr. President, I would like time to respond that, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I thought before you spoke, I must caution the Member who has asked the supplementary that possibly it distorted view" do agree on perception is my view. The question for the Chair remains open.

MR. JAMES M. ROSSOW: Mr. President, how do I get that you only have like the Ranch Elected Member from Golden Rule, the Elected Member for East and East I say? However....

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps because you talk more.

MR. JAMES M. ROSSOW: However, I will like the "distorted" out of it and would appreciate a reply...

MRS. M. JANICE MCCORD: Mr. President, the same Member stated a while ago that he thought that it was normal procedure for a Member of Government to maintain anonymity. The reason why I was able to provide the exact cost of the ceremony was because I anticipated that there would be a questioning as that extent. However, I am pleased to see that he has taken out "distortion" because I can assure that Member that I do not deal with distorted facts. Right I have requested have the audit accounts, supplied to me by the Controller, and with more permission I can disseminate it at any time to Members of this House for their perusal. I only did that much.

MR. JAMES M. ROSSOW: Mr. President, in view of the fourth point I don't think it be in order to interpret this to the House so that we have a breakdown furnished. I have already heard...

MR. PRESIDENT: What is what was asked and he has endeavoured to provide the breakdown.

MR. JAMES M. ROSSOW: Not just the total figures, I want a breakdown of what was incurred the first time. What it was spent for and then also it was spent for the second time.

MR. PRESIDENT: What do my understanding....

MR. JAMES M. ROSSOW: I do not want just the bar "What" Figures, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: My understanding is that he is understanding.....

MR. JAMES M. BOOCHEVER: Is that what the Member is prepared to give?

HON. M. BRYANT MACKAY: I have the Hansard, Mr. President, and with your permission I can give them to the Member now if he wants them.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, I think if you distribute them it would be better because we have several more questions on the Order Paper.

MR. C. RAY MACKAY: Mr. President, may I ask:-

1) If it is Government's policy to have second openings, and

2) If there is any precedent for fake openings?

MR. PRESIDENT: The first of these questions has been answered already and the second is inadmissible.

HON. M. BRYANT MACKAY: I think the precedent for fake openings has been set.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order

MR. JAMES M. BOOCHEVER: Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order. Please be seated. I am reserving on this and identifying the Second Elected Member for George Town to ask the next question.

MR. JAMES M. BOOCHEVER: Mr. President, please. The Member said....

MR. PRESIDENT: I have asked the Second Elected Member for George Town to ask the next question. Please be seated.

MR. LINDLEY A. STEWART: Mr. President, with your permission, Sir, I would like to rephrase the order of the questions here.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, I am afraid not. If the questions as now are reached today, then it will be possible to put them down for tomorrow.

MR. LINDLEY A. PIERSON: Mr. President, may I make a statement here to explain why I requested that?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes,

MR. LINDLEY A. STEWART: When I rephrased my questions, they were submitted for a purpose and for certain information. If there are changed on the Order of the Day there is no way that I am going to get the kind of answer which I request from these questions. The first part of this question, the way I understood it, was that Mr. X should be asked before Mr. Y. Now, this was changed without my permission, or without inquiring me here. So to ask Mr. X before Mr. Y can be in any to not what I really intended to ask. However, I will go ahead if this answer be changed.

MR. SHEETSKY: May I just look at this. Do you mean that you had Nos. 3 and 5 down as one question?

MR. EDWARD A. PATTISON: No, Sir, what I mean is that when I submitted my question... I was part of the question and No. 5 was next two. I was further told that they would have to be divided into two questions, but to ask No. 5 as it is here before No. 3 in order to get the most before the house.

MR. SPEAKER: I see. Very well, if that happened I will allow you to ask question No. 5 before question No. 3.

MR. EDWARD A. PATTISON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask the Honourable Prime Minister whether Members were informed of the Government question No. 3 on the question paper.

MR. SPEAKER: It is the last item,...

MR. EDWARD A. PATTISON: It would be renumbered as No. 4. It is No. 5 now.

MR. SPEAKER: It is No. 5, yes.

HON. EDWARD P. PATTISON: Mr. Speaker, just to make the matter clear, Sir. On the Supplementary Order submitted to us, right now the question No. 5. There was no change as far as the question was asked.

MR. SPEAKER: The reason the Business Committee has made a change?

HON. EDWARD P. PATTISON: No.

MR. EDWARD A. PATTISON: Mr. Speaker, that may be the case I think it...

MR. SPEAKER: I think we should not get into the reasons as the questions of Members remain in whatever order and Answering matters. There are only a few more minutes for question time.

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY ORDER WAS THEN READ BY THE SPEAKER AND THE QUESTION WAS ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR BONAVISTA NORTH.

No. 5/ In view of the non-existing balance sheet of the Provincial Exchequer as at 31st October, 1954, would the Member advise the current balance of that date?

ANSWER: The current balance of Government's Provincial position as at 31st October, 1954, were as follows:

(a)	General Revenue	$(10,005,565
(b)	Sinking Balance	837,579
(c)	Public Debt (see Appendix I)	8,567,923
(d)	Self Financing Debt (see Appendix I)	2,755,644
(e)	Loans due to Government	10,700,000
(f)	Some Overdrafts	5,555,892
(g)	Amounts due from Canadian Development Corp.	2,145,457

SUPPLEMENTARIES

MR. EDWARD A. PICKERING: Supplementary, Mr. President. Is it possible, and I am sure that the publicity has anticipated, that the Member might give us a breakdown of the General Resources Fund expired at the 31st October, 1968?

MR. PRESIDENT: I have not seen the statistical answer, but my understanding is that that was what he was giving you.

MR. EDWARD A. PICKERING: With respect, Mr. President, what the Member gave was the total balance as at the 31st October, 1968. I am asking for a detailed breakdown which is a more difficult matter.

HON. JAMES C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I believe that the Member is looking for attached to the answer. The Treasury document is attached to the answer.

MR. EDWARD A. PICKERING: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state if the Surplus referred to as Development Funds of $4,993,291.00 which was added to the surplus position has been included anywhere else under expenditure, as being a part of the supplementary, say, on the Loans Authority?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the answer to your question is: With regard to the Trade Authority the figure $1,693,000 is in the supplementary, Mr. President. There is a difference between the $3.8 million which is an amount due from Development Bank, this is included in the Trade Authority position, $7,193,291.

MR. JAMES M. BOSTIC: The supplementary question which was mentioned a while ago, would that not have been reversed up in the payment of the loan funds by Caribbean Development Bank?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the amount of the funds that Jean mentioned Development Bank, that is $3,158,960 were received in late November. That would reduce the investment amount by that portion. It would also increase the public debt by a similar amount.

MR. JAMES M. BOSTIC: But the question was what off by the funds which were due back to the Government on the Caribbean Development Bank loan?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the repayment is $2,000,373.00. The amount due from Caribbean Development Bank is $2,158,960. The investment is reduced by that amount when it is received. There is a small provision remaining.

HON. O. MAIS BOYCE: Mr. President, is it not also true that while the normal repayment from Caribbean Development Bank minus our investment, there are funds also forthcoming the Government?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the arrangement with the Loan Agreement between Caribbean Development Bank and this Government as the Loan Authority Agreement Building and also the Cayman Islands Government have first call that minus from Caribbean Development Bank, is whatever the funds are received they are taken in as revenue under Loans.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am afraid that I am going to have to stop questions like because we are already at the end of the period that I allowed. Before actually stopping it I would invite the attention of those Members whose questions have not yet been reached to Standing Order 23(6), in case they wish to consider their rights under that. Briefly for the information of any Member who is not familiar with the procedure, any question which has not been reached by 11.00 o'clock should be answered in writing unless the Member does to ask the question might like to reconsider with Standing Order 23(6) to have the question postponed and put down on another Order Paper for oral answer.

How does any Member wish to proceed in that might?

STANDING ORDER 23(6)

MR. EDWARD A. PEARCE: Mr. President, I would like to consider my rights under Standing Order 23(6) and have the question postponed until Wednesday if possible.

MR. PRESIDENT: That is question No. 4, which was originally...

MR. EDWARD A. PEARCE: Yes.

MR. JOHN E. MACLEAN: Mr. President, I would like under Standing Order 23(6) to have my question, which is No. 7 on today's Order Paper, answered over until tomorrow.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Burgeo Fortune, did you mention both your questions, or did you mention just question No. 4?

MR. EDWARD A. PEARCE: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: You mentioned both did you?

MR. EDWARD A. PEARCE: Both, Nos. 4 and 8.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am so sorry. That is fine. That concludes....

MR. D. GORDON WILLIS: Mr. President, as a point of clarification, Sir, can the Members ask that the questions be put down on the following day or do they have to follow along which is available according to the Business Committee?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that is a matter - but let me read that anyway. It is a matter for the Business Committee to determine.

MR. D. GORDON WILLIS: Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think a Member has a right to state that his question should necessarily be asked the following day, although I would suggest that the Business Committee would ordinarily put it down for the following day.

That concludes question time and since we have already exceeded, very nearly at least, the time for our normal morning break, I would suggest that we be adjourned for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11.14 A.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

HOUSE RECORD OF TUESDAY, [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Item 4. Bills.

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1978

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1978.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1978, be deemed to have been read a first time and to be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1978.

HON. THOMAS S. GBILLIGBO: Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1978, Law 5 of 1978.

The object of the Bill, Mr. President, is to increase the stamp duty payable on cheques from five cents to ten cents. The amount of stamp duty as charged, Mr. President, has been five cents since 1978, and it is proposed here to increase it to a reasonable sum, taking into consideration the inflation factors in the last eleven or twelve years. It is also proposed that purchase agreements should pay ad valorem duty, Mr. President, there are cases of land sold by an agreement and it is possible for some of such agreements that the property can be completed from one purchaser to the other and stamp duty not be paid. The only fee payable under the Stamp Duty Law is the fixed fee of five shillings.

It is also mentioned, Mr. President, in this Bill to create a charge on mortgages executed in this Federal Republic, for the purpose. It is thought that a number of tenants accommodations are made available on the basis of a mortgage agreement, which is secured by the payment of a sum, whether it is N5,000 or N2,000 for one bedroom accommodation. It often occurs that this agreement are entered into twenty five to forty years, even more. It depends on what it is.

The duty imposed is to be a reasonable one since mortgaging is substantially made by Banks, and it could be an opportunity to double some small increase from the customer. It then it is sometimes said, "Without the person which lays the action right".

It is envisaged, Mr. President, by increased revenue by this Bill, and the amount raised by this Bill is approximately N300,000. I now beg to move.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1978, be given a second reading. The question is open for debate. The Member for North Side,

DEATH OR SECOND READING

MR. G. EDGAR HILLAS: Mr. President, I support this Bill in the entirety. I do not believe that the charges being contained on a cheque form five cents to the whole Bill justify any hardship to our "Know Yourself" on the friendly specialists likes to contend as the other Bills. In fact, it might have a beneficial effect in the Bahamas economy because we might reduce the number of cheques which are written for less than $10 which have no value, but because they are for less than $10 it is not worth the Bank's expense to recover the money.

As I said, I do not believe it will affect the local people at home, or the private Companies, because most of those business do transactions in cheques.

So I support that section of the Bill, and I also support the other sections, in particular the introduction of stamp duty on cheques generally. I think this is an area of revenue which has been ignored in the country. However, Sir, I do not agree with the cheques which are being made under the Bill and I do intend, Sir, to ask Legal of the Chair under Standing Order 32 to move an amendment which would be first being the increase to 5¢ per cent, which I believe in the country wants the Government to meet expenditure connected with the sale of land and other property of this kind. Mr. Sir, we continue the charge at 25¢ we could receive a reasonable sum on an instrument which sold for $2,000 of only $2,000 however it can only be sold for 25 cents, however I think most places take two cents for endorsement.

If we applied the 5¢ then again we might have a reasonable income on the 25 cent sale of the same consideration of $10,000.

So, Sir, I am in favour of the Bill and I do ask Members of the House to support that amendment when it is proposed in Committee Stage.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: If no other Parliamentary Member wishes to speak I shall invite the House to exercise its mind of early that time, the Second Elected Member for North East.

MR. G. MILO BOWEN: Mr. President, I had hoped that I could not have to speak since I was going to break for the lunch interval if I start at this time.

The Bill before the House is seeking to produce revenue from three different sources. The section of the Bill is good although not as good as it should be. One section is bad, and the third part is the most ridiculous which could ever befall the economy of these Islands.

Let me speak on the good part of the Bill. The good part will put a tax on transferring assets. However, the tax proposed is not sufficient. I concur with the Elected Member for North Side that it should be 5% per cent, and I intend to support his amendment. I dare not say the amendment because the Speaker rules of the "Bahamian Dollar" would reject it and it would not get that far. However, if the Elected Member for North Side puts it I will support it. The reason why I support it is that I feel that - Members might not be in the last Parliament of this country. Some - thing to bring about when I contemplate cannot call a contribution to any person. We then go out and ask people to pay $5, pricing by contract to work income that might be used the consideration for one week out of the year for as long as the contract runs. This, of

MR. P. [illegible] (CONTINUING): ... the Senate introduced the bill said men be from 35 to 40 years. I do seek permission to have a quorum for one week just gone on to report on to complete the event from the amendment for one week next year. The first year of 2000 to disqualification because this is a tax of $100 for the entire life of the contract. When a consideration is paid by this method it is very unlikely that Civil registration Government will even be paid again. When a consideration is paid under traditional methods, that is one payee bought from one policy, that cash will be paid over and over again. Under the disqualifying Agreement the income of the unit be included from the very around and if we look at what is happening here you will see that this is true. It is customary for the time starting cash to be paid on a weekly basis for a period of from $5,000 up to $25,000 in some cases of the world. Let us take for argument's sake a figure of $10,000. If he wants to buy a consideration, cash paying $20,000 for the use for one week, the given borrow only fifty weeks for the use of the consideration since the other two weeks are required for maintenance of the building. Those people would pay a total of $500,000 to the Government for one consideration unit which principle on the market would have been sold in the traditional manner for $100,000. So the consideration is most suited at the very beginning for five times the market value. This means the price is so inflated that no buyer in the future can ever hope to pay his money back if his wage is around of $500,000.

Also, it has been found in Canada and those places where disqualifying units have been used that it is not a desirable type of investment. We should discourage it here. It can attract a type of resident who does not bother to work from the Government interest. Instead of paying the salary of the consideration he pays the one fifth of the dollar, and may not a person who has had his unit received his weighted home on this income, would not succeed to have his consideration or a place like this. It may attract people to come in and bring their own investment being their own profit of foreign papers; bring their assets of business of Nigeria and on. While they are living here they will not be putting very much back into the economy. The whole business of disqualifying has been disposed in other places with a number of problems have been all sorts of problems.

The Government would surely be taking to pass a law to ban disqualifying. However, if we do not take an interest a group, or issue I feel that there surely should pay something for the benefit which they derive from Government having put a stamp of approval upon the disqualifying. By the introduction of this, you do not really in business today which Government's approval to the disqualifying business.

The reason why the fact that is not applicable is because there is such a disparity between the price of the units. The Senior Advisor suggests that the price will stay from $5,000 to $5,000 per unit. In other words, and it will probably come here as well, the prices of these disqualifying units range from $5,000 to $20,000. Even the most fanatical unit, even if in a simple unit there is a discount, do the people who get their income in the Eastern Region pay as much as the people who get the use of the units simply that number because the people who get the use of the units simply that number monthly.

That is one reason why $10,000 per a week is really, another reason is that even with Treasury would have paid $20,000 for the use of the units. You can be sure to profits and for entities but, nevertheless, I think there is one on the right hand to take a look at them.

MR. G. MAIN SCOTT (CONTINUING): The bill is good in that it gives flexibility, the application of this current Government's economic policies. Because in December, 1984, we had unemployment at 2 per cent and there we are today talking about getting it 7½ per cent back on down if the amendment by the Elected Member for North Side goes through. So there is some confusion in the Government on the economic policy. It does not know what it wants. This was highlighted in the Finance Bill on Friday or so. The Chamber wonders. They take the duty off wines to help the poor man and then they put a hefty 2 million dollars extra taxation duty on to help him some more. Mr. Speaker, they took off the tax of 2 per cent on the commercial sector to increase the investment and home ownership and they are putting it back on, so it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the confusion is in the minds of the present Government in their present economic policy.

We were told in December that it was very necessary to take off that 2 per cent tax because inflation was beginning in the construction market. Now they come here on Friday and in the Budget Speech they tell us that what they said in December was not correct. On page 23 of the Budget Address we read that in 1985 there was a dramatic upward trend in the number of births registered, up to 135 in 1984 from 75 in 1983. So the amount of construction will be needed under the normal figure in 1992 almost double what it had been in 1983. For in December we were told that we had to take off that tax, but now are not given the statistics on it. We have not half been enlightened in 1984 because these statements would have taken place had they given the statistics. Nevertheless, that is history but it does highlight the labour confusion....

MR. SPEAKER: I think that the Leader should also in this gain. All the parties are making speeches by the Elected Members for North Side gone through. So there is some confusion in the Government on the economic policy. It does not know what it wants. This was highlighted in the Finance Bill on Friday or so. The Chamber wonders. They take the duty off wines to help the poor man and then they put a hefty 2 million dollars extra taxation duty on to help him some more. Mr. Speaker, they took off the tax of 2 per cent on the commercial sector to increase the investment and home ownership and they are putting it back on, so it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the confusion is in the minds of the present Government in their present economic policy.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that the Leader should also in this gain. All the parties are making speeches by the Elected Members for North Side gone through. So there is some confusion in the Government on the economic policy. It does not know what it wants. This was highlighted in the Finance Bill on Friday or so. The Chamber wonders. They take the duty off wines to help the poor man and then they put a hefty 2 million dollars extra taxation duty on to help him some more. Mr. Speaker, they took off the tax of 2 per cent on the commercial sector to increase the investment and home ownership and they are putting it back on, so it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the confusion is in the minds of the present Government in their present economic policy.

We were told in December that it was very necessary to take off that 2 per cent tax because inflation was beginning in the construction market. Now they come here on Friday and in the Budget Speech they tell us that what they said in December was not correct. On page 23 of the Budget Address we read that in 1985 there was a dramatic upward trend in the number of births registered, up to 135 in 1984 from 75 in 1983. So the amount of construction will be needed under the normal figure in 1992 almost double what it had been in 1983. For in December we were told that we had to take off that tax, but now are not given the statistics on it. We have not half been enlightened in 1984 because these statements would have taken place had they given the statistics. Nevertheless, that is history but it does highlight the labour confusion....

MR. C. MAIR ROGERS (Commentator): I have spoken about the good work of the Bill. The hon Member for West Coast-Hokitika gave us the true, the stark duty from New Zealand's point of view. I have it officially from the Pigeon Bay Sawmills Co. I wonder myself that it will not have the small businessmen because some of them use a large number of employees but perhaps that is all right to have an advantage over secondary industry. This tax will increase by 1½ per cent whatever the profit or handed the shareholders. So it will affect every person who handles a thousand in these Islands. Like the Bill on trade and like the other section not to come into only those that the Government do carry out the policy which it has propounded in the Budget Address, none of which it says:

> "While peace, 1968, the first establishment here [illegible] people with the professional services".

As I said on Friday they are not being increased in number, they are being depressed to pay about thirty whole accounts every week which the Government ask during.

This stamp duty would have a high effect on local people just the same as the half a million dollars increase which was put on in Friday on the local people. It will take the cell because the Government's stamp duty on a cheque is not the only item of handling a cheque. The person still has to pay his ledger fees at the bank. So the small businessmen will feel the amount of this increase and this is just another light on his account somewhere which has been put on the little man since the elections in November of 1966.

In addition to the cost of the stamp duty and in addition to the ledger fees, increasing the small businessmen finds himself having to pay interest on the overdraft, so anything you add to that must add to the burden. The only reason given for increasing the stamp duty from five cents to ten cents is because it has been like that since 1874 and if I were the Government I would not mention this because this does not justify the increase. The fact that it has remained at a cents since 1874 only shows that somehow the Government, particularly in the last eight years when there was no reason to increase it from five cents because they are their increase through inflation of the economy and the decline of more cheques rather than less cheques, we do still see fit to increase it. So there is no justification for increasing it. The justification given by the Minister does not justify the increase but should rather deter us from putting on the increase. As far as the economy in connection we have over in the Cook Islands, no matter what he said of the last seven years which have been seven years of plenty, a situation where we are now facing, not seven can help us, but four cents to [illegible] people. These four years of plenty have been squandered by the politicians which this Government is [illegible] today and the problems which they implemented in December as well as the problems which they promised to implement in their campaigns.

Critics were all over when they talked out of this Chairman of [illegible] which might have added a half million dollars to the burden of the taxpayer in the Cook Islands.

So I am against this increase and will certainly vote against it.

Now I come to the third part of this Bill which seeks to put a tax on an agreement for sale or purchase of property. I hope the elected Member for North Side could have an amendment to strike this section out. I object more to

Mr. S. MALO PEARCE (CONTINUING): Amendments would not then arise. But I believe my duty is the least which was borne in the Cayman Islands since a previous Government of which two of the Leaders are now Members of this Government, tried to introduce a development plan in 1975 which killed the price of land. If they introduce this law today it will mean the end of real estate development in the Cayman Islands. It will mean economic hardship for the people of the Cayman Islands. What is this thing which has come to pass before our eyes today? What are they doing? They are saying that you must get a loan or an agreement for a piece of land and that that has must be paid within a certain time whether the land be bought or not. This is wrong.

Let us take a case that crosses my desk. I have a house but now have sold and made a deposit down. Unless he has a contract which is non-cancellable and that gives me a mortgage which is non-cancellable; one day or will have a penny right which cannot be extinguished. What is the good of having money if you cannot spend it? What is the good of having a contract if the contract is non-cancellable? So here on this agreement the Member also talks about his deposit of $500 and signed an agreement to purchase a piece of land, of which in the future to guarantee that sale would not only that he forfeited but would have paid 2% per cent of the value to be transferred.

It is unfair to ask somebody to pay for value not received. Even if the Member had had any amendments or will and had said that the law should be simply on the deposit or the cost of the agreement this would be unobjectionable, but to make the law the subject of the full value should be determined to this country. The amendments says that:

> "Agreement for sale of interests of any land, estate title or other immovable property under or by any party thereto - except and a half per cent of the value of the immovable property, the subject of the agreement.
>
> Assignment by any party of any rights under an agreement falling within the preceding clear - again one and a half per cent of the value of the consideration".

In the Bible proceedings at the beginning of the bill, the Memorandum of Objects and Reasons it says:

> "By providing that immovable property shall, unless non-cancellable, attract stamp duty at a rate of seven and a half per cent of the value of the property the subject of the agreement".

This will be passed into law will have a devastating effect on all real estate sales. This hurts everybody. It hurts the man in the street. It hurts the man building a house. It hurts a man putting up a gas station. It hurts the developer and I believe the Minister should be the first in the Chamber of the 1975 development plan era.

What we have to consider here is that 20 per cent of all real estate sales in the Cayman Islands are speculative in nature. In other words probably only 20 per cent of people go out and buy land which they are going to use right away. The people who, the young married couple buys a plot because they are going to build a house and later on as they

MR. O. WAYNE ISLEY (CONTINUED): Anyone they go out and buy land which they are going to farm and leave for their grandchildren, and which they are going to hold as an investment because in later years they may get a better price than they paid for it. These purchases are speculative in nature, but you must have speculation if you're going to move. If you want people who are going to have an opportunity to receive some of the benefits which the current generation has received from its forefathers, they have a right to buy and own property; to rely and not be encumbered by the restraints and which is the subject of this Bill.

So all of this will disappear. Our economy will go flat. The Government will prohibit loans because it will have had its arm and a half torn out, this is not good enough. It was this same attitude established in a Government manner in the development plan in 1976, which caused the decline to begin and remove the entire Economic Council in 1979. This time it is coming back in little bits and pieces; not as a document presented by United Nations, but by a simple amendment to a Bill on the Statute Books.

Anyone who has any interest in the economic development and the economic welfare of Guyana alive today cannot vote for this Bill. I understand that the Government initiated, although it was not put forward any statistics that it may lose a little revenue here and there because some concept has been assigned. I understand that. However, what the this? Freedom hardship will be put on the little man if this tax on these agreements goes into effect, because we have to remember that while most of the people who [illegible] on the purchase of a piece of land or a property do so only because of economic hardship. Anyone who sets out to buy a property, or to buy a piece of land or to buy a business [illegible] which the sole income eventually comes up later on and he is prevented from continuing the purchase. This per would take further hardship on people. It would only escalate the hardships which would be suffered by those who had [illegible]. My contention for this if there is a loss of revenue the Government will make no attempt to derive that loss of income and will also no opportunities at all to show that there is a loss of revenue. In fact I do not believe that they can give statistics because the statistics which are available to us show that revenue from this source has increased, and I have those statistics.

In 1975 the sale of property stamps brought in $968,781. The revised estimates for 1977 were $1-million, the 1977 estimated income had increased because of the 1975 Development Plan to $900,000. However, look at the difference firmly. In 1981 the actual collection from revenue stamps was $2,662,807, eight times the actual collection in 1975. So how can the Government claim that they are losing revenue from stamp duty when the statistics show that in 1981 we collected eight times what we had collected in 1975. That election instance alone that eight years passed came because the Government of the day scrapped the development plan which would have put a stop to speculators, encouraged developers to buy land to sell land; encouraged local people to invest in land, and this was done without any "hanky panky" business. This was done by simply stimulating the economy. It was done without increasing the fee nor were there any [illegible] which had existed for some time. So that statistic [illegible] about the revenue from the sale of land because the sale of land was unrestricted. It came about because there were more sales and more purchases because the Government of the day was not involved in the economic policies. It came about because the confidence of the investor had increased. It came about because the Government reopened the banking facilities and the investor, and they supported the Government of the day.

MR. G. WISE JOHNSTONE (NORTHERN): Now today we are trying to shatter that complacency, and the question is in every citizen's mind right here before the House. We are trying to shatter it by the nationalisation of one of the utilities for the generation of power on a large scale; whether it be building a dam on the Waikato for the generation of land or other projects. We should not be trying to hinder a procedure or policy movement. We should be trying to encourage more of them. Some of them will fail by the wayside and some people may lose their properties. Some people may get them back, but most outside aid will come to a halt in these Islands and when this happens the day will be just as dark as when the Islands were removed from economic hence.

For the first time in the history of these Islands we see Government's revenue declining because of the halt put on development in the Cayman Islands. That just only happened in the space following the TIME hurricane. It never happened again until 1975 and 1976 when we saw Government's revenue decline. Now we are here today with the same old tired buildings; the same old worn out schemes, asking the Members of this House to put a brake on development.

This amendment has been brought in keeping with the policy of the Government which has been put forward that the local industries will be required to contribute the additional revenue. The Member just mentioned $500,000 on Monday; nearly $1 million out of the pockets of the people of this country. That is not local. That is not local. What is local is that this is one amendment that we may use to demonstrate the methods by which we could raise the money to pay. We should that the Government has done some Wednesday there have been many bad things, but this is the worst because if we do not stop the Government now the Members will continue for some time. However, like a clock which is wound up it will one day run down. A little break in the economy here and a little break there will certainly bring this country to a state where the inhabitants will not be able to enjoy the good life which they now enjoy. We should not do anything which will hinder economic growth. I have stated recently from a media to have of one item which is going to maintain the economy and the Crown has not failed. Every time all I have seen are bills like this one which will hamper economic activity. This bill, with the exception of section 3, subsection (2) which deals with transhipment goods that will. It looks to me like the type of bill which we would have Ambassadors would have been employed like the Government often used by whatever Year the United Nations who have nowhere about the Cayman Islands. We did not expect this to come from the people who are the pride of this country but those complicate to hinder that they were local people.

MR. G. BILLY MCCREE (CONTINUING): They made a mistake but it is not too late to straighten the Bill. They made a mistake in putting forward the Bill. They presented honestly believed that they were doing the right thing, but it is not too late to repeat and withdraw the Bill.

I would reasonably move an amendment to strike out subsection which would exempt the steel mill in these areas. All I can do, however, is speak against it and vote against it, because while I commend wholeheartedly the wish I can only characterize four votes against it, and with the assembly these debates that there are many right there. One of our great Members has gone out on a limb when she should have been home with me. However, this capital letter of the which means that the debate may consist merely as he had been and there should be no change in this respect duly too.

Nevertheless, with all this, I must say that I intend personally to support this move because the proposed Amendment is doing the small man and is being honest about it and put it in the Right Address to his point. The local residents are being represented now in matters with the additional Revenue to municipalities for the year which they took off the assessments in December. Because we have difficulty in the tax county. I believe the Utilities should come as they have come in the past from the municipalities of the county, not from selling any pound of beef, but selling many more vehicles. As an Elected Member I have an obligation to speak when the Government gives away and it is surprising to see them doing seven as four.

I can understand a modest petition off because often the utilities begin to get tired but it is regularly when they have just taken the helm. Right then are in such a state of confusion that befuddles the mind.

I will not hold my breath but I will guarantee that I unreservedly will vote against this measure or any other measure which, in my opinion would be detrimental to the welfare of this country.

MR. SPEAKER: I think perhaps unless any other Member stands to speak....

MR. JOSE MELEAR: Mr. President, I am sure that there are other Members who would like to speak, but in the customary Christmas tree should take a little longer hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I was going to contemplate taking a lunch break. I was just making certain whether there was any other Member who wished to speak. I guessed that there are a number who do wish to speak and I think it probably will be best to take the lunch break before anybody is expected to start his speech. So let us do that....

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. Speaker, since we have quite a long recess at 12.00 o.m. we just either, could we not carry on until 2.00 p.m., Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The normal presentation of the House has been to suspend proceedings between 12.30 p.m. and 2.00 p.m.

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: That has been the general idea of Members and it has usually been quite best but I suggest somebody to start a speech and have five or ten minutes of it before breaking off. So I think reasonably there will be most convenient and I will suspend proceedings until 2.15 p.m.

AT 12.34 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

SOUTH AUSTRALIA, 27 JULY 1972

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

The Premier (Hon. D.A. Dunstan) obtains leave and introduces a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duty Act, 1923. There being no other immediately available Member who wishes to speak, I formally move that the Debate be adjourned and the Second Reading be made an Order of the Day.

MR. RUSSACK (Light): Mr. President, before I am prepared to support the adjournment of this debate, I would like to make a few comments. I do not intend to speak for very long, but I feel that I should say a few words on this matter. I am sure that the Premier would appreciate that I am not opposing the adjournment of the debate, but I feel that I should say a few words on this matter. I am sure that the Premier would appreciate that I am not opposing the adjournment of the debate, but I feel that I should say a few words on this matter.

I am sure that the Premier would appreciate that I am not opposing the adjournment of the debate, but I feel that I should say a few words on this matter. I am sure that the Premier would appreciate that I am not opposing the adjournment of the debate, but I feel that I should say a few words on this matter.

I am sure that the Premier would appreciate that I am not opposing the adjournment of the debate, but I feel that I should say a few words on this matter. I am sure that the Premier would appreciate that I am not opposing the adjournment of the debate, but I feel that I should say a few words on this matter.

Mr. Leonard A. Stanley (continuing): Mr. President, it seems to me that we have other steps duly taken which are now being considered to be placed on tuesday agreements will commit a loophole in the law and that's exactly the thing that I understand is now happening under discussion, that's all for it. Because of present the views of many hon. Members opinion, Mr. President, in looking after the interests of my division. Personally, I believe, Sir, if such an amendment will not be fair disclosure, because from coming to this country. It is one matter, for the purpose to think about the little bit of income which we have to obtain, but it is another to consider the different benefits which apply to the country even though we may have a provision to grant the remains in the officers of the Company. There are many different benefits which accrue from time to time.

Mr. President, I question again what is Government's economic policy regarding to promote from this country? Can we afford to educate the little people in this country? Can we continue to aid 10 per cent, 20 per cent, a little bit here and there to employment of Nigeria. The Financial Secretary in his speech said that he would give due great attention to employ that he thought's Government budget was a good one. But, Mr. President, my fear beloved Members is not manifested if he has got to be a bad one. Thanks to give income by assessing the little people in this country have got to be had for this country. I cannot support that kind of contribution. I cannot subscribe that kind of financial proposal. Even if is to be collected method, and I believe that I can speak with authority when it comes to other types of business,

Mr. President, I feel that before the Members of this House ought to encourage business that sufficient thought should be given to the possible adverse repercussions and adverse effects on people of this country. I believe, Sir, and I stand to be corrected, but I believe that this was a desperate attempt for Government to reduce what perhaps was a major deficit in the first draft of the budget which we have for discussion before us. I also believe that these items were not given full consideration and that the possible adverse effects to the people were not properly considered.

Our country today is in a very serious position, Mr. President. Whether we want to see that the Nigerian people have the highest standard of living in the Continent or not is immaterial at this point in time. The highest standard for which if we were to take the per capital income of each person in this country then we would know how poor some of our people are. When we talk about a standard of living and per capita income all we are doing is taking the national income of this country and dividing it by the population. What we are not considering is that 60 per cent of the wealth in this country is owned by 5 per cent of the people. There are a lot of people in this country who go to bed at night without even having food to eat. Many of our Members probably do not know this because they cannot identify with those people the way that I do. I happen to know that many of our people in this country are on the subsistence level and even below subsistence level.

At the least, Sir, if we want to know the peace and tranquility that we began after the Nigerian Islands, we must continue to make life a little easier for our little people. I believe, Sir, that a good Government is one which makes life easy for the people and makes it easy for the people of this country to be able to eat well, not a Government which forces the people into doing unjust things.

MR. LARSON A. PEARSON (continuing): The point I want to make, Mr. President, is that unless we are ready to buy and police the atomization of power of our little people-this country is going to go down the drain. We have got to be like some of our neighboring islands and [illegible] of the fact that they should have looked after the needs of their little people. Take for example the Virgin Islands today which is now being bought. It is a little sorry [illegible] that he has got to sell it for [illegible], but one of the first things [illegible] has to do is to pay a 10 per cent income tax on it. If [illegible] that the Town which he has accepting [illegible] is not profitable then [illegible], what happens if he was also forced into paying 10 per cent on that amount. He would also lose his $750. This only does a small amount to some of us here but it is particularly a great amount for some of our little people who have not a cent to their name and simply have to go and borrow this money. ..

This is why I say that in principle I do not agree with this, because I do not think that sufficient thought was put into [illegible] which have been proposed.

On the amendment, Mr. President, of the Interdepartmental Committee on Housekeeping of Rice and of the Elected Member for North Side's amendment page [illegible], I wonder, Mr. President, whether sufficient thought has been given to the possibility of some of the [illegible] coming here. I wonder if anybody has even looked around to find out how many of the [illegible] which have been negotiated are still there merely because they cannot get houses to buy them. I wonder, Sir, if anybody has given any thought at all to the idea of [illegible] some of the [illegible] around here and whether the little bit of money which they are hoping to extract here and [illegible] is not [illegible] to kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

Mr. President, it is my plan for us to get back with a better plan like [illegible], but it is another thing for us to take a perilous look at our economic situation at this point in time. I know, Mr. President, as has been suggested here, that I also have pre-empted on my motion the [illegible] and that it is not that I will be supporting certain areas, but I suggest, Mr. President, what I think is the main point for my people. If this [illegible] with any other Member's views, so be it. However, I cannot see where these little [illegible] some of [illegible] are going to help our people. I believe, Sir, that we are going back ten years when we should be making [illegible] economic policy for this country.

I also think, Mr. President, that if we [illegible] employment here we are making the unemployment problem in this country worse. A person simply cannot get by like [illegible] in this country and it is very sad indeed. I believe that for us to start [illegible] these [illegible] is going here to [illegible]. What will this happen to the people who are employed in the construction industry? What will happen to the local businesses here who sell materials for these [illegible]?

Mr. President, whether we have no need here in this country, as [illegible], we need to be about it in a very serious and analytic manner.

One Member mentioned, Mr. President, that in the December sitting of this House we dealt a few more of [illegible] and I am pleased to say that I associated myself with that. But the only reason, Sir, that I supported such a move was to encourage construction in this country, because I feel that it was high a [illegible] to many [illegible] coming here.

MR. SINCLAIR A. PEARSON (CONSTITUENCY): On this one right we should be entitled to take a stand by this country and in another we disassociate them. It appears to me, Mr. President, that there is quite a bit of confusion.

Mr. President, while I will discuss the Government Bench for any efforts they make to look after the best interests of our people and to protect the interests of our people, I would like to again clearly state that I will not be an accessory party and I will continue to speak out on any issue which appears to be in any sense detrimental to the best interests of our people. However, as I said, I will endeavour to support any issue which appears to be in the best interests of our people, however, as I said.

Mr. President, I know that there may some of us here who really do not intend to stay until 7.30 p.m. this evening and I know that some of the Long Administrators have not spoken yet, but I intend, Sir, to exercise my right and debate this matter further on the Throne Speech and Budget debate.

Mr. President, I would close by saying that I cannot in principle support the Bill before us in its present form, and I hope that in Committee there may be some co-operation from the Government Bench in making the whole of people on this side of the House.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak? If not then, in which case, I would ask the Honourable Third Official Member to exercise his right of reply. The Hon. Member for Indian Town.

MR. JAMES M. BROOM: Mr. President, I wish to refute this Bill and the Bills which go along with it when again, and when the public at large that the Members of the Alaska Government took themselves in a different. They are fully with a practical appreciation of the financial problems they are confronted to do, that they cannot come with. We are asking the people, according to the Budget Address, to assist. Mr. President, we are not asking the people of the Cayman Islands to assist. We are asking the Members of Government to assist them to survive. It is very nice that they be able to unanimously assist. This is where we the Executive used the Budget and we came unity in the Cayman Islands.

Mr. President, this is a very detrimental Bill to the welfare of this Caymanian people and to the Caymanian economy as a whole. I would ask the Elected Members of Executive Council who have apparently fathered and sponsored this Bill to withdraw it, because what we are doing and what we are showing the people at large is that our Elected Members have no confidence in the Cayman Islands, if this present elected Government should remain in power much longer, there will be no revenue coming in the Cayman Islands, and that is a third to put simply bankruptcy or chaotic time. Whichever they stick to it, in the long and the run, it be passed by this House and that have money in the bank when they close to go that.

MR. JAMES K. BOREN (continuing): I know that in the minds of some of the elected Republican Members Medicare is nothing new. They have thought that now for years, but have had to withdraw it in the past. Unfortunately, Mr. President, this House is now in a position where there is only strength in the opposition, and therefore when it comes forward again it can be nearly still done, there is not enough strength to oppose it and it will pass.

Mr. President, as time goes on and the debate gets still grimmer still, I really have to wonder and I know the population as a whole is beginning to wonder just exactly what will it stop? Will we have Republicans on the heads of our people who elected us to the seats which they occupy tomorrow, and we come running to have another session this year? Or will we wait 'til the Republican Convention next year?

I am shocked that with all the statements Republicans continue to make in front of this nation and presented to this House, in the next eight years the people of this country have not faced such devastation as they are faced with in this budget. Before we would have presented a budget which would have been this devastating to the people of this country we would have been like cockroaches and hidden our heads in the sand. However, I do not expect that to take place in this case.

This bill will have adverse effects on the people of this country and in the economy of this country, not only today but for years and years to come. In my opinion, Mr. President, and I am sure that I am correct, steps must have been collected before on the disadvantaged while, because unemployment in the Country Today have become a way of life as they have in many other areas of the world.

I am not here to debate whether I am for or against it. The point is that it should and taxes must have been paid in the past. I really question why at this time a Bill would come before the House. Why should the sale of a three-month bill, be it for $5,000 or $10,000 only because this stamp duty for the life of that contract?

It is difficult for me to believe that such a Bill would have been introduced in this House, and that they would think that our mentality was not higher than that. Mr. Mr. President, is this another case of special interests as we have had in the previous Bill where the amendments can be proposed? I really hate to question the motives behind these actions, and to question why this is being done and for whose benefit.

Many unfortunate and disappointments were made in the past but, Mr. President, one we should be avoided completely is the Senate Delegate or Whichever Delegate it is? Should pull it from these massive Bills before the House be finished, which I have no doubt they will be. There will be at least an additional $2.5 million raised because of those bills in the financial year 1985. Now here who is going to pay most of this $2.5 million? It is going to be the $5,000 people and the approximate $1,000 head of households who we have in this country. I ask those people of mercy if they think that is the way to show mercy to their fellow men. I do not think that there has been a word in the history of the Queen Islands when the least people have been asked to pay more of a burden as they are today asked to pay this year. Believe me, as determined in the end as it could be it would be much better to tell those people that they are going to pay the increase tax that the Democratic Senate elected Member of Assembly and some of the opposition wanted to burden us with so many years ago.

MR. JAMES M. RUSSO (CONSTITUENCY): I would rather pay the bank than pay the workman.

I would have thought that the time-worthy issues covered under this Bill was adequately answered before. I would hope that to merely list some of the other Laws on the Statute Books of the country the hotel tax is also collected or the rental of those units in the Casino. Our economy is in a very fragile thing. It is built on imports and artificially high interests the different financial institutions. However, those people today must be making observations, "How can I check right now complaints with the Legislative Assembly Members of the Cayman Islands do not share faith and confidence in their systems?" Where the answer for the future is not changed as some of the ministers would tell us to do it, but rather we are unfortunate and going towards the war.

If we are to ask the world at large that we have confidence and faith in our country we must first show that confidence and faith in ourselves and the people. We cannot stop it by keeping to ignoring the Governments of its past as is continually being done. We cannot do it by berating them our present Government, because chances it might be. Rather we must show that faith in our country to the point where we feel that we can build adequately for the future.

I ask the Members of the Elected Executive Council why do they not come up with a programme which has attached additional money into the economy? If we build up the economy and attract additional money into it at the same time as TAPC is JAPC, we will not have to worry so much about plugging the deficit. They have already managed to adequately balance their budget by using for this year approximately $9.6 million of the Reserve Funds which were not supposed to be there. Cannot they be satisfied? They have already used the bread which was built by the sweat of other people. Will they continue to use the bread from the sweat of our people in the future?

I could see an amendment on the purchase agreements to where the commitments would be registered and before the closure of that sale, if there was a subsequent sale, that difference the increase between the two figures now that would be taxed at 5% per cent. In other words if a person had an agreement for $250,000 to purchase a piece of land after a period of six months, and he was fortunate enough to sell that to someone else for $350,000, then I can see where that additional $50,000 should be taxed. However, I repeat cause with what we are going to do, which is to put the hands of Government in this country. The present budget calls for about $8.3 million to be raised this year from various sources. We will not raise $8.3 million in revenue because of this Bill once through. We will raise much less because people are not going to invest and take the chances which those people are asking them to take. You know what will happen. The rest of the money which has been left in reserve from the unfortunate Lotto Government will be used up like the $6.3 million which will have already been used by the end of this session.

It seems to me that they have embarked on this system where anyone will be able to spend the money earned by someone else in order to perpetuate the party which they might be representing.

MR. JAMES H. QUINN (CONTINUING): In the Bill which is before us under the Standing Order, the last section of it which follows the time sharing vote is very confusing. I must admit that I have found my heart to try to figure out the last phase or four lines of it, and really I think we need some explanations on that to come from the Honourable Second Minister of Resources Development.

In regard to the heavy note ambers it appears that on checking that they seem to be quite, although it will affect a lot of people and it is a big difference, I will have to keep with that because I think to go higher with them in those heavy note ambers. While it is a heavy note ambers so therefore I may question that one, however, Mr. President, I would hope that they will, while they were considering the rest of it, and as they always consider that to come up with some answers which can be of help to our people. I do not believe that this is the time for us to have closed minds. I feel that the Member Resources Council which has been the brain child of these Bills which are before the House should keep their minds open, and that they should be willing to listen to the explanation and see that if these Bills become law that they are serving the future of our country.

Mr. President, our economy is going to be hit for a severe blow in 1985. There are many economic factors outside of the Cayman Islands which dictate that. However, we in the Cayman Islands must not "go on my shirt" for the years 1975 to 1978, when the outside world was faced with a recession and locally our Government did everything it could to shelve investment from coming in this country. If we go back and adopt that system we will be going back to the bankrupt Government that we had in 1968. When I say bankrupt, Mr. President, the country was flat on its back. There was no $10 million in Reserves at that time. The capital debt of this country stood at about $9 million, which is still a part of the $18 million which we are being blamed for today. I can well remember those days living. I can well remember those days as I think many people in the Sister Islands can remember them. I can assure that there are people in the Cayman Islands today who can still remember the hungry years of 1968 to 1970, although they may have forgotten some of them. The problem of it is that the young generations like ours the grandparents of our Country then are the grandparents who are trying to steer the country at the present time.

I am worried, although I do not believe that it will happen, that the Elected Members of Government will use the cover of these ways to some of these Bills and still at least offer to convert some of the amendments which may come from this side.

Mr. President, I will leave the rest that I have to say for the further remarks of this Bill and from the Throne Speech and the Budget Address which I have still to debate Separately, rather than as a whole.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. K. HUBERTS FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before this House is one which has been hailed over the years. I do not believe, Sir, that I will ever be able to please everyone, but at least, Sir, I am going to try to please the 7,130 people who put me here. To please them, Sir, I have to give them a great deal.

MR. K. MCKENZIE BAIN (INTERPRETATION): With our declining economy I can see the need for Government to raise an additional which has been used to finance Government of course can from land title transfers. I would suggest, Sir, that future transfers be registered and stamp duty paid before it leaves and that no second instrument be initialled without the payment.

The other fine point on this issue I believe will put no burden on anyone and, Sir, least of all the little man about when the opposition suddenly seems to be so concerned.

On the matter of withdrawing Sir, the extra tax imposed on this financial moment affect the little man at all. It cannot affect locally at all, which is poor. Instead, Sir, it is a move to create more revenue which this country can certainly use as I said, despite the decline in our economy, and the bad position which we have inherited.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the last financial debate from Golden Spot, who talked a lot about economic stability. We must that the Hon'ble Minister today would be so less talkative. We cannot do this, Sir....

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Mr. President, I would like what the Member who preceded them I was talking, Sir. I did not say that.

MR. SPEAKER: I think he is referring to what your colleague the Second Elected Member for Golden Spot said. He said the last Member from Kenyon Town.

MR. K. MCKENZIE BAIN: Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe he meant the second....

MR. G. LUCE SCOTT: Because I am not the last.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: I was the last Member from Golden Spot, Sir.

MR. K. MCKENZIE BAIN: No, Sir, I said the last Elected Member from Golden Spot.

MR. G. LUCE SCOTT: But, Mr. President, I am not the last Elected Member. I am the Second Elected Member.

MR. SPEAKER: I was not quite sure to whom he was referring, I confess, when he said last Elected Member. However, I think that the Second Elected Member for British Town did make the point that the Second Elected Member for West Bay is now Elected.

MR. K. MCKENZIE BAIN: Yes, Sir, it is no secret to anybody our Constituencies, whether he is the Second Member. There are only two Members in Golden Spot as he has to be the last Member.

MR. G. LUCE SCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. President. We have an obligation under the Standing Orders to refer to a Member as the First or Second Member.

MR. SPEAKER: That is quite correct, yes. When you said "last", I thought you meant last speaker to start with....

MR. S. MOHAMED BUSTAN: The Second Elected Member, Sir. I will have to give nothing, Sir.

Anyway, Sir, my question is this: that needs be noted. Why, why should nonetheless the minister not hesitate on the penalty but be prone to the economy as it stands, little though it may be, why should nonetheless take this be banned? The Hansard record that the Honourable could be used to provide a greater amount of revenue as we can now tender to it. If these people who set up new stores, Sir, abuse the little rule this and the little rule that when they do not even see the little rule because they have run away from their responsibilities, although so much of the little rule they would not even think about [illegible] would have standing on the floor of the House and saying that it would be an ideal thing.

The money derived, Sir, from this levy will give us votes for education; will give us more for social services and help step the deterioration of our social structure which we have experienced during the period of boards in the near eight years. If they want politics, Sir, they can get politics.

Mr. President, the people most affected by the 3% per cent stamp duty on negotiable instruments are the small private sports who have been buying land from Government at a low price recently. Well well they already have paid the [illegible] in higher or much higher prices. That, Sir, is the order of the matter here today. For example, Sir, the Agent Bank a piece of property from a Corporation for $6,500, paid up stamp duty and then sells the same piece of property for $10,000 and pays the Government for the 3% per cent stamp duty. Which the State is responsible from the Corporation to the investor. Shall [illegible] that? This has robbed the little man of $10,000 less the consideration he should normally pay the real estate agent, and, Sir, has helped to double the cost of the property to the investor, or the more the building Government of the duty on the first $5,000. I believe I am right in saying that, Sir. Further, Sir, the Corporation who has made a deposit on a piece of land and paid the stamp duty on the negotiable instrument; if he cannot complete the purchase then he loses the instrument. It is a non-negotiable document on which no stamp duty has been paid by either buyer or seller. So I believe I am right, Sir, in saying that this Bill will only serve to protect the little man since we now will go unscrewed at once.

My criticism the Hon. Member in this Chamber is easy as a visit to the United Kingdom to attend a meeting held by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Now, Sir, there is much talk on the airwaves and in all newspapers, Sir, of the many type of references which have been uttered from this floor saying to withdraw the people. The Member making reference to the Hon. Member, Sir, Hansard will say who is right. However, Sir, I do not believe that this was the reason because, Sir, I am an Executive Member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and I do know that the Second Elected Member for Nyeri, from making reference to the Hon. Member from West Ray also invited to go on that occasion. I do not believe that he was really desiring himself to this meeting of the House.

MR. G. KERR SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. President, no earnest Hansard reference. I simply said that Hon. Member was not here and I regretted that she could not join with the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think it is quite true that the Second Elected Member for Nyeri did not witness that it was likely or impossible of the Hon. Member to be present. And be true as I should know answer him at this time. We are thinking, as he may

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUING): Order, simply representation has changed because he would have voted for her anyway. I think that he might have voted in vain but that is a separate issue.

MR. E. MORGAN JONES: Yes, Sir, contributions as I said there has been some talk and I am only putting it on the record for the sake of posterity. So, as I said....

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps I should put on the record for the sake of posterity that there is not in my view anything improper in any Member, either the Second Elected Member for Saint Croix or the Only Member who is Only a Member applying to be on a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Seminar. I think that is a quite proper thing and I think all of us should take advantage of opportunities to attend. So I do not want to appear from the record that any Member should be thought improper for seeking to attend.

MR. E. MORGAN JONES: Thank you, Sir, you are most kind in straightening that issue. I really did not want to belong in on this, Sir, I think I am the only. I do have a few Members who left the country on Duke business or work, so as order to Members, to a little piano pilled. But Tom might....

MR. C. ELIS DOTTIN: On a point of order, Mr. President, is this relevant to the debate? I do not know what he is talking about. We have not taken the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: I confess I am unclear as was the relevance and shall then be if he cannot show it to me fairly soon. I hope the Honourable Member speaking will make this point.

MR. E. MORGAN JONES: Yes, Sir. I think I have straightened out that matter pretty well.

Mr. President, as I said there are many talk about the small men, and people unnecessarily with the small men. But, Sir, I am a small man. I may not have been associating myself with the small men. It is just unfair, Sir, to many talk down. I have never shrunk. I can talk their language, Sir, and I have what the small men experience. I believe I am safe to say, Sir, that of all the Members here I am the least well off. I was born in 1922, Sir, thirty years ago. At 7 grew up with Cayon. I know what it is to be fourteen. I know what it is to have to study from candlelight. So I do not think, Sir, that I can be blamed or accused of not appreciating the small man. As I said I am a small man. Some may say I am a little fat hardly, however.

I have said it before and I will say it again that I do not believe our people are prejudiced about race, born racist or even bloody-like people. We have people passed and I have many, many examples, Sir, for my constituency. We have better and better health services. I have a first more and learning salary for my constituency. We have a project going ashore and Frederiksted Airport to boot now. We have more for social services for the country, and as I said, Sir, in these times of declining economy where do the money really lie?

We have much which necessarily must, Mr. President, this Government is doing a positive attitude and nobody in this Honourable House or in the country can deny that fact. The accounts for Cayon disaster have been laid on the table and that Government effort to help alleviate the deficit as

MR. M. MAHTAB (Bhubaneswar): Sir, I rise to support the Motion moved by the Hon'ble Minister, Shri Biju Patnaik. Sir, I am only, Sir, on the 30th June last year. But only knows the position today. Yet they call us that we have inherited such a large amount of money.

Mr. President, Sir, I am no mathematician but I can confidently say that we have two crores four. If we have Rs.2,000 in the House and if we bind up to a year and we spend one lakh, it is just eight, Sir, we cannot use it. So this shows that our good position today is just nil, I think. If the resources of the previous Governments had been reasonable or may I say responsible they would have been fixed. One honourable Member of this House said that money is like the leaf in autumn and he only warned to point that it is so.

As I said, Sir, I will mean quite and will give the plus and fight spokes only from of direct taxation on some people, but these little bits of steps taken cannot and will not have the little sense. If it were possible may I say, Sir, I would not support it. Therefore, Sir, the entire BOX has my full support and I am also on the outside the one political platform and call my people so.

Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think it may be timely to take our customary afternoon break and I would invite Members to be back early to start again by 2.35 p.m.

. [illegible] AT 3.37 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Senate resumes debate on a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1978. The Honourable Finance Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. VASCO C. MCGRATH: Mr. President, I rise to support this Bill, a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1978. Of course I support the three proposals contained in the Bill. The first is that a 2% per cent stamp duty be applied to an agreement for sale. The second is that a fee of $250 be imposed on lien-holding and the third is that the fifty cents stamp duty be changed to twenty-five cents.

Mr. President, first of all I would like to say that the 1978 Government was obliged to implement the Stamp Duty Law because of overheating [illegible] and some of the paltry duty on certain transactions. One of the most famous of these transactions was first taxation of property a conveyance property, the property would be taxed for 20 years or under the stamp duty was very small. There was other [illegible] under the Law that an enforcement was needed to replace the Law with the present 1978 Law.

The same thing has happened in the meantime to the present time, Mr. President. There were numerous complaints from the public about the times which was taking place under the present Stamp Duty Law and Government was urged to look into it and consider this Bill. I believe here today that it gives people with the large majority of these islands, yet Cuba is one of the measures to [illegible] was money with which to assist those poor people.

One of the options which is open to Government is duties Government of duty in the matter into an instrument for sale which does not attempt stamp duty under the present Law. For instance and by people liquidating positions and are people enter into a scheme to assist those agreements. Mr. President, if it was only yesterday it was time for the Second Elected Member for West Bay said a while ago, it would not be so bad. However, we have seen cases which were transferred once [illegible] and there, which means that the stamp fees or the percentage of assignments Government made no stamp duty on it except the last one when the assignment was actually given. Mr. President, with that amendment Government lost a lot of revenue.

So if anyone is thinking that Government is doing the poor people [illegible] by this amendment they have another guess coming. I am sure that they are not going to [illegible] all of the people all of the time. They have done this in the past. People are aware [illegible] of what is right and what is wrong.

The other measure, Mr. President, is regarding [illegible]. We heard quite a lot of [illegible] about the payment of the 6 per cent [illegible]. Now we are going to [illegible] stamp duty, in other words [illegible] out of one hand and passing it out through the other.

SEN. TAMASESE S. LEALOFI (CONTINUED): Mr. President, we are all Territorial people and I am sure that we must know the difference between one system and the other. Although the opposition did not like what was done to remove the 5 per cent tax from condominiums, and I am not complaining here for those views, the view of this Government was that we were in a dilemma; a also passed which we inherited. It is not something which we start over about. The whole of 1994 we heard cries and both sacred here about people out of jobs. What should have been done then to provide some of these jobless people with work was not done. The Ocean Building was one of these examples. Had a new building been constructed it would have placed from it. Also millions in the hands of these poor people.

Mr. President, sometimes I do a good interpret here and we heard quite a lot about investments and how the developers were going to help Government if these bills were approved. Now they threatened to sell all these condominiums while without keeping a penny of tax to Government. It has been happening. It was not given to Aggrum, it was just unnecessary.

Mr. President, the timeshare brought in no different from ordinary and ordinary condominium unit, which is the present system under the law. They had to go to court together to declare a system whereby they would deprive Government of this tax. I think the present Government should be complimented on having had the foresight to mark a clear line to block that gate, that face of Government's promise. It is not going to have the timeshare concept except for those developers and investors who, had it in mind to deprive Government of its rightful share of that tax. So there is a vast difference between the removal of the 5 per cent tax on condominiums and the time sharing concept.

Someone said that in one building the owners that hold the golden egg. All sorts of statements have been made here against this bill, Mr. President, let me say this. I represent a certain number of people in this constituency of Western Samoa, and people that I have room myself now at Intercontinental the visiting Cabinet Ministers, and I talk from day to day with a lot of people, and poor people not the wealthy. I use not wanted to be a party to any measure presented to this Legislative Assembly if I knew that I was hurting poor people. Mr. President, all we are doing here is to find a little money to balance our budget to balance a budget which is going to be for the benefit of the people of these Islands. Because that 800 million we 2 gold members in maximum address is not going into our pockets. It is not going into the pockets of what they would term special interest groups. It is going into the pockets of the people of these Islands.

Concerning that special interest group which is mentioned here occasionally and the Pension Scheme which is also mentioned, I bet you one thing, Mr. President, you never hear anything about these Pension Schemes.

HON. JAMES M. BOYCE: The Pension Scheme cannot hurt this country, up through, did it not?

HON. TAUESE P. SUNIA: We begin to hear about them now, Sir.

HON. JAMES M. BOYCE: Sorry.

HON. HARRY O. JONASON: I think that they could put on their fact sheet where Pennsylvania.

MR. JAMES M. ROCHON: You have Pennsylvania, we're very glad to accept Pennsylvania which came late but where were you? Some reason you have had the reason not included.

MR. SHEARER: No comment here - well.... (Laughter).

HON. HARRY O. JONASON: I am glad that he mentioned that, Sir, I am glad that he mentioned that because I am trying to tell you that for instance since I have been the chairman of Pennsylvania in this country. I have had the responsibility to represent revenue and income here and I am not talking about the bill that they reported to a little while ago. I am sure that they have done their work now and they should look the picture also as fair. Everybody knows about the poll taxes. Pennsylvania have more of another thing.

Mr. President, I suppose that if I was not so optimistic on the amount of expenditure for this country; if I had not spent a lot of time investigating revenues in this country, no question might not have an audit out when I was looking my seats on the Ways Means, 1949, when I left 921 million in the kitty.

MR. SHEARER: Up again!

MR. JAMES M. ROCHON: Mr. President, a point of order. The Member for Question did not come all prepared to the bill, that's before he left, at the Joint Economic Committee meeting which he attended, the item to Cyprus Mission was reviewed, as he came out February if he left $21 million in the kitty.

HON. HARRY O. JONASON: The item to Cyprus Mission was another thing. (Inaudible). Anyway, we still have left that at another time, Mr. President, that we see how I suppose to deal with it this stage.

Mr. President, what I was really worried about was that the two Members from Scotia Nova, one of them took half an hour this morning to talk about this programme to increase the taxes only on chickens from five cents to ten cents. He argued about on the Government for taking such advantage of the poor people. When his other colleague got up and said that he is not going to further with that because we are just a young Government. So like one the thinking, Sir. One of them thought it many members and the other one said that he is not going to further with it, definitely, Mr. President.

Nothing that we propose on this side is going to be considered some shame because they have many long talk the same attitude this half between 1972 and 1974, Everything must be politically influenced. One Member, the Jamaica Labour Party for Golden Town mentioned the 1975 Government from this morning and said that that killed the economy. However, I am so happy, Mr. President, to hear his colleague the Leader Elected Member for Golden Town admitting that there was a recession in 1974/1975. Mr. President, people were fooled in 1975/1979 about this Government Plan. Many attempts was made to kill this tribe and to criticise it by many persons. Everybody knew that Plan affected the economy and no question was made of the other conditions which were responsible for the situation in the country. Mr. President,

MR. MARCUS G. RAICHLE (CONTINUING): Citizens of these communities may ask the opportunity to improve this Government by blowing their development plans for the proposed plutonium plant. How have what happened? The Government sent their men and they were surprised, they said, "Well people will not believe them". They should have not be used information themselves. They did not. Things are taking the same trend this time. They are not and simply criticism on the part people of these Islands.

MR. MARC H. MORRIS: Mr. President, on a matter of order please. I do not think that we have ever had relation on this country played the way they are being played since this Honorable Member has been elected. So I do not know why he is bellyache or speak about the need of no intelligent criticism.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that is really a point of order but you have made your point anyway my friend.

MR. MARCUS G. RAICHLE: Yes, Mr. President, when was his the speak after they have.

Mr. President, a statement can work that if we contribute at this time Americans will have no confidence in the Federal and therefore the economy will not move. I do not think, Mr. President, that we have to warn about that. Just just here we are discussing (the economy moving) matter, because I am sure that there is little need for this Government to make any white statement about the present uncertainty in the minds of the Guamanian people. What the reaction is. There are people standing around in the morning from long years looking for work. I can tell them people in Guam that unless we if they could come down here and sit here for a little while to see if they could find work. I tell them they had better not. They had better stay in Guam for I give them the assurance that something will occur. Because we cannot and will not and still not let to threaten the persons economy and security.

Mr. President, there is absolutely nothing wrong with this amendment to the Fiscal Duty Law. We have that Government will make some money out of it. Some weeks which should possibly go to Guam Building or the Museum center. By the today to build it up, do not know.

Mr. President, with all the delays which have been said, as yesterday that I can personally remember then, I, as the last minutes said, am confident that I have no regret to supporting this bill, and when I am on the outside I can tell the public said can be then, "How I did this. I did it because of the great interest I had for you. It is being done to raise a lot of money. Never mind the 10 cents cents you have to pay on some thereafter, on increase of 5 cents". In any case, Mr. President, those people like take a chance took account the those people who are trying to save a comment statement to the bank, even if it is not doing that. As the poor people are not concerned about the 5 cents anyway. They care a few dollars to check purchase and on Saturday, and that is it.

As far as the other two amendments are concerned, we are happy that we have eliminate the loopholes and that the poor people will enjoy some of the benefits which will come from these measures. Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak? The Minister of Energy and Mines.

MR. JOHN R. KOZIAK: Mr. President, I am in full agreement with Honourable Members who have spoken with regard to the Clean Environment Commission. The Premier himself once said, "The power to hurt includes the power to destroy".

The Bill before this House to amend the Stamp Duty Act, 1973, has only one section which merits having been brought here. Mr. President, it is my honest opinion that even that section should be handled cautiously. The section I speak of, Mr. President, is the section regarding transportation. What the December, 1982 six per cent tax rate takes off consideration transportation. Now, Mr. President, as early as March, 1983, we are here again discussing a Bill which will be putting back into use a section which will be costing some $5,000 in control in collection by the original Bill which has already been paid. Mr. President, I think the Honourable member mentioned something letting the genie back into the bottle, eggs. I think of the comparison to another such as this one, an error which has brought much to the economy of these Islands, we could be looking for problems.

I am not up here to throw stones at anybody. I am not here to criticize the whole Bill, I am merely here to try to make a point which I feel is of benefit to this country and the people.

Mr. President, I think from personal experience we have known, we continue to have stamps taken away from individuals and I think this Bill should be supported. Rather than taking this amount we should look to endeavour to put more people together to try to go out to get more for this country. I think the time has come where vehicles should be taken out of this Chamber and we should try to encourage no one. I don't say to anybody because I guess I will be told, "This again".

Mr. President, in times like these with a fragile economy like ours, it is my honest opinion that we should be looking where we can lighten each burdens. We are like many Caribbean places like Canada have experienced with transportation and, Mr. President, it seems as if from this Bill, that we as a Government will be encouraging transportation. Again I say, if this is the stand we are going to take, before we stand on here and waste time we should first have legislation to cover these shortcomings.

So, Mr. President, again I do support this on one hand I endorse what the Honourable Member who spoke on the earlier part of this Bill, the Hon. Minister and Government on diligence. Mr. President, anybody in these Islands who has been into Government and put forward for this country, it is going to put it on the one on the street, one guy on the other. I think that could not be been known that we find many people having the responsibilities of whether they are successful or not try to manage their affairs. Take for example a school teacher looking a bank; you use private find him with a cheque book and you cannot cash his cheque, Mr. President, what I say, Mr. President, what you may that you are going to put Bill now that encourage the duty on new vehicle then like that, it has to hit the man on the street, and I make sure that I disagree with it.

MR. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV (CONTINUING): The other members of this Bill, the new Governor, which Senate bill numbers amendments. It is my honest opinion that if this bill goes into law, and we should do well because I think the majority will support it, it will be very surprising to our most astute political observers. I feel that by passing this Bill tonight, Sir, we will be giving an inducement to the people of the Guyandotte Valley.

Mr. President, this is a serious moment which we have assembled on. At least about every Republican across the new Government have been together as Mine Inspection and Mine Education. Where will it stop? So many recommendations people, the Guyandotte people are a very principle race. Therefore, Mr. President, it must also remember that when you are trying to put somebody's head against the wall, sometimes their head will bleed. Let us remember that when we do what is right for our people. Let us endeavor in the other areas where will be good business to our people. Nobody ever will say that they are not always interested in employment opportunities which will help, Mr. President, and not hurt. It must remember, experienced people are constantly irresponsible and they know our duties. What is when somebody breaks an amendment, in which they should not do it, sure.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the new Government will consider this Bill and put forward amendments to remove the two areas in this which I consider very detrimental to the people of these Islands. It is a large opinion that there are only two people who cannot change their minds and that is a dead man and a fool. I do not think that we have either of these people here.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. MINISTER OF EDUCATION: Mr. President, I welcome this Bill, Sir. During the course of today's debates we have heard much about the economy through this, but I would like to call Members' attention to one of the areas of revenue which I consider the main source of revenue. I would like to point out that the Bill before you a full of revenue in these areas over 1983, much less a disappointment in the amount predicted as required in the annual budgetary fund. I refer specifically, Mr. President to Government Revenue; the income collected in 1982, the revenue amount is less than the actual amount collected in 1983. Revenue amounts are here by some $200,000 plus, and Mr. President, the previous speaker, he should be pointed out, are especially those amounts collected on account of employment. Gentlemen have come down. Mr. President, local persons and corporation unemployment fund have gone down, and there are other areas which have also come down 1983. So it is obvious that the revenue has taken a down turn and that if revenues are to be maintained at current levels, much less improved, Government has to find areas of employment for revenue.

The first amendment to the Bill before us, Mr. President, is one to impose by your most stupid Bill on agreements for the sale or purchase of land or other immovable property, which agreement sometimes may prefer to be contemplated, is an attempt to plug a loophole which has been opened over the years. It is not a measure which will affect the small person, in my opinion, as has been suggested. This loophole has been used by the more affluent in our society.

HON. EDISON O. MINGE (continuing): Examples have been given and I think that bear repeating, where maybe a Corporation has had a piece of property and an agent has had the right of assessment for maybe $200,000 somewhere that will show the value of the property is much higher. So has a Corporation available by for $200,000 and it is investigated for a value of without assessment whether they agree with it or not. It has been pointed out that it is supposed on normal assessments and assessment only goes for about sixty days that it is finally transferred on the tax-roles.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that a departmental agreement is used that often by the little person in purchasing a piece of property. In my opinion, if that were the assessment which I have made statement will just beyond doubt that that will not be the effect of this amendment, that is. Therefore, our cost to the small person. As fact, what is will do is to increase the problems that are existing with the small homes, because I believe to know, Mr. President, of several instances where people have put cost to remodel their or a five-payment bonds, the stated consideration on the assessment might have been $10,000, and when they make the final payment the value of the land was then $40,000 or $50,000 and they have asked to pay the taxes duly on that amount. With the amendment that maybe otherwise it will just happen any thing that the taxes duly will be the taxes duly paid at the commencement of the agreement.

The gentleman, Mr. President, and I will take them in the order in which they are in the bill, are as follows. Mr. President, the limitation of five years seems just an much though it should therefore take more than seven years of 104 per week, but it is nevertheless five times increase on such change. Unless people are in the habit of entering leases for very small income. This has got to be a very minimal increase in the most of other instances.

The section dealing with the change in timeschedule while, Mr. President, in my opinion, is a timely amendment to the Stamp Duty Act. I see no relationship to the 7 per cent tax which was removed in December, to the change which is hereby suggested here. The 7 per cent tax which was taken off in December applied to all commodities or articles with manufacturers and it was paid up front before the...assessment are even announced, unless it was refused. That was the day that it was 7%;...Again, Mr. President, will some one the Government has taken steps and to being paid and it does not apply to all commodities, only to those which are sold on a hire-purchase terms. As I understand it, those commodities or certain cities requisite which are now sold on a hire-purchase terms may be taken duty at 8%, and this is an attempt to get some duty for Government on those transactions.

I support that the amendment received by the Standard Motor (Hire Purchase) Limited is more equitable and it that is more satisfactory to the purchaser than existing a flat fee, and I would hope that that amendment is accepted.

Mr. President, this amendment can have no effect on the little man in this country. I do not think our little man in this country owns televisions units or any development, and he certainly would not be well advised to enter into any type of agreement of that nature for whether for himself. So I do not know where the little man comes into it.

MRS. BERGER (D-HI)(PARLIAMENTARY): So I would say it has no relevance whatsoever to the 4 days out of which were taken off in December, which was on Members have stated, with a view to eliminating constituents that something like those in the amendments included. I take it as a way of homecoming a time which was never contemplated in the Constitution when which would have normally been taken instead of the same was held in a convenient way around the Capitol Holidays. So I have no hesitation in saying that we object the amendment, Mr. President, and I urge support the vote of the Bill with equal fervor.

I do not know where these constituents are going to put electric on the little men, on whom the 10,000 records as we have said. Apartment in the Taiwans. However, I believe that they left out their Government anywhere quite a substantial sum of money which should have been there in the first place.

Thank you, Mr. President,

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak?

MAJ. MICHEL (R-IL): Mr. President, Sir, I have spoke to many that would schedule a little also taking the question time. Perhaps it could be a little early and call it 4:30 p.m.

MR. PRESIDENT: If no other Member wishes to speak I was going to ask the House if you would be willing to recess the night of early, and if at whether he intends to do so at any length. Or whether he would be available quite briefly. Otherwise as I understand it unable us to defer the moment of interruption if in my discretion I think a short deferment of it may enable the House to finish particular business. If the House intends speaking for some time then there would be no purpose in...

ROB. EDWARD C. (R-PA): I do, Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, in that case I think perhaps we could recess by to eventually 4:30 p.m. will.

ADJOURNMENT

MAJ. ARNOLD R. (R-TX): Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do adjourn until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow. Unless any Member objects be moved I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 3.50 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., TUESDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1987.

STATE OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

: (TUESDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1985)

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR D TAYLOR LLOYD, CMG, CVO - CHAIRPERSON

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON CHARLES K FLEMING, CVO,CBE,JP	CHIEF OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J BRADLEY, QC, CB.E	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C JEFFERSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON SAMSON O EBANKS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M MORPHY MORGAN, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES L KIRKCONNELL	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND AGRICULT ADMINISTRATION
HON CAROLE O JOHNSON, CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MASSEYA BODE	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR EDWARD A TIBERIN, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT GARRY S MCKEEHNEY	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SISTER ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS
MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR G ERIC EBANKS	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D RICHARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JACOB E THOMPSON	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SIXTH OFFICIAL & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1965) SESSION

OF THE CARIBBEAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TUESDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1965

SIXTH DAY

1. QUESTIONS

THE SECOND SELECTED MEMBER FOR GRENADA TOOK TO ASK THE HONOURABLE CHIEF OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 5: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER ANY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT HAS APPROACHED THE GOVERNMENT BANK REGARDING AN INCREASE IN THE OVERDRAFT AS AT 31ST OCTOBER, 1964, AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES LEADING TO THE NEED TO PURCHASE NEW POWER GENERATING?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR ST. GEO AND TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 7: WILL THE MEMBER GIVE A DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF THE QUESTION-NAIRE GIVEN TO PARENTS TO ASSESS WHICH ENCLOSED QUESTIONS AS TO WHETHER CHILD LABOURERS WERE BEING TAUGHT AGRICULTURE AND WOODWORKING SKILLS?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GRENADA TOOK TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 8: WOULD THE HONOURABLE STATE WHAT PROGRESS, IF ANY, HAS BEEN MADE TOWARDS THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE GRENADA GENERAL HOSPITAL?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 9: WOULD THE HONOURABLE STATE WHEN THE REGULATIONS UNDER THE CARIBBEAN PROTECTION LAW, 1964, ARE EXPECTED TO BE MADE?

NO. 10: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER THE POST OF GOVERNMENT INFORMATION OFFICER HAS ADVERTISED IN THE LOCAL MEDIA?

NO. 11: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER ANY GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, WHERE NON-CARIBBEANS WERE EMPLOYED IN THE CIVIL SERVICE, ARE BEING RENEWED WITHOUT ADVERTISING THE POST IN THE LOCAL MEDIA?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GRENADA TOOK TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 12: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT, IF ANY, PROGRESS HAVE BEEN MADE IN THE FORMULATION OF AN APPROPRIATE SET OF LABOUR LAWS FOR THIS COUNTRY?

2. OTHER BUSINESS

(a) SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 14(2)

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER TO ENABLE PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS NOS. 1 TO BE TAKEN AT THIS SITTING.

(b) PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

(1) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.1/95 - PROGRAMME FOR THE LEGISLATURE

TO BE MOVED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY AND SECONDED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE.

(2) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.2/95 - LYNCH'S LEGISLATION

TO BE MOVED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY AND SECONDED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE.

(3) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.3/95 - COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

TO BE MOVED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY AND SECONDED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE.

(4) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.4/95 - APPOINTMENT OF BOUNDARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY.

(5) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.5/95 - ELECTORAL REGISTRATION

TO BE MOVED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY.

(6) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.6/95 - AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDERS

TO BE MOVED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN AND SECONDED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END.

(7) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.7/95 - ESTABLISHMENT OF YOUTH CENTRES

TO BE MOVED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GRAND CAYMAN AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY.

5. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(a) MOTION:-

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO.1/95 - ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE POLICE ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(b) BILLS:-

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

CONTINUATION OF SECOND READING DEBATE

COMMITTEE STAGE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

REPORT STAGE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

ENTERED READING

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(22) FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(1) THE LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(2) THE REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(3) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(4) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(5) THE TELEPHONES REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS	1
SUSPENSION OF REGULATIONS 14(9); AMD. (a)	15
PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 1/85 - EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN REGULATIONS	51
PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 2/85 - PARKING REGULATION	55
PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 3/85 - CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITY	
(a) Mr. M. McMaster Beach	61
(b) Rev. D. G. Fowler	53
(c) Mr. G. Rudy Hodgins	59
ADJOURNMENT	65

TUESDAY

6TH MARCH, 1956

10.00 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
Questions. The Second Elected Member.
for George Town.

QUESTIONS

THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 5: Would the Honourable the Government Secretary advise whether any Government deposits were hypothecated against the Government Bank overdraft as 31st October, 1954, and the collateral backing for the loan is perhaps the Town Building?

ANSWER: No Government deposits were hypothecated against the Government Bank overdraft as 31st October, 1954.

There is no collateral backing for the loan in respect the Town Building. However, Government has agreed not to borrow for any Local Purposes presently held by Barclays Bank and to allow the Bank's holdings of our funds to increase as revenue is collected, Government's letter dated 6th September, 1954, signed by the Honourable Member refers.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. EDMOND A. EBANKS: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Honourable Elected Member explain whether the Bank overdraft was considered as a deduction to the General Reserve Fund?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the proceeding in this matter is that the General Reserve should be shown at the $10 million figure and there should be a footnote in Government accounts at 31st December, 1954 indicating that the letter was given to Barclays Bank.

MR. EDMOND A. EBANKS: A further supplementary, Mr. President. Am I to understand then, Sir, that the General Reserve funds of $10 million plus have not in any way affected by the bank overdraft or the amount negotiated for the Town Building Loan?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Elected Member has just explained the way in which it was effected.

MR. EDMOND A. EBANKS: That I am asking for, Mr. President, for clarity of the situation.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I believe that in the answer given I indicated that there were no hypothecations against the bank overdraft. Therefore we cannot reduce the General Reserve by the bank overdraft.

MR. [illegible]: I think the honourable third [illegible] Member has made the position clear. If the question posed that the accounts should be kept in a different form or presented in some different way, no doubt he can make representations accordingly. However, I do not think that further information can usefully be solicited.

MR. LINDSAY A. PETERSON: Mr. President, if I may first clarify my notice for this. I have as I said in my remarks yesterday, some very considerable caveats of this position of Government at the first October, 1984, and I think it is only in pronouncements of this House that of the country that we have the true position.

MR. [illegible]: Thank you. Question No....I am sorry do you have a supplementary? Yes.

MR. [illegible] M. SCOTT: Mr. President, I wonder if the Honourable Third Official Member who has answered this question dealing with the concepts of Government could tell us whether he was the one who prepared the release which came out some time ago under the signature of the Joint Planning Secretariat of Executive Council, which incorrectly stated that the country would have been broke if we had followed those figures.

MR. [illegible]: I do not think that is really a supplementary. It is a question which the questioner can ask [illegible] if he wants.

Unless there is any further supplementary, I will invite the Elected Member for East End to ask the next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END WOULD LIKE THE HONOURABLE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND PUBLIC SERVICES

NO. 7: Will the Member give a detailed analysis of the expenditure given to revise to ensure that included revisions are to whether they were using rivers and streets, and who authorized same?

MR. [illegible]: Perhaps I can just mention something. The usual procedure is for the Member requiring to read out his question, but in fact since we received from Stanley Orders to order to make it clear for people who listen on the radio what [illegible] and since questions are now going out in full, perhaps it would be sensible for the questioner rather than the Member answering to read the question. I note that the Elected Member for East End has done just that and I invite other Members to follow his lead. I think that is perhaps sensible.

ANSWER: Because of Government public concern surrounding the [illegible] of dangerous drugs and alcohol within the society and in an attempt to develop a programme for treatment and rehabilitation of this problem, a Council on Mental Health and Drug and Alcohol Abuse was established in January, 1984, under the chairmanship of the Financial Secretary for Health, Education and Social Services. In September, 1984, a sub-committee of the Council decided to develop a questionnaire in an attempt to determine the extent of drug and

alcohol abuse. The questionnaire was developed using model questions for a similar survey in the United States.

The form was strictly anonymous and served as means of identification; the investigator was interested in collecting general data, not specific names.

The questionnaire entitled "Knowledge, attitude and practices of teenagers towards use of drugs and alcohol" contained eight questions. The first two questions were to determine the age and sex of the individual. The third question examined whether these specific forms of tobacco drugs and alcohol were also heard of by the young person. The fourth question asked if the young person had experienced any of these products under any of the three specified forms of drugs and alcohol. The fifth question solicited an explanation of his or her decision on the part of the student in the event that parents were known to use one of the specified drugs.

The sixth question examined whether the student had ever used the four main drugs mentioned and if so how frequently. The seventh question asked if any of the four main drugs had been used by the student during the previous month. The final question sought to determine reasons, if any, for using either form of dangerous drugs or alcohol.

The questionnaire was approved by the Principal's Secretary in the capacity as Chairman of the Council on Mental Health and Drug and Alcohol Abuse and in consultation with the Health and Education Departments.

COMMENTARIES:

MR. G. MALE ROOPUL: Mr. President, may I ask when was the questionnaire answered by the Principal Secretary?

DR. ANDREW O. FRANCIS: Mr. President, I am not certain of the exact date on which approval was given, but the decision to procure the questionnaires was taken in September, 1983 so it would have been some time between then and when it was circulated in January of this year.

MR. G. MALE ROOPUL: Mr. President, if he is in position that the decision was taken in September to procure the questionnaire can I ask why he does not give us the exact date on which the questionnaire arrived and sent to the schools.

DR. ANDREW O. FRANCIS: Mr. President, the minutes of the Sub-Committee indicate the date on which the decision was taken to procure the questionnaire, but I have not been able to determine the date on which it was approved from that source or any other source.

MR. G. MAIS POCOCK: Mr. President, may I ask why he would not determine that date? Was the date on 1885?

PRES. HERMAN G. MORRIS: Mr. President, I have said I do not know the date, so I could not say whether it was 1885 or 1911.

MR. G. MAIS POCOCK: Certainly, Mr. President, if the amendment to the motion the Member placed with me, was my question in order or is it to the motion?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think you have been answered that, Pocock, I may add. That is my understanding. That was the answer to the supplementary.

MR. G. MAIS POCOCK: Mr. President, may I ask the Member to see he have him say that?

MR. PRESIDENT: Wait I will ask him....

MR. G. MAIS POCOCK: I want to the motion in January, 1911?

PRES. HERMAN G. MORRIS: Yes, Mr. President, I said that in order to an additional supplementary. It would have to have been approved some time between September, 1910 and January, 1911 when it was circulated to the motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member for North Side.

MR. G. RICHARD MITCHELL: A supplementary, Mr. President. Was the Member state whether he personally approved this amendment?

MR. PRESIDENT: With respect, the answer to the original question stated that the amendment was approved by the Provincial Secretary.

MR. G. RICHARD MITCHELL: Mr. President, a supplementary. Will the Member state whether he was aware of the decision to issue this questionnaire?

PRES. HERMAN G. MORRIS: Mr. President, I did not see the questionnaire after it had been circulated, sir.

MR. G. MAIS POCOCK: Mr. President, may I only if he had any discussion of it before he was circulated although he may not have seen it?

HON. HERMAN G. MORRIS: Not of the contents of the questionnaire.

MR. G. MAIS POCOCK: No, President, may I ask if the information received from this investigation been handed over to the police so that the matter may be prosecuted, if any of the questionnaires were in the affirmative?

MR. PRESIDENT: With respect, you have already been told that it was anonymous. There could therefore be no possible question of prosecution.

MR. G. MAIS POCOCK: Despite the fact that it was anonymous information that these should be turned over to the police so they may find out who the citizens were who were under the threat of the questionnaires in the affirmative.

MR. PRESIDENT: That may be an observation of the Honorable Second Elected Member of Belize Rural East but it is not a point which I share, and it is not something upon I could agree to serve.

MR. G. ERIC SMITH: If it is a criminal offence in this country to order an underage minority, I believe, may I ask if the Member intends to bring over to the House at the future any effective answers to the use of dangerous drugs?

MR. PRESIDENT: Since the Member has already been told that Backbenchers are encouraged I do not propose to allow the supplementary. Is there any Member unconvinced?

MR. C. WES WOODS: Yes, Mr. President, I have many more. Mr. President, may I ask the Member what action he is now taking as a result of the representations from parents that the police visit the centres?

HON. GEORGE O. PRICE: Mr. President, I have not taken any action because the police are cooperating with the Committee. There is no way of determining which schools the boys have come from. They are all amalgamated and hopefully the date which the Committee hopes will be completed they will be sufficient to combat drug and alcohol abuse among young children in the community. No other action can be contemplated. Certainly at this no way of identifying any of the exact centres which were used.

MR. G. ERIC SMITH: Mr. President, may I ask how many questionnaires were distributed and how many have been returned?

SEN. HONOR O. PRAIRE: I am unable to give specific numbers, Mr. President, other than to say that they were distributed to all children in primary and private.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Elected Member for East Corozal

MR. JOHN H. BRICEÑO: Mr. President, a supplementary. I'm... what the Member is saying is correct; he said there is a possibility of this to be found to be false or true or what action among the youths, my question is if there is anyone who has the results been brought into the picture?

HON. HONOR O. PRAIRE: Mr. President, as I understood it, it is purely to determine the attitude of children to the use of drugs by adults.

MR. C. RAY MOORE: Mr. President, may I ask if my interpretation is correct that ten year old children were asked to spy on their parents?

HON. HONOR O. PRAIRE: Mr. President, it was not a case of asking children to spy on their parents. I think that information, Mr. President, which indicated that certainly in schools in the United States a large percentage of children, by the age of twelve have already participated the use of drugs or alcohol. So from it is known that possibly that this would seem to be necessary if any success is going to be achieved. This was why they were given the questionnaire. No child was asked to spy on his parents. The children were given the paper and asked to answer it right there. They

REP. JAMES G. MARTIN (CONTINUING): ...did not have time to go home and vote on their recommendations. It was only if they had to do this once more it being done.

MR. O. WILD BRIGGS: Mr. President, have the sponsors satisfied their intention would be fulfilled with these amendments?

REP. JAMES G. MARTIN: Mr. President, I am not quite clear the point that I think that the subcommittee was called on and a discussion on this matter was held with them. As right I think that each school considered a student officer to come with the committee on the constitutions.

REP. JAMES M. GALLOWAY: Mr. President, I wonder if the sponsor would state briefly decision to use to count voting children as 16 years old rather than age 18 or 21 years, and whether or the records which have been obtained any information how these would affect the children of 16 or 18 years of age?

REP. JAMES G. MARTIN: Mr. President, I would assume the question was the decision of the sub-committee and I have not yet been furnished with any information obtained as a result of the survey.

MR. J. RAY ROBERTS: Mr. President, according to the answer the questionnaire was entitled knowledge, attitude and practices of teenagers towards the use of drugs. The question is why was it given to 12 year olds?

MR. MARTIN: I think that was been answered already.

MR. JAMES M. GALLOWAY: Well, in view of that, Mr. President, may I ask the Member whether he was his opinion that 12 year old children would be in a position to understand questions of such a personal nature as this and to answer on it?

REP. MARTIN: I do not think that that is a responsible opinion because he has obviously been made aware that it was not his decision, it was the decision of the sub-committee to issue the questionnaire.

MR. JAMES M. GALLOWAY: Well who is ultimately responsible for it, then? Is it the Sub-committee? Is it the Department Secretary? Or is it the Honorable First Elected Member of Executive Council? (Pause). I am waiting for a reply to my question, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am afraid you do not owe obligations to me. You can ask the Member that question if only he what you want to do.

MR. JAMES M. GALLOWAY: I thought I had made it quite clear that I was not talking to him. That I was talking to the Member. I am asking whose decision it was, or who the responsible minister ultimately must with? Would it be the Sub-committee, the Secretary or the Member in charge of the portfolio?

HON. DENNIS O. BARRY: Mr. President, if this assembly had taken place yesterday instead my time of office I would have no hesitation in taking responsibility for the decision. Unfortunately, it appears that there is a query arose as to what this was in

MRS. BRUCE P. SCARLETT (CONTINUING): Just approved. I guess this is the possibly because of the discretionary funds that place.

MR. JAMES M. BARRY: Mr. President, as there appears to be a query, does anyone object to the Senate disagreeing to the Amendments of this House the Sub-committee reports in their entirety or will as the Amendments, so that it may be determined under which authority it was passed.

MRS. BRUCE P. SCARLETT: Mr. President, I have given the answer to this. The only Sub-committee report which mentioned this is dated September, 1981.

MR. P. SAIC BROOKS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member who has the responsibility for this under the Constitution. To is the Members, or the Sub-committee....

MR. PRESIDENT: That has already been answered.

MR. JAMES M. BARRY: I do not think we can proceed in any, Sir. The second thing that the problem with this the only date we have is the date is September, 1984, which could be conveniently used to say or there the assumption that it was done by the previous Honourable Prime Minister of Executive Council.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Minister must make statements. If there is a question, please ask it.

MR. JAMES M. BARRY: To is any use to this House?

MR. P. SAIC BROOKS: Mr. President, will the Member give a statement that the type of questionnaire will never again be given to 10 year old children?

MRS. BRUCE P. SCARLETT: Mr. President, I am not sure whether the Member is referring specifically to the question which related to children's attitude to mental health, or whether he is talking about the questionnaire in total. If he is talking about the specific question which I have mentioned, I would agree that in looking at it if I had seen the question I probably would have asked that that question be left out. However, I would not rule the undertaking that a similar survey would not be considered if I thought that it had value.

MR. P. SAIC BROOKS: Mr. President, may I ask why if the questionnaire, instead of determining if parents need help, why was not the questionnaire sent to the parents? If it was given to the child, why was the child not allowed to take it home and let his parents help with the answers?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not really think what is a supplementary. I think we have strayed rather far from the original question. Unless supplementaries are tied to the original answer rather strictly I think we had better pass on to the next question.

MR. P. SAIC BROOKS: Mr. President, the question asked for a detailed analysis and so far as I am concerned this answer has not given it. That is why I am putting this type of supplementary question. I would have hoped the questionnaire would have been sent to the parents with all the answers: the child in question could be interviewed in the schools.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have waited great hopes. Before there be any further supplementary I will ask the former Elected Member for George Town to ask the next question.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN NO. 2 ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST MINISTER MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 8: Would the Member state what progress, if any, has been made towards the development of the sports complex?

ANSWER: The progress to date on the sports complex includes:-

(1) The reclamation, layout and top soiling of an infield access road;

(2) The layout of a practice field and a parking area with most of the multi-use completed;

(3) The connections system for the soccer pitch, including the water and clubhouse, have been completed;

(4) Work on the pavilion on the field layout for parking, landscaping, etc.;

(5) The Little Club underway with one cage, and further on internal part of the complex is still underway for reclamation.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. EDWARD A. MCTAGGART: I supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member advise whether the offer made by Cayman Society to assist with this project under the Arts Grant Programme, has been accepted by Government?

HON. JEPHSON B. EBANKS: Mr. President, I think that is the subject of a later question.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think it is the subject of a later question and is not really a supplementary which arised directly out of the answer to this one. So I think you had better keep that; you can ask that as a proper question. It is true, although not on Monday's Order Paper I understand.

MR. EDWARD A. MCTAGGART: Mr. President, I will have very little hesitation in asking that as a necessary question because it is directly related to the question which I just asked. So I will no doubt have to declare that from the point of the day when it arose up.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask a supplementary? What was the Capital Assets Policy Committee?

HON. BERNARD O. PEARSON: Mr. President, work was continuing on the project up until this year but the work on the access roads would have been through the end of last year. I think some work was done on that in January or so?

MR. JAMES K. POLLOCK: Could the Member give us a detailed account as to what work took place on this campaign before the elections and what has been done since the elections, since apparently he is hoping to use that as a check in his answers?

MR. SPEAKMAN: The latter part of that supplementary can be established. As to the first point, which is the principal question whether the Member can say how much of the programs was made uniform and how much after the elections, if the Member has the information and wishes to produce he may do so.

HON. ROBERT G. SPENCE: Well, Mr. President, I do not have that detailed information.

MR. JAMES K. POLLOCK: Well, I do not expect to get many questions answered in this House but let me make another one. Could the Member state what section took place on this before the elections and whether he could tell us what 30 per cent of the work which has been done on this so far was done before the elections in 1964, and whether 10 per cent has been done since that time? Or what would be in his mind the percentages?

HON. ERNEST G. HALL: Mr. President, I am unable to break it down in percentages. All I can say is that work continued as planned from the completion of the requirements, either them for breakdowns on the machines which should have left the surface to the working track, and also because of the fact that that machine had to be sent to Regina first to do work on the different there. In other words, the surface on the running track could have probably been placed before the end of the year but for the machine going to Regina first and having that kept before and after the return.

MR. JAMES K. BALLON: Certainly it would not take a genius to answer this question. Was the majority of the work done before the 1964 elections or has the majority of it been done since the November, 1964 elections?

MR. SPEAKMAN: I think if the Member wants precise information of that kind he needs to put down a question. The original question was merely what percentage of work has been made. It was not a question which sought information as to the timing. I can understand the Member's particular point but if he wants an answer he may need to put down a specific question so that the answer can be ascertained.

MR. JAMES K. POLLOCK: Well, Mr. President, I am reading this the question as it is now, "Could the Member state what percentage of work has been made towards the completion of the sports complex"? I can't see how I am not going into detail in this answer into this. It was explained by the Minister, so therefore I am asking, and I will take the explanation out of it, what percentage was made and was the majority of the work completed before 15th November, 1964? Or was the majority of it done since 15th November, 1964? That should be permissible. The explanation is out of it.

MR. SPEAKMAN: It is not a question of the explanation being taken out of it. It is a question that the original question merely asked how much progress has been made only, and not how much progress has been made by a number of specific dates. There

MR. PRESIDENT (CONTINUING): In no manner why, in order to provide an answer to the original question, the Member should submit information of this kind now being sought. The original question has been fully answered. If you want information of this kind you are now seeking, I am suggesting to you that you need to put down a specific question because the Member does not have the information today as he has already made clear.

MR. JAMES M. QUINN: I do not think I will be asking it, Sir, because as long as you appear to be in that chair I do not think we will get the type of answers...

MR. PRESIDENT: That remark will be withdrawn. Will the Member please withdraw that remark, otherwise I shall have no alternative but to name him?

MR. JAMES M. QUINN: Mr. President, I will withdraw it but I would like to see more fairness shown to both sides of this House.

MR. PRESIDENT: So indeed would everybody, I am sure. My hope is that we shall continue to see it. If there is no further supplementary, yes...

MR. S. ANTHONY MANNELLI: Mr. President, I would like to ask the Member, when the previous statement on this matter? What was the same answer?

HON. HERBERT O. REAVES: Mr. President, could I as not be a question to give a specific date but it was sometime early last year.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Elected Member for George Town.

MR. EDWARD A. VARELA: Mr. President, I promise you that this will be my last supplementary. Would the Member state when we can expect to see an official operational opening of any part of the sports complex?

HON. HERBERT O. REAVES: No, Mr. President, but I would assure the Honourable Gentleman we are going to try to have one opening only.

MR. S. ANTHONY MANNELLI: Mr. President, point (b) of the answer says that the Lacsa Club authority will on the site to call tenders for construction. Can the Member say when work was started on this swimming pool?

HON. HERBERT O. REAVES: Mr. President, the first week of December.

MR. S. ANTHONY MANNELLI: The Member also mentioned that the installation is still outstanding. Can he tell us what he means by "still outstanding"?

HON. HERBERT O. REAVES: The units are substantially built, Mr. President, with the plumbing and electrical fittings in. Beyond that I am not able to give details.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think I will say, because we are eating a lot of the period of question time for few questions, ask the Elected Member for North Side to ask the next question.

THE SPEAKER MAKING HIMSELF READY TO ASK THE QUESTIONS FIRST
QUESTION: REGULATIONS FOR IMPROVED SAFETY STANDARDS

MR. 9: Would the Member state when the regulations under the Consumer Protection Law, 1978, are expected to be ready?

ANSWER: The regulations under the Consumer Protection Law, 1978, are made and will be published when the Law is brought into force.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. LLOYDS A. PIERRE: Alternatively, Mr. President. Could the Member state when it is expected that the Law will be brought into effect?

HON. DENNIS M. ROGERS: Mr. President, hopefully in a matter of weeks, Sir.

MR. G. MAIC BOLDEN: Mr. President, may I ask that with the importance attached to this Bill and the experience given to it when it passed through the House last year, will the Member table the regulations in this House and will he also seek the approval of this Legislative Assembly before putting the regulations into effect?

HON. DENNIS M. ROGERS: We may, Mr. President. The regulations are made under provisions given in the Law and they will be published in the Gazette after they have been made by His Excellency-in-Council, in due course.

MR. G. MAIC BOLDEN: Mr. President, does the Member mean to say that the Members of the Legislative Assembly will not have what is in these regulations which they consider a part in the Bill?

HON. DENNIS M. ROGERS: Absolutely right, Sir.

MR. G. MAIC BOLDEN: Mr. President, may I ask if the Member is aware of the expressions of the public and the Members of the Legislative Assembly during the Long passage of the Bill before it became Law.

HON. DENNIS M. ROGERS: Mr. President, if the House had wished the regulations to come to the House they should have made that provision for the Law.

MR. G. MAIC BOLDEN: Mr. President, as the Member knows effect of the Law has been so long delayed, will the Member not accept as the wish of the House, or at least this Member that we be given a chance to look at the regulations before they go into Law?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think an effort that has already been mentioned.

MR. G. MAIC BOLDEN: Mr. President, may I ask that for future guidance, to what must I attribute an supplementary question, do you or the Member?

MR. PRESIDENT: You address the Chair, but the question is directed to the Member who is to answer it.

MR. G. WILLIS SIMMONS: I am confused, Mr. President, because I thought there was an answer from the Member. The answer again is....

MR. PRESIDENT: I think perhaps you meant you do not get the answer you want.

MR. G. WILLIS SIMMONS: No, Mr. President, in the case of the question addressed to the Honourable Chief Minister a while ago we never received in fact a reply unless it came from the Chair.

HON. LEROY H. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will try, to elaborate, but, although the Member seems very well how the working of these things goes. When the Law provides for negotiations to be made by the Government that are made in Council and then then are published and the public sees them. Now, Mr. President, I cannot stray from the legal duty of doing this. There was a system for delaying the answer into effect of the Law. It will not be too long and meanwhile will be published together. This was the relevant way of doing it, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. MORRIS: Mr. President, I think that the question asked by my colleague really did not get the answer it should have because we got it out sent of the workings caused by the Member and so was sent by the Chair. So we are really confused in knowing who to direct these questions to.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary I will invite the elected Member for North Side to ask the next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR TOURISM, INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING FOR INFORMATION ON GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENTS

NO. 10: Would the Member state whether the post of Government Information Officer was advertised in the local media?

ANSWER: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. D. CYRIL WILLIAMS: I misunderstand, Mr. President. Would the Member state whether the advertisements was as a result of my question, because I think no advertisements was out before the question was put to the Assembly before the advertisements appeared in the local media on the 8th February.

HON. CYRIL B. ROBERTS: I can assure that, Mr. President. The answer to Mr. This was done before the question was ever received by me, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. MORRIS: Was the question back dated?

HON. CYRIL B. ROBERTS: We have many applications and they are supposed to be in by the 8th March, so they are not all in yet, or they might all be in but they will not be dealt until after the 8th March.

MR. J. RICHARD MILLER: Unfortunately, Mr. President. You might not allow this but the advertisement which appears in the local media for this post asks for a Bachelors degree and a Diploma or more for the Senior Information Officer. Does the Member expect to find a graduate with those qualifications?

HON. DENNIS G. YOUNG: Not really, Mr. President.

MR. J. RICHARD MILLER: A supplementary, Sir. Does the Member feel that those two qualifications are absolutely necessary for adequate performance of the job?

HON. DENNIS G. YOUNG: Mr. President, let us put it this way. We would be much more successful if the applicant had those qualifications. If he does not have them then he will have to have the best we can get.

MR. JAMES M. DOWNEY: The Member presently occupying that portfolio, does he have a Master of Arts and a Bachelor of Arts degree?

HON. DENNIS G. YOUNG: The person there is only temporary, Sir, but to answer the question I am not certain what qualifications she has. She was doing the work before that came up to the 14th November.

MR. JAMES M. DOWNEY: I am quite aware of that in a general context. I did not like the advertisement as I cannot comment too much on it, but I am perhaps surprised that we would be asking for that type of degree for this position. I wonder if the Member could state how it was decided to ask for those qualifications?

HON. DENNIS G. YOUNG: To enlighten the Member the qualification is for a Senior Information Officer and an ordinary Information Officer and it reads, "The applicants should possess a Master of Arts or Bachelor of Arts degree in Journalism from an accredited university, and have a minimum of five years experience in the communication media and management of a news service". Mr. President, as the policy is not what we pay for and that is not try to get qualified people in the beginning, we cannot just close an eligibility for an Information Officer. Anybody could apply. I cannot tell you whether we are going to get one with a degree in Journalism or not, but it is quite possible that we might.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for East Bay was the first to catch my eye.

MR. P. GERVAIS KENT: Thank you, Mr. President. I wonder whether the Member would state the range of salary which is paid to this Information Officer?

HON. DENNIS G. BARTER: Mr. President, at this moment I cannot quote a number.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that answers a bit the supplemental question. The First Elected Member for Bonavista North rose. If he still wishes to speak? No, the Fourth Member for Bonavista South.

MR. R. EDGAR MARTIN: Would the Member agree, Sir, whether he feels that the greatest emphasis should be placed on academic qualifications or practical knowledge of these jobs for such a post.

MRS. DORIS D. BOOTH: Mr. President, I think a combination of both because knowledge of the statute is one thing, but if the person is not able to devote a decent volume of post secondary education it would be no good. I might say, a recent example of which I am very proud is the participation by the marine corps which the Intermediate Service did. And I think that all Montana are aware of this. If they have not gone to see it on the slide show they have quickly heard it on the radio and I think it was well put across. However, if a person does not have a half decent education they would not be that keen of doing, Sir.

MR. C. EDWARD HEDAHL: A further supplementary, Mrs. Mr. President. Does the Minority feel that a certain amount of academic qualifications are necessary, would the Member please explain his dissatisfaction who presumably held such a post in Government and who had no such academic qualifications?

MRS. DORIS D. BOOTH: I presume the Member is referring to the article which we had spoken of being considered and which was a first attempt to introduce some sort of information service. That particular office had been quite active and when we were advised that the Government wanted to economize some with the public, we decided we had to expand and try to do a better job. To get it all together, it is not just information that Government do the public either. It is many other duties like the Aeronautical Agency that does not get done as often, and quite a number of different things which come to the fore front.

MR. PRESIDENT: The next question.

THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES THE GENTLEMAN FROM THE 28TH DISTRICT, MR. [illegible], FOR THE PURPOSE OF ASKING A QUESTION.

MR. [illegible]: Would the Member state whether any Government contracts with non-Canadians who are employed in the Civil Service are being considered although disregarding the point in the local matter?

CHAIR: Yes. For example, teachers who have registered will be recommended for consideration to the Public Service Commission although local qualifications for specific vacancies, a general advertisement for teachers may be placed, and if a qualified local problem, the Commonwealth Nominal will not be removed. We advertise all posts in the local newspaper would be mainly non-Canadians.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS:

MR. D. EDWARD HEDAHL: Could the Member state if it is not a requirement under Government regulations that contracts held by non-Canadians be advertised before they are awarded at the end of the term?

MRS. DORIS D. BOOTH: Mr. President, I am not sure what is in the regulations but generally according to procedure. Sometimes, for instance that would be the case of advertising for a doctor when we do not have any available. Sometimes it does not take place. If we have a qualified person in a post and for the minute we are satisfactory service; this member in advance he tells us that he would like to remain and we are

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER (CONSERVATIVE): happy with his performance, he will go ahead and make another statement. Now so do, Sir, it would be a waste of Government money and everything else proceeding that again.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Could the Member state, Sir, what criteria he hopes to determine what words are acceptable and what are not, and where does he get the information concerning all of the qualified Legislators who exist out there?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, if it is a word considered like the Information Services it is advertised. If the contracted officer is a non-Legislator and he does not want to repeat or he decide we are not going to censor it, we advertise it.

MR. PRESIDENT: I make it that there is just time for one more question. The Second Elected Member for George Town.

SUSPENSION STANDING 24 (2)

MR. LINWOOD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I was just wondering whether I could exercise my rights under section 23(8) of the Standing Orders to have my question postponed until a later day, because I know that it is 11.00 now?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I would suggest you take it, Sir, since it is the last question on the Order Paper. For once we might...

MR. PRESIDENT: I see....

HON. MICHAEL J. DARGLEY: I think that the Honourable Second Elected Member for George Town is indeed that you will rule him out having through the supplementaries.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, that would be a risk, that if there used a large number of supplementaries there would not be time to take them all. My watch does say it is after 11.00, so since the Member has asked for suspension under Standing Order 23, paragraph (8) I will grant it, and we will take his question next.

Item 2. Suspension of Standing Order 24(2). The Honourable First Official Member.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 24(2) AND (3)

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, under Standing Order 24, Sir, I would like to move the suspension of Standing Order 24(2) to allow Private Members' Business today instead of Thursday, as everybody knows Thursday is Private Members' day but we had got the debate on the Budget to start on Wednesday morning. So in the Business Committee Meeting yesterday evening Members decided that it was their desire to have two days on that the debate on the Throne Speech and Budget Address could go right on from tomorrow on without a break in between.

I think it makes good sense, Sir. We can get most of these done today probably and when we start debating tomorrow we will be able to go straight on.

DOM. RICHARD J. GARCIA: Perhaps, Mr. President, Sir, if we could just give a little more particularity, and I would suggest to my Commonwealth colleagues that we suspend Standing Order 14(5) to enable Private Members' business to be taken today. Secondly, we should also suspend 14(2) and 24(3) to enable Government business to continue on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: That is Thursday of this week only. So the question before the House is that Standing Orders 24(3) and 14(2) be suspended in such a way as to have the effect of enabling Private Members' Motions to be debated today and to enable the Government business to continue being debated on Thursday of this week.

Does any Member wish to speak?

MR. R. LEO ABBOTT: Yes, Mr. President, I wish to oppose the suspension of these Standing Orders. I account the difference between dealing with Government Bills which are before this House today and dealing with the Private Members' Motions. I am aware of Standing Order 24 which allows this suspension. I want to question why the business of this House is being conducted in such a topsy-turvy manner.

On Friday, we were dealing with the revenue Bills and we were told that it was necessary to finish those two Bills, the Customs Bill and the Stamp Duty Bill. The House sat in session until 2.00 p.m. to complete the Customs Bill. We are still dealing with the Stamp Duty Bill which is a relatively small one and we are just finishing the committee. Why are we not dealing with the Stamp Duty Bill this morning rather than jumping off to deal with Private Members' Motions? Also, why are we not continuing to deal with all the other Bills; some four or five Bills have been on the Order Paper from Friday and yesterday? Why are we only concentrating those? Why are we jumping off to deal with Private Members' Motions which should be on Thursday? If we simply want days and only deal with Private Members' Motions today, we would have to deal with the Government Bills on Thursday which would still cause an interruption to the debate on the Throne Speech and the Budget Address. Mist de mon sense, Mr. President, I come here this morning prepared to deal with the Government Bills and all other Members must have also come prepared to deal with the Government Bills today. Now we are told that we have to deal with Private Members' Motions and I personally am not prepared to deal with them, although if it is the will of the House that we must deal with them I may be able to stay a few words.

However, Members have come into the Chamber this morning expecting the business to continue in the regular fashion, and it is our right to ensure the business in the regular fashion. If there were more important Private Members' Motions I could see the revenue Bill being set aside, and I could see any other business of the House being set aside. But there is no urgency at all to any of these Private Members' Motions and it has caught all the Members of the House unprepared. If we were told this yesterday afternoon, that this would be the order today, we could have no cavil. However, you will know that a very important thing happened this morning, that I came in at a few minutes before 11.00 a.m. the Orders of the Day were not on the table here and so it was only at 10.00 when the session was about to start that we were handed these Orders of the Day which are entitled this document change in the order of this House. This is normally known because Standing Orders should only be suspended according to Standing Order 82 for a

MR. G. LEE MOORE (Annerley): specific purposes. What he suggested here to simply a scheme to support the Standing Orders to satisfy the whims and fancies of the Members of the Business Committee who, as I understand have many of the Private Members' motions before the House. By the most ridiculous stretch imaginable of the suspended Standing Orders to satisfy the whims and fancies of the Business Committee, Standing Orders must be suspended for a specific purpose as we did on Friday with the Customs Bill because the Financial Secretary, rightly so, was anxious to have the Bill completed to prevent importers from taking advantage and withdrawing their goods from the Customs warehouse before the new rate went into effect. This would have disadvantaged the Government which would have been paid by the importers.

So while Standing Orders 91 allows the suspension not only time by the consent of the majority of the Members it must only be used for a specific purpose. No specific purpose has been given for the suspension of Standing Orders 34(2) and (5). Standing Order 34(2) is very useful in that it gives the Private Members the privilege of having one day set aside for their business. That day is Thursday and it must not change unless there are special circumstances to change it. It is the secret to have the Private Members' business today what we should be having the Government Bills, don't remember there we have that notification motion Bill which we were told on Friday by the Financial Secretary that it was his aim to have the motion Bills completed on Friday. Because of the length of debate we were unable to finish them. We did finish one on Friday. We worked on one yesterday, but that one yesterday is for three completion. Now this is now say that that Bill must be set aside to deal with Private Members' Motions? Are we going to have total disregard for the provisions of the House? Are we going to have total disregard for the systematic functioning of the House whereby Members know precisely what they will do, what they will deal with and if they are to be. Those certainties amongst our systems are wrong. At least we should be given the certainty of being given advance notice that on Wednesday we are not going to deal with Government business. We are going into Private Members' Motions.

As if this had been the plan of the Business Committee the Business Committee should have ensured that today's Order Paper should have been given to us yesterday evening so that we were not left in this state of unpreparedness in which we now find ourselves. I certainly will note against this change and I certainly hope that other Members will do so. The Private Members' Motions down on the Order Paper for today, while they may be important, or which may be worthy of discussion, are certainly not urgent. The only reason why just should change from normal practice of business is to deal with a matter of public importance, a matter of urgency or a problem which arises and cannot await its regular turn. We had an example some yesterday when the Member simply wanted to take suspension no. 6 instead of question no. 6. The Second Elected Member for Gaviyn Tuki was told that it would be wrong to interfere with the agenda once it is prepared. Yet here we are now suspending the whole agenda upon which Parliament has worked, and punishing the Members by great disadvantage for what? We are leaving Government's urgent public business like the Stamp Duty Bill unattended and unfinished. I know from what has happened in this House since Wednesday that anything put forward by the Government Bench will pass because they are Members who simply vote, no matter what the merits is behind it. We have a timely machinery which has been devised

MR. S. PAT DOYLE (CONSTITUENCY): Hon. Chuck has worked assiduously under the Constitution and in this House. No matter how he might or wrong, I'll acknowledge that he is sincere in what he does.

I have been here twelve years and we have never been put in this position in my twelve-year history in this House. If the Hon. Opposition Leader has been suspended now, three and I suppose that they should be suspended, but they should never be suspended simply to put members at a disadvantage when they have an obligation to the people who have elected them to debate with presentations and to obtain such knowledge and matters that be before this House. So we would be setting a bad precedent today if we were to allow this change.

I certainly cannot support it.

MR. PARSONS: Any other Honourable Member wish to speak?

MR. JAMES M. MORGAN: Mr. President, the motion before the House should be defeated. It is one more instance of the ridiculous policy of this administration. As my colleague mentioned a while ago on Friday before the House, there was a tremendous bill, the Income Tax Bill, for first two readings Bills I think, and there was such rush and such urgency that this House stayed in session until eleven p.m. that night to complete one of these bills. The other one was dealt with recently yesterday, and I wonder why was we not successful with the Government because Bill fourteen is the bill dealing with Private Members' Motions.

I hope nothing been under the impression that Government business was dealt with first by this House, and other minor matters would come thereafter. I think the Member who placed this motion before the House made mention about this being necessary so on Thursday we might possibly be debating the Throne Speech and have then the Budget Address. So it would be necessary to keep Thursday clear. Well, I think that we should remind this House then to us mind for Thursday as this House is going to be in session then necessitate Thursday before this session is over. So there is no such.

Yesterday to speak to welcome the Second Elected Member for West Bay simply said that his session could not be changed as the Order Paper when he was elected could be, may stay should be.

MR. V. MORGAN FOSTER: On a point of order, Mr. President. The Member, I think is misleading the House in saying that it was my question. Could he please identify that it was the Second Elected Member from George Town.

MR. JAMES M. MORGAN: Mr. President, I really apologize. I would not have wanted to make that wide because I would like to give the credit where the credit can be given. It was the Second Elected Member from George Town and not West Bay. I apologize.

Mr. President, I think that the Members of this House should object strenuously to this and we should not allow the bill to way the way they happen. As I said before, we appear to have adopted a shameful policy to the point where there is no master policy and Government presently is going in any direction that any hand, I for one is prepared to debate the business; prepared to debate anything which comes before this House, but I think we should have it on the order that we have been doing it in the past.

MR. DAVID M. PRICE (CONTINUED): I will remind this House that the very Members who are now protesting like any the Members who so strenuously objected on the outside and cast every aspersion which could be passed about the previous administration because Standing Orders were somewhat dusty with or a manner similar to this, and they were ignored.

Yet there was so much wrong on Orders of the Day time I wonder why it is not known as this time. I feel, Mr. President, that we should proceed with Government business and the motions of the Private Members on the subsequent days. Therefore that we will go to question time now.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. DENNIS P. PHIRRI: Mr. Speaker, whether the Member was not listening to me or did not understand me, one of the two, because there was a specific purpose which I mentioned when I asked for the sacking of that Standing Order. The Private Members' Motion Committee agreed on Friday that we debate the Motion on the Shamba Kenya and Budget Address until Wednesday, 6th March. It was for this purpose, and for the purpose of consistency so that if we intended Ministers on the Shamba Kenya and Budget Address we could sometimes might or have debate done sometimes and then going to Private Members' Day on Thursday and then going back on Friday again. This was the reason, which is a legitimate reason. We are not neglecting the Government business, Sir.

There are the other stages of the Stamp Duty Bill which I think we will get through and we also have the other Bills down here or will think are not as important. The thrust of the matter is, Mr. President, the two Members have wanted to withdraw which is why we cannot get on with Orders of the House.

MR. JAMES M. MUTIGA: On a point of order, Mr. President...

MR. DENNIS P. PHIRRI: Mr. President, I did not withdraw him when he was speaking.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, he did right. It is on a point of order.

MR. JAMES M. MUTIGA: A point of order, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: He is entitled to interrupt if it is a point of order.

MR. JAMES M. MUTIGA: I do not think the Minister should be casting aspersions. Each we are wasting the time of the House, time has been wasted here on many occasions and I really am surprised after eight years...

MR. PRESIDENT: You have made your point.

MR. JAMES M. MUTIGA: ...of whether should to withdraw with this Member that he should make such a statement against my colleague and myself. Because I was answering him, as I assure this House, if the time is surrendered wasted we will be on our feet for a long time this session.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member's point is taken. I do not think it is for anyone to say that whether Member is wasting the time of the House.

SEN. JAMES P. PIERCE: Well, Mr. President, I am not going to say any more about it. When I have something to do with a policy, sir, as to make a wasteful policy. I do not mind the Senator referring to the other Elected Members of Knoxville Council on that, but check it is something to do with me they shouldn't bother to me that way, sir.

I suggest we go ahead with the motion now, sir.

PRES. PRESIDENTIAL: I will put the question that Standing Order 12(2) and (3) be suspended to enable Executive Members' Motions to be taken today and that Government Business, being the Throne Speech debate and the interpretation Bill be taken on Thursday this week.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

SEN. C. DALE SAWYER: Mr. President, may I have a division?

PRES. PRESIDENTIAL: I will ask the Clerk to carry on.

DIVISION

VOTE

AYES	NOES
Hon. Donald H. Foster	Mr. Shawn M. Perkins
Hon. Michael J. Bradley	Mr. C. Dale Sawyer
Hon. Thomas G. McCracken	
Hon. Deborah C. Fleming	
Hon. M. Brenda Godfrey	
Hon. Capt. Charles E. McKenney	
Hon. Ronald G. Johnson	
Mr. W. Wallace Sunk	
Mr. Clifford A. Pierce	
Cmdr. Kelly E. McKenney	
Mr. S. Richard Miller	
11	2

MR. JOHN G. MORGAN ASSISTANT:

AGREED BY MAJORITY, STANDING ORDER 12(2) AND (3) SUSPENDED

SEN. PRESIDENTIAL: I declared this motion carried, and I think we have run out slightly our announced time to dispose of proceedings. I will now do so and ask that Members assemble at 12.20 p.m.

AT 12.20 THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

HOUSE RESUMES AT 11:22 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Announcements are awaited.
Item 2(b) (i) Private Member's Motion No. 1. The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 1/85
ENDORSEMENT FOR TWO PARLIAMENTS

MR. T. ALEXANDER BODDEN: Mr. President, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. 1 and the abbreviated standing in my name, which reads as follows:-

> RECOGNIZING Standing Order 6(1), of the Standing Orders of the Cayman Islands Legislative Assembly provides that a Session of the Legislative Assembly will usually consist of four Meetings, but that additional Meetings may also be convened by the Speaker if/when;
>
> AND NOTING the present arrangements for the Legislature is that Meetings are held once a quarter, that is, once a year, and they do sometimes find that it is not possible to have all the items that both Legislation and Private Members' business can only be dealing quarterly;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that consideration be given to establishing a programme for the Legislature which would provide for Meetings to be held on alternate months;
>
> AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that consideration be given to a change in the time of commencement of each Meeting from 10:00 a.m., as is now provided for by Standing Order 10(1), to 9:00 a.m. and 2:30 p.m.;
>
> AND FURTHER THAT these proposals be considered by a Committee of the whole House which said Committee would take into account any recommendation to the present Standing Orders of the House.

DRAFT STANDING AMENDMENTS TO THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY STANDING ORDERS

In accordance with Private Member's Motion No. 1/85 and Standing Order 98(1), the following draft proposed amendments to Standing Order 6(1) and 10(1), (2) and (3) are hereby moved:-

(a) That Standing Order 6, sub-section (1), be amended by the deletion of the words, "four meetings" as they appear in the third line, and the substitution therefor of the words, "six meetings to be held on alternate months".

(b) That Standing Order 10, sub-section (1), be amended by the deletion of the figures and word, "10 o'clock", and the substitution therefor of the words, "9 o'clock".

(c) That Standing Order 10, sub-section (2), be amended by the deletion of the figure, "2:30", and the substitution therefor of the figure, "2:30".

(d) That Standing Order 10, sub-section (3), be amended by the deletion of the figure, "2:30", and the substitution therefor of the figures, "2:30".

MR. SPEAKER: The question?

MR. D. BRIAN MCGEE: I beg to second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: For the information of members and of any radio listeners I should make clear what Private Member's Motion No.1 contains is essentially to the effect that a change should be made in Standing Orders. Standing Order 33(1) records that when a motion of this kind is made, the mover shall move the motion, and after it has been seconded the question shall be put forthwith that the motion be referred to a Committee on Standing Orders. If that question is agreed upon no further proceedings will be taken on that motion until the Committee has reported thereon. The effect of that Standing Order is that the motion now moved does not get referred at this stage, but only the question is simply put that it be referred to a Committee on Standing Orders.

I should add further that there is not at present any such Committee on Standing Orders appointed. However, since the motion itself calls for the proposals in it to be considered by a Committee of the whole House, I would propose for the purposes of the motion to consider that Committee of the whole House be being the Committee on Standing Orders for which Standing Order 33(2) provides.

The question before the House then is that Private Member's Motion No. 1 of 1969, pertinent representations be authorized by a Committee of the whole House, be carried.

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRIS: Mr. President, Sir, perhaps just to have the record right you could make that appropriate direction under 33(2) because the record shows that the Private Members' motion was adjourned on the 24th February.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you; I had not realized that. I had seen it earlier and I had thought Motion No.1 had been given. However, in that case I am prepared to direct that the motion be accepted now for consideration under Standing Order 33(2).

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. MOTION REFERRED TO A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE FOR STANDING ORDERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Member's Motion 2. The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.2/69

EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

MR. E. MCTAGGART JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No.2 standing in my name, which reads as follows:-

> RECOGNIZING there appears to be growing dissatisfaction on the part of the local labour force as to terms and conditions of employment, particularly those employed within the construction and tourist related industries;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House appoint a Committee of the whole House to study the foregoing matter and make recommendations for suitable labour legislation to be introduced at this legislative session at the earliest opportunity.

MR. D. FRANK HITCHCOCK: I beg to second the motion, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is duly moved and seconded. The Senator may now speak to the motion.

SEN. CAPT. CHARLES KIRKPATRICK: Mr. President, I thought here, Sir, where it says, "BE IT RESOLVED that this Honorable House convene a Committee of the whole House", is this not going to follow like the first one, Sir, where no debate will be allowed here?

MR. PRESIDENT: No, that is because the previous motion (Private Member's Motion No. 1, called for amendments to be made to Standing Orders. Standing Order 31(3) provides that where a motion calls for amendments to Standing Orders a certain procedure shall be followed and that procedure excludes debate. Private Member's Motion No. 2 does not call for any amendment to Standing Orders. Although it calls for the appointment of a Committee of the Whole House, it can properly be debated at this time.

MR. MICHAEL J. HARRISON: Mr. President, Sir, I take it that you are going to vote until all the Private Members' Motions have been considered before considering certain Select Committees, is that how you may decide whether to reconvene your Honourable House under Standing Order 31(3).

MR. PRESIDENT: I think now for membership so of that. It may be convenient, perhaps, so that we do not forget to make the necessary appointments, if on the case motions appointing Committees we do deal with the question of their membership. So, if I may at this stage, in respect of Private Member's Motion No. 1 which has already been carried and which has provided for a Committee of the whole House to consider Standing Orders, I will nominate the Honourable Chief Official Member to be Chairman of that Select Committee.

Now, Private Member's Motion No. 2. The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. H. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, Sir, the only little note, "This shall not apply to the Speaker", and "The Treasurer is worthy of his wages", this, Sir, is what the motion is all about, requesting this Honourable House to set up a Committee of the whole House to study the Labour situation in this country, and to make recommendations for the formulation of suitable Labour legislation we badly in need of.

Mr. President, it merely as the first person to rise to speak the or two-day the week, motions should the be allowed to set all of the time. The legislation which I am here, Sir, must protect the employee as well as the employer. I am aware, Sir, that labour legislation in other countries has had to abuse by employers or employees, as well as I know that

MR. M. MACEDA BUSH (CONTINUED): there are employers who take great advantage of the working man and woman. This mentality towards the working man has led to serious denial unheard of many other countries, and it will be time in our country if this Honourable House fails in its responsibility to the people who elected the Members here.

Mr. President, the need for labour legislation has been hotted around the political platform in this country since at least 1973, yet....

MR. S. SAM SOOKNEE: On a point of order, Mr. President, I must object to the Member reading his speech.

MR. PRESIDENT: I had not noticed he was reading it. I will watch more carefully.

MR. M. MACEDA BUSH: Yes, Mr. President, I have my notes and just so as to understand the notes I guess I have to read them, although I know I cannot read a speech. I do not envisage the opposition expect me to look at my notes and to understand them without reading them. I know they expect quite a bit from this new Government, Sir, but I hope they are not expecting that.

When I was interrupted I was saying that the issue of labour legislation has been knocked around in this country since 1973, with many promises. Yet, Sir, every successive Government has failed to deal with the matter of labour legislation in a predictable manner, even as more and more people are employed, and even as more and more complaints are made concerning labour in this country. Even since I entered the political arena I promised my people, Sir, that I would do all in my power to provide this legislation. Today, with much pride I am fulfilling that promise but, Sir, I cannot do it alone. I am therefore inviting every Member of this House to give me the chance to speak without interruption and to look me in a eye for a "Yes" for labour legislation. The requested legislation will not destroy the country as the economic pharmacists suggested to us but instead, Sir, if properly drafted and then properly administered, it will lead to the strengthening of our social, political and economic stability which the Honourable Prosecutor Hennessy so ably stressed in his budget address, the need for continuance.

However, as must run, Sir, contents coincide with paying the attention to this need. We must do something positive and this motion is a step in that direction. Legislation currently on our law books affecting labour in this country is outdated and has no relevance to the circumstance existing in this country today. As far as I can determine, Sir, there are five laws in operation, the Workmen's Compensation Law, 1934, the Employer Liability Law, 1946, the Trade Law, 1941, the Masters and Servants Law, 1942; and the other one is, Sir, the Trade Union Law passed in 1942. Each one of these Laws I am sure, Sir, was passed at the time because the legislature of the day saw a need. However, the need in our country today is more than any of these can cope with. One of these days, the trade union has would be used to disqualification sometimes to prevent certain people. Some of us want that to happen and that is one of the reasons for this motion being brought before this House today.

I now propose to look briefly, Sir, at the contents of these outdated laws. The Workmen's Compensation Law; this Law, Sir, has no relevance to the workman today in Guyana. It was in its good because it is limited to workmen earning $750 or $1,000 as the case may be today, for a week's

MR. K. MURPHY (Scarborough-Ochalaska): Where do we go, or least I hope not, any death payment envisaged in the Workers Compensation Act, Section 51(1)(a) in the amendment to the Act says:

> "Where death results from an injury maximum compensation is $75,000 or $3,000".

In section 51(1)(b) the compensation is limited to $3,000 or $5,000 for total dependents. There is a limitation period whereby claims for compensation must be made within one month of the date of the accident. This period has, Sir, in the past, been a very fine argument as to what is reasonable and what injury required. In some instances almost one has to be psychic to know what is going to happen. In the event that an employee should miss that one month period, he would be out of luck. As I said, this period is definitely too short as you will see from this case, the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1968, has many deficiencies and needs to be amplified.

When the Minister says that there were 5000 cases in 1967, it did not set a target. The only thing that a minister says was not true in 1967 and it may not be correct in 1968 because of common behaviours as the philosophy has changed from an eight hour day.

The Trade Fair is another area which is supposed to give the workers some protection. It was pressed by numerous employees, especially carpenters in Metro Area, from paying workmen a weekly salary on a day's pay with goods from their business, or forcing the workmen to purchase goods from their business. As an example, Sir, and this was very applicable to me somewhat twenty years ago, a poor man went to work on a vessel, but he was to the waterfront. Now, the owner of that vessel owned a store. Then they told the man's family must be purchase their weekly goods at that particular store. This was very expensive for purchase for the man and his family from being placed on by unscrupulous employers. It was supposed to stop the owner of the vessel from saying, "If you do not buy from my store, you cannot work on my vessel". The law as I said, Sir, was supposed to prevent the men from that kind of situation. However, you can believe me, Sir, that that law was never enforced although many times a poor man came home after a long, gruelling trip, knowing the much weather, and found he had nothing. It had all gone to pay the shop bills. That, Sir, is my humble opinion as an example of a legacy of a time when only certain families in my constituency had anything, and ruled with an iron fist. That is true, Sir, not a fabrication of any kind.

Under section 12 of the Act the penalty for breaching the Act is $50 or $100. Obviously the Act has no performance to enforce today.

The Workers Compensation Act was enacted to regulate the rights and responsibilities of employment between employers and employees. This Act then, Sir, was supposed to be the labour Act for the Province Labrador, but it falls short of providing even the barest minimum requirements of employment and employee relationships in the Labrador Labrador today.

Under section 4 of this Act a workman was only entitled to one week's wages on the termination for whatever dismissal. Secondly, under section 12 the court is limited to dealing with fines and discussion to a maximum of $50 or $100. It is quite apparent, Sir, that this is not a realistic figure and has no bearing on application to our situation today.

Mr. President, I have given what I feel is a brief but true outline of the Act and what this has agreed to since Confederation Metro the difficulties in the last Act dealing with labour in the Labrador Labrador area.

MR. R. HANSEN SUBSTITUTING: Mr. President, Sir, all of us here in this House know of individuals whom we represent whose workers in the Cayman Islands, both Caymanians and Non-Caymanians alike, I would like to state, Sir, that the majority of employers are fair minded but each day, I as a representative of the people must listen to complaints which are almost unbelievable from the workers here in the country. Since being elected, Sir, I have an average of three people and handle an average of ten telephone calls a night at my home. There are not enough money left over from the weekly Government pay see, so that I could not participate like the elected Members for North Side. Anyway, I see my people and I would say 95 to 99 per cent of the time these calls are unwarranted labour. Let us not delude ourselves. There is much disagreement on the various roads, but there in the tourist and construction industries and we as protectors and defenders have to take strong measures to remove the pitiful plight our people are finding themselves in. We have to work to straighten out the inequalities existing in the labour market today.

Sir, I would like to deal now with a few areas in the tourist industry. Night Watchmen, Sir, seems much to me as I was raised on the tourist industry, but there is much inequity as far as the employee is concerned. The greatest area of discontent might also be the collection and payments of gratuities. There are many stories circulating the country pertaining and many explanations. One explanation has been to do away with the system of gratuities. I, Sir, could never subscribe to that idea. This, in my opinion, would be the greatest mistake ever made and as I said, I will never agree to that suggestion. Sir, in those places which are paying the workers their full entitlement of gratuities, the workers do fairly well. In the place where my mother works, her gratuities for one month have gone as high as $40. In other places I understand they have gone as high as $1,200. I do not believe, Sir, any employer is prepared to pay that kind of salary and the people most of the time are not prepared to have that kind of pay for the week, sometimes, however, as mentioned. So, at the end of the month the small amount of money made by the employee could not supplement the kind of gratuity they should be getting if that suggestion was taken up. The people would go home at the end of the month with nothing and I hope that no Honourable Member in this Legislature would even consider that idea.

What we as a Government have to do is to make certain under the envisaged legislation that the gratuities will not be stolen, and I have that to not unwarrantedly fear our people. There are many complaints, too many in fact, Sir; not to have myself to them. I believe one way of combatting this, Mr. although I do not know whether Members will concur with me, is that employers must be made to submit to Government a copy of the hotels' bills which includes the amount of gratuities collected. They should also show how many staff they have on their payroll and what percentage of gratuities goes to waiters, how much is distributed and maintenance staff, how much to kitchen workers, and so on. On top of this they must be required to submit a monthly account of what was paid to staff. There are the many complaints, Sir.

Mr. President, when the word went out that I was leaving this section I had a lot of dirty cards, but happily to say, one honest person or a conscientious employer called me in and gave me an example of how they pay gratuities, and showed me their records also. If I may be permitted I would like to read what they put on paper, an example which commensurate with their records. This is an example of the gratuity system. I will not

MR. W. MINNESOTA RURAL ROUTE (CONTINUING): bother to say which couples this case fall in a specific system based on 50 per cent occupancy; 9 rental units rented for a total revenue of 156 days. There are 9 units. The total prospective charged on all rentals are 5%. The total gratuities collected during the month of January, 1965 were U.S.$2,227.20. The units at that complex are 50 per cent of the total but the governor and maintenance men get 33 per cent divided equally. The units' portion for the month was U.S.$2,713.5%. The gardener and maintenance man's portion was U.S.$744.37. The units worked a total of 78 days. This is then divided into their portion of U.S.$1,713.5%, which comes to U.S.$21.54 per day. Unit no. 1 worked for 23.32 days multiplied by U.S.$21.54, which comes to U.S.$502. These other units worked for the same number of days. One unit worked for also days at the rate of U.S.$22.00 and also added up with U.S.$175.57. The maintenance man got U.S.$387.50 and the gardener got U.S.$387.50 for the month, making a total of $3,447.00. As I said, Sir, these figures are based on a 50 per cent occupancy and what amazes me is if a conglomerate wants 5 investments for rent and rents out unequity on account of it, and pays out $2,447 for the month, why are these people who rent out such rooms, let us say 33 out of 31 apartments, paying the staff as little? Why?

Once at one place I knew, Sir, they employed 9 maids. Presently they have 4 maids, but the start is now getting less in gratuities with the same amount of apartments being rented that what they used to collect when they had the 9 maids. So something is definitely wrong. I know there that all have different ways and means of collecting these gratuities but this example, I believe, shows that something is definitely wrong. It is my belief that there are those in the conglomerates, restaurants and hotels who are definitely pocketing the gratuities which rightly belong to the staff. They are wealthy, Sir, and I believe the figures if they were available, would amount to thousands of dollars.

I only like to make myself clear, Sir. Those restaurant and conglomerate systems who are guilty of not giving their staff their rightful share of tips are dishonest and wicked, and a stop must now be put to these actions. I have heard some people say that gratuities are a part of the salary, and it would seem, Sir, that this is what they have been doing, taking the gratuities and supplementing the salaries of the staff. This is wrong and is a plain injustice. I wonder, Sir, how they claim gratuities are a part of salary, if the owner refuses to pay the subsidy to the management pertaining to raise the income of the company in pay the staff? I do not believe so, Sir.

Another area affecting staff and their gratuities is where some owners are not paying the gratuities, I understand. I do feel that the owners should pay because if the agreement is not honored out of if the gratuities are not paid, then the staff is collecting little or nothing for cleaning the said apartments. So I believe that owners should definitely pay gratuities.

Another area, Sir, is some places are collecting 5 per cent; others 8 per cent; others 10 per cent, and some places are also collecting 15 per cent. I think that if we are going to get justice for our people and all, we should have guidelines and set policies, and tell everyone without gratuities on the same basis. This would help not to confuse our people.

MR. P. MORRISSEY (CORNWALL): Another cause for discontent in the tourist industry, Mr. President, is that those people are required to work paying holidays and those days off sometimes for regular pay. Employees in industry do not know what it is to [illegible] overtime, but if a person works on a Government paying holiday, then the employer should pay them double time, and also double time for Sundays. We cannot expect our people to carry on in this way and age on this menace. We have to do something to protect them. Mr. President, there are a lot of run down system from my constituency, indeed the whole country who by their sweat and occasionally blood and tears have made our country what it is today. They have come this route. They have back the hours and they have had to do as to make ends meet; sometimes holding two jobs, one in the daytime and one at night; somebody to the detriment of the [illegible] of our children, our younger generation.

While I'm like of the remarks, Premier Smallwood, though it may be, why my constituency is looked upon as the unruly republic. I just wonder why, Sir, that our people have accomplished for the growth of the country.

By my watch, Sir, it is now 12.30 p.m. I believe...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The normal practice is that we carry on to between 12:30 and 12.45 p.m., and if a Member finishes a speech during that period, we inevitably then adjourn.

MR. P. MORRISSEY: I do not think I will be finished, Sir, but I will carry on...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we will give you a little longer then.

MR. P. MORRISSEY: The other day I was reminded that I had to stop at 12.30 p.m. Anyway, Sir, I am quite prepared to go on.

I believe, Sir, the time is here now when we as a Government must help our people working in the tourist industry to receive the full benefit of the tourism dollar. As I said, Sir, there is much inequity in the labour market for this industry and I recognize the employers unable to meet [illegible] as well as hear them. A lot of them come to me the other day, and one owner at a meeting. In that restaurant they have had half an hour for lunch but they took it out of their pay. Even if she did not get this lunch the cost still remained there as salary. Another one came to me and the waitress at a Chinese establishment for six years on the Avalon Peninsula as a hostess. Naturally, she also sometimes acted as the manager of the [illegible]. The two managers became insane at one time and they brought in a new manager and paid him $8,000 per month plus his rent. But they could only pay to pay the Chinese [illegible] manager him per month. The Government applied for the job but she was not even interviewed. But they gave her a good reason. They said she was [illegible], an accountant and lovely [illegible] but which came from Toronto, they could not even [illegible] her.

A friend said, Sir, that they have to do with construction. A man came to me and he has been working with a company for years as a waiter doing seven [illegible] per hour. He works 6 hours per day. He has repeatedly asked that he take his pilot's examination, but his employer only [illegible]

MR. R. HARVEY JUGH (CONTINUING): same. At the same time, Sir, they broke the minimum help going the same reason once, and the men who they hire in our town about earning $80,000 from one job alone while the local man does not even make $15,000 for the year.

I have Members see what I am saying, how long can this inquisitive complex to exist. How long do it go on. Who can cure mobile capitalism is. The Leisure Period is useless, Sir. It has no real substance to it. It has no look to back it. Something must be done to rectify what I call inequalities in our society, or some very serious situations are going to arise. The stability which we have enjoyed over the years is going to be lost. Our people, Sir, must be protected and I do not care who likes it. What I have to say here today I will say. There is too much, I repeat the most injustice and wickedness going on in this country, especially in places of work. We are finding more injustices meted out to our people.

What is going to happen, Sir, is that our people are going to rise up one day and say, "I have had enough. I am going to do something". That operation, Sir, could very well spell disaster. For the good name of stability which our forefathers have built up over the years, it is high time for us to cut at loopholes who possess ability, courage, foresight and pure old time courage and determination. If we do this, Sir, then we may recreate the advance trend towards the labouring man and women in the Cayman Islands. I am not finished yet.

Mr. President, on the matter of minimum wages, I would like to see a committee of the whole House set up with terms of reference where one of the functions is to obtain information from the private sector about minimum wages for each job description, so that they can get a correct and realistic understanding of what minimum wages have to be set.

Mr. President, I believe all employers, whether foreign or local companies, should file a return, say for example during the month of January each year. This should give the number of employees, their nationality, their salaries, conditions of work such as vacation leave and sick leave. Most importantly they should give fringe benefits or training programmes, if any, which are currently offered to employees. The reason why I make this suggestion is that it is my view that such returns could serve to point without a doubt that foreign employees have substantially better terms of employment than locals in similar positions, and steps could therefore be taken to remedy this inequitable and biased situation. Any labour legislation I feel must of necessity recognize, Sir, that the job market place in the Cayman Islands is restricted and therefore a worker who is laying a position for whatever reason, voluntarily or involuntarily, leaves a small job market. Therefore, any provision in such legislation for benefits or redundancy payments to be made by employers must be higher than elsewhere.

I hope Members will take this into consideration. For example, a worker in Jamaica can go from Montego Bay to Kingston in five week. A man from London can go to Newcastle in five week. Outside workers can go elsewhere. This what I mean, Sir. Above can the Government go?

So I hope when the law is drafted it will take into consideration these things.

Mr. President, in winding up, there is no doubt in my mind that many employers in this country, and perhaps this applies to Government as well, have outsiders in preference to Caymanians because, Sir, they find it easier to

MR. P. MCKENZIE (High-Townsville): appears a little bare out of the electorate if he has to wear garments hanging over his head. With ornaments, of course; he does not need a hair parted.

Gentlemen, we have come to my electorate, some of the most unscrupulous of these employers do not even bother to register a work permit for employed, making it a little easier to squeeze a little harder. We had one case of this last year, Sir, where a member of the Employers' Federation employed nearly 30 people on his jobs without any permits. The worst condemnation from the whole Islands is a good example of what I mean. Permits were applied from the Thursday Islands without even bothering, after describing four differences of skin and appearing, Sir, the Premier of Queensland. Today I believe many of these people remain in this country and are being employed by those who employ them on Government work with the strength of work. For this reason as we now see, some of these employers will go to any length to make a bigger profit. That is another reason why this legislation is so necessary in this country point.

Mr. President, I object the Hon. Secretary when I mean this branch because of failure that worship has no better example to follow than the Coal Mine. The objection not to mention the or the a wide use to evaluate people to show the or use a major source of power. For the or to purchase properly and to do his job/ work he needed to be fed, and his food came from the area which he was treating. The same, Sir, is true today the coal modern society: the worker who produces the income for industry is entitled to a fair share for his efforts. Without him there would be no industry or profit. He is entitled to be able to feed his family; the price that food may to be able to live in dignity, no matter how humble his position.

Mr. President, I see some Members who look as though they are going to sleep. I admit that they have been listening, Sir, because as I said yesterday I represent the small men in this country. These Members which I pointed out are hearing the small man; but they seem to be sleeping these things. I trust that every Member, and I hope that every Member of this House will give this considerable matter their support.

Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I might perhaps do well to adjourn the sitting now at the normal interval until 2.30 p.m.

AT 12.55 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2.15 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The motion before the House is Private Member's Motion No. 7/85, which is now open for debate. The Second Elected Member for George Town.

QUESTION PROPOSED: DEBATE ENSUED:

MR. LINVILLE A. RICHARDS: Mr. Speaker, I find it very easy indeed to support Private Member's Motion No. 7/85 on the subject of labour legislation, and I would take this opportunity to thank the Second Elected Member for West End for the able manner in which he presented this motion. However, Mr. Speaker, my definition of brief is perhaps slightly different from his and I promise you that my remarks will be brief indeed.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I would be remiss in my responsibilities and duties to my people if I let this opportunity pass because I am well acquainted with the facts as given to us by the Second Elected Member for West End this morning. I too, Sir, have had many, many complaints concerning the industries, particularly in the tourism related industries in these Islands. Indeed, as Hon. Ministers, within the Cayman Islands,

As recently, Sir, as the first part of this week, that is Monday, I had a delegation of people who met me at my office very early in the morning before I came to the Assembly. Prior to nothing strange. My office is always full of people seeking some form of assistance with their problems.

There is an impression in my mind at all, Sir, that the employees within a number of the tourist related services or businesses in the Islands are being abused. I would not go so far as to say that employers are deliberately stealing from their employees, as I think that that is a rather harsh term to use, but the net effect, Sir, would appear to create this situation. Our people are a very peaceful people. Caymanians are known to be one of the most peaceful people in the world and this is perhaps the reason, Sir, why they are oppressed and why they are deprived of their rights, because they are not as aggressive as the people from other parts of the Caribbean and indeed from some of our neighbouring Caribbean Islands.

We must this situation and this attitude of our people to continue, Sir, it is certainly left to our Government and to us to ensure that we lay the foundations, and that we make it possible for our people to live in peace and harmony.

As I said yesterday, it is my feeling that a good Government is one which makes it easy for the people of a country to do right. I am amazed, Sir, that it was not again necessary before now for such legislation to come before this Honourable House, before the Legislative Assembly of this country. I see this legislation as perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation before this country today because it increases the livelihood of our people. I have been accused, Sir, of being a dictator for the people but I take this as a compliment because I see my role as being one of a representative of this people. When I say the people, Sir, I do not exclusively believe. I consider the

MR. LIFFOOK A. PETERS (CONSTITUENCY): Cayman Islands is proud and the constituency of George Town in particular. I do not divide the electoral district of George Town in analogy. I represent the people of this constituency.

This problem is not one which is restricted to just one particular class even though it is perhaps more prevalent amongst the poorer people in the community. I have no reservations, Sir, in supporting such a piece of legislation because I know, and I share the view that it is very, very badly needed. Many times I have had to refer individuals to the Labour Office, but in one way, Sir, this has accomplished ineffective, I would not call it a waste of time because the officers in the Labour Department are doing a wonderful job and I do understand that they can do so well with so little to work with. They are simply out for help. I have spoken to officers in the Police Department and they are begging us to give them the legislation to work with because they are aware of the problems which continue to face the these areas of employment.

It is all well and good for some of us to sit back and understand that there is such a problem in these areas. Just yesterday afternoon the Commissioner of Police and I had the distinct pleasure of visiting some of the areas in George Town with the four honourable Elected Members of Executive Council. Some of the districts we toured did prove of the conditions we are here particularly. You can see the great contrasts in homes where there are those above the very high standard of living to those quite notable in the Cayman Islands who do not have and face the conditions under which many of them have to work. It shocks to me sometimes that employers pay their employees their rightful gratuities and this seems to be the most glaring light of the problems. There seems to be such a disparity within the same levels of employment. The disparity is so great that it creates resentment and ill will on the part of the employee. For there is nothing that the Labour Department can do about it but call the employers and plead with them. However, the employers must not listen because the Labour Department can do nothing about it without appropriate laws.

Mr. President, there is no question in my mind that urgent attention must be given to proper labour legislation. This morning the Second Elected Member for West Bay took a lot of pains; he did a lot of research to bring to the attention of the House the need for proper and appropriate labour legislation. He quoted a number of instances which he had had to deal with, some of which were very familiar to me because I had encountered similar instances and similar assistance. But Well, Sir, this bill will get the full support of this House. I cannot see any Member of this House not supporting such a worthy motion.

As I said in my debate, if we have to summarize what I think is right and good for my people and I could not think of a better piece of legislation for this country today than the labour legislation.

In closing, Sir, may I thank sincerely the Second Elected Member for West Bay for his foresight and I feel, Sir, that he is echoing the sentiments and the feelings of the other Members of this House.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

FOX, H. RODGERS (COOLEY): Mr. President, I am prepared to give this motion which has been brought by the Second Floating Member for West Bay, Mr. Bill Cox wholehearted support. I, like the previous Speaker would like to offer my congratulations to the Second Elected Member for West Bay for the very capable manner in which he presented this motion this morning.

What there is differentiatable amongst our Trade Unions there now is little doubt. More than 60 per cent of the membership I have listened to all the past few months have been expressing dissatisfaction mainly with working conditions, the availability of overtime and other benefits, just mind and me.

I believe that quite clearly there is a pressing need to address these problems and whether definitely there is a need to amend or to state labour legislation which will adequately meet the needs of the developing Cayman Islands. However, I believe that this matter must be handled carefully and cautiously. Nevertheless, as I have said I strongly support the motion that labour legislation suitable to conditions in the Cayman Islands, aimed at ensuring full and equal protection for all workers must be implemented be done as is humanly possible.

This will undoubtedly secure the needs of both employee and employer. We must have an equitable system which avoids and avoid any discrimination of workers rendered to the general public, which is an utter to our tourist and corporation industries. I firmly believe, Sir, that the best approach is the one suggested in the motion whereby a Committee of the whole House will be able to study the overall situation carefully to decide and consider input from the hotel and building industries, Chamber of Commerce and other local related organizations. This will enable Government to distribute and recommend suitable labour legislation to this Legislature, possibly at the next sitting.

This type of legislation, I believe is in the best interests of our people the Caymanians, and also those investors who come here object to enjoy or business here. This is needed to retain stability and harmony in our Islands and I close this motion my full support.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak? The Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. FRANK E. MCKEEVA: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Private Member's Motion No. 8 concerning the introduction of Labour Legislation.

I support this wholeheartedly this motion because, Mr. President, without proper regulatory Labour protection there will always be discrimination among the working class. I know that there has been much discussion over the past few years, especially when John Canter first and when it was seen that supposedly Foreign Labour took a lot of what was available here.

There are discriminations, Mr. President, when large projects or special schools only employ like persons $400 to $1,000 a week. These were seen on Shiftsharing and Corporations, Mr. President, there are hotels anyone could do about it. The other areas of labour concerned especially in the Government sector at what was seen on the Christmas tape displayed under the Members Compensation Law, that law has long been outmoded but unfortunately it is only Government who uses it.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] there is absolutely no control where labour is concerned, because if you want to [illegible] and now said that they want more money, the Workmen's Compensation that they would [illegible] case society practically controls Government at that rate. The Government is also [illegible] as many people as they possibly can, Sir, if you look around and see Government farms at work you will probably know the reason.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no proper facility or inducement in the labour force of a country, there will certainly be a lot of unrest. Strikes always will [illegible] lead to many "isms", "ists" like communism and socialism. We have seen it even where there is some [illegible] Nevertheless, the absence of proper legislation can lead to social unrest and I have no doubt that if you cannot increase this salary today, you will find much of this;

Mr. Speaker, to provide a proper Labour Legislation which would fit the local bill is quite costly and will need to be carefully done. However, I feel that the process which has been recommended in the motion will no doubt explore every aspect of such legislation to ensure that the end product which is recommended here will be acceptable to one and all. I too want to congratulate the Second Elected Member for West Bay for bringing this motion. I think, Mr. President, that he made about the need for labour legislation and all his statements and there is no doubt in the minds of the people of those Islands that it is one of the issues of the election which should be given immediate and urgent attention. I therefore give it my wholehearted support, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any other honourable Member wish to speak? The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. D. GEORGE HOWARD: Mr. President, I also want to congratulate the Second Elected Member for West Bay for bringing this motion and so ably elaborating the needs and justifying it in his speech this morning.

In connexion of his motion, Sir, he has left no little room with which to help him. Sir, in the numerous colourful explanations printed and freely distributed throughout the Islands by the Government's Department of Tourism and in particularly of business and commercial interests, the success story of the phenomenal economic growth of the Cayman Islands over the past seventeen years is recounted. Today, Sir, we are facing the ill effects of the neglect in labour of this over development and expansion policy. Today it is estimated that 80 per cent of the labour force in this country are foreign nationals.

I believe, Sir, that there is an urgent need for labour legislation in this country. Like the Second Elected Member for West Bay most of the problems which I have dealt with since elected have been labour related and the easiest thing in the world is to refer individuals to the Labour Board for discussions. When they go to the Labour Board, however, the people there can really only bluff their way to get help for these people. So we need the labour legislation to provide a mechanism on which the Labour Department in Government can function and be established.

I believe, Sir, that under this labour legislation, the employees and the employers both should know their rights and their protections. It should deal with

MR. D. SCOTT MITCHELL (CONTINUED): Mr. Chairman, Members, I do not want to detain the House very long, Sir, but I think this Labour Legislation should enhance the development of our only natural resource in this country which is our people, the manpower resources of this country. It should provide for other benefits other than mere bits and pieces. It should provide opportunities to advertise the Labour force. Good management, Mr. Speaker, and good Labour relations have to work for Labour unions. Sir, Labour unions may have served a useful purpose in some communities but they have also been a very destructive force in other communities, unfortunately, Sir, when these Labour unions unions are created for political reasons and are backed and organized by political groups. If they attempt to develop the Labour scheme and it is not successful for that to happen, Sir, if we ignore the viability of the Labour force in this country much longer, we might not a Labour union in this country that do any profitable union which would be very detrimental to the economics and welfare of this country.

Sir, I do not disagree with some points that Opposition who may not agree with me will object to others but I do not subscribe to the idea, Mr. Speaker, that Opposition do not want to work. In fact I have the unfortunate experience of discussing this problem with a high ranking in our community quite recently and I referred to their inefficient complacent about the lack of initiative and the lack of drive in Opposition. This individual, Sir, recommended for us that we should on human rights the stability and the peace relationship of Government. This type of action, Sir, but to tell this Government that I thought the problem existed outside of his view and he was therefore incapable of managing his organization. He was very pessimistic but I had to go on to point out to the individual, Sir, that Opposition want to see all the country going ahead and move fast. In a decade, in the early 1960s there were many, probably the highest ratio of any nation in order for the number of industries of various nationals, unfortunately with unfortunate strategy holding. The nation for that, Sir, one because they were given an opportunity to develop. They were encouraged to learn and they accepted the responsibility. I believe that if the Government in our society today afford the young Opposition who were here from colleges or out of high school the same opportunities and give them the same encouragement, the do will then where Opposition can hold the highest positions in the financial industry and tourism industry of this country.

This was further brought home to me, Sir, in a recent discussion with a member of the Banking Institute of Management. We were talking about the training needs of these Islands and I was very surprised when the gentleman questioned me as to whether he had interested the training of private sector management in our society. Also in Cayman in our statistics especially, it that be believed that there was a concerted look at and a determined effort not to create Opportunities to take part there for roots in the economy. I believe, Sir, that that gentleman was quite right in his assessment, because after all what Government do here when these jobs they will eventually fashion institutions who in most instances will be going back to women qualifications than those which they are existing in Cayman.

There are also, Sir, several human stories about Caymanians being passed over for promotion. In this one example I happen to know of an instance in one of the Banks where a Caymanian was always of the opinion that was involved by another Caymanian who in the period of nine months to a year was given a

MR. D. SCALES MINISTER FOR[illegible]: very interested in management. She was told she was doing a good job but to her amazement one day, she noticed the wife of a foreign banker who had just been employed in this country, and that wife of that banker is now the supervisor of the work. That Caymanian who had been told that she was doing a good job and had been given an increase in pay and had been made to believe that her efforts and responsibilities were acceptable, was passed back into the tapping pool. That, Sir, is the kind of problem : what is the kind of systems which can lead to ill feelings in such future relations. These things have to be assured as well as wages and remuneration pay, and so on.

In fact, Mr. President, I believe I am correct in saying that some of the financial institutions are required to file some sort of an annual return on their employment within the communities, that is what costs are being held by foreign nationals; what posts are being held by Caymanians; what training is ongoing, and what grants the Caymanians are being provided to.

It has been my unfortunate experience, Sir, to see suddenly what these facilities in these agencies and some of the posts which they claim Caymanians are occupying they really are not. They are also being paid at a much lower rate than the expatriates who'd be occupying the posts.

That leads me to the fact, Sir, that in many instances in this country Caymanians are doing the same job as foreign nationals. They do not receive a lot of the other benefits which the foreign nationals do. Pension benefits such as housing, cars and so on and that, the underlying responsibility the same functions. However, they are being paid at lower scales. These inequities, Mr. President, have to stop. The Caymanians must be allowed to develop. They must be allowed to have their rightful place in this economy. They must be allowed to contribute to the best of their ability.

I have no hesitation, Mr. President, in seconding this motion that remains for the Second Elected Member for West Bay. As I said I fully support the motion and I believe it is high time that the Government got down to motion on Labour Legislation, and caused it to give it its impetus.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak? The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: In thanking on this motion, Mr. President, I would like to make it very clear that I support Labour Legislation. However, I would like to make it doubly clear that it is not the result of this motion being piloted before the House.

This motion I feel is very much politically motivated and I would not want it to be construed by the public that the only persons in favour of Labour Legislation in the Legislative Assembly are the persons who have brought the motion to the House. It is true, Mr. President, that those in Opposition in the undertone in the Cayman Islands today and it is nothing new to the fact that many of the many statements which we have in hand with it, one of those being particularly the termination into the pensions.

The next thing is the idea in some of the intelligence which Caymanians, regardless of how many degrees they may have or how capable they are, are denied places of[illegible] in their own country. So we cannot hide that fact that there is discrimination.

MR. JAMES M. BEGGER (CONTINUED): Federal legislation will not take away that responsibility. There will be absolutely nothing in the workforce as long as there is an employer/employee type of relationship. Because it is human nature that each and every individual would like to get on the top of the cooperative field which they may be in, and always human being wishes relentlessly to work on his own. So we cannot legislate anything in this Assembly which will eliminate that problem. However, what we can legislate for is to make the social warrant work to protect into the country. This social warrant will come about when labour sees a diversity in their wages and in their working hours, something which we are aware of which has been happening in these Islands for many years.

The employment tax scheme ... steps towards helping this and I would like these to be very clear. The Labour Office was set up under the previous administration and in my opinion did a good job considering the restraints which were placed on it and the fact that there was no Labour Legislation to work with;

I would like to trace the history of it: of the attempts to bring Labour Legislation by the previous administration into the halls of this Assembly. Labour as a whole was a part of the Portfolio which I was assigned. Many, many years ago I went off to various parts of the world, to many countries, to get copies of their Labour Legislation. I received quite an amount of different laws and I thought to put Labour Legislation together as far back as the time of our previous Attorney-General Mr. Bowden so that I could present it to this House. I also was instrumental in having a representative of the ILO (through the help of the United Nations, came to the Cayman Islands and drafted some Labour Legislation. I did not believe that the Labour Legislation which was drafted, in view of my experience with legislation as a whole and with Labour, having associated with it in many areas in the United States of which I have been employed for this country. Therefore, instead of immediately it as a Bill, I presented it to the Law and asked that it be dealt with by a Select Committee.

I can remember the discussions people which were raised by some of the Members in their attempt to just that through. We felt that it was necessary to go into a Select Committee so that everyone could give their opinions and that as a whole we could put our heads together and try to come up with Legislation which would have been ultimate for the country. Unfortunately, the elections intervened that attempt and that legislation still remains on the hands of either the Member who is dealing with Labour now, or the Honourable Second Official Member. It is just unfortunate that it was brought back and I have a question raised in this Assembly when it is planned to bring it back.

So I would like it to be made very clear that my connection with this matter is in view of the work which was done by the Unity Team Government in the last eight years, attempting to bring Labour Legislation in the future. I would also like to make it plain that Labour Legislation is already drafted and is ready for presentation. Ask them if the Elected Members of Executive Council will see fit to bring it back. Much time has been spent in the formulation of the Bill which has been drafted. I personally almost many, many hours reading the legislation of the different countries and adding my things to make ... of the drafts.

MR. JAMES M. BROOM (CONTINUING): Unfortunately, what I really would have liked to have presented to the House was never drafted adequately in the fashion that it should have been.

The whole question on this motion, I think it was the Democratic Search Elected Member of Executive Council, if I heard him correctly and was able to analyse correctly what he was saying, I thought that he was trying to portray the idea that if Labour Legislation is enacted there would be a contract of wages. If that is the opinion of the House or the opinion of any Member, I think it should be rejected immediately. I agree with setting minimum standards, but Government cannot go into legislation which will tell the employer what he cannot....

HON. JOSEPH J. JOHNSON: A point of correction, Mr. President. I did not say that there would be a minimum of wages. I was speaking about Labour and the Labour Legislation.

MR. JAMES M. BROOM: What I read of the opinion was made by the Honourable Search Elected Member of Executive Council was that he was expressing Government's intention which would put a bid on what could be paid to people in any respective position. My argument is, Mr. President, that we must get a minimum wage but if the minimum wage is to be fixed on any respective position, can an employer whether to pay it or not, Mr. President, then that employee should be entitled to.....

HON. JOSEPH J. JOHNSON: Mr. President, a point of order....

MR. JAMES M. BROOM: .... may sit or not.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is it a point of order?

HON. JOSEPH J. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir, the Member do still understand that in my remarks I said that there should be a bid placed on the level of wages. I did not say what. I am talking about contractual labour.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think this is a point of explanation not a point of order. If the Member is happy to allow you to proceed that is alright. As he wishes.

MR. JAMES M. BROOM: I am quite happy, Sir, as he is still understand what I am saying then I....

MR. PRESIDENT: As he is happy to allow you to proceed so carry on.

HON. JOSEPH J. JOHNSON: Mr. President, from my notes which I have before me I was speaking about the need for minimum contract of labour. I said nothing about wages at all however I feel that there are various rates of wages paid by various employers. I spoke about Government applying the minimum wage while the Workmen's Compensation Board sitting right from the minimum scales of wages. What I was trying to say is that there is perhaps need on the present time to either review the Workmen's Compensation Act to introduce a reasonable level of wages, they to specify that is some other manner. However, I certainly did not say that there should be a minimum placed on wages.

MR. JAMES M. MORONE: Mr. Speaker, I only wished to reasonably the gentleman for yielding the member to speak as long as he did because he was not a point of order.

I should comment, Mr. President, that I wonder if the times would be glazed that we could have an inquiry of what the Speaker did say, because I was listening and what I heard was that what had happened in the past, and it did happen here right upon, was duplicitous. We use remember the fact that some reasons had been made, I think, 5000 jobs week. If a person had a job, so I'm sure and he looked to explain a reason and pay him $10 an hour and the person said only $5, and that person was willing to do that job for more reasons than job is the standard we think it should be performed, then I think that he was entitled to receive that wage, even his own union entitled to pay him. So I am still concerned why the Speaker would have objected that type of procedure for he was not expressing that there would be some concerns put on labor. I am sure that the teacher, moreover they are retirement, will create my point that the Speaker was disappointed that governmental legislation should be playing a responsible role in terms of wages people could be paid. I think that could be the very thing which would hurt and disappoint any labour legislation which would be enacted in this country.

If we are going to enact labour legislation please let us all support the noble as a whole as we tried to do here, and pass the necessary thrust from all sides. Because this is legislation which will help the country and will shape the future destiny of the Cayman Islands. So not let us try to legislation which has some accomplishment and failure to do, and will pass this House just because it has the numerical amount to have it. That will not benefit the workers either it will not benefit the Labour Force as a whole and it will not benefit the country.

We are already under the know the kind of destruction under this present Government is still on to go on. Once adequate labour legislation is brought to this House the next thing which will follow, and I am concerned to hear that it is here, is that we have a strong labour union in this country, which will take in all aspects and kinds of people, and will work for the benefit of all the workers of this country. not just a select few. Labour unions have played an important role in the development of many countries. I do not agree with anything that a Labour union does but unions have done it for the working classes throughout the world. We could look at the English labour unions and say that they have brought the country on to its knees but we do not have the necessary talent of that. We do not want how these people were held down for years gone by. So maybe the children of the children did plan to benefit themselves more than they should have done. However, labour unions in most countries have played to play their part in the development of those countries and to do it wisely. I feel that a Labour union would do the same thing in this country. We could have it in the same way that it has been and in other developing countries and I feel that if a labour union was tried to start a political party, it would not be as bad as some of the things which have been dealt with politically in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: What Elected Member for the Eastern Districts.

MRS. MARY J. MILLSAPS: Mr. President, I support the motion before the House. I realize it is necessary that we provide for some protest and working clause. I also realize that it is the responsibility of this House to study carefully all aspects of Labour Legislation before we reach any decisions. Labour Legislation can be beneficial but it can also be detrimental if it is not the right kind. Therefore, I would ask each and every Member here today to give this very serious consideration as we deliberate in Committee and as the Law is drafted.

Previous speakers have mentioned Labour unions. Mr. President, in the early stages of many industries they were beneficial, but through the greed and insensitivity of Labour unions now will find that they have brought countries to their knees, particularly developing countries. I would again that we should be very cautious as we approach this subject. I personally, speaking for myself only, do not feel that we need Labour unions in the Cayman Islands. I think we are intelligent enough and we are a close enough knit people to help protect each other, and that we can do without the complicated Labour unions.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the Second Elected Member for West Bay for his presentation. Labour Legislation has been on my mind ever the time I came into this House four years ago and I am glad today that we are moving forward on it. However, again we should do it very cautiously.

Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless any other Member wishes to speak.... The honourable Third Elected Member for Executive Council.

AGR, CAPT. CHARLES L. EBANKS-WILSON: Mr. President, I rise to support the motion before this honourable House. I believe that it is in the best interests of our Islands that we, as one of the Members said before, have to be realistic, pragmatic and flexible in our Islands.

I feel that the time has not arrived for us to have a comprehensive Labour Bill. In the past we have had no Labour problems as most disputes were easily sorted out or agreed upon before having to go to court. Today we have an industry, or several industries, the greatest of which is tourism. Even tourism we have several strife such as construction, hotel workers, dive boat operations, without operations and I could go on and on. I think that there should be some clearly laid down for employer and employee alike so that persons working know exactly what to expect. I feel that we should insist that people working should give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

In the deliberations this morning each one spoke of the penalty system. Mr. President, we happen to own two small hotels on the Island and we subscribed the penalty system. I do not agree with it because I do not feel that penalties should be made unrealistic. I feel that penalties should be paid to the persons who work them by the persons they employ to our detriment. Then, sir, seems to ensure promptness and carefully we should not be retaining them on our premises. I feel that eight hotels, or each industry whatever it may be should pay a fair wage to their employees and if they give the service we have they should give them the benefits or increase will be. Have fair pay or a penalty at the end of the day.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES E. KIRKCONNELL (CENTRAL): Mr. President, I too would like to congratulate the Member who introduced the motion and I assure him of my full support. It is a pity, Sir, that we have in this Assembly certain Members who are always casting aspersions on the present Members of this Government. We have inherited a very difficult task and that is not like country back we the past. Whether the people of this country want to believe that the country is in good shape or not, I am telling them right now, Sir, that the Cayman Islands are not in good shape. No, the four elected Members of Executive Council are working as hard as we possibly can, together with the three Honourable Official Members and yourself as Governor, to try to restore Responsible order in our community, and to try to get control of the Cayman Islands finances before we have lost everything.

The First Elected Member for the Sunrise Area made mention of a Labour union. He did not state his intention but he implied that this might be one of the roles which he might play in the future, to form a Labour union. Well, Sir, maybe he is just obsolete to his purpose since the country has nothing for him. It will have nothing for anybody else either. So if this is all he has to organize or to plan this country, I believe nature will destroy it. God bless every one of us.

I thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless any other Honourable Member wishes to speak I will call on the Honourable Mover to exercise his right of reply.

MR. H. MONROE BODDEN: Mr. President, I thank those Members who offered their support and also for their kind remarks. Mr. President, one writer said, "If you speak like a man, you look like a man and you fly like a man, you will be what like a man". Standing up here in this Honourable House, Mr. President, and saying how much he supports Labour legislation, and unionism, Sir, that he was the Member responsible for Labour ordinance, Sir, that he looked at very hard and he had many concerns, but after eight long years of being the Member responsible for Labour, I did not, Sir, support the type of Labour Union that the Member wants. This is very genuine, Sir. He is a senior Member in this House. He ought to be supposed to be the father of the House and, Sir, I suggested that he might play a very responsible role in Labour legislation. Instead, Sir, he has said that my motion is politically motivated. We would that Labour legislation should take away all the classification....

MR. JAMES M. MILLER: A point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order as will the Second Elected Member for West Bay kindly state.

MR. JAMES M. MILLER: Mr. President, it is funny that members in this House is only heard when somebody thinks it fills a point for him as the Member is trying to do now.

MR. H. MONROE BODDEN: What is his point of order, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

MR. JAMES M. MILLER: It might be more than that when I get through with it, Sir.

MR. W. HAWKINS DUDA: Will the gavel not have a point of order to stand at the desk. It is my claim to that. The Member has had his chance.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: I make on a point of order them, will the Member kindly state it.

MR. PRESIDENT: If the Member does not come to a point of order straight away I cannot allow him to proceed.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: Will the Member kindly state what my classification was on it. I do not doubt Labour legislation from this Government; I do not do it now and I never did in the past. It was on the basis of the Honourable Second Official Member and his staff. I pointed out that we had once put on ITO correspondence....

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think this is a point of order. It is a point of explanation.

MR. W. HAWKINS DUDA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wished to give the floor to Elected Member for Pointe Rouge, but I also have to point out, Sir, that he did nothing on terms of a Labour Law. He can do all he wants and he now sits to waste his time....

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: What is Government

MR. W. HAWKINS DUDA: Will the Member sit down.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: So I will not sit down.

MR. W. HAWKINS DUDA: Well I am standing on my feet and unless the President tells me to sit down I will not sit down.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: Well I am not going to sit down because the Member tells me to sit down. Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: Are you rising on a point of order?

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: Yes, Sir, Mr. President, he is concerned to what he is saying because Labour Legislation was not before this House....

MR. PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. That is a point of explanation. If the Member wishes to resume his seat on a point of explanation on the part of the Second Elected Member for what Pay's speech he is entitled to do so in connection with Standing Orders, but he must not today....

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: I would like to continue that now then, Sir.

MR. W. HAWKINS DUDA: Thank you, Sir. Mr. President, about the point that the motion was politically motivated, are we not politicians? Mr. President, our manifesto which I also elected to office on, "A better pay for most Pay", which I hope can become "A better pay for the Cayman Islands" and, "When we are elected on 10th November it is our intention to...." One of the sections of this manifesto said, "To investigate the cause and conditions of employment, including those in the Government Industry as well as in the casual labour market".

MR. M. MATHEWS SUDU (Abyssinia): I am fulfilling my promise to my people. If the Member has had the people at heart we would not have had any call to do this. But might I say that he did nothing towards any legislation to be on our books for labour. Once the Member says that, Sir:

Mr. President, for as long as I have been involved with politics I have heard promises of this Labour Law coming and I have not heard it debated here yet. The Speech of the second Meeting of the 1977 session of the Legislative Assembly on Monday, 7th March says in a speech by the Prime Minister for Foreign Trade:-

> "Anyway this year we will be remembered in the budget we plan to employ another Labour Officer. This is necessary because the work load in Immigration and Labour and it will become even worse later this year when we have fresh new Labour Legislation".

I am saying, Sir, that the Labour Legislation which the Member said he would bring has not been brought to the House, so it is not a new act. We had sufficient time, Sir,....

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, this Bill was brought to this House. It is unfortunate that the House did not have enough time to....

MR. PRESIDENT: This is still a matter of consideration. The Member must keep it until the end.

MR. M. MATHEWS SUDU: Yes, Sir. When he undertook later I hope it is put in a point of explanation and is not another speech.

In the Budget Speech for 1981, midway in his term I would say, another promise was made:-

> "The need for a modern employment law is becoming more pressing".

That is another promise and might also be the last minute, Sir, the Member was saying; this is from the Budget Speech given on Friday, 16th February, 1981:-

> "It is hoped that Labour Legislation will be introduced to this Honourable House in the same meeting".

All I have say, Sir, is that they were promises but there is no law. We have sufficient time for a law to be drafted. So he should not try to mislead people about who wants minimum wages and who does not want minimum wages. For the record, Sir, I want to quote what I said about minimum wages in case they want to misconstrue that. I am quoting from my speech which reads:

> "On the matter of minimum wage, I would like to see the Committee to be set up have a thorough reference where one of the Committees would be to gather information from the people whether minimum wages for each job classification, to get a coherent and realistic assessment of what minimum wages have to be set."

MR. M. HAZZARD RISE (Inaudible): I have that in quite close, no ceiling.

I, Sir, am not concerned with my own seat. I am a new Member for this House. This is a new Parliament and this is a new Government. The First Elected Member for Eastern Town does not rule us any longer. He does not rule this country any longer. The fact remains, as I said after eight long years there is no Eastern Town on the Bench as expected.

Responding the unions, Sir, I do not subscribe to them. People argue [illegible] when they first start they have that stigma of the public believe that they can not behind a union and get that faith again. If we give the people the basic necessities he was saying else will be alive to make a union in this country and be successful. It will be like the [illegible] Party, Social, Leftist and gone.

Mr. President, I am wondering whether I should read this because it has unparliamentary words in it, and I do not want, Sir, how you will react.

HIS EXCELLENCY: I will take you if necessary.

MR. M. HAZZARD RISE: Yes, Sir. I am referring to a publication I received on the mail. This came from the Labour Office. It was dated March, 1979 and has the Honourable Elected Member for Eastern Town's address on it. If I am not permitted to read it please tell me so now, because I am ready to read it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: You will have no objection to me first [illegible] that. I consult [illegible]...

MR. M. HAZZARD RISE: Quite enough.

MR. S. ALEX BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. President, I [illegible] see the relevance of all this.

MR. M. HAZZARD RISE: Yes, Sir, it comes to. I have to has always been blind.

HIS EXCELLENCY: I think he is [illegible] which were made [illegible] debate.

MR. JAMES K. ROSSEN: On a further point of order then, Mr. President, I wonder if you as the President of this Meeting would then disclose to the House whether that is one of Government's files, or whether it is a letter written to anyone or what do it is?

MR. D. GLENN HILLIER: On a point of order, Mr. President, I think that other Members of the House rise on a point of order they should quote the Standing Order under which they are rising a point of order. Maybe that would restore some order in the House.

MR. M. HAZZARD RISE: All they are doing is trying to [illegible] me, that I am wasted up here, Sir. I have been [illegible] me,

HON. MICHAEL J. ENRIGHT: On a point of information I think it is almost [illegible] break time, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, I think I would have to ask you if you objected reading the part. I promise you were going to read of that so it would be better that you should not read it.

MR. JAMES M. ROBEY: Would you disclose to the House whether that was a private or a Government file, or whether it is a letter written in respect of some subject, Sir?

MR. E. MARVIN HUFF: If I cannot read it then let us not read it. Let us not deal with it because if we start to talk about it I will want to make my point clear.

MR. JAMES M. ROBEY: The point is, Mr. President, that things which have been done in the case of letters written and on file in the Government Administration Buildings have appeared, apparently through Nigel Ramsey. I am just wondering whether this is another case of a file which has been taken out of the Government Administration Buildings and brought here so to speak so one need anything happens because if it is anything that I think you are mistaken in, believe me I believe in it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the Member continue.

MR. E. MARVIN HUFF: Mr. President, I am only saying to show, Sir, that those Members who might they support future legislation, might have reservations as an patent in supporting my motion. I have to close, Sir, that is the whole truth as far as I concerned. That is all it is.

Mr. President, the same Member responsible for taking, according to a statement, said that he was absent from work because, "I am ashamed to hear recently how skilled Supervisors...."

MR. JAMES M. ROBEY: I object again, Mr. President. Why do you not try to make this more relevant in this House, if you concur the most of us do?

MR. PRESIDENT: Maybe that Standing Order are you objecting?

MR. JAMES M. ROBEY: My submission is that the Hon being the Deputy Prime Minister. Under Standing Order 32(2) he should be able to prove that either from first hand knowledge which comes to his attention.

MR. PRESIDENT: Standing Order 32(2) says that no Member shall impute improper motives to another Member. I see nothing improper about a newspaper being associated with a political party. It is common practice in most countries.

MR. JAMES M. ROBEY: I would but that if I had raised it on another occasion I would have been thrown out of order, right?

MR. PRESIDENT: If you had raised it improperly you would have been.

MR. MICHAEL J. MILLER: Mr. President, Sir, the Honourable of the office is talking while that of the House is seeing.

MR. SPEAKER: I was hoping that the Member was speaking here today to finish soon and we could then get on with...

MR. R. HARRIS SMITH: No, Sir, if you want to drive me we can take it.

MR. SPEAKER: If he is not going to finish, in that case I think I will recess proceedings until approximately 2.30 p.m.

AT 1.10 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings were resumed. The Second Elected Member for East Bay.

MR. R. HARRIS SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before we took the break, Sir, I was dealing with an article in the Sun newspaper. However, before I go on with that, Sir, I want to say this. I take very strong objection to any Member trying to use the Press Chamber and trying to threaten me in any manner. Since I have been elected here and even in I have been trained, and I mean literally trained inside the precincts of this Assembly. I want to say that all this will not seem to intimidate me in that sort of tactic will have to stop. It is not easy to kill a Bush you must. Thank you very much. The Ministry are to pay this, Sir.

Before we took the break we were dealing with an article in the Sun newspaper where the Member responsible for Labour was quoting all negotiations to resolve their employment practices. The Sun went on to say that Mr. Robin made a statement just one day after a number of unemployed Caymanians made a peaceful march to the construction site of the new terminal at Owen Roberts Airport. He said:

> "I am disappointed to hear reportedly about alleged Caymanians who are unable to find work which they are trained to carry out. I call on all employers to review their employment practices."

Mr. Speaker, I would like in order to read this. This is another Sun newspaper dated Tuesday, 2nd August, 1994. These were the same newspapers why he was negotiating to:

> "The protesters said that after they spoke to the foreman and owner who told them to talk to Mr. Robin, the job was closed down. In a subsequent statement later the Work Permit, members of Spanish Rock said the workers had been sent home because they had legal reasons they would not be getting any income. He said Government Security Member Mr. Mac Robin was involved, more as the owner of the hotel but as owner of the company doing the construction."

MR. P. JACKMAN MAY (CONTINUING): I have read this to show, Sir, that all this talk about the Labour Government is just that; lip service and nothing else.

One other Member, Sir, raised on a point of order that I was not being relevant. That was the Deputy Premier Member for Golden Rock. I want to read on article he did, Sir, a newspaper report which quoted the Honourable Member as saying:

> "Right now the Government would have one dozen more qualified engineers, but where are they going to get them when the parents allow their children to study music. When they will not let their children go to school."

My comment this morning, Sir, and my statements now, I maintain, are very relevant to the labour situation in this country. We are talking about protecting Expatriates. Let here is this Member saying that Expatriate parents allow their children to study music and not to go to school. I do not believe this, Sir. Expatriate parents in my opinion have a deep and abiding respect and love for their children, and they do all within their power to help them. It is not because of that that they are not getting jobs. It is the statistics which I read from the Government. It is not Expatriate parents. This is double talk, Mr. President, unfortunate, If I have to use some statistics to prove my points I can easily do that. They have warned me not and that is what has happened. The points are genuine. As far as this Labour Legislation which the Member claims was drafted to concerned, this is an extract of recommendations from reports of Select Committees as tabled at September, 1981 Meeting of the Legislative Assembly. It says, "The recommended Select Committee Labour Law". Terms of reference:

> "At the Sitting of the Legislative Assembly on the 5th day of May, 1982, Government Notice No. 5 moved by the Honourable Chief Elected Member of Executive Council, was passed. The motion read,"

and I believe that this will tell the tale:-

> "That this Honourable House do, in accordance with Standing Order 59 of the Legislative Assembly Standing Orders, 1978, constitute a Select Committee to consider and report upon the laws of the Cayman Islands which now regulate the relationship between employers and employees, and to make recommendations as to whether new enactments are now or will in the near future be necessary or desirable and if it is so considered, to make recommendations as to what amendments or new legislation is, in the opinion, necessary or desirable;
>
> and that this Honourable House do appoint all the Members of the Legislative Assembly, both Elected and Official, to be Members of such Committee and that the quorum for a Meeting of such Select Committee shall be seven Members;
>
> and that the said Select Committee do make its Report to this Honourable House in the month of or before the month of September, 1982."

MR. E. MCGARRITY ROSS (CONTINUED): This week the Government will make a replacement to them. It will make a payment. This is the last month of the season. If the Government had decided to do it could have been paid in that fashion if necessary. But they could make a payment, not having that dreadful implication. So the Member should not come out with such stupid and stilted implication. I do not see why. There is nothing in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I am here today is because I made an overwhelming stand against the kind and flagrant misuse of the previous administration. I made an overwhelming case against a feeling of brazen practices such as the former has. I know, Sir, there are those who oppose this motion. They oppose it. They circumvent by motion because they could not stand to see this little junk boy from West Bay previous a motion when they had failed in eight years to bring legislation which would be debated in this honourable House.

Mr. President, in winding up or closing off, whatever way we term it, no amount of emotion will make our people a real people. All efforts will be wasted unless the hearts of the people are actually taken along the path on which they will feel more enthusiastic about this place called the Cayman Islands as their home; that they their country and that we as leaders and responsible Members rather than be concerned with the problems which confront them. They will then go home for their country; make more effort; think more; make more sacrifices; have more discipline; by more honest and do more with them by any other measure which can be brought to bear on country.

We need a Cayman Post and I would have preferred to see anyone from every single Member of this House if they were persons.

It is against this background that I commend this motion to the honourable Members of this House. What say us?

MR. PRESIDENT: Before I put the question to the vote, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town requires a right to offer an explanation in connection with the provisions of Standing Order 31(2) and I will his attention to the interpretation imposed by that Standing Order. Subject to that, he may offer his explanation.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Well, the other Member was allowed to speak. I do not know whether I will be able to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the rep will mean into when I will have to follow the steps of the Fourth Day Then West Bay. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town while you allow interpretation. I remember that was moved to conclude me because at the break I went to him that and I said, "If you are going to deal with things which I sincerely had and I am sure had better be more of the facts. You will not find me opposed Speaker". I do not think that that was contradictions on a threat. However, it did well meant.

Before Conciliation was drafted, it was drafted by the ILO representative attached to the United Nations Caribbean office and it was placed at a meeting in this House last year on the suicide of the Jamaican Governor who in his present here now, who said that possibly the last way to which to deal with it. It was our feeling that there should have been participation by all Members.

MR. JAMES M. COOPER (CONTINUING): As to the practices for this Chamber to get up and make the statements which he has made. However it is not surprising when you understand who they come from. I can apologize for him.

MR. E. HARPER JOYCE: Thank the gentleman.

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: It is plain that the Democratic Administration of this Government has been able to divide so many race so quickly when it had such popularity for some years, as I recall those years which I can remember, in trying to put the Democrat back into office.

Mr. President, I have not heard the finish of the quotation. Who knows in not knowing or care. It is just nonsensical.

MR. E. HARPER JOYCE: Is it noted at present, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the Member is already over the period of accommodation. He has been accommodated as far about the discussion of Reconstruction. However, if he is going on to talk about the Negro race's past and present, then I think he has been within rule.

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: I was just referring to the manner in which you addressed the Member on right.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member was not speaking on a specific point of explanation. He was commenting a debate.

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: Well, I will then change that, Sir, to said that if the Member had had the people of heart more would have been done. I would remind him that if he knew as much as he thought he would not feel for the people as do for the people of the Cayman Islands what I feel I have done. That is public record.

MR. E. HARPER JOYCE: You can say that again.

MR. PRESIDENT: I will not put the question....

MR. MITCHELL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, Sir, with respect I just desire to make a personal explanation. In that regard I would draw your attention to Erskine May, 19th edition, page 123, in which it says:

> "No Member should cause disorder but if another Member is considered to be a personal attachment, he is generally allowed to give his own view of the matter and to any question he considers it or not."

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well.

MRS. MYRTLE J. DARRELL: Mr. President, Sir, as Attorney-General, the Second Opposition Member, I am responsible upon this being Government's chief legal adviser, for the drafting of legislation to accommodate with Constitutional requirements by the Privy Government. I hope that I will be as loyal a Member of Government during this administration as I hoped that I was during the last administration.

SGM. MICHAEL J. MAHONEY: My memory, Sir, and I think the records of Government will show that at no time was I formally instructed to draft Tobacco legislation. My memory of the contents of Tobacco legislation is that there had been several drafts prepared by my predecessor. Also I had talked to the Minority Member from Sublette Town informally and we had agreed on a number of points. I had personally, in anticipation of a formal request, brought and started work on certain legislation. It was then even not sent proper by the Minority Member from Golden Town to construct the committee to prepare independent legislation.

I make that in no way is this clear being done upon the drafting section of Government as myself in determining that there was any disadvantage or malevolence to draft legislation as a legal Chief Counsel.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. I will now put the question that Minority Member's motion. Mr. Secretary, proceed.

SECRETARY MAY: Members:

MR. D. MARCUS BUSH: Could we have a division, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: We did not hear any noes so I am not sure there of my ruling...

MR. C. NILO TOMICH: I think the Members ought to vote against it myself.

MR. PRESIDENT: Let the Chief Clerk.

MR. D. MARCUS BUSH: No, I want to hear the individual vote.

MR. PRESIDENT: Let me just have a look at Rule[illegible]. Indeed. Maybe the honorable Speaker Official Number will be right or not finding what...

SGM. MICHAEL J. MAHONEY: Mr. President, Sir, may I respectfully draw your attention to Standing Order 43, subsection (3) which says

> "The results shall be declared by the Presiding Officer stating "I think the ayes have it" or "I think the noes have it" as the case may be, but any Member may challenge the opinion of the Chair in declaring a decision."

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well, how now have a division. Even though I did not hear a single no you are entitled to a division.

DIVISION
NO. 11

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis M. Foster	
Hon. Michael J. Bradley	
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Hon. Frances D. Stanley	
Hon. K. Norman Geddes	
Hon. Capt. Charles S. Pinkerman[illegible]	
Mr. D. Marcus Bush	
Mr. Lunsford M. Pearson	
Capt. Mabry S. Pinkerman[illegible]	

[illegible].

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Mr. President, I call your attention to Standing Order 33(c), which says:-

> "A division shall be taken by the Clerk calling each Member's name and recording the vote given. The Clerk shall then announce the number of those who have voted for and against the proposal."

So if there is no one against the proposal, in my opinion there should be no division. "shall declare the result of the division" because there were abstentions.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the answer to that one is that until the Clerk has called the names to account be certain that there is no one against. A Member may challenge my ruling as defective and claim that perhaps I did not hear a no or an aye. My interpretation there would, if I understand it, the Honourable Second Official Member was in agreement, is that if a Member wishes a division he is entitled to it.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Well my vote then, Sir, I fully support Labour Representation coming to the House but not the motion which is before us because we have already had Party Declaration which can be put.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think you must either vote aye or no or abstain. It will be difficult for the Clerk to know what to put down otherwise.

DIVISION (ABSTENTION)

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Mr. S. Parnell Miller Mr. John B. Watson		Mr. James M. Scott.
II	0	1

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION DECLARED CARRIED BY MAJORITY.

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried. Private Member's Motion No. 7/86.

HON. MICHAEL J. SAVAGE: Could I have that count again, Sir. Did the Clerk say eleven?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think it may have been eleven because you are under arrest, I think there are two abstentions and two absentees. It must be eleven.

SPEAKER: My Executive Council and the Third Elected Member for West Bay are absent. That is correct.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is still carried but I think you both first have your record so that it is eleven.

SPEAKER: That is right, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council and the Third Elected Member for West Bay are both absent.

So, Private Member's Motion No.2/88. The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. EDWARD A. ERSKINE: Mr. President, before the moving of this motion, on a point of order, Sir, I wonder if I could get an explanation from you under section 25(2) of the Standing Orders. The motion I have to make here, Sir, is that I feel that it is unconstitutional for this honourable Legislative Assembly to continue and transact any business as it presently exists, with certain members, and I think this applies to me. Although certain members have still spoken with the public.

I have of nothing but honour, Sir, by all Constitutional Instrument which was re-enacted by the general public as was this motion. So, Sir, I believe that although the motion was moved of me, it is based just as here.

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, this vote Constitutional of Politics, has continued and left the Islands and can be imported to ask why is it more necessary to proceed this motion. However, I have been advised that it is highly possible for the vote Constitutional of Politics to file a lawsuit or persons here whom he might feel let to his benefit. However, the vote Government because is to unduly vote people who have benefited by the multiple persons in the first place.

Sir, I well remember the passage of that motion; the here, the many things and the deliberate attempts which were indicated into the debate. I sat in the gallery and I smiled thought to all and said to myself, "What unholy hoodlum, may God have mercy on them." Is Honourable Member said. "What while I stand in the public by the grace Christ".

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 2/88

CONSTITUTION OF POLICE

MR. K. MCTAGGART DAVIS: Mr. President I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. 2/88 standing in my name, which reads as follows:-

> WHEREAS in Private Member's Motion No.1/88, moved by the Legislative Assembly on 1st December, 1988, it was recommended that this Government agree to indemnify Kelly the Commissioner of Police, Mr. James Pinnock, in any costs and damages he may incur in bringing proceedings for defamation against persons who made or published false allegations against his conduct and character;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House hereby rescinds the said Private Member's Motion, No.1/88.

MR. D. SCOTT MILLER: I beg to second the motion, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is duly moved and seconded. The Second Elected Member for East End may now speak.

MR. K. MCTAGGART DAVIS: Mr. President, the problem before the House is a very straightforward motion. It is a motion designed to remove from our law books what became known as the Dalmain/Cranston motion of December, 1988. This was a motion which offended to the most Constitutional of Police inherited Rule from the public because by the motion after he, through certain members, had fallen into his private,

I have of nothing but honour, Sir, by all Constitutional Instrument which was re-enacted by the general public as was this motion. So, Sir, I believe that although the motion was moved of me, it is based just as here.

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, this vote Constitutional of Politics, has continued and left the Islands and can be imported to ask why is it more necessary to proceed this motion. However, I have been advised that it is highly possible for the vote Constitutional of Politics to file a lawsuit or persons here whom he might feel let to his benefit. However, the vote Government because is to unduly vote people who have benefited by the multiple persons in the first place.

Sir, I well remember the passage of that motion; the here, the many things and the deliberate attempts which were indicated into the debate. I sat in the gallery and I smiled thought to all and said to myself, "What unholy hoodlum, may God have mercy on them." Is Honourable Member said. "What while I stand in the public by the grace Christ".

MR. M. MANOHAR RAO (CONSTITUENCY): What did you do for me to have some money on this country. People like the mover of this motion, the seconder of that motion, and that little boy from George Town took the worse beating at the polls than any other individuals in our 150 years of self-government. The Bhagwa have been kicked, praise be to God.

That motion was unqualified. It was unnecessary. It was here of mixed and twisted minds and today it is my great pleasure to move this motion for a substantive. I beg Members for their support. Thank you very much.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is now open for debate. Does any Member wish to speak?

SPEAKING PREVIOUSLY: HONOURABLE MEMBER

MR. DENZIL F. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, it is good that such a motion as this has to be brought back to the House. In the recent years nightly paid a while ago, it was not necessary for the right one to come. Therefore, I really do not think it was necessary for this one at all some. I would like to note, Sir, from the Hansard of 1st December, 1988, when this matter was before the House, I am quoting what our legal advisor the Honourable Second Official Member quoted there then. He said:-

> "I wanted to direct Honourable Members' attention to Government Regulations and to Government Regulation 7, 9A, 2 which is the normal safeguard of the Government Regulation which relates to legal proceedings. And I will read it - 'Subject to the orders of the Attorney-General in any particular case, the Government will accept responsibility for the defence of officers against whom legal proceedings are threatened or instituted in respect of acts done or liabilities incurred in the execution of their duties. Where any such proceedings are threatened or instituted the right should be reported to the Attorney-General, and no bonds or other expenses shall be incurred by the officer or other steps taken in connection with any such proceedings until the directions of the Attorney-General have been received'."

I will read emphasis instead of that Honourable -

> "Mr. President, Sir, Members have said or inferred that this is an unusual step being taken and that there are no safeguards against it and that it leaves it open to unlimited public expense. The Motion, Mr. President, Sir, as it is before us says that the House strongly recommends that should the Commissioner wish to institute proceedings, Government agree to indemnify fully the Commissioner of Police. This is a recommendation to the Government and if passed would be a recommendation, albeit a strong recommendation."

But it would still be covered by Government Regulations which state:-

> "No action may be taken by an officer to institute civil proceedings in any court in connection with matters arising out of the discharge of their public duties, or against any other public officer, or anything done in the performance of his duties, unless the consent of the Attorney-General has been obtained".

MR. DENNIS R. KEEFE (CONTINUING): Having said that, Mr. President, and the Commissioner no long distance - which was unpleasant to be unnecessarily brought up and I would ask Members not to dwell on this as hard and as long. It is something which has already happened. Something which could have never helped in the beginning anyway, and two wrongs do not make a right.

I think the speaker we can do away with this motion, Sir, the better.

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

MR. C. ERIC SCOTT: Mr. President, I take strong objection to the Elected Member's motion before the House for what it is a spiteful motion. It does credit on a member which he could have had been told so much. Here is here also the Commissioner of Police, Mr. Stevens had been ridiculed by a certain segment of certain section of the community. He had been ridiculed by a woman which was not Bermudian, for your files' law enforcement officers. The big part of the story is the lack treatment of everything which was said by these here.

Everyone knows the story and everyone knows that his car be one belonged of who is not committed by Police Squads. Everybody knows the story. This motion should accordingly not be brought at this time. What knows the Commissioner Stevens did? He made a statement on the radio to clarify a problem which had been distorted by the media. It had in fact been reported in the normal way the press on this Member report. They report what they want to hear rather than the straight facts.

I do not want to go into the details as the case may still be before the courts. However, the Commissioner was charged of having been the person to cause a misstate in the court. Everyone knows it was not the Commissioner but it was a statement made by a newspaper on Radio Cayman. So the man has done nothing wrong.

The same faction which started this campaign has ridiculed the Commissioner, and also tossed an investigation into the conduct of the Commissioner and other Civil Servants. The result of that investigation was published and showed clearly that the Commissioner had been exonerated, and that he had done no wrong. The investigators were brought in and they examined all the evidence. I believe you, Sir, in your capacity as Governor made a few made selection at the time and certainly the press carried the story that the Commissioner was a man of honour.

The motion which was brought by the Member in December, I believe a resolution. I supported it then....

HE. PRESIDENT: I am afraid I must interrupt the Honourable Member. It is quite clear that he is not going to be able to finish his speech today, and therefore in accordance with Standing Order 20(3) I will invite the Honourable Elected Members to move the adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS A. PROVOST: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is Member wishes a division?

HON. HUBERT A. BRUCE: I would just like to know whether tomorrow is to be allowed to debate the Throne Speech or the Budget Speech, which one?

MR. PRESIDENT: It is the continuation of the second Reading debate on the Appropriation Bill, which you will be in a position also to comment on the Throne Speech, in accordance with past precedence. Is that not correct?

HON. DENNIS A. PROVOST: Yes, Sir, we will be debating the two speeches at one time.

MR. PRESIDENT: We have in fact already passed on the motion of thanks for the Throne Speech. That motion is therefore now dead. We have still before us the Second Reading debate on the Appropriation Bill and that is what the speeches will be on. That is my understanding.

HON. MICHAEL J. ENSLEY: I was just wondering, Sir, whether you could give me your interpretation on Standing Order 10(5) which says:-

> "Any motion under discussion at the moment of interruption and any business not entered upon before that time shall stand over to the next sitting or sitting."

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, that is a good point which I have not considered.

HON. MICHAEL J. ENSLEY: My own feeling, Mr....

MR. PRESIDENT: Standing on critique - sorry you were going to say?

HON. MICHAEL J. ENSLEY: I was going to say that my first impression on that, Sir, would be that that which is interrupted continues as pursued and that the Order Paper as set down tomorrow would continue in the normal way. In other words if we finished this consultation Friday Monday's Motion tomorrow and then we went on to the Budget, that would be correct.

HON. HUBERT A. BRUCE: One of my questions would be that the Throne Speech and the Budget are two completely different items and, in my opinion, they should be debated individually rather than to try to group the two as a whole.

HON. DENNIS A. PROVOST: In fact, Sir, they were both debated together.

MR. PERKINSON: They have both been heard exceptionally and we have already voted on the motion to reconsider the Simone Speech.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Mr. President, we seem to be getting so many different answers to the point I just mentioned whether it would not be more appropriate if we did it, because we are dealing with really two substantially different items.

MSM. FRANCIS R. BOSTIC: We are not changing the issues, Sir. The issues is....

MR. PRESIDENT: Let us consider other matters have been so announced about "Threshold Applications". I cannot remember what the phrase was....

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: "Threshold Activities" or that will help you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: "Threshold Activities". So perhaps it is better that we get off the Threshold for a time and report to the recessed personnel which now to debate the two matters simultaneously. Moreover, the both issues Members are then to range over potentially all matters which

MSM. MICHAEL F. MASTRO: Why I am saying this, Sir, is....

MR. PRESIDENT: Let I was trying to wrap up the point which the Honorable Second Officer had raised. It was, "Need meeting on minutes" and the definition of Meeting is readily ascertainable, the whole or part of any meeting. I think it could be interpreted either way and to be really a reminder of what made the proceedings of the House. Whether Members wish to continue debating the Minute Member's Motion No. 2 which we have in the middle of debating now, before we start on the debate on the Appropriation Bill is not to us to them. In fact if you had taken the point the other day, were we not in the middle of a debate on the Stamp Duty Bill which is inconclusive? So I think the procedure is that we do not necessarily continue with what has been interrupted.

MSM. MICHAEL F. MASTRO: My only concern, Sir, was that Members could then say the other day, if we are going to keep reminding the recess.....

MR. PRESIDENT: We are going to have Lunch soon.

MSM. MICHAEL F. MASTRO: Yes.

MR. PERKINSON: Well, we are. I think it will only be two hours if we must start on the debate on the Appropriation Bill. We can pick up the Lunch Hour thereafter.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: In view of what has just been said, Mr. President, are we going through with the Minute Item Bill removal also or something has been left out?

MR. PORTERFIELD: No, I was suggesting that since we have unlimited gall bladders and agreed to a motion that the appropriation bill be debated tomorrow, that we go ahead and debate it and leave both the Sharp Duty Bill and this Private Member's Motion over until we finish the debate on the Appropriation Bill.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: I do not think there will be any objection, Sir, because we are ready to go here about six weeks anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: So, unless anyone thinks otherwise I think that is perhaps the best arrangement; that we go ahead with the debate as planned, leaving the other things to be completed at a later stage. Did I put the question? I forget. Yes I did, because I asked if any Member wanted to speak and nobody spoke. So we will assume nobody does.

AT 6.37 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M. WEDNESDAY, 6TH JUNE, 1995.

STATE OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(WEDNESDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1985)

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR G PETER (LOND, CMG, CVO - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS E FOSTER, CMO,CdC,JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J BRADLEY, QC, LL.B	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C CAMERON, CP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON MORGAN O EBANKS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M NORMAN ROBERTS, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES E KIRKCONNELL	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON VASSAR G JOHNSON, OBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MCKEEVA BUSH	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR LEVEROD A EBANKS, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT ROBERT S KIRKCONNELL	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF THE SISTER ISLANDS
MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR G HAIG BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D EZZARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN B MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING: 5 HUNDRED AND TWO OF THE (1965) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

WEDNESDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1969

MORNING SITTING

1. QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 13: WOULD THE HONOURABLE STATE WHAT, IF ANY, EFFORTS HAVE BEEN MADE IN THE FORMULATION OF AN APPROPRIATE SET OF LANDING LAWS FOR THIS COUNTRY?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 14: WOULD THE HONOURABLE STATE:-

(a) THE SOCIAL NUMBER OF MOTORCYCLE ACCIDENTS DURING THE YEARS 1960 TO 1964; AND

(b) CATEGORISED THE NATURE OF THE FOLLOWING:-

(i) BY TYPE OF ENGINE OR CYCLE;
(ii) HOW MANY OF THE MOTORCYCLES INVOLVED WERE REGISTERED?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 15: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT THE PRESENT COST PER PATIENT AT THE HOSPITAL IS AND WHAT IS THE OCCUPANCY RATE?

NO. 16: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE MEDICAL OFFICERS EMPLOYED AT THE HOSPITAL AND WHAT ARE THE DUTIES?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 18: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER THE OFFER MADE BY CAYE COUNTY TO ASSIST WITH THE SICKNESS CONTROL CONTRACT, UNDER THEIR PAYE CITED LEGISLATION, HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY THIS GOVERNMENT?

2. COMMENCEMENT OF DEBATE ON ANNUAL APPROPRIATION AND SUPPLY ADDRESS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Questions	1
Statement by the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council	2
Continuation of the debate on the Throne Speech and Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1965	8
Mr. Clifford A. Pearson	8
Adjournment	20

SPEAKER

APRIL 14, 1995

10:00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Questions. The Second Electoral District for Rockbridge Falls.

QUESTION

THE SENATE ELECTION MONDAY NOT CHOSEN DOWN BY ONE INDEPENDENT SENATOR BECAUSE WOMEN OF REPUBLICAN SENATORS ARE ALREADY AVERAGE FOR THEIR

Q. 22 Would the Senator kindly, if any, efforts have been made in the formulation of the appropriate set of Senate Rule for this event?

ANSWER At the direction of this honourable House yesterday, the Senate, Honourable Members considered and passed Tribune Senator's Motion No. 3/85 which appointed a Committee of the whole House to formulate short Senate Legislative guidelines to the Speaker Election.

Based on the recommendations of that Committee, a Bill for the determination of appropriate Senate Legislative will be submitted to this Honourable House at the earliest possible opportunity. I suggest this as the proper course of formulating appropriate Legislation.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

HON. S. BARE ROSS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if the answer to this question was determined on the premise of the Private Member's Motion yesterday, and if it was not, he is not sure if that was the answer why there was the increased in the proceedings of the Senate? Whether or not the Private Member's Motion could be taken yesterday instead of the Government Bills?

HON. M. ROSIE POTTS: The answer, Mr. President, it had nothing to do with the Private Member's Motion yesterday, because it was my decision to have a Government Motion to the House in connection with the matter if I did not have Legislative that matter could have been passed by a Private Member's Motion. However this Bill will be passed that I was aware of this.

Regarding the proposed workshop to be the Senate, I think this was a recommendation which was made by the Senators' Committee. It has nothing to do with my reply this morning.

HON. S. BARE ROSS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member that the Senate may be aware regarding to yesterday's motion if anything to do with this answer?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think really it affect in the already answered part. It has nothing to answer.

MR. P. MOSES (QUEEN): Well, Mr. President, it is regrettable that the minutes were omitted as a result of the proceedings yesterday. This is only natural.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary, I shall invite the Clerk to read the next question.

THE PRINTED ANSWERS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN ARE AS FOLLOW:

NO. 38: Would the Minister state:-

(a) the total number of matriculants recorded during the years 1960 to 1964; and

(b) distinguish the causes for the difference:-

(i) by place of origin of pupils;
(ii) how many of the individuals concerned were females?

ANSWER: (a) the total number of matriculated individuals during the years 1960 to 1964 was 349 (four hundred and seventy);

(b) (i) 208 of the matriculants were between 20 to 30 years and one was over 40 years;

(ii) 60 individuals concerned were females.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. MAPE PHIRI: Mr. President, may I ask the Member how many males applied as the Lobatse Boys' Brigade when the latter was opened?

HON. DAWSON M. MOSES: The Member is not here, Mr. I do not know.

MR. G. MAPE PHIRI: Mr. President, the reason for asking this is that we have a very disappointed nation, because there is probably only one boys' hostel in the Lobatse which is open to all,

MR. SPEAKER: I understand the purpose of the question but I am sympathetic with the Member for not having the information available.

MR. G. MAPE PHIRI: Mr. President,...

MR. SPEAKER: Because he would like to undertake to obtain it for you and let you know if it does exist, is...

MR. G. MAPE PHIRI: It would be very helpful, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Could the Minister undertake to do that?

HON. DAWSON M. MOSES: The Member wants to know how many boys' hostels there are in the Territory?

MR. PRESIDENT: If the Member would distribute that to Members of the House that would be appreciated.

MR. S. MARVIN WILLIAMS: Mr. President, if I could ask the Honorable Floor Official Member to add to that how much the number of motor cycles over 50 cc are impressed in the law, also?

MR. DENNIS H. PORTER: I can answer that here, Sir. The top possible machine over that number is and I am sure that there would be no impoundment allowed.

MR. JOHN W. WALKER: Mr. President, a supplementary. In light of the answer which has been given would the Member state if the fine which has been placed on the larger motor cycles should not have been placed on the smaller ones.

MR. DENNIS H. PORTER: That is a matter for this House. If they want to amend the law that is fine with me.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary I will ask the Member for North Side to ask the next question.

THE QUESTION WHICH WAS ASKED WAS TO ASK THE HONORABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR PORT-OF-SPAIN NORTH/ST. ANN'S EAST WHETHER HE WOULD CONSIDER THE NEEDS OF THE SOCIAL SERVICES

Q1. If: Would the Member state what the present cost per patient at the hospital is and what is the increase?

ANSWER: The present running cost per patient at the General Hospital is $900.00.

The increase rate is an increase of 9% per week.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. D. ERSKINE MILLER: Supplementary, Mr. President. The Member stated the average cost per patient is. I do not think that is the answer to my question, Sir. My question refers to the cost per patient day. "Day" has been left out, Sir. It should be cost per patient day at the hospital. There is probably nothing I can do.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not unsympathetic maybe I have misunderstood. Are you asking however the Minister quotes the cost per patient day for hospitals?

MR. D. ERSKINE MILLER: Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: If that is a supplementary and you would like the Member to elucidate that certainly he may.

HON. ERROL O. GRIFFITH: The cost please is for hospitals, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is it per patient day.

HON. DENNIS H. PORTER: Per patient day, yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless there is any further supplementary I will invite the Member for North Side to put the next question.

THE SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not prepared to give the information asked for. Question No. 1, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Member state the qualifications of the medical officers employed at the hospital and what are their duties?

ANSWER: Of the ten medical officers presently employed at the General Hospital, seven have MB BS or Bachelor of Medicine/ Bachelor of Surgery and three have MRCP (Member of Royal College of Physicians). Six officers pursued full qualification in specialities which include anaesthesia, ENT (ear, nose and throat), obstetrics and gynaecology, public health and surgery.

All medical officers share general duties. In addition, each consultant attends to their patients in accordance with their sub-specialities.

General duties include -

(i) To be on duty duties, Monday through Friday; to examine in-patients, as required, with other medical staff.

(ii) To attend out-patients clinic Monday through Friday, to prescribe patients medical care treatment where necessary.

(iii) To carry out accident and emergency duties in rota, as required, out of normal working hours.

(iv) To be available for consultation at the request of medical colleagues in accordance with the professional interests, experience and specialities.

(v) To visit patients in the hospital wards and provide necessary medical care.

(vi) To refer suitable patients to consultants via the Chief Medical Officer, clinics in Cayman or overseas, for further opinion, and, if necessary, secondary care.

(vii) To attend, as required, clinics dealing with ante and post-natal care, pre-school examinations, family planning, immunization, maternal and child health and other public health activities.

(viii) To carry out home visits at the request of a public health nurse.

(ix) To undertake medical care in response to emergencies and disasters.

(x) To undertake such other duties as may be required by the Chief Medical Officer.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. D. BRIAN MCFEE: Supplementary, Mr. President. In view of the long list of duties and such things being carried out generally remarkable well by those people of paramedical, would the Honour please tell us what sort of technical officers who are qualified in, for instance, ear nose and throat, audiology, gynaecology, public health and nurses are Postal certified? The qualifications given here do not indicate that they are.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not sure that I have fully understood this supplementary. Is this supplementary to ask the Member whether he will indicate whether all of the paramedical officers have qualifications in every single specialty?

MR. D. BRIAN MCFEE: No, Sir, merely to ask if those who are employed in the specialities listed, ear nose and throat, audiology and gynaecology, public health and surgery are fully qualified. Is there merely also the purpose here or not? Is he a fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons?

HON. EDISON D. FRIPP: Mr. President, that is my understanding, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for East Bay.

MR. K. HARRY HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. In view of the answer:-

"Casual duties include -

(1) To be on duty daily, Monday through Friday, at weekends as above duties, as required, with other medical staff."

Could the Member advise why these same people are taken to hospital there is no doctor there to help them?

MR. EDISON D. FRIPP: Mr. President, I presume that is as a result of the fact that there are occasions when the doctors are on call but not necessarily on the premises and a nurse would have to decide the severity of the doctor needs to be brought in.

MR. K. HARRY HUNT: That a statement. Now, a duty which one. What duty he has not like a legal attack or a stroke. Could the Member give an undertaking that a doctor would be there at all times. Thank you very much, Sir.

DR. PERCENTAGE: That did not sound like a question to me. It sounded more like a statement. I am not sure whether you meant it as a question?

MR. K. HARRY HUNT: Yes, Sir, I said it was going to be a statement and could the Member also an undertaking that a doctor would be there at all times.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you mean will the Minister give an undertaking?

MR. K. HARRY HUNT: Yes, Sir.

REP. EDWIN D. ERLENBORN: Mr. President, I would like on occasion to rebut the present position, but the Senator would be issued an exclusive ruling when all the information is available to me.

MR. S. SEDAM MITCHELL: I do not know whether this will be allowed under supplementaries, but in light of the answer given to the Second Elected Member from Maryland, I wonder if it would be possible to explain the questions which were encountered in the hospital grounds several years ago from the Department of Agriculture based on the complaints? This goes on the time, I believe, about five years.

MR. SPEAKER: I think really that is straying rather far from the scope of the original question. Does any member wish to ask a further supplementary? If not, I will call the Second Elected Member from Baltimore to ask the next question.

MR. LEONARD A. PLEVOSKY: Mr. President, before asking the next question I wish to show your knowledge in section 22[1][d] of the Standing Orders, which speaks about the excessive length of a question. This is both a view to members when they are asking their supplementaries and also to the Senior Member responding the interpretation of questions. The majority for this, Sir, is that when questions are asked in so that they bear no relevance to each other and are not for different days, it makes it somewhat difficult for a Member to get the full picture of a question. I find it sometimes redundant for this cause to the answer this question. As a result I would like to know if possible.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not altogether sure of the relevance of Standing Order 22[1][d] which says that questions shall not be of excessive length. I am not sure of the relevance of that to the point which the Member was making. As I understand it the Member's point is that sometimes he may wish to ask two separate but related questions. If that is so and if he would, whenever that happens and the same applies to any other Member, be good enough to raise it on the Clerk and perhaps also to the Chairman of the Business Committee that he would like two or even three - not more than three because no Member can ask more than three on any day - questions to be put down for answer the same day, then I am sure that the Business Committee will do their best to accommodate the Member concerned.

MR. LEONARD A. PLEVOSKY: Again, Sir, with great reluctance I can only differ on the relevance of this. From my observation I will on the reason for anticipating the questions I ordained that the reason was the language of narrative length of a question.

MR. SPEAKER: No, if I may make it clear and I am sorry if you were misled, the reason was not excessive length. The reason was that two questions were disposed on one and without seeking to imply that you were attempting to do so, Members have been known to try to get more than their fair share of questions set down for a particular day, by arranging two, three or even half a dozen questions and supplementaries to precede them on one. One of my tasks is to seek to discriminate when questions should really be treated as two questions for the purposes of Standing Orders. It was that, and nevertheless tonight which tempted the question answered.

MR. ROBERT A. PEARSON: Mr. President, about your ruling, Sir, I think that if we have a look at the questions as they were set down on the question paper it is quite clear that there is a logical relationship between the two questions and that they are not separate questions.

MR. PRESIDENT: I accept that they are connected but then it does seem to me, nevertheless, to be two separate questions for the purpose of Supreme Orders. However I am aware of the fact that if they are so closely related that for your purposes it is necessary to be able to ask them one after the other, then I am sure that we can accommodate your wishes. Please speak into the microphone so that the Secretary and the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee. Meanwhile, if you wish to withdraw this supplementary question, then let me take Item Six Supreme Orders. I have not yet found a seconder for it. Can you refer me to the Standing Order under which you are seeking leave to withdraw the question?

MR. LAWSON A. PIERCE: The Standing Order under which I am seeking leave to withdraw the question is 10(2)(f) which states:

"A question shall not be asked -

(f) which relates to matters already decided by the House."

I believe that part of my question was answered yesterday. To go looking the Report which is already related in the first order would be of no relevance at all. My second supplementary was to the point of the ruling. In future before any questions are put and for clarification under the Standing Order seeking the question should be told, because for me to ask the second part today to receive not going to make very much sense.

MR. PRESIDENT: Since the Member seeks to object I am certainly prepared to give leave for the Member concerned to withdraw his question although I have not found a Standing Order yet which I can readily satisfied entitles me so to do.

I have been given notice by the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council that he wishes to make a statement in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 9(1). I will therefore invite him to do so now.

STATEMENT BY THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

HON. W. ROBIN DIGBY: Mr. President, I wish to inform this Honourable House that it is necessary for the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council responsible for Development and Natural Resources and myself to be absent from the Meeting this afternoon and subsequent Meetings which will be held during the remainder of this week. The reason for our absence is to attend to urgent Cayman Airways business with top level Government officials in the United Kingdom and the arrangements of this House in this matter will be appreciated. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDING: The next item on the Order Paper is the consideration of the debate on the Throne Speech and Budget Address. That question is now open for debate.

HON. MICHAEL J. FORRESTT: Merely a technicality, Mr. President, Sir. Should the Senior Member [illegible] Second Reading tomorrow....

MR. PRESIDENT: Well I think it should. I was counting them the Order Paper we had been before us. I think it does you quite right that it is the Second Reading Debate on the 5th November 5TH, 1985. That is technically what we are debating. Now any Honourable Member wish to speak? I find it difficult to believe that nobody wishes to speak. However, if nobody does I shall be bound to invite the mover of the motion to reply. Even then, I should invite the mover of the motion to reply. Does no Member wish to speak?

HON. EDWARD R. MAPPIN: Mr. President, I am taken by complete surprise, Sir.

MR. F. MARSH: Mr. President, since none of the Members and many Members of the House do not wish to speak I am wondering whether the House will allow some Ministers and Members with the motion [illegible] afternoon.

MR. PRESIDING: We can take the debate on the Appropriation Bill for today and if not have concluded, if no Member wishes to speak, which rules me by surprise, I think in this future we will have to find some convenient way of determining the order in which Members speak. Because already it is not going to be satisfactory for the House either to recall a position in which nobody is willing to speak first, and indeed everybody wishes to speak next to last and so nobody rises at all and we are in silence for a long time, or indeed to reach a position in which the mover normally does rarely and succeeds in denied a chance of speaking. I am sure that Members do wish to speak,

MR. G. MARK PEDDLE: Mr. President, under Standing Order 58(3) I would like the question read to me.

MR. LAURENCE A. SPENCER: Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, surely.

MR. LAURENCE A. SPENCER: I was just going to advise that I would speak the last.

MR. PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon? You said that you should speak the last. Well I think so. It is perfectly true that a motion could be put under Standing Order 58(3), but I think that it would be premature. Standing Order 58(3) unfortunately it appears to the Speaking Officer that the motion is an abuse of the rules of the House, or an infringement of the rights of the minority. The question should be put forthwith. I think that it would be an infringement of people's rights to put that question straight away. If the Honourable Elected Member for Pesaro does still wish to speak,

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I think I would be remiss in my duty, Sir, if I did not at this appropriate time, I would like both to thank you for your comprehensive, timely and well reasoned State Speech and to congratulate the Honorable Minister of Finance, the Senior Official Member for a Budget Address which is clear and well set out. As he is to be commended, also, for the improvements and proposals which he has brought to bear on the contents of the Budget Address.

Mr. President, it was President Kaunda who said the following recently after taking office as the White House, and I quote:-

> "The task we will have is not an easy one. It reminds me of those chaps in rowing who did the training, and for three or six months what they have done is a monotonous, dull series of exercises. The path we follow seems very far from any fruit that the Government and Party have to offer at the moment. It is a path responsible to follow which is the collective wisdom and genius of the people. Many more hard sacrifices will have to be made, I am sure, before the path of the socialist society."

I believe, Mr. President, that these words of wisdom are as applicable today to the people of the Cayman Islands as they are to the people of that great nation of America.

Mr. President, in listening to the presentation of the Throne Speech and the Budget Address, one might find time to further underline their contents, I am sure we have many people readily appreciate the serious responsibility which we the representatives of the people have undertaken in assuming the stewardship of the management of Government and the accountability of the public purse. Mr. President, I believe that the people have voted in the result of the recent election that they wanted certain changes. Whether these changes will be good or bad for this country will be seen over the next few years. I also believe, Sir, that we have a good Government and that the people of this country will stand by [illegible] how the choice which they have made. However, Mr. President, I would like to point out that [illegible] Mr. President, I sincerely trust, Sir, that the Opposition is sincere and that they are ready to co-operate, and that they will, in the true democratic fashion for the benefit of this country; that we will cease to deal with matters by [illegible] and to take a responsible stand over the next few years. It has been as I have said before, Sir. Our people elected us to give them good representation not to stand here and quibble over issues. I heard remarks such as "absurd". I heard other irresponsible remarks and this happened after hearing the attention of this Honourable House to the fact that it was previous the Standing Orders of the House to use such remarks.

Mr. President, Sir, when to the Members of this House on this honourable [illegible] can be taken away of us forget the most important of today here. The purpose as I said, Mr. President, of today, here is not to criticize each other. Any time you do that, Sir, and I feel that with the number of very good councillors who run in the last election, those elected by the people should be acknowledged the power of the vote, but see us, Mr. President, when we behave as if we are coming out of the prison.

MR. LINDSAY A. STEVENS (GUYANA): Mr. President, I believe that we need to learn a lot of patience in this House. I would just make a few remarks, Sir, if I could speak with honesty and sincerity that the behaviour of the Members in this House is something which could be emulated by the young people of this country. I believe, Sir, that the mentality of some of the Members is that standing is a sign of their intelligence. We want intelligent representation for our people. We do not want to have a lot of Members who run just about at each other.

So I should, Mr. President, maybe can start. We want to get some intelligent discussion, not just absurdity for the sake of amusing.

Mr. President, I believe, Sir, that it was that great President of the United States, President Lincoln, who reminded the people that a good Government is one which seeks to give the system, representation for the people, of the people and by the people. Any time, Sir, that we have weight of the fact that we are here to represent the people then it is the time Sir, I feel that we should be man enough and woman enough to handle our responsibilities, because we are no longer merely of the Chamber which the people of this country have placed in our hands.

Nevertheless, Sir, of our political leaders I feel that we cannot lose sight of the fact and the purpose of our being here. We must work together. We must put a lot of the politics out. Of course we will have political leaders as one Member said yesterday, we are politicians. Nevertheless you are going to have politics, that nine month we have in this House. However let us have intelligent and wise politics, Sir.

I commend you, Sir, for the very remarkable way in which you conduct this House and I am proud to know that when one of us gets out of place you are the first to put us in order. I hope they this will continue that I also hope, Sir, that when any other person of our Country wishes to express the same diligence will be given. I am sure, Sir, that you will do this.

I want to know, Sir, that after I have spent four years in this House I can look at my people and they will say to me, "Well done thou good and faithful servant", and they will also say to me, "You have been faithful over the little things over the last four years; now we will reward you for the next four years". However, Sir, I am afraid that there are many of us who will have. "Depart from me, I know you not". This will be said by the people of this country unless we give them the form of representation which they deserve. No Member of this House have ever been elected. It was the people of this country who elected to put us here. We have elected Members of this Parliament have been elected that is for us to join together in supporting the Government there.

We I said a few days ago I will support what I think is right. I have heard remarks such as "intimidation". I have heard remarks such as "Dictatorship". I ignore these remarks because as many Members think. I am not easily intimidated. I do not see other Members of the House who will intimidate me. I am not afraid of them so I pay no attention to those people and remarks remarks. My only intimidation comes from the people ... ... only Member of this House. What I want to tell the House, Sir, is a situation where the Members of the Back Bench, from time of a better term, can approach the Government Members and expect to get a sympathetic and honest answer to their problems.

MR. LEWIS A. SPANO (CONSTITUENT): Sir, I must admit that I have found it very easy to work with the members of the Government bench. So far, Sir, some of the promises which I made to my people in my constituency have already been realised. I must give thanks where thanks are deserved. Some of this came about through the co-operation of the Members of the Government bench. Of course, perhaps, I am inclined a bit in that two of the three Members for George Town are Members of Executive Council. So they have a vested interest in seeing that some of my promises are fulfilled because we stand for parties with the same ideas.

Mr. Speaker, remarks were made shortly after the election that I would be put to cold storage because I did not give allegiance to any particular party. Mr. Speaker, I see my position as that of representing my country in general, Sir, and the George Town constituency in particular. However, I also owe my allegiance to the Members of the Government Bench that I would give them my full support. But I must again make it abundantly clear that my full support will only come if the matters which I am supporting are matters I feel I can live with; matters which I feel are in the best interests of this country. This is why, Sir, I reluctantly oppose the Income Bill, because I did not feel that these Bills were in the best interests of this country.

I know the reason for these Bills was to put the people of this country. However I also feel, Sir, that there are many other ways of getting income instead of increasing the liabilities of the public people in this country. Let nobody fool you, there are a lot of little people in this country. We like right small a beautiful and high standard of living, but I asked a question this morning. Who are the beneficiaries of such a high standard of living? I meet a lot of people, as a matter of fact, Sir, I have opened the doors of my office to my people in George Town. My number is listed. My people can call me at any hour of the night. I have not yet been reviewed enough to get an office in the Lower Building but then, Sir, this to me is not important at this point, because I have opened the doors of my office to the people. They know that any time they want to see me they can see me.

I was amazed to know, Sir, that remarks were made that some of the Members from other constituencies do not see the people of their constituency. The only thing I can say, Sir, is that some constituencies are bigger than others. If there is a constituency with five people it is much easier for them to be able to meet their representative than it would be for 3,000 or 4,000.

We must also not lose sight of the fact, Sir, that unemployment constituencies people may be responsibly given. I have also, Sir, set aside one day a week when I do nothing else but see members of my constituency but this is in addition to seeing them as they come to see me. During this morning of how these I come out at 8.30 a.m. sometimes 8.15 a.m. At that I see many people, before I have to come home at 10.00 a.m. I also leave here and return to my office, where we do not leave here at 5.00 p.m., and I accept in the business of this office and see my people.

This is the most of Mr. Speaker that we must have our responsibilities. We do not need to go on the front page of the newspapers every week, Mr. to convince the public that we are doing our jobs. Our jobs should be done in the committees. This is where our contribution is needed, not

MR. LORENZO M. TAÑADA (Continuing): on the front page of our media, I would have hoped to have seen before you, Sir, a comprehensive economic policy for this country. I will not add duly my call to administration to appreciate the dimension of fundamental problem which could beset our little people. Before a strong indictment is rendered I want to make it abundantly clear that I do not support any form of direct intervention. However, I should also make it abundantly clear to those who may not know that there are other forms of rendering assistance other than we have been accustomed. I believe, Sir, that it would be in the best interests of this country if we seek to find out these forms of rendering assistance.

Secondly, Sir, we were dealing with twenty cents things; five cents on a chicken; ten cents increased to fifty cents on package war. We passed this situation twenty years ago. We are dwelling twenty years behind a sophisticated and mature industrial society. The people of this country are very wise people, Sir, as one always told this. People come here and say we are so nice. How long will this sentiment last on as a government sometimes to assuage the little people in this country, what happened to the question I asked here in September regarding the establishment of a commodity corporation before our people? I was told that this would be looked into by the Cabinet. Unfortunately, Mr. President, I cannot put a time frame on "the cabinet". How do I go back to my people and tell them that I will look after their problems in the cabinet. They will then accuse me to take it if I am still looking at these problems "in the cabinet".

Sincerely and, Mr. President, that the need to sell is armed with good intentions, Mr. President, within the scheme of our development we cannot and we must lose sight of the fact that we import our own country solely on good intentions, or some strictly on a business basis. We are working a Government and the Government takes into account not only the business aspects of the country, but also the social aspects.

While there is room to be sure in favour of the commercial business approach within our system, Sir, such an approach could tend to ignore the needs of those whom we who are desperately in need. I have heard a lot of people talk about the very high cost of living in this country. The inequity of the system, Sir, is that the same person which the little man on the I used him to pay in the supermarket is also employed in the mine who is getting perhaps $2,000 a week. But now, the system continues to expect stability which is the key to our future if we are going to constructively oppress the little people in this country.

Mr. President, I identify with the little people in this country. I appreciate the full constitutional responsibilities of the race, religious background, financial involvement or whatever of the people. However, I think, Sir, that we cannot lose sight of the fact that there is a major problem in our social and environmental structure in this country. Many of us like to say that there are no problems in this country. There are no serious problems, there are no social problems. Who are we kidding? This is a lot of nonsense, Sir. There are a lot of problems in this country, Sir, and we know about it. Let us be honest and call a spade a spade. We have a lot of problems in this country and it is time that we pull our heads out of the sand like the ostrich, and recognise these problems and do something about it before they develop as some of our neighbouring Commonwealth nations. We want to continue to live in peace and prosperity, but this will only be possible if we have a determined effort to keep it that way.

MR. LEONARD A. STEVENS (CONSTITUENCY): Mr. Speaker, this country, this Government, all Governments should have a certain level of humanity. In other words, they should have a heart. This country has only to speak for all of us when we appreciate and consider the problem of the little people. I have been privately, Sir, as I said yesterday of having a physician of the little people, but I take this as a commitment, because somebody has got to be the champion of the little people. Whatever we want to refer to them as the little people or not they are most important in the present and future development of this country, because it is the majority of the people in this country who are outside the economic input this country will take in the future.

One of the problems, Sir, that the Jamaican economy is what it is today is because of the changes brought about by the little people under their responsible or guiding. Under any democratic system the little people will ascertain to decide on those issues and on those matters. So if we foolishly push our hands under the bomb, Sir, we have only ourselves to blame. Her majesty's Canadian Queen Elizabeth, Sir, is one of the richest in the world today, richest than the Caribbean. This is a fact of life. Our society knows from what? Eighty per cent of the wealth in this country is owned by a small minority, so when you point to the income of this country a lot of the people who you say earn "x" income a month or a year is in reality a fallacy. This is not the case. What are we doing about the high cost of medical care in this country? Is there any comprehensive policy in the making to provide those who cannot pay their way?

I have heard a lot of people saying that when they go to the hospital, unless they have the money to put up front they are denied treatment. I know, Sir, that this system works for all people, but are there people where they are not getting assistance through the social Services Department? What are we doing to help our people aware of their rights in this country? There is a lot of discomfort in many areas of Government today. One of the greatest complaints I hope heard is perhaps about the hospital staff. Our own people are complaining that they are not being treated properly.

Why is it, Sir, that Canadians are not given the preference where they are qualified, to fill jobs? Where Canadians are available why are they not given the opportunities for training? Sometimes, Sir, when I go in the Government Ministries Building I feel that I am in London. Why do we not have more Canadians in some of these positions? I had a young lady who came to my constituency office. She has been told that her performance is not good and therefore are prepared to be kept in the job. What is going to happen to this young lady? From talking to the young lady she appears to be in the public employment and I believe, Sir, that I have the capability of helping one's shortcomings.

I have a lot of people, Sir, who have come to me complaining about the Immigration Department of this Government. Canadians seem to be treated like dirt. Why is this happening? I do not want to mislead here but may Canada for Canadians. I only would say it if I felt genuinely that Canadians would fill the positions. Sir, if one were to take a census now of the number of non-Canadians in jobs which could be filled by Canadians, it would be shocking, Mr. President, I am not for Nationalism in our economy and indeed in our society. I hope no racial tensions. The reason why I have no racial tensions, Mr. President, is that I see it as unhealthy. I see no need for having a hatchet. The only time I will feel it is if I regard

MR. GIBBONS: A. [illegible] the next man on having better than me. However, I do not have that sort of discretion and therefore there is no need for hesitancy. There are a lot of our people who are being squeezed though. In my conference I stated, and I wish to quote a short paragraph of it:

> "In our rapidly developing financial community it is not reasonable to suppose that we can produce in the short term the required number of lawyers, accountants, bankers and others locally with the necessary expertise to ensure the proper expansion and development of the industry."

I recognize that, Mr. President, and this is why it is a basic part of my manifesto which I intend to live up to over the next five years and the next four years. I believe that the key to successful long term development of the financial industry is interaction of the Caymanian professionals, not replacement of the expatriates. The term expatriate here is intended in its broadest sense to include all who are non-Caymanians regardless of ethnic or national origin. So before anybody leaves these premises and gets the impression that I am saying Cayman for Caymanians, let him first again. Let him realize me properly. What I am saying is that positions which Caymanians can profitably fill should have the first option and the first chance given to them of getting those positions.

Mr. President, I have often heard [illegible] in Cayman in this and in the Legislature. This worries me, Mr. President, because these people who are shouting loudness know nothing about the history of this country. The basic foundation of this country, Mr. President, was built on the industry and hard work of Caymanians. It was the Watlers, Bulls, Ebanks, Eldemires, Boddens, Parsons and others who built the foundations of this country. We would not have a financial offshore operation today or a vibrant tourism operation if it had not been for the foundations laid by our forefathers. With the limited education of many of our people, Mr. President, they were able to take those chances and stand by themselves who had the opportunity of college and university education. Today some of those people are amongst the greatest bankers and tourism engineers in the world, with unlimited ability to become master engineers of unlimited tonnage.

Mr. President, I would ask that people resident in this country who are visiting here and those very little about the history of this country please refrain from coming to Cayman for two and four days and then [illegible]. Anybody coming to this country who does not like the way of life in this country should leave. When you go to Rome you do as the Romans do. I am not suggesting, Mr. that we cannot learn from those people here, because we have learnt a lot. Most of the people from these shores and coasts when they are on a maintenance basis are surprised by expatriates. I am happy to see this happen. I believe in progression and I believe that we can learn a lot from them, however, I want them to desist in referring to Caymanians as lazy and not enthusiastic.

Mr. President, it takes for us to live in peace and harmony in this country as much progressive and to make investments that exist in my estimation in this country today would not have been possible if it had not been for the foundations laid by our forefathers. We tell the visitors coming here that the Cayman Islands are the most stable country in the world. [illegible] Mr. President, or how it built over a number of years by our forefathers?

MR. CLIFFORD A. PIERCE ROCKEFELLER: We hear people speaking here today, the people saw no jurisdiction, they are silent, and this is what some about? I say no, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I intend to be talking for a much longer period and I know that this is the worst time for a break. I do not know if you might not to stop at this point?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think we should go on for another ten minutes or quarter of an hour. If you will still be comfortable then after that we will take the break.

MR. CLIFFORD A. PIERCE: Mr. President, I notice an impression on the debate of the Charge Report of this country, a picture which arises as a witness of the political determinism for this country, and a notion an impression to the Budget Address must be given all-political time to be addressed. I would be grateful and it would be an benefit to the people who did such a wonderful job for me to please give some of their comments.

Mr. President, still on the question of this country, I said in my manifesto that Ghana were certain tenets of democracy which I believe in. Those tenets of democracy I am happy to say, are very evident in our society; existence of the basic human rights and freedom including freedom of religion, speech and the press, freedom of the courts and also might be have the basic necessities of life provided.

Mr. President, I think I am well enough aware of the attitudes which exist in the world today and I also think, Sir, that within my system we have to have the checks and the balances, all I am asking here, Sir, is to bring to the attention of this Honourable House that the gap between the rich and the underdeveloped is widening. So we all talk, Mr. President, and the beautiful country go into ruin. I have nowhere else to go and many of my people have nowhere else to go. Therefore on what precedence that we have.

Mr. President, I unanimously supported the Emergency Powers which are used by many of the people who happen to hold them. We are going to put some of our people out of the enjoyment of their society, Mr. Vice-Chairman, and this would not in the case of only a little punishment but imprisonment had been imposed. Mr. President, with a bit more understanding many of the problems facing our people today could be effectively addressed. We heard about the Ogoni Petroleum not minding all the pollution on the environment with the recognition that it is on the Ogoni Islands today I hear that the situation still exist wrong, not out of hand, Mr. President, but out of necessity.

We need to ventilate this economy, Mr. President. We know to stimulate this economy in encouraging investors to come here, not by discouraging them by increasing them with those petty taxes and import duties which affect them directly. When I see any member here, Mr. President, I want to be in house that is in my opinion and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of others in this House.

Mr. President, I see the major function of any Government as that of encouragement to make it easy for the people of the country to do this. It is not for them to do it. So until we have a responsive and accountable set of legislators we do have today under the Fourth Planning Law. How can the people of this country ever still survive such a repressive piece of legislation. On one hand, Mr. President, our Executive Council are the ones to open up the West for some to come in with the sundry to get whatever advantage of Ghana they want; they can do all, the Ogoni

MR. LEMMON A. PIERCY (continued): If you cannot afford it... Unfortunately, Mr. President, all people cannot afford it. The people around Nampa have asked without fail, the people who use the little restaurants around town seem to be on the busy main beach, because it is packed out of their ears. And so protecting the interests of our little people, Mr. President, since we do that, why should not such an economic decision be brought before this House? I know, Mr. President, that anyhow, so as much the negotiations is done by the Governor-in-Council, but I feel that a matter as important as this should have been brought to this House the same way that we will be bringing the Liquor Monopoly Bill forward to this House.

We are seeking, Sir, to make certain changes which will make life better for the people in this country and I know, Sir, that there are going to be a number of Members who will not support these changes. However, when the division is not on 1958, you can bet that I am going to live by my convictions, I might not agree to one on 1959 anyway.

Mr. President, we have to have legislation in this country which is just for all our people, we cannot be catering to any special interests because we cannot be listening to any particular section of our society. We have to look at the interests of all the people of the Province. In particular, Sir, we seem to antagonize ourselves many time we turn around. I think of the establishment, Sir, in Grand Falls, a tremendous establishment; one which employs over a million dollars if not more. But the operation of this establishment is being changed of course having still to meet the capital and investment expenditure under this Liquor Monopoly because we have a lot of people who went to tremendous personal expense of borrowing money to erect themselves.

So this more difficult, it seems middle-class, Mr. President, that that same establishment can get a number of necessary licences as long as he runs it in the interest. What are we dealing with, Mr. President? Is this a joke? If it is wrong it is wrong. What happened to the majority to the money coming from the sale of liquor in this establishment? I wonder, Sir, if any member of the church, maybe the Protestant, necessarily might object where the money was coming from when he was getting an opening?

We accept all grants, Mr. Canal - Mr. President, but we realize overall, Mr. President, that one may want to be necessary because everybody knows that you are a wonderful President. You could assume to be referred to as a canal.

MR. PRESIDENT: Now sit a good I know, Lemmon!

MR. LEMMON A. PIERCY: Mr. President, a little humour is a good thing because I do not want my fellow politicians to get too serious. I just want them to relax and listen to some good common sense.

Mr. President, shortly we will be dealing with some very important pieces of legislation and I repeat, Sir, that we are going to let our conscience be our guide. We are going to think of the interests of people in Churchill's government, of people in Bonavista's government, of people in the Straits Shore government. I could think of a number of places. I know of Fogo area, Mr. President, when up to twenty people have entered their establishments for food, and when they were told there that they could not get more a glass of wine they walked out and went right across the street to a place which was much nearer to the church.

MR. SPEAKER (PRESIDENT): Because that place was in operation before the coming into effect of the Liquor Licensing Act it is still given the opportunity to get licences every year. Mr. President, I mentioned earlier that a system is a proven system, for most of the time the Liquor Licensing Act creates what you must comply. It does not say that there will be an automatic renewal. A reapplication is a reapplication. You cannot say that because that establishment had a licence somehow you are entitled automatically get a renewal. If we are going to be looking at the various effects that has we must keep that in the mind.

Mr. Speaker, we must take a very close look at the adverse effects such a system of backlog on the courts. As I said earlier, Sir, without wanting to be repetitive any good Government will have to make this work for the people. It will not make it acceptable for them to go until. Mr. President, I notice how are....

MR. DEPUTY: I did not want to interrupt you on the matter of a witness but I was getting worry to take evidence of some another after to mentioned personalities. If that is acceptable I will do this now. If you are finishing....

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Then in this case I will suspend proceedings until approximately 11.55 a.m.

I would like to move Number 1 of the Order Paper which requires my going which requires that I leave the Chamber for the purpose of the Chief Official Number of Executive Council to preside over the proceedings after this short break until 11.55 a.m.

At 11.35 a.m. the House suspended

SPEECH DELIVERED BY [illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. I would invite the Second Elected Member for George Town to continue his debate on the Throne Speech and Budget Address.

DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1969) BILL, 1968 CONTINUED

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. Speaker, before taking the break I was dealing with some of the mental ills in this country. What last night listening to the radio, Sir, I got some very disturbing news indeed which I am sure many of us heard. It was that one of the females institutes in the North of us, Turks and Caicos, the Chief Minister of that country and others were involved in certain drug related charges. Mr. President, I am wondering, Sir, whether before the Honourable Second Official Member takes to get your attention if we should not take note, Sir, that we.... There is no necessity for the Member to get up. I will not be expending that energy. So one sees how breath,...do not make a grave mistake if we do not attempt to ensure the detection system which may exist once there is not allowed to creep into our society.

I believe, Sir, that what I have said in public knowledge because it was broadcast on the radio last night so I do not think that I am out of order for saying it here.

Mr. President, a part of my manifesto dealt with the mental services in the Cayman Islands. One of the points in my manifesto stated that I would support a system within our social services responsibly designed to alleviate the difficulties of the less fortunate thinking the mentally wrecked areas of the society. I believe that it is necessary to ensure an endeavour by Government to provide better housing facilities for those individuals normally in need of such a system.

Mr. President, I have been responsible in my discussions with the people, not only in my constituency but also from other communities in the Cayman Islands that housing is a major problem. While very recently before coming to this Honourable House a lady came to see for advice and also some assistance with her rent. This lady can ill afford some of the high rental charges being charged. Mr. President, that lady was fortunate because she had a place to live in. She could at least afford some of the rent. The situation which I have experienced with some of the people is that many of them are unable to meet any element of the cost of rental. What can we do today, Mr. President, to assist those people before it is too late, not only in the social structure of this country but also for the peaceful future development of this country? A prosperous Cayman Islands, Mr. President, will largely depend on the consideration and interest we give and place on all our Caymanians regardless of wealth, ethnic or social background. This is another section of my manifesto.

This country should be good for all and I will therefore support any efforts designed to enhance the financial and economic well-being of all our people, bearing in mind that such reward will depend on the appropriate individual effort. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not believe

MR. TIMOTHY A. STEARNS (CONTINUED): In many ways, I believe that our people should be given the opportunity to live in this society. I do not want to see a welfare system in this country but we must build such a situation only if we become a little bit more responsible to the needs of our people, particularly the needs of our people.

I believe, Sir, that more attention must be given to combining the long programs by president for social needs in this country. Mr. President, if these cuts are implemented we will inevitably encounter some economic problems in social disturbance.

Mr. President, the circumstances in this country is becoming major programmers and we cannot ignore the fact that it is having a very damaging effect, not only on the lives and conditions of the people in this country, but also on its security as a whole. All these individuals who are getting discouraged by drugs and other illegal acts are enemies of society. In the middle to late seventies many of our people were involved in a level of living, to an affluence not before seen in this country. And these people are becoming accustomed to which they became accustomed to and they are finding it very, very difficult indeed to adjust. This is one of the major problems why they resort to establishments which engage in illegal means. What is our social services department doing to identify some of the establishments which exist in this community? How we trying to get these social problems in these areas or is we continue to neglect our duty? I to look after them?

We have a report and an effect and we are only dealing with the effects, Mr. President. It is all well and good for us to say that we will spend our just to take care of the trouble instead, but our greatest concern, Mr. President, should be to prevent any more of our young people going into jail.

Mr. President, a major section, a major area of my manifesto deals with prison conditions and the upgrading of the person's conditions. I said in my manifesto that I should endeavour to improve our prison conditions, and ensure that proper rehabilitation programmes are provided for people to enable them to fit into society on their release from prison. More attention must be given to re-establishing the families to help to prepare them to cope with some of the many social problems which they encounter. There is no doubt in the Cayman Islands which can stem directly from the evils of the society. Four children and my children can be victims of the society.

Mr. President, last Thursday I had the unhappy experience of visiting Her Majesty's Prison. I was very unhappy because I entered the prison because I was invited the Warden of the prison as known before and if it was not for the grace of God many of us would be there today. However, Mr. President, somehow we have not realized up to those people who we have them to put. This when they come back into society to create them like first new-citizens, Mr. President, that they have paid their debt to society. Therefore, Sir, that provision to bring back in this budget for the extension of certain prison facilities. In fact I will personally be asking, if it is not there already. That provision be allowed, but I believe it is in front in the budget.

Mr. President, we need a proper rehabilitation programme for our prisoners. We do not want a situation, Sir, where as soon as they are released back into society they find themselves back in prison. We want to know,

MR. LEROSS A. PIERRE (Interpreter): Sir, that compels such gratitude to the opportunity for those who are being granted to reform themselves. This can be done only through a proper rehabilitation system. In my visits to the prison I had the opportunity to talk with the Director of Prison Services, a man for whom I have a lot of respect; a man who is experienced through many years. Also, Mr. President, both hands are answered when for lack of facilities. The space provided for combatting disease for some of the prisoners has had to be used for the prison officers when the prison was built in Bonabeng. I think there are the provisions including lavatories when I visited there. Mr. President, people are crying out for help in that prison. There are people who have been kept on remand for up to four months and over. Because of the inefficiency of Government. I do not want to prove this, I am saying this before I am challenged. However, I think I have made my point. People before me on remand should be given as prompt a trial as possible. Why should they have to rot in prison for four or five months without the privileges and human rights of being heard.

In this democratic society, Mr. President, and in any enlightened society a man is innocent until he is proven guilty. When we allow him to be prejudiced, why, for us to four months before we can be heard then we are sentencing it. So are punishing him and punishing him guilty before he has had the chance of being heard. This is the most kyllnal case if it is not dismissed. It is the most effect, Mr. President.

This is one of the reasons, Mr. President, I have said a lot of attempts to the Judicial committee in this country. Not only in the penalties in the Courts such are which I represent, the problems exist in West Bay, Bobbie Town, Secret Side, East End and Cayman Brac, whatever. We have these problems, Mr. President. What can we think to address this? We have the Magistrates side taken to prestige in this country, but the understanding which I have of the situation is that they are reluctant to the thing of costly and that money is sufficient a Stipendiary officer to cope with this problem. To we place the problem aside and hope that it will disappear? If we did not recognise, Mr. President, would we pretend that it is not there until it declares war? I submit, Mr. President, that this Legislature problem is like a cancer in our society. Are we going to ignore the problem? Is this problem, Mr. President, and all the other individuals of problems which are affecting our youth today - regardless of our ignorance that there is a problem? Is it a result of our unwillingness to the problem?

Mr. President, I intend to use my privilege of this House to put forward a Private Member's Motion for the establishment of a youth centre in the Sister Town area. Without pre-empting the Members on this matter I would hope that they will see it in their hearts to support such a worthy motion.

Mr. President, I have my talk of George Town with some authority because I know the problems in George Town. However, my motion will not seek to pinpoint that there is not a problem in other areas of the Cayman Islands, and I hope that in the situation will be given to all these areas. Mr. President, as Members have sight of the fact that the George Town District in the largest district in the Cayman Islands and we have a higher percentage of the problems within the George Town district. We Magistrates will have to travel overseas. My experience has been in the past, Mr. President, that when we try to deal with a problem in the general a purpose it end up not doing anything. It is all well and good for us to separate

MR. LORNE A. GREEN (CONTINUING): ... what the white colour female is looked into, but I say, Mr. President, that it is incumbent and imperative that the people in the House from time to time given urgent attention. We have many people, Mr. President, anti-social people which are causing tremendous problems in the Georgetown and Stanley and I would rephrase it actually that's gonna run into problems. I would further just, Mr. President, that they are victims of a society which has ignored them right from the cradle.

Mr. President, when we consider the future of this country and we measure it in terms of a few thousand dollars. If this country is developed [illegible] then we are wasting our time. If a country is judged in only terms of this country and it measures the determination where would our economy go from there? We have a very fragile economy, Mr. President, an economy which is based primarily on the existence and the continued stability of our country. Stability is the key to our future, Mr. President, and if we allow this stability to erode, if we allow an invasion of this stability we will find the Cayman Islands gradually.

Mr. Speaker, as I was concluding in basically that the Cayman Islands is the only place which investors can go to. We are so lucky.

Mr. President, on Monday night I was fortunate to have dinner with a big developer in this country, a man who has spent millions of dollars here. One of the complaints which he made was that he cannot take his wife on their friends by way of our night since [illegible] the [illegible] are making a great. Why is this happening, Mr. President? I have very [illegible] that this happens. Why do we continue to ignore this problem? The way we handle it is that we do not go there, but we know it is our [illegible] coming here to [illegible]. One man observed [illegible] said to me that this [illegible] after the [illegible] area. We have the mentality building up in most of the young men [illegible] Caymanians should [illegible] and go overseas the beach where believing that the women are brought down here for their purposes. Much to [illegible] of our sons of the land they are [illegible] with their husbands or boy friend at the weekend.

Why is this problem occurring? Why have the problem not been addressed? Do we actually blame the young men who do this on the beach? Maybe if those nine young men were treated more favorably to a satisfactory and meaningful manner they would not find it necessary to go on the beach. These young men, as I understand it, do not take out [illegible] on [illegible] problems. But regardless of the seriousness it does not it still will use resources in this country unless something is done about it.

Mr. President, I hope my fellow Members in this House will support such a motion which would seek to establish a youth centre in George Town. Going back to the list of everything which is happening today, whether we agree or believe it or not. We have the community centre in South Sound just to suggest that the people in certain [illegible] this, I think would be [illegible]. Of course they could use it but we have to consider the practicality of the situation. We must be aware, Mr. President, where the greatest needs exist. We can often see the problem as some to us, Mr. President, instead of people to the problem. This is possibly one of the biggest problems today in our society. This is why even the churches have been [illegible] to the problem. They are no longer giving [illegible] the problem still come to them and be solved. [illegible] people like the

MR. HAROLD A. WILLIAMS (CONTINUING): Much has changed and others which are going into the areas which are the biggest problem areas in the country. They are trying to help.

Mr. President, I have also spoken to some of the developers in this country and got very positive responses with regard to candidates with the philosophy of such a venture. As I said, Sir, I feel that these developments, if they are properly approached, will create jobs across the country I hope, Sir, that the idea will not be taken disadvantage of in the electoral district. You should not have it.

Mr. President, while we need private participation and while I feel that it is highly unacceptable that we get private participation, I feel, Sir, that Government must take the lead in many of these areas. We cannot allow ourselves to be led all the time as one recalcitrant Member said yesterday. We cannot allow the lead to stop the day.

It is a pity, Mr. President, that we were forced to debate the Throne Speech and the budget address together. But I think this was the system used in past years. The reason I say it is a pity, Mr. President, is that there were many good ideas mooted by the Government in the Throne Speech. I would, Mr. President, that it pains me to have to split hairs and differentiate to debate those two important speeches separately. However, I will nevertheless plunge in and attempt to offer some ideas while I feel requires very urgent attention.

I was pleased to note the statement made in the Throne Speech regarding the peaceful and efficient manner in which the General Election was conducted. I feel, Sir, that much credit must be given to the people of this country for the way in which they conducted themselves. The multi-party system is very different and it was new for the very efficient manner in which one of our Magistrates, the Supervisor of Elections, Mr. Sammy Gupta conducted the whole election process. I think Sir, that he should be commended for a job well done. If I had it in my power I would give him the OBE because I think he deserves it.

Mr. President, my experience of the election and that it was the most efficient and well organised election I had seen in this country. I speak not only as a victim of the Laisenia Qarase as a person who served as Returning Officer in various elections. I was thoroughly impressed to learn that it is the intention of Members of this House to have some somebody added to our voting roll. It has come to my attention, Mr. President, that the reason for this is that several Members have a little upset that I had so many "nos" voted. What can I say, Mr. President, if my people come to give me one vote? Do you expect me to tell them no?

Mr. President, I feel, Sir, that if we are going to make any changes in our electoral law we should come about, and only some minor, but an important piece of legislation, very urgently considered, we can talk about providing electoral districts also overseas. We can talk about all this. I have been heard talk about internal self-Government and Independence for this country, but because of the things we failed because we could not, I will have more to say about this, Mr. President, when this matter is brought to this House.

MR. EDWARD A. DURKIN (CONTINUING): I do not want to overemphasize what I may say then. The point I want to make here, Mr. President, is that I think we had a very difficult political election and I feel, Sir, that when we decide to make any changes they should be in the best interests of this country as a whole and of any individual ethnical group, and they should be made in the total interest of this country, not from political motives. The people of this country voted on 1968 Democrats as they felt the Democrats to vote. They endorsed those Democrats. They nominated those who they wanted to represent them over the next four years. Why are we questioning what they did? We are here to represent the people. It is not for us to question whether they did right or wrong. We must give them the credit that they are very sensible people and they knew what they were doing. When we suggest to them that they should not vote for this man or that man because we do not like it, we are depriving them of their democratic rights.

Mr. President, until I got here I feel that a number of these votes were from a cross section of this political district. When I consider myself as a representative in the George Lane election I consider myself as a representative for all the residents of this district, be they white, black, pink, yellow, purple. It does not matter to me whatever I do not see racial barriers. Whether or not I will like somebody voted for me it would not matter. My duties are upon every one to those who may have opposed me personally I hope that I may be in a position to counsel them. Many of us make mistakes, Mr. President, and I am sure that many of those who may not have voted for me have already realized their mistakes.

Mr. President, we are here to represent the people and this is the point I am making. We are here to represent the people regardless of their political backgrounds. We must stop saying that, "Because you voted for me I am going to help you or because", or "because you voted for me I am going to help you in this or that", but "If you did not vote for me God help you, I am going to squeeze the life out of you". That is wrong Mr. President. We cannot have this in our society.

Mr. President, again I congratulate the Representative of Rhodesia. As we say many times before, I enjoy when I have the pleasure and privilege to work on different occasions. Mr. President, we have just been given the ability to deal with the Executive Law. I see no reason for any recess at this stage.

Mr. President, regardless of our personalities we should consider them . The Administration, out of many our people. Mr. President, we have a lot to protect. We have got to, the object of mutually in this country where we want to make sure that anything which comes to us for consideration into groups and actions; anything, Mr. President, which could cause us to create hostilities or groups where we find that this group belongs to this certain individual and another group is for another individual. We have been unfortunately about this, and it seems to be unlikely to encourage it. I want to see a situation in this country where cooperation and information exists with those in power and harmony. I want to see a situation in this country where there will have an harmony. We pass and the rest with life in harmony.

We have got to be careful not to fractionize a segmented attitude such as we have in South Africa or Rhodesia, or wherever. We have got to be careful not to introduce an apartheid system in this country. It will only destroy us. We have too many important things to think about,

MR. CLIFFORD A. PIERCE (CONTINUED): Mr. President, I share wholeheartedly concern with our legislation. Mr. President, we are moving into a period when more than ever our country needs efficient and sound policies. Right now, Mr. President, we should be considering a comprehensive energy policy for this country. We should be considering a comprehensive economic policy for this country. Mr. President, our energy and efforts should be ranked ahead this. Very much consideration has been given to the possibility of improving our present Treasury Bonds. And such consideration, Mr. President, has been given in order to establish a mechanism just for this country.

Many of us, Mr. President, may very initially that we are not supportive of such an idea. However I ask the question, Mr. President, how many of us understand what it entails? Before I look at a number and say that I do not agree with it I would try to understand what it is all about. Mr. President, I should not suggest here that I have the answer to all these problems. I would however suggest that I have some of the answers and I trust, Mr. President, that members of this side of the issue will indeed be given the opportunity to look into some of these areas.

I feel, Mr. that the opportunity should be given for certain flexibility exists to be examined and to determine the viability of some of these matters. It is very fine one to say that it cannot be done. If the Members had taken this attitude where would we be today?

Mr. President, I believe that we must explore many avenues. We cannot overlook to meet what options which are acceptable to the interests of the majority of the people. We cannot continue to actively only the views from the standpoint of the minority when it was the majority of the people who put us in this House.

Mr President, I would like to think that I am associated with forthcoming and Members who will deal with matters with an open mind. I would like to see an innovative approach taken with regards to the future development of this country. We have examined the materials, Mr. President, when we have given looking at the country's options in a mature and sophisticated manner. We cannot continue to have this country ruled by Hoopla arguments. We cannot have special interests groups in this country, running in the show and tell. We cannot have certain people in this country only to have it run as if it was their private business. Mr. President, on a world scenario, I do not think that this will be possible however. I have a lot of confidence in the Senate Members of Economic Council and the Honorable Official Leader. I also have a lot of confidence in the Members on the other side of this Honorable Chamber, Mr. President, in good faith and the Second Elected Member for West Bay.

Mr. President, my point is to have well enough alone, but on the more time for us not stagnate in our individuals. But we realize that the only way this country can be good for us is if we endeavour to make it good for all the people of the Cayman Islands.

Mr President, in summation, Sir, it is incumbent on this House that they scrutinize the effects of these changes both positive and adverse, and do a benefit analysis to determine which outweighs the other. We cannot make changes for changes' sake.

Mr. President, I was very pleased indeed to hear from the Honorable Minister with major emphasis to being pleased at the establishment of locally based pensions for Civil Servants. Too often I hear with Civil Servants and that they

MR. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS (CONTINUED): Services to the Government. I have this when I was first employed in 1953 and thereafter my interest grew in the Civil Service. When I left as the Principal Secretary for Higher Education and Social Services I was still learning this. I know the problems which the Civil Servants are faced with. I feel that much more must be done to retain our own people. I am very proud when I visit Ayrshire and I see some of the local Councillors, and I am not saying local Councillors is a derogatory manner because I think it is generally accepted that we have lost Bryce of Cunninghame and I have that gift. But when I say local Councillors, Mr. President, I mean Councillors here here. I want to see more of them getting their work done efficiently such as our very efficient Clerk of this House; such as our very efficient Financial Secretary and many other Councillors. However, Mr. President, I also want to know that Councillors are not pushed up the garden path because they are Councillors.

Mr. President, the whole emphasis is that our people be given the amount of training which they are capable of handling. Train our people to get these privileges, I am happy to see that this problem is encompassed and that you, Mr. President, in the Throne Speech have given consideration to the needs of having this done. Mr. President, I notice that it is getting close to 12.45 p.m. I do not know whether you would like to break at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I think this might be a convenient time for us to break now. It is my wish that we break at about this time. So I will suspend proceedings and we will resume at 2.15 p.m.

AT 12.45 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Apologies are received.
Continuation of the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. The Second Elected Member for George Town.

MR. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS: Mr. Speaker, at the break for lunch I was at the point in your Throne Speech where you said that major emphasis is being placed on the development of locally based courses for Civil Servants, and I applauded that as a very good move indeed.

You also said, Sir, that participation Government would be placed on middle management and I see this as an extremely good move in the development of this country. However, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have reached the stage in our training/development when we must also look into the areas of training for

MR. ERVIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Arends, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Ford, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bell, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Bray, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Springer, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mikva, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Collins, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Pucinski, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Rostenkowski, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Yates, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Annunzio, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Reid, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Derwinski, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Michel, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Railsback, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Anderson, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. McClory, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Erlenborn, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Hyde, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Madigan, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shipley, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Simon, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Findley, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Price, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Gray, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Russo, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Crane, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Fithian, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Hall, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shumway, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Leggett, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mitchell, and I am very much pleased to hear the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Whitehurst

MR. LAWRENCE A. FERRARO (CONTINUED): I am totally opposed, Sir, to any move in this House which would tend to look like discrimination. I am not going to be a party to any legislation or amendment brought before this House which would seem to be a discriminatory move. I am totally in favour of a comprehensive insurance scheme. We need a general scheme. We need a contributory pension scheme. However, Sir, I do feel that the uniqueness of this country must first be taken into account, but at the same time, Sir, I do not feel that it is right for us as a Government to indiscriminately shelve what was done by previous Governments.

I feel, Sir, that it is time that we as a country re-examined what previous Governments of this country, regardless of how far back this extends, have done a good job, our job here is to build on the good things and improve the bad things. How many Governments, Sir, are guilty of removing the landmarks and things done by previous Governments, but I would hope that this Government of which I am a part will also think carefully and not get involved in such petty issues. I feel confident, Sir, that the politicians we have in this Assembly, the fellow Members of this Assembly will indeed behave more responsibly.

As I said this morning, Sir, the major emphasis should be placed on the future development of this country. This is one of the reasons, Sir, why I asked a question in the House yesterday concerning the financial position of this country. The Governor in his wisdom decided part of that question and he was perfectly right because I made that the matter should be put to rest. However I think, Sir, that I must thank the Minister for Finance that the matter of the question of the financial position of this country at the 31st December, 1984, will now be put to rest. I hope, Sir, that we will decide from performing good services on the part of the past Governments, unless there are things that are going to be in the best interests of this country, unless like the referendum we can leave matters of importance the longevity of the human race.

Mr. President, one of our Members, the Only Member in this House is on a course in the United Kingdom and I am very happy that it was possible for him to now, unfortunately I feel Sir, that every opportunity should be taken and given to Members of the Upper Legislative Assembly to express themselves as well as will be a Legislative Assembly second to none in the world. I believe, Sir, that this is possible because we have the infrastructure and we have the enthusiastic personalities and this position.

All we as Caymanians have ever needed, Sir, was the opportunity. We are with our own system one million in the world. All we need is the opportunity. This is why, Mr. President, I support so strongly your view point to create our Civil Service, and I hope that the private sector will take cognizance of what you have done and will follow in the same path.

Mr. President, this morning I made brief mention of the need for the Caymanian public, inside and outside Government, to do all in their power to build the Cayman Islands for the good of one and all. This is why, Sir, I look to mention some of the good work which has been done by some of the social and voluntary clubs around these Islands. I can think of clubs such as the Rotary Club, Kiwanis, to name just some of the smaller clubs which have given so much good work. I feel, Sir, that it is important that they be given some recognition by

MR. SPEAKER A. SIENKOW (CONTINUING): ...Government. I speak especially, Sir, of the nice and beautification scheme which was instrumental in beautifying this country for the visit of Her Majesty the Queen. Today we see the results of that hard work of this committee when we drive along the road to the airport. I would hope, Sir, that this Government will support such a good committee by providing a small sum in the budget. I happen to know, Sir, that the Lepers Clinic up and beautification committee has a number of plans for further beautification projects, but these can only become a reality, can only be possible if sufficient funds are available. Most of the funds to date have been collected from members and shareholders in the private sector. I am happy to see here, Sir, that credit must be given to the Local Government for their donation to this Committee. I think the sum was something like $2,500 to $3,000. I would stand here also, Sir, that this money was well spent.

As a people of Tahanda, Sir, as a country we are not as blessed as many of our neighbouring Caribbean Islands which respect to the unique beauty which some of these Islands possess. They again, Sir, as some claimed with some of the best people in the world. So we also have our problem when it comes to endeavours to keep our Islands clean and beautiful. When one looks at the Ocean's Office surrounds and sees the beautiful flowers blooming there one should also realise, Sir, that these did not just come about, it was the determined effort of a group of dedicated people who used a lot of energetic and non-energetic time to secure an their assistance. I hope responsible funds to support this committee and I hope, Sir, that this will be forthcoming.

In view of the other areas of my manifesto I spoke on the need for adequate sums for the next few road. Again the Local Government must be congratulated on their efforts to do this. I am one who believes in giving credit where credit is due, but then we must live in the real. Also we are in the present and we have to look towards the future. I sincerely hope, Sir, that the projects which was started will be completed. As often, Sir, in driving along the West Bay Road, and indeed in walking along the West Bay Road I see concrete splashed by cars. I see them having to jump from pavement to street and I strongly, Sir, feel the introduction of pedestrian use a major step forward in the interest we place on the welfare and visit these Islands.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues raised in my manifesto was the improvement of the pedestrian roads around the George Town Hospital, but in general of the pedestrian roads in the Cayman Islands. The reason for this, Sir, is that these areas were badly neglected. I am happy to support, Sir, that already this year there are considerable improvements. As I promised my people during the election campaign I will continue to raise these issues on any issue which I deem in the interests of my people until I see action taken.

Mr. Speaker, you also mentioned in your Throne Speech that the most significant achievement in the last twelve months was the passing of the Companies Ordinance Law. I could not agree more, Sir, and while I can appreciate the delay in bringing this Law into operation due to certain matters to do with the seriousness and lengthy, I would, Sir, that this will be brought into operation in the very near future. Because under the present Companies Ordinance Law we have a set of legislation which is useless to our people. I think it is ridiculous, Sir, when we have some one hundreds of Companies who come into and cannot get a job because they cannot get a work permit in their own country. I would like to see more

MR. LUBEROW A. PARKER (CONTINUED): would interpose one of those days if this section of the Legislature could be established. As I said, Mike, a good Congressman is one which ensures that the voters legislation which can enable the people to do what is right.

Mr. President, I have had the privilege of foreign mates come to my office, Diplomatic ladies, crying about the situation which they are faced with. They marry Americans, Americans, Chinese or Chinese and come here, and their husbands are given the opportunity to stay on the Islands. Their husbands cannot work. Is this in the best interests of this country and our people?

If the case were, Mr. President, if a male Caucasian married a female from Europe or Caucasian, she gains his status and can work in the Caucasian industry. This is a gross inequity, and I would hope that very soon this can be brought into effect and such practices will cease.

I am not prepared to continue to tell my people that that is the way it is when in fact I am convinced that this is the way it should not be. One often, Mr. President, our people apply for jobs in this country and the qualifications required are so high that they could not even dream of getting the job. The remark that this is done many times is because these jobs are already filled. In many cases our Caucasians apply for clerical jobs, lower management jobs and middle management jobs, and they are told that they do not have the experience. How in the world can we expect a person to have the necessary experience for a job unless somebody gives that person the opportunity to get the experience.

Mr. President, this is a serious situation. We must have more than a passing statement on this situation. We must ensure that our legislation and resolutions are there to produce the Caucasian quotas. Why call it a Caucasian Protection Law unless it is designed to protect our people? I hope our speakers refrain to do so on the Caucasian Protection Law. Maybe that is more appropriate. Mr. President, we have to take a workable approach to the needs of this country and serve its various needs.

This cannot be done after hours. We always have the situation of a rushed and crowded. Inevitably, Mr. President, we find ourselves dealing with the effects. So before it is too late we must try to find out the causes and I submit, Mr. President, that one of the basic problems with our system today occurs at the school levels. Mr. President, statistics show us that only 25 per cent of our school population will indeed get the full 12 years equivalent of Level 12 at the completion grade rate of a grade 6 or above. I ask you today, this, whether the 75 per cent who remain should be pushed aside and relegated to the menial of unnecessary subjects as it is in the school system today? This is a totally unfair manipulation because we are not all meant to be academics. Therefore, Sir, I feel that more emphasis should be placed on the vocational and technical side of our schools. It is not enough, Sir, to provide a fixed workbook style to suit some form of manual work after and then feel that is the answer to the problem. Why should we have to depend largely on many persons, carpenters, steel workers and others from outside? Why must we spend millions of money in a matter every year? Where private has become profitable, when in fact the marine life of this country is almost gone? Why do we not become more practical to the needs of this country? A vocational and technical school should be built in this country. And I would hope, Sir, that this Government would please this as a top priority.

MR. LAWRENCE A. PEZZATI (CONTINUING): If we are to expect more investment in this country then we must attempt and endeavour to have properly qualified people. I heard an interview a few weeks ago saying that we cannot hope to have a private car manufacturing house established in this country unless we are prepared to take a different viewpoint in the training problems in this country, indeed to the point sometimes people coming here. This is true, Sir, I am pleased to hear the Premier state that the Government were prepared to consider these recommendations from Opposition Members. However, while I am pleased to see this I am nonetheless very concerned that every attempt must be given to the training of our own people. We should not attempt to ensure that our Tasmanian people are not involved, or are not encouraged enough to fill training posts. Once that the training and the opportunity was there we will see how well they do. If our good employees have anything to do with it, Sir, we have other Tasmanians who are capable of anything. I remember, Sir, during my days at the Court Secretary's in 1970 I left there almost to go to Brighton and I have told them that it was assumed at that my departure to take this family and go to England to pursue a higher qualification. I have said it was disappointing, but would I do it with the responsibility of a family.

The point is, Sir, that what we have done and are doing and I am pleased to say. Sir, that with initiative Tasmanians can accomplish anything. Mr. President, all we need is the opportunity. All we need is the chance.

Mr. President, I wonder sometimes that there are more nearly 400 or more unemployed in this country that I should submit, Sir, that those are only the people who have gone to and registered. I believe that there are many in the country that discourage that those people consider it a waste of their time to go and register if they feel nothing is going to be done. This has been the experience of their relations to me. Why waste their time in going to register at the Labour Office? As I said previously, I congratulate the members of the Labour Department on the wonderful job they are doing with Mr. Tibbie. This is the reason, Sir, why I just think the Labour Legislation which put the responsible aspect of this House. However, this does not in any way satisfy the fact that the people today are in need and there is no light at the end of the tunnel.

At the end of the second week this week we still do seeing another ten to three hundred people, our young people leaving school to join the ordinate system as possible source. Mr. President, where are the jobs? What are we doing as a Government to augment new economic base so that there will be more jobs in this country? What are we doing to encourage more industries to this country? The previous speaker - the Leader, the Honourable Member for Hobart and others are interested. Ways in which the Government to get a very serious question, Mr. President.

In the Budget Speech last Friday we heard the Honourable Treasurer's Secretary give a very comprehensive account of the contributions already being made to our State economy through the private sector. This is good enough, but how much longer can we continue to expect the private sector without offering them an equal encouragement. Mr. President, the Honourable Treasurer in his very comprehensive Budget Address gave a lot of valuable statistics. One such valuable statistic was that the hours now been transmitted in this country accelerated considerably in the 1970 figures up to 1971 million to the economy, I think the figure was. The point is that they contributed a major

MR. LEONARD A. SCARNEO (CONTINUED): ...of the funds which were thus due Kenosha.

One area of concern, Mr. President, is the restrictions which have been placed across legal fines in Virginia now because what the county when such restrictions are not equally placed on municipalities. The legal fines in this county, Mr. President, contribute $5.6 million to our economy and I submit that this could have a multiplying effect if we were not so restrictive with these fines. Why are we restricting the counties? Why are we encouraging more lawyers coming here when we have our local people who are qualified to fill these positions when these many fines have a very economic impact upon our economy?

I would hope, Mr. President, that consideration will take a much more flexible approach to the question of increasing lawyers to come to this country. While I am on the question of legal fines I must congratulate our Attorney-General under whose superintendency I understand, the law moved fairly, for the wonderful job which they are doing to involving our local people to eventually fill openings in these fines. I think it is a great move forward and I hope that one of these days I will see the same happening in the reconstruction projection.

Mr. President, the reason I believe for the Chesapeake and the Budget Act we which you will be receiving over the next few days will be for Members to have the opportunity to express their views on problems raised in these speeches. I do not recall, Mr. President, since we should please some one of these areas of the Governor's or the Budget Address. They are perhaps the most important speeches which will ever come to this House during this year. Mr. President, we must build the infrastructure facility for the continued growth and development of this country. By encouraging corporations to do business, for the continued growth and development of this country. By encouraging corporations to do business, I have several letters which have come to my attention from the Secretary of Commerce and Resources in which he points out the fact that the Governor's Budget does not provide for the construction of any new roads in the Commonwealth. Now, I am not suggesting that we should build roads for the sake of building roads, but I am suggesting that we must build roads to encourage industry to come to this State. Industry will not come to this State if we do not have the roads to get them to the markets. Industry will not come to this State if we do not have the water and sewer facilities to get them to the markets. Industry will not come to this State if we do not have the water and sewer facilities to get them to the markets.

Mr. President, in this Governor's Budget Secretary's Budget Address he stated that the incidence of industrial expansion affecting the personal public at large. Industry is always on the threshold of expansion. I am not going to recognize this. I would say that until he is totally right he is wrong. Mr. President, without question is the most responsible form of taxation because it provides an effort where the public people have the same burden in the same locality, a burden which they can all afford

MR. SPEAKER: (Interjection): Mr. President, I will move from this elegant lectern I am accused of calumniating a direct form of Caribbean language I am not.

As Saturday the Guyana Government and, that on Friday last as previously, one member of the Government front expressed some views of surprise as to my comments respecting the discussion topics which Caribbean countries can have on the Haitian people. My little people I never think of our Caribbean brothers. I must only say, Mr. President, that I have to accept as my constituency duties that I am only responsible of any Member of this House and the discussions affirmed which Caribbean countries can have on the Haitian people of any country. We are to be advised, Mr. President. We have to be in a position to have access to all the facts of a matter, this is why I still again state that we should be disturbed for this Government to make conclusions on issues which require technical expertise of those areas are not immediately available to them.

Mr. President, one should remember one's Parliamentary. The saying goes, Sir, and it is the home people as we are when it come world, "We shall endure but what he knows not is the second kind of person". I should not say a fool, but that is what it says.

Mr. President, we must wake up and realize that we are here in 1991. Until I [illegible] a Parliament member, Sir, we must have a better programme than we know when an economy needs to be inflated. We must know when an economy needs stimulation. It is now [illegible], Sir, to say that the budget is balanced but when I see the amount which has been cut of the capital budget I wonder where our people will find employment.

While I believe in "Guyanese Salvo" type of economy where the economy is stimulated knowledge to the [illegible] of good trade and of good business, and while I do not believe in state controlled economy, I believe, Sir, that this Government and this country must take cognizance of neighbouring countries where they are keen to exist.

Mr. President, I listened to the Honourable Financial Secretary, his Chief Officer Mrs. Joseph have between closing the Budget Address. He said inflation is to be stimulated for a Budget Address. The percentage of his stimulated closing 1990 is approximately two, Mr. President, here in history in the Guyana Islands. We are now in 1991. We must concentrate our energies and efforts on now and the future. Mr. President, the past few little persons relate events as a guide to what may come. As a matter of fact the present already contains much of the past. So we are doing recruitment when we try to avoid an increase of the past. I repeat, Mr. President, [illegible] the past we are controlled by one of the world's greatest geniuses no other than the great Confucius who warned us that we must study the past to avoid [illegible] the future. However, Mr. President, the message here today is that we do not live in the past.

My concern today is exactly what is our Government planning to do to stimulate the economy so that our people can be blessed in reasonable jobs. Mr. President, it is evident that Government now will have to embark on capital expenditure plans, that you compare the 1990 Budget with the proposed 1991 Budget. When the 1991 Estimates Budget is compared with the previous Capital Budget of 1990 the figure is nearly $20 million. This is an effort the current which we are having now of this country as a view which we should be trying to put funds into this economy to stimulate it. Mr. President, I guess it is not the only ones the figures we mentioned in

MR. EDWARD A. DUFFANY (CONTINUING): ...the proposed budget.

Mr. President, this is not intended to criticize any figure made to balance Main budget. The point I am making here is that this balanced budget will further stagnate the economy at this time. What do we do, Mr. President? We do not believe in a deficit budget yet we pay that because the budget has been cut for it to be balanced. It is a bad situation. The point I am making, Mr. President, is that we need to expand our economy and find other means of getting the necessary revenue. It does not mean that because we have not that all the money it is good for our economy, that we just owe country money to stimulate the economy. That is the use of the businessman's budget now, to have to come to this House in September time and ask for further supplementary appropriations.

Mr. President, it is the usual thing for any Government to set the pace for stimulating an economy. However, I will agree that because of the type of our economy the private sector has, to a large extent, set the pace in that respect. My question, Mr. President, I think will be answered in the months to come when we will be forced to come back to this House and ask for more funds because a balanced budget at this stage is perhaps unrealistic. I believe in a balanced budget if such a budget is realistic to this country's needs, but I am saying that putting $10 million out of our capital budget is not right for us at this period in time. Much has been said about the amount of money which was spent by the last Government, and I am one of the critics because I felt that a lot of the money which was spent could have been avoided. However, I also know that the spending of that money at the time was necessary in order to provide a lot of work for the people in this country.

We need to study the full impact of a budget on a country's programme and development. Very recently we read in the papers that President Reagan has again opened the door to limit the expenses one finds in that country's defence. Many recently we read that the Secretary of the Treasury in his attempt to stimulate the economy was pushing more funds into the economy. While we cannot compare ourselves with those great economies they certainly serve as a guide to us. In other words, Mr. President, that $10 million should be taken out of the economy from capital works alone that based on the 1984 revised figure, put at the same time over $1 million to provide for new services with out of this going into the Civil Service.

Mr. President, I would have thought that more attention at this point in time would be given to setting up some kind of annual. One month ago I heard that there was a move to strengthen the marketability of the services of the Public Service with a view to getting back on stream. However, in studying the new estimates being presented I wonder, Mr. President, whether we are not worsening the situation in regard to the Treasury of Barbados's loss. Whatever claims is a valid, Mr. President, that could will eventually be felled. I would like also the Senior Building that is mentioned and I shall say it again because I think that priorities were a good suggestion. But the remarks which I made then under still apply are that very soon there will not be any space in that building and we will be seeking other localities for staff. That is the opposition's view, of Parliament's Law.

Mr. President, my argument is supported by a more comprehensive and extended programme that is going to come in the coming months of $4.4 million increase in ordinary revenue. This was only possible [illegible] already heavily taxed

MR. [illegible] (interjecting): economic issues we already have raised against. Of the $84.4 million of ordinary revenue budgeted for 1985 [illegible] from export duties. How then expect we are to help the little people in this country. Does that mean we are responsible for helping the little people of this country, while they be necessary to keep the Government going the fact is that we should not be looking into other areas of expenditure cuts.

MR. SPEAKER: I notice that it is almost 2.30.

MR. [illegible]: Now, I was going to ask how much time would be a reasonable estimate to [illegible]. Because it would have that you are not quite finished. I will suspend proceedings until just before 3.45 p.m.

At 3.32 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

AFTER RESUMING AT 3.50 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. Continuation of the General Debate on the Appropriation Bill, 1985. The Second Elected Member for Georgetown.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, before taking the break I was [illegible] the reduction in the capital expenditure of almost $30 million which the revised 1984 figure is compared with the 1985 estimates. However, Sir, I would point out here that included in the revised 1984 estimates is an amount of $7.6 million which is composed of the costs of the Lands Building and the Airport Development. While, Sir, the Lands Building and Airport Development are no withstanding funds going into the ministry other than had originally been put there when the Lands Building was built, still we see the same figure as the $7.6 million for the Airport Development. So it is still quite not to know this situation existed or is felt that more further explanation on the issue [illegible] be given.

While I am on the question of the Airport Development, Sir, I feel that this is an opportune time as any for me to state that the Government responsible for that development should be highly commended. The airport development, now you are handed an Asian Airport to indeed one of the best small airports which I have seen in my service. Many of the people I have talked to have also expressed the same sentiments. I believe, Mr. President, that this new facility is an asset to this country and I believe, Sir, that it will enhance the tourist trade and indeed development of this country. I was thinking additional, Sir, if the second [illegible] of the airport, that it may not seem possible or necessary to give tourists to those [illegible]

Mr. LOPEZ de VICTORIA (continuing): ...such a possibility entirely possible. However, Mr. [illegible] the name of the game, politics.

Nonetheless, it brings out the point that such a possibility is something which all Caymanians can be justly proud of. When I visited the new facility at Owen Roberts Airport I was very favourably impressed. I had to pinch myself to make myself realize that I was still in the Cayman Islands. I am proud of that airport. I want to be most encouraged when I had to meet people at the old airport. I found every nook on the back to that then knew that it was just a temporary structure and that it would soon be replaced down [illegible] way, Mr. President, we have a structure which we can be justly proud of. I am proud, Mr. President, about Mr. William which I performed in it while one was part of the development of this structure.

Mr. President, it is noted under the capital budget that an amount of $5 million has been allocated to the development of our water and sewage system during 1988 and I believe, Sir, that within that the airport will be perhaps the second most [illegible] in this country. I hope, Mr. President, that such sum will be given the deserving which sometimes will be given to the [illegible]. From my understanding, Mr. President, again this is being handled in a forthright where I think quite a bit of experience is available, and I understand that the whole project will be monitored under a [illegible] with [illegible] where there will be some sum to handle contracts mentioned through the Tenders. Mr. President, there was some question as to whether this project should get [illegible] in the first [illegible] but I think that the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council, in charge of Communications and Natural Resources, has given a fairly comprehensive statement on the philosophy and the reasoning behind the idea of [illegible] the most [illegible].

Mr. President, when should we be paid dearly for the expense for the sewage disposal? I believe that such a project will justify this expenditure. However, there is a subject of another aspect which I hope is being [illegible].

Mr. President, on the question of future facilities, [illegible] and the [illegible], I could not let the opportunity pass this afternoon without commenting on the many [illegible] that Government is undertaking a marine park system. I know, Sir, that there have been some objections to a marine park system in this country, but on further consideration and study of the matter I also have that we are not at all wrong in our efforts to establish a marine park system. Mr. President, the members of this committee are to be congratulated for their efforts in trying to raise the project visible. It was heartening, Sir, to read a message from the First Lady of this country concerning her views on the need to protect our marine life. I was very pleasantly surprised, Sir, when I was invited to join the committee to see the number of people who had given up their time freely; individuals such as Mr. Dudley Watershed, Hon. Samuels Shanks, Hon. Rosalie Bradley and others who are leading their expertise to such a committee.

We are all concerned, Mr. President, regardless of [illegible] in the matters of this country on [illegible] issues. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised that there were any objections at all when the fact we were only thinking and talking about [illegible] part of our [illegible]. This objection is about 25 square miles. We are talking about a marine park system which will be divided into [illegible] four areas of non-fishing zones, five fishing zones, replenishment zones and recreational zones. We have heard the question,

MR. [illegible] (CONTINUED): [illegible] of peaceful activities or economic approach has been [illegible] to obtain these objectives in a particular way." Mr. President, in my experience here since I have been assured that the results of these actions and attempts were not imposed on by ambitious or selfish wants. This decision was based from recommendations made by many of the noted [illegible] involved in one way or the other with external businesses in this country.

I will not attempt to give credit to any individuals who may have been involved in this as I would hate to leave anybody out. Suffice it to say this, I think our gratitude of this country should be expressed to those individuals for the time and experience which they have given in the establishment of these rules. On January last in use a [illegible] increase and privileges for us to participate in ... which [illegible] 4.00 p.m. and 6.00 p.m., in saying it put answer to the public the importance of respecting these various actions. Mr. President, it is not [illegible] to see that such thoughts and actions are not into this body. However, Mr. President, in view of the fact that [illegible] one of the major problems of our economy and that our economy lies in the hands of the [illegible] economy in such manner, it is [illegible] that some [illegible] is present our minds [illegible] in these [illegible].

I believe, Sir, that we must give this very serious attention. I believe that the best approach to rehabilitating our marine parks is to motivate the cooperation of the people of this country and the tourists who visit us here, but I do not believe that we should rely solely on that cooperation. I feel that we should put sufficient planning in our marine conservation [illegible] so that adequate [illegible] the income of the [illegible] and of the [illegible] will be provided in accordance with the law.

Even the simplest person, Mr. President, most [illegible] will tell you that they can remember the day when you could walk fifty feet into the sea and look at the [illegible] and the numbers they [illegible]. I also remember [illegible] saying to me that they can remember the days when they could go to [illegible] and get the [illegible] they needed. Mr. President, that is indeed [illegible]. This was the case.

Today the situation is very different. We can do one of two things, Mr. President. We can sit back and say that they are the evils of development, so be it. Or we can make a determined effort to endorse or [illegible] the former position. I believe, Mr. President, that the people of this country would be [illegible] a great deference if nothing else were to create these rules.

Mr. President, as I said the creation of marine parks is [illegible] to the Cayman Islands. There are marine parks in Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, the [illegible] Islands, Caribbean Riviera and many of the tourist destinations. The [illegible] of these countries found it necessary to create these parks to [illegible] these marine life. The case in point, Mr. President, of other forms of marine life other than marine and [illegible]. We also know that it was possible for fishermen to go out and make [illegible] without [illegible] of marine life they desired. Today this is not possible, and hopefully, Mr. President, we will [illegible] have a very [illegible] marine Park or Park in the future.

Mr. President, I hope that the people of this country will abide by the [illegible] put in the [illegible] of the [illegible] of endangered species and that we will be successful [illegible] in our deliberations at the [illegible] meetings to be held in [illegible] the start of this year.

MR. LEBOW: A. Urgent (continued): Mr. President, I believe that our people like democracy and abiding people and I believe, sir, that when the entire Democratic Bloc is brought together and further brought to the attention of the people, we will have no problems in having them comply with the constitution.

Mr. President, on this question of raising points of personal privilege, it must be very plain with officers under the law. It must be treated as a very important part of this country's development. It must be given the same importance as any consideration of offenses under any of the other laws in this country. I would wish to say, sir, prompt and efficient attention given by the police when they are called upon to deal with a certain offense.

Mr. President, as I started earlier and in my statements not to be repetitious, I said that together with the four Electoral Provinces of Mindanao Council I had met during the early part of this year on one of the issues which are dealt with and had to do with matters relating to the Lumad people in this country. One of the things which we must bear in mind while we are considering the question of protecting any minority in this country whether it be racial or otherwise, is that we consider the effect which this will have on the Lumad people in the country. Such has been said about the humanitarian efforts of some and quite good so on in the country, but let me not be blinded to the fact that many of our people are working a hardship from the use of guns. I just want to say the Governments of this country and this Government in particular to identify those individuals and those groups to endeavour to ensure that their interests are protected.

Mr. President, personally in our land if things have to proceed in their natural course and I understand. Mr. President, that nothing has been done even the groups I spoke to recently. It is very possible for an ordinance or a law even up the pipeline tends to go into this area. The residents of that area have had to take their problems to the Army in their area. Mr. President, this is a matter which we have noted for urgent attention and I will be giving this very close attention to ensure that something is done about it. I think, sir, that the people in this area have very relevant ideas from the people, as a matter of fact, sir, I believe that was that it has such a wide, sublime aspect to which consideration should perhaps be given to establishing that emphasis for future development and expansion of the airport. Because the airport has been extended in that area and has created a small village adjacent to the residents of that area. The airport came first and found the people there. It was not the other way around, Mr. President, and I feel that the people should be compensated in some way or the other.

Mr. President, it is very difficult when one has to debate a theme speech and the budget address at the same time, but to point from one to the other. This is why I hope that from next year on in future we will have a very lengthy budget address time, that it will be possible to have three separate documents debated at different times.

Mr. President, one area which I did not of course in the question of Private Hacienda Workers' Mutual Benefit and Participatory Association. The other, sir, I think that supplemental papers and memorandum is not given to answers to questions. It appears to be a way of nullifying the answer during the question. I do not know time to waste, Mr. President and when I ask a question in this House it is for a purpose. I believe, sir, that I made my point clearly enough as how I feel about making statements. So I will not dwell on this further.

MR. EDWARD C. PEASLEE [CONTINUED]: Mr. President, on the 21st December, 1984 issue of one of our leading newspapers there was an article in the editorial column entitled, "Good liquor control comes". Not right, Mr. President, I was also happy to hear that this proviso would receive some attention very soon. Anyhow as he says, I will have the opportunity of further debating this Bill when it comes before us.

Mr. President, I was somewhat concerned this morning when I felt that the opportunity for Members to debate the Throne Speech and the Budget Address would be lost. I had not intended to speak on this until much later, when I could have been in a position to quote from some of the remarks that would be expressed. However, the advantage of speaking first is that they will be expressing me.

Mr. President, this morning I had an individual who approached me and commented on the great need for sanitary conveniences in the town. What is our Government doing to provide such a facility? I see the honourable Minister Member of Agriculture Economic Affairs opposite, his budget. I hope he has provisions in there for this facility. $35,000 is not a drop in the bucket, Mr. President, this is a very needed facility in this country.

Another point in this morning is for the concerned one again to state the manner children can be transported from the rural areas into the schools for the buses. I understand that a subsidy is being made for this.

It is unfortunate, Mr. President, to see so many vacancies so late after the election campaign and the election. Mr. President, I believe that my colleague is being driven to the fact that there are other members who share my concern. This is good because I can know that there are other Members who see the need for this facility, and they are not belonging to Private Members' Motion at some future date. I am sure that the Second Elected Member for West Bay will second it.

Mr. President, anytime when I see people with concerned attitudes to assist fighting in many of the areas around the Islands. They are too numerous to mention at this point but, Mr. President, I trust the members of this House will give this matter their very honourable attention once it is brought to Committee Stage.

Mr. President, I am going to say one more thing before closing. I would ask to all Members on this side of the House that our very response must be in good support for the betterment of the Cayman Islands. I thank, Sir, in Committee Stage to take a much closer look at the budget and I propose at the moment to support what the Honourable Financial Secretary has already said on his Budget Address.

So in closing, Sir, I must just to have said much more about appreciated and to thank you, Sir, for a well deliberated Throne Speech. I would also thank the Honourable Financial Secretary for his Budget Address.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Mr. President....

MR. SPEAKER: I was just looking at my Standing Orders. I am not sure that they do specifically provide for a motion to which a Member desires something to adjust 4:45 p.m. However, it does seem to me that it is fitting to accept that the wishes of most Members that the adjournment be moved now rather than wait anybody....

MR. LAWRENCE A. PETERSON: Mr. President, I was just saying I could go on if you want. (LAUGHTER).

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think Members will need to trouble you. I think we can make the adjournment and if Members feel it is wrong we will be here at 4.00 p.m. They can vote against us. I think it will be the wish of the House, however, to adjourn earlier than to expect anybody to stay a while.

MR. DENNIS E. FOSTER: I think so, Sir.

ADJOURNMENT

LCR. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow morning

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 4.27 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., TUESDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1976.

STATE OPENING & BOOKS MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(THURSDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1985)

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR G [illegible], CBE, ED — PRESIDING

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS M FOSTER, CBE, ED, JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J MACKEY, QC, LL.B	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C JEFFERSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON SEWSTON G EVANS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
MAJ CAPT CHARLES T MACDONNELL	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MORRIS SOSA	SPECIAL ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR LORENZO A PATERSON, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT WILLIE S MACKOMBER	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CAYMAN ISLANDS
MR JAMES M BODDEN	THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR C [illegible] MCCOY	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D ESSARD SCOTT	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN D MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SENATE COMMENCES A BUDGET SESSION OF THE (1985) SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY THURSDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1985

1. QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR MOUNT SIRS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 17: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF PATIENTS TREATED IN OUT-PATIENTS AT THE HOSPITAL EACH DAY, AND HOW MANY DOCTORS ARE UTILISED TO SEE THESE PATIENTS?

NO. 18: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE THE COST OF THE NEW X-RAY TRANSFER EQUIPMENT AT THE HOSPITAL AND HOW OFTEN HAS IT BEEN USED IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS?

NO. 19: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHY INTERNATIONALLY KNOWN SYMBOLS WERE NOT USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE NAMES ON THE NEW SIGNS RECENTLY INSTALLED AT THE HOSPITAL?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR MOUNT RAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 20: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER THE CRIMINAL PROSECUTION LAW, 1983, WILL BE AMENDED TO REQUIRE NON-CITIZENS WORKING IN GOVERNMENT TO HAVE CRIMINAL CONVICTION RECORDS?

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR MODERN DOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 21: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER GOVERNMENT PROPOSES TO SET AN OPERATIONAL DATE FOR THE PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGES LAW, 1984, TO COME INTO EFFECT?

2. CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE SUPPLY (SECOND SESSION) AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1985) BILL, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Resolutions	1
Message From GPA Headquarters Secretariat	2
Continuation of the Debate on the Throne Speech and Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1985	6
Mr. D. Lorne McGibbon	7
Capt. Moby S. Pinkerton	29
Mr. James M. Bodden	33
Adjournment	41

FRIDAY

7TH MARCH, 1975

10.02 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated, Prayers. Questions. The Elected Member for North Side.

QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 11: Would the Member state the average number of patients treated in out-patients at the hospital each day, and how many doctors are utilized to see these patients?

ANSWER: The average number of patients treated at the out-patients department when computed on the number of days clinics were held in 1974 came 89 patients per day.

In order to treat these patients the hospital utilized an average of 9.6 doctors per day.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. D. RICARD MILLER: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member state if they have included in these figures of 89 patients those patients who visit casualty?

HON. DENNIS O. FRANCIS: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless there is any other supplementary I will invite the Elected Member for North Side to ask the next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 10: Would the Member state the cost of the new X-ray therapy equipment at the hospital and how often has it been used in the last three months?

ANSWER: The cost of the equipment which enables the hospital to treatment on X-ray by telephone to be used by a radiologist specialist was $181,478. In the two and a half months since the equipment was installed at the hospital, fourteen X-rays and CAT's were transmitted.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. S. ERSKINE MORTON: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member have available what percentage of the total X-ray taken at the hospital include hips and a body search period where fourteen X-rays represent?

HON. HARROW G. EBANKS: Mr. President, I am afraid I do not have that information, Sir.

MR. JOSEF E. MAYNARD: Mr. President, a supplementary... Will the Member state if it is customary that an appointment has to be made to have X-rays taken, and sometimes it could take up to a week before results are received?

MR. PRESIDENT: I really do not think that is a supplementary. It is a perfectly permissible question if the Member wants it put down as a question for the people to the Under Topic, however, I do not think that it really arises from the answer given to the substantive question now asked.

Unless there is any further supplementary I will ask the Member for North Side to ask the next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE MINISTERIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 12: Would the Member state why internationally known symbols were not used in conjunction with the names on the new signs recently installed at the hospital?

ANSWER: Mr. signs have been purchased for the hospital recently. It was when signs are purchased for the hospital consideration will be given to having internationally known symbols incorporated into their design.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. D. SHARP MILLER: Could the Member state whether someone was not hired recently for the significant purpose of designing some signs, signs such as on at the hospital?

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not sure that that is really a supplementary. Perhaps I could see the answer to the first question before ruling. If it is then he is bringing round what. It will be coming.

We have usually been highly successful in allowing supplementaries. I suppose it is alright. What was the supplementary again?

MR. D. SHARP MILLER: It is alright, Mr. President. I will just make it in my observation to the Chair's speech and Budget Address.

MR. PRESIDENT: Alright.

Is there any other supplementary? In that case I will invite the Second Elected Member for West Bay to ask the next question.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR KEEP EAST (Mr. Lee) TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 20: Would the Member state whether the Companies Protection Law, 1964, will be amended to exempt non-Caymanians working in Government to have gainful occupation licences?

ANSWER: Section 22 of the Companies Protection Law (Revised) makes certain exemptions which inter alia include persons employed by Government.

Section 22 of the Companies Protection Law, which is not yet in force, repeats the same exemption and this was debated at some length at the time the Law passed this Honourable House and it was agreed to exempt the exemption.

The same argument holds now as then: that we do not want to bring the constitutional rights of the Government into conflict with other laws while under discussions from Her Majesty's Government some appointments need approval of the Secretary of State. The answer to this problem is administrative and not legal.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless any Member wishes to ask a supplementary I will invite the First Elected Member for Bodden Town to ask the next question.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 21: Would the Member state whether Government proposes to set an amendment date for the Parliamentary Elections Law, 1964, to come into effect?

ANSWER: Government proposes to have a close look at the Elections Law, 1964, and hopes to introduce Bill to the House in due course.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. LEONARD A. PIERSON: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Member could give us an explanation of what a "three month" is? Is it two or three months from now? What sort of date is being planned to bring this into operation?

HON. DENNIS R. FOSTER: Mr. President, I am hoping for the next sitting, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think on a point of clarification I should ask whether the Honourable First Official Member mostly means the next meeting? The next sitting would be later today I think.

HON. DENNIS R. FOSTER: I apologise, Sir. I means the next meeting.

MR. PRESIDENT: So, it would be temporary, the next sitting. I am sorry, however, the next meeting is when we meet.

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: Could the Member state whether the proposed amendment will substantially affect the bill as passed by the House, or is it just minor amendments which are planned?

HON. DENNIS E. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not exactly know what amendments might be made or what might not be made, Sir. It has not been looked at closely yet by the Government. I cannot predict, Sir, what might be the amendments.

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: They cannot do that you are just guessing to have a look. It has not been looked at at this time. Is that correct?

HON. DENNIS E. SCOTT: That is correct.

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: Well, will the proposed look mean that the Bill will be altered to a substantial degree or will have no effect?

HON. DENNIS E. SCOTT: As far as I am aware, Sir. The Government might decide on just a few minor amendments. I really do not know.

MR. G. MILO BOOTHE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Member in view of the statements made in the House in September when the Bill was amended to change the operational date, will the Member assure this hon. House if the operational date which will be mentioned in the Act remains?

HON. DENNIS E. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer anything, Sir. The Member knows that there is some political ramifications and so will just have to wait and see what comes forth, Sir.

MR. G. MILO BOOTHE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Member in view of the apparent embarrassment surrounding this Bill, which one has had ever yet and the operational date changed on several occasions, he is now indicating that the whole Bill is going back?

HON. DENNIS E. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the Member misunderstood what I mean by political. I mean, Sir, that we will be carrying out the guidance of Government which have not been laid down as yet in respect of this Law. As far as I understand the requirement, Sir. I can give no assurance of what we will. Once again it is a Government policy decision and we will just have to wait and see, Sir.

MR. G. MILO BOOTHE: Is the Member aware that a change in the operational date was a promise of the Majority Team during the elections?

HON. DENNIS E. SCOTT: No, Sir. I am not prejudiced and I did not come back at any of the meetings or go to any of the meetings whatsoever, Sir.

MR. G. MILO BOOTHE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the Member plans postponed to the cable or communication with the operational date and the whole proposal in this Law?

MR. SPEAKER: I am not aware that I have fully understood the supplementary. To the Member seeking information, the Honourable Prime Minister's Number 10 answer to the media broadcasts of parliamentary debates, and if so, whether he has listened to that particular note? Is that the supplementary?

MR. D. ENOS ROBIN: No, Mr. President, what I was really trying to find out was where was the Member coming the allegation of he did not mean the complete use of the majority seats in supporting the parliamentary procedure that which had been passed?

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure that the Member had got a very effective part of our motion. If there is no further supplementary we can pass on to other business.

Before embarking on item 2 which any hon. private Member is entitled to mention with the leave of the House, the place for that the Clerk has in her capacity as Secretary of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, received from the Secretary-General of that organization, the Welsh Parliament, a letter which I thought that I would like to read to Members. It reads as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

"I am delighted that the Welsh Assembly has joined the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association so promptly and I am sure you will be delighted to welcome so many parliamentarians from Members of the Welsh Assembly.

I have spoken to Mr. Rowlands on the telephone since his return to Cardiff and he told me how much he and his colleagues enjoyed their visit to Cyprus. He particularly mentioned their pleasure at having visited the Commonwealth School.

Mr. Rowlands will of course be writing his own letter of thanks but may I, as Secretary-General, pass on through you to the Government and to the Parliament of the first opportunity our most grateful thanks for the welcome, generous hospitality and kindness extended to our delegation. Not for the first time, this visit to the Cyprus Parliament helped

MR. SPEAKER: I thought Members might like to be aware of that generous invitation and I am sure would wish to join with me in thanking the Clerk and Members of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association for the admirable arrangements which they made for Mr. Owen's visit.

The second point which I should like to make is that the Clerk has received no less than all Members of the Assembly nominations save two or three which are to be dealt with by the Standing Orders Committee at 11.30 p.m. The Table of Members are unfortunately not ready to enter the Chamber many Members have apparently not yet had the opportunity to register. Thereby the administrative staff would be grateful if all Members would be kind enough then to let Miss Berkeley who will be working to produce each of them for the purpose, know whether they propose to be able to go to the Welsh Assembly.

MR. DENNIS S. PARRY: May I suggest, Sir, that we do it right now.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, we could do it this way. You have had four votes and three.

SEN. DENNIS H. SMITH: Yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: If Members do know that would perhaps be a convenient way.

SEN. DENNIS H. SMITH: Speed up the game so go.

MR. PRESIDENT: Should we always who are able to go, two, two, three. Four, five, six, seven; it looks like eight. So perhaps the Chair could be kind enough to let Miss Markell know that it is expected that there will be eight pairs.

Item 2 on Group's Order Paper is the consideration of the debate on the Throne Speech and Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1985. Again I think traditionally it is the consideration of the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill debate. Does any Member wish to speak?

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1985) BILL, 1985

MR. PRESIDENT: I hope we are not going to get ourselves into the difficult situation which arose yesterday. (Pause). If no Member does wish to speak I shall...

MR. J. ALLAN MACLEAN: Mr. President, I would like to speak, Sir, but I would appreciate it if somebody else could do so before me because I am having a problem with my throat this morning.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, I think everybody wants somebody else to go before him.

SEN. ANDREW J. SOBEY: Mr. President, Sir, I do not propose anything, but merely as a point of order I think the majority of the House would be best served if informal consultations could take place on future occasions to arrange a batting order. I appreciate the desire of Members to have this been used, but I think that it does not look good from outside if Members appear to be reluctant.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that is quite true. I do not think it adds to the dignity of the House if we get here in a hurry for now or three minutes while nobody speaks at all, and I am sure that it would not worthy be the case that if Members if I were obliged to call upon the Mover of this motion to reply before others have had the opportunity to speak. However, in this my decision then I might be obliged to call upon him to reply if nobody has risen to speak. No, I think for the future we should seriously take heed of the point made by the....

MR. J. ALLAN MACLEAN: Mr. President, I will make my attempt, Sir, and.....

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member for North Side Gem,

MR. S. EDRED MPYANA: I shall ask for your indulgence if I have to take long breaks to get my throat wet because I do have a bad case of dysphonia.

Mr. President, I too want to congratulate both yourself and the Honourable Chief Official Member on the very impressive and able way in which given responsible ministries were presented. The Minute Speech was short and concise; this kind of speech I like to listen to. The Budget Address, this year however had to be long and detailed, and I must congratulate the Honourable Chief Official Member on his organisation and medium, the delivery was so good that I do not think even one member of the House fell asleep.

Having said these kind words, Mr. President, it now becomes my allotted task to pick them apart. What task is made the more difficult because we have to deal with both in the same speech. I would join the Second Elected Member for Georgetown in saying that I too would like to see on the Estimates, even if it be because of an Allocation, the expected Meetings being held. In the case of new Members it would give me that one more chance of having a say, Sir. That is probably the only thing which I am going to agree with the Member said yesterday, Sir.

Sir, still before the House, Sir, I will now be now to appropriate certain expenditures for the services of the financial year 1985, namely to give the Ministerial Summary of those Estimates the authority to spend a total of $47,272,754 under several sub-heads of expenditure.

The subject as detailed in this Bill and the Minister Summary for estimates are self-explanatory I think so I am not a good one and I would like to remind Members that it is not a Estimated Budget, Sir, but one which gives a certain of $10,420 as the 31st December, 1984, and thereafter is extended the 1st January, 1985 with a deficit provision of $737,252.

Mr. President, I attach great importance to the matters you expressed about the growth of the Civil Service. In your Budget Speech, Sir, you said that the number of public officers rose from 1,325 in 1982 to 1,859 by June 1984, due to recruit the requested numbers. In the Civil Service which accompany the Appropriation Bill, 1985, Sir, there is provision to add another 89 officers for 1985. I also note, Sir, your suggestion that appropriate means must be found to limit the growth of the Civil Service and I myself will agree with you there. Sir, I would like to make a few suggestions. The establishment section for the Civil Service needs to be examined, Sir, as a matter of urgency a proper organisation and management survey; not the usual type where we invite in a retired colonial officer to do it, nicely and he then sends up an over-staffed staff for four or five years, but a professional group, Sir, with the intent to reduce staff while increasing output. The group should also consolidation to view and revise studies now in the organisational structure with the hope of obtaining a leaner professional structure rather than the present rectangular hierarchy which exists in the Civil Service.

One of the areas in which I believe great improvements could be made, Sir, and great savings while at the same time encouraging the people, is in the standard area of Government. Let us look at the number of pensioned officers already on the establishment of Government. Presently, Sir, there are 230 pensioned people on Government and with their current salary of $28,260 that represents an expenditure of $1.6 plus per year. Now, Mr. President, my experience from the Ministries Department of Trade Industry determined that when a worker graduates from the

Mr. S. ZAMPA MILLAR (LOGAN-KINGS): With Labour's many modifications in typing, will I receive that when we have senior clerical officers in this we are talking about people who the Government Departments say pay type at least 50 words per minute. If we use the standard number of working hours in Government of 37.5 hours per week, that translates, Sir, that these 130 senior clerical officers should be putting out a total number of 240,375,000 words per year. Now, Mr. President, I know that the officers in Government produce a lot of paper, but by anybody's standards, Sir, that is a lot of words. So I would venture to guess at this stage that if the interviewed typing people in the Government services we could get the clerical staff for half and get more output. Sir, I have not included in these figures personal secretaries and personal secretaries-teachers who also do typing for Government.

Another savings which might be realized by Government interviewed typing pools. Sir, would be in the area of office supplies which I believe in this year's Budget are somewhere over $200,000. In my Provincial Secretary's office which you will find in Government today, Sir, you will see three or four carbons passed over the desk. If these offices were linked using dictaphones which could be more readily established in a typing pool, these items could be used again. I do agree, Sir, that the graphics machines on paper and pens in Government could be eliminated.

Direct personal emoluments in this year's Budget stand at $29,160,999. This is very close to 50 per cent of the estimated Budget and if we include the other related benefits it will go over the 50 per cent mark. There are some other figures which were mentioning to me in this budget, Sir, and these are the items which the Clerk's Secretary are allowed. I suspected these perks years ago when the Civil Servants were being paid a measly salary. However, Sir, today when there is the highest conceivable kind of Government are making salaries which range from $27,000 to $32,000 I really cannot support their getting mileage, car upkeep allowance and other perks as well. I think all their salary and fringe benefits should be done by the officers in part of the job. This mileage and car upkeep allowance budgeted for, Sir, is no small figure. It totals over $126,000. Add to that a provision for telephone of $103,000. Then, Sir, there are other items which must be added to the permanent emoluments such as duty allowances, retirement and overtime which total in themselves over $5.8 million.

Mr. President, I would not dare to suggest that the Civil Servants are not worthy of these salaries. As I believe, they do work hard for their salaries. However, I think that the time has come when the salaries should represent the responsibility and the work involved. So, therefore, the perks must go by the wayside.

The estimated expenditure for the year 1985, Mr. President, is anticipated at $40,488,000 or 31.6 per cent of the Budget. That, Mr. President, is I believe dangerously high and it must be curtailed. Government, Sir, must exhaust the resources which it has in hand in the form of manpower before it adds new services. The trend has always seemed to be that if we are going to add a new service we have to add a new department, divisions, sections, etcetera. We must find ways, Sir, of increasing productivity of the existing system than simply increasing the numbers to get increased output. I believe, Sir, that these things can be done if proper organization and management survey is done. There has been much dissatisfaction in the Civil Service over the years, Sir, and today it seems to be even worse, especially the increased and reasonable salaries which are now being paid. I believe, Sir, that

MR. D. LEVANG MILLER (CONTINUING): ...the dissatisfaction rests on the fact that the officers are not getting job satisfaction. They are not being encouraged to invest. They are not being motivated to produce. They are not being rewarded or made to produce for the salaries which they are living with. They want to be encouraged to take pride in their job and a job well done. One of the most frequent complaints which I hear from the Civil Service is this. It seems that Ombudsmen are come to the Cabinet table but seem to work in Government departments. In answering given to questions in Hansard he should be responsible to the Members of the Assembly. Sir, the latest article which I could find regarding their duties was one published in the Daily Gleaner for which I pay Canadian exchange. That, Sir, again I believe to be a very expensive media and I think that we could save a lot of that for which I think relate to the recurrent expenditure of Government. That we could help the General Elected Member for George Town with some more capital expenditure.

I am happy to hear, Sir, in an answer given this morning that Government intends to continue to apply foreign aid without subjecting that to the scrutiny of the Secretariat Board. While I agree with part of the answer given that there are certain posts in Government which appointments are made to which could lead to legal problems if they are subject to the Secretariat Board, that represents a very small minority of the offices in the Civil Service, Sir. I believe that the Ombudsmen who work in the Civil Service would feel more satisfied if capability...the clerical officers who are foreign nationals were subjected to the rigors of the Secretariat Board.

Mr. President, I have an open mind about the Civil Service, Sir, and that is the basis which has occurred in the Civil Service over the last few or seven years. I am afraid, Sir, that as a matter of urgency the personnel regulations should be revised, although I do note that there is intention to do so. I hope that that will have a beneficial effect but the reason for this brain drain must be found and it must be stopped.

Mr. President, I believe that what has prevented this country in the years past from going the way many of the neighbouring territories have gone is that we have always had a strong headquarters, stable administrative sector in the Civil Service. However, Sir, we cannot continue to lose people at graduate level from the Civil Service because we have not found ways within these ways to motivate them; ways to let them have pride and a feeling that they are contributing to the running of this country. If ways of doing this are not found the Civil Service is going to be in a very serious state of affairs for the next couple of years. We are my already in at that stage, Sir, because a lot of the Principal Secretaries, etcetera grew up as to speak with the country and therefore although they did not have great academic qualifications had many years of experience under their belts. Today we are finding that with the graduates leaving we are being left with people to be promoted who do not have academic qualifications, nor do they have the years of experience which the others had. I think, Sir, that this is a serious problem facing this country.

Mr. President, perhaps reasons why I believe an organisation and management study is a matter of urgency is to do with staffing and the utilization in the Tower Building. There again, Sir, I have to differ with my good friend. I do not think that the Tower Building was a good investment.

Mr. E. PAUL BRIAN (CONTINUED): According to the Budget Address the departments presently in the Annex Building are Social Services, Planning, Police Administration, Treasury, Learning Unit, Government Information Services, Law School, Water Authority and Environmental Health. Those scheduled to move shortly are Customs Training and crime Branch, Roads and Drains, Registrar of Companies and Teachers' Centres.

Mr. President, I feel that the officers which move into that building should have more determinative and decision making participation. I would have recommended to have seen, Mr. President, that we had united the Customs and the Immigration Departments into that Building, so that the perspective of the case may be so that there would be more coordinate the departments activities the areas. It would also be more convenient for the public. Also, if they could find services which relate and with which they may have to speak to get a problem solved located in the same building. Maybe it is sometimes wrong of the old museum steps, "Mind a fool a little Brutishness", rather than trying to solve the problem which the public is making to be solved.

On a more positive note, Mr. President, I am glad to hear you in your Throne Speech that steps are to continue to strengthen the police and, Sir, I am fairly proud that a Caymanian has recently been appointed to the post of Deputy Commissioner. Our police force, Sir, needs all the help it can get to cope with the increased crime and the young officers must be given all the encouragements and training we have the resources to provide.

The increase in the prison population gives no reason for optimism as we have to find ways to counteract the attitudes of our youth towards rehabilitation and detention in prison.

It is also good to read in the Throne Speech, Mr. President, that Government intends to ensure the more satisfactory labour, but I must caution that, Sir, in that in conjunction with this we must have increased vigilance by the Caymanian Protection Board. Companies who are being victimized or treated unfairly in the private sector must be encouraged to let their grievances be known to the Caymanian Protection Board, and care must be found to accurately the development of the manpower resources in this country and the utilization by the private sector.

Mr. President, I am pleased to hear that Radio Cayman has had another successful year and the Corp's finances for 1985 appear to contribute $165,186 to the revenue of this country. The reason why I am happy about this, Sir, is because of the suggestion which I am about to make. Mr. President, I would like to see Radio Cayman established as a Government owned corporation removed from the direct control of Government. It can be managed by a Board of Directors under that corporation as is ably done in the Port Authority. It can still be required to make the annual revenue over expenditure a contribution to the general revenue of this country but, Sir, the greatest thing that will do is that it will remove the concern and the fears which some people have that Government strictly controls the programming and the news content of Radio Cayman. I think that if we set it up as a Government owned corporation we will find that the professionals within Radio Cayman would blossom and develop and it would, as I said, remove the fear of many Caymanians that the news is pampered and controlled stations. Mr. President, I would not be adverse to the introduction of a private radio station just for the competitive spirit, Sir, and to encourage the development of the people and the quality of the programmes which are provided on Radio Cayman.

MR. O. PEARL MILLER (CONTINUED): ...to be good to know, Sir, that with modernization of machinery in the Dutch Bloomfield and Sandy Beaches Ranges they will give considerable attention to the development of the Community Colleges. The Rural School, the Nursing School and the Building and Trade School will be given the right direction. If the Community Colleges be developed into a proper business school and trade centre, and be run on the right lines of the evening Economics we would find children coming out of school at the age of eighteen trained in science. The University Grade Examination, the aggregate of science and physics is difficult to understand, Sir, but an eighteen year old is certainly much more mature in his outlook on life and could give a much more responsible contribution to the development of this country in the private sector in an employment, especially if he is provided with training in a vocational rather than business studies.

We have heard a lot of talk in recent past, Sir, about the introduction of a Sugar Tariff into Guyana. Sir, I do not think that it should be done, although I believe that it is economically necessary at this point. To bring in a large hotel unless we have protection for our factories would be suicidal and employer which such a large hotel is going to need to operate properly and profitably. To bring one in and have to bring in type of imported goods, furnishings, building materials we only going to put fuel to the fire which exists at that level of our society between Corporations and shareholders. If we bring in to end the mechanics and employees are not sure to have to bear the hotel successfully, and we do not allow them to bring in the employees necessary and in time, it is going to be very difficult to get qualified people in the future, Sir.

The educational budget in the Budget Address is well provided for, Sir, and it is as it should be, Sir, there are some comments about the figures mentioned in that 20 per cent of the figure budgeted of $8 million goes to Community Colleges. I am well aware that there is provision in the capital expenditure to construct physical facilities but, Sir, the training provided in the private schools are doing a very worthy contribution as the education system is only 2.3 per cent of what it would cost to educate these children in the private schools. It is also interesting to note from the Budget Address that these private schools are subsidising at least some children.

Private schools, Sir, that accommodate is standing about $1,800 per annum per student in teachers' salaries leaving only a little more than $400 per student for materials, equipment and other administrative costs. Sir, the other area of the educational system which seems to require to what I believe that is education system is efficient it should produce the right, Sir, one, a graduate who is adept calculating or in the other words one is well equipped with trades, education.

Although, Mr. President, in the last five or five years the statistics which have been quoted out by that department in Government indicate that there is an ever increasing number of passes per year and I do not deny that statistically this is so; there may be room to be more concerned because more have been the year before; that is to be expected, Sir, because more students sit the same age group. However, what gives us concern, Mr. President, is that there also appears to be a proportionately increase in the number of graduates who can go on to institution of higher learning and very few have the graduates to fill the key positions in our economy, being a graduate is almost

MR. D. EDGAR HUNTER (CONSERVATIVE): Unavoidably going to be a pre-requisite. So I am very encouraged, Sir, that the number of people who are receiving good grades in enough subjects to enter institutions of higher learning seem to be diminishing.

Of particular concern in this section of the estimates, Mr. President, is the fact that according to the budget figures we are increasing in American ownership but decreasing our reliance a quarter. Sir, which is based on the British system of education about which few American Governments know very much. The systems are markedly different in several ways, Sir, and I can speak from first-hand knowledge. I spoke to Americans of higher learning in both the British system and the American system. One gave the feeling that what is known there as what if one looks long enough one can find answers to problems here and agree with what he is doing. If this is what is happening in the American system which we are being told by these authorities is a good one and we are depending the standard of education on that country, the less knowledge, Sir, that there is increasing generalization that prevails the more difficult to maintain the higher learning. So do I think we do wrong will we use American yardsticks and practices if we are going to base our system on the British model and our educational requirements are entirely dissimilar.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to comment very briefly on the health vote system in this country. Mr. President, we appear to be spending more and more and more dollars on health care in this country and increasing less and less and less. Mr. President, there are some who are very suspicious and say that the Government says. I believe by that statement they mean the politicians who are responsible for health care in this country. I believe that the responsible final financial burden of education should rest there, who is now responsible for health insurance by whatever nomenclature I associate myself with the Honourable Minister of Health in Ontario, the Honourable Dalton Bales. Of course, Sir, I realize that the problems which exist in health care are not contained by the Province who have public hospitals, but by that little man who scrapes to believe him and who has the big income and all the qualifications. May I just read from these statistics, Sir.

This year we are spending over $2 million in personal contributions to health care in a new institution, now, Sir, I will give them the credit of the world in that they do in fact provide some services which an institution of similar size would not provide in the United States, such as out-patient services and public health services. However, I believe that is a minor part of the budget. Sir, from these statistics I am to say that hospitals in the Medical Centre which has an occupancy rate of 96.5 per cent, which is very close to what I was told this morning was in at the hospital here in this province by the Minister yesterday; I think it, told me it was 97 per cent. Sir, this type of hospital is today operated at a labour cost which includes payroll and employee benefits of half a million dollars, Sir, $500,000. When you add the cost of the materials which this type of hospital is using it is less than $1 million, $900,000. Now, Sir, this indicates to me that there is gross wastage and mismanagement of public funds in the health care field and I have other reasons to believe that that is true, Sir. Because using the costs per patients day which he gave us yesterday of $209.42 and taking standard formulas used in the hospital administration field, that indicates with an occupancy of 97 per cent as is stated in the estimates, a savings of over 240 per cent. Something is wrong somewhere, Mr. President, and I think it lies in the mismanagement of health care facility and

MR. D. ARNOLD ASPIN (CONSERVATIVE): the fact that the health system in this country had no public discussion. So, Mr. President, since I speak the shortcomings of the health care the benefit of the doubt and say that they are offering services which are not provided by this constitution, a total of 15 million Guyana Dollars! and the objectives which I read from were the United States Dollars. Now Mr. Speaker, Sir, Guyanese have to breathing space. That is Speaker knows that, Sir, in my answer given to me this morning and I quote from this answer:-

> "The average number of patients treated in the out-patients department when compared on the number of days attended were held to 1062 and 18 patients per day."

The average number of doctors need to see 18 patients are 5.5. Now, Sir, these number are 11½ patients per doctor. I still again give them the benefit of the doubt because I am not believe that we will have one half patients attending at the hospital, so we might say that each doctor is seeing 10 patients per morning, Sir. That is a ridiculous satisfaction of such expensive human resources.

Today at the hospital Sir, a doctor has to spend time with a patient to diagnose his case because he no longer has to rely entirely on symptomatic diagnosis, that is intensive questioning of the patient to find out what the problem is. They have expensive diagnostic equipment at the hospital and I ask question, Sir, as an employee of that hospital when can we expect 18 patients per morning on a sophisticated diagnostic basis. Then, Sir, when we ask why is there not a doctor at the hospital 24 hours a day they tell us they do not have the resources to provide them. That is ludicrous, Sir. The doctors work in out-patients and wards, Sir, an answer given me by the Member during that the duties of any medical officer at the hospital can be a multiplicity of activities, has to be exact to the answer given to me, and again they declare in his statistics specialist duties, that we should be able to shift that around and provide a much better service for the people of this country. Because according to this answer they will seem to be doing basically the same things except for the fact that one doing sub-specialty work. I am not sure that sub-specialty is because I assume it was either general practice or specialties. Maybe it has to do with the fact that the other part of my supplementary could not be answered in terms of broad classifications, so they are playing it safe and calling it sub-specialties.

Mr. President, the time has come when we have to face the realities of the situation and the hospital must provide to have doctors services to this country. Today, Sir, we made some statements upon the part answer of terms under the administration of Mr. Presh", which at operations was commenced on the hospital emphasis specifically to have doctors so that they could be on the compound, because one of the excuses being given at that time, Sir, was that they could not spend the night as the hospital because they did not want to leave their house at home. So they built them an apartment and I do not believe, Sir, that that apartment which cost over $30,000 was ever been used. So, Sir, there are no more excuses. We must have 24 hour coverage at the hospital. They have two doctors, Sir, at any two, lots of physicians in other country. I think, Sir, when we are paying all of these the salaries which we are paying our doctors, to have them to see only 18 patients a day is a very racial answer. As I said before, Sir, I think it is a very poor utilization of resources.

MR. L. DOUGLAS BUCHANAN (CONSERVATIVE): Some years, Sir, we find in the budget debates the privilege that we have been enjoying of hearing maiden speeches which are very short and say about one thing a good thing and that some possibilities are better than anywhere else. However they have done the opposite in this case, Sir. The additional plan at the hospital is allotted to our department for a similar way as American institutions. So what do they do for this case, Sir? They bring in people from Quebec to examine the X-ray and laboratory facilities and to tell them the state of their accuracy up there, Sir. They probably have not had a new X-ray machine in the last fifteen years. So of course they are going to think and to say that what we have is good; it is probably the best in the Caribbean. It is better than anything they have in Martinique. In Spanish town hospital, Sir, they are still using iron which lack nothing in which the lepers are treated through. I hope what I am talking about, I have seen it.

This kind of mismanagement in terms of misdirection of services provided to the people in this country, Sir, really has me concerned. The people are being led to believe that we are getting good returns in the investments we put under the budget and I do not subscribe to that, Sir. What the health care system in this country needs is a comprehensive health care policy, a policy which is going to identify what the needs are in terms of health care of this country; what health services are going to be provided for the people of this country. It needs to clearly identify how those services are going to be paid for; whether it is going to be by direct payment and we break to the system which we have now where Civil Servants and their dependents are free and people have to go to the health institutions determined and be seated a long lengthy thereafter lengths or years and get free medical care.

However, Sir, in practice I believe that what happens is that there are a lot of people who go up there even under that system and pay their own Civil Servants or dependents, but because they are not ready to directly themselves as such they get free medical care. We could be decide whether it is going to be free or so are going to go over to direct payment, to third party insurance system and Government will have to ensure the Civil Servants, dependents and children have an what the hospital becomes a self-sufficient entity. It will also enough revenue to pay its bills. Or they could operate it on what is now known in the United States market today, a health maintenance organization where the physicians contract for a specific fee to offer medical care to the population of this country. However, the fact that we do not have a proper health care policy in the problem and the reason given by the former Minister were quite sad, Sir, to note that to extend health care facilities were not health care priorities, Sir. They were what could be more commercially called operations necessary and not type of a hospital. They should not have been developed at the Port-of-Spain level. They should have been developed in the proper order of the system and the management of the system as it is. The emphasis should have initially to the system which is developed. When they are developed at that level and they are sent down with a developmental type scheme, "This is the way it is going to be done", Mr. President, most of the employees are not going to accept it. That is clear, Sir, how contributed to the wastage and the poor utilization of manpower resources in the health care system.

So, Sir, something needs to be done. Desperately about the health care system in this country and I hope that the new Honourable Prime Minister Member of Parliament responsible for Health, Education and Social Services can find ways and means to accomplish it and provide the kind of service which the people of this country not only are demanding, Sir, but deserve.

MR. D. SCOTT MILLER (CONTINUED): ...assure the people of this country that the case who now pretty [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: ... I wonder if this might be a convenient moment to take a break?

MR. D. SCOTT MILLER: Yes, sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I will suspend proceedings until approximately 11.35 a.m.

AT 11.23 A.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11.43 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Minister for North Eddy.

MR. D. SCOTT MILLER: Mr. President, as mentioned, Sir, the Labour Conference [illegible] a central clinic was established and equipped at Base Hut. While, Sir, I would not question the need for that particular one, for such a [illegible] I fully believe the people in that area are entitled to that facility, but I believe that the total national picture could have been better served by establishing a mobile unit which could visit all the districts. It could spend, maybe, in the district and it could then visit all of the schools including the High School to provide treatment. So I should have much preferred to have seen that money spent on the purchasing of a mobile unit.

With regard to the telecommunications equipment which was installed at the hospital recently, this could be given as $6,000. Now, Sir, I have to assume that that is the correct figure. It was unlikely to be used for operating the equipment, that is presumably like a T.A.B. unit where [illegible] telephone lines or whatever. Sir, for the information of such a sophisticated piece of equipment which has only been utilised [illegible] in the last two and a half months one has to wonder whether those [illegible] are so whether this piece really [illegible]. However, Sir, my observations do indicate that there is no question that X-rays have a diagnostic value. I question the urgency for this to need to be telephoned to Miami to be read by a radiologist and the information telephoned back.

If, as we have been given to understand on the Island to read X-rays and to interpret the diagnostic benefit, we have a fairly decent Air-Taxi service in this country which could take those X-rays to Miami fairly rapidly. Sir, in the cases where the reading of the X-rays would help in urgent diagnosis, probably even in the time it takes [illegible] aspect of the situation, I believe, [illegible] have an X-ray. So, Sir, I question this kind of [illegible]

MR. W. BEARD MILLER (CONTINUING): where I know that they do not have the proper bandages to treat such patients. Because an unfortunate incident happened last year when a friend of mine was burnt and I unrolled the bum bandages, Sir, because there were none in stock at the hospital. When we look at this kind of commitment you have kinds of architectural diagnostic equipment and the utilization rate, if it is to be done at the expense of necessary supplies I think, Sir, something is seriously wrong with the management in place.

I note with interest, Sir, that steps have been taken to improve the accountancy situation at the hospital and hopefully they are going to continue to do this because in spite of the fact that the amount of money that they have had for almost every year for the past four or five years. I believe I am safe in saying that the amount invested in medical fees at the hospital did not produce a significant increase in the revenue anticipated, but a very significant increase in the unpredicted purposes for the hospital. So I look forward to improvements in that area.

Then again, Sir, we go back to Tobago because in the budget address and we find that we have spent $1,000,000 on a kitchen, two more oxygen facilities. Now, Sir, I do not hospital which has a utilization rate or occupancy rate of 60 per cent I wonder what they are going to do with the number of meals which has to produce in a kitchen and existing more facility would cost more than $1 million. The greater room in that facility, Sir, is probably bigger than the one which exists in the biggest local hotel. If we feel the people in the 60 beds who are seeing there may be probably would not properly utilize the total capacity of that facility. While I will welcome, Sir, that in accountancy such a facility is to be used to build in provision for increased capacity in the future expansion of the hospital, $1 million is no wonder like a lot of money for a kitchen, meeting room and rest rooms. It is a very expensive facility. Sir. I look there and I know it personally. However, I believe that it is going to create some problems not that dissimilar, Sir, to what we encountered in the operating theatre a couple of years ago when we had a problem with the water system. I hope, Sir, that the same problem does not happen with the kitchen. I believe that it is very difficult for water to reach upstairs now if any flooding materials to be.

Sir, it is this kind of thing which is basically wastage of public funds. It must happen that these facilities were open when I was walking around, Sir, but I noticed that the supply line goes to the fish tank from one room, goes to a one inch line to supply the hospital. There is believe to have been time to supply this new facility and goes back down to a three quarters of an inch line to supply the facility. I believe that there are going to be some problems with pressure and other technical problems of water supply when the plumbing is done to that kind of fashion. Sir, something has to be done about the background and additions which have taken place in these facilities over the past couple of years. I have interested them sometimes suddenly on top of what they believe for the water supply and things like that.

In the early seventies when the plans were first laid there was a complete map of the plumbing facilities there and all the drainage supply lines were clearly marked out. Sir, I believe it would take several Wednesdays, or the coming years, to straighten out the mess which exists there now.

I hope that the cause which the honourable First Elected Member of Roseau South told me that many have not been created, but my information has it,

MR. D. FRASER MILLAR (Commissioner): Sir, that is an individual who specifically is in a wide categorage there, there may and yet still needed people to find their way around the complicated building that we've set up there. I also have said it is not how I see to incorporate the Administrative Services Unit. The signs because there are some people in this country who cannot read and write, and there may be some obstacle if cannot read and write but can follow a sign.

The Honourable Secretary in his address made that suggestion are the most important elements in government expenditure that personal emolument in that province. That year stands at over $700,000 and he hopes that the estimates will be with the Chief Medical Officer presently in Afghanistan to assist in the formula of the hospital.

That will provide a certain amount of savings but I hope, Sir, although I have not seen the formulary that is how can what Organization Activities is some responsible committee which is to identify the medications which are to be prescribed, they are not of any reason validity or will not produce any larger benefit to the patient. Because I am of the opinion, Sir, that there is a marked difference in the effectiveness of medications made by generic companies as opposed to those made by brand name companies. So I hope that the country will be multiplied but that they will not compromise the individual receiving the medication.

The Honourable Third Division Member also gave a figure which amounts to $77,000 for the cost of rehabilitation. It says that it includes specialists mentioned in the formula and also consultations with private physicians. That is good as we say that the number of existing specialists in 1977 are only three. In 1984 we have eight physicians from overseas and do not include those visiting physicians so some have expanded as we do not have beds $70,000 a year. I wonder if you have any figure and breakdown to those people who are coming for this kind of money, Sir.

It is good to know that the public health section is undertaking to look into the problems to be placed in primary health care. However, Sir has stated also, the Honourable Third Division Member said that existing one of the workshop a country on mental illness are established under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Secretary, for Social Services and Social Services with the Chief Medical Officer and also senior representatives from the Education and Social Services Department. Mr. President, Sir as my belief, and I have expressed this many times before, that it is bad management practice. The more you the Members of Executive Council being chairmen of boards and committees that sometimes may, Sir, be that because of the leadership responsibility by the chairman of the board to a junior officer, whether that junior officer of he disagrees or felt he should have. I misunderstanding which he can not name anybody has been, the chairman of the committee would accept, if he would or just make that recommendation, also if, Sir, the fact that the Provincial Secretary chairmanship of this committee might not be sufficient the usefulness and the information which can be gathered from that committee. I hope that I am proven wrong, Sir.

I am also pleased to see that there is money to be provided possibly for the health care of the elderly and I supported the motion of the Hon. Member from Fort-Rupert for elderly people at the Pines. This has long been a serious matter needed attention. I have that we are overcrowded and that we are adequately house the elderly, as that were at the Pines.

MR. D. LEGARE MARTIN (CONSERVATIVE): I thank the hon. gentleman for his interest, Sir, that he took in my speech last night that previously steps were taken during 1984 to address the problem of mental health, drug and alcohol abuse services. Since again I stated that there is a desperate need for these services and I offer all the support which I can give to the provision of these services in the hope that they can alleviate some of the suffering which is caused in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, in your throne speech you said that the Department of Social Services will be further strengthened during 1985 to enable it to meet growing demands. The honourable Third Opposition Member put it a little differently. He said the Department of Social Services in Government has a real place. I am all for the Social Services Department having a real place, more officers allocated but, Sir, I emphasized the hope that the Department is not going to have a real place but is going to have a real outlook on the problems and the solutions of these problems which exist in this country. There exist problems also in the social life of our population. There are social problems of the elderly and there needs to be the growth in real of counselling and education. If, I hope, Sir, that with the increased funding, Government is not increased its funding in an small extent, we would have a correspondingly increase in the services provided by that department. There is a desperate need for these officers to help out this field in this country to meet the needs in the immediate discretion to meet those people who need their services and help to assist them. I therefore hope that the new officers, new clerks, new desks and new equipment will not encourage them to say there was just for the problems to come to their desks, but that the Minister will find a way to motivate them and send them out into the various districts to provide the various services where they are needed.

With regard to Civil Aviation, Sir, I myself am quite proud of the new airport terminal which we have. It is a good facility. There are some things which I think could have been better, but it is there and I think it is the job of the new Government to operate the facility until the provincial with officials, officials could be better served with the tourists and the local people who pass through the facility.

Now, Sir, we go to Human Services. In your Throne Speech, Sir, you indicated that the Minister was borrowing a sum of $3.5 million annually during the four year period from 1985 to 1988. Sir, that is a serious situation and I would hope that any spending in particular a country with resources as small as ours, can maintain to substantial any service or facility at that rate. On the statement, there did indicate for the year ended 30th June, 1985, which was indicated showing that there is a deficit at the end of the year ended 30th June, 1985, of $14 million plus. Now, Sir, I will not say that I do not support Capital Expenditure but I believe there comes a time when the nation has a debt must tighten his belt or lose his pants. While I would not oppose that Capital Expenditure has contributed tremendously to our economy there is a certain amount of additional people who must have employment we have a national dilemma; $3.5 million a year is a fair amount for anyone. I am not completely unfamiliar to the fact, Sir, that we continue to substantially contribute to our provincial revenues by having on the other side of that coin, Sir, the argument given is that if we do not have a provincial airline why should we at any time of it is not a profitable venture. That is a true argument, Mr. Speaker, but the argument can also be extended that if there is motivation for a province to have its own airline why should we provide the necessary funds to the Capital Expenditure to some have for up to twenty million. Because if the country is not earning enough to spend money in our economy and if the situation is

MR. D. BRIAN MCFEE (CONTINUED): not wanted have to invest money in our financial institutions which can pay sensible interest to those savers, they are going to come to Nigeria from the Caymanians who live here will not be in a position to afford to go anywhere on Cayman Airways. There is an argument, Sir, which might seem to be plausible. In all the years of constitutional advancement Cayman Airways I have yet to hear any figures presented on the cost to the individual in this country of subsidising that airline. Perhaps, Sir, I believe that that airline I myself subscribe to sometimes on this,but I think that the national interest in maintaining like ours would not the penalty rather and the other activities would simply adapt themselves I do not have the figures here before me so as what are tonight on the passage of which must before the advent of Cayman Airways but, Sir, I have that today that the airline charges westbound Miami between here and there. You can fly from Miami to Grand Cayman almost as cheaply as you can fly from Miami to Cayman.

Further, Sir, if any books in conversations in other territories around us the nationals especially in the United States might now still find that it is more economic to fly from Cayman: to Kingston Jam, they there for two nights and three days whereas that they can normally fly from Miami to Cayman round trip. So, Sir, I think that the existence of Cayman Airways has to be looked at very critically. I look forward to the report which I hope will soon be laid by the ministry who have been tasked to do a detailed survey on that. However, Sir, I do not believe that if we were to lose Cayman Airways and unfortunately, Sir, the figures presented to the general circulate that it will probably cost much more at this stage to get rid of it than to keep it, it would be two cheaply. It is employing a number of people. It is unthinkable a certain amount into the gross national product of this country,but I think that we have to take a critical look at the situation and determine whether in general, the maintenance or the modification of a number of the gross national product, and if another airline could not provide the same contribution without the subsidisation of gross national product. So I look forward to a critical look at the situation by using Cayman Airways. I would look at this figures with an open mind. I am not biased either way whether it should continue or be wound down,but I think that it has to be looked at critically in the interests of the overall of the economy of this country.

I note, Sir, that in your Throne Speech you said that the Labour Office will continue to provide assistance to employers and employees where possible and I can quite appreciate by the passage of the motion a few days ago which was brought by the Second Official Member - Second Official Member for Health Day and seconded by myself. I am not sufficiently clear for should be presented, Sir, I promised to have serious legislation brought as soon as possible to try to eliminate some of the problems in this country. Because until the employees of the Labour Office have during a reasonable period have to be given authority to look into. They cannot continue to unnecessarily delay their way around; they have to be given the legislation under which they are to and to do our obligation, Sir, to provide to the employers the guidelines on which he can operate, and to the employee the guidelines of what he is expected to perform. So I look forward with keen and participation to the implementation of the Labour Legislation.

The Fire service sub-station at Frank Sound was completed in 1986. This is a service for which all the hardships and problems of the eastern districts of Grand Cayman are grateful. The fire service is doing a remarkably good job and I would offer to that Department all the support that I can. In fact, Sir, I think that it is the only Government detached

MR. D. BRAND (Attorney-General): On the first occasion on which I have not applied my mind.

You also mentioned in your Budget Speech, Sir, plans to redevelop the present Post Office in Queen Street and the construction of a multi-storey car park. I do not know which is needed more, Sir, the new Post Office or the multi-storey car park, but I do not think it can be denied that a need exists for both facilities. If the Government can find a way to accommodate them simultaneously, hopefully having that a self parking system in that the needs of the car owners and persons who work in the city, so be it, Sir. That is the kind of Government which this country needs. We need to identify how we are going to provide these services and we need to identify by what means we are going to pay for these services.

The Public Works Department, Mr. President, this speaks to a Department which I think needs some close scrutiny. Estimated expenditure of the Department totalled $8 million in 1982 as do a capital works programme of $9 million. I should propose that the Public Works Department be audited from cost since it became a trading facility, an inspection facility, a licensing facility for the trades such as electrical, plumbing, carpentry, auto mechanics or whatever. However, Sir, it remains to provide funds for recurrent expenditure of $8 million and inasmuch as only $1 million is being recovered, I believe, Sir, and I have seen evidence on this, that when Public Works Department gives out maintenance to persons or enterprises there is usually a savings to them, if the Public Works Department just will of the capital expenditure can be provided enterprise and private contractors it would be better off, Sir, not the way it is presently being done. At the moment the contract is let some where between Public Works Department supplying the materials, on the contract are for labour for the walls of the building, the plumbing and the roof while Public Works Department does the electrical and plumbing and supplies all the materials. It is going to be very difficult to evaluate a savings in that kind of a situation because the private contractor who has the contract is responsible in meeting his deadlines in which he loses his profit for the contract if he has to wait for Public Works Department to do the electrical or the plumbing or he has to wait for them to provide him with materials. He could come up to a loss position and to eliminate that possibility, Sir, I believe that some of the private contractors are forced to inflate the estimated cost for the building in order to safeguard their profits.

Sir, the maintenance section of Public Works Department is necessary, but I think that something is going to have to be done to correct there. One example is what is described the hall in the night time the post office, Sir, has been out for three years. The way the conversations has to go about getting that bulb replaced, I think, is to write a letter to the Postmaster General who will probably write one to the Financial Secretary of the Portfolio who in turn will write one to the Minister of Public Works, who then will refer a memorandum to his maintenance co-ordinator who will have a truck to work this will not be through a night bulb. So, if we take the front of the hotel of Delap, when the power of the bulb or three rooms has probably dimmed in that security, and someone else must arrive that is to say one's fault never will this matter although and possibly the bulb. The fact that one may have to leave George Town to go to North Side to change one light bulb is going to take them all day nearly. With the rates deficient

MR. D. RANDALL MILLER (CHAIRMANTIME): We have assistance which we are paying increasing time duty to be going to have had to be a fairly expensive high level. So, Sir, I would welcome any the creation of a post of minister or maintenance now in case of these older areas. We have spent a lot of money over the past couple of years building civic centres and I think there is some $500,000 budgeted in this year's budget to complete the civic centre in Mount Pearl. That is going to be a great facility, Sir, but it is going to need maintenance. It has to be cheaper to give subsidy to these outlying districts or a weekly or monthly basis. It is the minor maintenance of the public buildings in these districts. In South Side we have a couple thousand persons and all of the civic buildings are in one community. The mayor of that town district that way is surrounded as much as a mile square, but there is still places like Pouch Cove, Flatrock, Torbay to name the question of these areas for maintenance and financial assistance to these districts because I believe again as the Member across the House, who can no doubt speak on that better than people, who are here all the personal involvement of this country.

In the meantime, Sir, I do hear that there may be some success for our Pacific Rose with Pearl at the CFTDO meeting in Argentina next May, anyhow that we hope that we do get back into the United States market and the Pacific Rose can in fact be put back on a profitable footing.

The Port Authority mentioned in the Budget Address, Sir, speculation, sometimes it is a valuable asset. That is good news indeed, Sir, because the new public expenditure which Government has the new public Government is going to be. The only piece of information in that address which I query, Sir, is where the Financial Secretary says that it would be surprised that some of Georgs Pond was the highest escape throughout our hour of any point in the Caribbean of a similar industrial mix of the Eastern region that we have in our province. As I said I have my doubts on that statement but I will give him the benefit of the doubt and assume that he has the documentary evidence to prove it.

It is also nice to hear, Sir, that the plans are well advanced for the planning of permanent housing for the Labrador ridge. That has long been needed to stop the deterioration of the entire life in the area.

Mr. Speaker, it is noted that the Department of Development and Economic Planning is going to take on the energy problem in the Labrador West Town area. I support this proposal. I think that it is long overdue. Again, I think that it is a wise decision to create the programs in the area where it can be most highly publicized and therefore the greatest amount of revenue can be realized on the expenditure.

It is great to have that info, with the removal of the rent Agricultural Zone the Minister there is going to be continued and beneficial rent expanded planned on the development of agriculture in this country.

From his answer given to questions of mine on the floor of this Assembly responsible the Minister Responsible to Newfoundland Hydro is going to be in some difficulty for some time. That is understandable, Sir, but hopefully a way can be found to provide some capital cost in the water price to me as indication how please that some individuals who are being under the Housing Corporation had arrears of rent payment. Now, Sir, I do not believe that those are the kind of people who really need assistance in some more security, because they could quite readily qualify for a Housing mortgage in the private market and I know that funds there for the people who are genuinely in need of that kind of help.

MR. D. BRIAN HOWARD (CONSERVATIVE): Now, Mr. President, I would like to get to the nitty gritty of the appropriation Bill, that is dollars and cents. I think that it is very commendable, Sir, that the Government has found a way to come up with a surplus budget for the year 1986 while projecting for a deficit position. However, Sir, as I view a Private Member's Motion coming before this House of this to which some adjustments were made yesterday by the Member already, I will reserve my comments until the presentation of that motion. I do think though, Sir, that the Member was misled yesterday in relying the position what my motives for bringing those motions were. However, Sir, I think I would say more adequately deal with the position which he has taken on that the previously those motions.

Sir, the estimated expenditure for 1986 is $42.6 million, an increase of $4.6 million or 9.1 per cent. This is of considerable view by the Government, Sir, because they have projected a declining economy. I think economic have been declining for the last year, certainly for the last month of the year 1985, but I still join them in their optimism. I believe that the country is on the threshold of revitalization and I think that although the problems of this country were certainly greater than I anticipated in making allocations to offices, we hope the people there will not have the economic benefit. Who can fault this country out of the doldrums and I intend to offer them my full support to bring us and make investor confidence. I can in particular this, Mr. President, in the last couple of days on the debating of the Revenue Bills I have heard the words "double taxation" on different occasions, Sir. I hope that they were not using "double taxation" in the same terminology as I used it earlier in referring to the specific individual, but I will assume, Sir, that they were talking about the less fortunate people in this country. Now, Mr. President, much has been made of the argument that the Revenue Bills are going to affect those unfortunate people so terribly bad, Sir, any Government can but declare to the people that which is not from the people. In the past the revenue has been raised from the "Unwanted" Company in terms of increasing fees and charges of that nature and, Sir, the result of the matter is I have it to be that the less fortunate was never the target of the taxation. I do not think that there is any form of taxation which effectively taxes the rich to any extent other than in the form of direct taxation, Sir, and such as rates, high personal income, unemployment to create the situation which is what that already be based on. We have that there have been quite a few working persons we have had a fairly good growth rate that present for the last several years. In other circumstances, Sir, any form of taxation is going to stand up on the little man as they term him. This is nothing new. This is not something which the Government has decided up to present the Tax-Bills as to be performed to out of the little man. We are glad being a little more acceptable with the little man. We are making him to contribute and we are initiating the ways in which he will contribute. What has been done in the past, Sir, is they have had initiating him, "Now it must have to contribute, we will tax the banks, taxes companies and all the other areas of the financial industry and so will not upset your majority". That is not a fact, Sir. The fact is that when a banking license goes up my banking charges go up. When my banking charges go up as a merchant in this country, the prices on my shelves go up. When the prices on my shelves go up the little man have to pay more for the goods which he buys from my store. So it all stems up on the little man.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER (CONSERVATIVE): Mr. Speaker, I would only like to say that I would be very glad to see a copy of Hansard which is being introduced by the new Government. It has always been that way. It is a straightforward point of fact.

I disagree with the Premier speaking yesterday in his argument on the Throne Speech. I will not go into the fact of misreporting but I think it should be pointed out that the Leader was right when he said that the Premier was not present.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker....

MR. SPEAKER: I think you probably made a point of misinformation, but I am not quite...

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am being completely misquoted by the Liberal Member for North Bay. I did not say....

MR. SPEAKER: It is a point of misinformation. I suppose...

MR. SPEAKER: May I proceed my friend?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, let us speak for a moment. If you will sit down I will explain. I think it would be helpful if members were carefully certain what are points of order and what are points of explanation and if Hansard, with those two entirely opposite and there can be no misunderstanding would clearly understand what was permissible interruption. It is perfectly permissible to interrupt a speaking Member to move a Standing Order motion which is not a point of order but is not necessary to give up the floor to say that one is raising a point of order when a speaking Member misquotes him or when he thinks he can help by clarifying something which he is saying. However, under Standing Order 34(1)(b) of the speaking Member will not give way since he has to seek to secure his right to offer an explanation in terms of Standing Order 34(3). It is often helpful if the speaking Member will give permission to the Member and to ask him to give way on a point of order which then turns out not to be a point of order at all.

So I do not think that your interruption is a point of order. I think it is under Standing Order 34(1)(b). As far as I am concerned, provided the Liberal Member from North Bay, while he continues to be, is willing to allow you to misinform, you may continue speaking.

MR. LEONARD A. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the section of the Standing Orders which I have risen before me and I wish to clarify what the Elected Member for North Bay has just said since he has given way.

Secondly, on my behalf of the People I said that we believed that as a matter of principle that we should be opposed to any form of racism in the most expressive form of racism, and because of the share of our economy that all people have to be equal in the face of each endeavour form of racism that it has a much greater effect on the White people. My White people I did not use the term in a derogatory manner. I spoke in the one time I will off and I believe, Sir, that the Elected Member for North Bay is quite aware of exactly what I meant by that. In any of your different remarks, I feel, in making the most important to the public and I will, Mr. Speaker, my rights will your permission if he continues to misquote me.

MR. D. FRANK WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I thought I had made it quite clear that I was not attempting to quote the Member in fear of misquoting him. I do not really....

MR. PRESIDENT: I am in the Member's hands, but I wonder whether we have been interrupted already it would be a convenient moment to withdraw for lunch. If you want to finish dealing with a point I am quite happy for you to spend five minutes on that ...

MR. D. FRANK WILLIAMS: Well, maybe we could just put this to rest.

MR. PRESIDENT: Put this to rest. Alright.

MR. D. FRANK WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. I was talking about import duty and I do not wish to question the Member concerned what he finally had said about it, but what I was getting to was that import duty is 33 per cent of the revenue in this country. My interpretation, Sir, and it is my right to interpret what he said, of what the Member was saying was that import duty causes more hardship to the little man than it does to some other sections of the community. However, Sir, I think that that part of the import duty which one contributes to one's purchasing power which the country can I believe, Sir, that as has previously been said the greater purchasing power the more necessity of the properties. I agree with that and therefore, Sir, it follows that those who have the greatest purchasing power in this country are going to make the greatest contribution in import duty.

We can take lunch now, sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: (Inaudible) I think we need time to digest that. Let us therefore suspend proceedings until 2.15 p.m.

AT 1.45 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

BEING RESUMED AT 2.15 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Minister for Natural Resources.

MR. LIBERTO A. TORRES: Mr. President, there is a list of clarifications which we require. I do not know if you would take it at this point that we have misunderstood what he would be good if the House could have one point clarified before we continue so that we do not make a mistake which we have explained already through the proceedings. I would like to state the point if you do not mind, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is this a separate point from the point which you clarified before?

MR. LAWRENCE A. ZIMMERMAN: Mike points have to do with section 301(b)(3) and section 316 of the Standing Orders since they relate to a point of order, we have developing practice and needs to say one is missing on a point of information, because there may be some quick points, namely that one relies on a point of order must take one minute that one's point of order is to be with an explanation or to elucidate or whatever?

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding of Standing Orders is that if a Member is relying on a point of order he is relying in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 301(3)(a). Under those circumstances he should not be relying on a point of order and he should immediately specify in detail what the points of order are and identify which order of the Standing Order he relies is being broken. If a Member is relying in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 301(3)(b), then it is not a point of order at all and he should simply say that he is relying in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 301(3)(b) to intervene the motion. The difficulty of making the intervention in that if a Member is relying on a point of order under 301(3)(a) he is absolutely entitled to be heard. Until I make that is in fact a point of order at all. If he is relying under 301(3)(b) then it is up to the Member being interrupted to decide whether to give way or not. If the Member being interrupted declines to give way then the intervention is entitled to have up to fifteen minutes to explain the terms of Standing Order 301(3).

Does that make it clear or not?

MR. ERNESTO M. ORTEGA: Quite good very much, Mr. President. I think that makes the point clearer than it was before.

MR. SPEAKER: Well that necessarily is how I interpret Standing Orders and it will be helpful, I invite all Members of any Member who does have a genuine point of order rather than to be relying under 301(3)(a) and specifically specifically the Standing Order which he has to be relying on, that that is those are only to be relying on a point of order that is just to be relying under Standing Order 301(3)(a).

Alright, and the Elected Member for Secret Ridge.

MR. D. EDGAR KILLICK: Mr. President, I would like to deal briefly with the capital expenditure. Limited experience is estimated at £2.5 million. There is a massive shortfall in unmet necessities this year and I do not agree with what was stated yesterday that there has been a cut in capital expenditure. I think that there is really an understanding between capital expenditure provided recently, and there is a view taken by the Government to the areas that we which need immediate and which require, capital expenditure.

I would also like to compliment the newly Elected Members of Executive Council on the way they have shown personally their capital expenditure budget, in that they achieved most of the objectives, in fact I think all of the objectives with reasons to why that needs were in the specific areas. I think, Sir, that they have done a commendable good job of spending every penny available, however,

I note, Sir, with pleasure that two out of my five requests this year have been provided for in the Budget, that is the replacement of Gibraltar Rock Road in North Side which is a road which was mentioned about five years ago and it never was completed to the stage where it would be useful to the farmers who live in the area. Also there is provision for five, not for

MR. D. EZEKIEL MILLER (CONTINUING): The extension of the North Side Primary School and development of the facilities there. So I wholeheartedly support these two areas.

The other area which I offer a lot of support to, Sir, is the $50,000 which they have provided for the construction of some more facilities for George Town, which I think are very much needed facilities.

Mentioning this point, Sir, that the Town Building was a good investment, and as I said earlier I do not think that it was a good investment and I think that is to turn out here in this even after paying the funds which were paid we have to allocate a figure in the capital expenditure of $600,000 to make the building useful as a Government administrative building. That is not to provide facilities. That is to fix the building so that it will be useful.

Sir, Mr. President, I agree with the other major pronouncements established in the Budget Address under capital expenditure, that is the water and sewage projects, the Central George Town Project, the sports and cultural centre and parks. The Post and Police Centre, and the School Buildings at the Lower Valley Consolidated High Schools in Cayman Brac and Cayman Brac. I think they have done a remarkable job like I said in providing the said amount and I offer them my congratulations, Sir.

It is with these remarks, Sir, that I offer my support to the Appropriation Bill, 1985. Thank you, Sir.

HON. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? I think the First Elected Member for the Lower Valley area.

CAPT. MARK E. MCCOSKEY: Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on this very impressive and comprehensive Throne Speech and I would like to thank and congratulate the Honourable Third Official Member for his very clear, progressive and comprehensive Budget Address which he delivered to this Honourable House on 1st March. I am indeed proud, Sir, to be able to stand in this Legislative Assembly once more, representing the people of the Third Electoral District of the Cayman Islands, Cayman Brac and Little Cayman and to be able to make my contribution to this debate.

I am very thankful to all who helped to return me to this seat and I shall do all that I can to uphold their trust.

Mr. President, I am very concerned by the fact that I am the only Assembly to represent the people of my District and as a Member of the Legislature of the Cayman Islands. I shall always be guided by standing orders and your decisions as President. I feel this is the way all Legislatures should behave and why I ask all Members to consider the situation carefully. Let us put politics aside and join shoulder to shoulder to represent our people and to provide the proper Government for the people which they became used to the Cayman Islands.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to the present Elected Members of Executive Council for having which they have given to ordinary Members of this House of which I am one. This situation did not exist in the five previous years that I served as a Member here and I can assure you that it is very much welcomed and very helpful to the ordinary Members.

I again pledge my support to the Government and we have been my policy from the date I entered this House, I shall give them my full support wherever in my judgement their actions are in the best interests of the Cayman Islands.

CAPT. HERBERT D. KIRKCONNELL (CONTINUING): Mr. President, speaking on Clayton Lewis, Standard 3 of the Guyana Syllabus, which is accompanied by 80 miles of sewer water pipes, gives me quite a different approach to the needs of my people than other Members who have the privilege to reach central George Town. It is not in the position that Opposition Members are right now as their duties are very grateful, and would like to go on record to thanking each of the four Elected Members of Georgetown Council for their visits to my division so shortly after they took office. I think already we made by the fact that four of them were present in Clayton Lewis at the same time. I am also most grateful to them for allowing us to hold a public meeting at the same time during the Friday night that they visited, after everybody a complete tour of the island and seeing our needs and finding the funds for themselves.

I had the honour of chairing the platform with the four honourable Members and to serve as moderator for the night. Each Member enhanced considerably their portfolio and I would like to say at this time that this was very greatly appreciated by all in attendance, and I am sorry this did not attract more people since everyone that did not attend who would have enjoyed their visit very much. Again may I say thank you to each of the Honourable Members.

Mr. Speaker, I could not stand here and not thank the Honourable Minister for the work they have achieved since the administration during the four years it was his responsibility. We are very grateful for all the achievements which have been made in my division.

I must also state on behalf of my people that we feel we have failed in having my colleague the Honourable Third Elected Member of Georgetown Council as a Member of Georgetown Council, and in particular representing district administration. We are very grateful that you have placed this responsibility in the Ministry.

As I said earlier, we being separated by 60 miles from central George Town, myself a lonely who is unintelligible about the situation in the two smaller islands. We are possibly fifteen years behind the development in Great Guyana and we are struggling hard to achieve the gap.

In your Throne Speech, Mr. President, you stated most of the infrastructure necessary for economic development in Guyana are in place and I agree. You also stated that attention will be focused on attracting developers and visitors alike to help our economy to expand and to generate employment that is most meaningful. It is my view that the first step in achieving this points should be to obtain a market study for projected tourists and their numbers and how they would relate to Guyana first and Latin Guyana. There is an internationally respected firm in the United States, as recommended and unanimously given which has been functioning mainly in the Caribbean since 1957. This firm has also been lately studied in the Guyana Islands since 1977 and was responsible for the Guyana Islands tourist development plan. I strongly suggest that we employ a firm of this structure to make a study in Guyana first. In my opinion it would not be a costly outlay and it would invariably pay us on the right tracks for future development. I think this survey could be done in three phases, the first phase being a preliminary market assessment. I am told this could be done in approximately six weeks.

If the first phase proves the practicality then we could move on to the second and third phases which I understand would take approximately an additional three months

CAPT. WEST P. PINKOWSKI (continued): After hearing these figures at hand we could then make plans. It is noted that this year the new Airport plan for the Cayman Islands states that there was substantial opportunity in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman for development, while they considered that Grand Cayman was nominal saturated.

Mr. President, I therefore would appreciate it if the Honourable Member of Executive Council responsible for Tourism Aviation and Trade would give this study very serious consideration. It is my judgement that it will be a great step forward in the development of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, and will enable us to help ourselves, boost our economy and provide employment for our people with the needed development.

I strongly recommend the development of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman as an alternative means to further promote the Cayman Islands as a viable Caribbean resort for North Americans, Canadian and to a lesser extent Europeans tourists.

Mr. President, continuing to deal with my statement the present Cayman Airways fleet of five flights to Brac and Grand Cayman from Cayman Brac have often had to encounter the weather hazards in Cayman Brac and I am very grateful to the present management that they was fit to substitute the flights on Monday when it was proposed that they would be changed. We are finding that our reasons is gradually increasing and it is my hope that we will be able to help Cayman Airways and not continue to increase additional expenditures.

We are proud of the increase in our runway. We now consider our runway equal to if not better than the Owen Roberts Airport. Prior to my leave, Mr. President, to the airport terminal and I shall deal with them later. While desktop with Cayman Airways I have talked with the Chairman and the Member responsible for Tourism Aviation and Trade and made the point to me quite forcibly that if the relationship between Brac and Little Cayman as opposed to the scheduled service it was more, it would definitely encourage tourism in the two smaller islands. May I express my concern for having this Mr. President, the passenger being many small, that only 19 seats available created the situation where sometimes we have to use Cayman Brac to take them to Cayman Brac. Naturally, sometimes visiting to a destination may want to stay longer sometimes or another and not to be delayed and forced to pay additional hotel expenses in Grand Cayman, so they rather select their trip completely to Brac or Grand Cayman as their destination. If the Twin-Otter was working as a shuttle service with the first departure at 7.30 a.m. each morning and it would make flights approximately every three hours until the regular last one closed. It would provide to each and every person wishing to come to Cayman Brac and Little Cayman having guaranteed reservations on the same departing flight. This is done in the United Kingdom by British Airways and I understand it is very successful. I feel that it is worth our trying this to help Cayman Airways.

Mr. President, on my leave on the Caribbean Express I spoke of the higher freight rates which we have to pay to Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. I do not want to bore you by this statement but it is my responsibility to bring to this Honourable House the needs of my people and especially if I think I have them, to use paying a much higher per freight although the distance is almost the same. Except for the Cayman Islands is privileged to enjoy Customs and Trade therefore the local cost of our

Ch'ng, KIONG H. KIONGOMESS (CONTINUING): Unemployment is unacceptably high. This is further aggravated by the fact that people from Upper Demerara who succeed in getting jobs in Upper Demerara still own land down this coast which they cannot develop because of lack of water. You see, Mr. President, when this Government is the cause of our misfortunes in the election, the cost of living in Upper Demerara has to be considerably higher than Upper Corentyne. This does not seem to discriminate under the heading of fraudulent, does it, Mr. Speaker, as I would be interested to hear what kind of explanations the Minister has to offer for this particular anomaly.

We are very proud of the development of our Public Hospital. The Minister of Economic Planning visited there on Study Night and I think they were quite impressed with what they saw. We realize that we have a health hazard and we are pleased by the fact that we have a facility such as we have, but the fact remains that many people in our interior who are not able to pay their medical fees. I understand that the Department of Social Services will take action on this matter and the indigent people who are unable to pay, their medical bills. I might be wrong but help of the Social Services in providing this facility for my people, as it presently that do not enjoy this privilege.

Mr. President, we have noticed with deep interest the development of the Water Authority here in Upper Demerara. I honestly feel that consideration will be given to this problem but I would not like the Water Authority to make available their services to people in Upper Demerara, because presently we have experiencing a very serious drought. They still owing to us the bills of the year and some of them are becoming very costly to correct. If a common water line could be connected,and we do not anticipate large quantities of water, I believe that they might be encouraged to use facilities.

Previous speakers have highlighted a change in our Liquor Licensing Law. Mr. President, I do not share their view. I feel that although we do need laws to regulate our liquor, we also need laws which will protect our churches and our schools. We must realize that alcohol is definitely not a necessity of life. It is a luxury and an expensive one at that,and I would advocate today of this in the case of the Government Revenue of this nature. Only the construction of a church or a mosque should be obtained in the Law that this consideration is given to locating it in my opinion. In our fast growing and drinking people must be protected and our churches and our youth, and I feel that considerable emphasis be given in this vein.

Mr. President, the Annual Estimates laid in November 1988 are, in my opinion, a very great disappointment. I would like at this time to congratulate the Chairman and his entire staff for the good work and also the people of the Upper Islands for the orderly manner in which the elections was conducted. It was a privilege to be and again I compliment all who took part in it.

I thank you Mr. Vice President, for the opportunity which I certainly have to the public and I feel that we as people citizens must do all we can to provide facilities for our youth and to prevent them going in the wrong

HON. MARY S. KINGSBURY (CONTINUED): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all the cadets and the cheerleaders which are now the representative sports on the Cayman Islands. We have proud that a step has been taken forward in our district and the Cayman Sea Scouts Association has been formed. They are cheerily planning a camp to celebrate and I hope that it will be successful. I am very grateful to all who have volunteered and are continuing to help. It is encouraging our youth to participate in team-sport and to realize that team-work is necessary to be successful in their adult life.

I turn now to the Tourism sector. It is noted that at the end of 1992 there were 350 hotels and tourist accommodations and this was an increase of seven. I am happy to see that the market has increased and I hope this will continue to do so. It is also true that the satisfaction of the Government is down. We have the visibility and the infrastructure to work on.

Also we note in the Budget Address the recent visit the Cayman Islands Chamber Board in delegation to our Mainland Headquarters. We also heard of their growth and the purposes of the society.

Will anyone be correct explanation I am happy to see that this has not developed as many had predicted that it would. I am happy that this is continuing to hold its own and I am hoping that it will increase.

Further, when the Speaker has spoken our Cayman Islands dollar is proposed to our neighbours' Jamaican currency it really speaks highly for our tourist industry and the Ministry of Tourism Aviation and Trade that they continues to increase. I have talked to many and they all quickly say the cost is high but they do get the service, and I hope that a company employed within the American industry will continue their on and investments in Jamaica and that they will make every effort to give them a holiday worth for a dollar spent.

I would like at this time to congratulate Cable and Wireless on the establishment of the submarine cabled optic, between Grand Cayman and Cayman Brac and their other many developments here in Grand Cayman. We have a first class telecommunications system and for the first time ever the reception of television by cable and satellites are to able to visibly our local channels from Cayman Brac without slight interruption. It is a great improvement and I look forward to the further improvements which are planned and will come on stream towards the middle of this year. This necessary is to be computerized and modernized for the way they are providing the Corporations to take advantage possibilities in the telecommunications world.

Cayman Turtle Farm has had many set-backs both before the Government purchased it and since. It is my hope that the CITES meeting in Argentina in April this month in the United States to lift the ban on the sterile juveniles and let us go ahead with our planned development. I also feel that there is money to be made in shrimp, lobster and fish farming and that area should be given a careful look at, as if we had more than one product we certainly would have more than one choice.

The Fire Service, also a small Government body on the Cayman Islands is most exceptional. Our Chief Fire Officer and his staff in all they have accomplished during the years. The Grand Cayman station is ideally sited centrally to the East End, North Side area and I am happy to see that. I fully realize that it is also needed in the West Bay area and that I hope will come.

CAPT. ALBERT B. KINGCOMBE (CONTINUING). Thank heaven we do not have, Mr. President, where we have to depend on the fire service in Pigeon Cove and Gloucester. We would like to have as reasonable as possible but we do feel that we must have fireman on call 24 hours a day for we have had major fires! Our loss goes to eighteen months. There have been fires on files which has risen on that unfortunately which we had had in previous years. So the need for a reasonable fire service does exist.

The Police Department is playing a great part in the security and development of these Islands. I suspect each and every one of the officers who are in the Pigeon Cove area have quite a large job for a small force! and I feel that the time has come where both electronic help may assist because to employ the telephone in the station is hence a day. With the police cars having radio communications in them they could be sent to the scene in a short period of time. As it is we will the police car in the patrol car phone in to the station and there is no means of one has a hand for the police, of getting in contact with them unless they do go by the scene accidentally.

I am very proud to see that station, the largest welcome center in the Pigeon Islands will be housed in proper quarters in the very near future, in the Town building. Much has been said about the significance of the Town building. I suppose in them and I suppose so must. I think that is use a view similar taken by this Government. The location is near to this building, the Legislative Assembly and the Customs building and so does have Cooper Jane added it a great asset. It is also close to the Port Authority. It has been able to give proper heating to the many departments which will be occupied therefore and opened several floors. As I said I appreciated it then and I express for gratitude now.

Sandy and Army Department to speak! A very important part of our Government. In addition the development of these Islands. We understand that the Army Department still have active in Pigeon Cove and Little Cayman in the Cayman Islands Militia in order to help assist the Police Officers in order to help maintain the security of the Islands. We would like to have as reasonable as possible but we do feel that we must have fireman on call 24 hours a day for we have had major fires! Our loss goes to eighteen months. There have been fires on files which has risen on that unfortunately which we had had in previous years. So the need for a reasonable fire service does exist.

Hospital Department and Council. I could not attend the budget and pay my remarks to the late Dr. Lightfoot for his invaluable service to the community when he may rest be heard that department. I remember that without him and his department the success which we enjoy today would not have been possible. Any of us who remember what mosquitoes used a major factor responsible again.

The Planning Department. During the last year and a half I have had really close contact on a number of the Central Planning Authority and the Development Control Board in Cayman Brac and I am happy to see the progress that Department is making. The new head of the department, Mr. Peter King, is working very hard to help develop the Planning Department and I look forward to a whole. We have been most helpful to the Development Control Board in Cayman Brac. We have made the weekly phone and fax information on applications which we mail as members of the Board but is attached to assisting on the Department, and they are only too happy to help us. I would like to congratulate him on the job he is doing and thank him for his service to our Board in particular.

Our physicians. The health and welfare of our people is one of the major concerns. From whether to necessary, I fully realize that we can all have confidence to continue a balanced budget and to provide the necessary expenses for our people. Recently

MR. SPEAKER, MISCHIEVOUS CONSTITUENCY: We cannot forget the people of our communities who cannot help themselves. I hope that we will continue to give them even all the attention it needs.

I have touched on education, which is quite largely an urban part of my duties but, Mr. President, I am encouraged to see in the estimates that funds will be available from the contingencies of the Duty owed to Cayman Brac and its airport terminal. We need to ensure that it is not just paid on promises but we are seeking an improved air terminal.

We must do more to help the people. Our airports cannot be presently located very close to the runway and with the way jets the tarmac will give us the required international distance and provide facilities to welcome people to come to our Islands. We do not want and we do not need something as elaborate as Grand Cayman, but we do want that it be modern to attract and efficient to the needs of our community.

Mr. President, I could go my full debate on the Throne Speech and Budget Address that I will very probably but one of the Cayman Islands could accommodate a budget that of Sixty million, having a population of under 17,000 people. Today we are debating a budget of Sixty-six million. This places requirements, Mr. President, truly a large budget for a small community and I congratulate the Members of Government on how they have approached the various departments. I realise that the economies have been a difficult one, but I think, from observations here today and I am looking forward to further discussions this is a reasonable budget.

Mr. President, I agree with the needs of our dependable Police Officials member on his pleading remarks on the Budget Address and I would like to quote them—

> "There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. President, that the Cayman Islands is one of the most profitable financial centres, and so are, in my view, on the threshold of great things for these Islands and our people, but we need to concentrate on the world around us, lest we lose this opportunity."

These are wise words, Mr. President, and I hope that all the people will give them their serious consideration.

Mr. President, I had hoped that I would have gone on for considerably longer, but I am having problems with my throat and Members have been quite so brief on myself I will try to conclude at this time.

In conclusion I would like to thank you, Sir, for the Throne Speech and the Honourable Third Official Member for the very relative Budget Address. May I again ask all Honourable Members of this Legislative Assembly to take initiative out of their problems in this Chamber, and abide by the Standing Orders. We should all remember that every word spoken in this Legislative Assembly is recorded in the Hansard and is now considered part of Public Expense. In this white world we live in we must be therefore be very considerate in our actions.

Mr. President, I suppose the Appropriation Bill, 1981, will look forward to going this debate in the Committee Stage.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I'd like to ask for one additional question before we go to another Member wishes to speak, which that if he speaks for any length of time he may break before he finishes. I think that it will be convenient for someone to do so.

(PAUSE) Does anyone else? The Member certainly may rest I shall be obliged to invite the Honourable Third Official Member to exercise his right of reply.

(PAUSE) Would the Honourable Third Official Member wish to exercise his right of reply?

HON. TRAVER C. JEFFERSON: No, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry!

HON. TRAVER C. JEFFERSON: No, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: There is that anyone of the Members wishes to speak. (PAUSE) If the Standing Order says I think. If no Member wishes to speak the question is that the Bill entitled a Bill for a law to authorize certain expenditure for the purposes of the financial year, 1965. be read a second time and in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 52(1) that Bill and the motions would then stand suspended to Friday next. So if no Member wishes to speak... the First Elected Member for Dodan Town.

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, I will speak on the Estate Duty question until the house adjourns and I promise you I will be back tomorrow also.

If the Elected Members and the Government Bench with the exception I think that our voices will not be heard at the end. My colleague the Second Elected Member for Dodan Town is prepared to take his chance or speak as one of the last.

I am very pleased to be here to debate the Loan Budget. There are many people who I am sure present that my colleague and myself would not be having [illegible] to our people in the Dodan Town Division as some returned civil & judiciary criticism the noise or person responsible for employment. I must point it to the opposition that they have as a good point and that they realised as very sensitive. I am sure the more like very sorry apologising to them at the end.

Unfortunately in this already connected elsewhere more of my other party, three colleagues have returned to the house, but they will prove that the Government policy to be the people of the Dodan Division and the Legislative Assembly. I wish to pay tribute to my other colleagues of the party even those objected and I wish to endorse the Government of the day that we will be fair and that they will be fair.

In my constituency the voice of the majority prevails and that is what happens here. The people had their own representation there and for what reason I do not know. However, they felt unable to show this. As I go around and talk with people I encounter many the same thing, strong disappointment of the present administration and they are now angry because of taxes for what they see happening to the country.

Much discussion has gone on and much will follow my debate, but how much is what I personally am ashamed to see the many members of this Legislature and the Elected Members of Executive Council would try to manipulate the party, manipulate the funds and try to stop the people's voice

Mr. JAMES K. DUGGAN (CONTINUED): developments of this country which he's been going on very successfully. I have mentioned many times that they appear to generate the fears of the Guyana Taiwan to the people abroad if they continue to abandon the previous administration and to tell the people that the country is broke.

I'm a new group to the bank of Guyana maybe he would be very foolish to start blaming to see the bank manager of he's going to tell the bank manager that he is broke; he has no reserves, he has got nothing and expects to stay there the next week, and he has no insurance, because it would then be very foolish for the bank manager to even talk to him, much less consider loaning him money. That is the position which our Minister of Economic Growth and Planning is put into finding us.

I am very pleased that the Government has a public servant who is capable of painting vividly the facts as he has so capably done and I refer to the honourable Third Official Member. I imagine that it has been a very difficult task with all of the garbage which has been thrown around him to be able to present the true financial picture of the country to the people as he has so ably done.

Mr. President, it does not take a great genius to play with the figures as the Minister of Economic Growth does them. Mr. President, if only a country was broke and on its knees, and suffering gloom and depression it was this country in 1992. The records will bear out what I point to saying. At that time the country had a very small budget. The money which the Government was capable of borrowing was very small. There was no Guyanese there was no exception. If my memory serves me correctly the maximum that the country at that time was able to borrow was $3.5 million. But the country had a long term debt of about $7.5 million, and the Gross National Product was also low. I may not have my calculator and myself to back me in my arguments for saying that the country was in a very poor position at that time.

It is true that the administration had some public buildings, but it was also true, Mr. President, that the payments on these capital expenditures did not begin until after the party was administration took over in 1992. So the money which they had spent to build these Government buildings was money which was not borrowed by any stretch. If a country with a debt of about $5 million in 1992 and assets of about $7.5 million was not broke but in the world was a country to be broke in 1994, when we had a capital and Revenue of over $20 million. At what point, if I can comment and I think that I can, the Minister could stand on around $10 million with appreciation $8 million of that having been brought forward from the administration of 1992.

The Co-Operative Secretary as I am sure he was the one responsible for preparing these figures and presenting them to the public and probably encouraging his other colleagues to argue them with him, should be ashamed of himself for having watched the part of Financial Secretary with the attendant lawyers and for giving this position and probably trying to use his finest position to lay to mislead the people of this country in the manner he has done. I wish he was here today to hear me, but I hope that the good Lord is helping me and that the advice of the Devil is helping mine; and I am going to ahead and do so.

Mr. President, this country prospered in the years 1992 to 1994 which the only term administration has to its never experienced before, and probably will ever in the future. During that time this country was able, to spend $20 million on capital expenditure from many lines projects. There were very few projects of the country which existed at the attention to which

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS (Delaware): I move his withdrawal sir. It is the only time in the existence of the Civil Service Commission in this country that the Civil Service Rules have been violated to such a shocking degree. It may not look so bad down here in the Midwest where the Government has to ask the Civil Service not to use for a while, but to which some sharks of voting areas.

I am very proud that my home the people of the Midwest in this Federal Government can be heard since we happened to invest three of us in the House.

I suppose fully the violence which came about by our administration that I have that my colleagues who are here with me today also fully support it. We have nothing to hide. We have nothing to be ashamed of. We have the people of the Civil Service Commission to our country and we have taken pride in this country which nobody else. My colleague from Rhode Island, Thank God, can claim one party in this country, which none have the first position in this country. It is a name which has been honored through the history of this country and the people of that name have played a great part in the development of this country. We are proud of that background. We have our roots here. We intend to stay here and we intend to carry on the fight.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to work with the Democratic Party as we have in the past.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would it be a convenient moment, sir, you have to have received a natural break for us to take the afternoon break.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: I am in your hands for the next four days, sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well if it is the time then, I can state that a breakfast will not come again. I still suppose proceedings until approximately 4:30 p.m. That is about fifteen minutes.

AT 3:22 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

HOUSE RECONVENED AT 3:40 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The first Democrat Member for Indiana

Miss.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGS: Mr. President, the Democratic people have always been people who have been very progressive people who are very independent minded people who have tried to make their own way in life and to make their mark in history. This has been brought about because of our affiliation with the sea. Most have Democratic Governors have followed the sea and although a lot of

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT (SAINT KITTS): Delegations regrettably have left their seats at precisely the moment I have wanted their people to be reminded of it. I am very proud of the people of Guyana because I have always said that the only contribution we have in the world is the Jewish faith. They are the only people who have suffered and been through the administration of each one that we have. I am very proud to be able to stand in this House as a representative of the Saint Kitts district. In case the Members had forgotten it, it is the first capital of the Islands. It will be the capital again and it is the political capital.

For my convenience I am going to deal with the Budget Address and the Throne Speech separately. There may be occasionally some overlaps.

The speech which you, Mr. President of this Assembly have delivered to the House was duly done. I cannot associate myself with it having unfortunately done, but it was duly done. It is a speech which deserves much praise and thought. I will deal with what I consider to be the important points in your speech.

You, Throne Speech similarly to the United States wants us how the State of the Union message vastly despite the existence of the Cold War peace and the hopes and aspirations for the years to come.

The year 1989 saw the country have two Presidents (cancelled), one sponsored by the party which and the other one by a third party nevertheless Democratic the country seem. So you do the year, your task to contend with the difficult problem of opinion with regard to what was taking place in the country. Mr. President, I distinctly feel that the people of our country are disillusioned because they went through a period of eight years when the presidency in this country was utilized; when the people from all walks of life had a chance to make a decent livelihood for their families. They did not have to worry as we are all worrying now that some of those were going to be forced on them in the next attempt of this Government. The accomplishments of this country in the past eight years was phenomenal. We had received a push where we were the envy of many parts of the world, particularly in the Caribbean. We like to associate ourselves with the Caribbean because we are a part of it. Unfortunately we cannot move ourselves out of the Caribbean. As unfortunate happens in the Caribbean we are going to have some sort of effect on the Guyana Dollar.

I do only wish that this year, your year has the dedication of our new Chief of Staff. We have had over many months of grave worry, many crisis conversations with Caracas. Outside from Caracas in this country, one of Venezuelan descent, invisibly account for about 30 per cent of our economic population. The people of Venezuela have helped the Guyana dollar many a hard pressed and many of them have been very supportive of this country. Many of them in grave fear helped to shape the destiny of this country by electing as representatives to the Legislature Assembly. So we must not lose sight of the fact that we are closely linked. Anyway, Mr. President, there comes a time in the history of a country where there comes a time in the growing period of a man, and a woman where they like to know that they have entered the ranks of maturity or manhood. The Guyana Situation has come to that place and I sincerely wish the very best we made and was glad to make that move to put us out on our own of dispute. The only thing which I regret is that no Caymanian was the privilege possibly at this time to put on this Cloak. I will consider it a great honour in this country if we ever reach the stage where Caymanians can be appointed to the Court of Appeal.

MR. JAMES M. HODGE (continued): I feel that we have reached the point where we should call the whole end not some other minority, and I think that is the issue the Court appeal will have to answer in that manner. What they will look on that as giving jurisdiction completely to the Supervisor people.

I will endorse mostly to the part of your Thesis Speech which deals with the Civil Service. According to the figures delivered by you, Mr. President there are 1,600 people employed in the Civil Service at this moment. I do not believe that that takes into account the people who work on a day to day basis in the Public Works and maybe the Health Department and across like that. I am sure that by the time everything is accounted for this Government is directly responsible today for 25 per cent or more of the work force's employment. That is contrary to the point where it is becoming alarming. Any Civil Service in any country which grows to the proportions number in which ours has grown calls for serious study.

I feel as I have said for many years now I proclaimed to the Executive Council for the whole time that I was there, that the time has come to curtail further employment in Government positions. I know that this is a difficult thing to accomplish and many people will get hurt, but again the country as a whole will benefit. I feel that it is time that we come to grips and change some of the rules and regulations which govern employment in the Civil Service. We have many dedicated Civil Servants; many people who have been there for many years at small salaries and so forth, but we must now consolidate and make changes. The picture is a very serious one. It is one which requires examination. It is one which could build up visible unemployment and if the services of this country is such that is the area which we can really look to.

In my opinion a small cost of hard pushed people should be granted from Portfolio to Portfolio in Government so that when the time comes and there is an unexpected Hurricane or as a Permanent Secretary we could then be able to reach out and get capable people to fill those positions. As it is now, we depend too much on Temporary. We depend too much on subvention in the Civil Service coming by filling a dead man's boots. I feel that we have to be cautious with this system we will be paying out too much money for what is not in return. It is an area which in my opinion certainly should be given to.

Another area, Mr. President, is the unemployment rate among first school leavers. They should be imbued in possibilities of responsibility commensurate with their ability and their needs rather than just being put into a job to fill the time lapse. When a young man or a young woman has gotten from passing abroad in any university or college they acquire different habits to what they were used to in the Caymans. Their perspective of life has broadened and they do not just, I would say rightly so, that they should come back in and take a position with any person who has opened a post for twenty years and they are enjoying going home.

We must get to the point where we create the Civil Servants on merit and merit only. Our permanent will shortly become disillusioned and they will leave the Civil Service and go into the private sector unless there is a change of environment there. There is a chance for that to take responsible positions. There is not that sense of frustration hanging over their head while waiting to their going a more responsible position.

Too many times I know have one young people come back and join the services and they are put in positions where their job is under less than people from abroad, or with less than someone who has come there for two or three years from

Mr. CHRIS M. BROWN (CONSERVATIVE): I'm sure many other people have some kind words to say in this debate, but I am particularly pleased to support the motion moved by my hon. friend the Member for Ayr (Mr. Hamilton) because it will be my last opportunity to speak in a debate on the police before I am no longer a Member of this House. I have enjoyed my time here, and I am grateful to the people of Ayr for having given me the opportunity to represent them in this Assembly. I have always tried to be fair to the police, and I am grateful to them for the way they have responded to me. I have also enjoyed my time in the Scottish Office, and I am grateful to the Minister of State, the Under-Secretary and the hon. Member for Edinburgh, Central (Mr. Lynda) for the way they have responded to me.

I am delighted that the Minister has announced the appointment of a new Chief Constable for Strathclyde. I am sure that he will be a welcome addition to the police force in Scotland. I am also pleased that the Minister has announced the appointment of a new Chief Constable for Lothian and Borders. I am sure that he will be a welcome addition to the police force in Scotland.

I am delighted

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY (Belleville): Mr. President, I think it is disgraceful, Mr. President, in the face of violent opposition by a handful of people, I would say, against the most Conservative of parties, I know that Mike Harris is back for debate here and I will hold openly to that debate when the time comes. I believe that steps should have been taken by the Government to stop the abuse and the violence which grew to involve a professional man who conducted his office, in my opinion, in a very professional manner. It is time that the entire Conservative Caucus and I will stand here loudly and vigorously against which I believe to be right. I feel that the man was held a hostage because of the fascist actions of a few inside the proceedings. I am ashamed, as I have said before, Mr. President, not from the side of the Conservatives of Ontario, but on the back of taxpayers for two and one-half and the lack of support for the man who fulfilled the highest police position in the country to be assassinated out of the country in the manner which these persons planned Government did.

I final strongly, Mr. President, that it was another story of the trade unionists and the tax-payers of this country. On behalf of my party in order for a few individuals to have their way, something which I thought could not have been done under any kind of Government. Unfortunately I was wrong on that one as I have been in so many things lately with regard to the present administration.

I will endorse my most sacrifice of my thanks to the working people. My home having made over the past eighteen years the ancient city which we are fortunate enough to call our home and I am proud to have been associated with the citizens here and I am glad to know that our people today are not being used obviously not being recovered from the face of those brave lives because they have terminated a union.

I am going to deal with this subject in two ways. I am going to deal with what I think is the long term answer as the answer and I am going to try to work to be the rehabilitation other also. I have said from time to time the criminals should be made to work. I think that is a fair thing, even if it is the professional people have more to the mental health of the person concerned that is not carried on [illegible] unfortunately, during time I have been asked this subject is been many requests. I am in favour of a rehabilitation system to be put into effect to help those people. It is my own [illegible] those people from the community for one, two, three, five years or whatever it may be if we do not try to rehabilitate them in some such like society humanly. I will be the first one to agree that might be difficult to rehabilitate a person who has moved from to the cause to prison because every effort which society to check this must definitely have changed by that time, but I think we should have an attempt at it.

I am not one who believes in being cruel because I think that the state may have other for it. Some criminals [illegible] should be given any liberty to which they could be

MR. HUGHES (CONSTITUENCY): Just what sort of public service rather than being one of crisis. Perhaps the youngster at that point will merely be standing on his legs for the first time since he has entered this parliament.

I am sure the House will welcome the assurance that the maximum sentences will remain as they are, unless it would be for the purpose of consistency that the maximum sentence should be increased. It is really disgraceful that while there has been the appropriate panic when we quite rightly are powerfully home over 100 people in one raid and maybe a dozen or more waiting to go there, ... It appears to be that the prison is basically more secure where everybody wants to be an unpalatable solution since to that. We rightly object to go to this prison. However, more and more the prisons do become filled.

Which way do Government's thinking on sentencing must be accentuated. We need a system where there will be more checks and balances to it. The identity cards which were spoken of in your speech will be a means of easily distinguishing the people who are here under false pretences, but I have really to think about its, because if we start handing cards to every man, woman, child. The people of foreign origin will have to be issued a different card to enable them to be distinguished from. I would never like to think that the identity cards would be used in a manner similar to what has been done with the unfortunate system in South Africa.

In addressing the Nassau Agreement which was entered into last year between this country, the United States of America and the United Kingdom much was quite said about this particular weapon system. However, I am happy to see that these Polaris are now gradually, as we are beginning to realise that it was a step made in the right direction. It has got us in a much stronger bargaining position and it identifies the British Islands as an area where we are not trying to build an atomic bomb as many others. I am sure that in the progress with this there will be some slips from time to time, but it is much better to have these slips, Mr. Speaker, than to find the cross which our country would have faced if we had gone on such lengths because of lack of initiative. I would like the Members of the present Government that it is not too late to deal with the negotiations which will be attendant to this particular agreement in the future. When any steps are taken by this Government with regard to this agreement in the future, I hope that the members of Government will consultations to appear with Members of the House as can come under the wide term consultation when an application is. I hope that they will not find themselves out in the dark dealing with this, trying to keep the rest of us from knowing what they are doing.

I would also make that that this agreement, to be successful and not have the pressures of this country, must be negotiated and carried out in many different matters over many years to come. Great pressure will be exerted on the United States multilateral use also by the United Kingdom submarines to get us to accede to further requests. I would hope that any changes in this will be given by giving it on the basis of Polaris rightboush nombs for the next eight agreements, eighteen months for the next eight agreement until eventually we may get to the stage that we will have a choice. However, by that time the country should have built up an that it would not be affected by the moves then to make, but if we made hurriedly and agree to all the requests which the United States Government will put before us, the only other future we could bring ourselves is a very gloomy and depressing one on this country.

MR. JAMES M. HOUSER (COUNTY): As a point of order, Mr. President, I think that we ought to come to a conclusion as to whether or not you had an Eighteen Committee Council for two or three months ago because nobody knows. I would like to speak again to indicate to me that you were only elected into the Eighteen Member Committee and not one of the Thirty members of the Thirty Member Council. Regardless of whether just Democratic elected officials or any of those individuals could have thought that member would have been made in a more diverse manner than the manner in which you did it.

Someone has seen fit to re-classify the Committeemen of the Elected members of Democratic Council since the last election. I am glad to see that all some of the re-classifying it took so many people to do since a few people made some decisions. It is obvious to the Elected Members of this House that the country as a whole that re-classifying our Democratic Committee Council will find dissatisfaction with enough work to keep them busy.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that that has now come for our edification.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MR. HOUSER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning, CST.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. Those in favor signify by saying Aye; opposed Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion carries, and it is so ordered. The House stands adjourned until 10:00 A.M., TUESDAY, 31ST MARCH, 1981.

STATE OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(FRIDAY, 22ND MARCH, 1985)

PRESENT WERE:-

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR S ARTHUR LLOYD, CMG, CVO - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS M LEMON, OBE, CVO, CHIEF	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER (RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS)
HON MICHAEL J MCCOLLUM	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER (RESPONSIBLE FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION)
HON THOMAS C DEFREITAS, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER (RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT)
HON DENNIS O EBANKS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON CAPT CHARLES E MACCONNELL	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR W MCKEEVA BUSH	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR EDWARD A PARSONS, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT HENRY S MYRICKWELL	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CAYMAN BRACKISH
MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR O MARIO BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR TRUEMAN MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN B MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

CROSS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING & BUSINESS STATEMENT OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FRIDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1985

1. QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR MOUNT SIMS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 241. WOULD THE MEMBER STATE THE COST OF THE NEW SIGNS RECENTLY INSTALLED AT THE HOSPITAL, INCLUDING LABOUR?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 244 WOULD THE MEMBER STATE AMOUNT FOR WHICH WEST DISBURSED FROM THE CENTRAL ISLANDS TREASURY UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 5 OF 1984 - COMMISSIONER OF POLICE - CARRIED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON 1ST DECEMBER, 1983?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SIXTH ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

NO. 28. WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT STEPS ARE BEING TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT TO ENFORCE COMPULSORY REGISTERING OF FIREARMS INTO THE CAYMANS OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS?

NO. 35. WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT THE ACTUAL COST WAS OF REMOVING OF AND REPLACING THE HOT MIX SURFACE AROUND THE NEW AIRPORT TERMINAL BUILDING DUE CONSTRUCTION?

NO. 36. WHAT ARE MEMBER STATE HOW MANY PERSONS HAVE BEEN LAID OFF BY THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT SINCE 30TH NOVEMBER, 1984, GIVING A BREAK-DOWN OF CATEGORIES AND NON-CATEGORIES?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

NO. 77. WILL THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER ISSUE ARE PLANS TO CONTINUE ASPHALT HOT-MIX ON THE ROAD FROM PEDRO SOUND TO EAST END AND ALSO WITHIN THE DISTRICT IN 1985?

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

NO. 39. WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER COMMISSIONER STONERS, OF HIS OWN FREE WILL AND ACCORD, TENDERED HIS RESIGNATION OR WAS HE ASSISTED BY SOMEONE IN GOVERNMENT INTO TAKING THIS ACTION?

THE SPEAKER SELECTED MEMBERS FOR ORDERS NUMBERS 28 AND 29 THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 28: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS HAD THE PRISONER WHO HAD BEEN CONVICTED OF A DRUG OFFENCE AND SAID OF WHOSE SENTENCE WAS RECENTLY REMITTED SO THAT HE WAS RELEASED EARLY?

NO. 29: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER SHE DISAGREED PRISONER WHOSE SENTENCE WAS RECENTLY REMITTED IS RELATED TO ANY MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY?

2. CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE SPEAKER'S SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1985) BILL, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

APPENDIX

CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET BY THE HOUSE AND SENATE
STATUS OF 1985 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1986

MR. JAMES H. QUILLEN 28

INDEPENDENT 29

FRIDAY

31ST MARCH, 1995

10:30 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayer to be recited.
Proceedings are resumed. Questions.
The Elected Member for North Side.

QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 22: SHOULD THE MEMBER STATE THE COST OF THE NEW SIGNS RECENTLY INSTALLED AT THE HOSPITAL, INCLUDING LABOUR?

ANSWER: NO SIGNS HAVE RECENTLY BEEN INSTALLED AT THE HOSPITAL AND THEREFORE THERE HAVE BEEN NO COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PURCHASE OR INSTALLATION OF THE SAID SIGNS.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. F. LEONARD MILLER: A supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Member could state clearly that there has been no labour cost in relation to the signs at the hospital, whether they have been erected or not?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think, well, I will allow the Member to ask, but the question is the cost of signs recently installed.

HON. ALDRIN O. ROGERS: Mr. President, that is a fairly broad question, but maybe I could give the Member some information that would help. That is that although no signs have been installed, a signage plan for the hospital to be used in the future has been devised and the cost of that was $1,000.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary, I will invite the Elected Member from North Side to ask the next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 23: WHAT IS THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER ANY FUNDS WERE RECOVERED FROM THE CAYMAN ISLANDS TREASURY UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF BRITAIN MINISTER'S NOTICE NO. 1 OF 1993 - DOMINICIDER OF SOLOMON - PASSED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON 1ST DECEMBER, 1993?

ANSWER: THE MOTION, AS SUCH, DID NOT AUTHORIZE ANY EXPENDITURE AND NO FUNDS WERE REQUIRED UNTIL THE COMMON DEFENSE FUNDING UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 3 OF 1983

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

DR. G. BAYO ADEKOYA: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if he can tell us how this use of the spending of funds compares with the spending of funds on the investigations which were tabled by this member?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not really think that is a supplementary that arises out of the answer to the question. If the Member wishes to find out the cost of various investigations then he can put down a substantive question about it.

DR. G. BAYO ADEKOYA: That is fair enough, Mr. President. May I also ask if the Member can state how this use of the spending of funds compares with the $50,000 given to the Commissioner whose premature passing of the Scene was for some fundamental wage remained to this?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not really think that is a supplementary either, but I suspect you think you have made your point.

MR. O. SEGUN MILLER: Mr. President, a supplementary, Sir. The Member in his answer stated that the motion did not authorise the disbursement of any funds. Could the Member advise how the persons can merely be indemnified fully for expenses without spending any funds that they have themselves?

DR. THOMAS O. ADEDOKUN: Mr. President, my understanding is that the motion was recommending strongly that the Commissioner should be indemnified or be invited to proceed with that mission. However, the authority for disbursement by the Commissioner would have to be brought back to the House.

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps it will be of assistance to the House if I explained that the motion would have been, in my view, an contravention of Standing Orders had it sought to authorise expenditure. I advised the motion because it contained a recommendation, not an authority, and as the Honourable Chief Opposition Member said, it would have been necessary to return to the House for the authorisation of expenditure.

DR. G. BAYO ADEKOYA: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if it is correct that the only body which can authorise expenditure is the Finance Committee?

DR. THOMAS O. ADEMOREN: Mr. President, that is correct, the only authority is the Chief which can authorise expenditure is Finance Committee.

MR. PRESIDENT: I wonder if the Honourable Member, before we be make it public please to the House, would like to mention also the constitutional provision..... which I am trying to find:

SIR, KIRWAN J. MURPHY: Section 3(1)(a) may be relevant.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think it is 3(1)(a). I am thinking for the precision of the Constitution which envisages the Oireachtas to certify exemptives under certain circumstances. I am sure there is such a provision.

MRS. CORY, CHARLES J. HAUGHEY: Mr. President, would it not be "Government's reserved power - 28(1)(b)"?

MR. PRESIDENT: That is limited to a period when the territory is in receipt of financial assistance. Perhaps that is what I am thinking of. It does not apply at present, but there are circumstances under which it could theoretically apply.

I am sorry to have interrupted the business of the House, but I think the supplemental answer to the Honourable Third Principal Member has given.

If there is no further supplementary, I will invite the Second Principal Member for Post and to ask the next question.

THE SECOND PRINCIPAL MEMBER FOR POST AND TELEGRAPHS (MRS. MACKEON): I am directed by the Government to answer Question No. 24.

No. 24: MR. MACKEON asked the Minister for Posts and Telegraphs if the Government is aware of the hardship caused to persons living in the Dublin Mountains by the lack of telephone facilities; and if he will make a statement on the matter.

ANSWER: The Government has taken a decision to introduce a Bill to establish a Water Board for the licensing of fishing and a Minister of Authority.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless there is any supplementary, I will invite the Second Principal Member for Post and to ask the next question.

THE SECOND PRINCIPAL MEMBER FOR POST AND TELEGRAPHS (MRS. MACKEON): I am directed by the Government to answer Question No. 25.

No. 25: MR. MACKEON asked the Minister for Posts and Telegraphs if the Government is aware of the hardship caused to persons living in the Dublin Mountains by the lack of telephone facilities; and if he will make a statement on the matter.

ANSWER: The Government has taken a decision to introduce a Bill to establish a Water Board for the licensing of fishing and a Minister of Authority.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless there is any supplementary, I will invite the Second Principal Member for Post and to ask the next question.

THE SECOND PRINCIPAL MEMBER FOR POST AND TELEGRAPHS (MRS. MACKEON): I am directed by the Government to answer Question No. 26.

No. 26: MR. MACKEON asked the Minister for Posts and Telegraphs if the actual cost will be of laying of and erecting the 200-ft. surface around the new Airport terminal during its construction;

ANSWER: The small areas of roadway broken and replaced during the roadworks of car parks and associated areas around the new terminal building, these were in the Northern Bonding Handling Area and the Passenger Short-Stay Car Park. The costs only represented approximately 10 yards of roadway. Upon instruction by Public Works Representative Engineers, these areas showed to be below the required quality and some inconsistency removed and replaced by the paving contractors responsible for supply and placing this element of roadway. This work was carried out at no additional cost to Government.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. O. RAYE BOWDEN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if it is correct that the reason for appointment Public Works Department to monitor these jobs was that there could be supervision of the works to ensure quality and to ensure that the people get value for the money which was spent by Government?

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, the answer is yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary, I will invite the Second Elected Member for West Bay to ask the next question.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER REPRESENTING MIN COMMUNICATION WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION:

NO. 85: WILL THE MEMBER STATE HOW MANY PERSONS HAVE BEEN LAID OFF BY THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT SINCE 14TH NOVEMBER, 1984, GIVING A BREAKDOWN OF CAYMANIANS AND NON-CAYMANIANS?

ANSWER: THE NUMBER OF PERSONS LAID OFF BY THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT SINCE 14TH NOVEMBER, 1984, IS TWENTY-FOUR. OF THESE, TWO WERE CAYMANIAN AND TWENTY-TWO WERE NON-CAYMANIAN. ALL WERE CASUAL PAID EMPLOYEES.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JOHN B. MCLEAN: Mr. President, a supplementary. Will the Honourable Member say whether any of these persons, who were laid off, have been reinstated?

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, I understand that some of them have been reinstated.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state whether the two Caymanians laid off were reinstated?

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, I am not sure on that, Sir.

MR. JOHN B. MCLEAN: Mr. President, another supplementary. Is the Honourable Member able to tell this Honourable House the reasons for having to lay off twenty-four persons from the Public Works Department?

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, the workload in Public Works Department was reduced; the money for capital projects has not been approved and no capital projects can be started until approved by Finance Committee. This was the reason of the reduced workload. Secondly, the laying off of labour was to make more jobs available for Caymanians.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I just comment, Sir. I am confused by that answer because my supplementary was .....

MR. PRESIDENT: You must ask another question.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: My supplementary, Mr. President, was would the Member state whether the two Corporations were re-employed. The Honourable Member's answer was that the laying off of persons was to provide employment for Non-Africans. So I was surprised by that answer, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: But you must form your supplementary. I propose to move on to the order ...

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Would the Honourable Member, Mr. President, say if he has opinion laying off for Non-Africans will provide labour for additional Corporations?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am afraid the Honourable Member cannot be asked for opinions. There is a Standing Order that provides that, but you could, for instance, ask the Honourable Member how many additional Corporations have been taken on because some of his unemployed can be the effect that some had, and that might have confused you.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member state the number of Corporations who have been taken on?

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKWOOD: Mr. President, I am afraid I do not have the answer on that, but I would be happy to supply this information to the Member.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it might help Members if you were able to let them know whether the two Corporations who were laid off have been re-employed and how many Corporations have been taken on during this period, because you did tell the House that was one of the reasons for laying off non-Corporations. So I think that perhaps might be helpful to Members and I am grateful to you for undertaking to provide the information.

The Elected Member for East End.

MR. JOHN H. MEGGAN: Mr. President, the Honourable Member has stated that twenty-two non-Corporations have been laid off in order to create jobs for Corporations. Can the Member say what will happen to the non-Corporations once Corporations are found for them?

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKWOOD: Mr. President, I think that is something I am unable to answer, Sir.

MR. JOSE B. MARKS: Mr. President, since ...

MR. PRESIDENT: I think it would be for another Member to ..... answer that question because the explanation is, would they have to leave the country, then it is an immigration matter which should be addressed to the Honourable Chief Official Member promptly.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKWOOD: Mr. President, the immigration authorities were advised of the lay off of these foreign labourers.

MR. JOHN H. MEGGAN: Mr. President, that is the answer I wanted, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary, I will invite the Elected Member for East End to ask the next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBERS FOR SOUTH END MAY ASK THE HONOURABLE UNITED SECRETARY ACCESS RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

NO. 87: WILL THE HONOURABLE UNITED MINISTER ASSURE THE PEOPLE OF CONSTANCE ASPHALT ROT-MIX ON THE ROAD FROM MOUNT TO SAUK AND ALSO EXTEND THE ELECTRICITY BY 1962?

ANSWER: THERE ARE NO PLANS TO CARRY OUT SUCH WORK BY EITHER OF THE TWO YEARS BY 1962.

THE CAPITAL BUDGET PROPOSALS DO INCLUDE PROVIDING OF ASPHALT-MIX COATING TO 14 MILES OF ROAD FROM DEARBORN TO MOUNT AND A PROVISION FOR EXTENSION OF ELECTRICITY. UNFORTUNATELY, THIS PROJECT UNFORTUNATELY DOES NOT INCLUDE IN THE 1962 CAPITAL BUDGET.

IT IS, HOWEVER, GOVERNMENT'S INTENTION TO CONTINUE TO HAVE THIS SURFACE ON THE ROAD IN THIS AREA SUBJECT TO INCREMENTS OF 1.50 2 MILES PER YEAR SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

HON. E. RAY ROBERTS: Mr. President, may I ask the Honourable Member if he is aware that there are eight four years, eight years, his-self has been put on the roads department from the government of Indian Head every year.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. MACDONALD: Mr. President, sir, I

MR. PRESIDENT: I'm sorry sir is supplementary. I will invite the Hon. Minister for Indian Head to ask the next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR SOUTH STRIKE ARE THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AND CENTRAL AFFAIRS

NO. 88: DURING THE YUKON STATE MINISTER CONFERENCE SPEECH, DO HIS OWN WORK WITH ANY ACCORD, EXPRESSED HIS RESIGNATION OR WAS HE REQUESTED BY CABINET TO WITHDRAW INTO TAKING THIS ACTION?

ANSWER: NO CABINET MINISTER ANNOUNCED THAT HOWEVER THE HONOURABLE HAS HE HAS DECIDED TO RETIRE EARLY. HIS OWN WORDS WERE QUOTED IN A PRESS RELEASE ISSUED AT THAT TIME. I AM ENCLOSED A COPY OF IT IN CASE THE MEMBER DID NOT SEE IT THEN, BUT I HAVE NOTHING TO ADD TO IT.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Will he not considered by Cabinet to, which authority or recommendation from the Elected Executive Council that it should be done if he considers his resignation and make an offer to settle his contract?

HON. DENNIS H. ROGERS: I have no knowledge of that at all.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: My question to Minister Committee to a question put there that the Elected Members of Executive Council had been the cause to grant his removal. Did you subscribe there?

MR. DENNIS M. BROWN: No, Sir, I am really not in a position to do so because I was not a party of any meetings or negotiations where this discussed at all.

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: Sir, since the Honourable Member responsible, should you not have been privy to what went on and have been privy enough to have him to explain this question when he came to the floor of this House?

MR. DENNIS M. BROWN: Although I am responsible for this, where it comes to the issuing of certain visa waiver officials that the Foreign Office have to approve, those arrangements, like, are made by the Government and the Foreign Office. I honestly was not a part of any of these discussions. I do not know what really took place.

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: Well, if you are responsible with the Visa positions, why are you not acquainted with the Visa policies? In this case you failed the question bluntly that the Foreign Office should have to be approached on more or less again. Did the Foreign Office then agree at this time for the disapproval of Commissioner Stewart's visa position.

MR. DENNIS M. BROWN: I do not think, as far as I understand, it was a case of disapproval at all, Sir. It was a case of merely maintenance and I will presume that the Foreign Office had been notified about his decision to arrive early.

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: Do you have that file available now to be able to know. It is still the same thing. I would like to see those documents, Mr. Speaker. I will read with it in the new debate.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further Supplementary, I will invite the second Alternate Member for Western Area to ask the next question.

THE SECOND ALTERNATE MEMBER FOR WESTERN AREA (MR. MCKINNEY) ASKED THE FOLLOWING QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE:

QUESTION: WOULD THE MINISTER STATE WHAT PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS HAD THE PRISONER WHO WAS SENT CONVICTED OF A SHORT SENTENCE AND DEATH OF MINOR OFFENCES WAS RECENTLY PERMITTED TO SERVE THAT OF WHO RELEASED EARLY?

ANSWER: THE PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS ARE:

(a) THEFTING CLOTHING ON 14th MAY, 1967;
(b) HOUSEBREAKING ON 3rd NOVEMBER, 1967;
(c) IMPROPER BEHAVIOUR ON 28th AUGUST, 1970;
(d) ASSAULTING POLICE ON 28th AUGUST, 1970.
(e) POSSESSION OF CANNABIS IN 1972; AND
(f) POSSESSION OF CANNABIS ON 24th SEPTEMBER, 1966.

ALL OF THE ABOVE CONVICTIONS ARISE FROM THE MOST RECENT ONE IN 1966 AND OVER 10 YEARS AGO.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES H. BOGGESS: What do the prosecutors bring you here for if you do not have to really do what is required by the questions that are asked?

MR. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I just thought I would make it clear that prior to the last conviction the most were quite old convictions.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGESS: Would it not be considered that a charge of manslaughter is a felony serious offense?

MR. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Yes, I think manslaughter generally is a serious offense, Sir.

MR. JOHN E. NELSON: Mr. President, while I respect this body it would take a good damn player to play it. Can the Honorable Member say why a person who has such a long record has been released and is now on a free recovery again?

MR. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, the Member knows the circumstances, Sir, but I will remind him of them. I think if I gather the facts correctly it was a case where his father was sentenced for a very small amount of money found in a dilapidated car and he was given a maximum sentence of which is a minimum prescribed by law for a second offense. He was sentenced for two years with a fine of $2,500. By this being pronounced in the case the Magistrate or officer in charge of the court had no choice but to hand down that sentence, but he then in turn recommended to the Governor that he should exercise his prerogative powers to mitigate the sentence. At that natural justice may also be done in the case.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGESS: Can you advise the House whether this case for rehabilitation had been previously turned down?

MR. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, to the intention of the Member that I should cite things that were discussed in Executive Council. I do not really think it is advisable or necessary.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGESS: I think, Mr. President, my remarks regarded only a yes or a no remark. That is a very simple answer. I have gotten used to it still don't like them in the Budget debate also to speak be passed merely yes.

I will ask a further supplementary. Has there been given to anyone else such such a long second term this way in the past?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I do not think that any such circumstances in this have arisen before, at least not to my knowledge, Sir.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGESS: Will the other person, the Executive Council and the Governor have such file in other cases with the provisions of long amounts of money, let us say,-- not that many. I do not think I can call of order, and he has come with a man having this type of criminal record, they have seen fit to give mercy. Why?

HON. DENNIS M. HOUSE: Mr. President, I think, Sir, if there was a question once to take, rest on the Air Force, with the recommendation coming from the Headquarters it would be dealt with the same way.

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: With this proposed Standard Commandment, here, I agree it would.

MR. PRESIDENT: Ordered Order: The Senator does not have comments, he may only ask questions.

If there is no further explanation, I will ask the Federal Election Member from Boston Town to ask the next question.

THE SECOND SELECTED MEMBER FOR BOSTON TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER REPRESENTING THE TREASURY AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

NO. 10: WOULD THE HONOURABLE STATE HOUSING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WOULD CONSIDER THE SUBSIDIES AS REFERRED TO AND AGREED TO BY THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASSEMBLY?

ANSWER: YES.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: Would the honourable Member state which?

HON. DENNIS M. HOUSE: The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: How about a referendum, Sir?

HON. DENNIS M. HOUSE: A question.

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: Direct, constitutional thing?

HON. DENNIS M. HOUSE: I could not hear, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: Is it the policy of the present Government to seek money to finance the proposed electrical scheme?

MR. PRESIDENT: That is not a proper question. It is really out of order the terms under .....

HON. MICHAEL J. SMITH: Mr. President, Sir, may I rise on a point of order that it is my understanding that the procedure of the introduction of motion is your constitutional practice which the Constitution is which you are to give direction whether cases should or you do may not be given. It is your discretion. The information by any Member that you asked other than precisely in accordance with legal direction is necessary to formulate answers.

MR. JAMES M. BOOTH: Well, is it not a fact that the President of the House normally seek Executive Council or cabinet matters before a decision is actually made? Would you (the Honourable Second Official Member) advise the House whether or not I am correct?

SIR. MICHAEL J. SHANLEY: You are correct, Sir, and he may discharged such advice if he so wishes.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: And you may then appeal to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office might?

MR. SPEAKMAN: Could I make the position clear through there could be exclusion in Members' minds. There is a distinction as been what happened in capital cases and in other cases.

In accordance with the provisions of the Royal Instructions (and it is Royal Instructions 1983)- cxvi [211], I am obliged to consult Executive Council about capital cases, but I am then to decide there cases in my own deliberate judgment as Governor. I am not bound by the advice of Executive Council nor subject to the normal constitutional provisions about what I should do if I disregard such advice.

In non-capital cases when the prerogative of mercy may be exercised, I am also obliged to consult Executive Council and in those cases if I do not follow Executive Council's advice I am subject to the normal constitutional provisions which say that I must report to the Secretary of State. I can read the constitutional provisions in full if Members wish to be apprised of them, but essentially that I must report to the Secretary of State if I do not accept Executive Council's advice. So there is a distinction between capital and non-capital cases.

We are talking here about a non-capital case and in a non-accident case I could not certainly do either, but in that case I should be obliged to report it the Secretary of State.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: I would like to thank you, Sir. I am familiar with the position. I just wanted the public to hear the answer and I will deal with it on the debate on the Budget Address and Throne Speech when I will have latitude.

MR. SPEAKMAN: Perhaps I should just advise the Member that although of course he will have certain latitude, the latitude will not extend to statements which are out of order, and it is out of order to impute improper motives to another Member.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: I just note that other Members do not have any more latitude than the Members sitting here will have, Sir.

I would like to ask another supplementary. Why did you not agree previously to allow freedom in this particular case and later on thought more mind accurately?

MR. PRESIDENT: Could I make one more point clear for Members of the House and members of the public? There is a legal distinction between murder and other things. For any of the ones to need previously, means that the person sentenced has had conviction expunged totally, because it is considered that the conviction was wrong and usually this is done in very exceptional circumstances where fresh evidence has come to light after a person convicted a reasonable of the kind after careful enquiry (usually judicial enquiry) that the conviction was pardoned.

Sometimes of pardons is a separate matter which can also be granted by the exercise of the prerogative. It does mean that the person was convicted and that the conviction is expunged. It simply means that part of his sentence

MR. PRESIDENT (interposing). As mentioned prior to the recess on another matter, it may happen as we proceed in the case of a prisoner who is mentally ill and it is decided to release him forthwith. That may happen in certain other cases. That did happen in the case which is now the question.

I omit other more supplementary, but I did want to make it clear that it was not a problem; it was a decision of a part of a sentence.

MR. JAMES M. BOURAS: If this is the most serious, Sir, and I will use money. Did any other evidence come to light after 14th November, 1991, that would give reason to alter sentiment merely in this particular case?

MR. DENNIS M. POWELL: Not to my knowledge, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. BOURAS: Is this just a fulfilment of execution procedure?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that is a proper question either.

Is there any further supplementary?

MR. M. MENDES ROSE: Mr. President, not a supplementary, Sir, but under Standing Order 22, I believe, Sir, that I can make a personal explanation since serious imputations or allegations have been cast on my honesty.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have not heard anybody .....

MR. JAMES M. BOURAS: Mr. President, I did not cast any imputations. I just asked for particulars surrounding this case, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have not heard anybody cast aspersions on your honesty. ..

MR. M. MENDES ROSE: Mr. President, I just .....

MR. PRESIDENT: I am understand that since it was not the Minister, you may wish to make a personal explanation.

MR. M. MENDES ROSE: Certainly, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: However, in the course of an explanation you must not say things which are not so, and I did not hear anybody cast aspersions on your honesty.

MR. M. MENDES ROSE: Thank you very much, Sir, but since we have gone before, I rely by saying here is just so exact.

MR. JAMES M. BOURAS: Should not the Member stand when he is addressing the Chair, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member should stand, yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

MR. M. MARKHAM BUSH: Yes, Sir, I am standing, Sir. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, the record for any moment of correspondence to the press. I beg your permission, Sir, to tell this Honourable House that the man referred to in the question just asked is related to me. Yes, he is a cousin. Yes, he is a first cousin.

Mr. President, I am not embarrassed by this question, although I am sure the questioner expected me to be. I can only say, Sir, simply this but for this enemy, there goes either one of us in this Honourable House.

I also want to inform this Honourable House and the people of this country, Sir, that I in no way influenced or even attempted to influence his release. Personally, Sir, I think the case was investigated by this Honourable Chief Secretary, the Most Official Member.

I should think since in addition, Sir, that if other persons related more closely to Members of this Honourable House who are permanent residents more near, and had the evidence in a more mere not disappear .....

MR. JAMES M. BOOSS: Mr. President, that is a matter of opinion.....

MR. M. MARKHAM BUSH: ..... from the record house, this question would not have been asked in this Honourable House today .....

MR. JAMES M. BOOSS: ..... the Member is completely out of order .....

MR. SPEAKER: Would Members please sit. Thank you. I think the Second Elected Member for West Bay has strayed beyond what is permissible by way of personal explanation, as his recent observations has indicated.

MR. M. MARKHAM BUSH: Thank you very much, Sir. I abide by your ruling, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Miss, I think, has considered question, the next item on the Order Paper is the continuation of the debate on the Throne Speech, and the First Elected Member for Bodden Town was speaking.

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1965) BILL, 1965

MR. JAMES M. BOOSS: Mr. President, this is probably a good time for me to deal with the question that just been asked. Mr. President, some of the Members of this House, also of the Members of the last Government and the Opposition as a whole I think were concerned about this action. I had many people who asked me about it. I also had people to lobby in favour of the General Elections on this issue, and I am sure my fellow colleagues also experienced the same thing.

MR. JAMES M. BROOKS (CONTINUING): I do not think I am telling any tales out of school at this point, but there have been discussions now by these people in the past and merge in that time was here given the idea of this man's qualifications.

We have had many cases and I would like to make it clear, only right that I have fought for many years for this Board to see that we have an adequate duty law. There have been many cases, many of them I am sure that unconstitutional many for the years, and I am sure that right in the Governor's time the Lyblom at Beechwood Girls' Home might many girls' be many people possibly prosecutors for the first offense and get away that has been shown to them.

While now a point for the majority in that way. I feel strongly, Mr. President, as I feel about the dismissal of the previous Commissioner. When the light can way the day to the patient which has significantly been done the order by Philip Carpenter previous. Now if will say that as the first appointee that the night when may now is going to have resigned for the Governments of this country.

We have to be very careful in the image that we portray. In speaking like this I do not want to give the impression that we favor the use of force, however I do most possibly know it is wrong. But, Mr. President, I object a Resolution such as this to have been taken by our Governments and so sincerely advise the Legislature.

I am sure to, in this House, getting negative to questions that simply from the public. I am used to being told that I am out of order because I have called back and forth a thing or said such a thing, when the same individuals in having given the other Members to be the same things without to having brought to their attentions as this is nothing new to me.

I like a friend of Commissioner Stevens and I did not keep it a secret from anyone. If I owned any friendship to a person, why should I consider that person a friend? In my opinion Commissioner Stevens was still in this country in an unpredictably fashion and his reputation was ruined to be torn apart by the press without any action ever being taken by the Government to arrest him. If the man had been guilty then he should have suffered.

Some Indian from the Western district made himself very responsible in many areas of the country unfortunately downgrading this gentleman. That is one of the reasons that the Private Worker's Bill, which will be debated in this House, was made, because although Commissioner Stevens, like any other Civil Servant, is taken care of under the Government Regulations, government was fit to make an error, and it was about time for somebody to make a move to keep that and order in this country and to keep this reason of like which have being said to be perpetuated much further.

Government may hide the real issue as best they can, but I have been told reliably that Commissioner Stevens was moved on reason. I would not like to go any further in my debate and really describe when I heard mentioned this of Commissioner Stevens.

It's a question that I personally made to the previous elected Executive Council they agreed and endorsed in this affirmative that they had confidence in what now being made. In discussion with Councillor Stokes I gathered from what I was told that is actually what took place.

[illegible] SAMUEL K. EDWARDS (CONTINUED): My point, Mr. Speaker, is as I have said before that we are in a very poor condition in this country when a person is able to manipulate a position of [illegible], one of the highest in the land, and [illegible] and do everything to accomplish that person, eventually get into politics and through the political machinery [illegible] to dominate a man's conscience.

Sir, it is a serious thing. It is as serious as what I think has been done with regards to abusing money which I am sure is part of the party in which many should not have been placed. That, Mr. President, is what I am opposed to and it is what I will speak out against.

Much has been said on the part by a responsible politician about the inadequacy in the Police Department, but it seems as though the Police Department has been doing their job. It was other areas that fell down. I was very pleased to hear on one of the occasions that we [illegible] have that there has been a decline in the number of gang cases in 1982. I hope that that will continue. But, I will never unapologetically from this House and from any other place in the land, Mr. President, that I feel why Commissioner Stevens was scandalized in the way he was in because the man had found a way of coping with the drug trade. He was one of the few who even half that courage who came to grips with it, and it is because he was able to bring some order to successful constitutions. He stepped on the toes of some people and that is why the campaign was built up against him, and that is why he was constantly slandered in the manner in which he was. I hope the present Chief of Police and the Chiefs of Police to come will be dealt with in a more just manner.

I hope that this system will be scuttled away from our society that we will see no more of [illegible] in any respect.

I was very pleased that the Honourable Third Official Member did also to advise this House that a meeting that we mainly had been going under the notion that had been [illegible] around this Island by some [illegible] people with regards to the Cayman matter.

Mr. President, I will go on to my deliberation with something right now until the Lunch Recess Speech. I apologise to the House if [illegible] circumstances, in my deliberations, with us some of the things which you have dealt with and some of the things dealt with by the Honourable Third Official Member. I have tried to put them in order and to follow the manner in which the points are given.

Reference was made to the Community College. The Community College has served this country well. It has done a good job, it has helped a lot of people and the environment has encouraged diversity. However, in my opinion, it is time for us to take a further step and I think it is time that the Cayman Islands worked towards maintaining a graduate college here in the Island.

This should be done in affiliation with the International College of the Cayman Islands. I know the first thing we will hear is that I have personal interest. Mr. Speaker, I have no personal interest in it. I simply intend to fully support it and I have given them three years. I gave them the land on which the College is built. I am a life-time trustee. I have not attended meetings in several years. My only wish is to see that College grow and grow for the benefit of Caymanians. It has been recognised. Many students have come on them at our junior secondary degrees in the United States of America and in the United

Mr. Speaker Sir, Grenada (inaudible) Kingdom. What I find to have why we cannot work hand-in-hand with that institution and have our own local College. It will save Government a lot of money because we would educate these people there for half of where we - that is in some fields - the College cannot teach everything, but in some fields these people could be trained from what we could pay for the training of one person abroad also.

I know that in most cases Government has sent students abroad on scholarship to colleges that are not accredited as well as the International College of the Cayman Islands is. I am hopeful that those who are responsible for the education of our youngsters will bear in mind what I have said today on this subject and not just look at it as a cheap saving from the expenditure. The education of the youngsters of this country is of priority.

If we look back over the history of the Caribbean we see milestones mainly why these countries have faced with the many problems that they have faced. We see an difference as have faced the same things. Education was looked upon in the beginning as a priority. It was only made available to those could afford to send their children abroad. That system continued in this country until probably twenty or so years ago.

You can count on the fingers of one hand the number of people in my age group in this country who were lucky enough to have a college education. The rest of us had to get some knowledge of hard knocks.

We have reached this stage and for the past eight years the Minister for Government did put a lot of emphasis on education. He appointed it in every area that finances would provide. He arranged for student loans. He enlarged the educational system. He gave a lot of scholarships and we paid attention to the vocational training institute. We put up the Hotel Training School, the Agricultural Society and the Lands and Surveys School. I am certain that in the very near future some of these establishments will still be handled by Government.

I know that the present Government is now taking a backward step with regards to scholarships. I have looked through the estimates very closely and if I read them correctly it is my opinion that it is intended this year to spend probably half of what was given last year to send students abroad on scholarships.

I hope that this is not the intention of this Government in an attempt to balance their misfortune budget which I will deal with at this time or in. If it is, we will soon find out that the youngsters of this country will not suffer in their hands at such a feeble attempt being made to balance a budget. The youngsters of this country happen to be and an idea of the financial position of this country, I would say it is the whole intelligent if they are qualified enough to go abroad.

Steps were taken under the Duly from administration to raise extra monies in normal month and I hope our elected Government will see fit to continue along those lines.

Drug and alcohol abuse is a serious thing in any society. It exists in each and in those in every economy today. There are few families in the world who are not affected by it one way or another. So it is not something, Mr. Speaker, that we can touch under the carpet and forget about. It is an ongoing problem. It is a terrible world disease and it is incumbent upon the Legislative Assembly of this country to do something about it.

MR. JAMES M. DOUGLAS (CONTINUING): I hope that a programme will be forthcoming when we get into the Committee Stage of the Pensions Legislation where we will decide that more attention has to be paid to this subject and that more money has to be allocated for it. It is a surprise to me that the amount allocated is so little in that of the many areas of television that the Unity Team got from the present Members who are of the Majority Team in this House. We were continually told on many street corners what we were receiving the least with regards to the annual receipts of this country.

I certainly do not think that we, as a Government should, as trained to work with them, the Union group made political hay out them and of doing nothing, or purposely to do nothing in the years to come.

Our administration put into motion the completion of the wing at the Home for the Indigent people of this country.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would it be a convenient moment for us to take the usual morning break now?

HON. JAMES M. DOUGLAS: I am in your hands, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Will I imagine you are probably contemplating for quite some time and therefore ...

HON. JAMES M. DOUGLAS: I promised that I would and I will open it again on Monday, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Let us then proceed forward for approximately fifteen minutes until 11:45 a.m.

AT 11:15 A.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:40 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. The Hon. Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, the Unity Team in the past few years made quite a mistake in trying to market themselves as a low-cost housing programme. For the low income housing that was created by Government funds in the Eastern Avenue area of George Town, congratulations from that scene must go to the previous Member who had the portfolio of Health, Education and Social Services. The man who has been in the usual manner of a certain Member of this House, contributed on the floor of this House as well as on the outside.

Yesterday reference was made to him as the little man with big brains. I think that we have big brains because there is more in his bank pocket than there is in the heads of the majority of Members.

I also notice in the present elected Government that the people of this country are expecting that pensions be retrieved and be dealt with by Government's help and not only in the districts of George Town, but to be extended in the other districts of Lesser Island.

MR. JAMES M. HANLEY (CONTINUED): The members of the Daily Texan who are still in this House will undoubtedly be asking the public as we should like to see that this is done.

The other big issue that was made by the Urban Renewal Administration was the Housing Development Corporation. We could easily see the problems that the man in the middle income bracket would have and the difficulties he is encountering in obtaining mortgage financing for a home. I don't know if the people and if the Government upon this Government or if it is some requirements of many societies of the world to see that private ownership is kept alive.

I will recommend the resolution which was presented to myself and the other Members of the Daily Texan when the Legislature recently was held in Austin area. Enough time had been told before we got there. The way in which the people came to the point they would have turned and jackhammered us if they were able to do so. I will remember the night that myself and my colleagues had on the floor of the House in attempting to get that bill passed; the same Members who are constituting Government at the moment were, with a few exceptions, were the same Members who originally opposed us on the passage of that bill in Austin, Texas. Then did the bill was passed into law. It took courage to bring it into existence of various kinds that were made over which we had no control, and of the legislature experienced in a certain section. Finally, we were able to get the Housing Development Corporation into existence. At that point Government assisted the Housing Development Corporation by loaning the Corporation $187,000 so enable it to get started. The Housing Development Corporation hired two employees after a time search. The Housing Development Corporation received grant from the Austin Industrial Corporation and Texas Electric Investment Company, and to my knowledge it is the only invested there.

I have taken some quotations in this House which pertain to the Housing Development Corporation and I have not received the reports that I think should have been forthcoming. During the time that I was the Mayor approximately five, six hundred $2,000 mortgages or a value of $750,000. Mr. President, there were many more applications, but we could not deal with them as the money was not available, and I refer back to the difficulty in obtaining the money as I go on in my speech. But we can possibly see that Government should not put but very little money into the Housing Development Corporation. It is seen that the sum of $1,000 was loaned in the first place that people have in this country, but Government's only direct expense was $187,000.

Mr. President, we received a report which was made up of many distinguished persons in the community. The problems which were considered were given by that board were a thousand of money, many months, and it is on these problems which I, as the Member responsible for the Board, voted upon. I was shocked to learn the Honorable Member who is now responsible for it, after he had been in office for over one month, wrote to this House that he had not found time to look at the records or to have any information on the Housing Development Corporation.

It was grounds which was made in this House it was stated that the Housing Development Corporation is originally purchasing a certain for funds in every thousand. Mr. President, the method which would have furnished this funds for the Housing Development Corporation have been put in effect for a long time. What is the authority we used to get roughly $750,000 authorized? It is all that has been used. However, it is not in the point that they have actually pursue the record. The point, Mr. President, is that there is no harmony. The record is on, that we do not have a healthy

MR. SIKES OF SOUTH CAROLINA: The Honorable Member who is directly responsible for that is the Portfolio now, in my opinion, will never be able to cope with the problems throughout the Housing Development Corporation, and if we stand here for one second from now there will be only little money ever subscribed in the home county through his efforts. He is incapable of dealing with it. Besides that, in so many cases which will touch the generosity of his heart.

A further statement can only be the answer that future transactions that relate to the true purpose of the scheme. I really shouldn't have read it over several times. What is meant by the true purpose of the scheme?

Mr. President, it is the accident to everybody that the true purpose of the scheme was to enable returnees in the middle income bracket to eventually own their home. Many low people who are earning $50,000 a year in this country can afford to own a home. Many of them will never own a home because as the family burden increases, in order to meet the repayment over of 15 to 25 year mark, most of the people, if they pay this fluctuating cost, would not be able to pay. Therefore, what will eventually happen in this country is that we will have a society which will become a homeless society. A society with no savings. A society where the people will subscribe the maximum of Government's stability in the country because their will look at their relatives and fathers and see that if they are living in such sub-standard home after so many years of the great efficiency of this country, they will only be dismissed and they will say to the public that there is no need for such a society for me.

If we want to come to grips with the social problems, that is the area we must come to grips with. But, Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the public in the middle income class in the Cayman Islands had a brief glimpse of the type of future they would like to enjoy, but the clouds of darkness have come over their eyes and they can easily see the danger of the Housing Development Corporation.

In my opinion, Government will take no steps to try to convince this institution. Three years from now we will still have the same difficulties and we will have no alternative solution because of the unfavourable Member in charge should his Bill be defeated and both my colleagues have in reply to a question that if sufficient Government votes could be found that would not give added revenue to the Corporation, then I really have to wonder what we are dealing with.

The next item I will deal with is Tourism. I will deal with it as the subject matter then dealing with what you, Mr. President, said in your speech and that the honourable Third Official Member has said in his.

Tourism is the mainstay of the economy of the Cayman Islands. It is a very fragile and a very fragile commodity. When you have great tourism increases it does not happen by accident. It does not happen by people sitting on their backsides thinking that tourists will come to the Islands. It means the expenditure of a lot of time and effort.

Whenever we read about one of the largest insurance companies in America that have ever taken place in this country. Everybody was talking about 30 years ago the tremendous impact the Hurricane Hotel had on the economy of the country.

Immediately our attitude for the entire years of 1969 is to 18,000 tourists or an increase of about 20,000 people for the year. Again, Mr. President, 18,000 tourists

Mr. Mike H. Mason (continued): ...was not around much if at all compared to 196 persons. But when you take 13.8 per cent of approximately 150,000 you will readily see the additional effort that had to be made each year in order to maintain the numbers by the year before and to increase it by that larger percentage.

Guyana's receipts for the year of 1984 rose by 14.6 per cent; a total of $83,683 or so thousand, again, Mr. President, of about 80,000 persons from the year.

Tourism increased in 1984 by 50,000 people. That meant a lot of additional money into the economy of this country. Mr. President, I am sure that under the present administration there will not be one year in which we will see an increase of 80,000 tourists.

I am sure that once the true facts would be ascertained the predictability in the economy of the Cayman Islands last year from tourism was up to near unbelievable. This is what has enabled our people to enjoy the type of society that they enjoy, but to maintain this we must have firm and determined leadership.

It is the viewpoint of this Government that they ourselves to look for avenues where tourism can be improved. We have continue to open additional offices in the outside world. Presently we have offices in Miami, Houston, Chicago, New York, Toronto, Los Angeles, Seattle and London. I am pleased to say that it was under this Party from administration, of which I am part, that it was possible for us to open several of those offices. However, we must not sit idly back; we must continue to explore market place and Guyana must be known as a tourist destination people will think of a vacation.

I give much credit to the hard working staffs of the Tourism Corporation. I have found most of them to be very dedicated and it is only with that kind of dedication that we can continue to hold our own in the tourist market.

Again, one of the major things that assists us in being so successful in tourism is that over the years we have had outstanding and very loyal personnel. We have gone into the market place upon the profiles of people who have known this for years. Now I understand that the Amerindian department has been changed and I will deal accordingly in keeping with that.

I asked a question earlier of the Tourism Department what the relationship has been here, and he told me in absolutely of the Islands, particularly, and also the people. Mr. President, this right is now extraordinarily important. For eight years that was the thrust of our programme for tourism. We have continually educated our people in the advantages and there have been chain all over the world from our advertisements.

An effective media programme is what Guyana needs. I would hope that whatever efforts the next two months while this House is in session that the Honourable Member presently responsible will see fit to, either as Member of this House, work with the Deputy Tourism Minister, or to the advertising and promotion plan, and what he proposes to do. Although the new advertising agency which I understand he has secured, I'm sure to know the type of advertising media. We need to find out if he has done about the millboard matters.

Mr. President, an experienced panel of advertising executives to the millboard material, and the idea of Miami at the present time there is publicly owned hundred thousand dollars worth of good advertising collateral; and I would urge the Honourable Member that this should not be discarded

Mr. Hubert M. Bergen (continuing): and therein lies my concern because we have brought us to provide hospitals in Bermuda - hospitals which we will never recoup. This statement is going for by the Cayman Islands' people and we should sometimes to use it as well as the new material which he will have.

One thing which bothers me, and I believe my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, is the manner from of Government which we have gone into to. Years ago, originally which was known there in this country, we experienced it to decide that this is what is happening again.

I understand that when the respected Honourable Member from Lawyers went abroad to select his advertising agency, he took along with him a so called Bermuda expert. In my opinion I understand many times to the Bermuda delegation. We have a different type of tourism than Bermuda. I feel he was a man who had previously lived I think the correct test in the Bermuda Department of Tourism should be an expert to advise the Responsible Member. In my opinion he should have also to do this on his own accord.

In the administration of the speech it was pointed out that the hospitality industry is responsible for employing about 1,200 persons which would be good news of the Labour force. The heartening thing about it is that about 85 per cent of the people employed are Caymanian. I am very proud of this and I think one of the things which has brought this about was the continuity which has been given through the Hotel Training School.

One of the problems that the country faces with regards to tourism is that legislation must strongly come to this House where we set higher standards in the accommodation industry and restaurants. This must be done if we are to remain in the tourism field abroad as we have been going. We must maintain a high degree of standard. The hospitality industry must maintain from their desire to continually improve prices. We must stabilize the prices. We must stabilize the industry. Prices in Cayman are very high compared to tourist resorts in many other areas of the world, and I believe we do the wants of the returning dollar tourist pounds are paying attention to their bills and we must be very careful that the hotelmen, in particular, are not allowed to commercialize seasons and tourism while Government continues to increase their expenditures for entertaining because the hospitality industry in the Cayman Islands is a whole service but very little money in the circulating and operation of the Cayman Islands. The bulk of the entertainment has always been carried by the Government.

We must set up an Examinations system in the tourism industry where we constantly inspect and take action whenever it is needed. If we do not do this we will shortly find out that the problems are starting up with us and other islands in the Cayman Islands overboard is going to suffer from it. There is no action that can be put into the financial community that has the enormous power of the tourist dollar. I am very concerned about it because I have an closely association with it for eight years and although I may be considered an speculator, although I assure you I will continue to operate, if the Honourable Member responsible should ever think that I would help him, I would like to do so for the benefit of the country.

Another matter, in my opinion, which needs to be attended to is the long road Prices to a cruise ship landing jetty in George Town. I am not an engineer, but in my opinion it will not be that extensive an undertaking compared to the dollars it would yield to the treasury of this country.

MR. JAMES K. RONDEAU (OPPOSITION): It is much more important for us to do this, Mr. President, because George Town, whether I like it or not, is the capital. It is the hub of activity in this country and I think it makes much more sense to expand the George Town community as regards to the airport than to do so for us to go with a Bonaventure controversial election time type of building a smaller ship landing in Cayo.

I respect the people of West Bay very much. I have many close friends in the West Bay district, but in my opinion a smaller ship landing in West Bay is not going to solve any problem, it is going to make more problems than we presently have. I would think that when the time comes for us to deal with this in the Committee Stages, the Members will find out and review in their opinions with regards to the taken flow that has been put in this unbalanced budget to try to fool the people. I will deal with that later on my dissertation, Mr. President, but if anyone has the idea that we are picking this land and that we are going to build a smaller ship landing in West Bay until the ship pilotage says I am in the budget, they will be fooled across that they are going to be fooled in the future.

One area which I heard compliments several times by various Members of the Sister Islands Department, and I too, would like to add my compliments to the efficient fire service that we have and the capable management of the fire service by Mr. Adams. I hope until this many, many times in the past that the time is a capable man and has done a capable job from this country.

I am proud that under the Montly Term Government in the good 1980's, we were able to build a fire station in Creek Ground. There is something that has been badly needed over the years because it takes a long time to respond to a fire in East End or North Side mainly from George Town and sometimes even traffic.

I feel that the time has come again because we have to contend with a lot of traffic and we are getting a lot of homes in the West Bay area, for a fire station to be established for that area. However, I do not believe in duplicating the public by saying that we can get it up again with the small amount which I see appropriated in the budget.

One Member spoke about the improvements of the fire service in Cayman Brac. Mr. President, I am prepared to support that under certain circumstances. Government presently has to maintain a fire service protection at the Cayman Brac Airport. We have spent a lot of money in the last few years in upgrading the airport and runway facilities in Cayman Brac. It is planned to build a new terminal building in Cayman Brac. When all of this is done, Cayman Brac will be all to international standards and it will be mandatory at that point for a fire service to be maintained at the airport. As well as Cayman Brac is I think it would be somewhat ridiculous for us to go to the extreme of that, which may be how maybe such from the present site for the mile away - I do not exactly know what it is, why not be another fire service when we already have one at the airport.

If we were to them I would say that we could have finance and that it be turned on a 24 hour a day basis. However, I cannot give my support to building up another fire service in Cayman Brac when Government is looking to have to expend a lot of money by losing the use of the airport as it grows. It will only be another parallel service which the people of this country will be paying for.

MR. JAMES K. POLITIS (CONTINUING): We have a notice on this House during this Meeting which Labour Legislation and we have had I think very questions also with regards to Labour Legislation. Labour Legislation should come forward. We have passed the stage where we can continue to substitute without any legislation. It is a shortcut back because there are many loopholes attached to Labour.

I would point out to this House that Labour Legislation, contrary to what my good friend the Hon Roy Mac Keon, has drafted under the auspices of the Daily Labour Government could not be presented to this House. Unfortunately, time did not permit us to adopt this, as the whole gist of the Legislation is already adopted although we may wish to add the penalty clause to it, and it should come forward to this House. I will explore it although it does not come under the Speech of today. I will support Labour if they bring suitable legislation that should come here.

This Legislation was drafted by an ILO representative. The present and past Attorney-Generals both gave some help on it. The Honourable Leader of Opposition also spoke on the matter recently and he said that he had been officially asked to deal with Labour Legislation. He knew I had many discussions on Labour. He knew I had many discussions about the Merchant Legislation. Secondly, I must admit that sometimes I guess I make things look complicated, but at the time I took it that I was a part of Government and I believe that whenever I speak, although it was informally without publicity it is an answer or that my answer is conveyed with the Government, that it was not necessary for me to go ahead and issue a long detailed letter and spoil the nice thing that. I thought it would be quite an acceptable answer. If I acted incorrectly, I apologise, but I will advise the House that that is what makes the Merchant Navy Legislation, because Government gets bogged down in too many petty frivolities.

Now, in some aspects, Mr. President, we've lost a lot of possibility for Deputy Team. Unfortunately we do make a problem with traffic in Nauru Town, but the unfortunate thing is it is not going to get any better - it is going to get worse. We need to make a major study with regards to the traffic problem, and I would say immediately in Nauru Town. Under our administration now was carried out, but I felt it was not carried out far enough. More needs to be done in this particular area, however, Mr. President, as my opinion is for an Building & Air Port facility. I approved it when I was a Member of Executive Council and I will endeavour to proceed it in this House. I feel that it is an investment which Government should have considered still. They should go out and use their financial position to say we cannot afford the facility to undertake this. And if we are going to do it, I feel it be shared, Mr. President. In overseas Nauru trade which we most notice another will probably bring $30 to $35 per square foot to make up a cost work facility. Why do not we go up around the Angle & Secret in the first area where land would probably be bought for 25 per cent of what it would for this type of land area.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it will probably be convenient for me, Members of the Bench to have early lunch and the Minister to resume the Conference in this Room. So, unless the Member speaking wants to have refreshment break, I will suspend proceedings .....

MR. JAMES M. RODDY: Could I have just three minutes more to wind this session up, Mr. Chairman, and come back?

MR. PASHAYAN: Sure, certainly.

MR. JAMES M. RODDY: This proposal is nothing new. It was put forward by the post Association Council and we rejected it then. I hate to see it coming back upon reasons in my opinion as to why Government should support to a special interest group.

We have discouraged for years a Post Office and we do need one, but in my opinion, again, we should give further study to this. We have plenty of land in the airport area land which is not expensive. It is within the zone where mail is brought in and it would be much easier to deal with. There is plenty of parking space. We should consider putting the new Post Office at the airport and building a small sub-station in Canoga Park.

This Post Office location seems out many miles of what was where it was better to accommodate from that area than it would by using this expensive land down here for it. Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Chairman, I will rest my point and I will be back like tomorrow, and be willing.

MR. PASHAYAN: I do not see any objection why Members have they the lunch at their place is expected to come. I think we might be able to be back by 2:00 o'clock again we are breaking rather early. So let us suspend proceedings until 2:00 o'clock.

MR. JAMES M. BORDEN: Mr. Chairman, would I just say something on that, then? I have a commitment which will keep me until about 2:30 p.m., because I was hoping that it would be the usual time ....

MR. PASHAYAN: Very well then. Let us say until 2:15 p.m.

AT 12:58 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

ACTING PRESIDENT AT 2:21 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Motion is carried. Proceedings are resumed. The Chair declares recess for Bubble Team.

H. DAVID M. DOLLEY: Mr. President, I apologize for being a bit late, but I was held up in traffic on the way from the airport.

Mr. President, the Turtle Room is an institution in this country which has had a noble past - one which has encountered many, many difficulties over the years. However, it is an establishment which us, the people of the Cayman Islands, identify with. The Turtle industry has played a big part in the history of the Cayman Islands for hundreds of years, so in my opinion it was appropriate that Government also found and not close the Turtle Farm in its liquidation.

There had been many years of concern with regards to the Turtle and that should be passed on to future generations to come. I am very proud to know that the Cayman Islands Government was able to purchase the Turtle Farm and that it was done during the Unity Team administration.

With the problems that the Turtle Farm is currently experiencing it is difficult for it to get to a breakeven position, but I believe that we can look into other areas with regards to the Turtle Farm, for instance a restaurant which would serve turtle products, and further afield, in look at the establishment of a brewery. This was done in the later months of 2004, but I do not believe that it has gotten to the point where it can be established yet. However, I would hope that the present administration would look into these because they could be very profitable and it could mean that the Turtle Farm could operate at a profitable balance, even if we are not allowed to trade direct due to the restrictions of the CITES treaty.

The Honorable Member who was responsible for operations in the last administration secured a lot of efforts on behalf of the Turtle Farm. He made many valuable trade abroad which are important as well I am hopeful that this administration will proceed along the lines which have been laid down by the Honorable Member for the past.

I am very pleased to see that the Cayman Turtle Farm is available with the programme of releasing small turtles back into the wilds. This can only put back us in our traps abroad as well as to help possible hunting in the wild around our country.

Thought can be given to the establishment of other products at the Turtle Farm, for instance such as the production of shells for jewellery. This has become a big issue in countries like the United States of America and a lot of shells are now being seized in the ranges which is within the turtle farm.

Hopefully, in the year ahead, Cayman Turtle Farm will get to the point where it can at least provide enough turtle meat for local demand. In spite the present time this has not been possible. What we need to do is to continue to employ experienced and professional persons abroad which can assist us with our many problems - people who are competent with their principles and who have ability to do the work. Our administration did have such people and I hope that the present administration will see fit to continue with these competent people.

Mr. James M. Eagan (continuing): The economic circumstances, including on the debt which has been done which required to increase quite by the previous administration, I was to note the problem to establish, finally, the reforms people around the Islands. Mr. President, this is a very important issue because it affects the Island people and it will affect everyone as a whole in the years to come. It is my opinion to assess the problem as it is for very much longer. We must do everything possible to increase the military bases which surround the Trust Islands. It is an exceptional thing for America and we should not allow our Islands to be used as many other countries have allowed their countries to be abused.

Mr. President, in establishing these ambassador duties posts, we must also be very careful that we do not jeopardize the welfare of our local fishermen. Guam since, for years, have been used to fishing grounds and a few months ago I heard that there was a move afoot to where this ocean would be controlled and that fishing licenses were going to be issued to the local people. This is essentially I see as very difficult and I hope that it will not really be pursued in the immediate future. There may come when that may be necessary, but I do not believe it is necessary at this point.

With regards to the negotiations, I am a bit hesitant personally to criticize the negotiations affecting this being pursued by Ambassador Haydn Williams upon as where the Members of the House would not like aware of what is going on. We are all fairtood Members of the House, elected by the people, by the majority of the people to represent districts. We now have to see about the well-being of these people. The negotiations, as stated, permit executive Oversight to control the flow and to do as they see fit. I am of the opinion that these negotiations may be taken-advised too far and we may get negotiations which our local people will decide are required to live under. Personally, I imagine, although myself and my colleagues may disagree, we still suffer the fate which is usually suffered when the ruling party has the majority.

Reference was made that the Territorial Development, which was formerly the agriculture function, will be engaged in several other major programs in 1985. I would like to know what these major programs are so I can advise the other Members of the House would like to know also.

In passing the budget I do not find any money available for these major projects and I am wondering why this was initiated. If we have no money voted in do these major projects, then how are we going to do the major initiative? Is it that we are paying the services to the Honorable Member who is responsible for that Function? Is it that we think he can accomplish the things which were set out in the Bible as being accomplished by Jesus when he blessed the fishes and the loaves of bread? I wonder why reference of this nature was not made in regards to the other Portfolios and why it was only this portfolio which this reference was drawn to, and I wonder what is intended to be done?

The Governor advises, Mr. President, is something which is much needed by this country. If we are to further develop these of tourism and in the business community. Much has been said about this across from the present party in power and it is different. Much was said about the purchase of the property where this will be located, but it only serves to remind the House and the people, as a whole, that the Governor advised in January of 1985 and all of the groundwork surrounding that including the negotiation for the 1.75 with Courtesy Development Bank was undertaken and done during the early

MR. JAMES M. QUIGLEY (CONTINUING): Mian Administration. Credit cannot be taken exclusively by the present administration for the return. We will give credit if they continue to develop this scheme in the comprehensive manner in which it was conceived to be done.

This country is faced with a major problem come 30th April of this year. At that time the concession which was granted to the Cayman Islands by the United States of American Government under the Bermuda II Treaty will expire. I would like to elaborate on this very important issue.

When the first Bermuda air treaty was negotiated and signed in Washington, D.C., the honourable financial Secretary of this country at the time, the Honourable Vassel Johnson, went with the delegation, or I think headed the delegation to Washington, D.C., for negotiations between the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Upon his return we learnt that he had not been allowed to participate or to take part in any of the negotiations, with the result that the Cayman Islands and the United Kingdom territories in the Caribbean as a whole suffered unnecessarily.

The Caribbean air routes were more or less given away to the United States in return for the United Kingdom being able to continue their air routes out of Hong Kong. A chess game was played and we were the pawns on the chess board. The Cayman Islands suffered tremendously as a result of this.

To give the Members of this House an idea of how we really suffered, we were allowed two points into the United States out of seven named points. We could select two at any one time. If we decided one of these routes was not paying off we could change it by giving the notice for another route. It was only up before the 1971 administration to make this Government would have opted for Miami and Atlanta.

Atlanta, as a terminal point for air traffic in the southern United States,would have diverted traffic off our Miami operation, and besides that there was a problem as to whether the DC 10-10 with its limitation on fuel would be able to service the Atlanta route. We immediately decided that we would not for Houston to cover the western part of the United States. So we chose Miami and Houston, and we still continue on those two routes.

American carriers by the same token were allowed to come from any point in the United States to the Cayman Islands. We could have had, if business had warranted it, an airline from New York, Chicago, Los Angeles or any part of the United States, and we would not have been able to prevent that route. Also, under the Bermuda II it was agreed that any country could operate more than one carrier on any specific route.

Sometimes, in the past eight years, we had been faced with as many as six to seven applications from other airlines in the United States to fly the Miami route. To stop unnecessary flight we had to pay a lot of legal fees in order to try to keep these airlines off the Miami route. We went to Washington and were lucky enough, through personal contacts, to establish an arrangement whereby the United States assured us that for the next 2 half years they would not allow another carrier on the Miami route other than Republic and our national flag carrier. They also gave us an agreement that if any American carrier decided to operate out of any other city in the United States, we would have immediate approval to commence that route if we so desired.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN (CONTINUED): This was a difficult thing to get and the entire negotiations are very wrong in my mind because the English had a very strong delegation at the meeting. At first they bluntly told us that we could not take part. We would have to trust them and they would negotiate on our behalf. That was not good enough for us and we did not accept it.

They then told us that only three representatives from the Cayman Islands could attend the meeting. We did not accept that either. What I am trying to tell the House with all due respect to Her Majesty's service, we did not obtain any good or any help from them in these negotiations. What we finally did accomplish was accomplished entirely on our own. The Civil Authority in the United States, which used to govern the operation of all airlines, has now been abolished and the function of that body has been passed on to the transportation department; so it is with the transportation department that we will now have to negotiate.

In addition to this, the Bermuda II treaty is about to end and new negotiations will have to take place. If we are not forceful enough in the coming months in unions upon the United Kingdom and the United States of America our desire to maintain our own national airline and our desire to keep further competition off the Miami and Houston routes and maybe other routes in the United States, we are faced with a grave and serious problem. I personally am concerned about it and I hope that our present Government will be able to cope with it in a manner to where we maintain, at least, the status quo which we have now.

Instead of taking this as a point of criticism, I hope the present Government will pay the attention on this particular point.

You touched on Cayman Airways in your speech, Mr. President, and I beg the indulgence of the House to be able to speak on it now. At the present time, shortly, taken on an great debit.

Cayman Airways has had a difficult and rocky past. About the only thing in the country that has probably been lied about more than myself is Cayman Airways. However, Cayman Airways signifies to the world the courage and determination of the people of a small country. It is vital for the economy and the future growth of this country.

If we allow Cayman Airways to be abolished, Government is going to suffer a substantial loss. Not just what we suffer at the present time, but what we will suffer in the future; because having Cayman Airways we are able to more or less negotiate the traffic into this country and work along with the Tourism Department. Once Cayman Airways is not there we are not going to find the foreign carriers giving us that assistance. Like what we will find is that once we become entirely dependent upon foreign carriers, we will be treated as we have been treated in the past, particularly by British West Indian Airways when they pulled out on very short notice. Foreign airlines are not going to subsidize this route just to please us.

Another point to think about is the disruption in the economy to the present 300 employees of Cayman Airways. Cayman Airways, owned by Government, and with the figures not included in the Civil List which was given to us, is another one of the big employers of labour in our country. Most of these people are well trained, have acquired great skill and maintain commendable salaries. Once these people lose their jobs there is no way in the world that they are going to get similar jobs with other airlines, and we must remember that a greater proportion of

MR. JAMES M. JOHNSTON (Inaudible): these employees are young fellows who have become pilots and co-pilots. They are now able to earn a decent living. They are able to live in our community and spend their money.

Some foreign assistance came in handy. It will be just as we were told by AID when they employed only two Cayman pilots, Captain Thompson and Captain Bodden. They told us we certainly knew that after each did work a tour of the Cayman Airways personnel who use Caymanians can fly on the Cayman Airways plane which was also owned by AID and the Cayman Islands Government. It will mean that some of our people may be able to assume blanket agent jobs or jobs of that nature until the other assistance, but our main personnel will be our own.

I have read and heard much in the past couple of months about the study of Cayman Airways' operations being conducted by Aitkenair. This is a bit difficult for me to understand because Cayman Airways is a small airline operating two jets and one small propeller aircraft. Aitkenair is a large international carrier. The problems which they encounter are identical to the problems which are encountered by Cayman Airways. In my opinion, Aitkenair studying the problem of Cayman Airways and giving up with an answer for the future would be like asking Cayman Airways to study the problems of the American airlines or Eastern Airlines in the United States. I am sure that none of us are inclined to the point where we believe that anyone from Cayman Airways would be asked to study the problems of one of these major carriers. I just wonder how we obtained them and were they the advantages of the Kennedy Airport?

Mr. President, I beg leave of the House to deal further in my speech with Cayman Airways. I will not be talking the next thing over again, but I will be dealing with some specific facts.

According to the Open Internal International Airport terminal, without a doubt the Cayman Islands have an opportunity in the Caribbean and one probably based upon more than that that we could compare with Jamaica in many, many other respects. It is a monument to the people and it is a monument which will stand for many, many years. It is a monument which cannot be destroyed by the whims and fancies of politics.

Mr. President, the airport terminal should have a very bright future for it is like the Bethesdden in church who have been baptized below. It is also meet to forgive by man.

The airport terminal building was probably the only enterprise which Government has ever undertaken which came in within the budgeted cost and was completed before the time called for in the contract. Again, we have had many instances of these facts.

The question was raised in this House Mr. President, by some Member as the moment Honourable Member in charge of that Portfolio with regards to the cost. The cost was put at $18,000 plus, when it was opened on 31st December, 1969. The cost was put at $2,000 plus, when it was opened on 20th January, 1968.

I point this out to show you how the present elected Executive Council will work with figures when it is for political good. I asked for a breakdown of these expenses and I was furnished with a breakdown which showed that of the $18,000 which was alleged to have been the cost on 10th November, $2,000 plus of that was a payment to Arch and Godfrey which I would assume, Mr. President, was a part of the contract price. As far as I am aware, Arch and Godfrey was not supposed to do anything outside the contract that will have to be paid for.

Mr. James M. Scotty (continued): there was also a cost of $2,000 plus to the Public Works Department. Now I point these out, Mr. President, to show, particularly the public works expenditure that if there was an expenditure of $2,000 plus for 2000 Knockout Fun Athletics Competition Public Works took place on [illegible] have been a corresponding cost to Public Works in March-April, 1987, yet it was approximately 4000 plus to me.

We have heard of the plans for the financial management of the airport. I can advise the House that the management plan for Queen Elizabeth Hilmpiscomil Airport Limited was put into effect as right 18 months ago when it was formalized. It was formulated at the time when the Airport was taken over with Caribbean Development Bank and based on what we obtained from Caribbean Development Bank to finance the improvements and based on the future revenue. The future revenue on annual basis that would help pay off the loan, plus all the management and operations of costs and still leave a surplus. That is why today I question when I hear of this new financial plan for management which has been recognized, and of the new Airport rates which are being put into effect; and I wonder why it was necessary to do this.

Before I leave the airport terminal, Mr. President, there was for many years back a direct connection between the Cayman Islands, Miami, Florida and Cuba Cubana. The Mayor of Dade County happens to be a personal friend of mine as well as a personal friend of many, many Caymanians. He has been visiting this Island for many years. He was [illegible] extremely upset on behalf of the people of Dade County by the manner in which he was treated on the terminal. As far as I am aware this airline has never been installed and it may be chance a lot of disappointment for a neighbouring country and neighbourly people. If they are not prepared to install this airline, Mr. President, before it gathers much more dust I would ask the responsible Government to see if they would make way this available [illegible] I will keep it for you.

Several Members, Mr. President, have commented and made many remarks with regards to the Tower Building. They have said that it was not a good investment. That it was ill-advised for Government to purchase it, and it seems we have heard a lot of political rhetoric. I am proud that upon the Tower Building was a part of the accomplishments of the Unity Team Government, but we as Members of the Third Term Government should really take the praise for the Tower Building.

The Honourable Third Official Member was really the one who carried out the negotiations and was where the purchase of the Tower Building. I congratulated him the day it was done and I continue to congratulate him. Regardless of what his critics may say, I think it was a very wise move.

I have heard here, that the Tower Building, in fact I have never been on the grounds of it, but it has a fine amount of land. Apparently it is well constructed and surely by the square footage of it which I have been told by the [illegible] Government to buy it. In other words what I am saying is that we have gotten a bargain. We have paid about $4 million, at least, less than what it would have been built for.

MR. JAMES M. DUNCAN (Continued), from Anderson Mercer, the financial genius, to add to the debate that we were lucky for Government to keep the Lower Building which had just been completed and that it would have been better to create duplicate another - again, if we had built a similar building we would not have had the additional debt to maintain for then to spend, which they say we did not have.

Mr. Speaker: For what reason will I would hear from the present Minister who are in the House, other than the Unity Team Members who are here, was the Administration and Executive that was done in the Unity Team Government while responsible to the Opposition of the previous Government Records. I truly wonder why those people would have said about the construction of this Façade between 1976 and 1981, when you look at the construction of the present Façade under this present Government. If your Government played the part, if ever anything was suitable to be in the construction of these Figures.

I would like if know was available to really deal or laugh with the construction of these Façade, to have academia, we have courts, we have hospitals, we have airports, we have Magistrate, we have Supreme-in-Law, non-in-Law, Jake and every member of a family who would wear be put in a Grand Jury have been put on the present Jury. No thought was given or to the composition of the Grand Jury Jurisdiction.

On that Façade we tried to see that every District was represented as much as possible. I know that in the Magistrate Jury there would have been Disability to get Jury members from that District, but I know there are a few of the people who would have been glad to take part. But, the Magistrate of Façade Jury and Grand Jury, I admit subjects to correctness, but I do not think there is a member from these Districts in any of the Façade, it is going to take more than that to obviate the voice of Façade Youth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we move to the new Façade which was administratively, in a public attempt to balance the budget, has inconvenienced the people. The first term, Mr. President, made after the elections by this present Government was to demolish the Administration Law. But, the disappointed Minister in his delivery of the budget Address told us that last year, 1984, 160 Jurisdictions were implemented under the Magistrates Court Law, none of these Jurisdictions, Mr. President, probably cost for as high as $400,000. Just per cent of the Jurisdictions were then supposed to have been paid to Government. But, but we assume, Mr. President, that each one of those Jurisdictions last year only had a value of $150,000 each year which we could assume, that would mean $24,000 under the Jurisdiction that should have come into the Treasury. But, the present Government have seen fit to abolish that law, did away with it completely and gone up the might to that body.

They then come in the Legislative Assembly Building as every month that which was in the books for many years. Jurisdiction should really have been abolished, but in they could not think they further retained, they came up with Jurisdiction in these last and the whole matter then.

We know the percentage that Unions have been increased 400 per cent and the cost of that will be borne by the Jurisdiction public and the Jurisdiction from abroad who live here. It will hurt the person people because it was to increase their cost of living. Import duty on airfreight has been increased by about 200 per cent. Again, who is going to pay and who is going to bear the burden of these increases? It falls on the backs of the Jurisdiction and Jurisdiction. Again, while it will do is increase the cost of living for the poorer people in our country and it will

MR. JAMES M. FOSTER (CONSERVATIVE): Some Members always do have midnight sessions as most people will begin to whip by then. So the people who will benefit in the end will be those with hearing interests.

The warehousing fees have been increased. Cigarettes have been increased by 20 per cent. I am not going to speak very strongly on that because that is an increase I think the public can bear.

Liquor licences have gone up by some three by 200 per cent. These are increases which normally would never be contemplated by Governments. This will affect our local people and it will affect the tourists. Most of all, these and, it is affecting many of these approaches.

The cost of writing a cheque has gone up 100 per cent, and again this is going to be borne substantially by the Caymanian public.

The withholding increase to the 7 1/2 per cent stamp duty on mortgages principles. This is going to affect local mortgages and foreign investors, but most of all, Mr. Speaker, it could have a very, very damaging effect on the economy of this country. The only asset that Caymanians really possess is land. A great majority of Caymanians built their land for their coming years to help provide sustenance to themselves and their families.

Land is bought to many times by foreign investors or speculators. Many of these people pay a deposit, return to the United States, sell some property or make a home or whatever they have to do, and pay off the agreement in probably 6 months. Leaving that time is the hold essentially by a form of sharecropper or a mortgage agreement. This is going to cut these two avenues which this country will enjoy, either that increase it because it is going to deter people from investing in the country.

I am sure that a more equitable way could have been found to deal with this problem. I would suggest to the Members that they consider that all agreements be registered within so many days. If the agreement was only for $25,000 or $50,000 more within a stated time than what the agreement was for, then that additional amount would bear the 7 1/2 per cent stamp tax. However, I believe that if this goes through in the manner in which it is now, it is going to affect the economy of the Islands drastically.

We also have the increased in hire-purchase. I will not relate the merits or the demerits of hire-purchasing. I have an involvement in purchasing as one of my companies handles the sales from Tempo company here on the Island. However, Mr. President, if we had not been multiplying now on this in the past, I think we made a mistake because we should have been collecting it. However, 7 1/2 per cent on most things is a bit high. It might a case of which the Government could obtain. I will say here and now that I will unequivocally vote for the withholding tax, but I am hoping that we can see an amendment to it rather than the way in which it has been proposed.

I reasonably based of I can't see any of the $1 million tax which is now being levied on the consumer. This will affect Corporations, companies and tourists, and will probably 170,000 tourists going through this airport this year, plus about 30,000 Caymanians. It is going to amount to a tidy sum. Seeing these plans for the financing of the airport, I think it is unnecessary at this point to put it on at this point.

MR. JAMES M. MORRIS (CONTINUING): Mr. President, I welcomed previously the budget of 1986, which has been announced in this House and I prefer to it as being a nasty auto budget and a budget which was not brought out - and I stand by that. There are many areas today where money could have been saved which we have not spoken about. Areas which would not affect the morale of the Cayman Islands adversely. Areas which would spread the burden of taxation. Areas where large amounts of money could have been secured without hurting anyone or making many more poor Caymanians. The problem is that our physical resources should have not reached this dreadful stage.

I think that the present budget before us, with all due respect to the honourable Third Official Member, is a bit misleading. I am not blaming him for the misleading part, because I am familiar with the way these budgets are formulated. I really feel that most of the supplement things which have been formulated in the budget were against his advice.

There is nothing in the budget which may help on the street and see the market attitude which was alluded to by the Financial Secretary and the reason for which it was decided will benefit. There are things which will bring problems during this year, and I will point them out as I go along.

The country already is in a depression; a recession where it is quite plain an economy which had plenty is an economy which has nothing. We are going from light into darkness. The country needs leadership and not a divided confrontation ways-ends which divide us in the house. This is the reason which I mentioned in the beginning today. The country needs direction. It needs a back into the future. Today, exactly what we are and is going out tomorrow.

It is necessary, Mr. President, to give me and administration a 30 day honeymoon. It is done in the United States and it can also be here. The 30 days for that honeymoon has past and it is time for us to see some positive action. ...

The Members of the Unity Team who are here are still willing to work for the good of our people. That is the commitment we took to our people and that is what we have come in the game. In the case of my colleague from Bodden Town - he and I have served now for over 12 years serving the people of Bodden Town and the people of the Cayman Islands. However, as an Legislative Members of this country must utilize all our knowledge who are able to give us new ideas. Many people can come up with ideas which are worthless a lot believe them when we have worked on for months and months. This we must cooperate. For we still break people in and let us try to build a society on what we have. Let us try to build something for the future.

Mr. President, I have just about dealt with your Throne Speech. At this point I move .....

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder whether, if you have reached a natural break, it would be a convenient moment from your point of view to take the customary break .. Yes. In that case I will suspend proceedings for approximately 15 minutes until about 3.30 p.m.

AT 3:20 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

House resumed at 5.45 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Minister of Finance for Ontario.

MR. CHARLES S. BOSCHE (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I have now come to the point of my deliberations which deal with the budget, which, although I discussed with many areas of it, it was only just finished by the Ontario Treasurer. I wish to congratulate him for his fortnightly service, obtaining our knowledge. I thought congratulations were for the previous position he found himself in because it used to be a difficult burden to bear knowing the manner in which the former Provincial Secretary could shrink in the Provincial Secretary for every, and to put us with the present placing Executive Council which I am sure need every pressure to get the way.

We have just come through an election in this country which the honourable Prime Minister in his address referred to. It was stressful, Mr. President, a dirty campaign. It was a campaign where many of small minds preyed on every person in this country who was -- it was a campaign in which the Progressive Conservative Party played a very prominent part. If the lines had been built by that Conservative Party, God knows what would happen.

One statement which I like made by the Honourable Prime Minister is that he wants to make changes in the country's economic development policies. I recognize because what I hope does not that this country has been so just in most of its economic development policies, but we are stumbling in the dark as a new world who has lost the compass, or as I said it was in a skyscraper that has lost its window.

We have been waiting nearly four months to find out the direction we are going under this Government but we still do not know what direction we are going. The Government plan if there is no unemployment, they cannot even tell us how many unemployed there are in this country. We are told to expect more unemployment in the months ahead. We are told to expect more inflation in the months ahead. We are told to expect more taxes in the months ahead. We are told to expect more of everything in the months ahead. We are told to expect more of everything in the months ahead. We are told to expect more of everything in the months ahead.

There is today a blanket of gloom hanging over our people in this country. There is a feeling of helplessness in every town which we serve. There is lethargy. There is stagnation. Nothing is happening in the country today to give any person faith or hope.

I was in the United States at the time that John F. Kennedy became the President of the United States. He succeeded President Eisenhower who was a great man, but not a great leader. The United States at that time had sunk to the point where everybody hung their heads down. We saw with a smile. There was no hope. The day after the election, although President Kennedy had not taken his seat yet. Just October of 1960 the United States and people had hope. That is what I compare those Liberals to at the present time.

The leaders which we had know in Government Council were mainly the leaders of this Government because the years of 1972 and 1973, and I do not have to remind the people of this country what happened in this country during those four years. It is good to say that the problems which were dominant that

MR. JAMES M. GOOSS (CONTINUED): will become the dominant problem in this administration.

The present Honourable Minister Electoral Member of Executive Council was the Honourable Secretary of the country at that time and with all his authority he was not able to keep the economy of this country going. Because on one hand he may have been in favour of doing so, but on the other hand he held the Constitution of this country which has the development plan which the administration of that time had put together. A development plan which would have completely destroyed this country.

These people speak of development today. What type of development would we have to look forward to today and what development would we have had with the last eight years if that massive plan which they devised by outside sources for this country would have come through?

Mr. President, it was a good thing that the people of this country removed. It was a good thing that they were able to see through what was happening, because if that plan had gone through we would have no development on the island today. We would have no investors here because everybody had gone to the point where rents are low.

I remember very vividly those years. They were difficult years for everyone in the Cayman Islands. When one stops to think about what happened under that development plan, from Spotts up to Rock End Point Caribbeana, down Lucy North Side, we could have had to have four acres for the average man to build a home. What would have happened to the principle of Ownership which happens to be land? It would have had no value. It could have been eliminated by policies taken by the Central Planning Authority so where one could not have developed 10 acres of one did and the five acres to build a house upon. The result would have been that some of these farmers, who had the money to spread, would have come in, bought the land and four years later the development plan would have been changed and by that time no Caymanian would have any land left - but he would have gotten a pittance for it. Then the rich would have soared and the special interests groups would have profited.

That is what this country was saved from then. It was saved from bankruptcy because we had a budget at that time of about $12 million and we had a debt of about $2 million. We had the resources used up. So we had no reserve to fall back on. Even the banking institutions, which have their friends, would not agree. The country was in such a poor state.

The administration which had taken place had been done on the promise of permanence you to come to pay, and we started paying for that in 1972. So I can understand. I think the country as a whole is concerned.

A lot of this which has been done to this country has been done because we have had a Civil Service type Government. We may have elections and our people may be elected by the electorate, but, Mr. President, this form of Government and the manner in which it operates is actually a Civil Service system. Coupled with that, the present administration in the past entrenched and adopted every suggestion that was made by the advisers from other countries - experts who have nothing within our country. These experts may have done their jobs in their own countries, but it certainly did not play a part in the Cayman Islands.

MR. JAMES M. BUCKLEY (CONTINUED): They promised to share profits. They promised a problem under which we made no more profits and no contracts would have been let that time and no orders have been taken. No version could be taken unless they were led by the hand of an expert from abroad or a consultant.

While in what I am afraid we are about to embarrass again. This time it would be more tragic because this time it would be the Seventh Continental playing that part. All of us in this room have read and heard stories about the unpredictable things that happened in the Seventh Continental. Syria disappeared. Persia disappeared. Europe disappeared. Our relations disappeared along with that.

I think I should accord a welcome to the present movement that the people are a little more apt to be united and dictatorial in the Seventh Continental. Europe in this country, as I would personally be by speech, are very determined and knowledgeable people, and we pay honor, respect and prospect to our forefathers. We pay homage to our heritage.

Our forefathers have given us a lot to build upon from the cause from which broke and we the people of the Eastern Peninsula should be willing to build upon that. Our forefathers came from abroad. They were free countries where they were humiliated and subjugated by many human laws, and that is why they were willing to flee the dominion of tyranny in the Colonial in the constitution of 1787 a few hundred years ago. It was much better to live that way and live in freedom than to live in their own fatherland. Therefore, Mr. President, we will never allow this country to go in the manner in which some of these people think it will go.

I will almost the most part of my speech be the complete agreement. Because the agreement was not understood and people were not able to realize internment the reasoning behind it made them seek other, constitutionally obvious the election campaign, about the particular agreement. However, it was a step forward for those lasting development in our country. I am very pleased to see Miss Hunsaqata Third Official Member, in his speech, would advise the House and the people that there is very little recession in the financial community here at present.

We are able to enter a phase where there will be more negotiations, and I would hope that the next negotiation will seek only an agreement to deal in services rather of major trade. This agreement was entered into with the belief that it would take two years to successfully move to a treaty stage, and during that time we would like to see a little give on a take. If we each of us at this time had to give a bite of that pie, the particular agreement would be of advantage to this country.

In making this agreement the Islands received many benefits. One of those benefits was felt before that many of the people in the financial community, many of the lawyers, have been employed and they could not travel into the United States. There had been a commitment that there would be no more federal bureaucrats.

This agreement has allowed us to allow our light on this financial world as a beacon shining into the night. It benefits in the whole world that the Eastern Islands are not prepared to stay alone with the communist trends. It has benefited to the whole world that we will do everything possible to increase the investment in our country, but we will not abandon the customs of the Islands to communism.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN (CONTINUING): Hurricane is a bad word. There are many evil effects suffered by the individuals who are hit by the franchise who have to put up with the inconvenience by the country as a whole. In order to accelerate the health, tangible results have to measure up to enough money to feed that habit, and this is where we get a breakdown in society. It is the incumbent upon everyone in the Cayman Islands to work against the narcotic trade.

Hurricane Gilbert left many economic effects many, many people and there are very few families who have not been touched by the effects of it.

We must never, Mr. President, lose sight of the fact that the economy of the Cayman Islands is greatly influenced by personal fortune over which we have no control. Our own made decisions, one can have devaluation of currencies, one can have epidemics, unfavourable/risky oil effects us, but the factor likely that will affect our economy is the natural inherently.

During 1978 to 1979 we heard that the economy was strangulated here because of the unfavourable recession. It is true, there was a real recession during those years, but the Cayman Islands should not have suffered in the manner in which they did. The Cayman Islands suffered greatly at that time because of local problems and the lack of politics.

We must fight ourselves out to the future and be the world people who are capable of shaping the destiny of our own economy. In any constituency there is usually the controlling and the governed. We must be very careful and confident to ensure that we are responsible to the fight and the interests.

The year 1985 was a very good year for the country and for the people of the Cayman Islands. The Cayman Islands experienced might good years similar to that where the economy increased by at least 20% per year, where every sector of the community benefited, where every person in the Cayman Islands could hold his head up with pride because he had a job and he was earning a decent wage. Those days appear to have passed. The year 1990 may not be a good year.

Banking licenses commenced in 1966. They commenced and were here were registered here because the financial community had faith in the Government. They had faith in the stability of the country. If you look at the records and can easily see the substantial increase in this area which took place from 1977 through 1984.

The banking community plays a great part in the economy and well-being of this country. They are on their side a responsible people and in my opinion they owe a lot of responsibility to the local community. It must not be an easy decision to the point where the banking community is just going for the financial community and not for our people. It is time that the banking community adhere on a programme of certain staff training. The banks have just with us for many years and it is surprising the amount of Caymanians who have come and gone and there are many few Caymanians who ever get to the position of authority. They are usually subjected to the lower ranks as here are of mind and [illegible] of labour. The banking community owes it to the stability which they enjoy here to put in a decent amount staff training courses and train the people for middle management at least.

MR. JAMES K. LOUIE (LEGISLATIVE): We have to, in the very near future, set up a new strong banking relationship. The time has passed when we can expect one or two men to build this bank. We must have the strong enough to ensure that we do not have any further runs like the Intraspac debacle.

The failure of Intraspac and the attendant damage that was done to this country, mainly to the small people who still paying and will pay for the rest of their lives, was brought about because we were not vigilant. The banking community which existed at that time should probably have ensured that this would not have happened if we had not been ignorant. But the most finger must be laid at the feet of the former Government - Secretary of this country because he is the person who was ultimately responsible to seeing that the banks stayed within certain guidelines, and evidently he did not pay any attention to this particular case. We cannot allow ourselves to without any more failures of this nature. We should make a determined effort at this time to enhance more of the international banks. When I say international banks, I am not really talking about a place or the world and the Mainstreet. I am talking about their physical presence.

Many of these institutions will probably be moving from Hong Kong in the next few years and we should make a determined effort to try to bring some of this business to the Cayman Islands. We started on it a few months ago and we need a team to Hong Kong. I hope that the present administration will continue along those lines.

Looking at the economic opportunities, directly to Government revenue, about 7.2 per cent of the amount that is earned and investment of money that will be spent. That is a fairly large slice of the pie and although it we would have a very hard time in balancing our budget. It is not only the direct money that is received by Government, it is the many benefits of the business which we get from it.

Mr. President, I come to the things for the future that I would like to touch on. One of these, Mr. President, is that it is my opinion we need a development bank that can assure that local people will have a chance to enter the business field. If we do not get such an institution in the near future, the time will shortly come when there will be but very few Caymanians who will be managers and owners of their own businesses. The situation means the local people in establishing businesses of their own or the present time is not a good situation.

The next thing that we should work on, and more immediately, is the setting up of a monetary authority which could eventually lead to a central bank. Developments which are taking place in the Cayman Islands have risen at the present. It would go a long way in helping us with revenue and Government would have more effective control with regards to banking. I know that this is a subject which has been brought up before many times again to the former Financial Secretary who has always been strongly against it.

The Agricultural and Industry Development Board plays a vital role in the community at the present time. I am pleased to know that it was not my again thanks the administrations of the Utility Team and it was equally administrations under the auspices of Agriculture, Lands and Natural Resources. I pay tribute to my colleagues for the manner in which my duties were the Authority. However, we have only begun to scratch the surface. There is a lot to do that needs to be done and we need to look into other avenues so that we can produce the long-term planning that was denied to the country. This probably represents the last chance for Caymanians to harness entrepreneurs.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN (CONTINUED): I can very proud that we have our own currency and our own Currency Board. It has been a tremendous success from the beginning. I am pleased to know that during our administration we were able to have the Currency Board issue the $50 and $100 notes.

As mentioned by the Honourable Financial Secretary, who quoted correctly almost my whole $18 million, and in circulation we have about $15 million. So you can easily see that we have a very strong currency.

At this point I would like to give another thought as to what can be done to strengthen this position. At the present time gold prices are very low, according to all the authorities it will not go much lower, and then we are in for a tremendous rise in price. Gold is what has backed most major currencies from the establishment of time. It is looked upon as the true wealth and I do not believe there we can issue with gold. Having $18 million in reserve, I would think it would be a practical idea for us to at least invest $5 million in gold to back our currency. The effect of our currency being backed by gold might be tremendous. It would cause notice to the world of our strong financial conditions.

I do not believe that our present Financial Secretary has been negligent to the point that we have large investments still in the pounds sterling area. If we do, for God's sake get them out and buy gold.

During 1984 the Currency Board contributed to the general revenue of this country $240,642. This is a fairly large amount of money, and this given I have not really gotten to that part of the budget yet where this will be how that revenue is spent. It should be, I am sure, at least $250,000 or $300,000. My colleague has just told me that they expect to get $600,000.

Before I get off the currency issue, I would think one suggestion and that is that we just put some commemorative coins this year which will have the new Government Building featured on the back of them. I think it is a suggestion that is worthwhile and a suggestion that could bring money to the Government and would pay tribute to the people of this country by showing what a determined spirit can do.

During 1984, we were lucky enough to continue to have a lot of expensive aviation here. According to the Honourable Financial Secretary, during the year 1983 there were 7,664 more commercial vehicles which landed in the Cayman Islands than there were. The money which the currency regulation has brought to these Islands and to the general revenue for the year 1984 represents 10.9 per cent of Government revenue. Now, in continuing the prosperity that this enjoyment to our country we should make a determined effort to promote economic the benefits of banking registration in the Cayman Islands. We should not just rely from now and hope that people are going to continue to come.

Years ago we would never have believed that our company registrar would get to the point where there are nearly 10,000 companies registered in the Cayman Islands.

Another area which has great potential for the future is in the area of the insurance companies, and I spoke on very lenient that this legislature has brought into being during the administration of the Unity Team. We have helped to put in a form of revenue which should last for many years to come. At the present time there are 371 insurance and 38 A licences. The Honourable Financial Secretary advised this House that, according to information available to him, it represents four times more than we had in 1983.

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY (RUTHERFORD): I commend the present Financial Secretary for his ability to discern what action should be taken and I refer to the point where he is planning through the Portfolio to organise a seminar of Caymanian companies. He should be commended for taking that action as it is a step in the right direction.

As the tourism industry grows in the Cayman Islands and more and more companies register here, it will eventually provide a pool of long-term funding. At the present, according to the figures presented, it provides 1/3 per cent of Government revenue per year.

Mr. President, my next subject is a very long one and it will take me quite some time. I wonder if it would not be appropriate for us to stop at this point?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think Members will object to adjourning a little bit early, and I am certainly quite willing to have the question put if that will be more convenient from the point of view of your speech?

Would the Honourable First Official Member ....

ADJOURNMENT

HON. JAMES M. POOLEY: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 a.m., Monday, 21st March, 1995, pm.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m., Monday, 21st March, 1995. Does any Honourable Member wish to speak? In that case I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 4:45 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1995.

STATE OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(MONDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1985)

PRESIDING MEMBER:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR S PETER LLOYD, CMG, CVO - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON BRENTS M FOSTER, B.COM.,LEG.,JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J BRADLEY, B.C.E.,E	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR METRO ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C JEFFERSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON PERSIS D SHARMAN	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON P NORMAN BERGEN, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CLIVE CHARLES D ABBOTTSMITH	MEMBER FOR TRANSPORTATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON WESLEY R JOHNSON, B.COM., JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR W MCKEEVER, BROWN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NEW HAY
MR EDWARD A PICKERSGILL, MP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT MURRAY A MACKINNON,	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EASTERN ISLANDS
MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR A MARK HOPPER	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D ORTHNEL MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN B MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RANK END

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

STATUS QUESTIONS & SHORTER MEETINGS IN 2ND (FINAL) SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MONDAY

11TH MARCH, 1974

1. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS.

COMMONWEALTH DAY MESSAGE

TO BE MADE BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS BRANCH OF THE COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION, THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

2. QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE TEMPORARY FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR SPORTS EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 31: WOULD SAID MEMBER STATE WHETHER THE CONTRACTS TO CONSTRUCT SPORTS FACILITIES ERECTED SEMI-SQUARE, AND IF SO, WHETHER THE INSTRUCTIONS OF THE WEST BAY DISTRICT?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 32: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT APPROVAL HAS BEEN GIVEN TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A RESORT HOTEL AT SEVEN MILE BEACH AND WHAT STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO PROTECT THE BEACH?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR AGRICULTURE AND LANDS

NO. 33: WILL THE MEMBER EXPLAIN TO THIS HONOURABLE HOUSE THE OBJECTIVE OF THE RECENT ADMINISTRATION OF UNDERTAKERS IN THE VARIOUS DISTRICTS AND HOW SOON THE RESULTS WILL BE EXPANDED FOR

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FOURTH ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 34: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAY WHETHER OR NOT IT IS CORRECT THAT CERTAIN NEW AGRICULTURAL POLICIES WERE IMPLEMENTED WITH YEAR AND COULD HE SAY WHAT THEY ARE AND HOW SOON THEY MAY BE KNOWN?

NO. 35: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAY WHAT IS THE INTENTION OF GOVERNMENT TO HELP WITH SOME AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY AS HAS BEEN DONE IN THE PAST AND WHETHER CERTAIN REQUESTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS BY THE SOCIETY WERE IMPLEMENTED

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 36: WILL THE MEMBER STATE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY COLLECTED FROM THE FINANCIAL COMMUNITY LEVY SINCE IT WAS IMPOSED, INCORPORATION SINCE 31/12/1973, THE NUMBER OF MORTGAGES AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS PLACED SINCE 31/12/1973 AND THE NUMBER OF MORTGAGES AND THE FINANCIAL AMOUNTS OF SUCH MORTGAGES PLACED BEFORE 31/12/1973

THE FIRST SELECTED MEMBER FOR EXCUSE TODAY IS ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND

Table of Contents

	Page
Communication from Secretary	1
Agenda	2
Statement by Plant Officials Members of Executive Council	3
Consideration of Bills on the Senate Calendar and Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1965	
James H. Hodges	15
Adjournment	25

MONDAY

FIFTH MARCH, 1962

10.30 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayers be offered. Proceedings are resumed. That I presentation of Papers and Reports. The Chairman of the Cayman Islands Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

COMMONWEALTH DAY MESSAGE

HON. W. ROSWELL BODDEN: Mr. President, it gives me much pleasure at this time to read the Commonwealth Day message as received from Dr. the Honourable Sir Ronald Baker, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, which reads as follows:-

> "On Commonwealth Day, which falls on 12 March, I extend greetings to all my fellow Parliamentarians. On this day we rededicate ourselves to the principles of international peace and order, liberty of the individual, faith in the inherent dignity and worth of human beings, eradication of all forms of racialism and racial prejudice, elimination of colonialism, achievement of a more equitable international society and international cooperation contained in the Declaration of the Commonwealth principles adopted in 1971.
>
> As members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA), we hold these principles dear, and in our various meetings and conferences it has been our endeavour to re-emphasise them.
>
> The hallmark of the various Commonwealth organisations has been cooperation and consultation. It is the same spirit our Association brings Parliamentarians together on one platform, where they exchange information and experience in a free and cordial atmosphere. In our parliamentary institutions and the ideals underlying them, we have much in common because of the Commonwealth connection. Relating the democratic processes, the CPA through seminars and other means has been engaged in broadening the understanding of, and promoting the respect for, parliamentary institutions. The Commonwealth link has lent a great stability to our Association, and a sense of belonging to the Members.
>
> The Commonwealth has evolved with the times. In the process of transformation the Commonwealth has shown great dynamism and resilience. It has grown in membership as well as in the scope of its activities. It has been a common meeting ground of the developed and the developing countries and a forum of excellent opportunities, where Parliamentarians meet freely and gain a better understanding of each other and forge personal ties.

In times of crisis the Commonwealth has provided a holding vessel. The sinews parliamentary culture, the same medium of of speech and frequent meetings have forged many members a sense of kinship and emotional attachment.

During the tenure of my office as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I look forward to meeting a number of leaders, representatives of the Commonwealth countries and members of the Association and to exchange ideas as to how best we may further and strengthen the worldwide, understanding and cooperation among the various members of the Association."

MR. PRESIDENT: Questions. The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

HON. JI: Would the Member kindly explain the intents to development school children specify bus stops and if so, what are the locations to the West Bay district?

ANSWER: The intents to development school children do not specify bus stops.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

HON. M. MEDERO BUSH: Supplementary, Mr. President. I do not suppose it is any use asking the Member why not because he did not make up the advertisement I am wondering whether he would give an undertaking to see that when the next advertisements are made up that all districts will have specified locations for bus stops?

HON. HENRY O. BARNES: Mr. President, since the question specifically deals with West Bay I have determined that there are about 25 pick-up and drop-off points in the districts which have established through practice. It appears from a glance at the advertisements that these could be made format by an exchange of letters, and I would seek to do this in the future.

HON. CLEVELAND A. PIERSON: Supplementary, Mr. President. Since this question deals with bus stops and it is of interest to the Cayman Islands I wonder if the Member could satisfy us here that he will do his best to ensure that the same procedure is extended to other districts in the Cayman Islands?

HON. HENRY O. BARNES: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary I will invite the Second Elected Member for West Bay to ask the next question.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL REPRESENTING FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND SPORTS

NO. 12: Would the Member state what progress was done by Cayman Airways Limited in respect of the previous Chairman's financial account and what steps have been taken to recover them?

ANSWER: With the respect, I must point out that this matter relates to the day-to-day management of the company for which I am not directly responsible.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no supplementary the Elected Member for East End may ask the next question.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND SPORTS

NO. 13: Will the Member explain to this Honourable House the objective of the recent registration of unemployed in the various districts and how soon the results will be attended to?

ANSWER: Government decided that it was time to obtain a realistic figure of the unemployed and in the same vein to make the public more aware of the services being offered by the Labour Office, and to ascertain the number categories of those unemployed. The results of the survey will also be made available to the Commission Protection Board to assist it when considering requests for gainful occupation licences.

The Labour Office has already successfully placed a number of those unemployed and efforts in this area will continue.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member what category of unemployed persons were placed in job vacancies?

HON. M. MEDLEY BODDEN: Mr. President, since some hotel workers and a few more common categories.

MR. ROLAND MASEFIELD: Mr. President, as a result of a question asked in this Honourable House a few days ago until the Member advise whether the Commissions who were laid off by Government were registered by the Labour Board?

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not sure whether the Member was here when that question was asked and answered. It was another Member of whom it was asked, I think. But it was asked of the Third Elected Member of Executive Council who I think undertook to obtain some information and circulate it. Perhaps I could ask the two Members concerned in this case if the information already received is sufficient to answer your point now. Would that be satisfactory to you?

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if the survey completed by Government now completed as it would have how many people to lay off from Public Works Department?

MR. W. MICHAEL BERRY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary the next question may be asked by the elected member from East Fork.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST FORK TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEMBER REPRESENTING THE AGRICULTURAL AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES:

NO. 32: With the Hamlet close whether or not it be correct that certain new agricultural policies will be implemented this year and would he tell what they are and how soon they may be done?

ANSWER: We are still in policy formulation stages. The only real policy which has already taken effect is to develop the information flow on priority agricultural issues so as not to impede the market mechanism.

No established policies have been discontinued, and with the assistance of the newly established Agricultural Development Committee by Executive Council it is hoped to identify the areas which call for policy revision or new policies. It is also hoped to examine the feasibility of a viable agricultural economy for Labrador, who would be able to undertake agricultural production of highest quality and maximum and thus improve overall outputs.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JOHN B. MCGEE: Yes, President, a supplementary. To the best of my knowledge the farm at Lower Valley has already been established for some years. Would the Minister enlighten me as to what further changes will be made at the farm?

HON. HAROLD G. JOHNSON: The Lower Valley farm will continue to be a demonstration farm, Mr. President. I cannot envision any changes taking place.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Mr. President, perhaps I should have anticipated from my Lower Valley, has there been an experimental farm. I wonder if the Minister would enlighten me about the changes there?

HON. HAROLD G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, the answer would be the answer that I gave just recently. There is no difference really. It is probably just the same kind which is used here.

MR. G. WILLIS ROWSELL: Mr. President, can the Minister say how many of the members of the newly established Agricultural Development Committee have any expertise in agriculture?

HON. HAROLD G. JOHNSON: I did not hear the question, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you like to repeat it?

MR. G. WILLIS ROWSELL: Mr. President, the question is will the Member state how many members of the newly established Agricultural Development Committee which has set up by Executive Council recently, have any experience in agriculture?

HON. WILLIAM C. JOHNSON: Mr. President, we have very experienced farmers on the Board together with the Chief Agriculturist and Personnel Officer. It is hoped that when we recruit the extension worker he will be the expert on the board. At the present time the board consists of only farmers.

MR. S. SAANID MUSLIM: A supplementary, Mr. President. Can the Member state whether or not the demonstration farm or experimental farm, whatever it is called, did not do the part will revolve on the spot market in competition with the local farmer?

HON. WILLIAM C. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. President, and the farmers took exception to it. This is why we mentioned here that it is a new policy now that the Department of Agriculture does not operate against farmers in the market. Because from the demonstration farm will just be offering to the farmers on a wholesale basis and they will be same market as the farmers.

MR. JOHN M. MEKALI: Mr. President, those prices are no different to what happened before. The produce was offered to the farmer before but I would like to ensure that it was only a few who made mistake. Could the Member say what will be done with the crops which are produced by the experimental farm as a result of experiments in the future?

HON. WILLIAM C. JOHNSON: Mr. President, this question will be different to Government institutions which have dealt of them. Since it is only maybe it will be different to the farmers as a wholesale basis.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there be no further supplementary the next question will again be asked by the Member for East Bel.

THE QUESTION WHICH WAS ASKED BY MR./MR THE HONOURABLE MINISTER, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATIVES AND DEVELOPMENT AND RESPONSE FOLLOWS:

MP 25: Will the Member state whether or not it is the intention of Government to work with the Agricultural Society as has been done in the past and whether monetary sequence and/or disposition by the society will be implemented?

REPLY: It is my definitely the intention to maintain a good working relationship with the Agricultural Society. For the moment, the President of the society is a member of the newly formed Agricultural Development Committee, through which lucky policy direction is expected to be generated. It follows, therefore, that any input from the society as conveyed by the President in his capacity as a member of the Committee will receive due consideration, and will indeed be most welcome. However implementation of the society's suggestions will of course be considered upon merit as discerned by the Committee.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JOHN M. MEKALI: Mr. President, a supplementary. The Member stated that it is the intention to maintain a good working relationship with the society. Will the Member also state whether he feels it would be a good idea for him to attend and become a member of the society?

MRS. MARGARET G. MCNEELY: I would respectfully like to make that declaration, Mr. President.

MR. JOHN B. BROOKS: Mr. President, I really was not expecting that an explanation. I was asking a question. I feel that the Member responsible for this Resolution or explanation should not be given. I feel that it is his place to attend the meeting.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is any further explanation, I will ask the Elected Member for Bridgetown East to ask the next question.

MR. JAMES M. BROOKS: On the Order Paper, Mr. President, I think there is possibly a mistake made either by myself or the staff. I think this question should really be addressed to the Honourable Deputy Elected Member of Executive Council rather than the Second Elected Member of Executive Council. I think I made a mistake.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think there is room for both, sir.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BRIDGETOWN EAST TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL REPRESENTING THE MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Q1. By: Will the Member state the amount of funds withdrawn from the financial commodity for use by the Housing Development Corporation since 31/01/69; the number of mortgages and dollar amounts placed since 31/12/70; and the number of mortgages and the financial amounts of such mortgages placed before 31/01/69?

A1 Ans: The amount of funds withdrawn from the financial commodity for use by the Housing Development Corporation since 31st December, 1970, is $500,000.

No new mortgages have been approved since 31st December, 1970, so there were no funds available with which any mortgage.

The number of mortgages placed before 31st December, 1970, is twenty, with a total dollar value of approximately $1,777,000. Further breakdown is as follows:

(1) Insured loans (19) $947,700

(2) Uninsured loans (1) $100,000

(3) Approved loans not yet placed or cancelled (3) $130,000

Eight of the placed loans were placed prior to 31/12/64 totalling $360,3000 and a further nine date totalling $111,9000.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. HALL GUSTAVE: Mr. President, may the Member give the reasons for the withdrawal back of confidence by the financial community in purchasing bonds since November, 1970?

HON. CHARLES F. ADAMSON: Mr. President, there are several points which to the least sympathetic, which in my opinion impair the lack of confidence in the institutions making further contributions to the Security Corporation.

MR. D. LACY SCOTT: Mr. President, in making this remarks I have to make a statement from the Senate, before December, 1934, amounting to the amount 3,777,000 had been given to the Authority for funds. Since that time only 840,000 has been given. Which of the two figures indicates a lack of confidence in the Security Authority? Is it the figure since December or the figure before?

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER: Mr. President, there may be a claim to view as far as contributions are concerned. The figure of $60,000 mentioned here has just been authorized by Congress. It seems to through complications be being implemented in the near term.

MR. D. LACY SCOTT: Mr. President, the new mortgages have been granted since December, 1934. If had been granted prior to December, 1934, which of these two figures would indicate a lack of confidence in the economy?

MR. CHARLES F. ADAMSON: Mr. President, since the Federal Government would seem to stand as surety in the Corporation's security scheme and there is nothing that the Senate should do unless they do just all they can possibly guarantee purchasers against the application of new funds. It is just not time to put a bill over today for lack merely of. It had been more time since the last authorization was made.

MR. D. LACY SCOTT: Mr. President, I could have not heard an objection to my question. Which of the two figures show a lack of confidence, the issuing of 22 mortgages before December or the issuing of 60 mortgages since December?

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER: Mr. President, the 3100 mortgages to the date would not indicate confidence in the Security Corporation were made some time before then. It is not as though authorizations were made right up to the 31st December and after that nothing was permitted. It was finally come time before the 31st December that any authorization was made to the Board.

MR. D. LACY SCOTT: Can the Senator say that the authorization of 3777,000 came back to the Board?

HON. CHARLES F. ADAMSON. Mr. President, I am not quite certain on this but I believe that it was some time in September.

MR. CHARLES K. BURDICK: In the request to that question, Mr. President, I have to make some statement from the Senator. I am quoting from his report:

> "No new mortgages have been approved since 31st December, 1934, or those above not funds available until very recently."

I have that question in regard to whether or not any part of the "no funds available until very recently". Is the Senator referring to the $60,000 which the Authority has authorized since December?

MR. HARRY G. JOHNSON: For, Mr. President, those are the only funds available to the Corporation now.

MR. JAMES M. MINOR: My question the housing corporation will give out mortgages, how many mortgages do you think you will be able to put out from the $61,000 which you received?

MR. HARRY G. JOHNSON: I am not sure, Mr. President, because it appears to me that new policies will have to be adopted by the Housing Corporation. For instance we have some mortgages granted to a person with a net worth of over $100,000. The amount of these mortgages is $62,500 and it is the opinion that mortgages could not be granted to persons with net worth of over $100,000. There are policies which have to be reviewed. I am not too sure that the $61,000 sum is low I should like to see that distribution will start again when funds are collected.

MR. JAMES M. MINOR: Mr. President, a further explanation. This is a bit of an explanation too. The Housing Corporation has a loan committee which is composed of many worthy people in the community and if persons with assets of over $100,000 has been granted a loan I am not really familiar with it. Really this is not a question. I just wanted to point that out. It is handled by a board and if some particular person has assets of $100,000 I am not aware of it.

Could I ask the following supplementary? Would the Hansard please elaborate on the purposes of a lack of confidence to be done by the previous administration which is keeping money from being multiplied? I think that was the gist of his reply and I would like him to further elaborate on the lack of confidence in order done by the previous administration.

MR. HARRY G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I have been informed that the lack of confidence which was mentioned was in relation due to a statement made by a Member of the last Government stressed to banks that had they failed to make their contributions perhaps other action would be taken against them.

MR. JAMES M. MINOR: Mr. President, to supplement this I would like to ask some of those money words too. In his reply he mentioned that we made more available, I think, to the Corporation. I would like the Member to advise us whether on the City Hospital there were funds available to the Housing Corporation to take care of the re-housing commitments, and what were the amount there on 31st December, 1971?

MR. HARRY G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I have given the answer here that on the 31st November, 1971, there were 17 closed loans valued at $442,300. There were five committed loans valued at $156,000, and there appeared loans not yet closed or committed valued at $135,000. So the Corporation will have funds for pending commitments.

MR. JAMES M. MINOR: I think the Member may rush for nothing so if that because in one of his replies he gave the impression that there was no money left in the Housing Corporation at all as at 31st November, 1971. The Member spoke of the responsibility of confidence which has been built up since the election. He said that before the election in the few months that the Board was operating, there had been a total commitment of $778,000. I do not remember the exact figure which was multiplied up to that date.

MR. JAMES K. BOYCE (COMPTROLLER): Evidently there was at least three members of a Middle Bridge Service Building committee who felt that needed. We have explained to me that so far they have, I think, put $80,000 aboard. How about the others would show willingness in the administration? The previous committee of Senate on the question of bonds admin. Dr. Slat Recreation, Dept?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that is a question which was raised already by the Second Alternate Member from Pueblo West.

MR. D. WAYNE ANDERSON: I believe I never got an answer to it.

MR. JAMES M. LOCKER: Well, I will ask if I may get an answer from him. Would the Member state whether approximately $50,000 of the $80,000 which he has collected since the election was completed by the financial chairmanship before the election or whether this is completely new money which he has received?

MR. WAYNE D. MINGER: Mr. President, the problem is that the appropriation request the new Governments in the Arkansas Watershed. Have we an opportunity -- are we still voting additional funds.

MR. JAMES M. LOCKER: Mr. President, if he may clarify that point for the Members. The point is that they have been an effort nearly five months and I believe they have done a tremendous job.

MR. PRESIDENT: Point, order. The Member must ask a question not make statements.

MR. JAMES M. LOCKER: Well I think we should clarify this matter, Sir. My recall I ask the Member whether there is any hope of further funding?

MR. WAYNE D. MINGER: Mr. President, I have made them.

MR. JAMES M. LOCKER: The people do not, Mr. President, I really did not receive a reply to my previous question because he was interested in his answer that the reason for the monthly reservation being on such a low position was because of lack of funds in the previous administration. I asked whether of the $80,000 which he has committed since the election, $50,000 of that was contributed by that financial chairmanship before the election. If the answer is in the affirmative it would mean that they have only contributed $10,000 on their own, since the election.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary....

MR. JAMES M. MINGER: Mr. President, I am ready for my answer. I have some further questions.

MR. PRESIDENT: I believe that you have not satisfied with the answer you received to your inquiry.

MR. JAMES M. LOCKER: I did not get an answer as to whether the $80,000 was committed before the election or not, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: He answered the question, or should I say either you did asked that question be again again. We may not have given you a specific answer to your inquiry.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Well I will choose it, Sir, as the country will know. It was committed before. Would the Member state whether steps to any proposal afoot by the present administration to put down the practice or curtail the Housing Corporation's activities?

HON. WILTON O. JOHNSON: Not to my knowledge, Mr. President.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Would the Member state whether there would be the possibility during 1985 of at least matching the amount of mortgages which were placed in 1984?

HON. WILTON O. JOHNSON: It is the intention of this Board to do so, Mr. President. Perhaps the question will be looked upon at the end of the year.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Does that scheme of funds come the Member proposes to do today

HON. WILTON O. JOHNSON: Mr. President, we are negotiating. We are not established.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: With whom are we negotiating, the Caribbean Development Bank?

HON. WILTON O. JOHNSON: Possibly one source.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Would not their interest be higher as they the Corporation would not be able to pay out the loans at a low rate as it has done?

HON. WILTON O. JOHNSON: I did not say that we would accept their terms.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Will the Member then state please Cayman the Housing Corporation will accept?

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: We will accept the terms provided by Board policy.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, I have no further questions at this time. I think the public is aware of what is happening.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless any other Member has further questions let us pass to the next question. Again the First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL WHETHER HE WOULD KINDLY STATE THE POSITION AS AT TODAY

QUESTION: Will the Member advise the terms of appointment of the new accountancy agency in North America for Cayman Airways and the Cayman Islands Department of Tourism, and whether such agency provided services for any other entity in the Caribbean?

ANSWER: The agreements between Premier's Department, Government employees Bureau are regarded as confidential and the release of full details of the appointment is therefore not possible. However, it is safe to say that the appointment conforms to the standard agreement used by the Australian Association of Stockbroking Agencies, and was settled by the Legal Department.

The Agency agreements are dealt in the normal manner.

QUESTIONS:

MR. JAMES M. BOOLEY: Mr. President, it may be argued that the agreement with Queen Victoria should be confidential but with all agreements which are made by Government and are subject to Minister Committees, particularly the Premiers of the States might have a right to know what those agreements contained. I wonder why the Government has taken this step at this time in not being willing to make the terms available to the Members of the House to see how to vote the funds for it?

MR. PRESIDENT: Could the Member state that into a question because as far as we notify a statement.

MR. JAMES M. BOOLEY: Well I think that we had a question Mr. Speaker, that is the question. The Member has stated in his reply that the agreements between the Authority, Government and Queen Victoria are regarded as confidential and the release of full details of the appointment is therefore not possible. I said that I would overrule the point that maybe Queen Victoria could be established under those terms, but the Finance Department has to pay the money to maintain this agreement. Under the most recent agreements on that basis that the Members made available to the House so that we may be governed the proper in our consideration of the budget?

THE HON. MURRAY ROBERTS: Mr. President, copies of the agreement can be made available to Members of the Premiers Committee but I do not feel that it is in the interests of Government to unveil this information in an open House. However, copies will be made available to Members of the Premiers Committee, which are to be treated in a confidential manner.

MR. C. PETTY BROWN: Mr. President, can I ask the Minister for some information publicly the terms under which the contracting party will work, should the Member tell us the terms of appointment generally, since how the job been advertised it would have agreed the terms under which the contracting party would work?

THE HON. MURRAY ROBERTS: Mr. President, I think this would be a departure from what has happened in the past with other similar agreements. However, the Member raising the question is a Member of the Premiers Committee and he will personally have the full details when he gets his copy of the agreement.

MR. C. PETTY BROWN: Mr. President, is the Member saying that he will not have the public have the general terms of the appointment for this contract?

HON. E. MORGAN PHILPOTT: I would ask Members of Parliament to treat that sort of information. I have never seen any piece of statement made available to the public.

MR. C. VALLEE (QUEBEC): Is the Member saying that he will not tell the public news, Mr. Speaker?

HON. E. MORGAN PHILPOTT: The Member can provide his own interpretation, Sir.

MR. C. VALLEE (QUEBEC): Can I ask him if he will allow the public to decide it as well?

MR. JAMES K. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Member a further supplementary as to whether he was satisfied in securing the services of this particular agency on the basis of an open, fair examination?

HON. E. MORGAN PHILPOTT: Mr. Speaker, the expert from Europe referred to by the Member was a member of the advisory committee which dealt with applications. That committee was composed of members of the Department of Trade and Members of Parliament.

MR. JAMES K. HUGHES: Will it be the case Department of Trade and Commerce, under which terms of reference will we have the assurance of a so called expert from Denmark in advising on this agreement?

HON. E. MORGAN PHILPOTT: The terms of reference for his services were to be just as otherwise in the case of the committee.

MR. GILLES G. GRENIER: Will they be published this point where Canadians have to make application or to get just a part of the Danish Scientific syndicate?

HON. E. MORGAN PHILPOTT: I am not familiar with the Danish Scientific syndicate, Mr. President.

MR. GILLES G. GRENIER: Could the Minister state under the terms of reference the amount of money that Dr. Mills was to receive?

HON. E. MORGAN PHILPOTT: The details referred to in the answer are not as Dr. Mills was to receive.

MR. JAMES M. HOUSTON: Will the advertising policy figure among the items of which he is being asked for these particular services in the Eastern Provinces?

HON. E. MORGAN PHILPOTT: I am not familiar with what their advertising policy is, but our advertising policy will continue to be maintained at a high level and will be directed towards the continued growth and development of tourism in the Atlantic Provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary I will recognize the Right Honourable Member for Rocky Town to ask the next question.

MR. JAMES K. BOYCE: Mr. President, I must apologise but because of all the shift of responsibility on Government it knew the question I am not quite sure whether I have this question posed to the right Member or not.

QUESTION ASKED BY MR. BOYCE TO ASK THE SECRETARIAT RECORD SECRETARY MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR LABOUR LEGISLATION AND ITEMS

MR. ED: Will the Member state when labour legislation, drafted during the term of the previous administration, will be presented to the Legislature for action?

ANSWER: The Honourable Member is aware that on Thursday, 6th March, 1985, a Select Committee of the whole House was appointed to formulate draft labour legislation, which, when completed will be presented to this Honourable House. Any provisions drafts of labour legislation will be made available to the Committee for consideration.

MR. H. DOUGLAS LEWIS: Mr. President, the question has been directed to the right Member.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES K. BOYCE: May I ask the Member if the last Government's drafted legislation will be made available though it was not enacted it will come forward to the Committee for consideration?

MR. H. DOUGLAS LEWIS: Mr. President, in the debate last year I thought it was brought out that there was no Labour Legislation drafted by the past Government would be brought forward. What I did say was that any previous drafts of labour legislation will be made available to the Committee for consideration. I did not say legislation drafted by the past Government because it is my understanding that none was made.

MR. JAMES K. BOYCE: I do not know whose fault was or his understanding of it, but I think it was made completely plain that Labour Legislation had been drafted by the previous administration and the cost of such a draft, if I may say it to the House, was I think $250,000. So it is unfair to say that legislation has not been drafted. I am asking whether he will make that a part of what is submitted to the Committee for study?

MR. H. DOUGLAS LEWIS: Mr. President, my understanding which I referred to a while ago and which was just confirmed to by the Member was based on a statement made by the Honourable Second Official Member of Government last week. I emphasized any draft legislation was prepared by the International Labour Organization and this is what I am referring to which will be made available to the Committee for consideration.

MR. JAMES K. BOYCE: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: It is 11 o'clock so that concludes Question Time.

I have been given notice by the Honourable First Official Member of his intention to make a statement under Standing Order 20, paragraph (1). So I will invite him to make it at this time.

PARLIAMENT OF PINEY ISLANDS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DEBATES

SUSPENSION ORDER 30(2)

MR. DENNIS D. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, under standing order 17(1)(g) statements by Members of the Government come right after Question time. I note you noticed this morning as you have correctly said, Sir, and I would like to make a statement now.

The Constitution provides for the Governor to exercise the prerogative of mercy. In particular section 17(a) empowers him to remit the whole or a part of any sentence. So is provided to exclude Executive Council before pardoning anybody. This power of pardon is rarely used. Circumstances in which it may be considered are, for example, when a prisoner is terminally ill or on the recommendation of a court. It was used twice. Director of Prisons named Lavina Curtis. A question about this case was asked in the Legislative Assembly last Friday.

Lest any misunderstanding should take place it has been decided. Justice Sunk please notify us a change of punishment of servitude to February 1994. A unanimous decision of the court was reached by the Full Court confirmation of a similar offence during 1974. Between 1977 and 1979 it had also had convictions for some unrelated non-drug offences, details of which were given to the Assembly.

The magistrate considered a two year sentence amply severe, having regard to the fact that the offence involved which was one gram, and to the fact that the prosecution case were more than four years old. He accordingly recommended that the Governor remit part of the sentence.

At the Government's request the Chief Justice was requested to establish whether if the magistrate's recommendations were accepted, any other sentences in respect of other mandatory minimum sentences have been imposed should in certain have some of those sentences remitted too. The Chief Justice reported that none should. All those cases were on the Justice entirely different from that of Lavina Curtis.

The Executive also considered that the unfortunate combination of the remote imprisonment for such fair and reasonable. That is probably what it ought have received and there had been a mandatory sentence.

Separate representations about the case were subsequently made to the Governor by Mr. John Edwina Barker for Mary Day, from which considerably Bank arose. He pointed out that Dawn had been sentenced while pregnancy a termination appropriate and should therefore have been treated with sympathy rather than with condemnation. In considering the case both the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Police agreed that consumption would have been a more appropriate charge. Conviction on such a charge would not have carried a mandatory minimum penalty. The Legislative Assembly subsequently reduced cocaine as a less serious offence than possession and provided for lesser penalties.

The Governor consulted Executive Council in accordance Members' views about the possible exercise of the prerogative of mercy. He was advised against considering it at this time but a recommendation was made that the case should be reviewed after Dawn had served a year's more in prison. The Governor again consulted Executive Council in December, this time on the advice of Mother Teresa Hospital Authority, having regard to the opinions which had been expressed by Mr. Chief Justice and the magistrate.

The Executive Council then advised that the balance of Dawn's sentence should be remitted. It was with the result that Dawn served ten months in prison, the equivalent,

MR. DAVID D. EVANS (NORTHWEST): noting the reference for the statutory entitlement to one third maximum for post hostilities of a fifteen month sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I am the order paper, consideration of the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1985, the First Elected Member for Middle Arm may continue.

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE SECOND READING AND ASKING LEAVE OF THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1985

MR. CLYDE K. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, as I spoke and spoke on the 1985 budget which has been delivered by the Honourable Minister of Energy to this House, it is necessary to consider the entire stewardship of the Lucky Team administration from 1979 to 1985. The reason for this is that 1984 was first the culmination of the promises for growth, development and prosperity which this country had experienced from 1979 to 1984. The Honourable Minister in his delivery has given us various figures which I will quote from. He has advised this House that the construction industry contributes about three million a year to the economy and that the employment in the construction industry is about one people, for this could be people in different shapes.

I will try to point out to this House why to the country at large that we have to be very careful as to what is done by Government so that this can continue at a good rate of growth. The construction industry is very vital to the economy of our Province. It takes employment in the part of it because to develop a hotel, condominium project or whatever it may be because when built it is a lasting type of investment. While I may frankly I would not like to be brought to task later on by someone who may think that I supported that thing until just for ever. I am talking with regard to the longer of the life of an investment type of development. Mr. Speaker, it would just this type of industry to continue it does rely extensively upon people having money in investment, faith in Government and stability.

Take in that context about the major development of this country between 1979 and 1984. During that time people in the Eastern Province enjoyed a measure of life which they had never been able to enjoy before. This figure represents a large amount of people, young people mostly who have employment in this country, and it is very vital that we continue the building trade moving.

The building trade moved ahead during the previous administration of 1979 to 1985 as never it other trade schools were. It has done a lot for the people who have taken the time to go through these schools. I would like to point out to this House that anything from the figures of the Provincial Economic Council there was a drop in approvals in 1984. Approvals dropped from 831 million in 1983 to 804.7 million in 1984, or a 7% per cent decrease. This is a frightening thing and in my opinion a lot of it could have to be laid at the feet of the objection in the United States as well as the election in our own Province. Coupled with that is the difficulty of obtaining long term financing.

I have stressed this because I feel that it is vital when the statistics have fallen in our economy and faith in our Government, and that is why I suffer a further decline in 1985. The indications on the outside are continually receiving

Mr. SPEAKER (Mr. Ramjattan): [illegible] from our Government that they will be determined to continue the policies of peace and prosperity. If this signal is not forthcoming in the days ahead, Mr. President, the entire economy may suffer drastically in time.

The Development Plan which was brought during the previous administration of 1977 to 1981 had a realistic approach to the development of this country. Changes will be necessary to improve upon anything after a period of seven or eight years, but I am hopeful that the present Government will not tamper with that and that it will not, by its present legislation in this House just because it has the majority of votes. This would seriously affect the growth of this country.

It is well known by this Government and many observers to agree that one of the downfalls of the 1978 to 1981 administration was the Development Plan which they tried to keep on an annual basis by the Ministries. Our country has plan and it has not brought about significantly by the manner in which Government policy with the Development Plan for the country. I like symmetry and my constituency will also, hopefully, have this Development Plan so not to be tampered with and that we will not start up with the pressures of the old Development Plan being done in this way that passed by the House.

I would have to give credit to the previous chairman of the Development Board under the administration 1977 to 1981. I think the Board did a good job and it carried out the policies of Government, and it also carried out the policies as laid down in the land. I am sure that the present chairman has the responsibility which rightly is on the right shoulders and I hope that he will carry out a programme of rehabilitation to be sure that the infrastructure in our country is improved significantly so that the production will be brought about and I am asking the Members of the Government Bench to be very cautious that this new Development Plan and not what will cope with the problems of the country.

According to the report from the Honourable Minister of Finance, Government's total property taxes are at a very high figure for the year and the total value of property assessment was $69,4 million. What amount collected this year is planned to be increased significantly to 1985. With reference to the new proposed Stamp Duty Act I would like all Members to look at that there is to be the area of 10 per cent of Government revenue which comes from the transfer of land. If that revenue is not forthcoming in the years that Government will suffer. The people of this country will suffer and transfers are not going to be made as they have been in the past if there is any hampering with the development of the Islands, and, in my opinion, the more stamp duty for persons through this Bench. There are many pitfalls in the proposed Bill. I will try to deal with them later on in my contribution, but I can safely say that the Law Society of Trade would have proposed something to bring to the attention of the Members of the House to the pitfalls which exist in the present provisions implication.

The Honourable Minister of Economic Affairs stated in his submission that during the year 1981 the exemptions were registered under the Registration Act. That is still a significant amount of transfers. What brings me to my other point, Mr. President, is to why the new administration is not [illegible] the exemptions this year. In the year 1981, I think that there were 200 exemptions transferred. In the year 1982, I think that there were somewhere around 250. In 1983, that is the projection there was a drop and I think that during that year there only 75 registrations. However, the present Government

MR. JAMES M. HOOSEY (CONTINUED): some to this House when they proposed to take the conservation aide off, and said that they were taking it off because of the stagnation in the economy and the fact that conservations were not being built. Mr. President, when there were 230 registrations in 1969, which was nearly half of the amount which was registered in 1973, when there was a significant increase was. There was no reason to attack the economy and blame the increase by saying that the conservation industry was lagging so badly, mainly in the conservation phase of it because of the conservation aide. The conservation bug is something which could have worked. It could have been collected because the law plainly set out how it was to be collected, and a conservation developer could make it back a certificate of fitness from the Attorney General before that conservation would be registered. So there is no reason why we could not have collected it. We have lost a significant part of the economy and we are going back to mortgaging it back from the Local people to pay for conservations. This would alarm anyone and it is alarming the local levels. It is alarming the Americans who have built this country as to whether Government has any type of policy at all.

I think that must has been said about this legislation but one of the legal aspects of this country is my gratitude with the elected Member of Roosevelt Council, Gold Coast where we did not see anything materially wrong with the two unit plan because why it was passed expected years ago. It could have contributed a lot to the economy and I think that is . where that it has been taken off.

The main part of my deliberation, Mr. President,will concern on the Portfolio of Agriculture Land and Natural Resources for the year 1986.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder whether before the Member enters on another part it would be convenient to take the morning break. I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes until 11.50 a.m.

AT 11.35 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

AFTER RESUMING AT 11.70 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Elected Member for Golden Sand.

MR. JAMES M. HOOSEY: Mr. President, I would like at this point to deal a bit with the submissions on record to agriculture. During the United Seas administration this department was headed up in 1980 and 1984 under the leadership of the Elected Member for Port Sea, a colleague of mine whom I am very pleased to associate with. During the time that he was in charge of this portfolio he implemented many efforts to enhance agriculture in this country. I think he like many other people in a bit concerned that even with the

Mr. JAMES M. KNIGHT (CONSTITUENCY): appreciation of hon'ble and the mechanization of them the used agriculture was left out. I think that is one drawback to the growth of this country that we can export but many things do the people do come to you first to answer agriculture for the country.

It would be very good if the Member would make himself available to the common people and experience the state of the body as the Prayer Member experienced there. The former Member was that there was television now to enable farmers in the Eastern District to get to those factories. Governments during them they experienced but of money to sustain the farmers. The Member suggested an interesting outside and point of an attempt to improve the skills in this country. Aside this was done with the assistance of funding by the Government. He needed many delegations always and to enquire the assistance of consultants when required, and not at the level of the small home level. We got data play the Government programme which has helped the rubber industry in this country. It is only one that our local farmers in a few areas are having able to supply the demand in the country. Now this is only a temporary stage and this is why it is so important that the Government and the Member in charge of this Ministry work very effectively in the future.

I must mention the necessity of the Agricultural Society and the Association of the members. They have done more than their share so far as supplying the Country in this regard. We should try to market in every area that we can. It is ideal that the Government formulate proper policy and at which level consultancy that industry should increase in this area. We should make a serious attempt to grow local crops and possibly flowers and no fertilizer is going to be done in order to agriculture for the country. Therefore this is only a temporary stage and this is why it is so important that the Government and the Member in charge of this Ministry work very effectively in the future.

I must mention the necessity of the Agricultural Society and the Association of the members. They have done more than their share so far as supplying the Country in this regard. We should try to market in every area that we can. It is ideal that the Government formulate proper policy and at which level consultancy that industry should increase in this area. We should make a serious attempt to grow local crops and possibly flowers and no fertilizer is going to be done in order to agriculture for the country. We must be more aggressive in the marketing strategies we have done before.

The honourable Member during the years 1980 to 1985 did exhibition where members can be involved the people and the Department and they worked together to promote a common goal.

This Portfolio should also pay much attention to the planting industry in these islands. It can be promoted economically, maybe more so in the past where we could secure employment. Besides to do so is going to need the guiding hand of Government. It is going to be necessary to provide more funding. It is going to be necessary for us to also include the services of people who can market our local produce. This could possibly be done through Government assistance and funding in the form of a cooperative and we should make a determined effort to have our fishing industry properly developed. Again the honourable Member expressed a lot of efforts in this particular area, but I still pointed the Bonus were to be going to be of any use if we must designate. We also will need to explore.

I am pleased that the honourable elected Member for Port Moresby was able to put in a programme of importance of local waste. This has helped the Capital City in the clean environment and he has helped the country progress. I am very pleased that the new administration has been fit to promote funds for a rat control dig in Gizumbur as it was once probably the majority of the people for eating and even with new the have increased. Because, I still pointed the House and the people of the country Tolanam that is only a contemplation of the province surrounding Kiwai Island Member of Parliament

MR. JOHN M. BOGGS (CONTINUING). Correct, because plans were fully agreed that had we lasted I can thank the present administration for completing if only one worthwhile project of the anti-town movement.

I will speak further on this in my speech to really show what the objectives of Bodden Town will be next year.

The million dollar parking tournament which was supposed just gone was a tremendous success. Again I speak subject to correction, Mr. President, because I do not know whether that has also been taken away, from the Ministries of Tourism and Trade or whether it will continue under the Leader responsible for Tourism Aviation and Trade. I apologise if my assumption is wrong that this has also been given to the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council. If I am wrong I apologise. Because, again this was a tremendous success for the year. It was a bold step forward and considering the benefits which were derived by this country Government had but little expenditure. I would like to praise all of the people in the private sector who contributed tremendously and effort he showed to make that the success that it was.

This year that particular programme will be sponsored by Mr. Slaughter, a businessman from Miami who is world famous. I wish to thank him publicly also for his efforts on our behalf just to still. I hope, he also with the administration of Government involvement. This was the way to use and if before the objections was I hope that it will continue.

I also hope that the present administration will continue the Premier's Road project. This has contributed much to the economy for many years now and it has been started under the Unity Team's administration. Just because it was started by our administration I hope that the new administration will not see fit to abolish it. It has meant much to our people and it has meant much to the economy. During the time that this project has been going on we have had several shutdown. They all have done a wonderful job. I must at this point pay tribute to the chairman who piloted it through Lady, Mr. Lookwood. I would also like to give my thanks to Dr. Frank Hirtzel.

The previous Member of Executive Council responsible for the agriculture portfolio started a piggery programme and an abattoir. I maybe have not succeeded completely in the revenue budget for this year but I do hope that these worthwhile programmes will continue. I also hope that the Member responsible will see fit to put forward a programme to give more feeder roads in the interior. During our administration we assisted people in agriculture in every respect that we could.

Nearly all of the equipment which would be needed and the supplies which are needed to successfully carry on agriculture in this country had the duty removed from them by us. I hope that the Member in charge now will not be using his financial knowledge in order to persuade the House in the near future to restore these duties on to the backs of our people.

The year 1986, in continuing the programme of the Unity Team Government a police station was built at Bodden Town and a whole complex which cost $650,000. I am very proud for my people of the district of Bodden Town and for the Islands as a whole that Government was able to expend these funds on their behalf. To those who have not seen the police complex in Bodden Town it is a beautiful building and it is in an asset to that district. I am hoping that we will all be able to attend a dedication of this nice complex at East End which I understand will eventually cost $1,500 and which was started under our administration. I believe

MR. JAMES M. BARRY (Chief Steward): The committee in the time of the elections and referendum in the neighborhood of $600,000. So when that is spread I hope we will not have an occasion to impinge it to take.

I know that the elected Member for East End has worked very hard to benefit his people. Even the year 1977, since since he has been an Elected Member he has worked diligently on their behalf, and have and has made many strides in the last eight years.

There will also be a necessity in the near future to construct a police station for the district of West End. The circumstances have been worsened in the neighborhood of Lady Cumberbatch Estates to purchase skyhouse or whatever name in West Bay. We which is in hope we will be able to build a police station, a community hall and possibly an area for sporting facilities. Again I hope that the Elected Members in Government who are leading Government at this moment see fit to consider that policy.

Anyone that under our administration put a police house and I will deal with this matter later. So it is reasonable that George Town come below in the near future provision the estimated funds to provide the many facilities for this district. I will support it fully and accordingly I will also support a request for a station for North Side.

The Honourable Financial Secretary in his statutory position was to be sure the expenditure and budget of the Civil Service is $68,000,000 which represent for about 44 per cent of the national revenue. And this included the large salary increase and the salary scale for the Civil Service which one does accept the fact from administration in the year 1981. However, Mr. President, I must give a word of warning at this point that any time the Civil Service salary and benefits take 44 per cent of the general expense it is reaching an alarming figure. We have spoken a little on this in the previous debates, and I will speak a little more on it now.

I think it is incumbent on you as the Chairman of this committee and the person ultimately responsible for the Civil Service to see that we do not have a further large increase in the expenditure. We must get to the point where people are paid for what they do. We must get to a position where people are promoted on merit and ability and not on longevity by keeping the same system. Those days are past and these issues continue if our country is to proceed in the manner which it should do.

In my opinion, consideration should be given to a change in the Public Service Commission. I feel that the present Public Service Commission is an accumulation of the past in our scientific days and that we should make an attempt to streamline it.

The next point which I would ensure, Mr. President, is the ship registration. My colleague from Bodden Town and myself over the years have fervently tried to get proper ship registration legislation in this country. We have experienced many attempts to deal with this by bringing experts here and so forth, but we have come to a point where there is a little reluctance in it. It was noted last year that the ship registration should be abolished for various reasons, one of them being that it is not a large revenue earner. I spoke against it at that time, Mr. President. I speak against the closure of the registry at this point and I think I will continue to do so for many years to this future. Ship registration to me, if not a revenue earner, is a vital thing. It shows our flag abroad. It gives employment and gives some control in the local market. When you consider the

MR. SPEAKER (Continued): Development of this Cayman Islands and the Government of the Territory could never support a motion like this evening.

The Honourable Financial Secretary in his budget statement has given that there is a reasonably substantial fiscal deficit. We anticipated this earlier enough to ensure we could do. When the Budget of the Cayman Islands is compared to similar countries in the Caribbean with the same size and population then we can hardly complain that Government has been lean. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that when we get back in October the 23rd August the Honourable Financial Secretary and Members of this House will be able to give the same optimistic report. Although with the help of my country and the people I hope that it will be so, my financial fears are that unless we get substantial aid.

I say to most people in the Cayman Islands be glad of these and with all we can encourage ourselves during the next elected Government will make. Whether these moves will be beneficial to the country as a whole or whether the Government will continue to support special interest groups remains to be seen.

The 1981 Budget as presented to the House began with a balanced budget of $23.4 million. However, when additional moneys are to be taken during the year including the re-assessment of the rebate that was enacted since then, the 1981 Budget was $23.7 million. This is a large amount of money and a very large amount of money when you consider the size of our population. However, that money was needed. We borrowed a little of it as the Honourable Financial Secretary has explained and we will be continuing later in my discussion. I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, to point out that the new Government has not been able to increase that budget for the year 1982, but neither have we decreased it from what was given in 1981. For a country to continue and grow as we have been growing, this is impossible.

I have a special part in my speech to deal with what I usually look at the Budget and I will leave the back of my Administration until then. However, I am very vexed that for the entire period of our Administration the local people have not failed more in love the growth budget, the number of ones who to balance our budget, we have had to put large emphasis in revenue and would not tax the local people, particularly poor ones.

The year 1982 ended with a deficit of $700,000 which is the first deficit which has been recorded since the year 1977. So the country as a whole, the Legislative Assembly as a whole and the Islands people as a whole know that this speaks highly for the stewardship of the newly elected administration.

The Honourable Financial Secretary has indicated to us that with the Port Authority, Town and the various other loans; the Town Authority loan, the airport loan and so forth, the debt for the country now is $22.4 million. This is not an alarming amount when you consider the size of our budget and when you consider what the debt has stood at in relation to budgets in the past. We are also indebted, as he mentioned, to Caribbean Development Bank for $700,000 for students loans. Again, I and my colleagues are very proud that this is something else which we introduced under our administration.

The General Reserves as at 31st January, 1982 stood at $10.1 million and during the year they earned $1 million in interest. Leaving the sum $9.1 million and there are specific requirements including the Cayman Brac airport runway. The Government Members in this House are seeking to further maximize the

MR. JAMES M. BRYSON (CONTINUED): ...reserve funds of those Islands by $2.3 million in order to pay to Saipan their 1998 uncollectable budget... those funds now to make, Mr. President, I will warn the Members of the House and the country as a whole that the large reserves which have been built up will be nearly depleted. That is where the problem comes in. It is not the economy which the present Elected Members of Government should have so many kind words for before and after the election that the economy was broken. The country was not broken in their view, Mr. President, but we are facing the point where it is nothing more than a political smokescreen. Because in the short period of little over four months, since this section passed the House, they will have taken over $6 million from accounts and that is nearly just $1 million more than which they said the people's tax did not have. So I wonder if we did not have those resources where could they have put this money to responsibly spend as they have been using.

The balance of reserves at the end of December, as reported by the Honorable Financial Secretary, stood at $27.7 million. With the $2.3 million which the Executive Branch is now proposing that we take for 1998 to will begin us with the small amount of $5.4 million. The former Financial Secretary of this country, who is now the Honorable Speaker Pangelinan of Commonwealth, in some deliberation in this House Chamber this morning, has said that when he left Government a year and a half ago there was $21 million in reserves. This was a big increase, Mr. President, and it was only said to start an argument with the Ways Then administration and on the present Honorable Financial Secretary. I think that the statement should have been withdrawn because we are also aware that as the time he left Government he had started a financial mobility that before that whole substantial amounts of money were taken out of the reserve fund to be used for the benefits of the people of the Northern Islands. So the reserves did not stand at $21 million when he vacated the office.

Another source of revenue which has been accomplished during the Ways Then administration was the privatization of the Postal Savings. In the years to come this will have a significant impact on the people of the Northern Islands. Many people depend on having cash a facility. They thought of having the chance to compete for the Post Office people from other countries who had been employed here, and to open the type of business which they would be proud of. We have given them this opportunity. At the present time ownership in the Financial Secretary's speech there are 14 mistakes who will shortly enter the privatization. Some of these have now completed the third year of a five year course. I don't have all the previous of success and I hope that they can become as much an asset of our public business here.

Mr. President, my fellow colleagues from Saipan may say during the Ways Then administration was majorities for the Territory of Commonwealth and made appearance a lot of effort that year Senate president's vision was established. The first water supply was established in the districts of Saipan Town in Susupe Valley. The second one is now being completed to meet the need of the work on the Beach but will provide the completed Garapan water distribution and to check the manner in which we looked at the problems of the community that we placed a supply of water as being of vital necessity. In order to provide for the number of customers which we now and for our local people, water is of paramount importance. I would like to say briefly to Saipan Water Company, I think they have three plans, who have the desalinization plant on the West Hagåtña Road. They have contributed tremendously to the capital growth of tourism which has provided money for investment, money for the infrastructure, money

Mr. Chief M. Sparrow/continued: for the hotel-keepers and money for the airlines. If they had not had the foresight to go ahead with development, today the country would have been build ahead at least five years in the development.

I would like to point out to the Members of this House that as was the intention of our administration to see that never was placed in the standard of water and before it would have been piped to an hundred in some of the native areas. Unfortunately I believe the present elected Government have not been fit to provide funds to enable this to happen.

My colleague from Caicos and Cay is also responsible for seeing that the sewerage system would come into effect by the year 1980. We along with other members of Government negotiated successfully for the Inter-Development Bank, our administration purchased the land and we put the full plan into action for the sewerage system for the West Bay beach area. Again this is important if we are to overcome to alleviate the number of tourists to the country that we do. It is also important for the welfare of the local people and to see that we maybe thought opinions before any could get in. My colleague spent a lot of his time and effort in bringing this to what I would call a successful conclusion, and again we will be ready to capitalise in future.

The administration was also responsible to negotiate money that the Private Sector could provide the necessary funds for the purchase of land in West Bay. This is a large piece of land and it will be many years before it is fully utilized. However, it will provide a natural place to have a civic centre and parking facility to service the people of West Bay. I would like at this point to warn the present Members for West Bay not to look around for this, because this was done in a previous administration. It was this which appeared that Government as well as the private citizens of this country had already only four weddable money to invest in work in many ways to better the life of our people. I hope that they will provide the funds necessary to the most famous to see that development takes place. In the present budget, although they provided as much as possible to service the Last Electric, I apologise if there is any worry or if for the development there, but I have not got some monies for. I do apologise because I have not had a chance to complete my work on the budget as presented by the honourable Financial Secretary. That is why it will be necessary, Mr. President, for me to continue debating until tomorrow afternoon.

The administration in the year 1982, as in previous years before that, was for to provide money for West Bay, North Side and the other districts to provide community parks and playing fields. This is something which we attended to every year. As I mentioned previously, Government bought the land for the sewerage project on West Bay Road and we purchased the land for the new airport terminal at Owen Roads. I should stress at this point that as I go further in my debate I will be dealing on matters that will the airport terminal and the other facilities for Owen Roads.

We also provided a lump sum grant in Small Grant for the people who have lands and they are in the banking business. Much was said about this issue and I think some people even went so far as to say the money would discredit the work in the Sanitary Board. However, Mr. President, it was one of the first duties in South Sound where this could have been and that I am very pleased that the Member whose family who also came under attack first and stood firm, and that it was completed. I am sure that the people particularly who appear to the taxpaint business in their small hotels will pay tribute for what people do make for that being done.

MR. JAMES H. BOREN (CONTINUING): ...that grew up when establishment of metropolitan districts as Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division was a great step forward and it shows that we have confidence in every level of government in this country.

Property appraisals as I understand it while ago have decreased in value. In 1932 there was a total appraisal of $28.7 million in Memphis, Tennessee. In 1952 it increased to $83.1 million. Mr. President, I am sure that some day in the near future the present financial problems of Southern Bell will be joyfully forgotten & plan to construct the tallest building in this country. If this should ever come about, Mr. President, I am sure it would be the beginning of a revolution in this country. It would be a revolution in views if nothing else because Engineers never that years have taken pride in the ownership of property. The most important of the whole city would and it is their social security for coming years. That is why the public must act accordingly in the years 1954 to 1975 when the development plan of Dixie area would have unquestionably increased the value of property in the Cayuga Islands. People who thought they lost wealth because they owned land, and they owned land in the areas which could have been developed and developed property, suddenly found themselves out in the dark. If that law had been given through as Commission could possess may acquire in my hands today.

I would like at this point, Mr. President, to praise the work which has been done by Nashville Tennessee and Memphis Light Gas and Water Division for the many years which it has been serving in this capacity. It has built the groundwork for the success of our industry. Many of us can remember the good old days we have enjoyed to when the municipal problem was really something to contend with. I spoke last year, Mr. President, and spoke this to one of my good friends, Mr. Whitsitt who was in charge of that department for many years did an outstanding job and should be commended by the people of the Cayuga Islands forever and ever. I was not a friend of his, either. I could not remember him as such, but I believe in giving credit where credit is due.

Mr. President, the Interstate Plan for this country which was just formed by our administration in 1947 would increase in our population and brought great improvement in this country. I would like the present elected Governor of this State that he agree with what is going to their destruction in our country. It brought members of our people in these areas and believe me, if it is compared with it will bring them again.

There was a committee to meet with the Governor this week and set up by Governor from Texas that morning, our administration, and I would hope that a committee representation would be taken to this and that some time in the near future the House will be told that we plan to put in a suitable building code. Personally I would hope that not too many bureaucrats would be used by the Civil Service Act of the Planning Department.

Mr. President, my next examination will be dealing with the Department of Health Education and Public Welfare, and this will be a very long examination. As we have received just about one week time for finishing I would be willing to stop at this point and be recognized this afternoon.

MR. PRESIDENT: If it is a short matter then we hardly stop and it is going to be going on for a long time.

MR. JAMES H. BOREN: I am prepared to go on, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Could look at a bit of the Department for another ten or fifteen minutes?

MR. JAMES V. SCOTT: I can deal with my first two items on it, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Alright.

MR. JAMES V. SCOTT: The Portfolio of Health Education and Social Services is the most important Portfolio in our Government. It is a Portfolio where we deal with the day to day problems of sick people, and when you are sick, Mr. President, nothing in the world matters more to you at that time other than to have your first problem well-taken care of and understood. As far as education goes, it is an understatement to say the future of this country depends. If anything is not properly attended to we will easily revert back to the days in the history of the Cayman Islands of the early 1950's. We have moved away from that. In the past eight years Government has made strides in education which have been unmatched in the previous history of education in this country. This must continue.

It is unfortunate, Mr. President, that the Member who headed this Portfolio in the Lucky Team administration was not elected in the Elections. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ramon, Member Bodden would probably be the most person who has been encouraged the most from some sources. A reference has been made here, and I will be dealing with this later, Mr. President, which in my opinion should never have been made by a Member of this House. The matter may be trivial to anyone, but as far as his having gone, and he has provided help to the country, there are some people in his Lucky Team most of those on the present Elected Government would have to check himself. My hope does lapse to myself health and educational services in this country that any other Member who has occupied the Portfolio, and hopefully any who will be in the future.

At this point, Mr. President....

MR. D. EBANKS MILLER: Mr. President, I wish to venture under standing order 49(7)(b) my right to clarification the matter which the Member has just referred to, if he was referring to what I said in my speech.

MR. JAMES V. SCOTT: Mr. President, I am ready at this time to give him the floor as he may wish his point.

MR. PRESIDENT: You may go ahead and make the point now then.

MR. D. EBANKS MILLER: Yes, Mr. President, I did not question which the Member had expressed as responsible the Portfolio under his administration. I merely just wanted, Sir, just in my writing and in my interpretation of those expressions, it was a waste of taxpayers funds as was done in the Lucky Administration, Sir.

MR. JAMES V. SCOTT: Mr. President, I am not sure whether what I was referring to that particular Member or not.

MR. D. EBANKS MILLER: Thank you, Sir.

MR. JAMES V. SCOTT: Mr. President, I do question why the previous Member responsible for this Portfolio was not in and the actual representative to our young people, which was done a few weeks ago. Many people....

MR. BENTON D. FRANCIS: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would give way, Sir?

Mr. President, I thought that the Question Time would be very clear that I did not approve the questionnaire which was put to the children. I think the Member is out of order when he attributes that motion to me, Sir.

MR. FIDELIS K. BOUCAUT: Mr. President, if I had been in that Member's place I would be ashamed to admit to my fellow Legislative Members and to the country as a whole that such an outrage could be carried out by one of the departments for which I was responsible and not know anything about it. I see only scratching on this Resolution in yesterday, but now I will spend more time to discuss with it.

Mr. President, the sanctity of the home is of great importance in a community, and the home stands as the link between the parent and the child. I would accordingly say that these type of questions may be done in a communist society but I would hope would not continue to be done in our society. I stand on first question though as any human being could also do, and emphasis which will have to eliminate the drug problem, such as the acquisition of my life if it had to be, I would do it for the people of the Cayman Islands. However, Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for us to produce a questionnaire and give it to children of ten and eleven years old, and expect them to answer truthfully to the questions. I honestly have never seen the questionnaire and if I had maybe I could elaborate more on it, but I fail to see where we have any precautions or we can get anything from such a questionnaire. Children of ten and eleven years old should not be asked questions of this nature against their parents. In the circumstances the honesty of the home and if we were to continue with things would wind up like the majority which have been in the United States in the past few weeks concerning the use abuse of young children.

There have been two aims to this argument, one for and one against whether the children should be questioned in the manner in which they have been questioned. I am not here to say which is correct but I am here to say, Mr. President, that I am against such questionnaires being given to children ten and eleven years old. I will state further, Mr. President, that the Member of this House who is assigned a portfolio of Government is responsible for anything and everything which happens in that portfolio. He cannot shy away from it. The blame should never be put on the technical Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the clerk, the Secretary or anyone else. The Member must do as I have done in the past and say, "I was responsible". He should not shy away from it. The Member owes it to the people of this country that they know everything which takes place in his portfolio and he ought ultimately be the one who permissions it. If not, Mr. President, as any policy might look into what I have been talking about for years and that is a Government of Civil Servants, and so should which at this point the Question ends.

Why do we have the clause for Government under our Constitution by the Members who are elected to fill these positions are going to take the complete advice of the Civil Service and leave it completely to the Civil Service to run our country. If that is so, however, Mr. President, you should question this House today and the next will realize these powers should be the repeal of the Election Law.

HON. DENNIS O. DUGAN: Mr. President, I wonder whether the Member is prepared to give way [illegible]?

MR. JAMES M. BROOM: Mr. President, I am very pleased to give way.

HON. DENNIS O. DUGAN: Mr. President, in the customary fashion the Member is misleading the House. It is very clear and on the record that I only used yesterday the question in regard to the qualifications that if the rate could be established that the increase was approved during my administration I would have willingly accepted the blame or responsibility for it. However, I made it clear that we were able to satisfy no other the qualifications was approved. That is on record so the Member would not go out and tell half truths or whatever he could call them, sir. If he can please his memory to anybody of that kind.

MR. DENNIS M. MCDONOUGH: Mr. President, I am not saying to give this House a half truth and I do just what was the rules be before. I admit, to my second night, I agreed, and I am proud of it, that I was elected here and debated a very long time, and listened unbelievable. However, Mr. President, I still remain the fact that no record plans the previous Member or blame the Civil Service. Expansion to Lawrence Cemetery took place on the 31st December, and this operation was only six and a half months later. It has not [illegible] a half months to fully appoint Mrs. [illegible] with the problems attendant to his position. So he cannot sit, very [illegible] it. So not responsible.

MR. PRESIDENT: I know that I thanked the Member to [illegible] but I wonder if we have come to the end of that particular point would be in a consultation. However, it take [illegible] that I will suspend proceedings until 8.30 p.m.

At 10.30 P.M. the House adjourned.

HOUSE RESUMED AT 8.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Right Elected Member for Berbice, Mrs.

MR. JAMES M. BROOM: Mr. President, in the budget debate we were told that in 1984 the Government spent $6.5 million for health care for the Guyana Defence. Of this, capital expenditure amounted to about $500,000. This is a significant sum of money and it is a significant amount of some which has been invested in our people. We hope that in 1985 the people will continue to receive the same type of health service which they did in the previous administration.

Attention was paid to many areas and namely the state of Ireland the dental clinic at the hospital are renovated and Government personnel is able to provide accommodation

MR. JAMES K. BATTEN (Scarborough): New additions for dental treatment at Central Mobile have established and equipped an Oral Aid. A portable dispensal unit has been purchased and $10,000 was spent on medical equipment. Also the rehabilitation equipment was transferred to Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital from another ministry the same year. I understand that some of these have obtained with the help of one of the staff members at the hospital, and I congratulate that staff member.

Delivery of medicine from the pharmacy has always been a problem. It continued into 1982, and I am sure that we will also see it in 1983. I would commend the Chief for saying that in my opinion much more money should be allocated at the hospital for this. The pharmacist who prepared the bills for patients said that payments could sometimes be held up for a couple of months. In many cases, the staff in the wards and nursing positions make sure that the patients leave the hospital and by that time it is not usually collectable.

With regard to the nursing shortage I have the impression that many people who cannot afford to pay find it easier to get work in other areas by nursing vacancies in establishments. I think that the attitude of the patients, and so is not able to volunteer while the patient is still in the hospital, that the nurses could not be able to pay the bill when they left. In principle, I commend my sympathy and I hope that the Government will be involved with that and that the patients of the past will continue. It may that hospitals charge people who do not afford to pay, if a deposit system could be introduced to where a deposit would have to be paid at the time that the person enters the hospital. Now by saying this I do not intend in any way to mean that any patient will be turned away from the Ontario Psychiatric Hospital or any of the mentally ill hospitals because they were not able to pay a deposit. I do not prefer to do it in that manner.

I am pleased to see that in 1983, there was the appointment of a second full time doctor to Cedar Lake.

The purchase of additional mental health beds in 1983, amounted to $700,000. Of that the purchase of beds for the treatment of patients amounted to $600,000. The Mental Health for that particular year provided a program to upgrade the auxiliary facilities for the elderly people of the Cedar Islands. Work was done in this area and again I hope that the personal interaction will continue there there.

I think the physicians from various the this year have performed many invaluable services at the hospital in undertaking in problems in ophthalmology, orthopaedics, neurosurgical surgery, brain metal surgery, neurology, plastic surgery, psychiatry and neurosurgery and thyroid disorders. These people have to be complimented and we should extend every reasonable undertakings to them to enable them this continue in the future, and maybe even on a broader scale.

The immunization programme for children has been successful. Even in one part of the province there has been and it is probably one of the highest percentages in the world. In my opinion, Governments should begin discussion the Canada committee to provide family planning clinics throughout the country. This is something which we can no longer keep under the carpet. It must be dealt with. The same thing applies to sexually transmitted diseases. I unreservedly use phrases when I say this applies to the people. If you take the amount of people we have in this country, it could probably assume to the highest incidence of this illness in the world. If we do not eliminate education and treatment soon this will probably be, and will not affect the whole of the country. Ideally the view has been that the Ontario Government should introduce sexual education and maybe even some legislation on this subject for inclusion in the school curriculum. However, it needs to be dealt with and dealt with on merit.

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: I pay tribute to the Clerk and Deputy Clerk for their assistance with any and all problems. Where the organizations have made changes I personally and they have spent much time and effort and money to ensure that our people were satisfied.

Another particular which must be dealt with is the matter of the Clerk and Recorder position. Offices dealing in these matters should be organized and be handled only by properly trained staff. Many other members of the House share this problem. We have to do our best to have these offices and they have proved to be very helpful, particularly in the long Adjournment. We could help our county records a lot if this is done and done as soon.

There was a comment dealing with the problems of the mentally ill which was contributed by the previous administration and the member who made responsible. I hope I have that will continue and will receive primary attention from Government.

Primary health care clinics were established at Nuku Lau and the doctors' clinics expanded to cover a week.

I would also like to pay tribute to the Rotary Club for helping to provide the blood pressure and diabetes screening equipment. We are fortunate to have members of our organizations spend so much time and effort in helping the less fortunate in our community. Rotary has done this for many years and I am sure that they will continue with it in the future.

It was the Member responsible for this portfolio also helped to organize the Seventh Summer Games and the other sporting week. There are two important areas in our country where further work should be done, and I hope that the Member responsible will continue to pay to his support.

A medical clinical care unit was established at the start. This was something I gave my support to and will continue to support as I feel it is time that we were to provide with the problems of the elderly people and the retirement people who are not able to take care of themselves. To avoid having a great shock on the hospital and it was brought a stress in the part of the facilities there.

Mr. Speaker, during the last eight years the previous administration neglected the out-patients and subsidy used at the hospital. A new duty was added for specialists. A new physiotherapy unit was installed. An out-patients duty was added. Kitchen facilities were renovated. A new operating room and recovery room built. The out-patients department was renovated. Some doctors' quarters were built and a department was built for the doctor on call. Eight hospital beds were added. A new operating was delivered from at the Public Hospital at Lautoka from the Indian and also Malay area facilities. The public health offices were renovated. Some public health officers were added to the force. The vaccine programme was continued. There was a public awareness the shortage of drugs. Mos dental clinics were added. There was renovation to the Lautoka Eye Dental clinic and an X-ray block and sterilizers were installed at Lautoka Eye. Three dental nurses were graduated with regularly basic examinations. This represented a ten of capital expenditure but there is no better area where the money could have been spent than in the care and protection of our people.

Mr. WALTER H. BOSSERT (CONTINUING): With respect to education, another department which just misses the responsibilities of the Honourable Minister of Revenue is Social Services responsible for Health Education and Special Services, which is the second largest in terms of dollars which was about 7½ per cent of the total amount of money spent in the field of education.

In 1965 the previous administration announced the policy of withdrawing revenue grants to assist the private schools in our country. The private schools which operate in our country have an enrolment of approximately 1,900 pupils of the 6,274 who are attending schools in this country, or 30 per cent of the total number of students are enrolled in private schools. This contains the Government unfortunately because of the way in which the legislation was drafted to handle all of these students as would find that our budget would be seriously strained.

The Middle School was built during the administration of the years from between 1977 and 1980. This is a facility was open to respond to the educational aspirations in the Cayman Islands. The present enrolment in the Middle School is a large enrolment for a school which has only been in operation a few years. I am very proud that this was one of the accomplishments of our administration. It was a policy decision taken which proved to be taken in the right direction. In the one opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the High School was getting too large and that we were right before to move the youngsters of eleven years old and up away from the neighbourhood and education which used to the High School. I think that the decision was a wise one and again history will prove that to be wise also.

Student enrolment at the High School is 858 which means that for the next three years we can look forward to over 200 plus students every year leaving the High School and going out into the world seeking employment. In most cases grant assistance should be paid to be in the area of vocational guidance and counselling for the young students. As many times we find that the average child coming out of the High School really has no direction to be taken particularly should he would wish to enter one. As a result we find that some of them take up the square pegs in round holes.

In particular the Budget for 1984 we find that the annual cost per pupil in our primary schools in the Sister Islands was $1,980.89 compared to Cayman where which was $1,830.89, this is a very large discrepancy and I really wonder why this should be. I can agree that costs in Cayman have should be much higher than in Sister Islands but to have an excess of 50 per cent more spent in Cayman above is this high.

The annual cost per pupil in the Cayman Islands High School which is located here in George Town was $1,938.99 per child. The annual cost in Cayman Brac was $2,752.00. My previous remark with regard to the differences in cost should be noted as the Cayman Brac High School is not located on the primary school.

The annual cost per pupil in the Cayman Islands Middle School was assessed to be $2,369.00. The accommodation cost for students was listed in 1984 as exceeding slightly a million dollars. This is a large expenditure, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot see where we can expect to be lowered, anyway in the near future because as the population continues to increase there will be more demand for accommodation. Government has seen fit to consolidate the High School and the Middle School in George Town and the primary students from the other districts have to be involved in. In many cases the parents of these children could very afford, with all of the other problems which they encounter financially. In fact the money to accommodate these children in the

Mr. Miss K. Sutney (Constituency): High School and the Middle School. Therefore, I must commend to support the proposal whereby Government pays for this transportation. I hope that it will continue to be run by private enterprise carefully monitored, and that Government has no intention because of the weakness of politics to try to make any change in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place a suggestion on record that either this Government immediately the enlargement of the present High School system on Georgia Street, a High School be erected in the very near future in the Indian Cove/Glendale area. This could save money as far as transportation is concerned and every penny counts these days. I would not be against it being built in the Riverbend area either. It is my opinion that this is justified because the population of the Seaham district is growing and it is quite a problem for many of these youngsters to come from the eastern municipalities and to arrive in Georgia Town around 8:30 in the morning to be ready to go to school. It would also save many problems. It would ease congestion if our suggestion should be considered and adopted. After all, Eskimo Town contains the politicians capital so we can use the capital to spare some for, and it was quite plain during this that we associate ourselves with the districts of Port Hope North.

In the year 1969, two tennis courts and two volleyball and a multiple purpose hall were provided at the Middle School. I would like to see this completed in 1970. Contracts were provided at the Middle School and the High School.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have one alarming problem associated with education and that was revealed in the honourable Third Opposition Member's Budget Address when he mentioned to us that the teaching force consisted of 75 per cent expatriates and only 25 per cent Labradorians. This is a problem which should be addressed by Government as soon. We should endeavour locally and we should prepare and assist people in our district to train as teachers. It is much easier for a teacher to deal with the problems of our people when he has been born and bred with us. This is not saying that the expatriate teachers are not also trying. I do not wish to infer that. What I am saying is that it would be much better in the years to come if we could change this composition to where we had 75 per cent of the teachers who were Labradorians and 25 per cent who were expatriates.

I think this can be accomplished by placing more emphasis on education, especially our matriculation programme and training the graduates mentally when they come here. I had occasion last year to deal with a problem of a local teacher who had acquired a Bachelor's degree and then went off after some time at the High School to acquire another so that eventually that person received a Master's degree. When coming back to Grand Falls with a Master's degree was not in a position of being a telephone operator at the High School, plus suffering many other indignities. The guy would then die down into practically less. I hereby place points out to show the members of the House that we should accept our graduates as teachers a little sooner so learning when they are trained in this country. This young lady involved had very little assistance from Government during her training. I think she is still employed by Government and I believe that she will make a good addition to the school system in the end.

During the last eight years the Liberal administration experienced the educational difficulties of this country and addressed the problems in all areas from pre-school to adolescence with the introduction of the special education programme for the physically and mentally disturbed. This was done by the former Liberal administration

Mr. SAINT M. JOSEPH (Independent): For this Ministry and the Government body of the Community College will speak for the efforts in this area.

School libraries and reading workshops were established. A pre-school educational programme was started. Resource rooms were built at all primary schools to attend to the learning disabilities of the youngsters. A curriculum co-ordinator for social studies was appointed and also an examinations officer for primary schools. These were steps in the right direction.

The building itself which was made by Mr. Simon Hawker of Government, the Member responsible for Health Education and Social Services, was taken by task force early in 1977 to accommodate the Caribbean Examination Council for the Cayman Islands. This will go down in history as a very memorable step and one which would possibly earn him at least a CSE if he was not so small and had no pen behind his ears. Mr. President, we can all visualize the state of affairs which would have existed in the Cayman Islands today if for eight years we had without this country in the group of personality to accept the Caribbean Examination Council exams. These exams would have taught our children to strive only for high, commendable, acceptable, first class, and not just. I cannot understand, Mr. President, why the Member who was responsible for this up until 1976 would have ever considered putting this state beyond the means of the future generation of this country.

Mr. President, renovation took place in all of the schools throughout the Cayman Islands and this period also saw the beginning of the Lighthouse School. This is a school which is much needed. Such is a school which I trust will change positive Government policies. These are children who although handicapped can play a part in the society if the right type of education is made available to them.

Mr. President, I come to social services and I quote the words of the Honourable Financial Secretary when in his speech he said:

> "Changes can be made from the Department of Social Services in 1980."

Mr. President, many talks have been held; many studies have circulated about the lack of attention which was directed to social services by the previous administration. However, I will attempt to show that all of these studies have simply been shelved. I will attempt as I proceed with my deliberations on this subject to point out that Section of the present administration building on the foundation which was laid by the previous administration, they have attempted to take it down and this year they are not even paying the attention to it that we paid to it last year, much less speaking on it.

The budget for social services in 1980 was up 14 per cent over 1979. We commend the staff of this department and applaud additional personnel. I will give an indication, Mr. President, as to really what was done in regard to the field of social services.

The Bible has said that we will have the poor with us for ever and many people in this country are poor. It is no shame to be poor. There are many fine Members of this House who at one time in their life could not have been considered poor. However, in 1978 as little attention was paid to the poor relief fund which helps to take care of the poor people in our country, there only $13,300 was spent on poor relief.

MR. JAMES K. HOUSER (CONTINUING): Mr. President, that is not the end of the bills. I can remember sitting down several evenings along with my colleague here from Seldom Seen in 1978. At that time I can remember discussing the budget for the previous year for poor relief was $700 and many tables of it had been spent. When the Minister Responsible started the Saltbanking Program we ventured why it was not going ahead and also why it had not been started the year before. The present Honourable Elected Member of Parliament responsible for Social Services was also the Member for Social Services at that time and responsibly when we talked in the administration of the town relief funds we were told that it was so little that there was no way that she could begin to spend it, because if she had spent $10 out of it somebody would have turned up and needed $100 and that she would not have had anything to give them. After about a day and a half of debate my colleague from Seldom Seen and myself, with the assistance of some of the other Members were able to get that increased, I think, to $2,000. I am just giving the Members the history of what has happened with this particular thing under the administration of the present Honourable Member who is responsible for it.

In the year 1982, the government spent $126,257 on poor relief. Mine notes that the poor relief expenditure has increased by roughly 1,000 per cent in the last eight years. That does not mean that we have that many more people. It means that we are paying better attention to those who do have.

In 1978 provincial expenditures amounted for an expenditure of $12,761 by the then Government. This Government had as five Members responsible for Social Education and Social Services the same Member who is the Minister responsible for Health Education and Social Services in the year 1985. In 1982, Mr. President, this expenditure was an expenditure of $40,219, a tremendous increase in eight years, an increase of roughly about 1,200 per cent. But the Member who was responsible or split as all the Members of the Party have been responsible by the newspapers and by certain people for the responsibility for their lack of attention to social services. Those figures speak for themselves as to what is attempted to do, Mr. President.

During the previous administration substantial funds were loaned to the Town. This arises in a project which the National Council of Social Services has undertaken with. It is a project which with public support has gone into, but in the end they felt short of the necessary funds to complete and Government was asked to come to their assistance. I would suggest to Honourable Members here that I think that the announcements backed up the Government to the National Council of Social Services approximately half a million dollars.

Another point which I would like to bring up, Mr. President, is that during our administration the pension to Newfoundlanders after March was implemented and this eliminated the war years of suffering which existed in many poor families in the country. In addition to that the pension was implemented to bring it in line with the minimum wage of today. There are things which the people as a whole will not forget and it is hopefully which the present Government should not forget. They should pay attention to this as necessary welfare change in the future although I doubt they will be there long enough for us to have to change that soon.

We also established free medical care for the pensioners. This again was a substantial benefit to Government revenues, but we felt that there was no better cause than these people should have to receive good medical treatment free because pensioners who had to pay some cost sufficient, and that

MR. JAMES H. QUILLEN (CONTINUED): those people who had given many years to Government service, in their waning years should be able to live with dignity.

A new provision was instituted for the Civil Service and not just for the Legislative Assembly whereby the present Minister of Government could like to widow the pensionable bachelor. This was a welcome change from what had been in accordance before.

Another great help came with the passing of the Supreme Pensions Ordinance; equal rights were given for husbands and wives under that Law. This was something that my colleague and myself had sponsored in this Assembly from 1972, which was when we brought our first motion, I think.

A pensions Board was established for the Judiciary and staffed, and Government undertakes to provide maintenance and staffing costs of the Pensions Boards' Office. Again I give credit to the organisation which helped to provide the money to assist this. It shows that the people of this country are willing to put their shoulders to the wheel with Government wherever it is needed.

A pensions collection system was started in Cayman Brac and we saw the consummation of the Cayman Water company. Road was made accessible previously, as I have touched on before, were completed.

Land was purchased in many areas of the country for cemeteries and the facilities were improved in all areas. In addition money was voted under the Budget and used to fence these cemeteries. We purchased additional land in all districts for playgrounds and in built most of them.

We regularly saw about land be passed grants for use by the public. Recreation facilities were provided for the public at the George Town Dump. We provided money for Mull Service Lane through Town to the Civil Service Credit Union. We subsidized the recreation of students' fares. We passed money to nearly every private school in this country at some low rates of interest and in some cases with no interest at all, in addition to the grants which were given to them on the regular budget.

The sports complex at the Middle School was started and I am hopeful that the Member again will not give it the second position when it is completed, as it was started under the Unity Team administration.

At the end of the year, due to our commitment to the young people of this country, there were 20 students given scholarships. Mr. President, I mean once more that this is an area where much attention needs to be given. This is an area which we cannot cut in order to try to balance the budget. The young people of this country must have the help so that they can come back as capable citizens and help us to establish a community which we will be proud of.

I pay tribute again to another person on the loss of a Cessna Twin Otter, Report has also it to make such a large donation to the cultural centre in George Town. I give it Mr. President and I hope that with Government and the private sector working together, the establishment of the cultural centre will become a fact in the very near future.

Mr. President, I come to social problem. I am very proud that that is one of the responsibilities of Government where we have a separate Department at the head of it. The present Minister of Civil Aviation has proved his ability in many areas. He has proved that under the Cabinet System he gives the opportunity, to the

MR. JAMES M. SCOBEY (CONTINUING): ...congressional committees. I also wish to thank our entire staff.

During our administration we provided a new administrative office for state government. We established the international section and two area liaison units for the state. Mr. President, the design of that complex is similar to the design of the Samoan Fitness administration offices and is the most pleasant workplace. It gives me great pleasure to see that our country was able to help this, and it gives the people of this country great pride. Moreover, to the inhabitants who come to Samoa Islands, it proves to them that we are capable of administering our own affairs. If some more people passed through Pago Pago's airport in 1972 will find them well here through Samoan hands. This alone must be ample of all advantages that we received during our tenure. I will deal with this further in my answer in regard to choosing the amount of revenue which is earned from these areas.

In 1964 we had through them Roberts airport 255,220 people of which 214,371 people as nonresidents. Data data available is recorded there will be twelve, to create doubt as to why a new airport terminal had to be built. Our there should be expressed but one which should meet the needs of the country hopefully for the next fifteen years.

I personally am very proud of the new airport terminal and I am proud that it was a fruition of our appreciation to Pago Pago for the friends who helped to pioneer the success which our country enjoys today. That airport terminal of ours could be probably Polynesia's largest investment, but it is an investment which has put together modern ethnic architecture, with help from the Samoan Development Bank. When the management-in-place that facility should not fail itself to serve visitors and still leave a surplus each year. I have had many good comments made about it and I am proud that I had the opportunity to play the part which is that I did.

Samoan Air was previously at 17,979 people and expenditures of 18,851. This again was a great increase and it is these that there is a chance for Samoan Air and Samoa to develop in the future along the lines of Trans Samoa. In fact there can be talked why in the future of the Samoan Islands.

Revenue in the year 1967 from civil aviation was $2,841,116. During 1967 changes flights were established from Trans Samoa to New York and Chicago. This opens up two important tourist areas to the Samoan Islands by direct service. For many years our Government, through the assistance of the Department of Tourism, has established offices in New York and Chicago. For these are areas of great potential and we point this view we have really not tapped the surface of it. I hope that these will continue, hopefully on a yearly basis rather than really are looking at a time.

We have been able in the last year to increase our revenues at the airport through the establishment of Samoans stewardess from time, with their exploits into the United States of America. We have also helped to establish a service from Samoa and Cairns Islands which has added considerably to the economy of Samoan Airways and which I will deal with when I come to the Samoa Airways section of my speech.

During the year 1967 we had to suspend the operation of the jet service into Samoa Isles. This was the history of Samoan Trans and while Samoa successfully but we failed to make with it on the best manner that we could. Shortly, I think, we have with be given these good reliable services I am sorry that this step had to be taken but it had to be taken in regard to safety and to economics on the operation. I am glad that

MR. JAMES M. ADAMS (CONTINUED): We were able to re-distribute the surplus in December of that year. I know that the people of Laguna Beach have been very thankful that we have extended to them the water received from State facilities we have been experiencing here in Laguna for many years.

We expanded the old terminal building at Laguna Base in order to serve both the Sheriff's and Fire Departments. However, a new terminal is planned for Laguna Base this year. I expect that it will be completed in the year 1965, but at least it is available for the people of Laguna Base to look forward to. They have assured themselves benefits in the long range under the previous administration, but the old terminal for the Navy has been expanded to double its former size.

We established the Santa Ana Canyon Sanitary District, one in Laguna Canyon and one in Laguna Base.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the formation of the new Orange Harbor District. Under the plan which we had worked out, and I do not know how many changes have been made in it since the election, it will provide revenue this year of approximately $622,000; that is vessel revenue, which will go towards retiring the Dana Point Harbor Development Bond of $3 million which is to be repaid over a period of seven years. Tax Supervision Fund is $169,000. Again most of this was the result of legislation which was part of the administration. Leasing fees should bring in income of $453,000. I do not have the exact figure as yet, as to the income it is expected to get with the rental rate increase. The service charge tax is a new tax which was part of the administration and will probably bring in their county approximately $650,000 in this year of 1965. However, it is safe to assume that the income will be in the vicinity of $700,000. Along with that we will have the new property tax which the previous administration has instituted. So, Mr. President, I will only say that this was one more effort expended by the present administration to pull a few more dollars out of the pockets of Orange County.

I would suggest to the present Member in charge of this portfolio that we spend a few additional dollars and install some real water in the outside ponding area of the airport. Sometimes one has to stand outside on foot to see there and a lady to walk for people to be impressed through customs and immigration, something which I think should be accomplished by further attention than it is, because we have wonderful facilities and we are still having temper to preserve the amenities here that we enjoy.

Mr. President, before leaving this area I would like to speak on the question which I posed to the Member responsible for the Portfolio during this Session when I was told that the cost of the flood opening of the airport was $19,500 plus compared to $6,000 plus for the second runway. I requested a breakdown of this, Mr. President, and I am not that pleased with the answer. Because it was an expenditure known of $13,000 plus as soon as rock and bedding. This made up a part of the $28,000 plus. Mr. President, as far as I can ascertain all of the cost of rock and bedding was incurred under the contract under which the airport was built. I am not aware of any additional funds on a rush basis being needed to pay for rock and bedding. The rock they should apply with the $6,000 plus which is the allowance was paid for the flood opening by the civil Defense Department. The civil Defense Department had been contemplating this airport project for a long time and had given valuable assistance when the possibility was there we might use the new airport.

MR. JAMES M. DOUGLAS (CONTINUING): ... which they had to do for the first opening would be any difference to the work which they did on the second opening. If we had to pay them $3,000 for what was done on the first opening, why did we not pay something on the second opening?

I mention this because I think the guarantees of this nature should be observed correctly and should not be misleading to the Members of the House as well as to the public.

MR. W. HOWARD BOZMAN: Mr. President, on a point of order, Sir. I would like to clarify what the Member is saying regarding my party.

MR. PRESIDENT: Are you stating as a point of order or a point of explanation?

MR. W. HOWARD BOZMAN: Yes, Sir, under 3(f)....

MR. JAMES M. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, I do not think it is a point of order, but as a point of explanation I would be glad to yield the floor.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Assistant to Regional Director Member of Executive Council was probably absent when I mentioned to the House the other day the difference between a point of order and a point of explanation. I think that this is a point of explanation. But since the Member has spoken may you may continue.

MR. W. HOWARD BOZMAN: Thank you very much, Sir. I think that the Member is talking contradictions regarding the party which I have. I would like to clarify that the explanation given to my Member of this House that it belong to $3,500 paid to Arab and Godfrey which was additional considerations outside the contract terms for the clean up of the corridor in preparation for the ceremonies which were performed on 25th November. $3,500 was paid to Public Works Department but no additional payments were made to them for the ceremony which was held on 25th November. The explanation which I have given by this House is correct as provided to me by the Municipal.

MR. JAMES M. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, I do not think the Member has enlightened us very much because that was roughly what I was talking about. What I am saying, Mr. President, is that if we paid $3,500 to Arab and Godfrey for whom we do not know but you have said Godfrey or some time ago, it is not charged for the clean up. We would have had to pay it whether it was paid for the 25th November or we paid it on the 23rd November. So I do not think that it was fair to include into the speaking explanation a figure of this nature. I think it was only done for the reason that the Member was trying to mislead this House. The same thing...

MR. W. HOWARD BOZMAN: Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. W. HOWARD BOZMAN: Again on clarification, Sir, regarding here we must understand, Sir. The amount paid to Arab and Godfrey was not included in the contract sum. It was paid first because of the immediate opening.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, I did not say it was paid twice. I pointed very clearly I think that many of the people that Godfrey C. Jr. was giving, and I am not sure of it, he would have to have been paid for them to clean up the project when they finished in whether it was the 31st December or the 31st January. It is also $2,000 plus paid to the Public Works Department I am not aware of that that was ever paid back for. However, what I would say the Public Works Department I am sure signed a check in the sporting accumulation in the 30th January or April or 31st December. If they were paid $2,000 plus on 31st December then there should be some account paid to them on 30th January when their accounts were open. It is an expenditure which in my opinion did not only relate to the question which was put to the Member.

HON. SPEAKER: I think we have reached the time when normally we break in the afternoon. If the Member has finished speaking on this particular point?

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Sir, I am finished on that particular point.

HON. SPEAKER: Yes, I was not assuming that you had finished your speech. I think I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 4.31 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

AT 4.47 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

HON. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The First Elected Member for Sister Isles.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: I do not intend to be repetitive, but I think the Speaker was dealing with the circumstances on the first opening of the winders and the second opening of the winders. There was a figure given of $2,000 plus, I think it was, which was paid to Public Works Department and I understand that the money was paid for counting the checks which were made available to the public, and was also paid for the transportation of the money which the Member spoke from. I was not really aware of this expenditure, but if this expenditure was paid to Public Works Department for performing that work, then it had to be paid to Public Works Department on some other application for the second opening also because I am aware that similar arrangements took place. In regard to the expenditure to Arch and Godfrey, if that was not covered in the original estimate then it is additional expenditure. It would have had to have been paid to Arch and Godfrey in order that some of it had been covered on the 31st December, because the only reason the cheques which had been issued at some date subsequent to that the counting was. So that is an expenditure which

Hon. WADE H. MCCREE (continuing): I should almost hesitate to put one enlargement or a name of the official opening.

The next point on this, Mr. President, which I will speak on is that I notice in the final running there was a substantial amount of plant floor for public relations which was just into the reply. Now I am sure with all the pressures I have seen of the meeting floor in the paper that there also had to be quite a bit of expenditure for routine relations at the second opening. It may be that in the case of the first opening it was considered under a contract with an agency. With the second opening it is probably just considered a part of the cost of Government operating the public relations office, in which case it may take some time to give the breakdown of all. However, it would have been quite an improvement either way you look at it.

Mr. President, in reviewing the 1968 budget, as I stated previously, I put a high priority on the 1968 budget considerations must be given to the eight years of the previous administration. Surely that time span justifies the Government's bill for the past. In addition negotiations took place, mainly, on the level of the Director of Public Relations and his staff to examine that we had complied or come out as many miles and we do, this fact. That is something which I am also proud of because I am only proud of that country. Every country contains a Disneyland aspect. If our system has it the right that we on the Cayman Islands should have the control over the [illegible] which surrounds these islands.

The Cayman Islands Airport Authority building or administration block at the airport was built under our administration and is a lasting monument to the people of the Cayman Islands.

We also saw the establishment of new postage stamps which we have on sale in the Cayman Islands.

We built the new station at Owen Roberts Airport which is used by the staff there in regard to flight movements at the airport. As well as that the Government has purchased new fire trucks and security vehicles. We installed radio equipment, a generator and a lighting system for Cayman Brac. I want at this point pay tribute to another Caymanian who in my opinion has done and is continuing to do an excellent job. I refer to the present Fire Chief. I think he is one of the most important in Government and a department which deserves very fine recognition by the Portfolio.

According to the report given to us by the Financial Secretary the Fire Department received £9,45 per head more for protection in 1967 than they did in 1968. In connection, Mr. President, that with the expansion and development which has taken place in Grand Cayman in the last eight years and also in our sister Islands this no time had no major fire of any magnitude. I hope that this can continue into the future.

A new airport which has been purchased for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman also provided a small fire fighting unit. In addition a 100 feet tower was erected for communication with the aircraft as a result of the fire.

Mr. President, I come to the point of Labour and Labour legislation. Caymanian labour relations are very important for the development of any country. We in the Cayman Islands have been very fortunate over the years to have management and workers have usually been able to come together very closely, and I do want to see the other one's problems. We have gone on this until now somehow. There always is the needs of people and we will find

MR. DAVID M. BLOOD (CONTINUED): ...that in the very near future we may have major labour problems. It was for this reason we felt we should remind the working force in this country that our non-existent or, at least, poor record in terms of labour legislation in this House. I personally sent off and obtained copies of labour legislation from many of the different committees in the Commonwealth countries, as well as some Canadian material. I perused this labour legislation very closely. I made it the Leader's responsibility, perhaps that's legislation which I thought we could introduce once it had been put in appropriate language. I subsequently spoke to the previous Attorney-General on several occasions and had discussions with him and members of my staff somewhat daily with him on this particular subject.

He gave me a copy of the Ontario labour code which was, I think, just completed for that country. I perused that very closely and gave a study of my opinions as to the things which we could incorporate into this Act. Unfortunately I was never able to get a commitment during the Legal Department which I could bring to this House. I was approached by the International Union Representative in Kingston, Canada who offered his services if one of these sessions to come to Ottawa to prepare a new labour code. I agreed to the expenditure of approximately $10,000 and the man was to travel to Ottawa and be employed this legislation. I understood at the Attorney-General that his appointment and I then brought it to Executive Council, and they brought it to this House in the form of a motion to be put before the Members of this House that it be dealt with by a Select Committee so that each and every Member could participate and give us their input. I felt that this was very important because from this type of legislation which would affect one and all in our country, it was necessary that each and every one, whether in the party which was in power or in the opposition should have a chance to air their views fully.

Unfortunately this motion got out of the Committee stage and as such died with the 27th Parliament. As such the results of the election changed many things and this Bill was never dealt with. So the Government now has before it a labour code and a complete comprehensive labour law. I can only hope that in some time the Elected Members of Government will see fit to bring that back to the House or into a Committee, so that it can be dealt with and then all Members will have a choice. However, it should not be there very long because it was just mentioned under the auspices of the United Farm Organizations. The Government has already expended money and energy on it and it should come forward. I feel that each and every one of us should look at it and give our input into it.

Mr. President, labour unions are nothing new. They have played their part in the development of every country in the globe today. I will remind Members of this House that a lot of Governments have spent many hours dealing with some of big labour organizations. I, in my capacity now as the Opposition Spokesman on Labour legislation and what a labour union is. I spoke on this subject before in the House and I am still prepared to negotiate quickly with such ... movements if it should be required by the working force of this country.

The new organization just mentioned a moment ago which has recently come to us that there were 200 people unemployed in this country. Now, Mr. President, if we look at a percentage of the population as well as a percentage of the personal labour force, it stands, in my mind, extremely high. We should be thankful that there are not more people than unemployed in the country. However, the fact still remains that we do have problems

MR. JAMES M. BOSSY (CONSTITUTION): who are economically affected in this country. I hope so, but right now, as I said, that cannot be done in view of the present policies of the present Government, because I see many more people than this being affected and losing employment in the near future.

Mr. President, I am very sorry that a delay because the Labour Officer under the previous administration had gone to the Seychelles and consulted and talked to many stakeholders of such industry. I will urge the Members of the present Elected House that in the type of Government and type of economy which we have, this is my opinion was more than time a step to make because it does show the utmost effort of the Government and it shows the sincere approach which exists throughout the islands today with regard to the problems of the present unemployment. It also shows to the people that there is a lack of responsibility and things are not as good as some people would like them to believe. In my opinion, this is a step which we should never have made in playing it as we such a great thing which was done.

I am asking the Members of the present Electoral House to do their duties. Please tell their fellow Members in the House and the people of the Labour Islands what they plan to do about the unemployment which exists. Whether they will keep their minds on real questions to go down the path blindly, or whether they are prepared to come out boldly and create Government policies, and there the methods which they will use to help alleviate this problem remains to be seen.

Mr. President, I will now deal with the Post Office. I am very pleased again to see from the speech which was delivered that the Seychelles is a Corporation. That goes very well in the Civil Service which is filled by Seychellois although they do not have the college degrees. But they do have the ability to cope with these jobs. I am pleased that already we will have, I hope, the opening of the new Post Office at Victoria which have been built already that now for lease to the people of Mont Fleuri.

Mr. President, I cannot go lightly over this subject because I have to thank many people who assisted in getting us to that point. But the main thanks must go to Captain Clive Rouget who kept up a constant fight over many years to see that this should be done. An estimated sum of the money will be put in a lot of the money already, and Government I would say covered the expenditure. I hope that the people of Mont Fleuri will continue to keep that in the beautiful manner that it was and that they will use it wisely. Also I hope that it will not become a dumping ground.

Mr. President, another Hon. Minister, my colleague from Anse Royale. Then had the honour of being the elected Member of Executive Council responsible for Communications and Works. I would like to pay tribute to him for the manner in which he dealt with the day to day problems of the portfolio, and the time that he spent contributing the many things which were done by the Government in that portfolio.

I would like to thank the Public Works Department for the work they played in the construction of the new Pointe Larue Airport terminal. The Head of that Department happens to be a Seychellois and one who appears to be very capable, and he was ably assisted by his assistant whose name I think is Mr. Jolicoeur. I had the pleasure of working in many committee meetings with these two gentlemen and I can tell the people of the Outer Islands that they had their interests at heart and that they did everything they could be cooperative and to see that the airport project was completed on time and within the budgeted figure.

MR. JAMES M. POTTER (CHAIRMAN): Public Works Department continues to carry a heavy work-load and I am not saying that everything done is done as expeditiously as it should be done, or that the most could not be ascertained. However, by and large they have accomplished most of the tasks which have been set before them.

Our administration in 1993 ran in the new Public Works Department at Cayman Brac. That will ease the problems in respect of Public Works in the Lesser Islands. I do not know whether it has had the second Captain, but I wish it the best of luck.

We also provided for Beach public rights of way and in doing so the cause.

A new aviation was built at the hospital in Cayman Brac and renovation took place on all the main in the various districts of the Islands.

A new runway for aeroplanes was built at Owen Roberts Airport and maintenance took place on the runway on several occasions during a year. We re-surfaced the mile of the North coast road in Cayman Brac. We provided sidewalks at the Creek in Cayman Brac and on West Bay Road and Seaview Road. This is a big plus which you got there so a big job would be done to see that these new sidewalks completed. It is a costly exercise but is hopefully will be of tremendous benefit to the people of this country.

We also created the establishment of the Staff post in Cayman Brac.

We built additions to three primary schools and the High School.

Altogether there was about 10 million dollars carried out in 1994. Additionally to this, the Government also undertook to build another Hurricane of Bodden Town and in George Town we saw the building of the new airport operations room. In East End some houses were built, the long awaited little Cayman was built and we saw the completion of the dock in Cayman Brac. This facility was badly needed for visitor vessels tremendously. It has, I think, reduced their cost of docking, it could be has reduced the cost of importation into the country.

We made loans to Cayman Brac Power and Light Company in order that they could be assured of providing power services for Cayman Brac.

Our administration also saw to it that the purchase of lands was guaranteed for Caribbean Utilities Company and guaranteed by Government.

Public Works carried out some of many duties across the islands. They provided new toilets blocks, new shelters, stay-put rooms, carrying cases, playing fields, hard courts at five primary schools, all of which cost $222,000. Expenditure was provided at the Lighthouse School to the extent of $249,000. We repaired the High School assembly hall and the library and they were both air-conditioned at a cost of $129,000. We improved construction on a science building, assembly hall, theatre and recreational facilities. Altogether this should have cost $43,000, of which at the time of the estimates $182,000 had been spent. So that these facilities are maintained I will ask the Members of the House and the people of this Cayman Islands to remember that these are not words of the present administration.

Mr. JAMES M. ERSKINE (CONTINUING): ... the Guyana Public Works Department with the construction of the packing sheds which is approximately 100,000 square feet, and provides for the packing of fruit domestic as well as for export. In addition to this shed, provision for packing room for 500 crates, the area of the fruit loading ramp, the necessary fencing and landscaping. These things represent an approximate cost of $1,000,000.

The final phase of the new cocoa factory at Mahaica Berbice should be in the vicinity of $10 M million dollars. At the figures made available by the Financial Secretary. While some progress was made by Public Works Department in 1974 with Caribbean Development Bank of $12.5 million. However we ... ascertained the experts in this sector can now readily see that the project will be completed for much less than previously estimated.

Another point, Mr. President, is that the Georgetown building was completed approximately four months ahead of schedule and it was brought in at budgeted cost. This is something which can hardly be said for any job undertaken in the Region before, particularly by Government.

The Linden building was programmed in 1973 and I see according to the agreed Development Programme $12,250, and that more improvements will take place in 1974. Another work of the agents agree that as we said I think it was been proved by this time that the purchase of the Linden Building was a worthwhile thing done by Government. It was a very wise move and it has provided much needed accommodation at a small loss seen that it is now been built at the present time.

Necessarily and incorporate to the improvement administration Building and Fort Wark Building in 1974 some $275,700. Also in 1974 a bank was built at Little Cayman.

Mr. President will recall a number life-blood area of the country, the Post Authority and the Stores in Georgetown, again I am very pleased to see this although a capable Chairman was named from that position a few months ago, we have another Chairman filling that position. I hope that he can continue in the footsteps of his predecessor, and if so we have no cause to worry.

I am pleased that the promises ... for the coming years will be realized. I congratulate ... on his and I also wish to thank the various hard operators who have assisted in this venture.

Mr. Chairman Sir we proceed to see that the highest ever throughput per hour of any port ... of similar size in the Caribbean which is very good in George Town. This is a very good feature and one to be envied, and a record which I hope we will uphold.

Mr. President, I would like to touch on capital expenditure. In 1974 the proposed budget calls for a capital expenditure of $9.9 million. Local financing will provide for $7.3 million of this expenditure, while $2.6 million comes from loan funds. Now, Mr. President, I would have thought that this was unsatisfactory, this administration which has power to do the most ... for all problems in our society and which is filled with financial promises, would have paid more attention to the capital budget for 1974, particularly in view of the unemployment situation which exists.

In 1973 the previous government spent $19,253,675 on capital expenditure of which about $10.1 million came from local revenue, and about $7.1 million of it from loan funds. 1973 was a reasonably good year for the construction industry in the country and for the workers of this country because much work was executed by Government. While the present budget with the promises

MR. HUGH H. BOGGS (CONTINUING): ...Mr. President, there is going to be a reduction of nearly 40 per cent in the expenditure as compared with last year. I seriously question how they can figure that they will get this saving based on the work that they have done and maintenance since they have been in office.

The water and sewerage project was started under administration with a part of it being brought to fulfillment last year and a part of it still remaining. All the financing and negotiations which were necessary to ensure that this project was continued were put in place previously.

The same applies to the sports and cultural centre at the Middle School and the Boys' Most Night Centre; the school buildings for the Middle School, Cayman Islands High School and Cayman Brac High School.

A significant point which I have not spoken on before, Mr. President, is the amount of the Roadways District has a couple of years ago. This was a fund which should have been repealed many years ago. It was a fund which the Roadway Members ought to get rescinded four or several years before it was finally removed, as it had no more place in our present economy. By removing the roadways matters regulations which existed under the financial community. The Roadways District has use as enactments of the past and was dead. It had no other use. We waited for several years but the then Financial Secretary of the Islands was against the removal of roadways control. It was not until then late 1978 that the law was finally repealed.

The financial figures of Government show that the loans made by Government on 31st December, 1978 amounted to $14,967,080.00. This is a lot of money and it is good to know that the Government was in a position to enable these loans to be made.

With regard to capital, Mr. President, between 1978 and 1979 $9,369,900 of Government capital was spent by the administration in power then, while from 1979 to 1982 the only borrowings which were made by our administration were $5,143,182. Any have been made above that date do appear to the Loans Ledger and the May statement. However, when we compare the financial position of Government now compared to 1979 and 1976 it can readily be seen that we were borrowing much more than we were capable of repaying at that point.

In 1978 the debt of the Government, that is the long term debt, was 50.6 per cent of the local revenue budgeted for that year. The borrowing limit from local revenue was 14 per cent of general revenue. Now, Mr. President, compare with any financial authority we all know that any country which is made 50 per cent of the local revenue to be used to finance long term debts, is beginning to have problems. We were facing those problems in 1979. The people in the country know it and the local Government knew it, and it was a good thing that we did not continue with that policy.

In 1983 in the budget which was presented by the previous administration the debt stood at 18.6 per cent of local revenue compared with the 50.6 per cent it was in 1978. The borrowing limit of Government's various times in 1983 was 2.6 per cent of local revenue compared to the 14 per cent that it was in 1979.

In 1978, Mr. President, the total recurrent of this country stood at $7860,000 approximately. In late 1983 that stood at $20.13 million, quite about a 1,000 per cent increase.

MR. JAMES M. BUDGET (CONTINUED): I will deal with the capital expenditure which has been made in our sister Islands. In 1978 to 1982 $610,002 was spent during these four years on capital expenditure. In the years 1977 to 1983 $10,500,300.22 was spent in the Sister Islands. This represents for an eight year period, compared to the four year period before, approximately twenty times the amount which was then spent.

In 1983 our Government spent in the Sister Islands $3,805,285. I am sorry and do apologise that I do not have the amount available to me which was spent in 1974. During that time in the year 1983 the revenue generated was $702,048 from the Sister Islands which represented an outlay of $3,772,689; or roughly four times the amount which was received in the form of revenue. I state these figures, Mr. President, so that the Members of the Assembly and the people of the Islands as a whole may know that the Sister Islands were never neglected under the previous administration, and I hope that with the two capable representatives they have, during this year they will treat them in like manner as we did.

Here is such some significance when we realize that the population of the Sister Islands compared to the population census of Grand Cayman is only 8.9 per cent.

Mr. President, our present budget before us is a budget which is unrealistic. It is a budget which can never be carried out. It is a budget where we are going to see a tremendous increase by the end of this year and I will attempts to point to this House how this will come about.

There is an item for furniture and equipment under the Judges. In 1982 this particular item cost in expenditure $65,317. In the year 1985 we have budgeted $10,000, quite a reduction and we must consider how we are going to be able to provide for the on-going necessities which will be needed. This is obviously unrealistic. These figures have been put in in a feeble attempt to balance the budget and although they will be looking about $1.3 million from the reserves of this country in order to try to carry out the work which they plan to carry out in 1985, they still have a problem. They still cannot come within any possibility of balancing the budget for this year.

Communications equipment in 1982 cost $84,274. This year we propose to spend $10,000. With heavy equipment, Mr. President, as one check back on the records of expenditure for many years now we find that it is an item which continues to increase from year to year due to the nature of the business. In 1983 we spent $420,730 to purchase new heavy equipment. This year we expect to be able to do it with $172,500. Mr. President, this is unreasonable.

As for our medical equipment to recommend this to take care of and assist our people and costs for this in 1982 were $238,000. But the people who were going to take care of every $10 which passes the country in the year 1985 have budgeted $80,000 for this.

This is very sensible, Mr. President, and we will have to fight very hard when we come to the Committee Stages to try to get something done about it.

Another heavy expenditure over the years for Government is the purchase of new vehicles. This year it is for the police, the prison, a firefighting truck, the water authority and my portfolio. However, in the year 1982 $335,760 were spent. This year it is expected that we will spend $167,000.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS [CONTINUED]: Mr. President, I will be ready on Wednesday to put Dean at third podium and carry on tomorrow, because my speech alone is to be about 4,50.

MR. PRESIDENT: I was waiting for a convenient break because the time has come for the recess of this morning.

ADJOURNMENT

SEN. DENNIS E. POSTON: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of Ohio House until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that Ohio House do now adjourn until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MTG: ADJOURN. HB 3 at 3:15 PM WEDNESDAY UNTIL 10:00 A.M., THURSDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1995

SECOND SESSION OF THIRTY-FIRST LEGISLATURE (1965) SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(Tuesday, 12th March, 1965)

PRESENT WERE:

His Excellency Sir Kenneth KING, KBE, CMG, VRD - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

Hon Kenneth H Kingsley, CMG,CBE,JP	First Official Member and Chief Secretary and Minister for External Affairs
Hon Archibald J Bradley, QC,BA,LL	Second Official Member and Minister for Legal Administration
Hon Thomas C Jefferson, JP	Third Official Member and Minister for Finance and Development
Hon Dennis C Brown	Member for Health Education and Social Services
Hon W Norman Bodden, MBE	Member for Communications Aviation and Ports
Hon Capt Charles L Kirkconnell	Minister for Communications Works and District Administration
Hon Vassel O Johnson, OBE, JP	Minister for Development and Natural Resources

ELECTED MEMBERS

Mr W Gilbert Bush	Second Elected Member for the North Eastern Electoral District of West Bay
Mr Lawrence A Pierson, JP	Second Elected Member for the South Eastern Electoral District of George Town
Capt Roger A Kirkconnell	First Elected Member for the North Electoral District of Cayman Brac
Mr James M Bodden	First Elected Member for the North Electoral District of Bodden Town
Mr C Eugene Conolly	Second Elected Member for the South Electoral District of Bodden Town
Mr D Reginald Miller	Elected Member for the North Electoral District of North Side
Mr John B McLean	Elected Member for the Eastern Electoral District of East End

ORDER OF THE DAY

MONDAY OPENING A BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TUESDAY

10TH MARCH, 1985

1. QUESTIONS

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FOURTH ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

NO. 39: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE HOW MANY PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR FOR THE PROPOSED MULTI-STOREY CAR PARK AND BY WHOM SUCH PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED?

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AND TRADE

NO. 40: WILL THE MEMBER ADVISE WHETHER, WHEN AND WITH WHOM EARLY PRELIMINARY CONTACTS HAVE BEEN MADE IN WASHINGTON, D.C., IN AN ATTEMPT TO ACHIEVE THE PRESENT NEGOTIATORY OR AIR SERVICING THAT EXIST ON THE MIAMI - GRAND CAYMAN - MIAMI ROUTE?

NO. 41: WOULD THE MEMBER ADVISE WHAT POSITIVE ACTION GOVERNMENT HAS TAKEN TO DATE IN RESPECT TO NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED STATES AND UNITED KINGDOM DESIGNATIONS ON AIR SERVICES UNDER THE BERMUDA II AGREEMENT?

2. CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1985) BILL, 1985

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS:

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(CONTINUATION OF SECOND READING DEBATE)

REPLY BY THE HONOURABLE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER

COMMITTEE STAGE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

HOUSE RESUMES

INCIDENT TRIBUNAL

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(iv) FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(1) THE DEFAMATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(2) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (COMMITTEE POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
CONSIDERATION OF THE ESTATE OF THE LATE JOSEPH STALIN AND ADOPTION OF THE RESOLUTION DATED JUNE 1953	
Mr. James M. Fielden	17
Hon. Charles E. Kirkconnell	53
Adjournment	99

TUESDAY

21ST MARCH, 2023

12:00 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated,
Prayers are answered,
Before I call the First Elected Member for Southern Town to ask the first of the questions submitted in his name I should like, and I think the House would perhaps like it recorded that we all learned yesterday with shock and sorrow of the sudden death of the Prime Minister of Barbosia. Some Members perhaps have not heard but he died of a heart attack. It was on the night news yesterday. I think it would be the wish of the House that I send a message of condolences from this House since we cannot be present and from the Government and people of these Islands to the Government of Barbosia. If Members agree as I see they do I will arrange to do that. I think we might just write in this House the names of the Members of the Legislative Assembly right to appear there across all this page.

Questions. The First Elected Member for Dodder Town.

QUESTIONS

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR DODDER TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATION: WHAT

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Member please indicate whether proposals have been submitted from the private sector for the proposed multi-storey car park and by whom such proposals were submitted?

MR. JAMES M. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, this question is directed to the First Elected Member of Executive Council responsible for Communications Works and Internal Administration. In his Order Paper I apologise that it is mentioned as the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

MR. WESLEY S. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make an explanation before reading the reply to the question. The Ministry that I have is under the Ministry of Communications and Works. This is a proposal which included a multi-storey car park and also contained a development master and has therefore passed to me for preliminary investigation. However, this is being done in association with the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council responsible for Communications Works and Internal Administration.

REPLY: The proposal currently being examined for a multi-storey car park in central George Town was submitted to me by Hazlewood, Bradford and Partners at the request of the Honourable Financial Secretary. The proposal is in fact more accurately termed a "shopping" plaza as it has also to examine the problem of traffic circulation and congestion in the Seaview area, to analyse the various options available to alleviate these problems and to make recommendations for proposed solutions.

In addition to the Report, over 100 commercial establishments in the downtown George Town area have been canvassed in an effort to ascertain the degree of support the proposed facility would receive. No one spoke against the need for such a facility and many emphasized the great urgency for it. In fact, one hundred 100 firms which responded indicated they are willing to reserve a total of over 800 spaces depending of course upon the price.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES M. DOWDEN: Mr. President, could I ask counsel whether the Member who gave the reply to my question is really the person of making decisions and negotiations on behalf of the Portfolios, or whether it is just for this particular Portfolio?

HON. PASCOE G. JOHNSON: I gave the reason already.

MR. JAMES M. DOWDEN: Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege of being informed on most of the responsibilities by my colleague and myself in this particular Portfolio. Does counsel have some evidence or should we establish evidence in the House?

HON. PASCOE G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I thought that I took care before answering the question to give the reason why I was delegating the answer myself.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, on a point of information, I took pains to point out that there was a mistake on the Order Paper and that the question should have been posed to the Honourable Third Elected Member of Counties because as far as I am aware it is Counties Portfolio which deals with Provincial Administration. I am confused at this point and I think the House is also.

MR. PRESIDENT: On a point of explanation merely of a ruling. I think without being unfair to the Speaker in the Assembly to place my hand on the relevant Standing Order that is for Members of Government to answer questions which of them will answer a particular question. Much though this questioning puts that is provision for answer by one Member he may put an answer from another.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: I accept your explanation, Sir, in the vein which the words which things have changed.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think they have changed. That, I think, has been standard practice in the past.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: I bow to your ruling, Sir. Could I pose another question? Is the Member aware that the firm which submitted this offer to newly January has also submitted a previous proposal on the same subject?

HON. PASCOE G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I am not aware of that.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Is the Member not aware that the proposal was rejected previously?

MR. PASCOE G. JOHNSON: No, Mr. President, ...

MR. G. ELLIS BROWN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if the proposal for a new park includes the construction of the new Post Office?

MR. PRESIDENT: Did Honourable Member hear? I would only hear part of it. I am not sure whether your microphone was operating.

HON. WILFRED G. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir, I heard the question.

MR. PRESIDENT: Alright.

HON. WILFRED G. JOHNSON: Yes, the fact is that the present plaza is supposed to be the new site of a Post Office.

MR. JAMES M. BOWDEN: Could the Member state if he is in possession what this will be done between Government and the private sector on a joint venture?

HON. WILFRED G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, we have not reached that point of the study yet to determine who would do the construction; whether it will be Government or the private sector. Certain proposals have been put forward that these are being studied. Nothing has been put before Government as yet.

MR. JAMES M. BOWDEN: Mr. President, the Member mentioned that there was a proposal from, I think, Hutchinson, Bowflow and Partners. My question to him was not who would do the construction, but what would be more or less the financial arrangement. Would Government put up the land and these people would put up a certain amount of money to which this value and the rent would be lowered, or what would be the proposal?

HON. WILFRED G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, as I said before we have not reached that stage of consideration as yet. If the new park is going to be built on Government property it is very likely that it will be Government would rather than.

MR. JAMES M. BOWDEN: Would the Member state if the proposal did not indicate that this particular company would wish to participate financially in this venture?

HON. WILFRED G. JOHNSON: Not to my knowledge, Mr. President.

MR. JAMES M. BOWDEN: Mr. President, the Member's knowledge must be lacking because he tells the House that no proposals have been considered, and so have gone to the public and asked them how much of the system they would take. This seems a bit unusual. I wonder what is in this proposal. Could the Member explain the Hyson what type of proposal he received coming on behalf of the Cayman Islands Government from Hutchinson, Bradford and Partners?

HON. WILFRED G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, what has been done already is just merely for preliminary investigations to see whether the first the public of downtown Georgetown feels that a new park facility is something really needed today. However, we the Government are not committed to any suggestion made that the private sector or from any private individuals. It is for Government to look at the problem if it is a problem, the new library, and do whatever is necessary to alleviate that problem.

HON. DAVID M. CROSBY: Mr. President, I thank my hon. friend on the Opposition Benches for his question. Could he mention whether the proposal to allow the private sector participation is for new projects or for existing projects?

HON. FRED D. DOWNEY: Mr. President, the Member said that if our park facility is needed today and...

HON. DAVID M. CROSBY: No, Mr. President, I do not want my question misconstrued. I did not say that. I said why don't your old child health clinic in Spaniard's Town we have a traffic problem, I did not say that a multi-storey car park was the answer to that problem.

HON. DAVID M. CROSBY: Well, that is just another way of putting it, Mr. President, but if there is a traffic problem, then it does without saying that additional facilities are required. Mr. President, the proposal was made to Government. It was picked up the media not to ignore it. We studied it and we discovered the private sector is now here fully alive to it. Something must take the place which essentially was not put there by Government. Letters from influential business community Government members of the Dominican community in central George Town and so the proposal therefore had easy access to the press. The press announced to us, and I think everybody knows the views of the Government about it. The Government accepted such a facility in George Town. It was not put there deliberately by Government.

HON. DAVID M. CROSBY: As this is a proposal then which apparently has not really received much discussion from Government will the Member give this House an assurance that he will explore the possibilities of his responsible for this facility, also with the private sector to ensure that the private sector will not undertake this notion that Government at this time?

HON. TRUMAN B. BODDEN: Mr. President, Government is always very grateful for what the private sector can do. It is a matter of building the private sector interested in providing services like these.

HON. DAVID M. CROSBY: Mr. President, he has just assured this House that the private sector is very much interested in this proposal. What I am trying to get across is that rather than the Government using its limited resources at the present time urging to put in this facility, would it not be better if he left responsible made to the local financial community that they undertake the financial risks rather than Government?

HON. TRUMAN B. BODDEN: Mr. President, I do not know what the Member means by financial burden. If the facility is going to be built eventually Government would have to seek financial assistance from the private sector. However, I should very much like anyone in the private sector will want to build a multi-storey car park although I believe that it would be an economic burden.

HON. DAVID M. CROSBY: Mr. President, the financial community is the one which has helped to make this possible. Would it not be the willingness of Government to attempt to get the financial community to put in some kind of car parking facility? When the Member spoke about the financial side of it I was only thinking that the Government

MR. JAMES M. BOGGES (CONTINUING): Even stories told by him the country was broke and I know that it is deeply broke now after they have used up about $6.5 million of revenue in four months. So I know we are broke.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Was the Member asking a question?

MR. PRESIDENT: Was a question asked? There was a bit of a statement made afterwards but it started with a question. I am afraid that I have now forgotten what the question was but as long as the Member knows. You did make such a long statement after your question I was thinking that the statement was going to be turned into a question too.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGES: No, sir, I merely said that the Parliamentary Member had been telling the people of this country that ... it was broke and after using up $6.5 million I know it is broke.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, but what you started by asking was since the financial community had solved a lot of the traffic circulation problems would they not help solve these? That was the question and that is a perfectly proper supplementary.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGES: I am getting confused, Mr. President, with these questions. The Member asks that the Government do both. Well that is quite true, but nevertheless we all know that in order to finance any sizeable project, Government is never able to find the money up front to do so. This financing must come from the private sector, from institutions who can very well provide mortgage money.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGES: The Member has said, ...

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, I think the Member for North Side was on his feet, and he has not had a chance yet.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Could the Member state, Sir, if it is not now the policy of the new Government to carefully discreetly consider solutions and methods of payment before taking such a giant step?

HON. JAMES M. BOGGES: Mr. President, that is exactly so. We intend accordingly to any projects we undertake. We first examine the need and secondly the method of financing it.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGES: Mr. President, the Member has said that the country is broke and that has been said on many occasions. Could the Member advise this House whether to his knowledge there was not over $10 million in reserves on the 31st November, 1984, and that would cause us to be broke since then?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not really think that that is a supplementary which arises out of the answer to the original question It arises out of statements which have been made subsequently and we have wandered rather astray. If the Member wants to put down a substantive question on the point, he may, although it is a point which has been put as a question separately already.

MR. JAMES M. BOGGES: I will withdraw the question and deal with it in debate this morning, Sir. I have one more question. I have to make a bit of statement to make this question, Mr. President.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN (CONTINUING): The presumption....

MR. PRESIDING: Make sure the question arises.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: On the question is pending. You must not worry about that, Sir. The land which we are talking about is Government land right across from this building in the road. Land is land, that would cost $8000 to 10000 per square foot to build. Will the Member make this House aware that if such an undertaking is done by this Government, he will say at first time wisely and not waiting Government's next approach look to put a new park out?

HON. THOMAS G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I cannot give this assurance. That is a decision which Government must make.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: With all his financial problems, Mr. President, would it not be better to try to maximize property value. So say, $5 per square foot, instead of immediately property would $50 per square foot?

HON. THOMAS G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, the property in question unfortunately belongs to Government at the present time and should over a long number of years, because it is used as a public use park most of the time.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, we must look at the opportunity value. Certainly the Member would not want the Government to sell that land at $4 or $5 a square foot. As the spirit of the statement such of a commercial enterprise in Caymans Brac. To surrender a piece of land by parking here on it....

MR. SPEAKER: The Member must make it a question.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: I think I did make it a question, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Not yet. It has all been a statement so far.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Well, Mr. President, I am asking the Member that if I am sure he is quite aware of the value of that land and it would not be sold for $5 or $6 a square foot, would he not consider using other land which could be more easily spared than to use that particular land? That is a consideration which we would like it have.

HON. THOMAS G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I should very much like Government would be able this Honourable building that piece of land. For I am glad to be accessible to central George Town so that it may be used for the purpose for which it is originally. I should very much welcome the opportunity to find a large enough parcel of land around central George Town to replace that particular site.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: May the Member not first address this House that that particular piece of land was considered more or less worthless?

HON. THOMAS G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I said as from years gone by until the present date because it has become an increasing concern to Government as until now.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. D. REGINALD ARCHER: Could the Member state that in fact the acquisition of using that piece of land has been reduced by the last improvement made in the construction of the Tower Building?

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, I object. It is a matter of opinion with regard to the Tower Building. It can be substantiated that the Tower Building was probably one of the best investments this Government has undertaken in a long time.

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, it seems to me if we are getting at those questions. The Member is making a question and the other Member is answering it.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, I did not realize. I objected to the Member making that type of statement which was a matter of opinion. It should have been asked on from the Chair as far as I am concerned.

MR. PRESIDENT: I did not hear...

MR. D. REGINALD ARCHER: Opinions have been made all morning, Sir.

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

MR. LINDSAY A. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. President. I have been trying for the last fifteen minutes or so to get your eye. Mr. President, I am going to follow what I am going to say by a question, but it appears to me, Sir, that these questions are intended to be a big joke on this floor when I believe that Members are genuinely trying to get proper answers.

My question is, Sir, this in view of the importance of this project could the Member advise if any other similar local enterprising firms other than Safehaven, Bradford and Scotiabank were requested to submit a proposal on this project?

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: I am not aware of that, Mr. President. I have left Government and the project was handed to me and I answered it to the extent that I mentioned a while ago.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Did it come into the Member's hands or was it solicited?

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: May I have the question again, Sir. I did not hear it.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, I will try to answer so that he knows my side also. Did the Member state whether the proposal just came into his hands or he had told the Banks or did he solicit on his behalf collate the proposal from Safehaven, Bradford and Scotiabank?

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: I did not solicit the report, Sir. I found the report on my desk.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, following on the reply made by the Member a few minutes ago in acknowledging the contributions

MR. JAMES M. ANDERSON (CONSTITUENCY): ...of the land needs done because it has not yet in this case reached some of a release to Government. I will pose the question to him. Would he consider the land on the Seven Mile Beach where we have the Government's negotiations which should probably cost $300,000 to implement at this time and the land is probably worth $2.5 million; do view of us having a $300,000 investment selling on a $2.5 million further investment, would he consider that as contributing to be considering the long term view?

HON. JAMES M. MORGAN: Mr. President, the word contribution used by the Member himself. I did not call the land contribution.

MR. JAMES M. MORGAN: I will make the answer for him then. I will say no financial value.

HON. JAMES M. MORGAN: Neither did I say no financial value. I said it brought no financial return which is different from financial value.

MR. JAMES M. ANDERSON: Will Minister not consider as to whether he should consider the land on Seven Mile Beach to have little or no value because there is only a $300,000 liability on it and it is probably no return to Government?

HON. JAMES M. MORGAN: All kind, Mr. President, whether it be views for Seven Mile Beach or the central George Town is valuable property.

MR. JAMES M. ANDERSON: That is what I was saying in part only.

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for George Town.

MR. CLIFFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, by follow on my supplementary, would the Member state whether it be the intention of Government to propose other local engineering firms be asked proposals before Government's action on this project?

HON. JAMES M. MORGAN: Mr. President, I cannot give any assurance what this will be done. I stated that the report which was then submitted by Halcrow, Rendel and Partners was requested by the Honourable Financial Secretary. The report does not only deal with it as was stated that I mentioned already. As to what further steps or actions which Government will be taking on this particular subject it is not known at this time.

MR. CLIFFORD A. PIERSON: A further supplementary, Mr. President. Would it be possible for me to ascertain what is going on from Government procedure for the Government to employ by which as many experts as possible so that a very sensible decision could be made in such a major project?

HON. JAMES M. MORGAN: The Government would have no objection to this, Mr. President.

MR. CLIFFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, with respect, Sir, I did not get an answer to my question. If I am not going to have my question answered I am wasting time, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I think you have had your question answered.

MR. LEROY A. DAVIS: No, Sir, I did not. My question was that with such an important project would it not be reasonable to assume that Government will attempt to get as many experts from similar engineering firms as possible? We have had one report so far and we have acted on this.

HON. MARK G. ROBISON: Mr. President, I have already said that Government has made no decision on this particular matter and if it is the Government's wish to have other engineers or consultants provide a report on the project I am sure that this will be done.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Boston Rise.

MR. C. SAID BOXALL: Mr. President, may I ask if the proposal currently being considered by Government makes any recommendation with regard to the lease or ownership of the car-park?

HON. MARK G. ROBISON: The recommendation, Mr. President, is that Government owns the facility.

MR. C. SAID BOXALL: Mr. President, what part would the private contractors play in this game?

HON. MARK G. ROBISON: The private contractor would have a contract to construct the facility and that is right all.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: Well, in this publication were the proposed sites Fire Fighting, Brelford and Hawkins. Could the Member advise this House what part did they propose to play in the overall completion of this project?

HON. MARK G. ROBISON: Actually no part, Mr. President. They submitted a report and it is well known by everyone that if Government is going to undertake a project, that they propose to put out to tender and it is made from there. However, there is no commitment on the part of the firm who submitted the report that they should do the job.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: Will they not therefore be going to the Member's attention that Government had a raffle problem. Could the Member speak whether that is correct?

HON. MARK G. ROBISON: I do not know, Mr. President. The request for this report, as I said before, was made by the honourable Financial Secretary.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think we might move to the next question. We have an hour exhausted there are 4 questions.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR DEVILS HILL TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER REGARDING NUMBER OF RECEPTIVE COURTS, PROBABILITY FOR TENNIS PLAYING AND TYPE

Q. 47: Will the Member advise where, when and with whom have personal contacts been made in Washington, D.C., in an attempt to obtain the present marketability of the exemptions that exist in the Grand Lagoon - Point Pocket?

ARMAND: Official contacts have been made in person through the British Embassy in Washington, D.C., with the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Department of Transportation. Negotiations are continuing and it is not considered appropriate at this time to recall the nature of these negotiations because the outcome could be prejudiced.

QUESTIONS:

MR. C. RAY ROBERTS: Mr. President, I monitor the answer made as attempt at any rate. I assume if the Member would elaborate on that I might.

RT. H. MONRO DONSON: Mr. President, I apologise for that, Sir. I should point out that the first contact was made on 21st December, 1964.

MR. JAMES M. BOSWELL: Could the Member state whether that was a personal contact, or just a telephone contact encouraging to make progress?

RT. H. MONRO DONSON: Mr. President, that was a personal contact. It was an official visit to Washington on that date.

MR. JAMES M. BOSWELL: Could the Member advise that whether in the contacts he said were made through the British Embassy in Washington, the British also became involved in making the meetings and accompanied the Wayne delegations to the meetings?

RT. H. MONRO DONSON: Mr. President, the arrangements were made through the British Embassy in Washington and officials from the Embassy accompanied the delegation from Cyprus to the meetings which were held at the State Department and the Department of Transportation.

MR. JAMES M. BOSWELL: Was the people from the British Embassy that we saw on the grade of the Air Attaché or somebody of that nature who assisted?

RT. H. MONRO DONSON: I would say that the grade is one referred to if the person from the British Embassy who attended was, I would say, the second in command with respect to aviation matters.

MR. JAMES M. BOSWELL: In other words the Member put the offer?

RT. H. MONRO DONSON: I would not call him a chief, Sir. I should be more correctly higher than that.

MR. JAMES M. BOSWELL: Could the Member advise the name of that Government official made to the United States Department of Transportation and the State Department? Was it on the ambassador level or below?

RT. H. MONRO DONSON: Mr. President, I do not have that fact here with me but my recollection is that at the State Department it was one of the Under Secretaries of State responsible for transportation and at the Department of Transportation it was at an equivalent level. However, if the Member wishes the exact grading of the individuals whom we held meetings with I am happy that be written.

MR. JAMES M. BOOCOCK: So, my only concern, Mr. President, is that it be known that there is no use in wasting any but level negotiations unless they start at a Washington level, and I am quite aware of how the Soviet Embassy in Washington will attempt to lead people into discussions with the claims. So I am trying to obtain from the Member whether his contacts have been on such a level that we may be optimistic of some hope for a continuation of the negotiations? I am simply aware of how this is done because I have been a lot of it on behalf of the Government. All I am trying to find out is whether we have any hope?

HON. H. DONALD MUNRO: Mr. President, I am satisfied that the level of persons whom we have had discussions with in Washington are of a level that we can expect that our case will be given due consideration. I am satisfied and I do not feel that we deal with any people at the level of clerk.

MR. S. HALL BOOCOCK: Mr. President, will the Member tell us if any of the people he dealt with are in a position to make decisions regarding the extension of the moratorium?

HON. H. DONALD MUNRO: Mr. President, they would not be the people who would make the decisions, but they would be level that they could make recommendations. However, these decisions would be made by persons at a higher level naturally.

MR. JAMES M. BOOCOCK: Was any comment made with the Secretary of Transportation on the discussions anyway?

HON. H. DONALD MUNRO: Yes, Mr. President, contact was been made through our legal counsel with the Secretary for Transportation at the State Department.

MR. JAMES M. BOOCOCK: Why has the delegation not pursued that contact in order to ensure that we get our message across at the highest possible level?

HON. H. DONALD MUNRO: Mr. President, it is being quietly pursued at the highest possible level, both from this end and from the United Kingdom namely through the officials in Washington. As the Member knows very well, I am sure, the case on behalf of Cayman Airways has to be put forward to the United States by the United Kingdom aviation authorities.

MR. JAMES M. BOOCOCK: Not necessarily, Sir, it is but I suppose if that we would not have the existing moratorium which we have had for two and a half years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The Member has not made statements. He must ask questions.

MR. JAMES M. BOOCOCK: Mr. President, a statement was made to me. I should at least have the liberty of explaining my side....

MR. SPEAKER: You were given an answer to a question.

MR. JAMES M. BOOCOCK: Mr. President, I can deal with the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary the First Elected Member for Bodden Town may ask the next question.

THE HONORABLE EDWARD KENNEDY ASKED THEN TO ASK THE HONORABLE SECRETARY OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL REGULATIONS AND POLICIES AFFECTING THE STATE

QUESTION: Would the Minister advise what future action Government proposes to take in regard to negotiations with United States and United Kingdom delegations on air routes under the Bermuda II agreement?

ANSWER: The UK/US Air Services Agreement, commonly referred to as Bermuda II, is a treaty between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Therefore, the Cayman Islands Government is not in a position to open direct negotiations. However, representations will be made to Her Majesty's Government for consultations whenever the Agreement is being renegotiated.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES M. RUTLEY: Will a Cayman delegation be able to visit the area when the right to participate in one of those talks between the United Kingdom and the United States of America's Governments?

HON. W. MCKEVA BODDEN: A request will be made whenever renegotiations are held for a Cayman delegation to be included as a part of the United Kingdom team which might be negotiating this Bermuda II Agreement.

MR. JAMES M. RUTLEY: Has any assistance been made by the Cayman Government that they do take part in these negotiations?

HON. W. MCKEVA BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, no discussions has ever been made because, to the best of my knowledge, no date has been set or any discussions have been held between the United Kingdom and the United States to decide when or where the Bermuda II Agreement will be renegotiated.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Member whether when making the representations to Her Majesty's Government will they require that the Attorney General or some other legal mind be included in the negotiating team?

MR. SPEAKER: Did you say [illegible] the negotiating team? I did not hear.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Yes, the last which will go to Washington for the negotiations.

HON. W. MCKEVA BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, whenever Bermuda II comes up for renegotiation and the Cayman Islands Government is finally invited to attend those negotiations, I would say that it is quite likely that the honourable Second Official Member of Government would be included in that team.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary, then Question...

Then S. The nominations of the Police on the appropriation Bill, 1985. The Hon. Second Member for Bodden Town was speaking.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT ON THE TRUSTEESHIP AGREEMENTS (THE SECOND REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION TASK FORCE) S.Con. 1995

MR. PAUL H. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, the questions which have just been posed to the Honorable Second Ranking Member of Executive Command were questions made out of sympathy, concern for the people of the Cayman Islands and for the immediacy of the Cayman Islands.

If ever the sword of Damocles hung over the heads of people, the sentence is appropriate in such a regard. It is something which could quickly will destroy the livelihood of many people in the Cayman Islands, and could completely devastate the economy.

If the Members of the present Electoral House would wish to cooperate, maybe there could come from this side of the House which would be of assistance. I visited on behalf of the Cayman Islands Government for a brief period and established some very good personal contacts in Washington in respect of people at the United Kingdom Embassy as well as in the Executive Secretary of the United States Government.

Mr. President, I do not think that any Member in the House is more aware of the problems which are attendant to this subject than I am, having dealt with it for so long. Recently it came about many years ago, the Cayman Islands Government at that time sent a delegation. It was a delegation which did not intend on promulgating the sovereign rights of the Cayman Islands, but rather was a delegation which met in the State Department discussed the problem with the fifth and ninth ranking officials in the United Kingdom Embassy in Washington, D.C. This delegation was headed at that time by the man who is now the Honorable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council. On his return, as he may recall whether he had been able to participate, if I remember correctly, his answer was, "No".

The result was, Mr. President, that the Cayman Islands and its other Caribbean territories which are still under colonial rule continued unknowingly to Britain II. Our rights were jeopardized once by the United States authorities in order for the United Kingdom authorities to have full sway out of many ways, as it was considered to be a much more lucrative market. What is one of the reasons that Cayman Airways has been so handicapped from the beginning. The United States can fly planes from any point in that territory to the Cayman Islands. Although we have two airports which will be up to international standards we have not been allowed the same latitude which the United Kingdom enjoys, in that they can designate American airlines into Grand Cayman Montego or Cornwall. We are looked at as one territory and one point of entry.

These things have come about, Mr. President, because we had no representation and because we could not take part in the negotiations. I am quite aware that as a territory of the United Kingdom we cannot adopt responsibilities with the United States Government and rightly so, as I am fully aware of all of that. However, we can indeed hope that we have our rights to attend and to take part.

Mr. President, just as Mr. and a half years ago we discussed the same problem when the United Kingdom began negotiating with the Americans back on matters of certain things which involved it. The outcome was will be the Government Administration Building. All the correspondence is there.

MR. JAMES M. MCCORMACK (CONTINUING): We were told that we could not take part in the official talks. I shuddered otherwise what we encounter this. I was later told after Washington, in discussions with the United Kingdom Ambassador that the representatives like you invading this particular subject, that only three from the Cayman Delegation could attend the talks. Again I and my delegation stood our ground. By the way, in addition to that it was stated that all of us would have to be people of Caymanian origin. I explained to him the nature of the Cayman Islands and that we had to depend on expertise from abroad. I pointed to our Honourable Speaker, Official Member who is sitting over there and said that he was not a Caymanian, but was a British subject. At least it should have made no difference whether he was a part of the Caymanian team or not as far as the United Kingdom delegation was concerned. After a long, hard fight they finally gave in and we were accorded seats with them to the meeting room in the Department of State.

The Americans had a very strong team, the United Kingdom had a strong team, but I was able to benefit of your involvement, by permission from the United Kingdom delegate, to make oral inputs many occasions on our behalf. I will say from the floor of the House this morning, and I think the people who came there with me will back me what I am saying, that at this point we received no assistance from the United Kingdom delegation. The fight was carried completely by the Caymanian delegation. The talks broke up and they gave Irish recommended to the United Kingdom. They broke up because at the end of it all the United Kingdom delegation was not prepared to give a small voice to the fishing of the Cayman Islands Government to allow us to get some of the things which we needed. It was only through the personal help of the leader of the American delegation that we recommend the concessions which we have today and which has kept me alive for the past half hour.

I should have mentioned and I state now that if we had to depend on the United Kingdom delegation, we did have money on us for what we would have got. We did get the concessions. It was mentioned in a side letter written by the American leader of the delegation. We not only welcomed the concessions but as were proud who maybe enjoy them than they should any American service begin to fly from certain points to the United States to the Cayman Islands, we would be considered favourably and favourably to parallel such routes. We did not have those rights under the original Bermuda II Agreement.

So, Mr. President, I am very thankful with the long, hard, work read which one have failed on such negotiations. I am only trying out of concern for my people and for the country to ensure that the rights gains we have and that we got to reach us to wean out of the real agreements, and that we do not let someone else upgrade only our birthrights. This is why the questions I have asked have been tabled for this House. It is concern for my people.

Mr. President, I would like to voice my sympathy to the people of Jamaica and to the family of the Prime Minister at that necessary. I happen to have had the privilege of sitting in several proceedings meetings with this gentleman, and I have been on panels where he both spoke to large audiences, and I became quite friendly with him. So I am very saddened to hear of his loss and I do sympathise with the Government.

I am sure, Mr. President, that by the time I sit down tomorrow afternoon you will have no trouble in getting the other Members to their fees. Because by that time I think I will have finished these representations sufficiently and I will have let the

Mr. James M. Bodden (continued): ...some kinds of expatriate banks. ...has unfortunately not on the party caucus which I understand was held... in this building yesterday evening, I am sure that every Member has been put in the right mood to begin talking about the Budget. I will only remind the Senate that the session that I hope is to be sure that my colleague have spoke out the last Government speaker... or at least the next to the last one. So if the Government wants to be protected I hope a colleague who can stand as I could and deal with them. So they are not going to have to sit there for long. A question of what plans were made in the party caucus held in this building yesterday evening, we are prepared to deal with it in the orderly mode of debate.

Mr. Speaker, in continued debates, and I believe even in the questions, it has been said that the responsibility of the Government of the Unity Team Government. Well, if it is, Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that we have business one can imagine going after page and I am not any place where one will find any happiness for the Unity Team Government other than a debate undertaken by Mr. Ulysses Seymour which was then a debate undertaken by Mr. Ulysses Seymour which was then a debate undertaken by Mr. Ulysses Seymour which was then

MR. JAMES M. MCCORM (CONTINUING): Mr. Speaker, eight years in Government administration I am quite aware of all the rules and regulations and things you have to do. The honourable Financial Secretary is responsible for the majority of these items, but ultimately this is an elected decision. We appear to the capital investments and indeed one section under areas of expenditure, as well as nothing in our laws. This is a political decision taken by the elected Members of Executive Council so therefore my points is directed to the fact of them that they have increased and promoted in this country the recurrent budget, and I will deal with it step by step.

Yesterday I had mentioned the point of the purchase of vehicles, where in 1984 the Government spent $222,166 and they proposed to do it this year with $352,000.

I go on now to airport development. For this do mainly on the field such as the parking apron and go North at Owen Roberts Airport and the work which has to be done on Cayman Brac. This last year it went the Government $2,574,814 to do this and this year it is only proposed to spend $328,000 or about 12 per cent of what was spent last year. You do have remember that recurring expenses such as this give fewer interests and they give employment to many people. Therefore, when the high unemployment rate which exists in this country today, which the present Elected Government have participated, it should look at the ways they could do something to try to keep activity along. It is also understandable, Mr. President, that these costs would be a bit reduced this year, but what I am saying to the people of this country is that it would have been more realistic if they had figures to relate exactly to what was spent last year. That maybe some of the poor people who need employment through the efforts of this Government.

Another point, Mr. President, is that looking at the budget for 1985 the people of this country cannot view critical as because in 1984 to cost the Government $44,826 for the investments. We have got more people on the scrolls now and this year they have told us it is going to cost $80,000. So again we are spending this year one third of what we spent on the scholarships last year and we have more people.

Another item is disaster preparedness, last year it cost $27,000. This year they are going to do it for $2,000.

$140,000 was budgeted for fire service buildings in 1984. This year $70,000 is budgeted, just on a campaign pledge and as politicians we have heard that the West Bay area is going to have a fire station. Of course I can go on to deal with this a bit further also but, however, here on the fire service buildings we have reduced it from $140,000 to $60,000.

Government staff housing for 1984 was budgeted at $105,187. This year they propose to spend $70,000.

In the year 1984 $245,000 was spent on medical facilities. This year it is going to be reduced to $138,000.

In 1984 $1,106,787 was spent on the purchase of land. This year we are going to spend the grand sum of $65,000. And I will deal with this subject again but, Mr. President, but in perusing the estimates I find that $40,000 is to purchase a piece of house land I imagine somewhere in the West Bay Beach area to provide the employees housing going for that day. Now whether there have changed dramatically, Mr. President, the piece of land which we are proposing to buy in Seven Mile Beach

MR. JAMES W. BOYCE (CONTINUED): for this amount of money must be the envy of a postage stamp. So they have been unselfish to the people of Rock Bay and the people of this country, and they have brought a budget to here in attempt to fool the Members of this House, and realizing that we also have a financial problem on this side of the house, my apology to the Second Elected Member for George Town, who has since left the Benches of the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

Almost unchallenged, really in 1961 were $3,197,719. This year they are $7,883,719.

Further items of expenditure to be provided in the 1962 budget which make it a problematic and unrealistic budget are under Personal and Personal offices, the 1962 estimates are $436,899. It has increased in the 1965 estimates to $3+3,053.

Legislative Department in the year 1961 cost $189,496. It has been reduced this year to $109,010. Now, here is a Portfolio which has really disappeared and it goes to show where has happened and what I meant when I passed a question to the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council in this House a while ago.

Minister Education and Trade has a very large Portfolio, and I am glad that it may not disrupt and that people have cooperated to do the job which I see doing. However, Foreign Relations and Trade Administration in the year 1961 was $738,247. That year this year has been reduced to $557,520, a significant decrease and a significant reminder to the people of this country that the important Portfolio, which keeps the money coming into this country is thought of by the present administration that they would make such a drastic cut as they have done with this.

The next Portfolio which appears unfavourably is the Administration of Communications and Works. When I picked this out, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country will see the significance of the words I made a while ago, and the reason why it was announced by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council, because the administration cost of Communications and Works has gone up from $345,272 to $170,196. As I go along on my calculations we will find where all of this money has gone to and which particulars Portfolio you have in. This is where the significance comes in in regard to the announcing of the conversions by that particular Member.

Non-statutory Government expenses have increased from $260,000 to $41,000 from this year.

Equipment purchases on page 32 have been reduced from $225,000 to $208,000.

Local Audit Government notes, which still gave one penny somewhere in the Civil Service Commission and the Police, in other words there was a penny more there this year, last year were $265,996 and this year are proposed to be $400,012.

Head 8, Colonial and Judicial Offices. To find the cost for this administration was $379,705. It has been increased this year to $1+1,712

The Legislative Department is, the cause of expenses and revenues have significantly affected here. The cost last year was $181,272 and has been reduced to $10,510 this year. Legislative Department grants and subventions were $21,000 last year reduced to $10,000 this year.

Police Department supplies and materials has an expenditure last year of $193,100. It has now been decreased to $09,800. Maintenance services for the Police Department cost last year $295,887 reduced this year to $292,213.

MR. JAMES M. DUNN (CONTINUING): Equipment rental for the Police Department was $166,757 last year. I think this was mostly equipment purchased rather than rentals. It has increased to $33,500 this year.

Fleet and Development Facilities dealing with grants and contributions last year spent $460,822 and that was reduced this year to $270,621.

Non-capitalized equipment purchases last year were $880,409 and this year will be $85,000.

I have already covered items to the Civil Service Association; last year under our administration $665,000 was spent.

Grants and contributions for the Municipal Office of Health Education and Social Services were last year $201,807. This year they will be $238,600.

Tuition reduction and fringe personnel emoluments were $481,870 last year, reduced this year to $130,139. Supplies and materials for Cowtown Auditorium and Stockyards $27,465 last year. This year we are going to spend $1,600. So we should not even expect this year to get a penny from the portfolio of Tourism Activities and Trade until we do an Economic Feasibility. It will probably be an appeals which came from the Department of Agriculture. Utility expenditures for this department was $10,254 last year reduced this year on the zero estimates to $200. So they will not even be able to turn on the lights up there. This is a very ridiculous situation for a country to be in. Maintenance services for Tourism Activities and Trade were $108,025 last year, but this year is $71,000. Grants and contributions for this Municipal were $77,363 last year and is $35,000 this year.

Communications and Works personnel emoluments were $238,809 last year, and this year is $81,308. Supply for this Portfolio was $6,778 last year, and this year is $5,000. In addition to this the Member in charge of this Portfolio happens to have added local administration to his Portfolio. So how in the world is he going to make his budget to the committee of Ways and Means with a cut budget like this. Communications and Works supplies and materials last year were $12,750. This year $500 will be spent. What a ridiculous situation.

Inter-departmental services under Communications and Works were cut from $11,701 to $700 this year. Now, Mr. President, if there was any doubt in the people's mind as to how ridiculous this budget is, we should have been able by this time to prove our point. All of that money which has been cut from the Communications and Works budget and from the Tourism Activities and Trade budget has now gone on to what is known as Sub-Divisional and Natural Resources Portfolio which used to be under the name of the Department of Agriculture.

This year we have a total under this department, Head 38, of $880,736 compared to $440,005 the year before. So this is why I requested to get the answer which I got to my question when it was posed to the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

Mr. President, the Honourable Financial Secretary said in his Budget Address that this year the local revenues were being reduced in order with the additional revenue.

HON. SPEAKER: I am told the hope is finished so perhaps....

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: Sec, as this time I would like to apply, Sir,

MR. PRESIDENT: I will suspend proceedings for fifteen minutes and we can resume at 11.45 a.m.

AT 11.30 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

AND RESUMED AT 11.45 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Elected Member for Saddle Peak.

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call for a vote of no confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you wish me to put the question?

MR. JAMES M. DOOLEY: On no confidence, yes.

Mr. Speaker, in analysing the 1996 budget and addressing the speech which was delivered to this House, the Honourable Financial Secretary said that this year the local residents would be required to assist with the additional revenue. Mr. Speaker, when you accept matters or do something you cannot say that you request him to assist. Because once these measures will be passed that they shall have the full force of enactments behind them. So therefore it is not a matter of wishing to use proceeds to assist, we are then completely committed to assist.

I have dealt with the misleading manner in which they have tried to balance the budget when making estimates which they have will come short now since in 1996 to it than they have budgeted. Therefore, there will be an over-expenditure of at least $6 million by the end of 1996.

The people may have been misled into complacency by believing that we have a balanced budget. However, Mr. Speaker, I think that the public at large can easily see by now that this is not a balanced budget, although since $6 million will be taken from the funds in the General Account, which according to the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council do not not know.

I will deal at this point, Mr. Speaker, with the additional revenue which is to be raised through this year, and I will show the people that the main areas of increased have to deal with the tax on the steel. The one and half cents will be spending there just have millions every day.

Stamps tax has been increased to income from $20,000 for 1995 to a projected $100,000 in 1996.

Liquor licenses is also projected $34,000 in income for the Government. The year 1996 is to be expected that will receive $200,000.

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUING): Trade licences have increased from $250,000 in the year 1964 to $450,000 in the year 1965.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure in the view of certain legislation which is before the House and which I will deal with later. It is projected that year 1966 when only $71,777 was collected in court fines, this year they will collect $140,000.

Land registry fees have been increased from $84,850 in income in 1961 to $200,000 in income in 1965.

Stamping applications have been increased from $177,000 in 1962 to $340,000 in 1965, or just about double. Stamping applications have to be paid for by people who are either businessmen or people who are resident or have a financial interest in the development of this country.

It is projected that revenue from the revenue stamps which is the Land Transfer Tax will increase to $4,500,000, or an increase of $1.2 million for the year. This is a significant increase, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that it was projected on the new revenue measures to respond to unavoidable contracts and agreements which have been signed in this House and which have affected some debits already. I only warn the Members that with those tightening measures and the manner in which they have approached the upcoming of this country, that instead of having $3.4 million from revenue stamps, we will probably be lucky if we receive half of that amount. People are not going to invest in a country in which they have no faith and in which the stability has apparently been lost.

Another item, Mr. Speaker, which is unavoidable is their debt and debts in which $350,000 in the year 1966 from the interests due on the overseas debts. Because of the manner in which the present elected Government have dealt with the business of this country, we find that a $10 million plus in finances has been shrunk at this time to about $4.5 million. Or to put it another way the present Elected Executive Council, in four months of administration has already taken $4.5 million out of reserves which has been put into reserve by the only Labour Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there is no way at this time that the present elected Government can get away from the fact that these measures did exist. Much has been said about the money not being available to Government, and that the country was broke. Mr. Speaker, the country is just bursting broke. So we cannot expect to have $500,000 accrued in interest from the measures of this country this year.

So after all of those points have been taken into consideration, Mr. Speaker, we can easily assume that the country finds a year in which there will have to be an over-expenditure of about $5 million, which will not be covered by revenue.

I will deal with the revenue measures which have been tabled in the House and that does the increases.

The hotel room tax will be increased from 4% to $10 per room.

Sales agreements which are assignable will carry an increase tax of seven and a half per cent. Mr. Speaker, this can drastically affect one income. This seven and a half per cent tax, and I am not speaking because I am a real estate broker, now have a lot of local people as well as it does have the knowledge. This document was purchased privately which is by an assignable deed which is then sold privately.

We have also seen the introduction into Session of a duty increase to the people of this country by changing the duty payable on freight which would come on the aircraft.

Mr. Glenn W. Goode (continuing): The law before said that it would be the freight rate charged for ocean freight, or $5 per ton, of whatever the amount was. This means that if the freight by air freight was $50 before or in view, the person would normally pay only half or $25. With this new law going into effect a person will pay $25, or $50 per cent more to ocean back he would before. This will have devastating on the Cayman Islands, and it particularly may hurt the airline, the very thing which we need to sustain. What this will do is to entice people to ship their freight by the shipping companies rather than by planes. The airline which is the principal line carrier will suffer tremendously as a result of this.

Telephone service on airplanes have increased from five cents to ten cents, or a 100 per cent increase.

The Government has attempted to deal with the transshipping trade which are being acted on the Islands by placing a use fee of $100 on each overseas visit. Now I do not imagine that that is proposed to be just for one week of the year, but I think that it would be considered to be for the benefit of the businessmen. In my opinion that is a bit low, but whereas I think it is another area which we should consider it would be inequitable if we asked to change the full amount and a half year work in that. I think a consideration on this particular section should be entertained by both sides of the House because we are looking at an area where the tourism sector could be seriously affected.

Liquor distributors will now pay $2,500 for their license instead of the previous $400, an increase of 525 per cent. The retailers will pay $3,000 for a license instead of the previous $350. The restaurant will now pay $100 for their license originally is $50 unfortunately. The hotel license to sell liquor will increase for those who have 20 rooms or less from $400 to $1,000. The hotel with 20 rooms or more will increase from $1000 to $2,000. The hotel with 50 rooms or more will increase

Mr. James K. Boyce (continued): permits by remarks at a time, but in a very large amount. He threw all of that out of the window in favour of having our local people to the extent that they are now being asked to be taxed under these legislations.

The district of Mission that is represented by my colleague and my self has received but very little attention in the 1968 budget, except for instances in Capilano Creek. I have already shown expenditure by Government in Capilano River but, for instance, Capilano Creek is being asked $250,000 to extend the Bluff road to the benefit of whom? Indian Road is getting a subsidy. I do not say this disparagingly because three-fifths of the people of the Province for agricultural in the district he may have shared with us some of our tax information, but we may have to assist him. It is also much needed by the people who reside in that district. So I am glad that we have been able to get from the Provincial Government the commitment amount of $19,000 to improve the cattle dip in Chilliwack.

The Sardis Park Elementary School will also receive part of the extra from the mill rate and it will get $21,000 for expenditure on that. Chilliwack Primary School will share with them that the expenditure of $22,360 for a hard surface at the Chilliwack Primary School.

Before I should forget this very short and important point, Mr. Speaker, I would be being remiss in that the private mail of the editor of that newspaper is finally being passed. I do not know what the arguments of that particular protest be, Mr. Speaker, but I am glad to see that they are showing gratitude to at least one of their civic corporations.

I would like to point out a few further discrepancies in regard to the budget in areas which apparently the Provincial Government has chosen to ignore such concern. That is unfortunate since under Social Services, the page 91 of the present budget estimated to rise $1,000 this year. That is very little, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think what kind of a programme or school counselling can be put into effect with $1,000. Also there is another expenditure for private individuals under that department. Private agencies and sports facilities were cried down in the last administration and this administration was supposed to have cured all of the ills in connection with that department. However, we note from the magnificent sum of $9,000 for having appropriated extra grant towards sports equipment. That will probably buy a few extras for the playgrounds.

Another area which was a lack of concern in the previous Session was public parks, gardens and beaches. In this particular appropriation we find $200 and $1,000 of expenditure for this year.

Mr. Speaker, an medical care already we are presently in around $300,000 this year. I do not have available to me the amount that was expended last year under this section of the appropriation, but I am certain that it was much more than this. Members could judge what they are, if you are going to be able to attend to many people who need hospital consideration with the $300,000 which have been appropriated. It must be true that I have misunderstood a matter that we are supposing to utilize all of the facilities in the Provincial Hospital in Kamloops and to send the people there who need medical attention.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the West Kootenay have problems and were told that they would be getting a fair station. In perusing the budget which has been presented I would

MR. JAMES H. DOOLEY (CONTINUING): And when the people of West Bay do be denied because we have an appropriation of only $75,000 towards purchasing of a site for a five classroom primary school. I made it abundantly clear that I thought that this was a necessity, and that I would be prepared to support the expenditure on a five classroom primary West Bay. However, what are we going to do with $25,000? And we going only to one of the schools who have five classrooms today to buy a five toy five schools to supply the services with?

Another misleading thing we heard in the West Bay area was that they were told that they would be providing a service ship landing jetty in West Bay. I find on the budget sheet for the year 1969 we are only going to spend $15,000 to purchase the land compared to an expenditure this year of way over $1 million to purchase Government land. This $15,000 is going to be used to purchase an frontage along about three of land on Seven Mile Beach. Because if we are going to put a service ship landing in that is the most place where we have a sandy beach if it is going to serve West Bay at all. This I may point out at this stage, in my opinion, I think is a ridiculous and one which should not be further considered because it is not going to really work in relation to the amount of money which would have to be spent to provide this facility. However, this can we buy for $75,000?

Then we have a further West Water extensions and they do give $25,000 to construct a jetty and for maintenance of the North Coast jetty. I quite, Mr. President, I will be on the Elected Members of both Boards to be thankful with we are to give up a budget which is available. The budget which has been presented to us is not a realistic budget and shows wastage of money and only makes work and wages for the job, or if the job is done the over-expenditure on purpose like this will be a scandalous shame.

Mr. President, I come to more of the amendments of the Law and Regulations which are proposed to be passed by this Bill. We have a look at the books which is the Airport Regulations Law and it came into effect, I think, on 15th January, 1969. The Elected Executive Council do not presently to change the manner in which Regulations can be made by the Executive Council and they are proposing to put the same-enterprise Ministers. I say enterprise because once this Bill the Elected Executive Council can do its own wisdom and its own good time put these Regulations into effect without once coming back to the Elected House. Therefore, this is the only time that we Elected Members representing our people have an opportunity to discuss and to stand our wisdom with those of power.

I will read, with your permission, section 3 of the proposed Regulations which it is proposed to change under the proposed new Regulation here. There are some of the more which are particularly major bits sections:

"(1) Electronic or interfering with the proper use of the airport;

(2) Electronically any person acting in the execution of his duty in relation to the airport;

(3) Knowingly or the airport after having been required by a constable or an authorised officer to leave it;

(4) Wilfully any vehicle or animal in or on the airport after being required by an authorised officer to remove it or after the presence on the airport has been forbidden by an authorised officer or in his discretion;

MR. JAMES M. SPICER (CONTINUED):

(xx) throwing, leaving or dropping anything capable of causing injury to any person or property;

(xy) spending any waste, fence, hoarding or post;

(xxi) failure to comply with the weight of the load" contained in the Schedule;

(xxi) driving or placing a vehicle carelessly or dangerously or without consideration for persons using the street;

(xxii) failure by the driver of a vehicle to stop when required by a constable to do so.

(xxiii) failure by the driver of a vehicle which is involved in an accident to give his name and address and the name and address of the owner of the vehicle to any person having reasonable ground for requiring them;

(xxiv) failure by the driver of a vehicle constructed to propel by a constable or by the person in charge of the element any accident in which the vehicle is involved.

(xxv) failure by the driver of a vehicle to comply with any direction for the regulation of traffic given by a constable or a traffic sign;

(xxvi) parking a vehicle elsewhere than in a place provided for that purpose and in the manner required by an authorised officer;

(xxvii) failure by the person in charge of a vehicle to remove it from any parking place when required by an authorised officer to do so;

(xxviii) loading or unloading from a vehicle, passengers or goods elsewhere than in a place provided for that purpose;

(xxix) driving a motor vehicle on any roadway in an attempt to speed greater than thirty miles per hour or such other speed as may be prescribed by a traffic sign;

(xxx) smoking, drinking or otherwise dumping any waste, ashes or plant or rubbish on any place but;

(xxxi) littering or leaving litter except in a receptacle provided for the purpose."

Now the reason I have taken the time, Mr. President, to read these out is to show to the Members of this House and the public at large that there by and large were other safeguards. We are only dealing with one or two areas where these legislations which would be of a serious nature. Under the present law whoever is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction, is subject to a fine of $50 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months. Now, Mr. President, we have that Electoral Tribunal coming back to the Municipalities Assembly and asking that they may have the power to increase this up a fine of $1,000 or

MR. JAMES M. DOUGAN (Cookstown): Congratulations are due to the Minister for Agriculture on the publication of these Regulations. They are very important to the farming community. I am sure that the Minister will be glad to hear that the Regulations have been welcomed by the farming community. I am sure that the Minister will be glad to hear that the Regulations have been welcomed by the farming community. I am sure that the Minister will be glad to hear that the Regulations have been welcomed by the farming community.

The main purpose of the Regulations which the Statutory Committee wishes to discuss with the Minister is the Interpretation Act, Chapter III, which came into force on the 31st December, 1954. With your permission, Sir, I will read the appropriate section of this Act. It is Section 27 and it says:

"Where a Act confers power on any authority to make any Regulations, the following provisions shall, unless the contrary intention appears, have effect with reference to the making, issue and operation of such Regulations -

(a) a Regulation may be made, issued, amended, revoked or revoked by the same authority and in the same manner by and in which it was made;

(b) the Regulations may provide in respect of a breach of any of the provisions thereof that the offender shall, subject to the law otherwise provided, be liable to such fine not exceeding twenty-five pounds, or to such term of imprisonment with hard labour not exceeding three months, or to both such fine and imprisonment, as may be therein prescribed;

(c) where any Act confers power on any authority to make Regulations for any general purpose, and also for any special purpose specified thereto, the enumeration of the special purposes shall not be deemed to derogate from the generality of the power conferred with reference to the general purpose;

(d) no Regulation shall be inconsistent with the provisions of any Act;

(e) any breach of any Regulation may, unless the Act otherwise provides, be enforced in a summary manner;

(f) any reference in any Regulation to "the Act" shall be read and construed as meaning the Act authorising the power to make or issue such Regulations."

Now, Mr. President, if I agree that this should probably be enough information as we no longer have the power to be laid before Parliament in relation to the Orders in Council the way it was when we got the Act commenced, the specific fine here would now be £50 in our currency. If we take the reduction the power has suffered in the world market we could possibly be looking at a little more fine as being the fine.

Have to what this Regulation is

MR. JAMES H. JOHNSON (CONTINUED):

> "On the Solstice of the world twenty-five pounds one hundredth ounces of the world one thousand dollars, and by the Selection of the Lords Three minute and One hundredth thereafter of the world twelve months".

We are increasing the penalty of assessments from three months to twelve months, or a 400 per cent increase. We are changing the twenty-five pounds to a maximum of $1,000, an about thirty times what the fine could be imposed now before. Now I agree that one dollar is a very strong requirement and the maximum fine regard to the stability, but not even one dollar has increased in twelve years the standing ovation, as this enters. Finally I ask the distinguished Secretary to vote nay on the people of the Mayor Emeritus.

Mr. President, this point permission this may be a good time for me to stop at the next Pearl I will be finishing with will be quite lengthy.

MR. PRESIDENT: What you said it would be a good time to stop I think you missed one there. I think probably you should...

MR. JAMES H. JOHNSON: Mr., Sir, Excuse me.

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well, I will suspend proceedings until 2:15 p.m.

AT 12:30 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

AFTER RECESS AT 2:30 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have to announce proceedings are resumed, before I recall the First Placed Member for Second Time to continue speaking, perhaps I might lay the Member's indulgence to read out the contents of a petition which has just reached me from one of our Members. It is from the Third Placed Member for West Bay and is addressed to the Speaker, Members and Clerks.

> "Hello There, Congratulations are first class, Wonderful work and wonderful. The Seychois are taking great care of us and I am falling in love with Seychelles and the people. I can only hope that actually be happy. Miss a good Seychois.
>
> Sophie"

I will give it to the Clerk so that if any Member wishes to see it, they may have the opportunity of doing so.

MR. D. EDMOND HOARE: To the privy to be back before the Speaker to rise, Sir. (LAUGHTER)

MR. PEPPERSACK: I would only like there to only change that one bill be back before this meeting is over.

Earlier there was one other thing which has been brought to my notice which I should have mentioned this morning, but I thought to do so when I was mentioning the economic and fisheries which I felt some Members would feel in knowing of the role of the death of the late Minister of Education. Some may that I learned yesterday sad of the death of the former Chief Minister of this territory, Mr. Sheridan Morris. I am sure that Members would wish me to express my regret at learning of that news.

The Minister of Works Member for Public Works.

MR. JAMES M. MORRIS: Mr. President, I would like to speak on another proposed bill which is before the House. This is a bill for a law to amend the Marine Conservation Act, 1978. Mr. President, I would congratulate myself with certain aspects of this, namely the development of marine parks in certain areas of the country's waters. However, in my opinion they have gone too far with this. I think the original proposal was for areas more offshore than what has been published in this newspaper. For instance, if I am reading this correctly, we can draw from backbone to midway down South Sound. It appears that fishing will be prohibited. There also appear to be areas in North Sound and in Cayladena, and in the South Sound area.

I heard it said on the radio that in the newspaper that a certain area in the North Sound would be prohibited for boats regardless of whether they were fishing or not. If that is so, this again is one of the more unreasonable areas of the South Sound and I am at a loss why there could not be a certain amount of activity in that general area. To make recommendations that our local people cannot fish within a hundred or the shoreline, I think again carries the process a little too far. Commissions by nature have been used to dealing with conditions from the sea bed and it will be very difficult, I think, to enforce this in the Legislature.

The marine parks are necessary for the future growth of tourism in the country and to benefit the inhabitants of the Islands in the future. I also associate myself with some of the enforcement measures in regard to check, detector and so forth. However, Mr. President, it is difficult to associate myself with certain sections of this bill, because we know that the powers of the persons Minister Executive Council are far reaching and they are usually contained by experts in their decisions. So what we may find in the end result further is that Regulations will be held that they cannot even see the people wanted to take a swim. I am very aware of those for reasoning powers and the manner in which it is intended to use them.

I am also against giving them the right to make blanket Regulations under this Bill for the fear of what it may do to our people. Some weeks ago there was a meeting around the Islands and I really feel that it was more than a success. It was a total fellowship attended by the total Caymanian Electoral Number of Executive Council had need to request to the car parking facility. This total fellowship was to overturn fishing in certain areas of the Islands for tourists. Because the people rose up against the total fellowship, there was tremendous hue fracking, and they were justly told that this would not apply to the local people. They could automatically be prevented because. It would apply only to the foreigners who came here. Well, Mr. President, believe me whether the real offshore islands of the Cayman Islands, there are very few people who are coming to the Cayman Islands, particularly if they come as tourists who are going out grouper fishing.

MR. JAMES H. PIPPY (CONTINUING): So what I am saying to this group is that I feel even the juveniles who there all along be reported the moral principles, but because the trial Judges did not have enough time on it to finally hunt out this material in their books.

If we look at section 3 of this proposed bill imposing civil offenses and penalties under the covered unfair practices is of the provisions here, we find that the fines proposed here is not exceeding $5,000, or a term of imprisonment not exceeding twelve months, or both such fine or imprisonment, "and in addition thereto the amount of compensation any person who is the owner or equipment that is to be utilized has been used for the purpose of committing or participating the commission of such offense". The qualification further part of it is, "for the extension of the owner for such purpose". This is an excessive fine. It would have been better to have proposed different types of fines for certain sections of the law.

For a fisherman who has been used to working late at night to feed a family meal and who may not be fully aware of the law when it is passed, and he may go out and do unlawful fishing. I do not know what the final may be. It may be only one or two. They then put him in jail for twelve months. They confiscate his boat and then they confiscate his brother's boat which he may happen to have nothing to do with because they do not look at the statement to be used, and they put him in jail for a year. Maybe they even confiscate the family members away from society. It is a ridiculous piece of legislation.

MR. K. KOKEBOK RIBU: So that is the fact?

MR. JAMES H. PIPPY: The law can be interpreted in any way that we wish to do it. What I am saying is that this law plainly states, "or the extension to its owner for such purpose". It is very broad. Somebody could make the whole attorney in his hand. He could be using one of these and commit an offense by violating any more search than he was supposed to search, or fish in an area in which he was not supposed to be fishing in. They could find plankton plankton in the other boat in his hand, and it would be ruled that he intended to use that boat as might allow it. Just because the other one. So I am thinking with reasonableness, and the word in the provision will be based with some good intentions.

MR. K. KOKEBOK RIBU: But that is not in the law.

MR. JAMES H. PIPPY: The Member should say in interpret the law when he gets up. And then we will receive him.

Mr. President, I do sympathize that for the people whom this may affect the penalties are very severe. After reading this I wonder why there was not about $500,000 put into the budget this year which it was hoped would be collected from fines in the courts, instead of the more than doubling which was done. I could not conscientiously be support this although I hope that we have more fines of legislation. However, I would ask that the Committee Steward "Reform of Executive Summit" consider this and otherwise making more changes in it.

We come to the most important bill which is the Shrimp Law, or a bill for a law to amend the Shrimp Law, Act 19 of 1973. This deals with amendments to section 3, 4A and 5B of the present Shrimp Law. Section 3 deals with electrical contractors under this law and it calls for $1,000 or twelve months imprisonment in place of the $500 fine at the present time and six months to section 4A, subsection (1) of section 3.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT (continuing): Mr. President, I can announce myself with that section and would be prepared to vote in favour of it.

Subsection (2) of section (5) of section 57 increases the fines from $500 to $2,000 and imprisonment from two years, where the present law is only six months. Again, for a conviction of that type, I would associate myself and will probably vote in favour of that section.

However, Mr. President, we come to section 65 where we get into more far reaching effects. This section says:

> "Whenever anyone may bring or cause or permit dangerously or recklessly, or at a speed or in a manner or in a condition which is dangerous to the public, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including the nature, condition and use of the road or place and the amount of traffic which is actually at the time, or which might reasonably be expected to be on the road or place shall be guilty of an offence and liable
>
> (a) on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding $500 or to a term of imprisonment not exceeding six months or both;"

Again, Mr. President, with some minor amendments would, I would also support this section. I would like to have a little clarification on what is meant by "criminal" negligence or criminal carelessness or recklessly. From the legal mind of the House the Honourable Second Official Member where we come to consideration of this. The fine here is being increased from $500 to $2,000 or twelve months. When we have subsection (2) where the fine is going to be increased from $500 to $2,000.

Also we have section 67 which says:

> "Whenever anyone may bring any kind of vehicle or animal without due care or attention or without reasonable consideration for other persons shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding $500 or to a term of imprisonment not exceeding six months or both."

Like in a previous section and the increase to $2,000 for this, I just make it very difficult for me to support that particular section.

I can see the distance that the elected Members of Government would go in the saying of money should the case which may give another penalty, in order for them to spend up this year and not be at least $2 million in debt. However, I feel that we cannot give that opportunity to use this measure recklessly.

Mr. President, the question was put to this House dealing with the release from Northwood Estate of a certain person in the community and I feel strongly that a person with a person should be the one which this particular fine, the leniency and the money given to him was excessive, because there are many people who have been afflicted by accidental records of a minor nature in this country and such leniency has not been given to them in the past. I think in view recently a Magistrate which could come back to haunt me, and I think that it should never have been done.

MR. JAMES M. HOGGY (COLLINGWOOD): I know the manner in which this type of thing is usually dealt with, and I am quite aware that on the previous occasions it was turned down by the Elected Executive Council on recommendations that it should come back for consideration after at least a year of the sentence had been served. That year, I think, would have been up either at the end of February or beginning of March, which means that consideration could have been given to it in Executive Council or about the first April. However, I was pleased to hear that a petition signed by fifty people indicated that serving time would be honoured by the Elected Executive Council in as short a time.

The most puzzling of this legislation (possibly as a genuine attempt being made to curtail the freedom of interpretation in this House. Saying that Standing Order Seven does not apply to this eleven times. I would point out that in the previous administration which lasted for eight years, the Standing Order was never used on one occasion. It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, that every one who is in Elected Representative will have the full time which is necessary to speak within certain guidelines on the Resolution towards emphasis which comes before this House, and that right should never be curtailed, particularly when there is a minority group as has existed in this House.

Mr. Speaker, May's Parliamentary Practice generally that the rights of the minority are protected by the discretionary power which is given to the Chair and is completely exercised in refusing to accept a motion for closure. The Common Speaking Order, which is Standard of the House of Commons in England was a further protection of minority rights by providing the Standing Order 32;

> "If a division be held upon a question for the closure of debate under Standing Order No. 30 (Closure), that question shall not be decided in the affirmative unless it appears by the numbers declared from the chair that not fewer than one hundred Members voted in the majority in support of the motion."

This number in proportion is probably a high amount because not all Members attend the House of Commons sittings except on very special occasions.

I am pointing these important rules of order out to the House to ensure that the freedom of debate will continue unrestricted in this House as it has been in the past.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past about the services of the Government Information Services which were eliminated last. The one factor against this was what was termed to be the excessive cost of operating such a facility. I wish to point to the budget where you observe where we are given that for the provision of the salary and emoluments for the staff and for seven others, for seven months the cost will be $74,000. That is only looking at the salary of one experienced person. Mr. Speaker, once we add to that the sums which would have to be paid if this person occupied quarters in the private sector, and so add the other attendant expenses with it, we will soon run up to the figure of $100,000 a year which was made before. We will also probably have a service which is not effective as it was had before.

There is a figure in the budget of $50,000 to help with pensioner rehabilitation. I suppose this may reach and hope that it will be carried through. However, again I will remind the Members of the House and the people of the country as a whole that like this was stimulated by the poor administration also.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT (CONTINUING): He had sent the Director of the Maritime Trade School an account for dismantling all the equipment of Northwood prison requesting taking an agreement to cover according the people who were transported there by Japanese three main type of trade. I am very glad that they have accepted one more of our ideas. In fact, so we think with you, there are many ideas in the budget. It is all a combination of things which were started by us.

Mr. President, I move to the point in my address where I deal with the old political whipping boy, Captain Aikman. Captain Aikman has formed it a duty to the country's history that he has pronounced that the country take a decisive step towards abolishing the future of civil aviation in this country. That step was taken in the form of this committee, because we chose to do this we had to break the established bond which LACSA had with the Cayman Islands.

At this point in our history it was a good thing that the Cayman Islands are flooded, we hope on solid rock, because the fall of this established bond would have taken us off the precipice that we just broke. It was such a drastic step. There have been in our history something which has come to benefit this country as for us with Members of Parliament, Capt. LACSA. But I am here to tell the House and tell them in no uncertain terms that everything which was made for the Cayman Islands under the LACSA agreement ended, and ends tremendously. The old records were brought here from Costa Rica and they are stored, I hope, in the vault in the underground section of the Government Administration Building. Should anyone take the time to peruse, everything is recorded there and it will prove the untruths which have been told by many people on the outside or next to by some Members of this House about the performance of LACSA.

It is true that Captain Aikman has had many difficulties to overcome but, Mr. President, the prosperity which has been experienced into this country in the last eight years would never have been experienced if we had not been masters of our own skies. If we had not been in a position that we could counter moves which were made by other countries and other companies, we would have been at the complete mercy of any airlines, and most foreign airlines would leave this country immediately if they were not in a position where they were at least asking others to breathing room. This history will be able to tell the great benefits which Captain Aikman has played in the development of this country.

Last year with the increased route structure and the operation into the Turks and Caicos Islands, the airlines should be making money on their participation route as the load factors are very high. It was a gamble taken which paid off and will pay off tremendously. In addition to that Captain Aikman was able to make an agreement with Cayman Airways from operations from the New York and Chicago. New York and Chicago were just two of the cities of the United States where hundreds & lots of tourist dollars have been generated from. We have offices in both cities but, Mr. President, we have not yet mounted any real effort to get the business from there as we should be getting. Recently, with the onset of Cayman Airways we have able to tap these markets, and speak on for on I am aware the load factors are very good. I hope that in the near of New York this can continue on a yearly basis rather than a seasonal basis.

In addition to that the company will also be able to derive revenue from other structure, and we have the re-joining business from the republic of Haiti. All of these things have added tremendously to the chance of Cayman Airways.

MR. JAMES K. POLK (CONTINUED): The balance sheet for Cayman Airways was prepared late last year by the auditors Price Waterhouse and Company. We did not have a chance to deal with it and table it before the last election. However, for the financial year ended 30th June, 1994, there is a significant factor to remember in Cayman Airways, and that is that the operational loss for 1994 was $18,188,288 compared to a loss in 1993 of $7,882,377. With the continuation of good management policies and with the appointment of experienced people, it is a possibility that if Cayman Airways continues to generate the income which it is doing at present, the airline may be in a position at the end of the financial year in June, 1995, to find out that it may only lose $2 million overall on the operation. The overall loss last year was $8,759,316. The depreciation which is included in that sum amounts to over $3 million last year which is a non-expendable cash item.

The deficit from the beginning of the operation has been $15,287,000. One of the problems which Cayman Airways has always faced is that it had to operate from time to time ... nearly all of the time on borrowed capital with a very high interest rate being paid. However, in addition to this I would point out to the House that although we have this huge $15 million in Cayman Airways which is money on deposit in United States Treasury funds, which is on record of the tax payers.

To fully understand what has been going on the two balance sheets should be analysed, but at least one should read the one we

In looking at this deficit we must consider what the present value of the planes would be if they should be sold, and also the increased value of the office buildings at the airports. The last figures which I mentioned are reflected in a lower value in the books of the company than they would be if they were both evaluated.

If we were to look at what Cayman Airways has done for the country, we look at the young people who have obtained their qualifications to a whom. We have young people today who are pilots of their airplanes, flight engineers and a couple of them are navigators who are very young in years of age. We know what these young people have accomplished for them, and we know that they would never have been able to do it if the country had not taken a bold step into the future.

The income paid to the Caymanian staff of Cayman Airways would probably be about $5.5 million a year. Most of the people there come a long way also. Furthermore, if we consider the multiplier effect from it, generates a huge amount of money into the economy of this country.

I would like to pose a question at this time to the Members of the House and the public at large, and that is what does Republic Airlines or the owners contribute to the Cayman Islands? In the case of Republic Airlines, although I do suspect them, I feel certain that their expenditure in the local labour force would not be half a million dollars a year. Look at the amount of Caymanians who would have well paying jobs and would have their futures if we were to liquidate Cayman Airways.

I heard a rumour on the road this past week, and I hope that we must never believe these rumours unless they are published in the Herald, the gospel of the kingdom, but I heard that the two Members associated personally with the airline had gone to the United Kingdom in the hope of selling the aircraft to one of the United Kingdom airlines. I hope that this is untrue, and I hope that these Members do not have such a thing in mind to do.

MR. JAMES M. BURKE (CONTINUING): When we consider the losses we have already sustained the losses which have occurred particularly on the Cayman Brac run, where we have had to use the private owner charter in a position where it cannot break even at five or four stations and accordingly, therefore, the people from Cayman Brac and Little Cayman are a part of the economy of Grand Cayman. They are part of the population of the Islands and we have to protect them. We have to give them the services which we are entitled to in Grand Cayman.

We should look at the overall value to the community which Cayman Airways is in. It is our calculation already - it amounts to the world at large that 18,000 people are accomplishing something.

Another factor which should be taken into consideration, Mr. President, is that according to statistics available at the Government Administration Building each overlay passenger to the Cayman Islands provides direct benefits to the Cayman Islands Treasury in the sum of about $60. There is from this various taxation methods which are used here. The average passenger is spending about $400 to $600 in our economy and that is the one which is generating the machinery which pushes Government wheels. So if we multiply that Government is getting $60 from every tourist who comes here, and if Cayman Airways had brought in and taken out 300,000 of those, Mr. President, we are then looking at direct benefits to the Cayman Islands Government of $18 million. So if we have lost $8.5 million out of that in the private operation, we are still ahead on the overall position.

In addition to this we must look at the other additional benefits which have accrued to Government. Let us look at the large amount of fees which are paid in landing fees which help to maintain our airports and help us to service the loan from Roberts Airport Terminal. Look at the permit fees which are paid. In addition the airline has to pay Customs to Government on the basis although it is a fairly small sum.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: (Interruption)

MR. JAMES M. BURKE: Sorry? Does the Member want a point of explanation? I will give it to him

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: No.

MR. JAMES M. BURKE: I thought he would like that. I'm sorry I did not understand what the Member said.

Mr. President, the value of Cayman Airways to our country is understood. I am hopeful that if the right steps are established it will be in nearly a profit position this year. Even so, Mr. President, we must be vigilant in order to continue on the moves which we make. The worst thing which could ever happen to Grand Cayman and the Cayman Islands would be for us to jeopardize our national carrier, just like our place in the market place to a foreign carrier, and then be subservients as we were in the days of LACSA.

The relationship, Mr. President, with LACSA was not a case of where we had 49 per cent as the majority shareholder and they had 51 per cent. It was the share of the money and the plane, and of the people of the Cayman Islands were the slaves. LACSA was the owners. We had people who were willing to give under that type of subjugation and hold it.

Another question arose, Mr. President, has been that Cayman Airways has enough fuel, as I indicated not a minute ago, to use borrowed money instead of private contribution.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT (CONTINUING): Mr. President, I commit all those who would attempt to hide from the people of this country the financial problems of tomorrow.

Our surplus balance at the end of October, 1969 stood at $661,000. At that point the Democrats were in excess of $30 million, and ever since this administration has been in power, in the months of November and December they have been in the surplus balance; they added about $9.5 million from the surplus revenue and General Revenues, and they have wound up with a deficit of $225,000. Really, Mr. President, what they have done to this is has cost the tax-payers of this country for those two presidents to keep the pendulum in office, over $1 billion a month. When we have come to the point where another attempt has been made to further deplete the General Revenues by asking for one-hour $2.5 billion this week to balance the budget. In just four and a half months since the election the present Administration Cabinet will have used up from General Revenues nearly $6.5 billion. So they have sought then the Democratic Senate Finance Member of Democratic Council proposed his submission to this purpose and said that the country was broke. It was not broke at that time, but it is beginning to get badly sore now, I have that he was very sensitive with his remarks but we really need a whip board to work on that way.

Mr. President, the future of our country looks bleak. It looks dark and depressing. These proposals a good politician game to try to accomplish the Ohio Valley coal miners from the House. However, we are prepared to help the people of this country here in spite of all our political differences the country must come first. The people put forward this fiscal budget, but we are prepared to offer ideas and work together with them for the benefit of the people. However, we are not prepared to be in a position of master and slave. We ask for the sensible thrift policies in our country and restore sanity to our system.

There is one particular person in Democratic Council whom I have to pray for, and that is the Democratic Secretary, because I think he has done a terrific job for Government and I know that he has the country at heart. I only hope that he has a very difficult task having to deal with these elected Members every day. I pray that God will give him the strength to carry him on having such a heavy load. (Interruption - Laughter) I want to have that to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to awaken him? (Laughter)

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: No, I am leaving that for the Second Elected Member of most day I do, Sir.

MR. W. ROBERT BOSI: Do you want me to speak now, or when?

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: No, no, not yet.

Mr. Speaker, I have finished the business for a very long time and I am pleased that I was able to do so because in my opinion it was important that someone about the other side of this picture. We should not be looking through the looking-glass just really our eyes on one side. Every argument has two sides. This has not been explained often because the true picture was not being presented to the people of this country.

MR. MIKE H. HOUSTON (HOUSTINGHAM): I think I have covered all matters which were in the Budget Address, the Hansard speech and the proposed powers for this year.

I hope that God will bless us all and that we can make out into a Budget which will be hotly debated by Members. I am only pointing out to the Members of the House and the people at large that there is a terrible problem and that we have a Withdrawal Budget before us, a Budget which has not been properly thought out. We must look for black and black times ahead of us unless a radical change is made in the direction of the present Elected Executive Council.

Mr. President, what I have said is not idle talk. It is the actual picture. Instead of looking at it emotionally I hope the Members of the Elected Executive Council will deal with it in a proper manner and will look at the suggestions which I have made and which are being made by the Unity Team representatives, and consider how they can best be used.

I thank you, Mr. President, for your tolerance and I thank the Members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder whether before I invite any other Member to speak it may be convenient to take the afternoon break now, rather than assert a speech and have to go for five minutes. So I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 2.33 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3.50 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. Continuation of the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1985. Does another Member wish to speak? The Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. CHARLES E. KENDALL: Mr. President, I would like to congratulate you and express my appreciation for your remarks and information thereon. I also wish to thank the Honourable Financial Secretary, the Honourable Third Official Member of this House for presenting such a detailed account of all financial activities within Government. These presentations were capably delivered and they provide important directions for the deliberations of this Honourable House.

Mr. Speaker, I will try to follow your example and be brief as possible. I remember well a saying of the Second Elected Member of Bodden Town, the late Sir Vassel Johnson Honourable House some years ago that the mind can only absorb what the bottom can endure. Mr. President, I realize that saying. However has reached that endurance point and I will not perform it too much. It is a pity that the previous speaker has failed to follow the words of wisdom spoken by his colleague.

MOW. SAINT-CHARLES (Translation): Mr. President, Mr. President, we believe we and the people have made their choice. Although a few members do not like the results they must try to learn and live with it for the next four years.

Mr. President, the First Elected Member for Riviere Rose said in his debate that the people are giving buckets of tears because of the decision in which they find themselves today. This might well be so, Mr. President, but he has not mentioned the reason why. If they are indeed crying buckets of tears it is because they are finding out more and more the economic problems the last administration has caused or to the present administration, and which are now coming to light.

I remember very well the day we talked to the faces of the people after the election, and people remarked on the accompaniment I used. Before the election they were afraid to voice their feelings for fear of victimization. Today, Mr. President, they are talking openly and freely. I have been talking with citizens of every and still receive congratulations and good wishes for the task ahead. People are happy and there is no doubt about it, Mr. President, a lot of good has been made by the opposition to this House about the ample opportunity to sustain fees which this Government has introduced. Increasing fees is nothing new and I would like to remind the opposition that their administration also raised revenue by increasing user fees in order to balance their budget on several occasions.

Mr. President, I have been listening very carefully to the debate, and I am alarmed at some of the misleading statements which have been made. I have not to talk myself if I was hearing correctly. I believe that the knowledgeable leaders of the last Government would have told the people the true financial position in which they left our Island on the 16th November, 1982. I also expected them to account for their past deeds and to ask the people to forgive them for their poor mis-management over the past two years in particular. Instead, Mr. President, I have heard nothing but wild and unfounded statements in an attempt to justify their reckless and disastrous financial policies which have brought our country to the brink of disaster. It is quite clear that they cannot explain or defend their position. In order to divert attention away from the fiasco and penalties they have to foreseen, they have resorted to criticizing the present administration which has only had three months, not five months as the leader said, in office.

The measure which this debate has made clear to us is that we have never taught people here what words mean. It is not the politics of the people who elected them, but rather their own personal welfare.

Mr. President, the budget before this Honourable House has been made up from the crumbs left over from the last administration. We were presented with a meagre which showed a deficit of $17 million. There was no way we could keep such a budget in this Honourable House. Such cut expenditures could be realized no further as had no choice but to bring in new measures which would balance the budget.

Mr. President, this budget is proof of the concern of the people of our Islands about the ever financial position in which the Irish Town Government has put us today. I promise that our Government will do its utmost to remedy this mess, and that when the financial problems improve, which I am confident that they will, measures will be taken to relieve our people to the possible way and to reduce the cost of living charges and wherever we can.

MR. CARL STAPLES (CONTINUING): Mr. President, when a person is unable to manage his own financial affairs successfully, how can that person be expected to run the affairs of our country successfully. I pose that question, Mr. President.

The estimates also show that the Utility Fuels Development brought forward a surplus from 1982 of $1,600,995 and ended up with a deficit of $968,577, a total of $2,569,572. The Utility Fuels took its cash of $6,112,616 from General Revenue. The total funds used by them were $8,670,187 in Estimates Third Budget.

In Estimates This 1983 Budget we will have to have the sum of $2,288,000 from General Revenue. Mr. President, we are taking $2,188,000 back from General Revenue that the Utility Fuels did in 1984. Thus, Mr. President, these projects themselves and will pass on the people that we are spending their money wisely.

Mr. President, much has been said about the Revenues of this country. I am taking the Financial Secretary's Budget Address and I find that on the 4th January, 1983, the Revenues stood at $210.7 million. Estimates carried for 1983 was 81 million but when these amounts are added together we have $11.1 million. A sum of $9.4 million is for specific appropriations for 1984, and this was the Utility Fuels Development, was taken from General Revenue leaving a balance of $7.7 million. The balance brought forward to 1984 is therefore $7.7 million, of which Government has agreed with Provident Bank to leave the present fiscal deposit plus revenue earned for 1983 with them. The reason for this arrangement is to ensure Barbados that there will be $6.6 million to purchase the Power Buildings as agreed. That means, Mr. President, that we have an unappropriated balance of $1.1 million in Revenue.

If we have to take the $2.2 million to balance the 1984 Budget, we will only have a balance of approximately $800,000. Now, Mr. President, I am not making much the balance of accounts as shown on Government's books. I am dealing with the actual cash available for expenditure. I am afraid, Mr. President, that we as Social Democrats on this side of the House will have to use the financial reserves on the other side of the House for some good help, because we cannot have $2 million when there is only $1 million left.

Furthermore, Mr. President, where is the money coming from to pay off the millions of dollars which Cabinet already owes. I am right that it will not be long before Government will be called on again to make good some of its overdrafts.

Mr. President, the people have heard for themselves the Manifesto on which the Utility Fuels Development would have taken this country and they have welcomed us power. The people, Mr. President, would not appreciate gloom and depression. They would not be fooled again and continuation.

I do not believe that any sound thinking Barbadian would agree us to follow their advice because the country would be driven hard and fast on the way of Bankruptcy. The more one examines and studies the financial condition of this country today, the more evidence one finds of the Utility Fuels Development and mis-management over the past ten years or somewhere. From 1976 to 1981 the Government of the so called Utility Fuels that took for the country. I am one of the first people to admit it. However, Mr. President, like a car which gave a good deal of trouble, they worked to scrap and after that they have scrapped and created Government funds, and it has put us in a financial bind.

SAS-CAPT. CHARLES E. KIRKPATRICK (CONTINUING): If anything was to stop any new constructions and plans of Cayman Airways, we would be in some difficulty today. The main reason for this security is the unbelievable manner in which the affairs of Cayman Airways in particular have been conducted.

In May, 1982 the Government paid off the indebtedness of the airline and also for the one BAC 1-11 aircraft, on the 2nd November, 1982, the same year, the Hon. Financial Member of Cayman Islands also was then responsible for the airport, announced that Cayman Airways had acquired two 737-200 aircrafts to replace the two BAC 1-11s. This was at a cost of U.S. 9 million. We were told that the replacement of aircrafts would enable the airline to become a viable operation. We now have the facts in our possession and find that the two 737-200 aircrafts have substantially increased the losses by an alarming amount. It is approaching $3 million of the new earnings just simply plus Government's injection of millions of dollars a year to keep it flying. This cannot be allowed to continue affecting the Treasury.

Steps have already been taken to reduce expenditure, but it is doubtful that the present aircraft will ever break even because they are too expensive to operate. Perhaps the Member who was responsible for the airplane now realizes that the two BAC 1-11 aircrafts were not the answer for the losses sustained by it, and that the 737-200 aircrafts, although desirable, are too costly to operate on the routes we fly and the usage we have for them.

Some of the statements made during this Session show the lack of responsibility among the Duty Free Members, which cost them dearly in the last election. The financial problems which we have today were created by them. They are fond of saying that when they took over the Government there was no money in the Treasury, but they never mention that they found no Government liabilities either. Today the situation is much different. We have inherited many financial problems, the principal of which is Cayman Airways' disastrous financial position which concerns daily.

This is the present Government's task to investigate and the affairs of Cayman Airways before it sinks the country. For years they have misled the public on the financial position of Cayman Airways, withholding accounts and other information. When we asked questions in this House we were told that we would get them in due course. When asked what the reason was the reply was "the course of the country". Now Mr. Speaker, they will be getting the same problem, believe you me.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town while he was the Member responsible for Tourism Aviation and Trade, stood on the floor of this Honourable House a year ago, and declared that he would keep the airline flying if it took the last penny in the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, that statement is nothing else but a reflection of what has caused the present situation of this country. The former Government had the priorities wrong. Because, lack of self respect, would keep that on sinking is detestable like as what prevails, Mr. Speaker. If we spend every penny and the last penny on the airlines or any other items we may think that we need, I can you how will we provide medical care for our people, educate our youth or develop our social services. With what will we pay the Civil Service and maintain the business of Government. With what will we provide the many needs and amenities our people want and need in this country?

I have said before and I repeat, Government of itself has nothing. Before it can provide something for the people it must first raise the money from them to pay for it.

DOR.CAPT.CHARLES D.KIMBROUGH (CONTINUING): There is no such delay in this country as a veto upon a specific section of the republic, or upon the less fortunate or wealth ones, or the back ward during their meeting in opposition Members. This kind of talk, Mr. President, is nothing but political phrases. It can serve no purpose but to cause the needs of discontent among our people. All based are ultimately borne by the consumer whether that consumer be rich or poor, and this Government is conscious of that fact.

The money derived from these taxes we used to pay for the services which the people want and demand, that is providing there is a responsible and a responsive Government. However, a Government cannot be held to be responsible when its leader declares that it will use the last penny in the treasury to keep income taxes flying while other needs and necessities go unheeded. Mr. President, saying it was not enough. They almost did it, and that is the end of the whole procedure. We still do not own a single bolt and the entire personnel is increasing daily.

In recent years the Government has been much further removed the duty from some items. Let me tell you how this was done. When they took off the duty from chicken and potatoes, Brinkley plays a package of a few pennies on these items, they then turned around and theoretically decreased the freight rates on airline cargo, thus enabling us the kind of food on every plane brought duty free country by air. In spite of a reduction in the consumers, these prices have risen. This is what I call politicial phrases, Mr. President, political phrases which cannot only be deceive the people and to mislead them. This Government needs revenue and so we must tell the people so, and tell them why. It is nothing but sheer deception for Government to make people who are living off a few pennies of duty on one or two items and then to take from the dollars somewhere else.

Mr. President, this Government intends to tell the people the truth at all times. We feel that they are entitled to know the facts. If there is no money they must know it. If there are funds to be paid they must know it. If there are new programs which will cost money, they must know it.

Mr. President, the people have elected us to run the business of Government, their business for them and we shall not take away or will take the drink of the minorities.

Much has been said in this Session about the sick and the poor. How are these sick and who are the poor? By what standards and what norms are we identifying them? Last we left some that which as many other developing countries have fallen into we should seriously consider that question also, as well as the question of what we can a Government in these Islands can do to alleviate the plight of the less fortunate.

Over 3,000 years ago our Lord Jesus, the greatest teacher of all time addressed himself to this problem which has stayed with us from the beginning of time, and will continue as be predicted until the end of time. I cannot answer all the problems in which he mentions the poverty and sickness around a few minutes. We must not handle the sick and the blind, and discussing the lepers, giving them all an equal chance to go out and help themselves. We as a democratic Government are not supposed to support the people as the Communists nations. Our role is to provide a good educational system and a good and proper health care system for our people, also seek to maintain a society in which there are jobs and opportunities for everyone to make a decent living.

GOVERNMENT CHANGES & ECONOMIC RESPONSIBILITY: It seems nonsense to preside these things, Mr. President, but previously the money we collected was the end of it. There is an old and true saying. It is not what one has, but how one makes it that counts. A lot of nonsense has been published and spoken during the last term. The people have dismissed with the nonsense provided, and made their dissatisfaction known on 18th November, 1964. Now, just three months later, we find the leaders of that Government putting themselves forward as the champions of the poor as they call it. Mr. President, they spent eight years in office, millions of dollars and a lot of time talking about the poor. But they did nothing or very little to alleviate their plight. All they did was talk, talk, talk as they are doing now.

Mr. President, the old people will not be shown... Some time ago it was announced that the Hon. Finance for Sedom Town, the leaders of the opposition, said at a public meeting that they had made the money in the Treasury last they would spend it as they saw fit. That was not a responsible attitude, Mr. President. As I said before, it was that attitude which is the direct cause of our present financial difficulties. I cannot go to my business and spend ten shillings carelessly. The money is not mine. It belongs to the business and it can only be spent as the Government see fit, by the Parliament of the Dominion Nations, to pay the staff, to replace the stock, to meet overheads such as electricity and phone bills, and so on. Mind would my business be, Mr. President, if every time a dollar appeared, I grabbed it and said that I had made it and I would spend it as I saw fit? I tell you where it would be. It would be where this Government was on 18th November, 1964 and where the opposition would like to see it again.

I see, Mr. President, would like to see our country free from poverty, free from disease, free from ignorance, free from suffering, and most of all free from ignorance. However, we cannot accomplish this by taking increases or spending every penny in the Treasury to keep the electors happy. It requires hard, hard and sensible planning.

I am not for opposition. Opposition is good. However, it must be responsible opposition. Can it be called responsible, Mr. President, for elected members of this Assembly to walk in while an appeal is being by trying to maintain the people here believing that Government is going to oppose them?

This Government was elected in the 18th November, 1964, because the people wanted a change from the irresponsible and wasteful policies of the former Government. Mr. President, we intend to provide that change so whether the opposition votes for it or not it matters not. If so the end of our four years of responsibility the people feel differently, they will do to this administration just what they did to the party from that Government sat out.

Mr. President, we believe the people are reasonable people. We believe that they are capable of viewing the situation and understanding it when they are given the facts. I believe that it is for us to endeavour and re-examine the programmes of those Islands from both the short range and long range points of view. We should not merely attempt to consider the way other countries are progressed. We should develop policies designed to meet our own peculiar problems in the light of past experience.

We have a few years from now, that a good economy and a good life for our children which only results from plans which maintain our political stability and enhance our financial position.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL (OPPOSITION): Our future will be secure only if we construct economical and efficient telephone systems. Mr. Speaker, the second greatest asset of this administration is the value of our civil service. It must be kept in mind keeping in mind the need to commit unnecessary expenditures. The staff increases the recurrent expenditure considerably. Other recurrent expenditure for the year 1980 is $146,883,095 which is 75.2 per cent of our total revenue. If the administrative expenditure of $3,589,252 is added it will take all but one cent of the total revenue of this country to run it.

Mr. Speaker, all of us should be concerned knowing that it has taken such a large percentage of our revenue to keep the wheels of Government turning. I therefore that we have reached a danger point and we must thoroughly examine and take immediate action now while we still have time. Employment in the private sector must be stimulated. I refer in particular to the areas of tourism and banking where we need to develop local expertise.

It should be noted that last year 693 persons were directly employed in Banking, and 75 per cent of these were Caymanians. Bearing in mind the enormous revenues from tourism we must cultivate the positive attitude of our people towards visitors. We must promote our tourism and take maximum advantage effectively, using discretion when necessary.

I believe the collection of duty outstanding system still needs us in this respect.

We must continue to cooperate fully with countries and Governments fighting the drug problem which has serious international implications threatening our free society. We are reminded one of the Caribbean nations for this vicious evil and we must do all we can to prevent the involvement of Caymanians. If left unchecked the drug traffic could cause us to lose all that we and our forefathers fought so hard to achieve. We must make every effort to rid our islands of this evil menace which will destroy our children and bring this country to its knees. Mr. Speaker, I pledge my full support to assist in eradicating drugs in our islands.

Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, Mr. Speaker, as has been stated in Her Excellency Speech has most of the infrastructure necessary to accommodate development now complete on Cayman Brac. When the new terminal building at Gerrard Smith Airport now been completed and the road through the Bluff, I am sure that we will witness developments to help us to expand our economy and to provide employment for our people.

Since the beginning of the new year we have had several travellers of cruise ship at Cayman Brac, and I have been informed that the prospects of getting additional businesses are good. The re-introduction of the jet service to Cayman Brac on the 21st September, 1988, has had a stimulating effect on our tourist industry, and we are getting more visitors on a regular.

On the 8th February, this year Cable and Wireless Bahamas Ltd. officially commenced cable system into operation at Cayman Brac. This new system will provide high quality telephone, telex, data transmission and the internet to Cayman Brac. It means that a new era in the history of telecommunications has become a reality for the people of Cayman Brac and they will now enjoy a first class service.

We hope to start work on the construction of the Bluff road as soon as the funds have been approved by the Finance Committee.

NEW EAST CAYMAN DEVELOPMENTS (CONTINUED): A tender for the new terminal building will soon be placed, and when complete will be submitted to the European Development Fund representative for final approval. It is hoped that work on this project will start in the second half of 1976. At the First Elected Session for Cayman Brac said he was aware the old terminal building will have to be removed in order to comply with International requirements relating to airfields before it can be classed as an international airport.

Mr. Speaker, I have to a previous agreement with the people of Cayman Brac. The Government is aware of the hardship that the people in the Sister Islands have had to pay in port rent duty on excess freight charges levied by the existing sea shipping companies on cargo going there. This is not a just position and I am confident that my colleagues in Executive Council will agree to the removal of this anomaly.

As stated in the budget Address the Sister Authority is aware of the supply of potable water in Cayman Brac and plans are being formulated to provide an emergency supply this year.

The capital projects have been reviewed and it is hoped that work will be available to carry out other needed projects as the financial position improves.

I explained that the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman proposed that support be given to carry out a further study of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. In this regard the First Elected Member for Bodden Town said that as they say Cayman Brac and Little Cayman might be the future hope of the Cayman Islands. This is one of the few constructive remarks which he has made in his long-repetitious debate. Mr Speaker, I recognized that the sister Islands had great potential years ago, and it was for this reason that I persuaded the 1970 to 1972 administration to place priority on the infrastructure of Cayman Brac. I was then the Member responsible for Communications Works and Planning administration, and both of the sister Islands took great strides, particularly Cayman Brac.

During this period a new civic centre was built and opened. The Radio Service was expanded with funds which were received from Cayman energy, and Government also put in a substantial amount of money to bring up the grade of the hospital. New X-ray equipment and a new refrigerator were also added.

A postage stamp was purchased and postage collection was started for the first time on the 1st July, 1975.

A new warehouse was built at the Creek which was the first phase in the development of a port facility for Cayman Brac.

In 1975 the Government decided to send a delegation to the Caribbean Development Bank in Barbados for the purpose of seeking loan funds for capital projects. The Financial Secretary, and the Chief Engineer of the day and myself were the delegates. Our visit was successful and funds were approved for the new dock, the Bluff road and also for the Gerrard Smith Airport.

The new administration building was started in 1975 but was not completed until 1978. Plans were approved to have the Public Works Department at the present site although it was not completed until 1979.

MR. CAPT. CHARLES A. KNOTTENBELT (CONTINUED): Mr. President, the reason I have mentioned the difference developments is to show the Members of this Honourable House and the public how far the Minister Elected Member for Rodney Bay will go to distort the true facts and mislead the people. We know just well who the driving force was behind the development of Cypress Lane and Little Cypress, but he fails to give full credit to his Unity Labour Movement colleagues. Mr. President, a drowning man will grasp at a straw. I fail to see what political mileage he hopes to get now. The elections were over four years on the 14th November when he and his Unity Team Colleagues were soundly trounced and put out of office. Instead of accepting his defeat in a gracious and statesmanlike manner, he was acted like a child who has, and I quote, "had his cookie taken".

Mr. President, I will turn to the Rural Authority. The Rural Authority provided four markets and started to provide permanent entrepot for produce sales. There are plans to construct three of these recently at Dennery South and the other at Mont Sec. The decision to construct the recently at Mont Sec was made by the corporation but facing unprecedented or corrosion type in Soufriere town. In addition, the drainage at Mont Sec is a constantly used efforts drive pretreatment and safety. It will also help the economy at Mont Sec and should bring more tourist dollars to that district. I would like similar to the one at Soufriere will have to be built when we have found a suitable site. It is hoped that the pretreatment entrance will be constructed during the third quarter of 1985.

Mr. President, the four Elected Members of Executive Council visited all the districts with their Principal Secretaries and the Chief Engineer of Public Works Department.

The capital road programme will be carried out in accordance with the wishes of the Members of the Legislative Assembly in each District.

I have noted the comments of the Elected Member for South West with regard to the need for a permanent and maintenance person to care for the public buildings in his district. I assure the Member that this matter will be given my consideration.

Mr. President, the Hon. Financial Member for Soufriere Town said that developers were waiting for a permit from the Government to grow tea. Mr. President, we have given that permit. In November, 1984 we repealed the Development and Planning, Investment Law, 1982, which compelled them to pay a fee of $3,500 per unit to consultants before they even started. We have also spoken to the developers of the Jalousie Hill Resort and we have been assisting them in every way. They are hoping to start construction of their resort project in May. They told us that they will employ between 300 and 350 construction workers, which means that they will need every construction man they can get.

There are other projects which have been approved and may materialise are being considered as well. Mr. President, the future outlook for our Nation is bright and I feel confident that we are on the threshold of a new era in our development. I am sure that this will prove my confidence and that 1985 will be a prosperous year for all Saintonians.

To sum up my response to the Budget Address of the Financial Secretary, I would like to underscore the need for financial restraint. With increasing budget expenditure it has been necessary to curtail a substantial number of projects and services where possible capital expenditure and new services.

MR. CARL CHARLES [LIBERAL]: We also have to acknowledge that because necessary, but we must bear in mind that revenue necessary must not mike us lose our competitive edge in comparison with other offshore financial centres.

I believe that the measures which we have taken are inevitable, while preserving our economic base. I believe that the Cayman Islands will continue to prosper if we promote our country the way we have been advantageously.

We have an enviable heritage to preserve and if we act responsibly and wisely we will continue to enjoy our prosperity in the future.

Mr. President, I support a Bill for a Law to appropriate certain expenditures for the purposes of the financial year, 1992.

I thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: There are just five minutes until we would normally adjourn. What may be useful is for me to invite any Member to comment on a private. Is anyone else who is not speaking now I should be quite ready to invite the Honourable First Official Member to move the adjournment. Let us just give them a moment to decide. I think we have nobody else wish to speak.

Would the Honourable First Official Member like to move the adjournment then.

ADJOURNMENT

FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. IT IS SO ORDERED THAT THE HOUSE ADJOURNS UNTIL 10.00 A.M., WEDNESDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1992

STATE OPENING & BUDGET ADDRESS OF HIS (HER) EXCELLENCY

THE ADMINISTRATOR

(WEDNESDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1985)

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR C ROSS; LEGCO, CMC, CMC - SECRETARY

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS M ROSS, LCO,CMC,JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J BOWDLER, QC, LL.D	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C JEFFERSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON MERVYN D EVANS	MEMBER FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M MORGAN GOODEN, MBE	MEMBER FOR COUNTRY AFFAIRS AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES I MCDOWELL	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND PORTS ADMINISTRATION
HON TASSEL O JOHNSON, CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MCKEEVA BUSH	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MR EDMOND A PIERSON, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CHIEF MOSES E MCMCCOMBLE	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CAYMAN ISLANDS
MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR J BALE BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D HOWARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN D MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

WEDNESDAY

13TH MARCH, 1985

1. QUESTIONS

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BOSCOBEL TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 42) WILL THE HONOURABLE STATE MINISTER GOVERNMENT WHIP CONSIDER PRESENTING LEGISLATION TO THIS HONOURABLE HOUSE IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE TO INCORPORATE A HONORARY ALDERMANCY AWARD AT BECOMING THE CENTRAL BANK FOR THE COUNTRY?

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR MISSION TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE.

NO. 73) WILL THE HONOUR STATE MAY IT BE RECORDED TO REINSTATE THE PERSONS DISMISSED FROM GOVERNMENT SUPERVISORY POSITIONS WHEN CYCLONE ALFREDA LANDED AND HAS BEEN STATIONED AT LARGE ROADBLOCK ATTEMPT TO SAFEGUARD AGAINST ALLEGED ACTS LIABLE TO ENDANGER LIFE AND PROPERTY AS WELL AS TO CAUSE A LOSS OF REVENUE TO THE AIRLINE; WHETHER THESE REINSTATEMENT OF THESE FORMER POSITIONS WAS WITH FULL BACK-PAY, AND WHO TOOK THE DECISIONS?

4. CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT ON THE THRONE SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1985) BILL, 1985

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

NOTICE—

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(CONSIDERATION OF SECOND READING DEBATE)

REPLY BY THE HONOURABLE ACTING OFFICIAL MEMBER

COMMITTEE STAGE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

MINOR AMENDMENTS.

REPORT STAGE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(ii) FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(3) THE REPRESENTATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(4) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (ELECTORS ROLLS AND QUALIFICATIONS) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CERTIFICATE	I
CERTIFICATION OF DECISION ON THE TAKING EFFECT AND PERIOD OF OPERATION OF THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1965	
Mr. W. Mabenge Rook	27
Mr. D. Nuhu Bozdam	39
ADJOURNMENT	45

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Personal statements are resumed.
Questions. The First Elected Member for Roseau Town. Has the Member made arrangements for any colleague to ask the question standing in his name?

MR. G. MALIC SCOTT: Mr. President, I am prepared to ask the question.

HON. MICHAEL J. JAMES: Under Standing Order 9(5).

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, I thought so - I was looking hard for it. Thank you very much. I thought that there was such a provision. Very well, that will be in order.

Q U E S T I O N

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR ROSEAU TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT.

(On the absence of the First Elected Member for Roseau Town, the Second Elected Member for Roseau Town asked the question).

MR. AS: Will the Member state whether Government will consider presenting legislation to this Honourable House in the immediate future to institute a monetary authority aimed at boosting the Central Bank for the country?

ANSWER: There are currently no plans to introduce legislation to provide for the establishment of a Eastern Caribbean monetary authority or Central Bank.

As the House will be aware, legislation amending the Currency Law has been presented from time to time which unfortunately have dictated new currency and banking arrangements. Thus, the Currency Law (Revised) already provides for the Currency Board to carry out certain operations, more generally associated with a monetary authority, in addition to the normal function of the issue and redemption of currency. I refer specifically to the ability of the Board to accept foreign funds, and to make short-term advances to the local banks and to calculate a clearing house system. In addition, a major function of a monetary authority/Central Bank, namely the supervision of the banking sector, is carried out by a separate Government Department.

Government, advised by the Currency Board is constantly keeping under review the most viable to implement fully the existing powers of the Currency Board or to seek additional powers for a central monetary institution in order to meet the growing needs of the Islands. At present, no changes in the existing arrangements are considered necessary.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

DR. LLEWELYN A. FRANCIS: Supplementary, Mr. President. The question arised - would the Member consider presenting legislation - I wonder if he would advise the House, since there are no immediate plans for introducing a monetary authority, of his understanding of the functions of a monetary authority?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that I would like to see the first

MR. PRESIDENT (CONTINUING): ...answer before considering the supplementary.

Yes, I think that is a perfectly proper supplementary - it embodies one of part of the answer to the first question, so I will allow it.

HON. E.C. JESSEMAN: Mr. President, a monetary authority [illegible] a Currency Board and a Central Bank in concept and execution. It performs all the Currency Board functions and, indeed, the Currency Law would provide adequate basis for a small monetary authority.

MR. DAVID A. DABUA: Supplementary, Mr. President. The answer received was that a monetary authority would fall between the functions of a Currency Board and a Central Bank - would the Member state whether in his opinion he feels that we have developed to the stage where we should be looking into the development of a monetary authority for this country?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think, with respect, he could treat the answer to the original question, the last paragraph of the answer to the original question.

MR. EDWARD A. ASPREY: With respect, Mr. President, I think the final section of the answer - whether there are moves to introduce legislation to provide for the establishment of a monetary authority, so we would not have answer of my question, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the hon. gentleman agree whether he considers one necessary?

MR. EDWARD A. ASPREY: My supplementary question, Mr. President sir - In view of the commitment of our country, the answer we have been given, that it is felt that it is high time we should, in fact, be looking into the development of a monetary authority for the Cayman Islands, since he mentioned in answer to my supplementary that it does, in fact, fall between the functions of a Currency Board and a Central Bank.

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well. In my present view it has already been answered, but if the Member is not clear about the answer, I will allow the supplementary in order to enable the Chief Official Member to put the matter beyond any doubt.

MR. JAMES A. BODDEN: Mr. President.....

MR. PRESIDENT: No, the supplementary can be answered.

HON. E.C. JESSEMAN: Mr. President, I do not even know what the supplementary is.

To my view the powers of the Currency Board at the moment have not been fully exercised, therefore it would seem to me that to move from a position of a Currency Board where you use only maybe a few of the powers which it presently has, to a monetary authority, I think, Mr. President, would be a bit premature.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member for North Side.

MR. D. KENNETH BANKS: Could the Member advise, Sir, whether in

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] that if such a necessary authority were to become a source of great revenue for Government, it would not be essential to re-introduce exchange control but it [illegible] become so simple.

MR. [illegible]: Currently, as I understand, exchange control, banking supervision and matters relating to currency is what would be considered by either a monetary authority or a Central Bank. I do not think that at this present stage of our development that the moving on to establish a monetary authority is going to provide a great deal of income for the Cayman Islands Government.

I think, as I said in the answer, the monetary authority that should be [illegible] at any stage there would be the financial community [illegible] the fees and [illegible] some income, that we will go, but at the moment we see no need.

MR. [illegible] [illegible]: Supplementary, Mr. President. I note the question raised by the member from North Side until it appears to me somewhat redundant.

MR. D. [illegible]: Mr. President....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The Member can ask her questions with statements. You must just ask questions, supplementaries.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I am attempting to ask a supplementary. Perhaps if you would be a little tolerant I would, Sir. I had to make that point for me to make my supplementary.

My supplementary has to do with the answer the Third Official Member made regarding the [illegible] of the monetary authority. Without a monetary authority we have specialist on exchange control matters in this country, that is why I said it was redundant. My question is -- is it the intention [illegible] a monetary authority can not fully understood why a feasibility study has not really been undertaken by Government. May I explain why I made that statement, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. [illegible], you cannot go into long explanations. You have asked a question, it can be answered.

MR. [illegible]: My question, Sir, is it because....

MR. SPEAKER: You have asked already, you have asked your question, is it because.....why you have interrupted me. All right ask the question again because the Minister may have forgotten it now.

MR. [illegible]: Supplementary. Is it because the whole matter of a monetary authority is not fully understood by Government why a feasibility study has not yet been undertaken by Government?

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, the Government understands that a monetary authority is, that is why I am saying the answer, that I do not think it is necessary. We have looked at the experience from time to time using the facilities and expertise of the Bank of England, and as we all know, the Bank of England has been responsible, for many, many years in establishing Central banks

HON. F. C. PROCTOR (Continuing): ...in various countries of the world as well as monetary authorities. So we understand what a monetary authority is, Mr. President.

MR. LEONARD A. FIGARO: Supplementary, Mr. President. Is the Minister sure that a monetary authority's functions are other than exchange control functions?

HON. F. C. PROCTOR: Mr. President, as I indicated earlier, it is only one of the functions that a Central Bank or a monetary authority may find itself dealing with, and that is exchange control. In the Cayman Islands there is no exchange control, but in other parts of the world there are exchange control regulations in place. It also deals with the supervision of the banking system and the issuance of currency.

MR. C. RAYO ARCHER: May I ask the Minister what is the money supply now known to be inadequate to our times, would he look into the establishment of either a Central Bank or a monetary authority which would, more or less, replace the money supply.

MR. SPEAKER: That supplementary seems to me,...

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: I am asking if for that reason he would look into the establishment - it is very relevant, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: What is very relevant?

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: A supplementary question is very relevant to the answer.....

MR. SPEAKER: I am not saying the supplementary is irrelevant - all I was saying was the supplementary seems to me to contain a statement, or an expression of opinion, which may be out of order. You said the money supply.....

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Sir, I am simply asking if the Minister will look into the establishment of a monetary authority or a Central Bank so as to guarantee the smooth flow of the money supply, which, at this time, from the budget, has been shown to inadequate to the.....

MR. SPEAKER: It is that part of the question that seems to me to be out of order. If you think it is a question, not in an expression of opinion that the money supply seems to be out of order or something, then the question will be in order.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Then, Mr. President, I will put it this way - will the Minister look into the establishment of a monetary authority or a Central Bank so as to guarantee the smooth flow of the money supply.

HON. F. C. PROCTOR: That would be acceptable.

HON. T. C. MCCARTHY: Mr. President, the money supply - by that I take it, he is talking about the domestic money supply - is still quite small, and, as I indicated in the answer, we are monitoring the situation. Whenever it becomes necessary we will do something about it.

We are not against looking at it; we are basically saying that we are constantly monitoring the situation, so we are aware what the problem is and when we feel it is necessary we will take action having legislation to the House.

MR. TYRONE A. ELLERBE: A supplementary, Mr. President. In view of the expanded jurisdiction of a monetary authority, would the Member state whether he would be prepared to consider a feasibility study into the establishment of a monetary authority to determine whether such a body would be viable for this country?

MR. P. C. JAGGERNAUTH: Mr. President, the Government would take on at any time an examination.

MR. LINWOOD A. PETERKIN: Mr. President, I do not think this answers my question. What I really asked was would the Member be prepared to undertake a feasibility study to determine the viability of a monetary authority?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think he gave an answer - it may not have been an answer that satisfied him, but it was an answer.
The Member for North Side.

MR. D. ERROL STUART: Could the Member state, Sir, whether Government is not at this time satisfied with the present arrangement that the Currency Board and the Banking Inspection unit if it is not, in his view, performing the functions adequately?

MR. P. C. JAGGERNAUTH: Mr. President, it is my view, and I believe in the view of Government, we are satisfied with the Bank Inspection section of Finance and Development; we are also satisfied with the Currency Board operations at the present time.

MR. D. ERROL STUART: A further supplementary, Sir. Could the Member indicate whether he feels the private sector is being adequately served by the arrangements and whether they are satisfied with these arrangements?

MR. P. C. JAGGERNAUTH: Mr. President, as the Member responsible for the financial community of these Islands, I have never heard any statement by any member of the financial community that they are dissatisfied with the Bank Inspection section or the Currency Board's functions. Therefore, in the absence of this information and taking into account the positive side, where people have made statements that the Bank Inspection section is running smoothly and they are quite happy with it, namely, the Currency Board functions.

MR. LINWOOD A. PETERKIN: Mr. President, a supplementary. Could the Member state whether he is aware that apart from maintaining the private sector, that part of his responsibility is to advise this Government possible measures which internationally are accepted?

MR. P. C. JAGGERNAUTH: Yes, Mr. President, I am aware that the Financial Secretary's responsibility is to be the financial and economic adviser to this Government.

MR. LINWOOD A. PETERKIN: Mr. President, another supplementary. Would the Member state whether he is aware that the functions of a monetary authority would perhaps be to monitor the exchange control of currency i.e. to U.S. dollars?

MR. P. C. JAGGERNAUTH: Mr. President, it all depends on whether that be considered the appropriate thing to do at this particular time.

MR. LINWOOD A. PETERKIN: Mr. President I am not going to make a statement but would the Member state whether he is aware of the amount of money that is generated through this function alone that is not retained

MR. LAWSON A. PIERSON (CONTINUING): ... by the U. banks in this country?

MR. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. President, I am aware.

MR. LAWSON A. PIERSON: Mr. President, a further supplementary, in view of the Member's answer, would he advise whether he feels that such a provision would be beneficial to this country and would bring in a lot of added and needed revenue?

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, since we have a few minutes we have to take think about the commercial banks that are operating in Puerto Rico and the services that they are giving to the Commonwealth as well as to the domestic population, and while it may come that a panel would be appointed and the possibility of making huge sums of money through a monetary authority. It is a matter of Government's policy decision at the time. On that score, Mr. President, it takes more than me to make that policy.

MR. LAWSON A. PIERSON: What is the reason for a possibility study, Mr. President. Would the Member kindly whether he has or will done any possibility to determine the benefits that would accrue to Government since this function is not basically a function of a commercial bank

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, as I gave in the answer, the Treasury Board is monitoring the situation in the private sector. We have not done a financial analysis of how much the monetary authority would save should it go in this direction, but it is not something that would take us years to do, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member from North Side,

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, would the Member write the Bill or not the immediate past Government Stabilization Law Reform Act?

MR. [illegible]: I do not really think that is a relevant supplementary.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, may I ask the Member first upon the benefits taken would accrue to Government revenue-wise, does he also consider that the establishment of a Central Monetary Authority would also help in times of inflation to reduce the money supply and in times of recession, like the present time, to increase the money supply?

MR. PRESIDENT: I have called the Member to avoid expressions of opinion, and like the present time, might be considered an expression of opinion, but the part of the question is in order.

MR. [illegible]: Sen. Mr. President, but I was asking that as a statement of fact, not an opinion.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is somewhere a matter of opinion whether something is a fact or not, but let us have the supplementary please.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, the money supply in this country is very small, that is the domestic money supply, and it is a scientific point as to whether the monetary authority should be initiating a new possible monetary policy which puts all unnecessary money supply within the country and hopefully eliminates the economy started.

MR. LINWOOD A. HOLTON: Mr. President, a supplementary. Is the Member aware, Sir, that the functions of exchange rates fall out of the Bank of Canada and really should be conducted through the Government's monetary authority or similar organization?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is an expression of opinion also, and if you would like to rephrase the supplementary slightly differently without expressing opinions.....

MR. LINWOOD A. HOLTON: Mr. Speaker, could the Member state whether or not he is aware that the functions of a monetary authority may entail the control of exchange rates that is not being considered by the A Bank?

HON. T.C. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, sometimes I think we are dealing with a Central Bank type, and not just a monetary authority, because a Central Bank is a different institution altogether from what we are talking about, namely Board and monetary authority. It is not like a reserve Board, a currency Board is dealing with currency on a parity basis and it has a fixed parity. If we get on to Central Banks we are talking about something totally different, not fixed parity at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The original question did mention a Central Bank, so I think it is perfectly in order for a supplementary to inquire about Central Bank.

MR. LINWOOD A. HOLTON: Mr. Speaker, if I may enlighten the Member, the currency Board is the embryonic stage for a monetary authority which then progresses into a Central Bank, so I think it is important for us to know the exact relationship.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. That does not appear to have been a question, certainly, that was.....

MR. LINWOOD A. HOLTON: I could that I was trying to enlighten the Member on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.....

HON. T.C. DOUGLAS: Mr. Speaker, this Member needs more enlightenment about Currency Board movement to Central Banks and the help was provided on monetary authorities.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Member was enlightening the remainder of the House.

I think that..... Well, the Member from Leaf Rapids, then I think we have almost exhausted the possibilities of this topic.

MR. D. STANLEY KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, before we get a long way to go, could the Member state, Sir, if, in his view, this step towards a monetary authority at this time may not be a necessary groundwork for necessary and early legislation in the Interests and steps in our Government?

HON. T.C. DOUGLAS: Any such proposal would naturally have an educational function, whether we call it a currency Board or whether we call it a monetary authority. There will be need to employ staff to carry out these functions.

Now, the answer just is hypothetical, Mr. Speaker, if we do not know exactly what functions we are going to carry out as a monetary authority, to employ staff about how much might we are going to have. But certainly it was said in the broad nature of which this is done in the

HON. D. D. CAMPBELL (Communications): woman, which is very small indeed.

MR. LINDSAY A. BODDEN: Mr.President, this will be my last supplementary, Sir. On the question of homosexuality, Sir, I wonder if the Member can advise the House how he would be able to determine whether the functions of a monitoring authority would benefit this country or not if a feasibility study has not yet been undertaken to determine the viability?

SEN.D.C.CAMPBELL: Mr.President, we have gotten away from the idea of a feasibility study. We are constantly monitoring the situation, we are aware of what the situation is. If we are to do a further study it is also the publication of the monitoring that we have already done and are constantly doing.

MR.SPEAKER: I think we could move to the next question. It is agreed that the First Elected Member of Sudden Rock.

MR.G.HALL ROBERTS: Yes, Mr.Speaker. With your permission I will ask the question. This question is directed to the Second Elected Member responsible for Tourism, Aviation and Trade. It reads -

QUESTION NO.63: Will the Member state why it was decided to reinstate the persons dismissed from management supervisory positions with Cayman Airways Limited who had been entitled at that date to repayment of redundancy payments which they had to be given a loss of seniority to the airline, whether their reinstatements to their former positions will result in any financial loss to Cayman Airways Limited and why took the decision?

ANSWER: This is a matter for the day-to-day management of Cayman Airways Limited for which I am not responsible.

MR.G.HALL ROBERTS: Mr.Speaker, may I ask the Member if Cayman Airways is owned by the Government?

HON.K.BODDEN ROBERTS: Mr.Speaker, with respect, I think the Member seeking that question is fully aware, but does it be owned by the Government of the Cayman Islands.

MR.LINDSAY A.BODDEN: Mr.Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Member advise this House whether or not the Member's Ministerial responsibility as Member of the Executive is in any way the reason for this question?

HON.K.BODDEN ROBERTS: The answer to that is no. As the Member responsible for Tourism, Aviation and Trade, Cayman Airways falls under my portfolio. Because I am responsible for the airline, the day-to-day management of Cayman Airways does not concern me as far as I am a Ministry Member and it has a Board which the responsibilities have been vested to run the airline.

MR.G.HALL ROBERTS: Mr.Speaker, may I ask the Member if he is aware that under the circumstances there is an obligation to answer supplementary questions or enquiries which arise under his answer?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I think that really you should ask me what the answer is on Standing Orders.

MR. RALPH BOSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to section 2 of the Constitution, with delegated responsibility to Director Services of Executive Council.

MR. SPEAKER: Can the Member tell me what part of section 2 of the Constitution requires Members to have responsibility has been delegated to answer parliamentary questions?

MR. RALPH BOSSON: I think it is 2(2). Sir, but let me be sure.

MR. SPEAKER: Not on my reading, 2 (2) requires them to support in the Legislature decisions any matter decided upon in Council, it does not mention parliamentary questions.

As far as Standing Orders are concerned, our Standing Orders provide that I cannot disallow quite the particular one, but I think it is Standing Order 9(1) that if no Standing Order explicitly covers a particular matter, we shall be guided by the usage and practice of the House of Commons, and the practice and ways in the United Kingdom is that United Kingdom Ministers do not answer questions about supposedly management of nationalised industries in the United Kingdom, of the Chairman, British Airways or the Capital or the Steel Industry, nor it would be inconsistent with that practice for the Minister concerned - the relevant part of Erskine May's words that -

"Ministerial Responsibility has refused, on grounds of public policy, to answer questions seeking information on the day-to-day administration of the Undertakings,

that is in relation to U.K. Ministers and nationalised industries in the United Kingdom, and in my view Cayman Airways is in precisely similar position to a United Kingdom nationalised industry.

MR. LEONARD J. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of clarity should be then assume, Mr. Chief of the Fire Dept. Cayman Airways is the Member responsible Council as the Minister responsible for Cayman Airways is in the Department similar to what you just referred to?

MR. SPEAKER: That was the view I was expressing that Cayman Airways, being now Minister responsible Council, is in a similar position to a nationalised industry in the United Kingdom, such as British Airways, Rank Xerox Ltd, Electricity and so on. Our Standing Orders provide that unless the Standing Orders themselves say that something different, we shall be guided by the practice and ways of the House of Commons.

Erskine May, from which I quoted, explaining what the practice of the House of Commons, in relation to questions about the day-to-day administration of nationalised industries has been, and I was simply saying that it seemed to me that the Member was following the United Kingdom practice in that the Standing Orders provide for United Kingdom practice to be followed and that therefore the Member was, in my general view, right in order in refusing to answer the question.

MR. LEONARD J. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, on a further point of clarity, should the House then consider that the Honourable Minister Cayman Airways' operation will not be brought to this honourable House?

MR. [illegible]: I think it be question of determining what is a matter of day-to-day management and what is a matter of significant policy and I would suggest that the Member concerned might request policy issues or matters of day-to-day administration. I would certainly be reluctant that matters of day-to-day administration can be used to obtain information that is not to be disclosed in the House of Commons. In the distinction between matters of day-to-day administration and matters of policy. Sometimes the distinction may not be easy to draw - there may be a borderline case where there is a slightly grey area.

MR. JOHN G. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to come that.....

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Mount Scio rise first, I will call you afterwards, if I may.

MR. RICHARD HISCOCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the Member stating that it is the view and theorize policy of the presentation of the new Government to refuse any policy-oriented questions or answers without consultation in the day-to-day management?

MR. F. MORGAN POWER: I would say yes, to that Mr. Speaker without any prejudice or the day-to-day management of the company or my position.

MR. [illegible]: The Member for Bonavista North.

MR. JOHN G. REID: Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a new policy. If the next supplementary, Sir, but other Members have directed questions to you - I am sensitive, Sir, that if we succeed the Premise of this Government we could place a different emphasis on this matter of, perhaps, Crown Liaison, because I do not think that there is another area the Government that has been questioned more on the floor of this Assembly House, on day-to-day management and matters. It seems strange to us that today we are going to have, as from a few days ago with another question, that we were not allowed to go any further with the day-to-day management. I disagree with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The manner of answers is entrusted to his mind, but frankly, as does arise in my mind I have heard on many occasions in the past, and I am speaking of the time when the previous Government was in power, the Member responsible for Tourism, Culture and Trade and at that stage responsible also for Crown Lands, always declined to answer questions about Crown Lands or answer them in the event a decision that is was going to be made but we are not going to provide information about decisions contemplated which is. I am not sure that we have specifically quoted the previous decisions in Speaker's Rulings. I have studied them, and I quoted them because a Member was seeking whether the Member for Labrador, Minister and Trade has a responsibility duty to answer, and it seems to me that is the place, as Presiding Officer, to rule in the House what the requirements of our Standing Orders are, and that is what I was trying to do.

That that ruling, all I can do is explain to you again the manner what Standing Orders purports, is to that for all Ministers' duties will be living taken a precaution to decide whether he will answer it or not. If you will remember, what I read out from

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUED): Speaking only for myself, that suggestion would have merit on grounds of public policy in answer questions and so on, but not the Speaker who to anticipate a question may not be correct or a question may not be answered, it is the Government of the day that is saying what its policy is to decline to answer questions of a certain kind. All I am saying, in trying to explain to the House why I have not accepted this point of order is that that is how it has been adopted in the United Kingdom, according to Erskine May and because our Standing Orders provide that Ministerial practice is followed.

MR. EDWARD A. BYRNE: Mr. Speaker, I fully understand your explanation on Erskine May's. My question is here, Sir, for my future guidance and I am sure for the guidance of any other Member in the House - can we be assured that in future we will not get answers to similar questions because it is my understanding, Sir, that a subject of Cyprus affairs falls under the responsibility of the Second Elected Member in Executive Council and it is his ultimate responsibility of the Department.

Now it could be that he does not plan to deal with the day-to-day running, but I would just like to have for future guidance whether we can expect to get answers on similar questions.

HON. W. NORMAN ZEROUKI: Mr. President, this is not the answer to a question, but before everybody is allowed a statement, I would like to make a statement as well.

I see my position as the Member responsible for Labour, Education and Trade as you have quite rightly put it previously, responsible for policy matters, and I will be prepared to answer questions in relation to policy matters of the company, however I would point out that in the past four years this line of questioning and answering in connection with the day-to-day management of Cyprus Airways has been accepted by this House before. Normally, it appears to me that when the opposition receives this type of answer and it is better than it is accepted, but when it is not what they want to hear, then they need a little further. I am standing on principle, Sir.

HON. G. SAID TO SPEAKER: Mr. President, will the Member give us the assurance that he will seek your permission to allow him to answer these questions about Cyprus Airways, in the future, should the Royal Prerogative, perceived, you have the right to give to him any instructions that you may find necessary, and give the assurance to the Legislative Assembly all questions concerning Cyprus Airways?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that supplementary is out of order on the grounds that it is hypothetical, because it presumes that the Government will be giving instructions, under the Royal Prerogative to the Member.....

HON. G. SAID INTERJECTING: I am sorry, Mr. President, you misunderstood me. I am asking him to seek your permission to give the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh! So your question to will the Member seek permission to give answers about the day-to-day administration of Cyprus Airways? I do not think he would need my permission, however, I will allow him to answer.

HON. W. NORMAN ZEROUKI: Mr. President, with due respect, I think I answered that previously. I have no intention to seek your permission

HON. W. ARTHUR RUGGLES (CONTINUING): If that is the procedure, he answer any questions in connection with the day-to-day management of Cayman Airways. I am prepared to answer questions in relation to policy matters and I think that is where.

MR. CLAUDE DOUGLAS: Mr.Speaker, may I ask if this question does not relate to policy, the policy of hiring and firing and marketing people. Is not that a policy decision?

HON. W. ARTHUR RUGGLES: It is a policy that comes under management, Sir, it is a management policy.

MR. LEONARD A. PARSONS: Mr.Speaker would it be in order for the Members of this Honourable House, in Finance Committee, to enquire for any supplementary funds, for us to request information as to what part of those supplementary funds may be as a result of mismanagement of the operations of Cayman Airways?

MR. SPEAKER: I dare say, I am afraid. The supplementary we will it be in order in future for Members of the House to ask questions as to whether requests for supplementary appropriation were necessary.....

MR. LEONARD A. PARSONS: Let me elucidate, Mr.Speaker, whenever we come before this House to grant supplementary expenditure on Cayman Airways and it is felt by many Members here that this is a direct result of mismanagement of the operations of Cayman Airways, my question is will we be able to get a breakdown in future as to what part of this may already relate to the operations of Cayman Airways? Because if we are not able to ask questions in this House regarding the operations of Cayman Airways, then I feel it is not fair to us to be asked to approve supplementary expenditure in this matter.

HON. W. ARTHUR RUGGLES: Mr.Speaker, I think that when supplementary expenditure is asked for from the Finance Committee, I dare say the Chairman of that Committee, who is the Honourable Financial Secretary, and is left to Members to support this or not, however, we propose mismanagement, is dependent on us as to a question to judge whether it is either of mismanagement or not. I would do not know who is in that position.

MR. CLAUDE DOUGLAS: Mr.Speaker, as the Member mentioned the matter of policy, may I ask a supplementary question. Who sets the policy for the Manager? Is it the Board of Directors?

HON. W. ARTHUR RUGGLES: Yes, Sir, I would think it is the Board of Directors.

MR. CLAUDE DOUGLAS: Mr.Speaker, may I look for time to see, since is not customarily true that the Managing Director would be able to have the input into the policies carried out by management and should therefore be in a position to answer for any policies which may be carried out by the Manager or supervisors down the line?

HON. W. ARTHUR RUGGLES: The Manager answers to the Board.

MR. CLAUDE DOUGLAS: In which case is he responsible then for policy? Mr.Speaker, I am asking a supplementary.

HON. W. ARTHUR RUGGLES: The Manager, I think, would be responsible to carry out the policies or directives given from the Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other question please?
Item 2 - Contribution of the deficit on the

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUED): Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. Does any further Member wish to speak?

CONSIDERATION OF THE ESTIMATES OF THE YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS SECTION AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1985

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Reading Debate for Hansard.

MR. ALEXANDER ROBIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a pleasure and honour for me to take part in this Budget Debate and participate in my Ministerial Review and Plans Speech debate.

I would like to commence, Sir, by thanking very sincerely, the Members of the staff of the House for the extra to which they have gone out of their way to make me feel welcome since I left, from helping me in different ways, as a young Member and for encouraging those kind of responses and gestures.

The Legislature, Sir, in its opinion, Sir, has a fine staff, even the least that one of them is a most good friend of mine and the staff, as I have found them, are very hard working and do it sometimes me to pay tribute to our young Clerks for the wonderful job they are doing.

Also on this item, I would like to say for the record, a vote of thanks to the former Clerk for the guidance and help she has given me.

Also, Sir, I would like to say a word of thanks to the Vice Principal Secretaries who have helped me tremendously in my first months here.

As most generally before giving my opinion of the Budget or the Ministerial Review, I would venture to speak a little on the attractions of parliamentary life in this country, as I see it.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding developments we have inherited from Britain, is our parliamentary democratic traditions. Sir, there are aspects of parliaments in the Commonwealth that have adopted the Westminster system with very little change. Guiana, this is so because we find that system becomes extremely suited to our needs when we find a system adopted to us. Not sufficiently flexible and viewed to allow us to apply any practicable adaption to fit in with our peculiar needs. This type of democratic system is a monumental system I regard as our greatest heritage in our democratic system.

The Constitution of Parliament, Sir, I believe, is one of the greatest contributions made by the British people in the history of man. They have struggled hard to accept that the divine right of kings in the Magna Carta, which is the foundation stone of parliamentary democracy, and I believe the freedom loving humanity of the world owes a debt of gratitude to the British nation for this.

Mr. Speaker, in this short speech, I think to say I think you are doing a fine job as President of this Assembly. I can see, Sir, though it is a tough job, even I, as a young Member, have gained great confidence, Sir, as Senior Members have tended time to time to me. But, whatever the criticism of Great Britain as a colonial power and the system which is now associated to the Commonwealth, I can only say that parliamentary government is the greatest because of it. Seen in the Cayman Islands, I believe it is the right thing and I trust that whatever role in this Honourable Chamber it may mean a model for study and emulation.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this Parliament, of this Assembly, I have my impressions. I like my lesson and I do hope that one day which I am just [illegible] to see a more parliamentary bias-politic involved. No more, Sir, and the Budget for 1984 or 1985.

Mr. President [illegible] : Since [illegible] at different places, with different minds, different problems, and not today or next year, I still hope to see it done during my term. Of course, I hope it takes no [illegible]. It can only do the country good for the long run.

While in my opinion, and [illegible], I have to [illegible].

Mr. President, since I have been here, [illegible] I have always [illegible] could be considered [illegible]. [illegible], I am not [illegible], and we must [illegible] in this House, [illegible] I should remind Honourable Members that it is not only on the floor of this House that one communicates, indeed, Sir, the whole country is watching us. Not I believe more so, on the outside, where [illegible] people are [illegible] our [illegible] here and there our actions, such deeds, have a [illegible] effect on them, [illegible] for me, Sir, sometimes [illegible] where I have nothing to [illegible] on as soon [illegible], the people who sent me here did so with the [illegible] that I would never [illegible] them down. I said then and I also told them that I would not, as a Member, submit to [illegible] on them that I would do, as a Member, where I would not [illegible] my personal integrity, or my [illegible] principle. So I [illegible] to make no [illegible]. I, Sir, owe [illegible] as a [illegible] duty, [illegible] and [illegible]. That is so, because I am a [illegible] [illegible] Chinese.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, [illegible] [illegible] Mr. [illegible] I [illegible] of that fact. As I said [illegible] in this House, I am no [illegible] by any means and have no [illegible] of [illegible] people by my people.

Mr. President, I [illegible] on this [illegible] I was [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] of the Queen [illegible] on it now on the [illegible] and as I [illegible] to [illegible] the background against which I propose to make my [illegible] of the [illegible] and [illegible] from the Throne.

Mr. President, Robert Frost, the great poet, wrote [illegible] ago -

> "The woods are lovely, dark and deep
> But I have promises to keep
> And miles to go before I sleep."

Like Robert Louis King, I have a dream I have a dream today and like [illegible] I have promises to keep and miles to go [illegible] before I sleep.

Sir, the Budget and the [illegible] speech before us today, which I must now comment upon both on [illegible] very [illegible]. To say, Sir, that I, as I am a new member, would not have [illegible] forces to [illegible] a most [illegible] [illegible], would not be true, but, Sir, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. Vandeberg [continuing]: they have neglected the future

Mr. President, as an example, if I go to the bank tomorrow and borrow the National Debt on my name, I have mortgaged my assets and my future earnings, because that money must be repaid in the future. If I accept that borrowed money today and do not use it wisely, I can, sir, jeopardize my own fortune and I can, sir, jeopardize my own future.

Much, sir, has been said about the need to take economy, the previous administration became one of the so heavy taxed great nations. Why, sir, I dare state upon any responsible authorities of conflict among the economists based on taking control of the whole nation's responsibility of maintaining the future of this country.

Sir, we have only as much land to develop. I do not have that the undeveloped lands is readily avail- ables, but to be utilized and when we have developed which we can handle we can handle it more fluent.

Having taken great heed of last war, enough navies were built to win Poland for the peace. In fact, many of them are antiquated today. Of those completed, only eight small ships, during that great hostility have been actually necessary with evidence, so were battleship of which I guess there are just eight to protect us during ground and sea.

I will guess today, sir, that at the peak of that load the aircraft for the reconstruction industries of this nation substantial the Department by 2 to 1. The money that those workers earned was mostly received on wages. If the policies to support were taken necessarily to economy.

Most probably of all is that many of our responsible young men were encouraged to stay out of high school by push a chair—Lawrence or a construction site where they learned there were that key to use design from the Department Defense forces. Today, many of those young men are putting around without the high school certificate that they could have acquired in that period of time; they are not qualified today to do anything other than what they learned on the construction site and with the loss having passed, they are not qualified to earn the wages to support their family. Now! I say sorry!

Mr. President, the revenue that was earned by Government, like the wages earned by our people, are mostly wasted. As the members come in, the Daily Government Account of the spending employees and machinery accounts is published in their good newspapers, but as I said earlier, they should be used in those new ports we could have here built in this period, therefore for the next five years to come to me, this unnecessary to build any great amounts of roads, the market be already placed, they surrounded our farms. Well, Mr. President, in the meaning of the resolution by the Second Session Number four I think from that we are in four years peace of time.

The reasons that they have in Alaska since has been spent simply because it was there to spend. Today some of our non-essential services are like because Government allowed the country to overspend in that two-year period. The fact, sir, was spent by unemployment development was only in- vested in a quick profit without any the regard for the economy.

There used to many shady dealings by the unscrupulous developers during that time that the entire Industry was brought into ill-repute and suspicion has been cast on the honest developer who has the economy at heart. For, if they cannot build, they cannot build. Well, Mr. President, now has the future of this

MR. P.MORGAN: (Interjection) ... assembly was mortgaged.

... Mr.President, the Government.....

MR.M.J.R. ROSEN: On a point of order, Mr.President, the Minister is misleading the House.

MR.SPEAKER: I think he is probably just explaining as quite acceptable matter.

MR.M.KAMANA JUNIOR: The Government, Sir, that was elected on 14th November was elected also to place measures to change course. We have all intentions of bringing our economy and social development under a sensible control. And the people of this country wanted to continue this managing of the finance, they would have returned the Unity administration to power in October. The Government, the new Government have a difficult task before us, we cannot undo what our misdeeds of the previous Government that was sent packing on 14th November, on the opportunities and those measures which, Mr.Speaker Correctly, he has pointed. Years ago! Not today - years ago when their developments were already to bring the entire mismanagement which finally ends ill-reputed by Bachmann dealings, such as soil-scandal revelations' money that finding to Solomon Islands for the peoples generation or further than that, when they bought what was supposed to be a piece of Jewish land, only to find out when they got to Canada, that had bought a worthless piece of swamp.

In certain instances, Sir, these unscrupulous unpatriotic acts of partnership with Members of the Unity team, and, Mr.Speaker, the lack of leadership exhibited by the Captain Solomon Government has fallen upon the shoulders of the present administration, and because of the opportunities we, they are now exercising their policy of widening up the parties. I refer to the meeting that took place in Dublon Town last Monday night, and such as the case quite likely to be on the floor of this Honourable House. If we still looking at my notice!

The purpose of this, Sir, must not be used to be every one in the country, but this purpose is to develop policies in the new Government and shift the blame from the mismanagement as one experiencing from the policies of the non-alignment Unity administration. These members of the opposition and their associates, one saying that after June we have in office the new Government, of which, Sir, I am proud to be a part, have abandoned no new policies. Sir, considering the need, including un-paid bills, that was inherited from the previous administration in 14th November I fail to see what we could have done in so short a time.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if this should be a convenient moment to take a break? If that suits the Member, then let us suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes and return about twenty-five to three.

At 11:30 A.M. the House suspended

THE HOUSE RECESSED AT 12:38 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Senate Standard Member for Vani Kay.

MR. M.NARASAYA REDDY (VANIKAYAPADU): Mr.President, Sir, law and principles, policies such as the non-development of the areas have been referred to, and the Governor of the undivided Andhra Pradesh. Such policies were set here and they moved from one period to another without any clear policies or plan.

Mr.President, Sir, the country today...

MR. JAMES M.DOUGLAS: We have known that the Member might not be capable of following a speech written to be presented, but after all, under Standing Order 81, I think it is so, the Member should not really be reading a considerably prepared speech, but without speak from notes.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Member is reading from either scripture notes, just as I think members of Members have referred to factual scripture notes.

MR. JAMES M.DOUGLAS: My notes might have been copious, Sir, but they numbered only about 20 pages which was delivered over four days.

MR. SPEAKER: May be the Member was planning to keeping to take for two days.

MR. M.NARASAYA REDDY: Mr.President, I am not going to be four days, Sir. The Bible they are going to take will be five months and a half hours, but I have points can be. While Jesus Christ I am a true Member and I sincerely believe for not more than half hours as much as the previous speaker. He spoke for five days. He has spoken years of unnecessary remarks and procedure in his books.

MR. JAMES M.DOUGLAS: Mr.President, I will speak for a long time, but I did not read a prepared speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member may continue.

MR. M.NARASAYA REDDY: Mr.President, the country today is paying the cost of this mismanagement and it will continue to pay until the new Government can devise a new workable plan that will enhance equity in our development. Our key interests, Sir, to maintain the integrity and credibility to make pay the bills.

The needs of our people are great. We need to pay urgent attention to our social development. We need to improve our educational system so that we can prepare all of our people for their rightful place in our developing country.

Mr.President, Sir, these things are not urgently attended to, the majority of our people will soon become disillusioned in their country. If indeed we have not got

MR. MACKAY, MISS (Wexford): reached that stage.

This is an intolerable situation that can only lead to the overall disenfranchisement and unrest that we all know will spell doom for our so fragile economy. Human problems, along with our other basic needs, have to take first place and that is what we are here for, to serve people.

All, it has been said that in case this Government of steady hands nothing, before it can give us anything, it must first take away from us something.

Sir, the role of a responsible Government surely is to relieve rather than add to the problems. If they cannot get it right - and they must be used wisely to provide the things that our people need. No one can, taken in any sense but if this country is to maintain its essential economic infrastructure, Government must have money. That is what budgets are all about and that is what the 1990 Budget presumably before this Assembly in the autumn.

In this budget, Sir, Government must outline the projects that it intends to execute for the year, including the desperately needed hospitals - colleges that will begin to prepare our people, especially our young people, for a more productive role in our society. That budget also must make provision for the collection of moneys owed to us in order to pay for this peripheral spending.

Mr. President, the leaders of the opposition have attacked these cases, both in this Chamber and on the public platform, as being oppressive to the poor. The great mathematician of the Opposition has said that the new rates system in the present budget for 1990 will cost every household in this country £250 per year - that was taken to be said on a public platform in Dublin town.

Mr. President, I do not know if this is correct or not but I should think that if it is correct it is roughly correct taken per day per household. Sir, what is this roughly amount when you consider that some households send out children to school five days per week with lunch-money possibly five sandwiches and five tapes-pocket.

Mr. President, using that household's figures, if each household spends one beer or packet of cigarettes less per day the most would be affected by it - mind, we are only talking about decent, solid pro-Irish households. So why all the nonsense about spending the poor? In my opinion this material money squandering the British are being put forward for the sole purpose of creating discontent among the masses, that can only lead to the social disintegration that has seen other dictatorship countries upset. This contention and they say they are protecting the poor people. Well I want to marvel the objection, and also marvel the ingenuity, that our politicians, Fianna Fáil would have been more lucky, more lucky, if we had not, in our good wisdom, set aside the Supplementary Pensions Fund, which the late Mr. Haughey made a most astute move. The total amount which would have been paid out this year would be in the region of £300,000. Did they pay it? No, they kept that £300,000. Did they pay it? No, they would forget that Supplementary Pensions Fund.

Sir, Mr. President, if the opposition were genuinely concerned about the lowly people, they would have explained the matter straight to the Honourable Members, last week, rather than the latest Gallup poll of a subservient Labour Party.

Anyhow now, Sir, should say my position on the Labour withdrawal from this country. I presume the withdrawal the motion which was passed without the support of the two

MR. MACDONALD (CONTINUED): Workers from the outside soon ascertained that they wanted to blame the Federal Member for not having labour legislation in the country. After they had been in power for eight years. Since that action, Sir, what has proved me more than anybody else, is to find out that they had paid somebody from T.L.C. or somewhere like that some $10,000 to come here to do some work of study - some report that they are always complaining about. Not that they paid this man $10,000 and still labour legislation was not brought in this House. But when my motion was brought to this honourable House, the two Members from the Pacific Coast immediately acted as if someone had stepped on a pin - just like that, Mr.Speaker, "I am the champion of the poor man".

Mr.Speaker, this motion calls for a Royal Commission which I suggest to see a Labour Office people should be set up to advise the workers of this country.

Recently, Mr.Speaker, I met a young man on the street, from my constituency, who had been recently married four months since he was not employed, after working two years, he did not know that there was a Labour Office that could have helped him find a job. I, of course, directed him to the Labour Office and he now pleased as I job the next week. The Labour Officers should be complimented for the job they are doing, but we must give them a chance here. We must put our efforts where our mouth is; we must work, not pay people $10,000 and get nothing done.

The Labour Officers should be complimented, but, as I said, we need to give them a time to prove that they do a better job.

Civil Service and Training. Mr.Speaker, another area of great concern to me is the Civil Service where qualified and specialized Canadians are rejected. It just seems to me, Sir, that as soon as a Government gives many and numerous qualifications for any post and persons, there is some Government effort to squeeze them out. That, in short order, the post is filled by an outsider. These are the complaints I get, Sir, and I am only giving to the House what I get.

I know, Sir, that in years gone by many of our promising people left the Civil Service because of the poor pay and poor working conditions. Many of those who left the Service have returned to the private sector and we can be justly proud of them. But lately, Sir, the complaints in the Public Service is comparable to the complaints in the private sector, yet our more gifted people continue to study it.

Mr.Speaker, I believe the whole matter is in need of urgent review and some sensible adjustments. Sir, I would check here and identify instances often instances where qualified and specialized Canadians have been pushed out of the public service to make room for some outsider in the post. My colleague from the Bonavista-Twillingate is but one of these examples, not only has he packed out of the service but certain leaders of the party have threatened, using the privileges that we enjoy in this House, threatened to destroy his professionality.

As I said earlier, we do need to address ourselves to the task of encouraging young promising Canadians to the service and after training them, ensure that they are put in positions for which they can feel what they are trained and appreciated.

As in closing, Sir, we will be hearing more and more qualified personnel in our public service and if we do not seek to correct our ways and to train them, we will only continue to become more and more dependent on outside help, a conclusion Sir, that I cannot agree with.

Mr.Mwanyigha (continued): On a final observation, Sir, I would like that Ulaya and Bahari MPs should take very well instead of the elections, but I would ask them to not decide the idea of which Governments in the water and clean their environment in the country, forget who I am, and take curious thought that I am a representative of the people. Do not give me orders, and when I work my book, make promises like the leaders give anything other by me'. They are not doing anything for me - what I ask is that they do the things that my people suggest of me.

Sir, in the manifesto most members they were in the party survive and there for that reason alone, support the budget.

In the case of farming, I believe, Sir, some companies in the private sector are helping to do a fair job. Cable and Wireless seem to be doing a wonderful job. At the present they employ 217 pensionable and 30 casual workers. Out of 217, 20 are in parents and out of the 22 they have 17 nationalists. All the key employments posts are filled by Zanzibaris.

With the national budget for this year given as well over half a million dollars, so, in my opinion, Cable and Wireless is doing pretty good and must be congratulated for putting something back into the country.

Other companies in this country could take an example from Cable and Wireless.

I believe, Sir, that in fairness, more promise a condition should be created that the employees, and they should retain in large businesses firms, banks and commercials, should notify the board of the number of Zanzibaris employed and indicate whether any Zanzibaris after suitable training, would fill the posts for which the appointments be being made. The names could be tested for two or three years, during which time the Zanzibaris could move a few months training should be given by the new employer. If circumstances training is necessary, this would be undertaken only at the successful completion, possibly one-five three or six months' secondment under the holder of the names for practical assessment and experience. At the end, if the Zanzibari has acquired already or has only satisfactorily, should be longer in necessary to bring in another applicant for that particular post. There should be an incentive for some of any employer to recruit a Zanzibari in favour of someone else.

The Corporations should permanently and I hope they do, and have the try to train your employees.

I would like to mention especially that I believe people from countries who come in these islands to take up jobs, which, as the rounds, should be filled by Zanzibaris. I should hope that all of these people would like to know that when a Zanzibari is fully qualified and able, he will give the job. A certain difficulties in which countries, where, when the local nationals be qualified, he or she gets the job. Until that time, and this is the situation in most countries like the Cayman Islands, we, for some time, must employ persons from overseas with certain expertise.

Mr.Speaker, Sir, I am sure to point that to out a thing, detrimental both for my people who should be in the Queen that's happy; those who have been and those who come for those whose loyalty.

In dealing with the training of Zanzibaris, Sir, I welcome the announcement that the Education Department will be establishing a full-fledged technical college in these Islands some time during this year.

Sir, in my opinion, to it would

MR. SAID ESSOP (UDF-INANDA): Sir, we have no reserves. They will but very little in any year. Their last year they had R1,716,115 in reserve, that was at the 31st of December, 1975 and on the 31st of December, 1976 that figure has been reduced by 86% and they only have R228,947 left. So they were used to working without reserves; they did not understand the working; they did not understand the value; they did not understand the necessity.

We took over at the end of 1976 and by the end of one year the reserves had started to accumulate and we had, 31st December, R1,033,302 in reserve. By the 31st December 1980 the reserves had gone to R6,872,805, a 500% increase as you will see, and in another 12 months the reserves had again doubled and at the 31st of December, 1981 it was R12,433,735, a 79% increase over the previous year. Now, needless to say, as far as reserves were concerned, was the best year the Government enjoyed. At that stage the reserves were exceeding the 5 months' requirement, or the 2 months' reserve, and we were in a safe position. This safe position continued as indicated by the Budget Address and that condition would still exist, I daresay, had there not been a change in the Government, change, taking place by the Elected Members whose master-minds had precipitated running the country without reserves during the dark period from 1976 to 1979.

And so, Mr.Speaker, I think the little maple leaf can no longer work, because the public will now understand how the maple is done, just like that little maple leaf had other games in it, as I said a game, which is related to what they are doing in other areas, as I will tell you. It had a card in the pack called a special card - the card had no back - in one side it had the ace of spade, when you turned it over in the little maple leaf and brought to your shakepeare audience, in the case of Shamrock and this is what they have been doing with Government's finances, and this is not coming from Government, this is not coming from the Financial Secretary, this is coming from statements by Elected Members of Executive Council. Sometimes they tell you "well, you know the reserves are there"; next time it is a collateral for a loan, or a hypothecation; one minute it is reserve the next minute it is something else. First they had the disappearing act, where is the cash, and then it was not there. They also have the cat where they always it was one minute it is one thing in the Budget, the next minute there was no reserves could even be a possibility in the country, they say they have wiped down the reserves.

You see, having manipulated, having perhaps from their election on hook-winking the public, that the country was broke and that there were no reserves, they find it difficult to accept that there are reserves. And even now, while they are spending the reserves, they are still saying the reserves never existed, or the reserves are encumbered in such a way that Government cannot spend them, yet they are spending them at the tune of over R1M per month.

So, they grudgingly, they have reluctantly admitted that there are reserves, and had it not been for their contemptuous disregard in balancing the Budget, they would not have, on the 31st of March, allowed the Estimates to show that the country had reserves, because you cannot take away R2-Gt from reserves, if there are no reserves. So by their own action they have admitted that the reserves are there.

So, if they had not done anything to the Finance Committee, and if they did not again today come a-begging to the Legislative Assembly, the public would have believed that there were no reserves. But the public statement that has just, take out from Finance Committee, the authority to spend R7.5M UR on Cayton Airways, and they understood that as the Financial Secretary said in his speech, spend over R500,000 out of that authority to spend, and now the public understands

MR. G. RAIG DOUGLAS (CONSERVATIVE): ... as they take another £2,000 from what they have left.

So I am not entirely anyone to take the word of the Unity Free Government as to whether there were surpluses; I am taking them to task the words of the Financial Members of Executive Council, because this Budget which we are now with the work of the Financial Secretary alone; this Budget which has come to the House had the approval of Executive Council, as will appear later on which came to the House here. When they ask this House to give £2,00 to help them balance the 1953 Budget, they are admitting that a surplus we there, and when they ask us to accept the fact that they can save £200,000 on whatever work they may have to do, they are asking us -- "Remember the Blanks", in fact, they are admitting that what had been said in this Council by many and on other occasions before that, it was said up, but would require the little magic box to make it right.

So, having now established that there is a reason, which the Elected Members at least admit, to look then are entitled to admit it, but they now have admitted it, I will move on to the other words of the Budget which show that the country is not back on the Rice of Servitude, but is heading that way, and the second point I wish to make is with regard to surplus balances.

We left a good surplus available, and in fact, in December. When I asked the Financial Secretary about the surplus. I also asked him about the surplus balances, and he spoke now a possible one, that there was a surplus balance.

Add to this, it disappeared - it disappeared because then, between November and now - it disappeared, because the Budget which they have put forward shows that they have taken no that surplus balance, and now have a deficit on the Rice of December of $682,000 (a deficit we left). So we had surplus balances, all through our 1952, now the Financial Secretary has made it clear that on the 31th of December, when asked about the surplus balances, that there was no surplus balances. We have pointed out on some occasion that the figures then had not just come in, and he did then admit on reconsidered possible that there had nothing to do with the surplus balances. So what has happened in between that surplus, which they admitted they had. They admitted on January the 31th of January that the surplus balances before on the Rice of December. That has been said, and I take credit that by their own statement that they had nearly $1M in surplus balances on the Rice of December; but on the Rice of December there was a minus balance, we they had almost that $1M, plus going in respect to the sum of minus $682,000, not only did they spend our balances, at the rate of $2M a month; but they must have gone away with the surplus balances of the 1952 speech, and the only reason why they have not spent $1M a month in surplus balances because we say not there. They have the responsibility of spending it.

So they took that $1M, one each, which they added into there, the Rice of December, 1953, spent it, spent all the rest of the money which they anticipated during November and December, which are very big months for surplus collections and used up the great part of $682,000. I will give the explanation, Mr.President, but I should like to say that this is surprising on a high scale. They have the responsibility to spend but we hope for the sake of the country they can find ways to spend, because they have an abnormal expenditure for spending, unfortunately as they have done, spending surpluses and reserves, but we hope the Rice might learn

ADJOURNMENT

MR. D.R.JEFFERS: Mr.President, I move the adjournment of this Honourable Council to 10 a.m. tomorrow.

MR.SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn.

MR. BRADSHAW (CONTINUING): ...until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. If any member objects to agreeing, I will put the question. Will those in favour please say aye?

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 4:20 P.M. THAT HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. THURSDAY, 24TH MARCH, 1960.

MR. G. NATO asked (CONSERVATIVE): In connection the $15.6 million dollars that remains, and, if I have to be one hundred, I will accept figure which the Member from North Side was given by the Minister Secretary. The Chairman Secretary said "Yes, I have in mind what I have been saying I have in mind that there is about $10 million ... acknowledge that statement, in connection, the response.

Now the time allocated Members was getting on that Member Constituency not one of them could get up and explain to the House statement which they had published. Anyway, they have $2.4M on the understanding he was at and some State money ... says.

There is also Revenue, in Question, of this year, on the basis of estimate, they put out a statement on the front page of the Compass explaining Government's position, and if you read this statement, you will see that they show that our net overall position, as at 31st of October, 1982, which responds to statement, was ... $1,268,849, and they had to base that the Financial Secretary had write in November to the Finance Committee that we have $10M, and then had to know that they now began the machinery to spend $15.6 million out of it. And they had to know that they had actually spent a sum of over $600,000 since they withdrew in November. Just they came out the Treasury, mean,why the propaganda that on the 31st of October there was only $1.6M in reserves. And if this were so how could they take $15.6 million from it in November, if we did not have it on the 31st of October?

If the story ended there, they could have to cause shame, but it does not end there, because in the Budget which is before the House, they are asking the members if they approve this Budget, to increase that revenue, into the revenue a increase Income of $8,800,000 to help them balance the 1983 Budget. So how can this become real be asked, on the 1st of March, to increase $8,800,000 this of revenue if we only have $1 that is not accumulated - $1.6 million million. So there has to be a misdescription of the figures in some where. I know the Compass tried to ascertain that, the Compass gave up additional saying that both sides may correct, the figures in that one case correct and the figures the two Statements were provided were wrong, but no matter how reverse he may do, he cannot arrive this and one out of figures in March, and I do not think the Financial Secretary is wrong.

They were playing a little game that reminds me of ... game that was said on television about 12 to 15 years ago. Where they offered for sale a little magic box and, would in it how opened the box and there is a card just like the box over and above it and a slightly polished the other card, and you opened it and there was no card.

There were 47 questions in the Question answering, to these people, but they were to go the Secretary and you opened the box and they showed on the questions, and they said 'We used $2,44 out of $1' and they got it, but then they went home and they opened and opened it in January 1983 and they said 'There is no money' then they closed the box and they covered it again and they came to see in the 1st of March and may 'We do have more money, please, please but we have $1.2 M out of these questions in that envelope' but you can't see inside so that we may influence it'.

But the story does not end there. They closed the box again and he heard in this Chamber words the 1st of March, in another BOX, about the questions and remembered you can't touch them, and you they have opened the box again today and they say here there exactly the figure again that they said it is worth $800,000 in interest on their cash balances. And if that, was in cash balances, and if there was no money, how can they have paid out in interest this year?

MR. BRIAN BEDDOE (NOTTINGHAM): Today's statement does not look very much and you would anticipate some of those, several million dollars left there; I would please somethings like the Financial Secretary will be there, something in the vicinity of $5M either way of those transfers. So there is no question about the reserves, the reserves are there, they were not there by the Philly Shop, they were left there by them and they are still there with the exception of what has been used by the present administration. And this, Mr.Speaker, is only the beginning of the story. Because in December when the House met in this special meeting, I asked the question, which was answered by the Financial Secretary - what were the reserves on the 31st of October, and on the 10th of December, just ten days before the meeting, and the Financial Secretary, in his considered manner, answered - 'The reserves of the country are, if I do not remember the exact figure, but in the vicinity of $19M, but I'm all for the Financial Secretary not necessarily had to be playing a game.

The point I want to make is not only were the reserves in the Government's coffers, but there remains unaccounted, these reserves are unaccounted, and they have been issued from the present administration to Government, I'm sorry with this budget. They will be drawn from the Depreciation Fund to finally account. Some of these revenues will definitely be there and will yield substantial interest during 1985, no figure in the question as to whether there were reserves; there is no question as to whether the reserves were substantial; there is no question as to whether the reserves are still there, but as the year these reserves are being spent by the present administration, there is only that the country is going will soon come, because they have already taken out, they have permission to take out $3.7 M here today and that is a lot of money in the few months that they have been in office. Just - there were there are those monies that have been in excess of 1 cent of the excess of five months.

But it is time that we time to time during the daily administration we look today from the newspaper, when we see that the reserves were outside too high, because it is possible it has money in reserve on which you are only earning five and you are to borrow money at 18% to do that you need to do, but no matter, in our entire right hearts, after we build up the reserves in three months, we never dreamt that there were being a big surplus and like to where this new Executive Council has come. They have drawn down the reserves which were comfortable and adequate, at the start of September, 1984 and throughout the entire year of 1985, they have now which have down to where they were before what is supposed to be safe contingency which is frankly totally inadequate.

It is true that when we passed the budget for 1984 we anticipated something of this nature, because of this time the reserves, notwithstanding to the existing provisions of the Government, would have to be drawn down. And it is true that during this year we intend to propose the adoption of Caymen Bonds like one of emergency measure which had a three hundred for and when the need arose, as had the case on hand, did we first that $3M were or less only represented the interest which the Government would earn during 1984, on the deposits which we had, as we have already spent it. But since the election, this new Government has reduced the reserves to where they are much less in what is considered adequate.

According to the budget Address the Financial Secretary stated that at year end, that is 31st June 1985, they will have $7.2M left, and although at the rate of $3M a month they will be out of reserves by June of 1985.

But the Leader of this previous Government knows the interest between 1985 and here and they are used to working on a give-and-take; they are used to having the country in a

MR. M. MASTERS (CONSERVATIVE): Sir, I would like to make a few remarks which, I hope, will be of interest to the House, but I do not wish to take up too much time. I would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Doody) on bringing down a budget which I think is a very responsible budget under the circumstances. I think it is a budget that is going to help the economy of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the people of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the business community of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the agricultural community of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the fishing industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the forestry industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the mining industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the tourism industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the manufacturing industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the construction industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the transportation industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the communications industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the public utilities industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the financial industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the real estate industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the insurance industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the professional industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the personal service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the business service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the government service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the non-profit industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the co-operative industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the private industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the public industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the mixed industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the other industry of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MASTERS: I think it is a budget that is going to help the people of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the economy of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the business community of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the agricultural community of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the fishing industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the forestry industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the mining industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the tourism industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the manufacturing industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the construction industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the transportation industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the communications industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the public utilities industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the financial industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the real estate industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the insurance industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the professional industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the personal service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the business service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the government service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the non-profit industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the co-operative industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the private industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the public industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the mixed industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the other industry of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MASTERS: I think it is a budget that is going to help the people of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the economy of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the business community of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the agricultural community of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the fishing industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the forestry industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the mining industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the tourism industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the manufacturing industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the construction industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the transportation industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the communications industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the public utilities industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the financial industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the real estate industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the insurance industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the professional industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the personal service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the business service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the government service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the non-profit industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the co-operative industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the private industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the public industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the mixed industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the other industry of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MASTERS: I think it is a budget that is going to help the people of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the economy of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the business community of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the agricultural community of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the fishing industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the forestry industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the mining industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the tourism industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the manufacturing industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the construction industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the transportation industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the communications industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the public utilities industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the financial industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the real estate industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the insurance industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the professional industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the personal service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the business service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the government service industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the non-profit industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the co-operative industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the private industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the public industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the mixed industry of this province. I think it is a budget that is going to help the other industry of this province.

MR. O. ERIC BOSSEY (CONSTITUENCY): The Budget Address was like the Throne Speech and paternalistically the Solicitor-General told us that 1984 had been a good year for the Government and that the new administration inherited a sound financial position.

I would like to start by most the many nasty words that were hurled across, during and after the elections concerning the finances of this country. Under Labour's stewardship of these Islands, has the Government enjoyed such a stable and sound financial position. But when he was seeking to appeal to a certain group of people abroad the propaganda that the country was broke, that there were no resources. This, Mr.President, could only be said in language that would be unparliamentary and I do not want to get into that, but anyone of us in any walk of life abroad Members of Parliament Cabinet did recommend to the public a picture that the country was broke. This recommendation included Legislative Assembly, our Financial Secretary, put an article in the newspaper on the 1st of November which should never have been there under circumstances could not be backed up, such of this nature, to get into Executive Council.

On the 1st of November, 1984 the Financial Secretary put out a statement which was headed 'Government position' and he stood the statement, which was mostly figures, with this like 'It is my opinion that the Caymans Islands Government is in a sound financial position'. He spoke with many words and I will have them to deal with the newspaper, but I think that in the Caymans statement also, because it is my opinion that you're a country to be in a sound financial position, it must have a substantial reserve, and this Government had a reserve on the 31st of December, 1983 of $10,130,850. These figures are now up to the end of August, 1984 and he showed the interest received from January to August, 1984 $702,717. He showed that during the year he had depreciated $2M from the reserve to do the Cayman Brac Airport, leaving a balance on the 31st of August, 1984 of $8,832,220. This is a statement of the Financial Secretary one week or so after some of the new present Members of Executive Council had said that there was no reserve. In fact, they had monkeyed around with the figures, they had juggled the figures and they had come up with a story that we had in fact something million dollars of unencumbered reserves.

This is only the beginning of the story, they went on with their propaganda, aided by the Caymanian and the Herald, that the country was broke. In November they were elected to Executive Council and they were still telling people that there was no reserve. For three Members of Executive Council sent to the Finance Committee in November and asked the Finance Committee to approve $2.4M of expenditure for building a block of apartments that they wanted to pay off debts which Cayman Airways owed.

During the election they were saying that the reserves were not there because they were encumbered by different things, yet they came in in November and asked that we approve $2M (87.4 million U.S. dollars) out of the reserves.

In the Finance Committee we had the Member, the Member from North Side who asked a question as to whether the Financial Secretary and the country had reserves and was told a resolution

MR. MR. MACKAY HUGH (CONTINUING): ...mention that Port Hay has no secondary industries, because we heard again with that we can turn him on anytime.

Mr.Speaker, the Lending Clerk and the Mayor both came to Port Hay and I have had the assurance of the Minister of Industrial Development, Mr. Joe Mc Any now, Sir, I feel did a good job from 1978 to 1985 for Port Hay. But ever since the 1985 Elections Port Hay was neglected because all we did basically got were a few crumbs. But anytime the Members from Port Hay want to call the people here and there to work.

Mr.Speaker, like Lending Clerk I feel still Lending much and needed development into our constituency, and Port Hay is a prime site for it. I commend Andy Lake for coming Anyroad, since he said he is such a gentle. So put the Lending Library there in Shanty Town, which is already over-crowded. Put that aside, Sir, that is the mentality of the Unity Team.

The commission and the people will be worked this year and the planning fields will be put in operation this year. I feel, Sir, that they will get the shops from Lime Dwight, whether it be a Stump-Lake plaza or Lone or whatever it is the name and the wharf, but we are going to put it, and this was the Lending Clerk saying that would remember that he is not the Member on this side: he is not the Member any longer, he is just the Member.

Mr.Speaker, I feel sorry for, Minister of Industrial Affairs many times Lights and one field has not been in operation since Some lights were placed. They were said not to function since there was a power, but the lights would function, but the Unity Team, they did not listen and the field, as I said, has been out of use for many, many years. But again this was pointed out by the Unity Team, in which it appeared that opposition would use it for their own benefit.

The importance of this field, yes, was a Lending problem and it is a problem that I intend to keep. So keep many mental problems in Port Hay and Port Hay is a Lending district, so I encourage see where we can participation should not decide to keep our campaign promise.

The last matter for Port of Spain concerns Sir, hence to have proposed road for on a part of the country, which the two Unity representatives were named to more unnecessary notice in this Honourable House. The present Member is not a Port Hayer and, as I said, the Honourable Prime Minister Secretary in four Many Day, thereby we have the voice to put the things which our district needs, even if it means another 50 for on a part of expenditure.

Mr.Speaker, if I am not mistaken, there was one decent piece of road done and that is back to Scarborough Road, and this was done just in time to promise a few votes. I have asked that the Main Roadhead be changed to Scarborough Main and Shrewsbury, I want to ask why I feel that this Road should be named Sailor/British Hero of the Hanson of the Lending Board, a well-known Lending and Industrialist of our community and a former Legislator, the late Adam Isaac Smith, Member and Businessman and the late well-known Chester, Senator Hyman and Attorney of our community, Alex Rouse Smith. These three gentlemen of Port Hay have done great work in the field of politics, business education and social work. They, Sir, have left a great heritage and I think if Lending Members can name their roads after them, I feel that they would be ... honour and privilege of Parent, should rename the Scarborough Road Facilities. Avenue. And I hope that this will be done in the very near future.

Mr.Speaker, while essentially with the most of Port Hay - when discussions in the Estates with Government Ministers, Port Hay would like to have their roads not be ripped up, because it would depreciate the value of property in that area.

MR.W.MOHAMED BUSH (CONTINUING): that was because certain people had no time to buy up property so that they would have made quick money on the Queen's Highway. But, Mr.President, our road in the Berbice/Abary Pleasants ... area will be done this year.

There are a lot of roads which must be done before the entire package area is all to be on their tracks ... get them done.

Mr.President, as far as Black Bay is concerned and the representation, I am grateful also again, a sincere compliment to the Minister and again I intend to speak to with the help from the people when I have responsibility to clearly meet this new ... these additional responsibilities. Sir, Mr.President, it is time for a new generation of leadership to come with new problems and new opportunities. This right is a new world to be won.

Mr.President, the new Democratic Council, with deployment have been cast as the Four Elected Members of Council. But I feel, Sir, that we must give them the chance to do the job, as I am wondering whether these people who put up and claim they are champions of the people, if they were on the other side, what would ... the position today. I do not think it would be any better than what we found it when we became Members of this Honourable House on November 26th. I feel, Sir, that they are capable, honest men and they might not be endowed with as many degrees as a Rhodes or Harvard to sell him to Berbice, but they are honest and they are hard working and that is why I voted for them and this is all I ask of them. I believe, Sir, the election that we had in 1985, coming from the era of pluralism like United States, will be welcome to do away with the ... this country and will find the four Elected Members with the three appointed Official Members, thinking to do business with them. But we, on all honesty, must give them a chance; we will get the investment, but we will not compromise across this country, or maybe our independence, or what have you. We intend to run a clean ship.

In conclusion, Sir, I believe that all of us, we should create participation problems in this country. While in a dangerous dynamics that has led to the destruction of political stability in every country we think it has been promoted. Although I am a poor man, from a poor family, I consider that I am here to represent all of the people of this country and in particular all the people of West Bay. It is my belief that if our country possess that all of our people will be given the chance to prosper, if we as Legislature here, perform our Annual duty. I believe that if the resolution and responsible for any of us, as Legislature, to continuously maintain our presence of any special sector of our society because the true position. What we must do, in my opinion, is to work hard and to work hard - politics as our duty, to alleviate, as far as humanly possible, all of the problems of our developing country. Unless I am mistaken, which I very much doubt, certain Members of this House seem to be intent on fighting our Agents and pitting one side against the other, and that is my opinion. But I ask them this question - where are the people who anticipate to see benefits from this kind of irresponsible conduct? And I am now referring particularly to a publication in Berbice that was published in one of the last week issues of the country, the Chronicle dated, on Friday, where the opposition held a meeting with their financial agents with Mr.Hubert Stoutly, saying, and I quote "they were going to recommend this budget and the Governor would have to go collect and that was ... Mr.Speaker, if our economy is going to get going again, then these kind statements will have to stop now, in this House, should not be said primarily to sabotage this country, full into stupid decay. We, in this House, are the pioneers, so are responsible for shaping the economy-that is why each

Mr. K. Mpofu (continued): ... Sir. So we have to look very closely at the high rates that are charged in these Estates.

In fact, protect our consumers, I feel, Sir, we need to look seriously at, and I would recommend strongly, some sort of bench patrol to patrol our business, especially in the night. I have had complaints of people being subjected and this to another thing that could have an adverse effect on our tourist industry. I think it would be wise of Government were to set up this bench patrol.

The Minister, Mr. President, I see in the Finance Minister that there is a change in command of the Police forces. I welcome this change, I am also pleased that a local man has been promoted to second place... But, Sir, it is only left to see how effective they will be.

The training programme seems to be well underway and I am hoping that at the end of the programme, the Police Force and our people would have developed their ability

Over the past years there have been many people brought in here who were supposed to train and organise our forces, but in the end they ran away thinking that we are making but a very wasteful in the area that our Force rendered, in my opinion, little benefit. We have some good Police and Army, we have some that should not be here in this country. Some of them have undermined our Army and have hurt and should be prosecuted. With the growing crime rate in our country, that is not another cost that we must pay for development, but I will suggest Commissioner Police Force be of permanent employment. The time I say Commissioner Police Force, I mean a Police Force made up of Zimbabwe, because it is my firm belief that a Zimbabwe, well trained, well motivated and with enforcement in this country that we may choose leaders.

Mr. President, thanks be but one issue I would speak on before I start with the remark of my constituency and the things would be education to it.

Mr. President, Comrades, as we have many jobs to provide and adding value to our economy. I am happy to see that the Honourable Minister of Government is beginning a seminar to help promote the country as a base for association-type companies. The use of companies, Sir, has increased dramatically over the past years, primarily because they often give large or middle-sized companies the potential to reach agreement between-related companies in the Americas, Europe and Management through a single corporate vehicle. The association enables, in principle, how to come a widely-discussed phenomenon because it allows individual members to take advantage of the benefits of a capable programme whereby the same financial commitments, that would be required if each were to form its own company, the company, I feel, is a good start to promoting this kind and I feel would be a means by which Government's economic and investment. I wish it all the best.

Generally, Mr. President, the investment seems to be doing good. It has its plus points, I guess due to the arrangement in the very real competence and knowledge [illegible] a piece of the small pie Zimbabwe, I must back to remind the country that when the going gets rough and the stone pile up, the Argosy people in this country expect [illegible] and [illegible] to assist.

Mr. President, the [illegible] Chamber that investment in the last three years has been [illegible] this country who will not [illegible] parties part of their business activities the country, [illegible] a great amount of investment are part-owned, with the money going into other country. These companies that are [illegible] this [illegible] the biggest part of their business overseas and only the small amount of [illegible] to life here in our country. I believe

MR. SPEAKER, CLOSE [CONTINUED]: take should not be allowed to continue. There are large internationally known companies doing business here with enough capacity and experience to make any of these ideas breathe. To offset this situation, she [Lou Arnold] is expected to say that the Minister should prove to the Superintendent of Insurance that the Israel market is unable or unwilling to settle claims. The Superintendent will be able to monitor and control the amount of local business that can be underwritten to the detriment of our local industry. I believe, Sir, it is a large amount of money leaving our country and this government is the only way good premiums, which these companies pay out overseas, will be able to stay in this country.

Insurance companies in Guyana, Sir, pay their taxes; they have businesses and they put a lot of money in the economy. Consumers should not be taken from this deficiency in the bill. When the Bill was passed in 1979 a fear was that it skirted the economy then and I must congratulate the Daily Argument, with all the bad things they did, they did do one good thing, and it worried the country that time and circumstance change, and the country must grow and the law must be amended to reflect those changes.

Now, Mr. President, my constituency, the Fifth Electoral District - West Bay. Mr. President, one of my political rivals, John A. Kennedy once said - "It is time for a real generation of leadership to solve real problems now the real opportunities, the blame is a word we'll do away with a real generation of leadership.

Now the point I was going to have heard the Fifth Electoral Member from Demerara-Mahaica speak on what West Bay would not mean what it does not mean. But might mean, Sir. West Bay was left out, it had no representation it suffered tremendously, people left the district and built their homes elsewhere. It became the black sheep of the country. Sir, small districts like Fifth Demerara-Mahaica, Fifth Cuyuni-Mazaruni get one seat because, Sir, because West Bay was left out and got two whilst West Bay, because some got one and that is not fair. North Side, I think, had nothing either.

Sir, we had to learn what way to grow to George Town to watch our football team play football. West Bay's played Bay himself for years. Our representation, it seemed, became like Rip Van Winkle - he was to complacent that he lay down by the foot of the trees and went to sleep and when he awakened twenty years later, his gun was rusted, his dog was dead and there was nothing left for poor old Rip Van Winkle.

Thank you, Mr. President, proud then. Now, as I say, West Bay has a new generation of leadership. Instead of having one Member and a Bill, we now have three. West Bay has the three elected Members and one Parliamentary Secretary to also a good citizen from West Bay and I believe this is a good team, as any, to pay him his compliments, and to say that he is doing a good job. I believe he left given in the jobs which we feel is good to see him still serving as Parliamentary Secretary, because Mr. Speaker Speaker had said on the Ministers, Sir, Ministers should fire him. Anyway, I think he knows the joke and I would prefer to leave it at that.

But, Mr. President, West Bay has representation. The Second Elected Member from Region Four, in his early campaign in his meetings at Bodles Town the other night, told the people where West Bay had no representations. West Bay has three able representatives and we are still living in our districts, and we still use the seats; we still remain with the economy; we are not like the Second Elected Member from Region Four, who left his constituency left his problems and went to another Commissionary to live, he should not

MS. V. KENDALL told [illegible]: develop our own culture and our own identity. I have always believed that we do not need to import some of the high rent bands that we import into this country to entertain our tourists; they could have discovered to them so many wonders the Kingdom of Knowledge in the Cayman Islands. I do agree, like this, our local entertainers are trying to do a fair job, but they should not be encouraged to believe that they must imitate the Jamaican bands imported here.

Mr. President, a good example of what can be done locally is the wonderful culture of what is known as Caribbean Pattoit, developed by a talented local lady, Mr. Edwina Solomon. She, this is the kind of entertainment that tourists expect to find when they come to our country, and we should do everything in our power to encourage and develop this indigenous culture of which we have so much.

Gentlemen, Sir, I do not have anything else to say but I do want to make one point clear, that Government has absolutely good reasons, we possess a good sense of opinion that is probably associated in any of the scholarship recipients from within our Islands right now. With a little effort, we could help develop enough entrepreneurial ability to benefit our present business interests.

Mr. President, Sir, we are quite glad to move forward and that is only one week out of the year. Again I say, we must do more to encourage these talents and to develop for our own benefit.

Mr. President, I would mention that the Cayman Islands have four separate physical attractions that are unsurpassed anywhere in the world and that is the beautiful waters surrounding our shores. It is a fact that many of the tourists who come here each year come here to dive or to come to them and I am happy to see that the Government has recently taken steps to preserve and maintain this natural asset. We could not save Coral Gardens but I am sure the opposition will have a duty then to develop the package we have to do something now to help maintain our good natural environment.

Mr. President, I am aware that there is resentment against the Casino Bonds - ask people from early years have been slow in finding their private investments and it is most difficult for them now to easily accept that of us who do make our private investments they still have to accept some responsibility. Sir, the situation is not being helped when the opposition talks publicly on the floor of this House about having to pay $5,000 for casinos, a figure far out by the Second Elected Member from South Side did in his political meeting. It is suicidal to talk that nonsense.

When I said earlier in my speech that there is something for everyone to do to encourage and develop our tourist industry, this was what I had in mind. I myself, Sir, am not, and I cannot be happy about being told when I can fish and where I cannot fish. Of course, I still do not know my Bible text which was discussed after our land-locked waters on West Bay, but I understand, as I said earlier, that there is a price to pay for something or whatever is the tourist industry is to this country, which amounts to $72M per year. This money we [illegible] is [illegible] and it is absolutely many of the little people, we [illegible] and when looking at the opposition get up and make [illegible] possible statements about [illegible] people against many efforts to preserve the few natural assets that we have for the future, they are not helping the country, but [illegible] are seeking the needs for the social needs that will lead to our [illegible]. When I see and hear [illegible] of the people today on I ask myself this question .. are these people really concerned about this country or are they concerned

MR. K. MORGAN BOYD (CONSERVATIVE): Short sale? Is there anyone coming into camp land up around North Side or is anyone coming camp land to some other area? Is this the case, Sir?

The Sister Islands economy benefits greatly from tourism and it is encouraging to see the especially stylish, by yesterday this industry and is promoting it for the future, for all Caymanians alike.

I had many complaints by citizens about the reckless attitude of some of those drive operators who seem to have no respect for the water and others using it, while they pay for protection for themselves. As an example, Sir, a fishing boat or other boats is required to stay 100 yards clear of the dive-boats, but the dive-boats are allowed to come anchorage alongside a fishing boat. This is definitely not right and somehow we must do something about regulation or rule that will end the problems in this area, there is much dissatisfaction here.

Also I feel, Sir, that if there are areas where the fishermen cannot go, then there should be a place where they can go and fish with no being prohibited to the divers. As it stands, it seems to me very unfair and must be changed so that the fishers will not be caught in between the disagreement in this country.

Mr.Speaker, in the Budget I see for last year we received $22,537 in fees and now $30,000. I am wondering, given our close proximity to the United States, why we are not receiving more. Now, Sir, I realize there is the question of hotel beds and I hope with the coming of the Hyatt this year this will begin to show substantial increases.

The other factor, as the Financial Secretary was explaining to me, is the matter European Dollar and the strong US Dollar, which makes the European market more attractive. But, on the other hand, as I said, bearing in mind our close proximity, I strongly US Dollar should permit more Americans to travel to Cayman to buy our European imports, jewellery, cameras, perfumes,etc. which should be relatively cheaper here than in the United States. Why, may be, Mr.Speaker, cheaper in the long term here I say.

I feel we really have to play close attention to the high cost of construction here. I believe we are exhorbitantly expensive. As far as the United States market is concerned, which gives us a greater percentage of our visitors, I believe much more growth is possible.

Mr.Speaker, looking at a matter side noting among of U.S.households last year, showed that only 20% of U.S.households took a vacation of seven days or more. That means that 80%, almost two-thirds of the population did not take a vacation, and of those 30% who did take a vacation of seven days plus, less than 4% visited the Caribbean. The same survey, Sir, tells us that only 22% of those interviewed had once visited the Caribbean on vacation while a great 20% said they would like to visit the Caribbean Islands. A good percentage of those living us use in the age group of less than 35 years old, so I feel that we have only begun to scratch the surface. I believe that with powerful marketing efforts there could be numerous specific interest markets with good potential for growth, as I stated Sir, the Government of Jamaica, when they can, and I quote "the Department has released a new administrative agency and will shortly be creating a whole new design and promotion approach to the presentation of its products throughout the world". I trust that the Government will take the things I have spoken of into consideration. The market place is much more competitive than it was ten years ago, all our countries are going flat out to attract the business. Antigua, Jamaica, and the

MR. W. MARSHALL HESS (CONTINUED): would have benefitted - he would have been joined, but the people did right when they joined him from that position on November 14th.

MR. JAMES M. BOLING: I did for the country what you will never be able to do.

MR. W. MARSHALL HESS: We have to see that yet, Mr. Speaker, I am still a young man and by the looks of it, some people in this House are going down fast.

MEMBERS: (Laughter)

MR PRESIDENT: Order, order. The Member should continue with his speech.

MR. W. MARSHALL HESS: Mr. President, Sir, Caymanians were also accused of not supporting our national athletes and this has been done many times in the past, Sir, and this is not true. Caymanians, I feel today, support our national athletes, but more such support would be given to having it done on a stable position, when we have the cases where the Caymanians are being charged $60 for a round trip between here and Miami and Caymanians has to pay in the region of $600. I am wondering, Sir, whether they had Caymanians at heart, and I say, no.

We also, Sir, have been accused of making the airline as a political football, but it looks to us that it was more of a financial investment for certain people, and if this high form of negotiation had commenced, we can easily see anyone what would have happened to our national airline. It is why, as of last night, Sir, all the real estates now know what the condition is today; and the whole way, now the Member of the previous administration, can say that this is a good position for this country to be in.

As I said, Sir, we support Cayman Airways and I hope that soon it will be made into a corporation where, at least, we will break even.

Our Fire Service. All Caymanians, Sir, are appreciative of the performance of the Fire Service Department. Today saw the addition of a sub-station that was badly needed in the eastern district and I am happy for this.

My own district of West Bay and the West Bay Beach were in need of a station and I trust that this need will soon be attended to, even if we have to use the garage-area piece of land in West Bay.

Mr. President, the scene now back to our resort area, and the Ruritania area in West Bay is another needed area besides. That, Mr. President, West Bay is a very large populated District and I feel that the Government should do well in bringing a fire station in that area.

The main station at the airport is in need of upgrading and we must also ensure that the equipment is dealt with any needs that may arise there. The Fire Service has many Caymanians who are doing a good job, some of them in senior lineups and I, too, should like to join those who have congratulated our Fire Chief and his fine staff. However, Sir, complacency are not enough for this man and his staff to do the job, I believe that he has necessary manpower since the grants, but nothing has been done to keep the men happy in a decent working atmosphere. A lounge for the station is needed for more reasons than one and I truly that this requirement will be something more than what has been done in the past, a more comfortable room for the staff of this Service.

If the Fire Chief and his staff are happy

MR.V. MATHEW (Kottayam): Each and every one of us welcomes the Budget. Even then, I would like to make a few observations in the Budget. I congratulate our Prime Minister and the entire Government for the Budget. I would also like to congratulate the Finance Minister for presenting such a wonderful Budget. I support the Budget.

Sir, the Budget is very important to me, not only because it is a Union Government Budget but also because a great many of my constituents depend on it for a livelihood. I was elected on February, as a result of the mid-term poll and within five months I had to go for another election. Because of this, Sir, I appreciate the value of stability for our economy, and this industry must be protected and upgraded to make it more competitive.

Mr. President, Sir, in the budget, although the industry enjoys some concessions - 20 per cent of excise duty - I would like to see the industry enjoy 100 per cent. Exemption and this is not an impossible goal if we provide this certainty for our people.

I also see the direct expenditure from this sector of the economy is in the region of Rs.4,42, which is total impact on the economy of Rs.8 lakh. Sir, if we do this large export from which the country is dependent to our development.

This is a highly employment intensive business and new prospect should be our people, since we have no choice, in maintaining an economic balance. We had one problem, Sir, but that was resolved during the Opposition.

And the lack of small cultural industries is why I have spent so much time in my debate, emphasising the need for us to maintain a stable, mutual climate. It was clear the reason for delaying the decision is this House for a further long, in which I would say should not mention the one that invigorate the country.

For a worker or artisan primarily to must be assured that job and he must be paid properly for performing it. The Minister, on the other hand, if he is to be kept happy, must feel that he is getting value for his money, which will the result be high, as it is high in these industries, including the cost of getting to those industries. As I mentioned in the beginning to maintain balance this one must pay from income to another income. Mr.President, there is only a small possibility that there is not enough we can do about it. There are lot of other things we can do. We have always felt the township may come from citizens and received funding. Through education we can encourage our people to participate in the field through private of our economy. This is all done in which study Government can help. Whether he is working in the industry or not.

Mr.President, it would not be reasonable that anybody with no small income would be without some cost and we must educate our people and inspire them to accept to pay the cost. With the assistance we come here, many local things are being discriminated that our home treasure society. Many people in the small economy, but there are others,such as fraud, parallel-ism and other allied evils. The task for Government is to minimise the effects of these evils only in maintaining this social and political atmosphere upon which the industry is so dependent.

Sir, encouragements in one area that I have already and an still encouraged about. But we in particular, one regret that sometimes will not please the manner of money now required to invest from their hands in the Union Budget or any other discrimination only in final methods different from what they had left behind.

We, in this country, must maintain our

MR. SPEAKER, SOME PEOPLE (Inaudible). As well, have persons without a couple that they have good facilities when it comes to upgrade. We have seen, in my constituency, some new recognition [illegible] and have been effective rehabilitation to attend [illegible] meetings. We will should take our hats off to these five facilities who have entered under such adverse conditions. I believe, Sir, that we must pay tribute to those men who are responsible who have financed to help [illegible] have said [illegible]. They have done a good job and I say thanks.

MR. SPEAKER, Sir, I believe our [illegible] a definite and material identity and rise to a degree of [illegible] among our people. It opens up possibilities for education and employment and helps to [illegible] our young people for the [illegible] of [illegible] in our community.

In comparison [illegible] what would have been [illegible] from Alberta, [illegible], I feel, in the past did little to help develop sports in a proper perspective.

We, Sir, I feel, have to [illegible] area [illegible]. MR. SPEAKER, I am not [illegible] [illegible] of sports but little has been done and the young people have the ability, [illegible] must now have [illegible] with [illegible] that ability.

I see in the budget speech that [illegible] through Social Services [illegible] to establish a multi-purpose [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. W.VASSEUR SIOUI (CONTINUED): under the past leaders of the Government there that could have been used for our social development, were diverted to the military policy. Members of the new Executive Council will visit, and during the campaign to put the military under civilian management in order to civilianize Quebec. I look forward to that day.

Mr.Speaker, I realize that an election is an expensive proposition, but I also believe, also, that a great part of the blame with Quebec Liberals because was from the hiring of unnecessary and expensive staff members. Also, for the election announced up until now only a delegation from the new Government, some seven, even of the candidates were ready to close, because of unpaid bills, and yet the new Government have been accused of watching the money's finances - what rubbish, Mr. Speaker.

The airline boycott, I feel, Sir, has been one of the main reasons for our disunity as far as our financial position is concerned. The boycott has been backed by such names, musical brothers, sisters, comedians, disc-jockeys, show-biz people and who knows politician Presidents, they talk about nationalism - that is where nationalism was, and these were the people who vacationed the Laurentians who helped to build the airlines and kept it from folding to pieces, scarred for months. Mr.Speaker, in my opinion, they were not for Quebecair, they only used used the Quebecair wars.

Mr.Speaker, if the Chairman of that airline had been employed by any other large corporation, he would have been fired one month after he took office as Chairman.

MR.JAMES K.BENNETT: Mr.President, the Member is imputing evil to the right of which under the standing Orders of the House.

MR.PRESIDENT: Order what standing Order?

MR. JAMES K.BENNETT: 33 (3) and (4).

MR.PRESIDENT: 33 (3) and (4) say that it is out of order to use offensive and insulting language or to impute improper motives to another Member. My understanding of what the Member-opposite was saying was that the previous Chairman ....

MR. JAMES K.BENNETT: Mr.President, I was the former Chairman of Quebec Telephone and I challenge any Chairman to do any better than I did, the present one included.

MR.PRESIDENT: I do not think the Member is accomplishing by standing Orders from expressing his opinion that you did not do an effective job any more than you have been stopped from expressing the opinion that the present Members of Government are not doing effective jobs. If he wished to say that you believed Quebecair to be an effective and insulting company, I would certainly stop him. As I understand it, he has been questioning your efficiency, was questioning the propriety of your conduct as Chairman, and that he is entitled to. So long as you are entitled to question the efficiency and the effectiveness of the present Members of Executive Council. If I were to stop him now I would have had to stop numerous times in previous days and I do not think that you would have thought that right.

MR.W.VASSEUR SIOUI (CONTINUED): Mr.President, the Chairman of the Board of Quebec Airways or Tele-1 was Chairman; if he were his stock running operated he is in charge, he should surely scrutinize the Member from Sorbier from was in charge, if any action has subsequently that the airline took between up until the 30th June, 1964 of $10,000,000. Mr.President, in my opinion, you, if he had been working for any other large corporation

MR. K. BARRETT-BROWN (Conservative): The economy could quite well take more charges for putting the letters into the right slot.

Mr. President, I could mention today why some big companies are not happy with the postal dispensation at the moment, but I will confine myself to one thing, not grumbling.

The moment will remember also, Mr. President, that yesterday we were not allowed the normal Business of the House with which to debate the 1968 Wages Act. Why was that put on the Agenda under the Ministry knowing that was not so. That was put on the Agenda if a resolution, as I am not arguing anything that is wrong. They could not like whatever it was about, they said.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think we have already gone beyond the normal time for the Lunch Break, so as the Member was interrupted temporarily, I will suspend proceedings until 2.15.

AT 12.55 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

At 2.20 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH (ELECTED MEMBER): Mr. Speaker, contributing to the Social Services, we must be thankful to the Survey Club and those who support it for the fact that here they have provided the time to raise for our troubled youth. The Recreature Park for-sure and the Prospero Pebble Mine for CAYMA.

I feel, Sir, it is incumbent upon the Government to ensure that these human life changing difficult and complex people who understand and deal with these problems of youth, for-example, this particular case out east to be the case in the Sister Islands. I have received many complaints of these girls roaming around the neighbourhood, unfortunately they are without unnecessarily dressed and there seems to be a lack of supervision at the home and I questioned the qualifications of these nurses who seem to be on a long vacation in this country.

Despite these two fine institutions, some of our young people are still being subjected to domestic violence which cannot be wiped under here. Sir, I do not agree with Hon. J. that not even one of our young people should be sent off of this country. If we do not have the facilities that is dealt with then we must get them, even if it means an additional jail or penitentiary.

Mr.Speaker, this country owes a great deal to all of the members clubs in this country who have really restored the moral fibre over the years when the Government fine because of the high revenues and surpluses ignored our growing social problems.

Another area of disagreement is on the Maintenance Fund in this country. I came to join a question to this unresolvable issue, what can $30 per week buy for a child today? Even men who work and on their pleas are withdrawn and locate them imprisoned for one not on any any contributing to our social stability. They, I feel, should be compelled by law to provide from those salaries to help prevent them from becoming a further strain on our nations social system. $30 is certainly not enough and I would like to see this increased and accompanied by having to deal with the product any cost of living.

Mr.Speaker, we are thankful for the Government who had the declaration for providing the proposed sports complex on Walker's Road, it is a step in the right direction, but certainly we have a long way to go. We must consider the facilities necessary, not only on Walker's Road, but in the districts and the local neighbourhood that will offer our youths the opportunity to play together and to learn to care while reducing off the energies of youth.

In providing these facilities, Sir, with our limited resources, we have to be careful to avoid waste such as occurred in the playing field in my constituency. Mr.Speaker, I believe its time now in this country for the appointment of a National sports commission and the creation of a National sports fund to provide assistance for organizations in the Entrepreneurial Sector.

I would also like to make a brief mention of a recent suggestion, and I hope that the Member responsible is taking his notes - the creation of a national square dance to encourage our young people to participate. Mr.Speaker, Cayman sports and cultural heritage

MR. [illegible] SOSA (DOMINICAN REPUBLIC): [illegible]

Sir, there has never been a most pro-[illegible] have never been and there is not now the [illegible] of school teachers to go daily the highways and byways of our country ... to the [illegible] lack of school work. All the money in the world [illegible] be used properly into our treasury. And I believe our good Honorable Secretary, would not mind that, if we had all the money in the world we would help our needed projects and we [illegible] might disagree, and believe us that we [illegible] projects. We do not have any more improvement and rehabilitation than any most [illegible] money back again in the [illegible].

Sir, Mr. President, the Trade Administration Agency, they wanted [illegible] money and [illegible], in my opinion, a [illegible] do there is a [illegible] way? The administration of the [illegible] spent $350 M; how much was spent on social [illegible]? Looking at the Appropriation Bill for the current [illegible] $2,387,000 was [illegible] to be spent, and the [illegible] Administration. [illegible] to spend only $2,226,428 and [illegible] 1983 and for 1983, they [illegible] spent $850,581, making a total [illegible] of $3,136,979. This is the [illegible] which they spent in there has [illegible] $200 million.

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: In a point of [illegible] and [illegible] under Standing Order 21, Sir, the Member [illegible] and the people [illegible]. The [illegible] amount that was [illegible] and spent. There [illegible] administration was [illegible] and not [illegible].

MR. P. [illegible]: I thank the Member from Kaduna East for that point. May I intend, Sir, [illegible] and [illegible] but he cannot say that I am not [illegible] by saying that they only spent one [illegible] that they [illegible] of the [illegible] $3,136,979. As I said in their eight years, they did not [illegible] they had budgeted for.

In the Estimates, Sir, for 1983, we [illegible] to spend $1,961,621. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Mr. Minister finally gave this [illegible] to come [illegible], and if we spend [illegible] for this year [illegible] $4,288,763, a total of $3,750 [illegible] what the Unity [illegible] for Unity eight years in Unity [illegible].

Mr. President, I have no doubt in my mind that the present [illegible] will spend the money that is [illegible] which will help [illegible] and to the [illegible] that is so necessary in our country, and, Sir, I have no doubt that given the opportunity, this new Government will spend more [illegible], and I say that I am [illegible] with the [illegible] for this year, and at least the [illegible] is the last time to [illegible], because we will spend in this year [illegible], as part more of what they spent in their entire two terms, or this Government does have a social [illegible]. The [illegible] should be [illegible] of [illegible] this [illegible] total [illegible] in the Estimate for [illegible], for [illegible], when he will [illegible] that our [illegible] to waste the money on the [illegible], and, Sir, if in the course of the year this [illegible] are [illegible] to build more [illegible], then they will be built.

Mr. President, all of us in this Assembly have [illegible] have a great [illegible] of the social problems to be caused by the misuse of drugs, this problem must be approached with the [illegible] from drug rehabilitation centres. Those people who become addicted to this social [illegible], must be given a chance to live [illegible] and useful lives.

Also many [illegible] people, Mr. President, are

MR.R.MORRIS DUPLOOIJ: ...want to remove the already have mental defects and I think it is important that they are placed in a separate building from others, not all of the time, but some of the time, and are given specialist treatment.

I believe that, also, that we should be prudent [illegible] mind-drug situation in which young people or in early age, can be associated with the dangers of drug usage I believe that this should begin in the schools.

This task is not an easy [illegible] responsibilities of the most we must try to do something to make our young people

MR.PRESIDENT, there is, it seems, [illegible] people [illegible] in this day [illegible], we have been saddened by some reports that the Bahamas, and more recently the Cayman and Turks Islands, [illegible] drug traffic. We think great credit to [illegible] people, to make it easier for them to destroy society, Mr.President, too long have our [illegible] high time to punish for smoking less than a stick of ganja while the big boys [illegible] have at the [illegible] enforcement in this country.

Mr.President, I am glad that I can [illegible] for giving rights where rights is due and if one section of our community is going to suffer [illegible] all must suffer for the same cause. The drug [illegible] in this country need to be looked at, I [illegible] agree with [illegible] and I do not see [illegible] that the punishment of the [illegible] should be taken away, as the only [illegible] especially with a first offender. Those situations being [illegible] which unfortunately [illegible] are the feelings of the people, must address ourselves to it [illegible].

Sir, I have also believed that only people in a lesser crime than the wedding. The drug user himself is a victim. I believe that whether he is [illegible] he is not.

Question raised by the Honourable Member Last week, I am sure [illegible] the questions already have the answers they were seeking.

MR.C.BAIN SCOTT: Mr.President, on a point of order, the Member must not impute improper motives for the making of that question.

MR.PRESIDENT: I do not think that unnecessarily [illegible] Members is necessarily an improper motive. I think most questions are asked in the hope of enlightening somebody.

MR.K.MACKEY SMITH: Yes, Sir, I have a few other questions...

MR.PRESIDENT: There are different kinds of enlightenment. Of course, but.....

MR.K.MACKEY SMITH: Mr.President, I, Sir, am not enlightened. Nevertheless I see the hon. member going to [illegible], I say, think for it is not I.

Another purpose of these questions, I am sure was to place emphasis that I, in my role, as a legislator [illegible] conclude [illegible] the evidence from [illegible] of this case who happens to be a relative of mine. Both of the Elected Members from Grand Bahama have [illegible] the request for clemency for this man originated in the Courts whereunder [illegible] by the residents, requests of the drug [illegible] request for clemency was made a year ago, on [illegible] long before I was elected to this Honourable House.

I, Sir, would like certain [illegible], on the acceptance of questions by the Speaker of this House [illegible] clemency. But the fact [illegible] have merely in clarity [illegible] to a minute that it would have been difficult for him [illegible] to question him. That is the only [illegible], Sir, but I have heard of instances where evidence has [illegible] from the Court House in a change room, [illegible] stuck envelope of ganja [illegible] that charge. Mr. President, was one of [illegible] I would like [illegible] and prying into [illegible].

[illegible] morning, in which the house rose to its feet on three hours on the morning and a long warmth in the afternoon. The days are just enough for this short season to provide that possible. Use, if I use my good will figures as my friends in the opposition, I should really try to figure out what the average guest temperature in this world.

I ask in the budget address where Government will provide the service this year with a view to enabling the service here a stable interpretation again. Although I know that I would help to alleviate some of our problems, I am not sure to exchange development in Singapore in some might well be handled by private enterprise. Why the drawing of school children to these festivals before expenditure by Government. In the meantime this matter is not how much the majority of every country deplorably which because of the political aspect of the situation have gone unheeded. Publishing or my, this new Government must urgently address itself to the problems before we find ourselves with a deficit on our hands that has really been unnecessarily avoided in the past.

Some of the basic technological ideas children have no doubt in your condition, for my other day, the children were packed into the house under the worst of overcrowding conditions. On returning home in the afternoons on a rainy day, they see put of the house in the rain for the classrooms that their homes to have their school books, their clothes, their bodies washed. This is unjustified for no time for the people of every Government to provide the opportunity. I must do more to object.

The two main objectives that we have to put in our discussion during the years, will accelerate some of the problems that that is not enough. These objectives that are being put that no amount of money must provide the assistance to encourage a society.

Mr. President, [illegible] from here [illegible] Singapore was mentioned just now. The two airports, the new facilities that we build, the ferry that sought to move of this [illegible] expansion, if I remember correctly, cost [illegible] of private development, of a cost of $12,000,000 and when the Government of the day undertook a responsible attempt of the year ago, for the private sector, the ferry here, on they are anxious now, stopped a small [illegible] project.

On behalf the country, which would like, why, commend the work of all departments such as Singapore, Singapore, and medical [illegible]. Since 1978, the Government in the previous administration have spent more than $60,000 broadway down while and building that have without deteriorating our health care service.

Last year they planned a new [illegible] for the $500,000-hospital. They also put the Government's hand in [illegible] which, a most unavailable place, and Singapore there, why, no one will not seem the problem, has figured out the extent of the [illegible] that they have [illegible]. This I do know, and that is, all [illegible] which can read for the people and they, like, in my opinion, to

MR. K. KAUNDA (UNIP) (CONTINUED): ... [illegible]. ... those so-called
shortcomings of the Welfare Society, were now saying incredible things
from 40 fourteen-in a pack of stupidities that one gave you answer.

I ask the previous Member for Lands
working between eight and six o'clock and 40 or 50 a week of
negotiations, while his fellow, Mr. Fraser-Moleketi, encouraged the public
never before a real enjoyment of experience came that: the Island.
That, Sir, is their mentality of helping the poor.

I am dealing with the Budget and I
would say, although it is not the opinion of some of my other
colleagues, that I had hoped to hear Mr. Ken Grant the Vice President
of UNIP, instead of bringing someone else. I know the man who is
acting as a qualified man, he has been here before, he is a good
man, but I contend, Sir, that if a man has called an UNIP or stood
in the other reserves for months and for months, and for months,
why do we need to bring someone in to replace him? I believe
and I would have thought he would make just a good choice. I only
use words, but that in my opinion, and as I said before, somati-
tationally, otherwise are perfect.

Social Services. Mr. Speaker, Sir,
Honourable Financial Secretary said on page 22 of his Budget
Address that change was the breakdown for the Department of Social
Services for 1964. Perhaps, Sir, there were mistakes, but there
certainly was not enough and not, in my opinion, in the right areas.
The new Government, in keeping with our promises, must pay attention
concentration to the social problems of our country as a matter of
urgency.

Mr. President, the Prime Minister Member
from Nadola Township, during his three or four days speech in
the House, he took much offence that we had received this sum of money
for social services. I said it myself and I say it today, the
Unity Government administration has no commitment to social development.
This country today needs a social programme that will work at every
level of our community to enable our people to benefit fully during
the have a chance in the future.

Sir, as they have [illegible] about
has not been all good, in fact, morality things have gotten worse.
Today, Mr. President, we see a number of social problems in our
country resulting of family support, exposure of our young people
to anti-social behaviour and creations of new dictations in our
society. We see prostitute ghetting, careless shopping crowd, juve-
tilation, disrespect for the law and mounting problems of the over-
powers family.

I, Sir, do not contend that nonetheless
we could have prevented all of our social problems, but I did
expect to see a clear course of positive action carried out now
that the Unity Government would have announced on the end to the
kind of social development which I believed would have prevented
most of the problems facing us today.

They talk about the increase in the wel-
fare rolls ... but yet, Sir, I agree again that they did increase the
amount in the welfare rolls, of course I believe it was done for
political reasons, but, Mr. President, giving someone $50 a month
did nothing to help the problem except to the very soul of our
society. What a month could half people like Shepiole Zwelakhe
who they were giving it to or how were wives, but it did no well-paid
to blame of alleviating our social economy of the day. When
we look at the amount of money spent on this country during their
administration, in comparison to what they spent on social services,
it is no wonder we have such backwards when it comes to social

MR. MAKGEKA (MAKWASSIE): ... and it is the only way before take him home.

Sir, lack of proper training today is the forerunner of much of the hooliganism in our society. Many of our young children are being taken out of school at age 15 and 16 years with hardly any qualifications for anything, and without the means or opportunity of getting any training. Our most of these young people, after leaving school roam about like a lame-duck. Is there any wonder what they human frustrated and rebellious and get into mischief?

Mr. President, I believe that these are the few of our young people who, if they are given a chance to do something constructive, will not succeed. We have them in every society, but more so here, because they are the out of school with no hope of breaking it all so as anything.

Sometimes, Sir, as an example, if I need my washing machine or refrigerator in my car repaired, to be almost a certainty that I will have to call an electrician, and, with the exception of one or two, the all Makwassies, will not be much better than a doubler, who will always be sure what the result is. In these are things that are affecting our economy and make life in these industrial very expensive.

In the past ministers, Sir, I made that nothing was being done for our young people. Some people wrote letters to the press saying that I should be doing more. Anyway, Mr. President, like the secretariat village, are what I was talking about and I am very happy to be a part of a thriving, well-organized Government, who cares. One need not be doing something about it.

The previous administration did about : Natal teaching school that was badly needed and I give them credit for that, but they were not nearly enough. The Native teaching School, in my opinion, is not a joke. For what jobs are we training scholars? On what basis are they going to find jobs? Sometimes, Sir, I wonder if the previous Government did not have ulterior motives behind, thinking as ways to waste the money belonging to the people; that would ensure that the black people, would never, ever get a chance to help ourselves.

Sir, thank God, we have found that the majority have confidence and, as the honourable Chief Minister said in his address - "We are on the threshold of great things".

Mr. President, I had hoped that the few Hon. Members who mentioned the land-locked status would have come this House with their open mind and that they would have joined with us in trying to do what they obviously did not have the experience to do, but instead, they have come in here, as I said in opening that was prepared to condemn the people and to make clear my opinion the new Government.

MR. ROBERT D. MOLEKA: Mr. President, on a point of order. The Member is referring to the Members of the previous Government and I happen to be one - I have never spoke to confuse the people of this country - I will never try to confuse them, I will never try to mislead them and I think if he is referring to the two Members from Lesotho he should say so. That I do not want to be included with them in ...

MR. M.MOKHEHLE SIKOTA: Mr. President, he was part of the Unity Cabinet and it was a Unity Government he has not forgotten.

Mr. President, they have come in here, completely in my opinion, to confuse, and they have been confusing our people ... to make them my opinion the new Government.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Mr. President, I do not think anyone since I have been in politics or my colleague has been in politics, for twelve years, they've been mislead or misformed the people of this country. We have tried to show what we going on, all of because we are telling the people how the condition the country is in that is upset.

MR. L. STANLEY MILLER: Mr. President on a point of clarity. Sir, I think you asked quite a question here a few days ago explaining that when people were asking on points of order or questions, they should quote chapter and verse of the Standing Orders under which they are ...

MR. PRESIDENT: I think what I said was if somebody rose on a point of order they should tell me which Standing Order the point of order was on. If they do not I will assume that it is a point of explanation and since the Member gave way, then it will be responded to under S.O. (b) - rose on a point of order.

MR. LINDSAY J. PATTERSON: Mr. President, on a point of order under S.O. (b), it states specifically that no Member shall impute improper motives to another Member, so I think that the Member from East End was quite in order. Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think it is improper to state people may be in what many politicians do all the time.

MR. LINDSAY J. PATTERSON: It is improper, Sir, to state that the Member is doing it, if he is not.

MR. PRESIDENT: Whether he has done it, it is a matter of opinion and people are allowed freely to express their opinions in the House.

The Member may continue.

MR. H. MONTAGU EDGE: Thank you very much, Sir. Continuing the point? commiseration, but I want to remind them that they would stop speaking and I want to remind them that they should ignore commentators. This is what they have told us.

And it is my opinion that they are saying it, again to the people unnecessarily. I do believe that much of this is tough and I wonder if they really want to get back in power. I believe, Sir, that they should be happy to see the new Council electing to maintain them at the road that they have started. It must be plain to the country now that they were incapable of proceeding the development as are on. They are misleading the people and this is my opinion, but I believe it is all right. They are like what my uncle used to say about a certain man in my constituency that he would go around and rock the boat - I pick for another he would whisper - I know you don't have one'. They are happy to find a fault, they are looking for a fault and making what they do not like it.

As I said, Sir, I suppose the expected community college and I will suggest at this time that we name it the Alpha Community College, certainly, Sir. We have all the ingredients - we are a new beginning.

Transportation for school children. Mr. President, in my Resolution document, at the present time, we only transport in one form or the other, about twelve thousand of school children to the High Schools and Middle Schools in Georgetown from the outer districts. Sir, I see in the Estimates where we will spend $388,000 on this transportation this year. So we have found ... by an equally large sum to be by and on what we basically a part-time

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTH LEGISLATURE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(THURSDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1995)

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR C PETER LLOYD, CBE, QPM – PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS W FOSTER, CVO,QC,JP	SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J HAWKINS, QC, JP	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C REFFORGOS, CP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON BERNICE D EBANKS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M MORGAN BODDEN, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES E KIRKCONNELL	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON TRUMAN G TOMLINSON, CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M McKEEVA BUSH	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR LINWOOD A DIBBIN, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT MARK P KIRKCONNELL	FIFTH ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CAYMAN BRAC
MR JAMES M ADAMS	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR G HAIG BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D ORRIN WILLIAMS	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN D HOLLAR	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING & BRIEF MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

THURSDAY

26TH MARCH, 1985

1. POWER BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS:-

(1) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.1/85 - COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE: THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR SECOND TOWN (CONTINUING)

(2) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.4/85 - APPOINTMENT OF ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST END

(3) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.5/85 - ELECTORAL LEGISLATION

TO BE MOVED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST END

(4) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.6/85 - AMENDMENT TO ROAD TRAFFIC ORDER

TO BE MOVED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR SECOND TOWN AND SECONDED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END

(5) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.7/85 - RESIGNATION OF PUBLIC OFFICER

TO BE MOVED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST END

2. CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE ENSUING SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1985) BILL, 1985

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS:

BILLS:-

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(CONTINUATION OF SECOND READING DEBATE)

MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER

COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

HOUSE RESUMES

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(37) SCHEDULE AND SECOND READING

(1) THE REPRESENTATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(2) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (CONSTITUTION, POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO. 1/21 – CONSTITUTION OF OFFICE	
(a) SHRI G. RAMA REDDY	1
(b) SMT. P. SUNEETHA RAMA	2
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO.4/05 – APPOINTMENT OF ADVOCATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	28
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO.5/05 – SECRETARIAL ASSISTANCE	31
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO.6/05 – ESTABLISHMENT OF SMALL FARMERS PROTECTIVE AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	32
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO.7/05 – APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE COMMITTEE	35
ADJOURNMENT	40

THURSDAY

14TH MARCH, 1996

10:00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. It being Thursday, it is Private Members' Motions which have priority, and there being no questions, the first item on the Order Paper is Private Member's Motion No. 5 of 1996. The debate on that Motion had begun on Tuesday, I think, of last week, and the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town was speaking.

The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. D. KAYE BODDEN: Mr. President, with your indulgence I would like the House to know that the First Elected Member for Bodden Town telephoned me to say that he was not feeling well this morning, but may be here some time later during the day.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

MR. D. KAYE BODDEN: And, Mr. President, if you would repeat your indulgence, I would just like to say that I regret the passing of Mr Ira Thompson who did so much to preserve the history of these Islands, and would like to remind the House that Government some time ago, purchased the many artifacts that he had collected over the years. When we .....

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps, if I could just recommend we start and thank you for it, I am sure all Members would wish to join in expressing their sorrow at learning of the death of Mr Ira Thompson, who was a very widely respected and loved gentleman.

Thank you.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.5/96
CONFIRMATION OF POLICE
(CONTINUATION OF DEBATE)

MR. D. KAYE BODDEN (CONTINUING): Mr. President, when the debate was adjourned on Private Member's Motion No.5, dealing with the Commissioner of Police, by closing statement had been that I supported the original motion passed by this House in 1992 - the motion which is now the subject of the Motion before the House seeking to rescind the original motion.

The reasons why I supported the original motion still remain the reasons why I still support it. The original motion resolved that it affirms [that is referring to the Honourable House] its fullest confidence in the integrity and probity of the Commissioner of Police. I still support that statement. I still have, although he is gone, the fullest confidence in the integrity of the former Commissioner of Police.

From the time he came to this Island he conducted himself in a manner befitting the rank of the highest police officer in the land. Members know that he had served as a high ranking police officer in these Islands several years before and had returned to England where he had been given a higher post, and he came back for his second tour of duty to serve as our

MR. G. LEE BODDEN (COMMISSIONER): Commissioner of Police. He came back to Cayman the second time in 1960, and one of his first actions was to meet with the Members of the Legislative Assembly. In that meeting he set out in an easy plan which he had for the improvement of the Police Force. Members also told him in that meeting of the many complaints we had about the Police Force at that time. He told him about the many promises which the Police Force had got to undertake and a plan of action which was well known to all the Members of the Legislative Assembly, as the representatives of the people of the Cayman Islands.

I can say that when he left here last year, he had carried out most of these plans. He had brought about improvement in the Force. One must understand that when the Commissioner arrived here in 1960, the Police Force was at an all time low in morale. There was public agitation against the police. The scene was leading to disciplines, and the Commissioner fathered about his job of building a Police Force of which we could be proud.

He accomplished this, and we find himself again being asked by the Queen granted the Cayman Islands the Prefixes of 1953, She, herself, bestowed upon the Police Force of the Cayman Islands, the suffix name of the Cayman Islands Royal Police Force. An honour which is only bestowed when a Police Force merits such recognition.

The programme worked out by the Commissioner was the formation of the Special Constabulary. This new unit in the Force was made up of volunteers from the private sector who dedicated themselves to extensive training; who received no pay, and who were willing to come out and render whatever extra hours are needed. I need not elaborate on the fine job they did with the security for the Queen's visit and on the many other occasions when their services have been used. And this is why I support the motion which affirms the confidence in the Commissioner of Police.

He also told us the one of his early ambitions that he wished to see up and working was in the Sister. This is something that had been talked about for very years, and is just one of the first questions asked in this House in 1972 had been, "When will Government buy a police boat?". So the Commissioner set up a marine unit in which the police had, at one time, three patrol boats which were used for patrolling the Islands; which have given assistance in rescuing those stranded in ships; which have been used to save the lives of people in distress, and the full unit is commanded by a Cayman Islander once. And this is why I still have confidence in the Commissioner Sinuens.

He spoke about the need for improvement in the facility for vehicle licensing and the issuing of driving licenses. The licensing department of Government of the Police Force had been working under conditions which were not conducive to the efficient carrying out of their job. And it was at the instigation of the Commissioner of Police that we built the new building all out of capital funds from our revenue - funds that mine were borrowed. This is one of the items that answers the question, "What did we do with the money that we spent?".

This fine building, Mr. President, enabled the Commissioner to carry out his hope for improving the facilities for the licensing department of Government.

The Commissioner spoke about the need for the provision of a modern communications network and of other new equipment. May I assure him and this Legislature that I agree with the original motion which affirms the confidence which the Legislative Assembly feels they should express to the Commissioner.

MR. G. CRAIG BROWN (CONTINUING): He had, as one of his qualifications, the ranking of the general standard of performance of the Police Force, and this has been done. We must remember that however much we criticise the Police Force, the performance of the individual officers is of a much higher standard than it has ever been in the past.

I do not want to go into the detailed programme for training which he set out, but I have two full pages of the officers who went away on different courses - officers who excelled in the classes in which they had been placed, and who came back and are now performing their functions.

One of his charges was also rectified and that is why I can say that I have the utmost confidence and I fully agree with the motion that was proposed and cannot agree with the attempt to remove that motion. But, the matter that most caused his downfall was that of the dual positions in these Islands.

Mr. Speaker, we are complaining that we only failed the little boy who smoked his little stick of ganja and that the dealers of any substance have never been brought before the courts. And the members of the Legislative Assembly, although some of them may drug it badly, know the Commissioner of Police is mandate to go all out to arrest the drug problem. And he spent about his job and he did bring to court many drug dealers and many drug problems. We also have tremendous assistance to the United States of America in which we spend the drug problem. But the head of the drug dealer, like the head of the mythical de long scorpion, and when you touch them you have trouble on your hands. And I believe it was because of this fine job the Commissioner had done in dealing with the drug heads, that he was removed wrongfully and that he left this Island virtually a disgraced man. He was humiliated; he was abused and finally rejected.

The second reason why I agree with the original motion and why I feel it should never be rescinded is because what motion also said that the Legislative Assembly will afford him all possible support in carrying out his duties of enforcing law and order in these Islands. This statement should stand for all times, and for all Commissioners of Police; the present one, and the ones to come in the future.

If this motion is rescinded today, the Legislative Assembly will be saying we would not have stood behind Commissioner Stevens in carrying out his duties of enforcing law and order. But, what is even worse, we will be saying to the incumbent Commissioner of Police that he will not stand behind him in the carrying out of his duties of enforcing law and order. And what would be most disastrous is that we would be saying to future generations to come that the Legislative Assembly will not stand behind the Commissioner of Police who enforces law and order.

So, for the two reasons just mentioned, we should not rescind the motion. The original motion went on and further resolved that this House strongly recommend that should the Commissioner of Police wish to institute proceedings for defamation against any person who have made or published such false allegations, Government as these allegations were made as a result of the carrying out of his official duties, the Government agree to indemnify fully the Commissioner of Police in any costs and outlays he may incur in bringing such action.

What the resolution did was simply to recommend that the Government should pay any expenses that he may incur in bringing action. But the resolution did not authorise the payment. There

MR. C. MAIG SCOTT (SOUTHERTON): It is only one body which can authorise a payment, and that is the Finance Committee.

So the resolution which was passed, merely expressed the wish of the Members who voted for it. It did not put any charge upon the finances of this country. It did not put any obligation on the Financial Secretary to expend any money. It could not. It simply said, "..... we feel strongly", and that what is happening to the Commissioner of Police could happen to any other Civil Servant. It could happen to the Governor of the land. It could happen to the judge of the Grand Court. It could happen to the Collector of Customs.

We feel this action is wrong because I believe that certain unsavoury elements for political power in this country went all out to make the Commissioner of Police a scapegoat, and also had in the back of their minds that if they could destroy the public servant, it would bring down the Government.

One must remember, in dealing with this motion before the House, the aim in which it was set. One must remember the conditions that prevailed; the atmosphere that led to the attack upon the Commissioner. It came at a time when the Cayman Government was at the height of its glory. We had just brought Her Majesty the Queen to the Cayman Islands - something never done before in our long history. It was brought at a time when we had the largest surplus in our revenue. It was brought at a time when we had the largest reserves in our country. It was brought at a time when the elected Government had confirmed at its very best, and the would-be politicians knew that the next move would be an election and if they did not start something there might even be nominations. There would not be any elections and we would just all be returned as the two Members from Sudden Death had been in 1972, that is the Member for East End had been in 1968 - returned without any opposition.

So the devil minds of the opposition had to find some mischief, and it is unfortunate that they selected an innocent man. It is unfortunate that they pounced upon the one man who had ever been willing to bring the drug dealers to justice in this country; and one wonders how far the drug money has really reached in this country.

The motion before the House would remind one of the last motions ever passed. Had, if that unpatriotic motion had done what the opposition claims it had done, I would say we should rescind it. Many elected members have spoken . They claimed it would break the Government (they might not have minded it in this House this time, but they have proclaimed it enough times from that they have). And, they associated some of the public with these wild assumptions that the Government would go broke.

So the motion over nothing, but the very citizens of the people who were against that motion cost there Islands a lot of money and a lot of anguish. It cost, as a result of this little tempest in a teapot which was started after the Queen's visit, an investigation of many public servants - cost that costs much money. Many questions were raised in the House in the early stages. At that time the money expended by Government was a little over $25,000; and I think afterwards there may have been other costs, or at least it must have cost the Government (F.C.O.) it was even the British Government some money.

Also, it has resulted this year in the opposition to have the Commissioner out of his job. We have called this Finance Committee the day after the swearing-in of the

MR. G. ERIC BOGGIS (CONTINUING): ...nearly ruined Honiara; and, in fact, the meeting was so hurriedly called that I did not get my notice as I had gone off to Makira. I did not receive the notice until I came back. But, it was so hurriedly called, telling us that all of a sudden the Commissioner wanted to retire and leave, and that we would have a new Commissioner; but, to get rid of Commissioner Kissoon they would have to pay him $50,000. And Finance Committee voted the money. I agree of public funds because Commissioner Kissoon's contract was to run until August, and if he had served us all of these years, we realise how hard he was, he could have lasted until August and we would not be paying two Commissioners of Police salaries from January to August. So we paid eight months extra anyway. We paid the eight months salary for the Commissioner to the end of his contract and we did not get any return for it because he was sent off. And of course, while we were paying him we had to pay whoever was acting or whoever was the new Commissioner. So it did cost the Government extra money.

While the elected members of Executive Council were making this thought provoking speech, they were destroying the documents and the records which are left, ending 31st September, 1982, in a deficit position or surplus in this range of $800,000. So this was just another $50,000 out of that.

I am not saying that we should not have brought in a new Commissioner of Police when the Commissioner's contract was up, but there was no need to do it in this fashion. And the feedback I am getting from the public is that this motion, or rather the explanation to this motion, had a lot to do with it, and the Commissioner's leaving in a manner result of complaint procedure. While it cannot be proven .....

HON. SIR PETER KENILOREA: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would give way under Standing Order 32?

I should just like to draw the attention of the Chair, and the Member, Mr. President, to the statement that was circulated by the Honourable Prime Minister on this question of the Commissioner's departure as a result of a question asked by the Union during this Meeting.

I think the Member is making somewhat a position entirely different from the statement made by the Commissioner on his early retirement.

MR. G. ERIC BOGGIS: Mr. President, I have that statement right here, and in fact, just been reading from certain parts of it when I dealt with the achievement of the Commissioner. I am well aware of what the statement said. It was a press release, and with your permission I will read it for the benefit of the Honourable Member.

> "His Excellency the Governor, Mr. Peter Lloyd, today announced that the Commissioner of Police, Mr. E.J.S. Stevens, QPM, will be retiring at the end of the year. A separate announcement will be made later about the appointment of his successor.
>
> Mr. Stevens was promoted from his post as Commandant of the Police College in Exeter, England, to be the head of CID in the Cayman Islands in mid 1978. In 1980 Mr. Russell, the then Governor, invited him to become Commissioner of the Cayman Islands Police for a period of five years to develop, re-equip and manage training for the force.
>
> Commenting on his decision to retire, Mr. Stevens said, "When I assumed command of the force in 1980, I said

MR. S. PAUL SCOTT (CONTINUED):

several major objectives. They included the formation of the Spaniel Conservancy and of a marine unit; improvements in the facilities for mobile klaxonway and the cause of driving; Mounsea; the provision of a modern communications network and of video new equipments; arrangements for boats and some refresher training to be undertaken locally; and the maintenance of the general standard of performance. Both of these objectives having been realised, it is now necessary to consider what should be the next steps in the development of the Royal Solent Islands Police Force. I believe that this might appropriately be considered by whoever will become responsible for implementing any decisions reached - and that is why I think it is now time for a new Commissioner to find out the action that had been planned."

The Governor said he was deeply indebted to Mr. Stevens who had served the Islands with distinction. "The task of a Commissioner of Police is never easy, particularly in a small community", he added, "and must often be controversial. But, Mr. Stevens can take pride in what has been achieved during his tenure of office. I shall remember in particular the successful performance of the force at the time of Lord Lucan's Royal Visit, and the splendid manner in which the duty was done during the recent elections. All of us owe much to Mr. Stevens, and, like his many friends here, I am grateful for the invaluable contributions he made. Furthermore, I quite understand the reasons which have prompted his retirement and have therefore agreed the arrangements proposed. "

The main thing of the Deputy's Party was to get rid of Commissioner Stevens if they were elected; although the getting rid of the Commissioner or any public servant is outside the domain of the Government under the Constitution. Every member of the Deputy Team and in their campaign that they would like to see the Commissioner go. And when he became one day, or picked on announcements to learn, one day after they were voted into a majority into Executive Council - what do you suppose the public to believe? Nobody ever changed my beliefs. I believe he left. I believe he retired. I believe he would have been a fool to stay with the vicious attack that had been made upon him by what is now a majority of the members of this House.

I understand that your Excellency has accepted his retirement. I understand that. But, I also know that the public are there believes that he were helped along in his retirement. It was a retirement that he did on his own, but which was forced upon him because he feared the representations that would come from a Government who had campaigned to get rid of him. He feared, or must have feared, what they would do to him. So they tell him go," they are not going to pay him anything. And so he volunteered his own head to leaving because he would have been sacked had he stayed.

The reason for the original motion which necessitation to occupy today, was because the Government of the day felt that the Commissioner had been unjustly criticised; had been unfairly attacked, and it did no good to the image of this country for would-be investors going around the place on public platforms saying our Commissioner was corrupt and that our Government were corrupt. And some people would disagree, I believe, which one mistake if it could bring them into power.

MR. G. WAIT HOUSE (CONTINUING): We can't make any more time for the hon. Member who left it a little bit too late to escape that distinction.

I now turn to the motion which is before the House. The Motion is phrased in such a way as to leave out the substantive portion of the original motion. The Motion reads:

> "NOTING the Private Member's Motion No.3/84, passed by the Legislative Assembly on 2nd December, 1984, it was recommended that this Government move to indemnify Philip Ben Commissioner of Police, Mr. James Stevens, in any costs and outlays he may claim in bringing proceedings for defamation against persons who made or published false allegations against his conduct and character;".

The key words that have been left out are, 'official duties'. Had the original motion read that the allegations were made as a result of the carrying out of his official duties, Government would stand behind him. But, these people who have brought this Motion have actually left out the words, 'result of the carrying out of his official duties'. This is the crux of the whole matter.

The motion that was passed originally did not give additional powers to people to resort to the Government for legal fees. It specified it to be an officer of the Government who was falsely abused while carrying out his official duties. There is no excuse for leaving out those words, and I understand why they have been left out. Throughout the campaign against this army, no mention was ever made from any platform that the Government was assisting behind a police officer in the execution of his duties, or the words read, 'in the carrying out of his official duties'.

Mr. President, it was brought out during Question Time in this House a few days ago that the Private Member's Motion passed in 1984 is dead in the water, and in itself is not even Government's policy. The Honourable Premier said in reply that no money has been spent under this motion, and that no money will ever be spent because the motion did not guarantee the spending of the money.

Now, if the motion is important and if the motion has not, in the past, and will not in the future, spend any money, why should it be rescinded? Is it simply to get rid of that little part of the motion that affirms the confidence in the integrity of the man, or that little part that said that we will stand behind a police officer just by which I mean the entire Police Force in the execution of his duties keeping law and order in the country? Or is the reason so easily understood, because not only did the members of this Legislature speak overseas, to raise the Commissioner's profile, but they also proceeded to get rid of the Commonwealth notice as they called it.

In nine things out of ten that we have dealt with in this House since the December election, we have only been dealing with the misinformation of the public. We have only been dealing with things that ..... if the Member wants to speak I will give way.

MR. SPEAKER: We did not hear.

MR. G. RAYE ROGERS (CONTINUING): We have been dealing solely with original premises and then Motions before the House to for the ratification of another contract premise. It cost us $40,000 in November to ratify a contract premise.

MR. M. McKAYA ROSE: What about Mrs. Rogers?

MR. G. RAYE ROGERS: It is going to cost much more in the long run of confidence and in the administration of this Police Force when they find out that this Government no longer stands behind them in the examination of their official duties. This matter goes a lot further.

Everyone knows that in the Magistrate which governs the Civil Service, and in your other powers, there is always a commission from Government, and it has been done in the past, to give consideration for legal fees whether the person be a poor person or whether he be a public officer. All expenses are paid, and even without this matter, would have been paid. I think if the Commissioner wanted to institute proceedings he would have paid his legal fees. This was not the object of this motion. The object was to try to put a period upon the mention of certain disciplinary points who had become threatening certain;

They were sending letters to the papers. They were organizing meetings. They were holding public meetings. We have coming near to a situation of real strife in this country, there, as my colleague from Bodden Town said, the fuse was lighted the day. This was the circumstance in which this motion originated for the good and peace of this country. It was not for the matter of paying legal fees.

MR. M. McKAYA ROSE: Did you say?

MR. G. RAYE ROGERS: Many the Police would have done it. Then of course, and the Commissioner, being a man of substance, might have paid his own way. But, it was simply to put a lid on this situation that had broken out. The motion was passed simply to ensure the political discrimination that were caused by ourselves, but not well-meaning people.

Today, if we pass this motion Member's Motion, we will be going back to anarchy. We will be going back to mob rule. We will be going back to the situation where no public officials of the Government can be respected.

Now, we are not here in judgment of the Commissioner. This Motion is not to decide whether he did right or wrong. This Motion is not to say whether he had been good or evil. This Motion which has been brought would suggest a ludicrous motion. This Motion which is before us would be a step backward, when no person who is attacked would know who might be a fair target. It has some meaning ramifications; some of them not understood by the enlightened temperaments of the time against our Commissioner of Police. He may have had his faults, but no person would have come against him if they had existed until they had found someone without even the least a stone;

I will close with two Scripts which will remain realistic in my mind. One is that when the Commissioner left this Island he had every right to smile because of his love of the challenge which the political machinery the this Island would have used against him. The second thought that will not be uttered in my mind is that it is a disgrace to the people of the Cayman Islands to suggest a motion which simply ramifications our commitments to support the police in their unselfish duties.

MR. S. MARY BOOKER (CONTINUING): Finally, when the public became aware that some of the perpetrations of the politicians against the Commissioner were themselves chargeable in corporation involved in crime, the public loosened the war which it had been taught to be. And now today, that all of that has been said to work, it is wrong to pronounce it and bring it up-to-date in the old genre fashion, and to appeal to our more simply to ratify the action that was expressed during the political campaign.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? Then I will invite the mover to exercise his right of reply.

MR. R. MONTAGUE DIGGS: Mr. President, in bringing this Motion to this Honourable House, I did so upon the request of my constituency, and many others from other districts, including citizens and voters from the Golden Rock constituency.

In bringing this Motion I had not really expected the reaction, foolish debate we have just listened to. But, Mr. President, if nothing else, this motion has served to highlight what really got the ex-Commissioner into difficulty with the public.

Mr. President, I first want to thank the Honourable First Official Member for his contribution and for his debate in which he enlightened the House. What they, who opposed this Motion here today, perhaps fail to understand is that in the early debate in 1623 on Sukkoth Hebrew's Holy Day, members of the public and myself were interrogated. And I firmly believe, Sir, that the motion was brought to this Honourable House in 1993 for that purpose and that purpose alone. They wanted to castigate people; they wanted to say certain things that they have said here could not be said on the public platform. Just like the Honourable gentleman just heard. This is one of the reasons why the motion was brought. They had not the guts to get on the public platform and say the things that they have said here. But they could do so here under the honoured privilege of this House.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member must not impute improper motives to another Member, and it is unparliamentary to say that anything Member said lied.

MR. R. MONTAGUE DIGGS: Thank you very much, Sir. Maybe misinformation is another word that could be used. I heard it used before.

Mr. President, let us get down to the Motion, politics, let us deal with politics, Sir.

Sir, a Commissioner of Police or any police officer, in my opinion, should not align himself with political leaders. Right or wrong, the people of this country feel that the ex-Commissioner of Police was chargeable of applying the law firmly to certain political leaders, their families and their friends.

Whether it be true or not, there were many rumours of the ex-Commissioner's failure to enforce the law against certain political leaders and their friends. We have heard, Sir, of the case of the Cecils, of when the Commissioner had certain information challenging Mr. Romero's involvement with drugs. But, Sir, Mr. Speaker was allowed to rescue .....

MR. PRESIDENT: Order. The Government may refer to any case of which a judicial decision is pending, and my information is that in the case of which mention is being made, a judicial

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUING): ...decision might be pending because... [illegible] hoped that if they were brought back here there would be a trial.

MR. V. HOWARTH (RCD): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise by point ruling. However, a Bill of Particulars or did they [illegible] Mr. Smith is not coming back to this country.

Anyway, I abide by your ruling on the President of this House. I was not going to refer to the case, Sir, so more than to say that one Kenyan walked out of the offices of a political leader in this country.

Another case I would cite, Sir, is that when a relative of a leading politician had in his possession an unlicensed firearm, namely, Sir, a revolver gun. He was not prosecuted. The public knows about this and the public was upset.

The ex-Commissioner's action in causing the ministerials was upheld by the public as the stand beside the agent's lines. Sir, there was a general outcry for his resignation then, and as Shakespeare says the conduct of the fellow Romans. Sadly enough in this country, Mr. President, we find leading the response for the fellow Romans.

I mention, Sir, of the Police Force was subsequently ordered and during the course of this ruling the results were not published, although promises were made to the public. I hope Government Ministers of Government will remember that remarks. It was a campaign promise that Flat Rocks should be only public and it has not yet been made public. I would like to see it. However, during the course of this motion, the ex-Commissioner of Police's resignation was pressured for two more years by the Unity Administration.

In September, 1992, Her Majesty's Secretary of State, Mr. Brooke, upon the result of the preliminary review, ordered a further investigation of allegations made against the Commissioner. By what were those allegations made? Who made the allegations that would this second review? Where was this man working? Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the name was Snapshot.

On 12th September, 1992, as I explained it and I may be corrected, the Governor of this country informed Legislature that the Commissioner had resigned, as had Mitchinson of Scotland Yard. What did we see? We saw the following morning that Members of the Unity Government, or some of them, not necessarily in this Assembly had decided to give Mr. Brooke a vote of confidence. As you then was published in the newspaper of the Daily Nation, the Sun, on Friday morning, 18th September, 1992.

This was, in my opinion, and I will hold it forever and ever, the statement of Mr. Brooke and his political release. Thanking them, not only at the Government people who wanted him to leave, but at the authority of Her Majesty's representative in this country.

Now, however this was with a proper denouncement of the authority of the Police Force as published in the Times newspaper in September, 1992, after a certain political leader had been arrested while driving under the influence of drugs. He always was seen brought before the court when a Detective Politician and members of his family, as a result, erroneously damaged the Swire Inn to the tune of $2,000.

MR. M. MENDEZ ROSE (CONTINUING): Mr. President, these are the things that cause the general public of these islands, including this Member, to look faith in the Commissioner's ability to operate the Police force of this colony, and which led to the cry for his termination.

In my opinion, Sir, Mr. Stevens exhibited good judgment when he tendered his resignation after a new Government was elected in this Assembly. That was said and done publicly before this honourable House, hopefully, will aid in restoring the Caymanian people's confidence in the Police Force; something that no one can deny is not now needed.

As far as the candidates of this election is concerned, we have much above the $60,000 and I would also here for public record that I have nothing of that nature. Although I understand they have begun to comment on that Finance Committee meeting. That had I been there, Sir, I would not have agreed because the cut of the Commissioner of Police in the estimates of the year has seen this country threatened and unnecessary and pharmacies of dollars, and no one knows where it will or just end.

Sir, as far as it being a campaign promise, yes, it was a campaign promise, and, yes, it helped to beat the Unity Team considerably at the polls. I would say, Sir, that the 5,350 odd voters that the majority in this House today have enfranchised, these all honest people concerned about the welfare of this country.

One thing the member proved to us, or purport to explain to this House which was lost - either the Commissioner of Police getting his $60,000 or the same thing that they did in a previous Civil Service, Mrs. Ellens, in the region of $40,000. Why was not that explained?

As I said, Sir, his explanations are not justified. I think the Minister personally before the House is a good one. If he is unnecessary, Sir, it is only since what should have been done before, and that was to remove the first unnecessary position.

The Commissioner, Mr. President, has gone home. The Unity Team has been beaten at the polls, and I believe I have the votes for this Motion to be passed. I will say, Sir, that the Chair has proved a full stroke.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately this was not the Minister's speech which I have been contemplating since he made it. and I think that position is still the case, in order to avoid any public misunderstanding, if I might on reflection to do this since it was a point made in the House on Monday. I would ordinarily have asked another Member to move it on my behalf, but since the Member was electing the Speaker, nobody else will be speaking to this Motion and there will not be an opportunity.

If I understood him correctly, the reason of the Motion said that the Unity Team, at some point I think in the summer of 1984, removed Mr. Stevens' services for the period. If I did understand him to say that, then I must say and that the statement is totally misguided. Constitutionally, no Member of the Government has any right whatsoever to approve or remove the contract of any officer. In the specific case of the Commissioner of Police, the approval of the Secretary of State to an appointment or a removal of officers is required. That approval was sought without consulting any Member of the Government and it was given. And, in any case, we were advised,sometime in late 1984 if memory recalls

MR. PRESIDING (CONTINUED): the previous time, before Mr. Stevens unfortunately came here at that extreme lateness and my predecessor, Mr. Stovell, kind he would come for five years and that although his original contract was a three year contract, it could automatically be followed by a further two year increment. So I suppose either it is to be terminated, a statement that the Unity Team rescind his contract. It played no part in the matter at all.

Well, then we put the question that Finance Member's motion No.2/65 be passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. [illegible]: I think the ayes have it.

MR. M. MERRITT BIGG: Could we have a division?

MR. PRESIDING: I think both of you were right. You ask for a division - yes. Will the Clerk please carry out the division?

DIVISION
NO. 11

AYES	NOES
Hon Senator C Tanaka	Mr Stanley A Paterson
Hon M Kamana Bridian	Mr F Haig Bedford
Hon Capt Ghulam S Khokhar	Mr John E Mahoney
Mr W Mahendra Dutt	
Capt Mikey J Kirkconnell	
Mr D Sagaram Miller	
5	3

CLERK: AYES ARE - FIVE
NOES: TWO (Honourable Second and Third Official Members)

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.2/65 MOVED BY MAJORITY.

MR. PRESIDING: I declare the Motion carried.

I think probably now it is a convenient time to suspend proceedings. Before I do so however I may just inform the House that I have, quite, unfortunately an engagement that before lunch and as I will have much, rather than inconvenience the House by suspending proceedings only very for the lunch break, I have asked the Honourable First Official Member to preside either now and until lunch-time. I shall be back again after lunch.

So I will now suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 12:30 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

SPEAKER PRESENT AT 11.15 A.M.

THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER TOOK THE CHAIR

MR. SPEAKER: Motion to be moved. Proceedings are resumed. Private Member's Motion No. 6/96.

MOTION
PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 6/96
ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUR-YEAR DEVELOPMENT PLAN

MR. D. BRIAN WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move Private Member's Motion No. 6, standing in my name which reads:

"BELIEVING it essential that a plan should be formulated to establish the areas to which priority should be given with particular reference to the Social, Educational, Medical, Economic and all other needs of the inhabitants of the Cayman Islands;

AND BELIEVING in formulating such a Plan it is incumbent to determine the resources and the amount of revenue that will be required to finance such needs;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government prepare a Five-Year Economic Development Plan to establish the Social, Educational, Medical, Economic and all other needs of the inhabitants of the Cayman Islands, the steps to be taken to fulfil such needs and the order of priority to be given thereto as well as the manner in which it is proposed to raise the necessary revenue to finance the said needs; and be it further

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Government lay such a plan on the Table of this honourable House for consideration during 1997."

MR. W. MCTAGGART SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion to be moved that Government prepare a four-year Economic Development Plan to establish the social, educational, medical, economic and all other needs of the inhabitants of the Cayman Islands, the steps to be taken to fulfil such needs and the order of priority to be given thereto as well as the manner in which it is proposed to raise the necessary revenue to finance the said needs; and be it further resolved that Government lay such a plan on the Table of this honourable House for consideration during 1997.

Does the mover of the motion wish to speak.

MR. D. BRAGG MILLER: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, in the circumstances this Session, I will make an attempt to make the usual type of debate in this Honourable House and if the breakfast there the battle took place then the fight for days. Not that I am afraid to fight in the trenches, Sir, because I have spent number two pneumonia and thirty-two in my hometown of the debate came back to the trench level.

Planning, Mr. President, may be described as the process for the long-term economic and social development of a country, and this, Sir, in country the intent of this Throne and before this Honourable House.

Mr. President, this country has long been provided an economic plan, but for the last eight years the only realization of Government's economic policy was in the annual budget. They are confined mainly to increased spending with the most part on administrative diversity defined, other than increased revenue.

The many jobs such a plan, Mr. President, I believe, is clearly understood in the fact that over 6850 million was expended and the only positive achievement is a little school, which, Sir, in my opinion should have been built; a new Lieutenant Governor's residence and a few other amenities.

Mr. President, our daily dealings with private enterprise. Many whom and others are in the province, and many social life based our balanced industries. Most of whom, Sir, have experienced during these years of great prosperity in this country, a reduction in their real wealth because they have been encouraged to hold their land simply in the form of whatever private. The money that they get from the sale of their lands is not liquid and they have no more land to sell.

The Government's financial statement as contained in the Throne Speech was laid on the Table of this Honourable House on the 1st of March, showing a deficit position of $8358,000 at the end of December, 1984.

Mr. President, as with the Throne Speech, I believe the time is ripe for action and not talk, and that is why I have moved this motion here today.

Sir, you will recall, Sir, that the Government announced five-year plan that was used to Government in the early 1970's gave us this beautiful building in which we are now assembled, the Court Building, the Government Administration Building, the dock, the highschool, the nursing school in all the districts. In other words, Mr. President, that plan gave us the infrastructure on which the economic base of the late 1970's were plans. That base, Sir, was the greatest base ever experienced in the history of these Islands.

Mr. President, Members will no doubt note that there have been minor changes in the wording of the original motion which I presented, and that, Sir, is simply what is known as the dance of legislation. The intent is the same, but the wording support for the legislation, we have to give a little to get a little. So there is no real change in the intent of the motion, and I am quite happy with the final wording.

Mr. President, I believe that when Government prepares a five-year economic development plan, and I have the assurance in the Members now will be working on that plan, that they will produce a good and comprehensive plan.

The aim of the plan, Mr. President, as I see it should be to reduce unemployment by replacing Canadian

MR. P. BEZALEL MILLER (OCHRIDGTON): ...and non-ministerial forecasting with simplified decentralization and national budgeting. It should also give priority to the needs for such inter and provide the framework for the Honourable Third Opposition Member to develop his annual budget.

The budget makers, I believe, make this plan have meaningful, which provide an more orientated, comprehensive and future minded, and those decisions under a dynamic plan might be considered by a continual process of preparing sets of decisions for future action which would be directed at achieving the goals and objectives of this five-year plan; and anticipating ahead in a way of determining the needs on their direction.

The five perspectives that I would like to see employed in the development of this five-year economic plan, Mr. Speaker, are: planning; programming; decision-making; implementation; and evaluation.

The planning, Mr. would involve identification of the needs of this country over the next five years. The programming would be the matching of priorities in these needs - that is what will be done in each year. Budgeting would be the purpose of implementing the goals of the solution for the needs and identification of the sources of funding for the projects. Implementation would then, Sir, with the actual implementation of the solution of the needs. Last, Sir, but by no means least and in many considerations most important would be evaluation. This, Mr, should be a continual and objective look at the solution developed to determine if it has in fact met the needs or solved the problems that have been identified.

Mr. President, I believe we could be on the threshold of creating those islands of the Bahamas envisaged by the Honourable Third Opposition Member in answer to a question. I asked during a debate of this House concerning the seasonal impact that there was an increase in the first two months of the year 1993 over 1992, and it was a substantial sum. Mr. President, that represents the real growth because no new revenue measures had yet been introduced.

If all plans, Sir, that is a game that we are in the threshold of another term, and I am very optimistic about that, Sir, that we will see a turn-around in the economy under this new Government, this plan becomes even more important if we are to build the pillars of the first term.

To create this anticipated term and to provide maximum benefits for the people of this country, this plan must give importance to a major investment natural resource - our people.

Mr. President, while the Labour Legislation, which will soon be enacted by this Honourable House, will provide one of the necessary framework for this measure even if we have to lean trade unions to remove those destructive theories as they are usually experimented when formed for political manoeuvrings welcomed by the Second Elected Member for Golden Gates. I beg your pardon, Sir, I think it was the First Elected Member for Golden Gates who said it.

However, if this plan provides first I anticipate that it will be effective manpower development which creates a source to harness and release the human energies, talents and knowledge of our young people towards sustaining our economic development. Finally, Mr. President, are the most important

MR. D. MAGEN WYNNE (CONTINUED): measure possible to the government, but, on the good years the politician have tended to limit and discourage outlays that go to human, social and economic disability.

This plan, Mr. President, must therefore encompass various activities that allow for manpower forecasting, manpower compensation, manpower planning, performance and appraisal, and human development for the growth of this country.

This manpower planning and development should provide higher wages, job satisfaction and acceptable environments. The plan must facilitate the development of the following basic attitudes, Mr. President. These attitudes are optimism, self-confidence, commitment and trust in our people, especially our youth.

Mr. President, it is my belief, one might formulate for this country, that contrary to many of the more mechanical theories of economic development, future economic growth is not necessarily an issue by overseas investments, nor of the concentration to some, on both of these, Mr. President, were looking on the past Government. How do I believe that to obtain resources into the hands of the entrepreneurs, is not really true in the past Government, when they were to rely on citizens of development and wealth without really raising the standard of living.

This five-year economic plan, in the longest application and implementation must be a concerted effort by the Government to raise the standard of living, the social well-being of Dominicans. This is meant to be, Mr. President, through a coordinated and total use of all the resources of this country, both physical and human.

This plan, also, must be the process of determining national security and social goals of the future, with the ultimate aim of eradicating the problems of hunger, ill and sickness in this country. It must be the means whereby the talent, intelligence and technical skills of the people of this country are brought to bear upon the formulation of programmes for the future growth and development. Indeed, also, it is the mechanism to act as the bridge between long range planning and policy making.

I believe that the plan, which will be presented to this Assembly soon by Government of this Nation is planned, well defined a social and political philosophy that the people of this country can be justly proud and that they will obtain maximum benefits as the gross national product is marketed under this plan.

It is something of a truism, Mr. President, that we are living in an era of planning and whether it be the Socialistic state, Communism, the Totalitarian with the responsibility to shareholders, or even the Democratic Economic system with the burden of our national budget.

Planning and control is part of our daily lives. We may not like it. We may even resent it when it is imposed, but we are part of self-discipline, however, I have come to realize that it is an essential factor in my business and private life and that it should be in our national aspirations if we are to be successful in the future development of this country.

Mr. President, as Parliamentarians we are privileged to serve in this House by the citizens of this country. We are custodians of our moral heritage, and we have a responsibility to live it on to future generations to-

MR. D. BRUCE MILLER (continuing): ...an enhanced and improved estate, in the true sense of the word, Mr. President, we must plan.

...Our economic plan, Mr. President, should be a dynamic one, subject to review every year to allow for changing national circumstances and the needs of our national economy.

Mr. President, I am not in the habit of quoting other authors, as I do not believe that the ability to intersperse quotes from books which one carries around for public display is any great reflection on one's intelligence. But while preparing this speech last night, I was reminded by my good wife of a quotation by Seneca. "Our plans must carry because they have no aim. When we are does not know what harbour he is making for, no wind is the right wind."

Mr. President, I ask all Members of this Honourable House, especially those who have proclaimed themselves champions of the little people, to support this motion. Let them put their efforts where their words have been for the last several days. I trust, Sir, that with their support this motion will be passed and this Government will produce a five-year economic plan which will lead to unprecedented development and prosperity in our country. Sir, most importantly it will have the ultimate effect of raising the standard of living of all Caymanians.

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRIVATE MEMBERS MOTION NO. 4/96

ESTABLISHMENT OF ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE - DEBATE

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is open for debate.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES E. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, I would like to support the motion, Private Member's Motion No. 4, before this House because I feel that it is timely. I feel that a plan is the first order of the day in a government that is presently managed day by day.

A plan is absolutely necessary in order for this Government or any other Government, or business, to know where it is headed. One cannot chart the course of any journey unless one knows where one wants to go. This is true if you are on a ship - you have to find out where you are, determine where you want to go and plot out your course. I feel that this Motion today will do just that.

We cannot continue to have a Government that is operated from minute to minute in a haphazard manner. It would appear that way. We need a Government with a long-term policy on the welfare of this country. We need a new direction and I am sure that this plan will help us to go in the proper direction when approved.

Mr. President, when people come to our country, particularly foreign investors, one of the first things they ask is, "What are the plans for your country?". What do you hope to achieve? Where are you going from here?".

If we do not have such a plan to show the foreign investor, then he will realize that the Government is not a Government of substance, and not being a Government of substance it has no stability.

I think that this motion will show the foreign investor that we have a Government with substance and a Government of stability, and that their investment will be properly secured if they choose to come to our country. We trust, Mr. President, that it has the confidence which the people of our Islands have placed in all of us in this Honourable House today. I believe by supporting this Motion, we will do just that.

I thank you, Mr. President.

SEN. E. MORAN SCORSI: Mr. President, I rise to support Senate Member's motion No. 6, which would recommend to the Economic Advisory Committee to set up an economic five-year plan.

Most primarily problems such results cannot be given day to day, we can realistically view the opposite. I believe, Sir, that Guidelines have an old line, misunderstood manner which is costly and disadvantage. A plain code the scenes and enables a government or legislature to measure their performance and ask the qualifications are confirmed in an orderly and businesslike fashion.

A proper plan can be the answer which will help to direct the future course of this country, and I am able to give this motion, Sir, my full support.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR. P. MENESES JOSE: Mr. President, I would not have it said that I lack an opportunity to speak, and especially on such a momentous occasion in this Government when we call for the introduction of a five-year economic plan.

Sir, as I say, I feel, we the backbenches contact that we are right to proclaim Cayetano Guidelines. It is through the taxes of history that we are able to project possible future development. As we have plans for our future and try to establish goals, Mr. Government should view this task with enthusiasm.

It is a task filled with great potential. It is a task that will affect the lives of our children and grandchildren, and to put it in simple terms, the policies we establish today will affect the future of the Cayetano Islands. The question is, what kind of Cayetano do we want to see tomorrow?

Before we can answer this question, Cayetano as a whole, and its Government, must have a clear sense of national purpose. The time has come, at last, Sir, we have long years when we must set our national goal. This national goal must be to develop an economic plan that will set policy in every area that affects our lives materially, and that will help determine the future for all Cayetanos in which our socio-economic opportunities will widen, but more importantly where patriotism of freedom, stability and justice will prevail for everyone.

While these goals, Mr. President, might be found in their very nature nebulous, this is a task to which we must achieve success. If we fail this task, we fail in the greatest challenge facing us today.

Statistics has been said that we are in the threshold of another crisis, and by all indications if no great problems arise or disaster, statistics will be whispered around. Taken place, we are moving into a period of hidden times. But, if this is so, we cannot allow this fear to be every which way the wind blows. We have seen the disadvantages effects of a new Government, of which has taken place over the we have had misunderstood policies of the previous administrations, and we must now embark on a workable course.

Sir, I have always maintained that our economic and material development was for sustain the social development of these islands. This has already created social problems and we must now embark on a progress plan of social development for this country.

MR. M. MONTEIRO DIAS (Interpretation): Social development has affirmed, more than anyone else, our young people. Mr Chairman, has been held in this year for social development, and I urge this Parliament to take a social development plan into serious consideration when we meet on the Economic Advisory Committee.

Sir, I wish to say that I support this Motion. It takes, Sir, a new mentality to reach into the little and hearts of the people to make ourselves to face the competition of the world, and I congratulate the Elected Member for North Side for his foresight.

I support the Motion, Sir. Thank you very much.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable third Official Member.

HON. CHARLES S. DARGENTON: Mr. President, as the Government considers this period of plan development, we find the period to be very timely in respect of various expenditures.

We see the need for a water supply, a sewerage collection system, additional fire stations throughout the districts, the need to strengthen roads and the traffic flow needs attention. As we look at all of these, Mr. President, it seems only logical that a development plan is needed. It will provide, hopefully, the answers to some of these problems, and I commend the Elected Member for North Side for the Motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there are no other speakers, would the mover like to exercise his option to sum up?

MR. D. DIXON MILLER: Mr. President, I would just like to thank Members for their support and I think they have brought to light the problems of the areas that we represent. I think the importance of identifying the priorities and needs of providing solutions for these needs in identifying the sources of revenue and how the cost of these needs will be made for, the public expenditure will be high. I would just, once again, like to thank Members for their support, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that Motion No. 6/93 be passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED.

MR. M. MONTEIRO DIAS: Could we have a division, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: There are no nays.

MR. M. MONTEIRO DIAS: Hon Member has not voted, Sir, and I understand I have the right to ask for a Standing Order 23(1).

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. M. MONTEIRO DIAS: Thank you, Sir.

DIVISION
NO. 12

AYES	NOES
Hon Michael J Kirkby	
Hon Thomas C Jeffreson	
Hon Jackson O Edwin	
Lord W Richard Rogers	
Rev Capt Charles A Kirkpatrick	
Mr W Mackay Rank	
Capt Mabry D Mackenzie	
Mr O Bernard Mellor	
Mr John S Nelson	
8	6

CLERK: THE AYES - NO NOES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The ayes have it.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTION NO. 1/85 PASSED.

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRKBY: Mr. President, Sir, the next motion which is to be moved on the Private Member's Motion No. 6/85 relates to a matter which goes, when you are dealing on Government Private Officials' Member, some considerable responsibility for. It is my understanding that the substantive Government is restraining other hands to answer the Chair, and I feel that it would be inadvisable if the matter for which some responsibility were to be debated until you were not in an opportunity to carry out your normal functions as the Government Member having responsible responsibility for that, and if in deed your wish and the wish of the House, would I suggest that perhaps we suspend sitting whence another time normally so that when the House reassembles at, say, two-fifteen o'clock, you will be in your normal place.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, thank you for that. I believe some Members wanted to go to Sydney as well, if they have not already gone (laughter) as I understand it is Governor's Cup today.

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRKBY: Are there any tickets going? (laughter)

MR. PRESIDENT: Knowing all that is going on I think I am correct in saying that two-fifteen o'clock.

MR. D. BERNARD MELLOR: So long as I get the same privileges tomorrow as you do Mr. President, Sir. (laughter)

AT 12.20 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:30 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Private Members' Motions - Motion No.5 of 1985. The Elected Member for North Side.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 5/85
ELECTORAL LEGISLATION

MR. D. REGGIE MILLER: Mr. President, I wish to move Private Member's Motion No.5/85 on Electoral Legislation standing in my name. The Motion reads:

"WHEREAS in certain Electoral Districts of the Cayman Islands each registered voter is entitled to vote for more than one candidate;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House appoint a Committee to study the Electoral Legislation and its effect in the Cayman Islands and to recommend such changes in the said legislation as will ensure that in all Electoral Districts of the said Islands each registered voter shall be entitled to vote for one candidate only."

MR. M. MASTERS BROWN: Mr. President, I second the Motion.

MR. D. REGGIE MILLER: Mr. President, I crave your indulgence, Sir, to suffer quite closely to my notes as such a delicate subject.

MR. PRESIDENT: So long as your notes are not too copious I am sure the House will not object.

MR. D. REGGIE MILLER: No, Sir.

Mr. President, while I realize that the Elections Law, 1984 (Law 22 of 1984), is a fairly up-to-date Law, and I do agree with most of the Law, there remains in the new Legislation carried on the old Law, in specific cases of multiple member voting. That is in some Districts, Sir, we find one of the new Electoral Districts with registered voters is allowed to vote more than once.

In the electoral districts of George Town and West Bay, each registered voter is allowed three votes while those of Bodden Town and the Eastern Districts are allowed two votes and those of East End and North Side are allowed only one vote. The latter case of each registered voter having only one vote is the only democratic process.

Mr. President, but at this time would be inappropriate to name them as I am not, and I repeat I am not advocating or espousing any Lobbying with the Constituencies of these Districts because there will be those who speak to this Motion who might suggest that is what I am advocating. Now, Sir, as I foreshadow there be increase the number of representatives in this House.

MR. D. BRAND Mister (DOMINICA): I consider the pillar of any democracy to be one voter, one vote. Rather, Sir, what I am proposing is that we look at the election law to find a solution to this multiple ballot voting.

Mr. President, I believe that this anomaly of multiple ballot voting can be resolved by the redistribution of the electoral districts in the principal Law. In the principal Law, electoral districts names or electoral districts are mentioned under section 4, and I would propose, Sir, that this section 4 be amended to remove this anomaly.

What I propose, Sir, is that section 4, which now reads: "(1) For the purposes of the election of Members of the Assembly and of organising and conducting the Times of persons entitled to vote at such elections the Cayman Islands shall be divided into nine electoral Districts as defined in the First Schedule.".

Subsection (2) of section 4 Sir: "The First and Second Electoral Districts shall each be represented in the Assembly by three elected Members.".

I am proposing, Sir, that this subsection (1) be amended to read: "The First and Second Electoral Districts shall be divided into three constituencies each being represented in the Assembly by one elected Member.".

Further, Sir, that subsection (3) of section 4 which now reads: "The Third and Fourth Electoral Districts shall each be represented in the Assembly by two elected Members.", be amended to read: "The Third and Fourth Electoral Districts shall be divided into two constituencies each being represented in the Assembly by one elected Member.".

These two amendments, Mr. President, I feel will effectively negate those subsections (2) and (3) which the provision of subsection (1) which allows one voter, one vote, which is as it should be in a democracy such as ours.

Mr. President, this division of these electoral districts into constituencies to coincide with the number of representatives now in the Assembly, would be a simple and straightforward physical division similar to those made for the electoral districts system.

The representation of voters in each of these constituencies would be the same except that in those electoral districts that would be multi-valued, they would only be the constituency in which they are entitled to vote in accordance with the other provisions of the Election Law. Candidates, Sir, would then only continue to represent a specific constituency within those electoral districts which have more than one constituency.

One voter, one vote should be it is to be noted that there are voters have three votes, some voters two votes and other voters one vote. Mr. President, I believe that the Cayman Islands can be only democracy in the face of this world in operation today which allows multiple ballot voting. It is time we brought ourselves in line with the other great democracies to ensure a democratic future for our children.

While, Sir, in some parts of the United States of America with the electoral is complete and each, there is a form of multiple ballot voting. I think I am correct in saying that in those instances, although the voter votes more than once, he votes only once for each office. In other words he may be voting in one election for four members of council, but he votes for those four people rather than four times maybe in or the same thing as we do in our multiple choice voting. So the electoral three representatives would be in the same manner in some constituencies.

MR. D. BRUCE MILLER (CONTINUING): Further to the adherence of the principle of one vote, one vote, there are other advantages in connection of this system, Sir, such as pinpointing the responsibility which the constituency body represented by only one member and he will either receive the credit or the blame, as penalty of the task, or they can, will no longer be possible.

Political shrewd voting by the more mature could lend itself to use by special interest groups which are multi-representative electorates as they could manipulate the election of their candidate by casting only one of their votes for that candidate and reducing the load of votes to be shared by the other candidates.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, take the Nine Electoral District of West Bay. At the last election they had approximately 8,000 registered voters. With most voters having eleven votes, that would give a total vote pool of 5,000. If 1,000 of those voters, Sir, for whatever reason decided to cast only one of the three eligible votes, they would effectively reduce the vote pool by 2,000 votes; therefore reducing the votes that can be shared among the other candidates for the electoral district and giving their lives, so to speak, Sir, a head start at the gate. Surely, Mr. President, like my deep concern that some interest group, whether nationalistic, parochial group or whatever interest group could unduly influence an election and thereby the Government of this country to their own advantage using multiple choice voting.

Mr. Speaker, some members of this House, or both as some ministers, have complained as to why I have brought this Motion so late after an election. I believe, Sir, that that remains under investigation, as I made explanations, towards the original intention of this Assembly. I would not, Sir, want us to be accused of electoral Gerrymandering to win a seat by leaving it until next year or the year before elections. Whereas, Sir, would I want to be party to changing the electoral process less than one year before polling day as was done with the principal Law in 1988. Surely, Sir, I would hope that this could be done in such as possible to give the residents of this country plenty of time to become familiar with the changes in the Law, and Government plenty of time to educate and inform the people affected by the changes in the Law.

I will not be directly affected by the changes as I represent one of the two Electorate that enjoy the same reasonable measure of one person, one vote. I therefore accept fully the responsibility of the Bills or course as the case may be, and very often, Sir, a first shot at each.

In closing, Sir, I would like to make it clear that in bringing this Motion it is my intention that the terms of reference for this Committee to seek that its deliberations and recommendations are confined to the Election Law and the definition of electoral districts, and not with increasing the membership of this honourable House as to change the Constitution.

I therefore, Sir, ask Members of this honourable House to support this Motion.

Thank You.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 9/94 - ELECTORAL REGISTRATION BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Private Member's Motion No. 9 of 1994 to now open for debate. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

SPEAKS
ELECTIONS AMENDMENT BILL NO. 3/85

MR. LIPSON A. SPEAKS: Mr. President, I have already told the Elected Member for North Side that I would be speaking on this Motion. Unfortunately, Mr. President, I misread my chance to speak on the one that preceded us, but I made sure that I was here for this one.

Mr. President, I believe that recently after the elections you circulated to Members of the Assembly on the question of the Election Law and you requested Members to submit any recommendations which they may have, especially on constituency in the remaking of Law 38 of 1983.

I submit, Mr. President, against a ministerial amendment to the Election Law - a law that I feel is fairly adequate and perhaps would be subject to just a few minor amendments after quite a lot of study has been given to it. I am not saying, Sir, and I would not object to any move that there are allowing reasons for bringing this Private Member's Motion, but it does seem somewhat premature that this should be brought to a Parliamentary Session at this point in time.

I think that this Motion is unnecessary. I do not see the necessity for having to change our Election Law to enable registered voters to be entitled to one vote for one candidate. I would perhaps agree with it, Sir, if a referendum was given to having a look at all the electoral districts in this country and perhaps increasing the Members for North Side and East End. Maybe at that time the Elected Member for North Side would accommodate his position.

Mr. President, the people of this country recently went through an election campaign that was held not under the present Law. There were no problems, and the people voted for those whom they wanted to represent them over the next four years.

I see this Motion, Mr. President, as just another way of being somewhat vindictive, and I believe, Sir, that it is just another way to try to rub it in, even though we had a landslide victory at the polls, we are still not happy.

I believe, Mr. President, that to divide our country into sectors would be to foster strife and people. We have a situation, Mr. President, in the Cayman Islands where we can still mix with people regardless of their political, religious, social or other leaning.

Mr. President, in my opinion such a Motion borders on irresponsible action, and this is one of the things that I feel should destroy this country. We have seen such unfortunate events divide countries such as South Africa, Rhodesia and other places, and I believe, Mr. President, that this is another attempt to divide our people. There is no reason why I feel that I should be afraid of this Motion be passed, while I have no doubt it will be in favour of the composition of this House, but I feel a Motion is difficult to go through I feel that it should be amended to read that the Committee should recommend seven changes or may be more in the necessary and not specifically as it is stated here.

MR. LYNCH: Mr. President, in the Orange State electoral district we have three candidates and I believe, Mr. President, that is true in many other districts where candidates receive under fifty per cent of the vote--a majority of the population, regardless of the result, would not endorse backgrounds of those candidates.

I can speak specifically of our Honorable Second Elected Member of Executive Council in every area that I have been I have received support. I know that that Member has received the same support and the same is true of the Honorable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council. The three Members for George Town.

In my society, Mr. President, the atmosphere under these circumstances are strained. I am sure that in the recent elections there was one vote cast for the Honorable Second Elected Member of Executive Council that perhaps was not cast for the Honorable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council. The same could be true of myself, but this does mean that we should tamper with the Constitution just to suit our own whims, feelings or desires. We are dealing, in the matter of this Motion before us, with a very delicate instrument in the constitution that should not be allowed to be tampered with.

I feel that this Motion before us is very much premature. When the idea of bringing this Motion was discussed sometime previously, I believe that it was the feeling of the people who disagreed at that time, and I am surprised to see that the Elected Member for North Side would sustain in bringing this here before us today. There are more important issues facing this country than dealing merely with the Electoral Law.

I suggest that all efforts be made at this point in time to improve the general status of this country, but we are dividing the country when we try to bring in these constitutional changes that only what this Motion suggests.

Mr. President, I wanted in my visits to this House that the future of this country depends upon our stability. Stability, Mr. President, is the key to our future, and if we allow ourselves to be put into positions where we start dividing ourselves, we will not succeed.

Mr. President, I believe the last major revision of the Constitution was in 1959. Perhaps it is time that we do have a serious look at the various electoral districts in Grand Turk, and perhaps a revision of representation in Legislative Assembly should be in perspective to the population. Perhaps, Mr. President, it is time that we had another look at the composition of the Executive Council. But this whole exercise will take time and it will take a lot of deep study. We cannot make these changes overnight, and for us to hurry with the Electoral Law would be a grave mistake.

Mr. President, my objection to this Motion is mainly on the basis of my desire to see us continue to live in peace and harmony in this country. So my main argument--- We do not want the Member for South Caicos and South Dimsdale Ward, and another one just for the place where several millions Dollars, and another one for the East End area. What are we doing? Under the Electoral Law any registered voter can exercise his franchise of voting. My only vote for one, but on these of us who have where there are three members running, we know where are these people. This is his democratic rights. I wonder if the Member is here to take this away from him?

MR. LINDSAY A. STEARNS (CONTINUING): Mr. President, I regard this motion as a very bad motion. I regard any motion that I feel is not in the best interest of our people and country as a bad motion, and, Mr. President, I would be remiss in my duties if I did not vote against the passage of this motion. I feel that if this motion had come about either we had had time to study the situation too precisely, I may have been in a better position to deal with it in a positive manner. But this is being pulled out of the sky, Mr. President. It is being done in a piecemeal manner after you spoke to us and asked us to submit your suggestions so that it could be done in a very comprehensive manner.

Mr. President, in the historical Statutes of George Town and Knox Bay we have three seats each. I cannot speak for Knox Bay, but I know that in George Town we still have a fairly stable society. We have people, regardless of creed or other leanings or backgrounds, who can still mix together. Mr. President, I believe that it is true to say that those of who were successful in the last election received support from a wide cross-section of the community. I do not feel that we were split that way. I do not feel, sir, that the constituency was on the basis of where you came from or what section of the constituency you belong to. I believe, sir, that the people of the George Town electoral district in particular and of this country as a whole experienced their frustrations on the basis of electing an MLA whom they felt was best able to represent them on the country.

Mr. President, let me not make charges for charges sake. I feel that this House would be much better served if any charges made here are made with open eyes and [illegible] I do not feel, sir, that this House should be involved in charges or the whims and fancies of Members of this House. I feel, sir, that we are very capable, honest and intelligent men and that our main interest is the interest of the future development and continued stability and prosperity of this country. Let us become, Mr. President, that in our endeavour and zeal we do not make charges that could destroy this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HON. DENNIS A. FOSTER: Mr. President, I am sure every Member of this House is aware that 'discretion' means wisdom and therefore I am going to speak on it and surely what I feel should be done in relation to the Motion.

The last speaker, Mr. President, mentioned your letter of the 31st of January, 1968, to all Members in which you called for their comments and recommendations. In addition to that, Mr. President, the Governor of Cayman, when I have heard much praise given to the Chief Minister, has set up a committee of six of his key staff who helped him during the election who were officers of the Government, to go over it with him.

There are many small amounts and small matters in the Estimates that are discussed and that I think we should not right away feel they be forgotten. If, Mr. President, as a result of your letter to all Members we get a few minor amendments, well then a draft bill can be done in the normal way and presented to the House. If, on the other hand, Mr. President, we get many major and controversial suggestions, well then a bill can still be drafted, but put to a Select Committee of the White House.

REP. DENNIS E. EICHER (CONTINUED): Mr. President, we have a very small population here, Sir, and to split up even the bigger districts like Helena Town and West Side would have the number of persons in each section would be very small. I do not know if there be any specific formula in other parts of the world in respect to the number of representation for a constituency, but I am sure if there be, Sir, they would be much, much bigger in number than we have here.

Mr. President, I think it would be useful for us to take the course that the member has suggested and I suggest, Sir, that we take the course which you started with in your letter and I am sure the Government will follow it up very closely. I cannot support the Motion, but I am sure, Sir, my constituency and the constituency that used to be made by the Election Law will be glad as a result of your letter and as a result of meetings that are going to take place with the Chairperson of Boundaries and his members.

I think members should hopefully reconsider the Constitution of this Motion, Sir, and have it take out time and look into this how to suggested.

Thank you, Sir.

HON. JOSEPH M. MALAMBO: Mr. President, I am totally opposed to the Motion before the House as I feel we really after a General Election this Motion makes us a step in the face to the voters of these Islands.

We have heard here, Mr. President, . once the first few days of the Constitutional motion, but, Mr. President, to me that motion was a motion which represented somebody that was very important. I feel that the Motion before us should a name 'the Speaker of your people Motion' because this Motion does do nothing else but to divide our people.

If this Motion is passed, Mr. President, we will be having only 8 Elected Members for Foreign Town only as the debate on this Motion we became one very public to say because I think he has pointed out every time that this Motion would become a detriment to the country and the people. My honest opinion is, Sir, that this Motion should be withdrawn and a public apology made to the people of this country.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Hon. Elected Member for the Eastern Division.

CAPT. HENRY C. KAMAKAMAKA: Mr. President, Hon. Private Member's Motion No. 3 was before this honourable House for very great concern from the first time I read it.

We have just completed a General Election which was properly handled and the people behaved in a proper manner, but,nevertheless, it did have an effect of division in our constituencies. This I think really ought to be.

I represent the Third Electoral District with my colleague the honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council and I am very proud that we as a team consider ourselves to represent each and every person living in Ogasa Town and Little Ogasa. What has the Motion would be done to our District, I have considered carefully on that.

CAPT. HARRY S. KITCHINGMAN (CONTINUING): I find it is our duty to enable the population of the Cayman Islands, that all the organisation and all Honourable Members of this House work from with our elected Members of Government in order to solidify our position that must stand. I can think of many things that are more important at this time that we should be wasting valuable time to discuss that this. Therefore, Mr. President, I invite the Elected Member for East End in moving that it would be my wish that the Mover would withdraw this Motion for I cannot support it, Sir.

Thank you.

HON. D. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, the Motion before this House, if carried, would in effect divide Grand Cayman into three electoral districts and three electoral districts of the same size as would be effected here in West Bay these electoral districts, three in George Town, two in Bodden Town and two in the Sister Islands.

As has been mentioned, the area of the islands is small. We have only 100 square miles and within that area we already have six electoral districts. The enactment would in effect give us twelve electoral districts although we only exist there or will then six Unofficial Members. Now, for political purposes we would have twelve electoral districts.

The population is small - it is approx 20,000 at the present time, and I believe that six electoral districts are quite adequate and we would not have any hope.

The Most Hooted Member for the Sister Islands who spoke, mentioned something about how the Sister Islands' district would have to be divided. He did not elaborate on it, but there would be many difficulties. For example, who would get the Little Cayman district with a population of 30 people, and would you put it along with Spot Bay or would you put it along with the Creek? Who would decide the formula under which we would decide on a constituency with the size and special characteristics of the two Sister Islands? Then who would decide the electoral boundaries within the George Town district? Would we split it from north to south or would we split it from east to west? Another item is the only district of the four electoral constituencies that have treaty sub-divisions into electoral constituencies because of the particular shape being extremely long it could easily be divided into two districts. But I should hope that there is no more division. The Government have brought enough division to Bodden Town already.

Some Member mentioned that in the last election there were instances where a candidate may have received only one vote. But what is wrong with that? If that candidate was smart enough to convince people to vote only for one person or if the people who contributed so much for that one person that they would not give their votes to anybody else, I see nothing wrong with it because this is a democracy and people have a say.

When I go to the polls I have a right to vote for one person or to vote for more than one person and this is a right that should not be denied. So if there is a duel constituency and a person wants to vote for one person, that is fine. If there are three candidates and the person wants to vote for two people, that is fine, and if he wants to vote for all three, that is also fine.

MR. G. MAIT ROSEN (CONTINUED): The Electoral Law which we have a thorough revision in 1992 and now assented to by the Governor in December 17, 1992. It was necessary to revise the Electoral Law because it had been on the books for a long time. I think the law we had been working with has actually been passed in 1966. There may have been some amendments over the years, but in 1992 we had a new Constitution and so we were amending the Electoral Order that had been passed before the 1992 Constitution was in use now-adays to bring the law up to date; and we hoped some time could have been caught when new laws for the General Elections.

The Law would provide a Select Committee. There were many reasons as to why everybody concerned had an opportunity to have some input in the law.

The recent elections showed a high turnout of voters in every district and in fact in North Side, Port and Middle Town the number of people turning out was exceptionally high for any country. Even in George Town where the turnout had been low in some years, there was an extremely good turnout of voters. The candidates returned, I believe, with the candidates that the public wanted.

I have always said that in elections we find that the public will normally return the people they believe to be the best ones to represent them. It is true that sometimes they find very soon they have made a mistake, but that is the way elections go. So if the honeymoon period with only after a couple of months, if as the electorate who brought and paid the price for the type of government they have and they will have an opportunity to correct that error after four years, which period, might even be asked so it is to think your original opinion.

If this Motion had gone to the House asking for a National election where Cayman Brac could represent the Cayman Islands, I would have supported it because I have seen also in other Islands that we believe the impression that there is an inadequate attitude which has prevented the capital budget which has been approved this year in that some allowance like Middle Town and East End, with no representation in Executive Council, have found themselves without any capital work. But I will debate this later when I come to the Budget.

It is true that there are not many places left in the world with such constituencies. In the Caribbean many of our sister Islands have the one member constituency. Why I would like to ask is, are they any better off by having this constituency? Are they any better off than the Jamaica Labour people or the Bajan Labour people, or the predominantly happy people in Trinidad South? Are they any better off by having one member constituencies?

There is no evidence at all that our electorate' system is not working well. Members come and go. Some of them a little faster than others, but this is a part of the election process and we have to consider that system because there is a danger in tampering with what has been established - whether it is the present thinking on the Jamaican Electoral System the people in a country have to accept a way of life. The way of life they have grown up with. This applies to which they were born.

There is a danger in tampering with the Constitution, which we are not doing here. There is a danger in tampering with the Electoral Law. There is a danger in tampering with, as a former Member of the House used to say, things that are working well. If it works well don't fix it.

MR. G. DALE DOWDEN (Government): I would not like to see this Motion sent to a Select Committee of this House. I would like to see it voted on here and action taken immediately on it. I believe the system recommended in this Motion would increase substantially the cost of running an election and would therefore complicate what already is a very complex system.

It is good there have been changes in electoral procedure. Many years ago, in English history, Lord John Russell had a lot to do with parliamentary reform, but that was necessary because there were grave inequities that existed then that do not exist here. For example, at the time of the 1832 first parliamentary reform, there were many boroughs in England that had nobody living in them at all, yet they were sending three or four members to parliament and some of the newly populated and highly industrialized cities had no members of parliament to represent them. And there were grave inequities at that time and he brought a Bill that divided Englandshire in some equitable electoral system so that a certain number of people would have reasonable representation. That is not the case here now I believe we have an election system that has worked quite well.

Those islands had its first election over one hundred and fifty years ago. Only a few short years ago we celebrated the 'Jubilee Anniversary of Parliamentary Government in the Queen Islands', and although Members may disagree somewhat I believe the election system that we have is a good one. It will undoubtedly help to preserve the system as it is. Because of that I cannot lend my support to the Motion before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak?

Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply? Oh, I beg your pardon - the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. STANLEY O. DIXON: Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to support this Motion at all either, neither am I going to condone what I believe to be the thought behind the bringing of the Motion.

Members seem to have been debating our electoral system rather than what I perceive to be the gist of this Motion, and that is that democracy is based on the premise of one man, one vote. As I see it this is what the Elected Member for North Side is seeking with this Motion. Therefore, having given consideration to that, I do not see the Motion as an obstruction as I might as some Members seem to see it. To start, I recall, Mr. President, that when our new Constitution was being drafted in 1972 there was a request done by the Constitutional Commissioners, Lord Oxford and Asquith. The request consisted of recommendations and then it had explanations and observations.

One of the observations was concerning which the Commissioners Lord Oxford and Asquith said was that it was to his regret that he had not been able to call the time of single member constituencies to the Island and implement of that day, but it was a matter which he hoped the next Assembly shortly after 1973 would address itself to.

Succeeding Members might found it convenient or not to their liking to discuss the matter that. The Elected Member for North Side who brought this Motion sees the system as somewhat inequitable. That being the case, Mr. President, I do not think that the Member could be criticised for having brought the Motion.

MRS. EDWARD O. REVELS (CONTINUING): To perpetuate a system that if we accept democracy as one must, one will do not in my opinion an enlightened approach. To discuss the electoral system generally, there are problems under the Electoral Law. For example, the question of postal voting where a complete constituency could be determined by a batch of say 100 or 150 postal ballots which could be controlled by a party, and those 150 votes could then determine all three representatives from the district let us say of West Ely.

If we had single member constituencies this would be more difficult. But, Mr. Speaker, having said all of that I recognise that you have circulated every Member of this House asking them to come on their comments if you will for any alternative of course or modification to the Law and that this would be given some consideration. I think that is the way that something like this should be handled. It is obviously not a popular move to introduce the single member constituency and I am afraid that the Electoral Reform for North Side will have to be obviously a lot more selling techniques on this concept if it is to find favour in this House and, I dare say, in the Islands because as one Member said there are people who cherish long established traditions very deeply.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, because of that fact I will vote against the Motion. I do not see the sense in setting up a multitude of Committees to look into the electoral process, and it is possible that a Committee may come from the comments that you have solicited and it is a matter for which I am totally will not recommend any hasty precipitate action as it is a matter which I would want to consult broadly on and discuss openly that my constituents, for example, understand what was being proposed before I took a position on the matter.

I have said this, Mr. Speaker, to say that I think the issue here is basically that I consider our interpretation of democracy. In this House we have one vote only and it is the recognised concept of democracy - one person, one vote. This could be the effect of what the Elected Member for North Side is attempting to do. I see nothing sinister or unusual in it. In fact, our situation in these Islands must be unique where we still have the multiple member constituency where a person has the right to exercise one, two or three votes.

Merely going that impress to the Motion, I must warn the Elected Member for North Side that for the reasons which I stated I will be voting against it.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think in fact it will probably be convenient if we take our customary afternoon break now, so I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 2.57 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RECONVENED AT 8:45 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Pursuant to Member's Notice No. 6 of 1985, Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to reply?

MR. S. BEALE SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. President. This is obviously the first opportunity I have had to speak alone on my Motion, but it is a quiet feeling. Sir, until I am sure it will happen many times in the future. It clearly identifies my political vulnerability as the appointed Members will have to be careful how they use their votes from now on.

Mr. President, I, in lobbying for the passage of the Motion, got some feedback that there would be some hesitancies, but not in my wildest imagination, Sir, could I have anticipated the violent reactions of certain Members of this House. It was, Sir, that a Motion which I thought and clearly in my presentation of that Motion stated that it was brought on the grounds to remedy equality with the two democratic process of one voter, one vote, it will not only one man, one vote because the women might get upset and think I do not want them to have a voice, however, the true democratic process of one voter, one vote, is why, Sir, that I have brought this for attention, maybe on for ever in Bermuda.

I apologize, as I said to my preamble-tion, I single member representing the people in the beautiful district of North Side using the true democratic process.

I would just like to draw your attention, Sir, to the areas where we are hearing the words separation, secession, dividing people by colour, the Motion in no way, Sir, if it was passed would or would have done that. There is nothing in the Motion that says we have to divide the electorate into good, better, black or white, and in my presentation I said that it would be impossible division should not exist for the electoral districts.

Mr. President, that statement for physical division need not mean it has to be in a straight line, it does mean it has to be the better-off areas and the bad areas separated. I believe, Sir, it would be very difficult to divide any of the multiple constituencies into single voter constituencies and not include people of all walks of life in all other areas where they were identified as single member constituencies.

Sir, I feel strongly about this...I have brought it to the attention of the House. I feel that it is my duty to my people and, Sir, I have no shame now, nor apologies for bringing the Motion. It is for us to be reviewed in as the Million/Mulloway Motion in the future, I am happy to accept that. Sir. I am proud of it because I am simply trying to equate the democratic process and I hope, Sir, that clearly those people on right and that those representative politics which so much has been made of and which certain Members have tried to identify as my motive for bringing this Motion, does not in fact raise its head under this system and we do find special interest groups electing their representatives for their own benefit and it matters the destiny of this country.

MR. D. EDGAR HARPER (Continued): ...that shows me once more, Sir, he that some people may be shouted not bother with the Election Law when it fact is was compared with the fifty-five different Sections in 1893. Only Mr Speaker, that left little time for the populace of this country to comprehend, understand and appreciate all of the changes that were only under that Law. It also created some confusion in the elections.

There are other Members, Sir, who do not want to tamper with the Election Law, but they are happy to tamper with an even more sacred document, that is the Constitution, because the only way they can increase membership of this honourable House is by changing the Constitution; and I am not prepared to support any changes in our Constitution. So you see, Sir, those people seem to be speaking with forked tongues. Or the one hand they do not want to tamper with one thing, but they are quite willing to tamper with something that is even more sacred or more important in protecting a democratic process.

Hon Members, Mr. Speaker, tried to dissect the mechanism and said that there are so many areas in this country that are more important than changes to the Elections Law. Why again not these Members, Sir, brought Private Members' Motions to identify those needs and to seek solutions to those needs? Why are they sitting back refusing the needs as neglected? I quite strongly object this and I would apologize to you, Sir, in this same letter about meeting of the Committee to look at the Elections Law received after I had handed this Motion to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

Sir, my contention in this principle, and that, Sir, is what I mean, if one votes, one vote, would not allow me to withdraw the Motion after having put it forward. If I am defeated, so be it, Mr. President. As I said, I shall never be afraid to stand on a principle which I believe, or to stand alone on something which I believe will improve a situation, create more opportunity for our people. So, Sir, with those few remarks I commend the Motion to the Members and implore them to support the Motion, even if they have to rethink it.

Thank you.

HON. PRESIDENT: I will now put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

HON. D. DAVID WILLIAMS: May we have a division, Sir?

HON. PRESIDENT: Certainly. Will the Clerk please call the division.?

DIVISION
NO. 13

AYES	NOES
Mr W Matthews (Teller)	Rt Hon Dennis J Hoyle
Mr J Bennett (Miltown)	Hon Michael J Breslin
	Hon Thomas D Jeffreson
	Hon Dermot G Ehlsaka
	Hon M Minister Madden
	Hon Capt Charles J McGuinness
	Hon Patrick C Johnson
	Mr Liam J Thomas
	Capt Henry J McGuinness
	Mr Owen M Madden
	Mr C Liam Madden
	Mr John B Mahon
2	12

MR. SPEAKER: The Government Motion cannot now be put as it has been defeated (Laughter)

TODAY: 9 APRIL - 12 NOES

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Motion lost.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.6/85 INCREASE

MR. V. MATTHEWS (Teller): It does show that the opposition and Government can work together though.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!
The next item on the Order Paper is Private Member's Motion No.6 of 1985 to be moved by the Fourth Elected Member for Broken Town. Perhaps I was just remind the House of what I said. I think it was before Private Member's Motion No. 1 was moved, was. I drew Members' attention to the provisions of Standing Order 82 and those provisions of course apply in the case of Private Member's Motion No. 6. In other words as soon as the mover has moved his Motion and it has been seconded I am obliged by Standing Order to put the question that it be referred to a Select Committee on Standing Orders.

MR. DR. RAIS BOSCH: Mr. President, I understand from reading that under Standing Order 82 this Motion, once moved, will go to a Committee and that once I move the Motion there will be no debate. However, I would like to draw your attention, Sir, to Erskine May, page 414, on the moving of motions.

MR. SPEAKER: Could I just ...

MR. D. RAIS BOSCH: It says a Member called upon to move a motion may speak at the moment he actually proposes it, and I am claiming my right to speak before I move my motion that the Motion be now [illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps I can just have a look at Erskine May to make sure that that particular .....

MR. G. RAIS HOWARD: I would also like to refer you to the paper that was distributed in the House yesterday where Mr. Laurence said, in the House of Commons, that once a member started to move a motion there was no rule of the House to stop him once he started to move it. So that if I start to move it with only a speech I cannot be stopped from moving the Motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Could you tell me the page again?

MR. G. RAIS HOWARD: Yes, Mr. President. Page 372 and it is the fourth paragraph - "A member called upon to move a motion... ...".

MR. PRESIDENT: I suppose I have a different edition of Erskine May. I have the twentieth edition. Do you have .....?

MR. G. RAIS HOWARD: This is the nineteenth edition.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

HON. MICHAEL J. FOLEY: Mr. President, Sir, if I may perhaps try, and so far as I can see it, myself the Hon. No, under our Standing Orders are bound by those standing Orders except in relation to matters which are not specifically covered therein, in which case we have recourse to the custom and practice of Parliament.

My understanding of Standing Order 82(2) on the reading of it, "When the motion is received, the mover shall move the motion .....", which is not discretionary on his movement at that moment, but that when the moment of time on the Order Paper has come, that he shall move the motion and therefore we have got specific Standing Orders in that effect that way by that you might feel that we do not have to have recourse to the practice and usage of Parliament in relation to a motion that we have a specific direction upon.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is all perfectly true. What I was doing was reading Erskine May to see whether perhaps in the Standing Orders of Westminster there was a provision similar to Standing Order 82(2) and whether they interpreted their Standing Order in a different way in which I had interpreted ours the other day.

The other day when I first rose to speak, it seemed to me that the only purpose of Standing Order 82(2) would be to ensure that a motion that fell within its ambit went to a Committee on Standing Orders so that that Committee should have an opportunity to advise the mover privately and in confidence before any debate took place on the floor of the House. If that were valued so, I assumed that where it said the mover shall move the motion that that meant simply formally move the motion and get up and have it seconded, and that there could not be any debate which is why I referred the Second Elected Member for West Bay Mr. Jones to move Erskine Mayne's Motion 82.1/82 and where I said how I should be doing.

MR. PRESIDENT (INTERRUPTING): It is perfectly true that Speaker Ray says exactly what you read out. But my own view is, for the reasons acknowledged by the Honourable Second Official Member, that there can have been little practical difference in the specific Standing Order that this House chose to adopt other than the purpose I have never explained, and if the Hansard record is the view that I am mistaken and that it is wrong to present Bills or a motion or to preclude the mover of a motion from speaking on a motion to amend Standing Orders, then it would be helpful to me if on some occasion the Honourable Second Official Member to make his position clearer. But for the moment I think that I am bound to interpret our own Standing Order in the way I did originally at the other day. In either event you formally move the motion, it will be formally seconded, the question is then put and the matter then goes to a Committee on Standing Orders.

MR. J. EARL EDDIE: Mr. President, I apologize for not having been in the Chamber when the other motion was moved a couple of days ago. What happened is that quite until somewhere mid-day the day in which the Business Committee had changed the business of the House and were making us to deal with Private Members' Motions instead of Government Bills, and I flew to my home during the coffee break to get my papers. It took twenty minutes and on that day you had only given us ten minutes for the coffee break or I would have rushed it on that day. (Laughter)

My feeling is that our Standing Order is clear. When the motion is moved the opposition to follow after that, but our Standing Order is sufficient to deal with what will be the matter before the motion is moved and hence our Standing Order is silent on the procedure that we must follow before moving the motion. So in that case we could reasonably have it up to Speaker Ray and she would be what the mover must ask which his motion or else the House may not accommodate the motion. So he should have the right to explain the motion before he moves it. Once having formally moved it and having the motion seconded, you then put the Question which puts the question without any debate. But I think an explanation from the mover moving the motion is very necessary.

MR. PRESIDENT: I was interested the logic of that argument originally. On the other hand if I accepted it, I wonder why it should be the case that those who framed and accepted these Standing Orders should have thought to deny the opportunity to debate the matter in the House. In other words, why they should have sought to allow the moving of the motion, but nobody to debate it at all, and it seems to me that it is equally logical to suppose what I have suggested that is that those who drafted this particular Standing Order had in mind that, for whatever reasons, it was advantageous to always maintain the known a way that discussion of Standing Orders took place in the first instance in a Committee rather than in the House.

As I say I frankly acknowledge that they are ambiguous, but having raised one way did not seem to be totally persuaded that my ruling was wrong I would welcome a clarification to Standing Orders that put that matter beyond the will of the House one way or the other. For the moment I think my ruling will stand.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.7/85:

AMENDMENT TO CAYMAN ISLANDS
CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) ORDER 1985

MR. C. RAE-THOMPSON: Mr. President, I will therefore move the Motion as drawn:

"WHEREAS Standing Order 98(2) provides that, "After a question has been proposed a Member may, at any time during the course of debate, whether or not any other Member be speaking, rise in his place and state to move 'That the question be now put' and, unless it appears to the Presiding Officer that the motion is an abuse of the rules of the House or an infringement of the rights of the minority, the question 'That the question be now put' shall be put forthwith; and if that question be agreed upon, the question being debated by the House shall be put forthwith.";

BE IT RESOLVED that under the provisions of Standing Order 98, Standing Order 98 be declared and repealed and that all Standing Orders thereafter be amended by substituting for the Standing Order numbers a number being one less than the present Standing Order number."

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the seconder ....

MR. JOHN S. McLEAN: Mr. President, I beg to second the Motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 98(2), I now give the question that the Motion which has just been moved be referred to a Committee on Standing Orders. Members may know that we do not at present in accordance with a Committee, but that when Private Member's Motion No.1 was moved and passed I stated that the Committee of the Whole House, for which that Motion qualified, would be regarded by me as being the Committee on Standing Orders for which Standing Order 98 provides. In other words the question now before the House is that the Motion be referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

QUESTION PUT. AGREED BY MAJORITY. PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.8/85 REFERRED TO A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON STANDING ORDERS.

MR. PRESIDENT: In that case the Motion be referred to a Committee of the Whole House and in accordance with that I appointed the Honourable Chief Official Member to be the Chairman of that Committee for the purpose of Private Member's Motion No.1, and I am reporting him, in order that there shall be no doubt, for the purposes of this Motion now.

Thank Member for Private Member's Motion No.7 of 1985. The Second Elected Member for George Town.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. [illegible]
ESTABLISHMENT OF YOUTH CENTRES

MR. LINFORD A. PIERCE: Mr. Speaker, private member's Motion No. 7 of 1985 - Establishment of Youth Centre reads:

> WHEREAS there is a growing social problem in this country and juvenile delinquency is on the increase, principally in the more densely populated and environmentally deprived areas of George Town;
>
> AND WHEREAS no form of intake or youth activities other than certain limited organised sporting activities are established in these areas;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that Government take immediate steps to examine the feasibility of establishing a Youth Centre in the central George Town area, adequate to provide accommodation for various forms of youth activities to be organised under the auspices of a Statutory body or group such as the Scout Association or Cadet Organisation;
>
> BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such feasibility study be given top priority as a matter of urgency and thereafter carried out in such as possible and practicable manner with a report ready for the November Meeting of the Legislative Assembly at the very latest."

MR. S. HOSPEDA SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I second the Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion may stand in the name of the Hon. Member.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERCE: Mr. Speaker, as I have said in this honourable House on more than one occasion the most important thing today in the lives of our youth - the young people of this country, Mr. Speaker, and that is the use and waste of tomorrow and indeed the future leaders of this House.

Mr. Speaker, while I am sympathetic, like other Members in this House, this House is ready for a major plan such as a major recreation plan. I see this as a plan that will no doubt take a number of years to get all things in motion to implement. Such investigations, Mr. Speaker, I do not see as being the effective way of addressing the problem before us today.

Today in Cayman, Mr. Speaker, in discussing some of the problems facing the Cayman Islands today, I still respected gentlemen said to me that we have minimum lighting about the education in our various primary schools of this country's development, but in this session much more emphasis should be given to the youth as I stated that is perhaps the most important issue facing this country today. I could not agree more, Mr. Speaker. I happen to be a member of this House and in my constituency as much I am called upon to act as a Magistrate or as a member of the House in the juvenile courts. It is very sad, Mr. Speaker, to see the number of young people who are brought before the juvenile court for shoplifting.

MR. LINDSAY A. PEEPLES (CONTINUING): This Motion, Mr. President, seeks to establish or to implement preventative measures. There is no use ... closing the gates once the horse has escaped. It is one thing to say that Government can prevent measures, I hope measures by keeping the young people in jail and taking money that is supposed schools. Mr. President, whenever we view the solution of our problems within the scope of detention centers, whether it be an approved school or training the girls, then I think we will indeed be taking a retrograde step.

We owe it this country, Mr. President, regardless of their financial, mental, social, religious or whatever background can boast that we care insofar to the society ills that are facing this country. Many of the parents, Mr. President, would wish that we could take our hands and put them on our children's shoulders, but this is not possible.

Mr. President, I happen to be very, very happy to many of the people in the poor areas of this community as well as the financial district of Georgetown. By the right and I will vote in favour of Bills in dismissing a problem that is developing around this country Town areas. The representatives for Kaniye Town are aware of this problem. There are many such similar problems, Mr. President, throughout the country. There are problems in West Bay, there are problems in Georgetown. Problem Town and in each and every district of this country. But, I think it is true to say that geographically the principal intensity of the problem is within the Georgetown Municipal districts.

Mr. President, I am not ignorant ... this problem. In this Motion I am referring to some attention at an immediate need. A result that is obvious to any resident of the Municipal districts of Georgetown and any district in this area. There is a growing disregard for law and order in this country and whether we want to accept this or not, this is the type of problem that forms the embryonic precursors for social decay. I believe and sincerely believe, Mr. President, that any funds allocated in this Government for the establishment of a Youth Centre in Georgetown will be money well spent. I am not in this like suggesting that we should allocate knowledge the full amount of money that may be required. This Motion is seeking for negotiating that a feasibility study be conducted to determine the type of Youth Centre and where and how this could be established.

I have certain suggestions, Mr. President, but I would be more than happy to share within the body of a Committee and I hope, Sir, that it will be possible for me to be able to share these ideas. We say that there is no money available, Mr. President, I wonder what will happen to the economy tomorrow if because of any disregard on the part of this Social social problems developed ... the economic system of our country. I wonder what the position would be if because of the disregard to this problem that some country was inflamed in this area of the country.

Mr. President, I am sure that even with the establishment of a Youth Centre we will still have the problems. But until a facility will provide recommendation for many, many of our youth who are out on the streets. Such a facility will provide a variety of activities which our youth could participate in.

Several weeks ago I visited the Thursday Young where a number of our young boys were in the weights lifting gym, but in my assessment and during the past every now and then they are being kicked out of that room and have no place where they may be accommodated.

MR. LINDSAY A. BURNSIDE (CONSTITUENCY): There are a group of people in this city who are seeking, waiting and praying to be able to have activities, healthy activities to be involved in. Are we making too much, Mr. President, to spend a little money in the north of this country? We must realize that the social problems in this country are like a cancer. You may feel better by some form of medication, but it does not necessarily make it disappear.

The same problems exist in the East End area and I would hope to see a similar facility, perhaps a Civic Culture South Centre or whatever established in that area.

Mr. President, it is difficult for Members to say no to this Motion unless they have taken time on the Members' Own Budget to experiment alternative with the problems in this area. I was happy shortly after the election when the Honourable Member of Executive Council found the time to drive around George Town and by doing that, Mr. President, we found a number of problems that we were not aware existed in this section of the country.

I would like to make it abundantly clear, Mr. President, that I have no vested interest except of my interest in the youth of this country. They are crying out for help, Mr. President, and it is up to the representatives of this country to help them.

I realize, Mr. President, that I will have the opportunity to reply to this, but I would hope that my reply will be very short because I will get the full support of the House. It would be very sad, Mr. President, if four more prominent Members of this Honourable House felt that they could not support such a worthy project and undertaking. All we are asking for in this Motion is the opportunity for us to be able to study the problems which the George Town area.

As I said, Sir, I realize I am running short time, I realize that a Motion was passed this morning, Private Member's Motion No. 4 to appoint an Economic Advisory Committee that will look at these problems, but I am talking of a people type of involvement in this country.

I trust, Mr. President, that the House will see fit to support this Motion.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: As the hour is now a quarter after half-past four o'clock, I will invite the Honourable First Official Member to move the adjournment.

Debate on the Motion will stand over until the Motion is next dealt on the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. HOUSE ADJOURNED AT 4:40 P.M. UNTIL 10:00 A.M. FRIDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1984.

STATE OPENING & BUDGET ADDRESS (SECOND DAY) SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(FRIDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1994)

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-IN-CHIEF O PETER ALEXO-SMITH, CBE, JP

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON MICHAEL A BRADLEY, OBE, ED	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C JEFFERSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON JENNIFER O EDWARDS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M NORMAN SOLOMON, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND SPORTS
HON CAPT CHARLES L KIRKCONNELL	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON RUSSELL E JOHNSON, OBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M McKEEVA BUSH	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MR EDWARD A PETERSON, JP	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT MARSH S KIRKCONNELL	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SOUTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR JAMES M RUTLEY	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR G HAIG BODDEN	ELECTED ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D RICHARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN D McLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING & DUCKED' MEETING OF THE (1995) SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FRIDAY

14TH MARCH, 1995

1. CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS IN REPLY AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1995) BILL, 1995

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH TOWN CONTINUING.

2. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS:

BILLS:-

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995
(CONTINUATION OF SECOND READING DEBATE)

SPONSORED BY THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR FINANCE

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

OBJECTS AND REASONS

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995 AMENDS THE STAMP DUTY ORDINANCE 1976 TO:

(1) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES FROM 1% TO 2%;

(2) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A NON-RESIDENT FROM 1% TO 3%;

(3) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(4) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A TRUST CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(5) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(6) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(7) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(8) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(9) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(10) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(11) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(12) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(13) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(14) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(15) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(16) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(17) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(18) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(19) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(20) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(21) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(22) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(23) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(24) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(25) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(26) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(27) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(28) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(29) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(30) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(31) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(32) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(33) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(34) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(35) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(36) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(37) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(38) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(39) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(40) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(41) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(42) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(43) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(44) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(45) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(46) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(47) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(48) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(49) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(50) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(51) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(52) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(53) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(54) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(55) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(56) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(57) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(58) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(59) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(60) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(61) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(62) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(63) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(64) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(65) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(66) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(67) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(68) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(69) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(70) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(71) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(72) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(73) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(74) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(75) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(76) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(77) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(78) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(79) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(80) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(81) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(82) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(83) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(84) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(85) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(86) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(87) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(88) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(89) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(90) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(91) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(92) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(93) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(94) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(95) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(96) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(97) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(98) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(99) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(100) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(101) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(102) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(103) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(104) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(105) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(106) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(107) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(108) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(109) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(110) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(111) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(112) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(113) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(114) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(115) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(116) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(117) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(118) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(119) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(120) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(121) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY CONTROLLED BY NON-RESIDENTS FROM 1% TO 3%;

(122) INCREASE THE RATE OF STAMP DUTY PAYABLE ON CONVEYANCES OF LAND AND SHARES IN LAND RICH COMPANIES WHERE THE PURCHASER IS A LIMITED LIABILITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Statement by Hon. Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio, Chairman	1
The Local Transportation Assistance Bill, 1976 - Washington	2
Statement by Hon. Charles H. Wilson	2
The Traffic Management Bill, 1975 - Oklahoma	2
Continuation of the Debate on the Reserve Supply and Control Mining of the Appropriation Bill, 1975	3
Mr. G. Holt Bolton	3
Hon. F. Bowman Bolton	17
Adjournment	26

FRIDAY

16TH MARCH, 1988

10.05 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
I have given notice by, I think, two Government Members that they wish to make statements under the provisions of Standing Order 60, paragraph (1). I, for that do as I think the statements should be taken before the debate since there are no questions on today's Order Paper. Then the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1988 may continue.
The Honourable Second Official Member.

STANDING ORDER 60

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

HON. MICHAEL J. BEARCROFT: Mr. President, my Honourable Members of this House are aware of the circulation of the Order Papers and the various Bills, one of the matters due for debate this and following at this Session of the Legislative Assembly is the Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill, 1988. This is a very short Bill seeking only to make a couple of very technical changes to the Legal Practitioners Law to bring it into line with other legislation which has been passed recently.
Since the Bill was forwarded to the Clerk for transmission to Members and placing upon the Order Paper, there have been a number of discussions held and I have been investigating several other matters, which if they are approved by the Government will necessitate several new amendments to the Legal Practitioners Law some time later this year. As, Mr. President, I felt in the past that Members would prefer if at all possible not to have their time burdened with a number of short separate Bills coming at regular intervals through the year, I am requesting the permission of the Honourable House to withdraw from the House the Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill, 1988. The request for withdrawal of the Bill, Mr. President, is made under Standing Order 60, and since the terms of the Standing Order are that I make a motion for withdrawal, I would wish to request leave of the House and yourself without notice, in accordance with Standing Order 53, to move that the Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill, 1988, be withdrawn from the Honourable House.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, under Standing Order 53 I beg you...

MR. PRESIDENT: I think we must finish dealing with the previous motion. I had not realised that the Honourable Second Official Member was going to be doing slightly more than make a statement. He has actually sought permission to make a motion. I was just reading through the Standing Orders myself to get the position quite straight. I think he is quite right that in terms of Standing Order 60 it is proper that there should be a motion for the withdrawal of the Bill, and I think that under the

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (MR. SPEAKER): Circumstances which he has outlined I am prepared to grant his leave - and I am looking up the right Standing Order - to move that motion without notice, so that the question can be put.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: My apologies, Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 32, sub-order (9)(iii)....

MR. SPEAKER: What he says.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: It may be made without notice. I am sorry for misleading the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: I had just got there myself. Do I do not think that the Member needs permission. I think it is quite proper for the question now to be put.

The question then is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Social Development Law should be withdrawn for the reasons which were outlined by the honourable Nursing Officer. Does any Member wish to speak? If not I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE MENTAL PRACTITIONERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988, WITHDRAWN.

MR. SPEAKER: Now the statement by the honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KINGSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 37 I beg your permission to make a statement with regard to a Bill for a Law to amend the Traffic Law, Law 18 of 1978. I wish to inform Members of this honourable House that it is my intention, with their permission, to withdraw a Bill for a Law to amend the Traffic Law, Law 18 of 1978.

The reasons for withdrawing the Bill are firstly, since the Bill was published and circulated I have received many requests from responsible and responsible people to give further consideration to the two amendments relating to sections 66 and 68. Secondly, since there was an advisory committee established with the Traffic Law, Law 18 of 1978, and all the numerous amendments with a view to bringing a new comprehensive Traffic Bill to this honourable House, I consider that the representation which I have received concerning this short amending Bill could more usefully be considered by this committee. Accordingly I ask Leave of this House to withdraw this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: May I take it that like the previous speaker you are seeking to move a motion for the Bill's withdrawal in terms of Standing Order 68?

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KINGSWORTH: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case the question before the House is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Traffic Law should be withdrawn in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 68. Unless any Member wishes to speak I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 68, THE TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988, WAS WITHDRAWN.

MR. SPEAKER: That completes the Statements of which I have given notice. We can now turn to the first item on today's Order Paper, the consideration of the Address. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION [1965] LAW, 1965

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment of this debate on Wednesday I had been speaking on the point which had been highlighted that the Government came into office in November, and that the new Government had inherited such a sorry mess. I had dealt with the Reserves which I stated were actually there as the Financial Secretary had said they were, until that those Reserves, unencumbered, were in the amount of $10 million. I had also touched on the surplus figures which existed. The Second Elected Member for West Bay and his counterparts on Executive Council had lambasted the poor state of the country owing as much in bills and being in such a poor financial condition. However, this is not borne out by the estimates and it is not borne out by the Budget Address.

The matter of surplus revenue is one which can be shown from the examination of a statement made by the four Elected Members of Executive Council themselves after they took office when they said that they had found surplus revenue of $277,500 at the 31st October. This is repeated twice on the Corpus of Monday, 26th November. So surplus revenue did exist and in fact the honourable Financial Secretary himself had given an answer in December to a question that we did have surplus revenue.

However, the Budget which has been presented shows that on the 31st December there was a deficit of $222,537. So the story which had been circulated before the election and the story which is still being circulated whenever it suits certain people, that the country was broke until 30th June, because the new Government inherited the $382,500 which existed on the 31st October according to their own statements and took out of it a deficit of $222,537, making a total of $1,744,037. Now this figure of $1,744,037 is the deficit which we would have right now if they had not found that surplus of $382,500 in this year's accounts.

However, this is not all the story because people will remember that I mentioned that on November they had come to Finance Committee and practically begged for $3.4 million to come out of the Reserves. So one knows just what has happened to that money, with the exception of the fact that the Financial Secretary has told us that they spent over $300,000 out of the amounts $3.4 million to pay some bills for Cayman Airways.

I believe the reason why they are using the Reserves, and the reason why they are standing exceptions that is simply to gain some credibility as the Financial Wizard that has been advertised what the country was broke. The country was not broke. It had Reserves of $10 million. It had surplus revenue of nearly $1 million and if the present trend of spending continues the country will be broke by June, 1965.

Also take stock of people moving on the Sister Isles and only then Reserves existed; not only story that surpluses existed, but accidentally there also they are again engaged great public debts. Here again one Member said in the Chamber that we have mortgaged the future. What statement has an unfortunate as all because the Financial Secretary told us on Page 17, I think, that the public debt is now only $11.8 million. The total public debt at the

MR. R. REID HARPER (CONSERVATIVE): Last December, there was $111.8 million, which excludes the Post Automobile Loan. It gives me a distorted account of how he arrived at the figure of $111.8 million. So if a country with the kind of revenue we have took out a loan for only about $111.8 million, it has not mortgaged the future of this country.

If you look at the history of public debts the world over or anywhere particular, and we will see that there were times in our history when this country's future had been mortgaged because of the large public debt which this country owed. In 1951 when a certain Government came to power the public debt stood at just a little over $2 million. Following that came the first years under the new Constitution with Planned Nurture of Governments given the responsibility for meeting many responsibilities of Government. By 1956 the public debt mushroomed to these first years to a figure close to $7 million. At that time in our history the public debt was about 80 per cent of the recurrent revenue. At this time the country's future was mortgaged because the Government had created such a large debt in proportion to recurrent revenue, and the principle of the children to pay, that the country's future was mortgaged. At that time it was taking something between 10 and 13 per cent of the recurrent revenue just to service the debt. So that is the only time in the history of these Islands that we have had an unfortunately large public debt in relation to the recurrent revenue which is the means of servicing the debt. So we had a servicing problem then.

While the public debt as that time was just a little under $7 million, today we are told that the public debt after eight years has only risen to $111.8 million, just a 50 per cent increase in eight years, while in those four years the office we had a 700 per cent increase.

The figures which we really need to examine is the relationship of the public debt to the recurrent revenue. Because when a man gets a mortgage the main criteria for that mortgage is how much salary the man is earning, how much income he has and to be able to service the debt. The problem in 1978 was that Government was closed bankrupt because it had borrowed to the hilt and became difficult.

When we look ahead in 1978 and first each economy can be put the public debt under control, and not to borrow during these first four years until such time we get a figure which we could manage. You will see that we did this because in 1977 the public debt was $7,012,010. In 1981 it was $111,847,000 pounds. It was $7,332,000. So that while we had contained the debt we had increased the economy so that the ability for anything extra had grown. What happened is that the public borrowed and we find that instead of having a debt which was 80 per cent of the recurrent revenue, we then used debt which gave a lesser percentage of recurrent revenue. In 1977 the percentage had developed so where the public debt was 58 per cent of the revenue. The next year that dropped to 60 per cent of the revenue. The following year that dropped to 46 per cent of the revenue, and in 1980 it was 32 per cent of the revenue. Since 1980 the public debt has not gone higher at 37 per cent. In 1981 it was 19 per cent. In 1982 it was 14 per cent. In 1983 it was 10 per cent. In 1984 it was 10 per cent and in 1984, May again they could be borrowing the future of this country it was still with 20.3 per cent. Now 1985 the public debt of $111.8 million will still be less than 20 per cent of the recurrent revenue so the statement that we had mortgaged the country, which I understand it mean that we had borrowed beyond our ability to service our obligations at all.

MS. C. SAIU BOSSY (CONTINUING): I have spent a long time on these three areas, recurrent revenue, capital revenue, public debt and the relation to our ability to pay, and the deficit. However, this is necessary because the second must be set straight. If the country is broke let us say it is broke. When the country is not broke let us tell the truth, because with our tourism and with our reputation having the country's image abroad is important and must supersede political ambitions of politicians who will speculate false stories which would damage the image of this country just to get another Government out of power.

It has been said that the budget is unrealistic and why, Sir, is not a reflection on the Financial Secretary, but on the Elected Members of Executive Council who have allowed this to happen. Let us look at the capital budget first and see what I am talking about.

The capital budget which they have put forward for the year 1995 is only $8,850,022, while the revised capital budget for 1992 was $20,128,275. In other words while we were able to spend during 1994 $18 million on capital projects they have put forward a budget in which they intend to spend $8 million. In other words they have cut the capital budget in half. The capital budget is the budget which builds roads, constructs buildings, pays huge heavy equipment and vehicles. I wonder if these Members really realize what they have done. In their attempt to balance the budget they have cut the capital budget drastically. Do they not know that this action will jeopardize many of the economy which has been working very hard these past few years? Have they not realized that by the cuts which they have made, nothing they have done could ever create the hope which Government's policies of cutting the capital budget will do.

You my fellow people, do we think the people of the Cayman Islands during the year 1995 are going to ask you and accept only half of the services which they received in 1994? I understand that the Honourable Elected Member of Central Administration will have the capital budget down previous services whether we want we will be serviced, or we have to pay it was increased. I do not have to explain with her cover operation, but the plain fact is that the Islands' capital budget was cut by the Elected Members of Executive Council in half, at a time when they are having problems with the economy. This is bound to cause further downturn in the economy.

If they had only put forward a capital budget less than we did in 1994 it might be understood, but to cut it by half is ridiculous. If you look at the capital budget for 1993 one will see that our actual expenditure is what year was $10,000,000. So we actually spent, and when I look at our current figures, more money on capital projects in 1993 than we expect to spend in 1995. So the country has gone back two years, do just three years, because if they spent here in 1993 they must be spending around the 1995 budget. So this country has gone back three years in the three months they have been in office, because the public is expecting the same level of performance. It just none of them recognized in their campaign to give a higher level of performance than before. But they believe that they can do it with half the money. They believe that the prices are going to fall when they move in by buildozers, flow tracks and whatever else the capital budget buys. They truly believe that, and that is why this budget is unrealistic.

MR. C. RAY NICHOLS ADDRESSING: If one examines it closely one will see that the budget put forward for 1985 for the purchase of vehicles is $935,794 less than was spent in 1984. What are they going to do? Are they going to tax their people? Look what the previous PC team inherited when they took office in 1976. We have an idea what the Public Works where they had four dump trucks. They had to buy one of them up to put the water in. Every time it rains they have a problem of flood to purchase new trucks and rear spray trucks. To whom will the money go?

The thing which gives me very concern is that the vote for local construction is $2,102,982 less than it was in 1984. I wonder if they have explained this to the people in the constituencies that they promised to give jobs to. I wonder if they have explained that the Government this year is going to help the construction industry. What the Government this year is going to improve the construction industry, and that this year they will pay for local construction $2 million less than last year. These figures are contained on Page 164 of the Budget and are the figures. I would not like to see them if I had to put them forward for them.

In the summary they show that capital projects are reduced by $2 million but what figure is only $2 million less than what we budgeted for in November, 1983 when we made up the estimates. The true figure is really the $12 million which is spent minus the $2 million which they hope to spend, or a difference of $10,982,984. So this budget is unrealistic. You cannot provide the services which were provided in the local for less money than was spent in 1984.

There a matter like Mosquito Seasonal and Drainage vote where the amount of responsible decrease on the price of oil. How can they hope to accomplish what they have set out in this budget.

We had a problem in this House last week when a question was answered about whether there would be any bus service on the route, the night route, the sixth street, and we were told that this year it had not been budgeted for. Now if it been budgeted for the capital budget would not be cut by as much as it has been cut. So the budget is really not balanced, there is not enough capital projects which are needed.

If they only with figures had only wanted the capital budget they could be accused, but in the recurrent budget I see in many areas increases where it appears that their expenditure for 1985 will be more than those expenditure for 1984. However, on a close examination one will see that there is not an increase in services. It is simply a salary increase, and the actual recurrent expenditure for providing the services have been reduced to make it appear that the budget has been balanced.

But we deal with a few of these and we will see how successful this budget is. The first thing we can say that this budget cannot balanced. They show that in December, 1985 they will have some $15,000 in surplus that year. However, there is only one way that can happen, and that is if they can find some way to eliminate the four trucks in this year. If they can stop two hands of rice or both businesses then they may end up with a balanced budget. But if they have to spend money in October, November and December I could bet any one of them that they will end with a deficit.

MR. G. RAY BODLEY (CONTINUING): I presumed to surmise some of the ways in which we appear that the employee hours seem unexpected when they have not been increased. Let us take a look at the Legislature department and we will go to Page 48 where the estimates for employees this year are $10,910. Last year we expended $98,500, and in 1975 we received that figure at the end of the year to $104,375. They show a decrease of $67,000 on that page alone. Of course a half hearted attempt is made to explain that this deficiency will be made up under Item 05-011. However, that figure is only $2,000 so it does not fool anybody who examines this closely. The employee supplies and materials are cut by a further $7,000 and that item has not been made up by what they seem to say is the contingency authorization for it.

The fact is that it is cut by $47,000 and the other note has only increased by $4,000. Let us look elsewhere in this. We will see that the total vote for that department has been increased by $70,910. However, if we look at the estimates we will see under personal emoluments that the estimate have increased by $114,910. So that while the total vote for that department has increased by $70,000, the staff has been given less money to run this place day by day. Consider there is an increase of $70,000 overall but there is an increase of $114,000 in salaries. So the Clerk has been given less money this year to run this department than the Clerk had been given in 1975. Even what I hear Members are going to be demanding more services. They want six Hansards a year and will get that because the Bigsby Team can provide it. Then we have more services yet they give the Clerk less money. So when we examine the estimates it is impossible to say that the budget has been balanced.

What is going to happen is that throughout the year not only the Legislative Assembly Department but all the other departments of Government will have to come back for more money, as we I said earlier they will have to claim over the back on the $114,000.

If we look at Page 37 we see the same thing happening only in the other sense, because the estimate for this department is actually shown as less than the new for 1975 $230,000 less which is the actual figure minus $69,811. So they give inadequate for less than they will be 1976. Not only have they budgeted for less but the deficiency is more than the budget shows. Because here again we have had salary increases which have another bite into the money. The approved estimate for salaries had been $161,075 for 1975 and these salaries have gone up to $190,820. So the difference between that is $21,255 and we have to add that to the other $69,811, which means by how much the salaries have actually been cut.

On Page 40 they have cut the supplies for the Police Department by $25,000. They have cut the equipment for the police force by $67,000. Can the police operate on less than they did last year? All the welfares cost less? Is there the same which they really should, they have more wages for services coming for additional policemen. So they are going to have more bullets to shoot, to provide equipment for, and yet they cut the budget below what it was last year. They come under the services now ask for some additional bullets. They have one Chief Inspector, four sergeants and one clerical officer. So how can they put in the same man hours for the department and have cut supplies and equipment by over $100,000? This is a make believe budget. One kind of budget which in Newfoundland would have created if it had been necessary for him to write a budget.

MR. G. WILLIAM SCOTT (CONTINUING): The Liberals do not believe what we put these estimates, when we have full well that the politicians are going to need the same number of seats and holders and heaters and boots or whatever they may be for. The Leader of the Opposition would have sent off the minority, as I said earlier, on the 20th September when this money runs out.

Now, the department which these two Members of Executive Council have placed their star is the Department of Social Services on page 101. Here we see the difference between words and actions, here we see the difference between campaign promises and the realities of running a Government, because do we hear more from Alice in Wonderland recently herself than on the vote for Social Services. We know the many promises they made to the contrary. We even read the motions and the speeches which have come. We heard the many words they were about how the Government looked at Social Services, but now they are going to do something for everybody. Now to look at the votes. It shows a total increase of $17,941, which of course a real increase would not be a real figure. I do not expect too much from the new Government in the way of increases because it has been demonstrated that they are looking at the ability to create revenue or to raise commodity taxes to balance the budget.

So the total increase of $17,941 if it were an increase in ourselves would make me happy. However, if we look at that page we will see that under personal emoluments are entitled, the exclusive for this department have gone from $218,728 to $402,509. So there is a salary increase of $183,781. So what has actually happened to Social Services? They have been hurt. The money to provide the services has not, they have a salary increase of $83,996. So if the services were to remain the same we should have an increase in the overall budget of $83,996. However, the increase is only $17,000. So the services have been cut by $71,840. No new people are added on this figure.

Under Tax Services they are going to add one executive officer, one secretary or something like that. In other words they are going to add one member of staff to Social Services Department. However, this is not included in this vote at all. So this salary increase of $83,996 is simply to pay the salaries.

MR. DENNIS O. EGARR: Mr. President, under Standing Order 42 (1)(b) the Member has given way, Sir. He opposes to read mine vote. The Member is using the 1974 increased figures, not the revised figures. The Member should be very well aware that in 1973 the salary increase for all departments was put in the budget for a block vote and it was later distributed. If he looked at the revised figures he would see that the increase in salaries for this particular department for example is only $44,634, whereas the total increase in expenditure is $183,120, not $17,941 as he is claiming. What is applied the approved, not the revised estimate which is the money which was actually spent.

MR. G. WILLIAM SCOTT: Mr. President, I think the Member had put in the budget what he first said because my budget says here on page 101 that the increase was $17,941. Why is he trying to withdraw the issue, was why is he contemplating me when he was willing to say? He says he did they added that the increase for that department was $17,941 and not the minus in Revised figure which is the new figure.

MR. G. MAIN SAGGER (CONTINUING): I am not using Alice in Wonderland figures. I am using the figures which he put forward, and he knows full well that this budget has only about an increase of $17,000 because of the actual increases. I am glad the Financial Secretary. I do not mind any Ministers on this bench [illegible] something was omitted in the budget. I have had it said that that has nothing to do with these figures. So I will give my word then he misses again, but I hope that he will study the budget instead of [illegible] in Wonderland".

MR. M. MCKEEVA BUSH: [illegible]

MR. G. MAIN SAGGER: I have only begun with the Social Services, Mr. President: the approved figure for last year, 1965. I do not need any lectures on the difference between actual figures, revised figures and approved figures. The approved figure, which is the figure we budgeted for this year, $[illegible]. We cannot have one year after the budgets [illegible] which shows up its budget in minus figures of $81,999 - minus $81,000. What is these figures? Even the Second Elected Member for West End will know at the beginning that there is the item for grants, contributions and subscriptions. If one examines the details of that vote one will find that its the vote which includes the pensions, prison [illegible] children care and protection, provides for maternity benefits, maintenance of children in approved schools, maintenance of orphans, poor relief and support grants which is the money which goes, month by month, to [illegible]

So whatever money extra some people might have been told in the budget that is that the 1966 budget shows a $81,000 decrease in helping the poor and the children who need care and protection. Those are their own figures, not from Alice in Wonderland but from Page 101 of the budget, minus $81,000. So if the public balance....

HON. EDWARD O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would give way under Standing Order 36(1)(b). I would just like to call his attention again, Mr. President, to the fact that the revised figure for 1965, that is the amount actually spent, was $388,609. So the vote under which this grant is increased by $119,000, not decreased by $81,000. The $81,000 is the difference between the inflated approved figure which was put in last year, which could not be spent wisely.

MR. G. MAIN SAGGER: Mr. President, if this Member wants to speak why did he not speak before me if he is getting ready. I do not know if you use [illegible] but if he is getting this then why do you not let me stop speaking and let him speak. Anyway....

MR. M. MCKEEVA BUSH: So I am telling the truth.

MR. G. MAIN SAGGER: Mr. President, I put it to the incompetent Member that the great Western had said that if they set the truth some people should stumble over it and go their merry way without knowing it. I am thinking, Sir, with this minus figure of $81,000 which is less than this House approved in November, 1965 when it presented the 1966 budget. In despite what they want to say about the Unity Team, an honest attempt to balance a budget in this fashion. It has been balanced by a stabilization in services and the social department will not be able to give to the public the kind of care which they have given in the past.

MR. C. RAY EDDIE (Constituency): I know about the salary increase. The Government deserticized them. We gave the Civil Service a decent wage. Our hands of Government were tying here pay which now for here what people do in the area jobs in the private sector. We gave them decent salaries and we knew that there would be a salary increase this year. I do not think they will ever get a salary increase again as they had before with the cost of what they have now.

So I would like to support what I have been saying. The total vote corresponding to the figures put forward by the Honourable Prime Minister of Ministries should when he helped to present this budget, because the biggest contribution in these areas is the product of the Electoral Government and the Financial Secretary does not direct the policy there; he only manipulates the economy of the figures, showing a total increase of $17,411, with a salary increase of $22,771. Therefore having what I call a service decrease of $11,930.

I have not finished with this. In fact I am just beginning this phase of my speech. On Page 86 we take a look at the personal emoluments.

MR. P. JOSEPH ROSE: (Interruption).

MR. S. ALEC BRIDGE: The Second Elected Member for West Bay wants me to tell him what we spend. We had him here to speak. I thought he should have read that instead of entertaining people, if he wanted details of the budget out.

MR. MORTIMER BUSH: And he is supposed to be enlightening the House. He should tell us how much they spend.

MR. S. ALEC BRIDGE: I do not listen to the Member. I do not take advice from him. When I come advise I know where to get it. If I need any advice on this budget I am going to the Financial Secretary. Some people like to sport a nice shoe, but they cannot wear the pinch.

On Page 86 we see that the same thing has happened, perhaps to a lesser degree. It shows an increase of $870,237. However, if we look at salaries again we will see that salaries have increased by $711,759. So the most important service here of the increase is simply used up by the increase in salaries and therefore cannot provide more to the people who depend the service when they go to the hospital.

Page 116, Lands and Survey Department which is probably one of the smallest in terms of spending. This shows a total increase of $69,601 yet the salaries are much higher than the salaries approved in 1986. What has happened is that this year they will pay in salaries $91,389 more than was approved in 1986. So here again we get a decrease in services of $1,122.

Mosquito Research and Control Unit shows the same thing. There is $66,439 increase in spending, but the salary increase is nearly double the total increase of the approved figures for 1986. The salary increase is $66,084. There is a reduction in services of $59,026 since what was approved in 1986. So if we are looking to Mosquito Research and Control Unit to do the same level of control which we practised in the past, we should not now be cutting the budget and through some Alice in Wonderland formula trying to conceal the decrease in the services.

MR. C. ALLO BOOSEY (CONTINUED): The Standing Committee, in 1982 we approved $176,700 and in fact we actually spent a little bit more, a couple of hundred more. This year they approved $202,200. If we look at the estimates we will see that there is a $28,500 increase in salaries compared to a $45,000 increase in part-recurrent including salaries. So here again in this important department we see a reduction in the money for services, despite the fact that we have opened a new fire station in Frank Sound, and we are talking about one for Cayman Brac and East End.

So the budget is unrealistic. There is no way that the Government can provide these services with the money in this budget. Of course I have spoke a lot about the financial adversity and I have heard a lot about the good management and the fiscal conduct. However, there are only 168 cents in a dollar and if the dollars are not there the services cannot be provided.

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to suggest that we took our break whenever it is convenient to the Member. I imagine he is contemplating for a while. Would this be alright?

MR. C. ALLO BOOSEY: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: We shall accordingly suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11.30 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

AT 11.45 A.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. C. ALLO BOOSEY: Mr. Speaker, I had discussed ways in which on fixed figures be looked at if certain votes had been increased where they were actually reduced below the approved figures for 1984. I did such a good job on it I am tempted to do it a few more times. I will now deal with the capital expenditure and there are important items have been cut both below the approved figures for 1983 and the revised figures for 1983, and in many cases below the actual expenditure in 1982.

One item is accommodation, computer equipment which is shown with an estimate of $10,000 against a revised figure of $50,000. However, I understand that if major equipment was purchased this year it may not be necessary to have a heavy expenditure.

There is mechanical/heavy equipment and the revised figure for this was $125,750. This year we expect it to spend only $173,000. That note is still more than a quarter of a million dollars - $273,500. Roads highway building

MR. D. WILLIS (Lockyer) (Government Whip): What the Treasurer and the rest of Government can get along without purchasing a substantial amount of equipment? How they galvanise the personnel with their out look on their budget? There is need for vital pieces of equipment, for example. I understand that the multi-flood vehicle should have been completed by mid or September to early October, and we were told here that it may be completed by the end of March, that is the end of this month. One of the reasons for the delay in that case has been because Government has been dragging its heels and stalling for the use of their machines. Here is just one example of a delay owed for the completion of a worthwhile machine. Probably if one knew enough the equipment at Public Works Department and Forestry Centre, one would find the need for much more. So it is totally unrealistic for the Government to budget for heavy equipment this year the sum of $573,000 loans. The budget is really not balanced when realistic items are put out.

We see that the note for vehicles and equipment has been cut, according to those own figures, by $227,000. We find there are only $50,000 as against the revised figure of $738,000. So how can the Minister of Government believe that they can get away with a budget like this, cutting the capital budget in unrealistic areas.

We see that the vote for Lakefield has been cut by $165,000.

Airport development has been cut by $2,000,000. This is understandable since they have been forced the new terminal twice. There should not be need to build this year. That vote is cut by over $2 million.

The vote for rural centres is cut by $500,000 when there is really a surplus need for these centres. Electrification of roads is not to $600,000. Our actual expenditure in 1977 on roads was $1,000,000 yet the figure before they amount to estimate over $1,000,000 was the actual in 1978. The vote for 1978 is $1,700,000 while in 1979 we estimate spent $1,400,000. These figures are unrealistic because the public is demanding more and better roads. We cannot satisfy their demands by spending less. It can only be done as a result of neglect or shoddy work, or it can be avoided, and this is what we see.

I heard Members above glowed the discussion and the plans they had from their Electorate Council Members and I am grateful that I have a discussion with them and mentioned some of the needs in our districts. We agreed with the understanding that it would not be possible to do all the things we had talked about. This is fair enough because Government like other businesses and other people always have more needs than they have money. We spoke about one road which has now become essential for not only Lockyer Valley, but the entire Ipswich, and that is a by-pass road, a road which has become necessary because the growth through Laidley has increased and now virtually paralysed in the mornings and evenings. With a by-pass road traffic could route from North Esk and East and into Gatton that without the congestion there. It would also open up the possibility of Laidley town. I do not expect that this road will be built over the next four years. The reason is that two of the Elected Members of the present Executive Council were Members of the Executive Council during the 1974 to 1977 administration. In 1977 money had been voted to build a community hall in Grandchester and since then it has never finished after the Government had changed in 1974. I do not expect to see any of my schools fulfilled because the capital were from Government. Only yesterday, amidst the fighting which were from Ipswich,

MR. G. HAIG BOSDET (CONTINUING): ...are projects of a political nature. If one examines the capital side one will see that Pagwa Area, Sandy Lake and West Bay...the three constituencies of the Elected Members of Executive Council, have across the board of the capital expenditure. Nothing has been provided for Golden Lake with a little exception which I will deal with later on. Nothing has been provided for East End with one exception which I will deal with later on, and a few crumbs have been thrown to North Side.

I had expected substantial money this year as that was usual. Instead I see that the word is Mr. Moses Commissioner's private arrangements has been fixed irrevocably and a lot of businesses are being driven by the Elected Members of Executive Council. Not even Solomon in all his glory has been arrayed like these divine people who run the Government, and his word has been fixed.

When I had the discussion with Executive Council Members on road work I do not recall their mentioning that road to us. They certainly never told me they were going to fix it. I have no objection that Sandy Lake has been said that the capital works have been carried out with the agreement of the Members from the various Districts.

East End will receive a drill centre which had been budgeted for last year. Part of this money had been set aside. The construction had started and naturally they have to finish it. What do all they will get.

Golden Lake will receive $61,000 for a school building which I think is necessary. It will receive three with Pays End one hand school for the school, and it will receive a cattle dip, it will start something in the vicinity of $100,000. There are only six classroom structures and yet we receive $200,000 out of a $3 million capital expenditure.

Sandy Lake is the same. In Sandy Lake a road will be built which will only benefit four or five families. Could that money not be spent, which has been spent on a North Side road which is a dead end road which goes into Saskatchewan, together with the road which serves Mr. Loutsenko's apartments....

MR. D. BILLARD MILLER: My, President, I wonder if the Member would please give way. On a point of clarification, Sir, I do not think that it is fair to say that the Saskatchewan Side road on North Side will benefit only five families. There are quite a number of people who live in there. In fact I believe that there are people from the Second Elected Member of Golden Lake's District who will benefit if that road is completed, because it will go through some people from Golden Lake's Land as well. So I do not think that it is quite correct to say that only five families will benefit. I think the whole Island will benefit in the widened premises and airfield which will be produced in that area. Thank you.

MR. G. HAIG BOSDET: Mr. President, I do not have objection five families or six families or seven families benefit. The point I am making is that throughout the estimates the Elected Member for North Side has been a strong supporter of the Executive Council and his road has been fixed.

MR. D. RICHARD MILLER: I have no principles, Mr. President.

MR. G. MIKE BOSTON: I am not arguing that they now paying here for living with them. I am only pointing out the inequities of the provincial capital budget which we have, where districts have not been reduced at all. In 1975 to 1976 they did not do anything for Golden Rose. It did not hurt us. We were returned reasonably and I think this time we might be heading for that again. So whether they spend our kind does not hurt me. It does not hurt me whatsoever. It does not hurt the Liberal member for Fort Rae. However, the people of that area are entitled to a piece of the pie. They have been shunned in this politically polished budget.

In one night seems we see that every district except for the benefits. We destroyed Golden Rose in many occasions when we could have planned it because we always seemed to do work simply to get elected. When that comes I do not want to be here because that is unacceptable. When one considers people he will find the Conservatives. When one considers people he will find Golden Rose, one is getting from the electorate shows one night, "You vote for me and you will get this". So my point is proven.

We have been short changed in this budget. I can speak to that. I suspect to be short changed in 1988 and 1989 and 1990, 1991 and 1992. If the public realizes what is happening I am certain that there will be a change and we would be given adequate funds.

Mike Ogilvie Rose. In the four years between 1974 and 1978 there was only a million dollars spent on capital works in Cayoosh Rose. I would think I were in here in 1978 I found the situation where the Liberal ended at Cayoosh Rose. Nothing was done in Golden Rose, Rose and Gunia Rose or Cayoosh Rose. Everything had been done at Fort George Rose and West Bay. We have some fifty schools in that area, where capital works are just up which are unnecessary. I will be standing until that time when I turn to the desk in West Bay for the purpose supplementary of Hansard and to point out complete paradox, that more important and more urgent needs are necessary.

I am dealing with the road works where the budget has been cut this year. What surprises me about what is left is that it is not distributed on a politically basis. It has been distributed on a political basis. We heard from a question asked in this House that the Government this year cannot possibly meeting the cut mix on the major roads. Can you imagine that? They cannot afford to. They have not budgeted in the this budget, except for the major campaign which swept this country. The block-busting had been done somewhere up from West Bay to Smithers and to use the statistics the major roads in North Side and East Side. Miraculously, miraculously we have billion vote getting roads are under this the major interior Rose have been neglected, looked out exceptionally from the budget. This is not fair.

The money which is provided for roads will be the bulk Road in Cayoosh Rose which I believe is necessary, but I would like to question if that road is as necessary as the Golden Rose to the major upkeep from Fort Rae to George Rose. I am not arguing Cayoosh Rose should not have the road fixed. I am saying that Rose road would rather have priority over a major road which now turns its blame bopping. No one has suggested Cayoosh Rose as the Rose the money been during the eight years. I mentioned this between 1972 and 1976 Governments had spent Rose than half a million dollars on capital works in Cayoosh Rose. Between 1976 and 1980 we spent $1.5 million on capital works there and in the four years between 1980 and 1984 we spent $3.4 million on capital works in Cayoosh Rose and Little Cayoosh, somewhere think what the previous Government had spent in four years.

MR. G. MAC EACHEN (Pembroke): Sure, Sir, there are things that we can do for Upper Ottawa Street, but I cannot see how this money could have been spent, or how some Conservative would have objected. I must admit I never placed his road because I did not want my picture in the Herald.

So out of the money provided one third of the money seems to go to Upper Ottawa Street, and the other two thirds are divided between the two other municipalities represented by Elected Members of Association Grants, Upper Town and West End, with as I mentioned the little bit which is left to go to the Pembroke Area. So the $781,000 for Upper Ottawa will go for work inside the Queen Mary and Base Line, Pembroke Bypass in North Bay, traffic improvements and so forth, which is good work in Upper Town. However, we should be thankful as I know they are going to spend the same half for us this year.

I must conclude to deal with other items in the budget which I feel are unsatisfactory. However, I would like to say that in the matter of the roads, I should hope that if the present Conservative Government ever have the opportunity again to prepare another budget, that in the matter of road needs they should consider the percentage rather than urban municipalities, and rather rural areas should be given priority.

Under capital works I see the vote for farm development is down by $184,000. I cannot understand how this vote is down when the provinces that have are going to be so many changes, and pollution and rural development is finally have been made.

I already dealt with the fact regarding equipment, one vote which is down by $193,000, but what has been done here is that the Government was so proud of it could not get together because it would have been too much. On page 151 we see that the vote for technical facilities is down by $269,000. This is at a time when we are going to provide better health care.

The vote for purchase of land is down by over half a million dollars - $560,161. It is a good thing that our administration over the last eight years bought large quantities of land for Government, because there is only $60,000 under purchase of land on this particular vote. In 1965 we had approved $520,611 for the purchase of land and that figure has been reduced to $2,198,761, which simply means that we spent last year half a million dollars more on land than we had budgeted for. All of this came out of last year's revenue and still we ended the year with a surplus. When I say the year I mean the end of the year we were responsible for which was the 31st October, 1965. I know that surplus disappeared between October and December, but that was the present Government which carried out the disappearance act.

The last year we actually purchased $2,198,761 of land. This year the miracle working Government is going to buy all the land which the Government will need for $60,000. The Hon. Member for Sudbury East already dealt with the purchase of the land for the dock in Moss Bay which he related as much as a person would need a hole in his head. He said that to what sense $60,000 would probably only buy a postage stamp size piece of land. By that I imagine he meant that it would be a very small parcel of land not sufficient for building a dock.

Now to open more controversy that there is an unrealistic budget is that in another area I see that $80,000 has been budgeted to build a dock. I have been informed that this loading facility will be similar to the one at Sparks. I do not have the exact figures here with me but the dock at Sparks, I believe cost something in the vicinity of $75,000 to build at that time. Now the present Government is going to build

Mr. G. Hale Goudey (CONSTITUENCY): a dove similar to that in Hant Bay for $20,000. This means that the figure is unrealistic. What is going to happen is that they are going to start the deal with the $20,000. Then they are going to come back to Finance Committee and seek further funds. It is the only way it can be done.

A budget should be a reasonable guess of what one's expenditure should be. We are never able to calculate the cost to the penny, but there should be a reasonable figure which [illegible] would meet the cost. To put in unrealistic figures in an attempt to balance the budget is foolish; money and might even be politically unwise in the long run, although the budget was presented about a surplus of $15,000.

We hear a lot about sporting facilities, playing fields and parks; yet the Government this year has reduced this vote by $169,000. This is a reduction greater than the actual expenditure in 1968. It is a fallacy that 1968 was a year of heavy spending on sporting facilities. Everyone knows that when we were elected in 1970 there were no playing fields except the one in Hope Bay and I believe one in George Town. Bodden Town had no playing field. Now since we have been here for eight years we have purchased the land and built playing fields for the principle in Bodden Town and Savannah. We also purchased land for a field to serve the children who have recently left school. This land is contained in the parcel with the adult centre in Bodden Town. But I have heard no mention of anywhere that land into a playing field, and I do not think it is possible with the little bit of money which is allocated here for sports centres, playing fields and parks. I do not think we will get that playing field this year.

The same thing happened in East End. There were no playing fields until the Unity Team bought a piece of land in the centre of East End. 1969 was a year of heavy spending by the Government on sporting facilities. We bought some parcels of land in West Bay at a cost of nearly half a million dollars, and these parcels of land total about 28.36 acres. This land can later be developed for whatever purposes the new Government may wish to put it to. The sporting complex up at the school on Walkers Road has been started and according to the Hon. Member for Health Education and Social Services work is progressing on it.

However, it is believed that this Government will have no need for land during 1972 to unrealistic. The only piece of land they have budgeted for is the one parcel of land we could do without. Last year we purchased a parcel of land for the sewerage plant, and no purchase of Government in recent times has come under so much criticism. The criticism from the opposition came because they knew Government needed the land. They knew it was a good purchase and they also knew it was a good price. That parcel of land was bought for much less than many other parcels in the same block. It is true that they had people valuing land who said it could be bought for a little over $8,000 an acre. The acreage of the land was 30 acres and I believe some of the people who valued the land said that it could have been bought for a little over $8,000 an acre. This is nonsense. Shame is no part of George Town which is zoned for heavy industry where you can purchase land for that price. I believe if adjoining Government took a very good bargain for what they paid much less than the true value of the land, but there are people who say that you can go out in George Town and buy a parcel of land for $1,000 in that particular area.

The land was ideally situated because it is to be the future site of the sewerage plant, and the heavy concentration of sewerage is in the central George Town area and the West Bay Beach. It is true that Government could have

MR. G. DALE BOOZMAN (CONTINUING): ...good cheaper land, but what can the use of paying up to the price of Rice Ski or behind Boulder Town to buy land for a passenger jet and bring it right across the whole area from Orange Park and Mark Bay. So there were many factors which came into this purchase. There were many factors which made it attractive, and I said in one of my published meetings that it was only because the owner had been a strong supporter of the Rice Town that the opposition had raised so much nonsense about this purchase.

I could name parcels of land in that area. Mr. G. Dalton owns the adjacent lot I believe, and he paid much more per acre for his land back in 1974. There were other landowners in that area who sold and bought for better prices. There are landowners whose acreage would not suffer from the entire plan. It is a good thing that we bought what land because there is only just enough for the West Bay Park, and only enough left which would be available this year for land. It is a good thing that the present Government is getting ready to use this land, and I do hope that they will get some highways out of it as well, which will be necessary to facilitate access time.

MR. TRUSTWORTHY: If the Member has finished dealing with the particular matter perhaps it will be a convenient moment to break.

MR. G. DALE BOOZMAN: Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: In that case I will suspend proceedings until approximately 2.15 p.m.

AT 12.48 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2.33 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Second Elected Member for Pickton Town.

MR. G. DALE BOOZMAN: Mr. President, I will now go into portion of my speech dealing with the consolidation budget which has been just finished. It is unrealistic to say a budget is balanced when it has actually been cut in half, that is the simplest terms. It is also unrealistic because the public will expect more services in 1985, the budgets also not balanced when the Senators are reduced below what is considered a safe standard. It is not balanced when when the First Elected Member for Pickton Town calls the penny onto system of taxation in error.

Before getting on to the remainder of my speech, I would like to mention a remark made by the Second Elected Member for West Bay. As far as I was concerned I will not attempt to deal with the many statements which can be made. However, he did make a statement which is factually erroneous, a statement

Mr. S. Gale Denley (continued): which is protected often was the subject. That statement is like referring to a case which was tried in the Grand Court and is unfair to Montana, together with the Montana Legislature, especially when the party and particularly the Fifty Elected Members for besides that interfered with the case, and the results which were brought about by politically determination. This statement is unfair. It is unjustified. The trial of the matter is that the case in question was tried in the Grand Court and there was no political determination. In 1965 certain Members of the Assembly who perhaps did not like the action of the Unity Team asked the Governor to have this case investigated by a special investigator, and you, Sir, wrote to the Chief Justice asking him, I would imagine, to give him guidance on the case. The letter which he wrote to the Governor and which was circulated to all the Members of the Legislative Assembly is that they should clearly that the case was tried in the Grand Court without any political determination. I am reading this letter in the hope that the Member will not persist from propaganda and his wrong statements about this case. The letter reads:

> "Thank you for your letter of July 22nd and June, 1965. I think the more sane Members of the Legislative Assembly had in mind was the case of R.E. Johnson and Sexton. It was not a fair trial. I doubt if the disappearance of a file would have had much effect on the case. What disappeared was an exhibit, a piece of wire with fingerprints. It was impossible to determine how that disappearance came about, and one obvious valid objection was that the exhibit was material until the case itself is closed. All civil courts do exhibits some embarrassment as the proceedings will not final.
>
> The case proceeded in the Grand Court but was suddenly when it was explained that most of the prosecution witnesses who were taken to one or more places. There was also a lengthening and at the particular the prosecution accepted a plea to a lesser offense. Judgment accepted, and so the accused were sentenced to their time and plea and were final.
>
> The exhibits does not become the property of the Clerk of an exhibit. Steps were taken to impress accuracy and secrecy exhibits are kept in a steel cupboard to which the Assistant Deputy Clerk has the key. Perishable exhibits such as firearms, hand cuffs and expensive jewellery are kept in a safe in the office of the Clerk of the Court. She has the key to that safe.
>
> I examined the arrangements in person today. While these fire resistant cupboards are reasonably adequate, in the light of the present experience I have decided to improve the Clerk of the Court to obtain funds to buy another larger safe in which to keep exhibits.
>
> Perhaps I should add that following the disappearance of the exhibit in the case there was a full investigation by the CID. All magistrates, even the Clerk of the Court to the messenger were questioned. The investigation did not turn up any reliable evidence to identify anyone as the culprit. The exhibit mysteriously reappeared after the case ended."

MR. C. RAY BOGGS (CONTINUING): Everybody knows at this time of year is Mr. Edwards who was Clerk of the Court and nonconsensus.

I have taken the time of the House to do this because the Second District Member from Black Hawk has brought considerable comment recently, not only in the House but outside there. I hope that now that he knows the circumstances he personally already knows, that he will desist from his mean habits of intimidating people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with the memo which I have in the Journal as payment to Senate. I think this particular vote should have the same thought that that of payment to Senate be that of Family Law. Because in the recent publication of Members of the new Senate I find the important Senate are filled with family members. I have listed a few of them - nephews, brothers-in-law, brothers, nieces, daughters-in-law. In fact, Sir, the only family member not found on those Boards is the mother-in-law. It is true that on one of the Boards in the past there may have been a relative of the party there. For example on the Iowa Advisory Committee there was a member, but that Board is not a decision making Board. Here on the Iowa Planning Board, the Iowa Juvenile Corrections, the Industrial Board, the Planning Board we have this relation. Also we see in order to know when they recommend anybody from Boston Post, they have a husband and wife team and put the husband on one Board and the wife on another. But, I have no objection to these people personally because I believe they are well qualified to be on the Boards. However, why could the Governor not find somebody else rather than voting husband and wife. On another Board I see two members from West Des. One on one Board and one on the other. Could they not find other people? Did they have to keep it in this family circle?

I see on the other major Boards a manager and his private secretary, one on one Board and one on the other. There are a lot of people out there to choose from. Why must it be kept in the family? I see on the Boards designated nursing nurse, as in the case of the Appeals Tribunal under the Commission. I see old members known to be close to the Members on the Boards and the Board membership stricken with nepotism. But what is more alarming, Sir, is that with the exception of the husband and wife team mentioned, there is nobody from Scottish Rite or East End on a major Board. There is one other man from Drake Area who is now living in Scottish Rite Area of the Boards, but East End has been left completely off. To my knowledge it is only on the Planning Board that one East End person appears. This is wrong to leave these districts without any representation on these Boards.

Closing on this point I would like to say that they are missing a lot if they do not have local input. When we established the Water Authority we decided to always keep on it although it was not written in the law, one Member from each area in which there was a water lake. When the first Members were appointed we had a Member from North Side, a Member from East End and a Member from Lower Valley in Scottish Rite where the three water lakes are situated. The new Governments came in power and took all these Members off and never replaced them with any local people except two local people who have special interests in the water business. They have the Board filled with Court Reporters and so on, and they are missing this local input from North Side, East End and Scottish Rite. Let me say that one of the best contributions ever made on the old Board came from Mr. Otto Kepler who was a Member from Lower Valley. While he was on the Water Authority Board, he brought to our attention the fact that some sewer would have started in that area the water had deteriorated. His belief was that these people were

MR. G. MAIS ROGERS (Constituency): checking off the fresh water and would actually double the lane. We have since ascertained by ... looking at somebody from the United States to visit an another gentleman who had worked on the Panama as a similar problem, and both of these matters connected with Mr. Otto Mathias. The results was that the Government put a moratorium on Mangrove Swamp and Control Unit building canals in the area of the water lens. Although it was not written into Law it was also unwise to go within a mile and a half of a water lens.

This information could not come from any other source but a source which was local and which knew the situation. So that the Government possibilities were understood and disappointed the public at large, particularly the areas affected, they are really hurting themselves. I would like to see this corrected as soon as possible.

In the Budget address I note that Government may contribute, although it is not included in these recent moves, looking into the transportation system with regard to the Building of schools-children. I believe it would be wrong to interfere with the system which was started. It is working well and I do not believe that Government can do a better job of handling the children. It is my belief that if Government were to go into busing the school-children it would be more costly. Just examples were twenty-five or more buses. I believe, are presently employed in the busing of the school-children, and if we were to buy that many buses then capital expenditure would be something in the vicinity of half a million dollars. Just in five more than we are paying now and we would still have the same operating costs because we would have to pay drivers and we would have no more employed at the Busing Scheme. I believe that in the long run the service would deteriorate.

The Elected Member for South Side actually mentioned the high cost of administration at the Public Works Department. So felt that we were spending quite a bit of money and in the fact the Department was doing some capital works which did not justify the expenditure. However, I would like to point out that the vote for Public Works is not really an administrative vote as it is for many other departments. For example if we examine the details we will see that there is a sum of $250,000 for street lighting. This actually has nothing to do with the administration of the Public Works Department. That vote is simply there so that the Public Works may pay Caribbean Utilities Company Limited for the street lights. It is really not an administrative expense like the money for paying a secretary or buying paper for the typewriter. Also there is in that vote a sum of $80,000 for fuel and oil supplies, which again cannot really be called administrative, but would more or less be a capital expense in some other department.

I see that there is a sum of $60,000 for traffic lights and signs which I imagine is money spent on buying traffic signs or having them made here. So that vote, although it is expensive, is really not as bad as it appears on the surface.

There was one campaign promise made, a promise to change the Executive Agreement which will not be carried out. The present Government, in my opinion, will not be able to carry out the promise which I heard during the election that they would change the system of giving information back to the way it was, where the information would be given through the Governor rather than the system of now giving it through the Attorney-General. I do not believe that they will be successful in changing the Executive Agreement in that manner. They may put some other changes but the major campaign promise about the Executive Agreement will not be fulfilled.

MR. S. HAJI MOHD ALI (Kedah): If he were a Malay Government's integrity would suffice. I think we would have a problem with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and it would be described in the eyes of the United States. So that is one campaign promise which may not be fulfilled.

I agree with most of the statements made by the Honourable Finance Minister in his Budget Address; particularly the one where he says that 1982 was a reasonably successful year. It is a very mild statement but then he is a very moderate man. However, that statement also tells the public that all the propaganda that we heard during the Penang election was pure propaganda, and that the Malays were never broke and that we were handing over the administration during economically rosy. So he said it was a successful fiscal year.

However, he did make one statement on Page 37 which I do not agree with. He said he thinks growth would be made in the country's economic and development policies. But this may have been true when the idea originated in his head before the elections, but regrettably since November there have been major changes in the country's economic development policies. We have new Chairmanship of the economy. We have seen no facts on the Government because they themselves have not their capital expenditure in half. We have seen the increases on local goods, a departure from previous years. We have seen cut backs in manpower in every area. So there has been a major change in Government's policies since the elections.

The Housing Corporation is headed by Tuan Syed Kechik. We heard from questions in this House recently that a lorry plies it is now in. It has no policies, no money and is making no loans. We also know in that same question time that prior to November the housing authority was quite well. I do not expect us to see any improvement in the present condition of no policy, no money and no loans, because those of the four elected Members of Executive Council opposite opposed the Housing Authority and what it was proposed to set up in Penang then. Now these Members, along with the other elected member from the corporation, are making it work. So I do not expect to see any change.

Let me say, Sir, that the opposition did not under the Bill in Penang then. When we returned to Penang a petition was sent to the Governor asking him to do away with the Bill by using his veto power. Some Members were not even satisfied with that and they put their advertisements in the newspapers, called a press conference, which was actually a copy of a letter they had sent to the Secretary of State. This letter is signed by two of the present Elected Members of Executive Council, one the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council at the time who opposed the Bill in Penang then is also associated as speaking with the consent although he did not sign it. This letter went to the Secretary of State saying that the Government would withhold assent to the objectionable Bill or alternatively this be using executive his power of disallowance of the ordinance but. So the opposition to that Bill was amply assured. They gave reasons for it which we not agreeing with certain provisions of the Bill, but of the customs the Malaysian one will see that three Elected Members of Executive Council, assured we have journeyed to have a discussion taken, actually voted against the Third Reading of the Bill. So that while their opposition had been up and to the last they Secretary Defence has been assured in which the full powers and to provide for the guarantee, the result of the petition to which they agreed when the crucial time came at the Third Reading of the Bill. So I do not expect any blame to be made by the Barisan Government for some time to come.

MR. P. RAJ MOHAN (CONTINUING): The Prime Minister mentioned the many avenues of future prosperity and potential for the country, and the Budget Address puts emphasis on the five building blocks to ensure us the three fabulous figures mentioned. This Building was opened by the Government after the completion before the General Election. I understand that it remained shut as was opened the Second Reading after the election. It is my opinion that there was no necessity for a second opening. I have never been to Zeno and I have attended the opening of many buildings around George Town. We are never called back when the staff moves in the furnishings and the gadgets purchased. There was no need to have an operational opening. The building had been opened. However, if I had been in the Government I would have insisted to open that building the second time because it is really worth it. I would hope that it would give to me an understanding given to them a lot of political mileage. So although they had inspected the first opening and did not attend it, they opened it a second time and have enough political mileage one can get from a second baptism. I suppose there is nothing anti-Christian to do with a person who was baptised once in the faith.

Moreover, I am concerned that they put up a plaque at the entrance in honour of a Member who had just come to power. Undoubtedly during the four years in Government he will accomplish much," and he will be many things of which we can be proud. However, I just think the people who put up those plaques like one of the Members whose names and stuff have on the construction of that building, should come clean. I believe in giving honour where honour is due, and if the Member financing has four years and does something substantial I would agree with it. But to just put a plaque identified as mine and shame and ashamed of waste to the one put in by the Member who constructed the terminal building, I think was a waste of public funds. Also as that opening many people were unaware; people who had helped in evolution, some of them in the early days of construction, and I agree, Sir, that those people should have been honoured. There were ways of that who worked hard and I agree some honour should have been given to them. What I cannot understand is how they could open a building built in the early years, headed by the former Member for Islands Activities and I was not given him to make a speech at the opening. This was an insult to the people of the Sister Islands because who then was Sister Islands Member for Sister Isles or not, he has made his contribution to evolution in this country.

I recall when we were elected in 1976, the new Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council Cabinet's desk which was in the same stage of completion as the airport was in 1984. I went out with the Honourable Premier First Elected Member of Executive Council Sentinel the former Member of Executive Council, Mr. Berkeley Bush, to make a speech at the opening of the desk. All the Members agreed to use the night time to fly because Mr. Bush had time to change when the desk was being, and credits for building the desk should go to the Government between 1972 and 1976. Mr. Bush was criticised and he rose and he made a speech and the islands were satisfied. The islands are now dissatisfied that the new Government has tried to pretend that the Member who headed up the construction of the terminal does not exist. However, I still feel that that is so very much wider and that they will have the speech. It really was a shame to treat him in this manner and if this is not politically unfashionable, tell me what is.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable Second Elected Member of Pembroke Parish.

HON. E. SCOTT JONES: Mr. President, I wish to join other Honourable Members who have spoken before me in thanking you for your excellent Throne Speech, and especially the Honourable Financial Secretary for his usual fine, factual Budget Address. both of these were very well presented, informative and ably delivered to this Honourable House on Friday, last March.

Each year at Budget time our Financial Secretary has the unenviable task of finding the finances around of this country, and again I am sure that this becomes more complex and burdensome. Needless to say the Budget Address for the year 1986 has been no exception.

I have witnessed first hand some of the very long hours he has spent at his office and I sincerely wish to congratulate him on his determination, ability and foresight.

Mr. Speaker, as has been customary, you have outlined Government's policies and programmes while the Financial Secretary has provided a detailed review of Government's financial affairs and the state of the economy. It is a responsible which any responsible Government must have to publicly review its past and its plans for the future, because in that society the people have a right to know.

Mr. President, as the Honourable Financial Secretary stated this year's Budget Address has brought a significant change in the Membership of this Honourable House there has been no major change in the country's economic development policies. I fully agree with Madame's statement.

I am grateful to the people of George Town for electing me a second time with such an overwhelming majority as their representative for George Town proper, and thank my colleagues for electing me to become a Member of Executive Council. I can only say that as I have done before, I have the interests of my people at heart and I will carry them. It is a fact, Sir, that in the General Election of 1984 the people identified that it was time to have the old styled party system had run their course. This is necessary at this present time. However, Sir, some whose time they were quick to assume others of being peoplists of their home will too suddenly themselves placed those roles. It is certainly just like quickly the tides change when the shoe is on the other foot.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is high time that those who have been elected that the people have spoken; that the last election is over, and so they may just be well settle down and unite against the political stability which has in a very large measure contributed to our success in the past, and will sustain the future of these Islands. Mr. President, the democratic process will not always please everyone. There will be those around who will be displeased with the results and ready to point an accusing finger, but may democracy always be kept alive in our country. The people's right to choose is the cornerstone of any viable society.

Recently the media and while I may consider dangerous posture I have been displeased the purposeful which has been spread the anti Chronicle which have done only the general correspondence Monday with the exception of Tuesday's, all issues of to consider, Sir, where is the love for the Cayman Islands portrayed by some would be leaders? Is it truly love for this country which commands that work, or a desire for power and position?

MR. M. DANIEL ROSSE (CONTINUED). Then, Sir, must mean the dividing line between the politician and the statesman because on him own part a statement taken of the country and a politician thinks of the next election.

I have sat for nine and days and I have listened to complaints from the opposition. Some of the very things which they complained about some of them are making. I have heard suggestions about people who knowing attended and things which needed to be done. May I ask why were these not given in the past eight years since the Party came into office or something else which is good in this country?

Mr. President, there has been talk about turning around the economy. Indeed one may that there has been a slowdown in some areas that aggressive with the social growth which this country has experienced. However, this slowdown was also on the way before the elections of November, 1983. Let me say in fairness, Mr. President, despite inadequacies, much longer had made more powerful commitments than the Cayman Islands cannot turn around the economy by the same step of a foot. I have always said it and I maintain it here once again, however before, the wars of recessions or slowdowns are like acts of God supplies, all reported from the United States of America and all affected by outside forces over which we have no direct control.

Additionally, for, the slowdown of the American years has the tendency ex-Looks especially when the recession unemployment is such an increase elections years of unpaid expenditures programmes for obvious reasons, which fortunately did not bring about the results which expected at the polls. It is all part and parcel of, breakdown, for people to lay blame to economic cycle or administration making or the moral of an economic boom, and again during a discussion which has not been given a fair chance of receiving us.

It is therefore a totally biased and distorted picture to link the recognition of eight years and attempt to compare them with the first three months of the administration of a new Government. This is unacceptable and to my mind prejudice an unfair allegation to the people of this country. I for one could seriously be totally ashamed of their financial ability were they are able to create a boom at any time that the United States and the rest of the world was in the face of an recession, whilst then they are not be more active in economic activity and discuss with the present Government.

I believe that as long as the United States economy is good and remains strong, as long as we remain a stable and strong country, Cayman's economy will not flourish as it has been precipitated. It is all political illusory as for as I am concerned. As a Government we have sound policies...

MR. S. W. TIBBETTS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Member is reading his speech. I refer to Standing Order 31(1).

MR. M. MCKEEVA BUSH: The Member should ask that instead of talking about reading the speech.

MR. ARCH MCLAUGHLIN: I have not noticed him reading it. I have seen him referring to his notes.

MR. M. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am not reading my speech, Sir. I have made notes. I am following them closely. However, I can assure the Member that if I did read

MRS. H. NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF (CONTINUING): ...anything at least written by Norman Schwarzkopf and not as was the case with some of the member's statements during the previous administration.

MR. G. MILLS ODOM: On a point of order, Mr. President, he should refer to himself as the Second Elected Member of Executive Council, not as Norman Schwarzkopf.

MR. W. MCKEEVA BODDEN: Hear, hear.

MRS. H. NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF: I believe I am entitled to call myself by the name I have gone by for fifty years if I so choose, Sir. However, I also like to apply my title as often as I can to remind more officials.

I was saying, Mr. President, that as a Government we have acted decisively. We are determined to maintain the strong connection to good Londoners for the Cayman, and we will continue to provide an appropriate destination for the visitors. There are many Caymanians we admire as hard-working, peaceful and joyous. We will seek out and encourage honest businessmen to continue as the backbone here, making it abundantly clear that it will be maintained within the rights of our laws. Caymanians whose interests are ours for sale, nor will they ever be used as a pawn for any manipulating within the approval of overseas Government officials.

MR. JAMES M. RIVARD: Use point of order, Mr. Speaker. Under Standing Order 25(4), although it has been brought to your attention the Member still continues to read his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: If I think the Member is reading his speech I will inform him.

MR. JAMES M. RIVARD: Alright, Sir.

MRS. H. NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF: I'm not sure what is happening there people about reading the speech, Sir. If we are saying anything in favour of them they never notice that we are reading it, just know (laughter). Anyway, if it is against them they do pay attention.

MR. JAMES M. RIVARD: It might have been prepared by someone else.

MRS. H. NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF: You do not have to worry about that, Sir. Maybe the Member is accustomed to writing other people's speeches but I write my own.

I was saying, Mr. President, that I unfortunately the Members both on and out of this House to accept their responsibilities in the true spirit of democracy and follow the sound advice offered by our Financial Secretary when he said it was necessary now more than ever to the preservation of political stability, maintaining our good financial practices and prudent control of Government spending. Because I will have no doubt about it, Sir, but the way when vast ambitious political plans create an atmosphere of political instability and unrest in this country, we can only expect problems in the financial industries which have made this country what it is today. It will then surely, Sir, return to the days of flood and bureaucracy and all the good characteristics of yesterday. Our people may not like the proposals but I have to remind it may of course, as this is one easy way of keeping promises we have done. We will all pay the price, Sir, those who can afford and those who are unable

MR. M. MOHAMED ZAHIR (MINISTER): Sir, I have also listened, Mr. President, the Eleventh Budget and Budget Address entitle Government to review the past and planning the plans for the future. This Government is fully conscious of the needs of this country. We know that we need more field workers for social services. We need more teachers and family people in the rural field. We need more school blocks, better roads, rehabilitation programmes, improvements to prisons facilities and the list could go on and on, for we really have many and varied. However, these all cost money and where will the funds come from?

Certainly the next Government cannot expect to find those funds in the short time frame in which we have had to work. It will take time and patience when the priorities have to be established, which is really financial commitments of Government funds, debts to be paid and a large infrastructure to be considered. ..

It is true that balancing the budget was a serious problem. This was done, Sir, by the introduction of certain measures whereby we have a surplus of funds from Current Revenues, I think it was $24.6 million, which is less than had to be implemented in order to balance the budget last year, in 1984. Mainly this was accomplished through by cutting expenses. I have heard accusations of financial experts, I do not profess to be one, Sir. I was told and I have evidence but I am sure that everybody knows that one way of balancing the budget is to cut the expenses. This is what was done in the case of the budget for 1985.

In spite of all the hullabaloo which has been made in this House about the few persons working overtime I am pleased to say, Sir, that after much pains Government has been able to remove the duty from individual drinking water. It is a long time in coming, Sir, but a glass of duty free water just is not worth it, and I am sure that the billion men who have been raised about so much in this House recently will be appreciative of what we will. It just goes to show us that the pay system in the Government Honourable Mr. Hamid Hassim, "Time longer than Rope" has a grain of truth in it.

I would also point out, Mr. President, that while there has been talk of all the revenue earning projects which this Government has introduced, no mention been made in the Estimates of this House one should find that when the Duty Free people in 1978, the first thing they did at their very first meeting in 1979 was to increase airport duty on liquor, wines, cigarettes, tourist accommodation tax and of course the Gambling Taxes which have been increased and increased and financed in the manner that we cannot add or only more in this range far from of losing many of them. Existing Establishments have, which would have an adverse effect on the future expansion in this country. It is people would argue and people should not be so short.

It must be borne in mind, Mr. President, that plans for the future are very often affected by the conduct of the past. It is therefore to this light that the year 1985 must be considered.

Mr. President, the budget for 1985 stands at $61 million and compares with the budget for the previous year, 1984. I would hasten to say, Sir, at this stage that many of the measures enacted by past budget addresses have gone unheeded under the cry of neglected. We can foresee Honourable Members, as usually put it so should turn out figures to how have recommendations required to provide the services to the people of these Islands.

HON. K. KOMBY DOUBLE (CONTINUING): Our future, also, is therefore strongly affected by the conduct of the last administration. So we are faced today with what could be termed quite rightly have hard financing. "But why" some must ask. Because some just should get blood out of stones and Governments must learn yourself to raise or restrict our tax finances to the very bare necessities. There is no alternative. This has to be done if there are to be any lasting, clearly due to many of these previous Governments we have been plagued by the opposition.

Mr. President, keeping all with the above mean that all the good things we see in our neighbouring countries, all that is fine, I do not discriminate or unfavourably about good communications and a high life style because I can enjoy that as well as the next man. However, it must be remembered that we, unlike the rest pay the price. All the fine facilities we have in place must be maintained. Manpower must be provided, but the other side of the coin is that these must be paid for. They must simply just the same as in the other countries we mentioned. Therefore it can only be reasonable to expect that it must eventually reach the stage where we must put the block to wait the economy, to quote the words of the honourable Financial Secretary. What day have arrived.

It has always been true and it will stand the test of time that we cannot eat what we don't grow and live different things.

Much has been said, Mr. President, as I have mentioned before about the economic warning measures being put forward. However, no-one has mentioned what country there is here to be introduced at this time. This country has in the past been taken on a spending spree especially during 1984, Mr. President. Governments must now find funds to maintain the commitments and these can only come from the public who enjoy and know the benefits. This is a reality which cannot be ignored and now avoided. A careful analysis of Government's estimated revenue will reveal that out of the total revenue of $88.8 million which this country is expected to generate in 1985, $48.8 million or 55.6 per cent goes to recurrent expenditure, the cost of running this country which is not cheap. That is why we badly need late for capital expenditure and very necessary, Sir.

To a household who earns $7,000 a month this means that he is spending $600 out of that $2,200 to operate or run the house, and therefore he only has approximately $900 left for other expenses. Government is in a very similar position. I have explained to all sorts of well-meaning people invited at this new Government, but last year and the year before, and probably going back further, substantial amounts of money have had to be taken from the essential Recurrent Revenue in order to balance the budget.

In 1982 there was $8 million taken and last year there was $12 million. This year there is $2.3 million! So why is this considered such a risk in 1985? It is because there is a new Government that this percentage is being used in a last ditch attempt to discredit the new Government and convince the public that they made a mistake at the polls. Last year one out of seven members of revenue failed to produce what was forecast.

Including the figures one will find that there has been $3 million. Tax was down by over $600,000. Timeshare were down by $800,000. Sales were down by over $5 million. Road taxes were by $700,000 and revisions were down by $80,000. With this sort of performance in 1984 the new Government has inherited a deficit which currently amounts to twenty percent in three months.

MRS. M. ROSALIE BOGGS (CONTINUING): The elected-Board elected, Sir, under the Local Government.

MR. G. MAIO BOUSQUET: On a point of explanation, Mr. President, we did make the estimate that known to us at the time. The decision to withdraw the Police Force by stage to 1984 was... Some areas were done, but couldn't be made 24.

MRS. M. ROSALIE BOGGS: I am not saying that they did not make their estimates, Sir, but those revenue estimates which I have not been taken from the budget and they were certainly less than what was forecast. That was the point which I was making. With regard to making the point I would like to remind the Member that he said he brought a balanced budget to this House, balanced on paper, showing that at the end of 1986 they would have over a half a million dollars surplus. However, if one takes the Revaluation was considered the revenue normal operations, one will find that they ended up in 1987 with a deficit of $17 million.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think this may be a convenient point to take our afternoon break now I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 3.25 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3.43 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. The Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

MRS. M. ROSALIE BOGGS: Mr. President, when we took the afternoon break I was saying that the nine-days started under the Unity Team Government. It was telephoned by the Unity Government and I am certain that the public in this country, know that they elected politicians, not magicians. They cannot expect miracles on these matters.

To come also, Mr. President and take out of the Budget of $61 million for 1988. $12 million has already been spent on commitment by the previous Government in 1984, accounting estimates for completing projects which have to be paid for out of this year's vote.

As I have said before, Mr. President, we have to reach these days about the little man and what we are doing to him. But where was the little man when school fees were enforced which perhaps should not have affected many a Dominican family, however I unreservedly reproached politicians from many, many Opposition for what hardship was created because of the introduction of school fees. Where was the little man when hospital fees were introduced? There also presented hardships for the little man. There are others, as observed in Grenada for our Carnivals to have persons fined. There too have affected the little man in one way or another, directly or indirectly, from time to time.

MR. H. DOUGLAS POWELL (CONSERVATIVE): It is my intention, Sir, that
adjourned by merely asking Members on the front Bench our views
a step to the gallantries which we pay on the public in 1982. However,
now many are actually willing to get down to the issues of the year
ahead in this relatively standoff to consider, and help him think he
really needs it. This is left to be seen, and would certainly be
interesting to many of the more recent by this remarks and are being
reformed to unfortunately by some people who have no time to spend
with them.

Mr. President, the 1982 position is
such and it is time that political matters should be put to rest
so that all of our energies can be concentrated on the difficult
task ahead for this country, the task of restablishing political
stability and keeping this ship of state on an even keel. For there
be no doubt about it, there are many problems ahead which demand our
attention. To be quite the opposite, the politicians, the
financial experts, the young administrators and the men on the
street in their chosen professions. If we really look into matter
this carefully we will post our objectives and find the way to manage
ourselves as can reveal high priorities which have increased the prospect
of the individual and make this country the success it is today.

However, having said what it is
desirable to see happen in certain areas, unfortunate past political
mistakes have been forgotten into these Chambers. Therefore, Sir,
just as long as these decent people who work their hearts into Pensions
Trade and who do a public very valuable to safeguard the public, there
will be those who shoulder the responsibility to see the matter
straight. The public must know, Sir, and experience of programmes
they are asked what went wrong [illegible] ago it
has brought nothing but unnecessary and unwelcome divisions amongst
our people, which threatens the very fabric on which this country
has been built. A division and dangerous situation has developed
and if allowed to go unchecked will eventually create more of a
devastating effect on the future of this land and our people than
any Commando Lt, III or IV as far as that be concerned. Let us put
our priorities in order.

Mr. President, I would like now to
thank my colleague to our Civil Service which has increased by some
six per cent. I too agree with those who have said that we cannot
continue to support further increases in this area. However, it must
by kept in mind that as more and more demands are made by the public
for improved services, just the same as any other business Government
must have the available manpower in order to meet those demands.
It cannot be done otherwise and all the fine buildings in the world
are useless without the people needed to provide the services to the
public. These services must be kept at a desirable level.

I realise that Civil Servants'
salaries account for £39 million of recurrent expenditure but, Sir,
I also realise too that Civil Servants must eat. Civil Servants
have families to support and many dedicated Civil Servants work
long and hard hours.

I believe that the move to eliminate
all posts in establishments which have not been filled is one means
of stopping further increases in the Civil Service and reducing
expenses to control and I support this action. Regardless, Sir,
of those who are quick to criticise it is my opinion that we have
a good strong Civil Service and I for one have always supported
them, simply because while politicians and their new-fangled ideas
come and go, the Civil Service remains the backbone of this country.

MR. W. HOWARD PICKERSGILL (Bonavista): I must have to quickly. I am most pleased to see, Sir, that a local well deserving officer has been given the position of Deputy Coastguard of Caribou, and that she is to have training of local officers in Bonavista Bay. This I believe to be a sound investment in our future because our young people who choose this area of the service must be given an opportunity, and they must be trained and trained well if they are to fill responsible positions in the future to keep law and order in this country.

I must turn to Radio Canada. I feel that Radio Canada is to be commended for their professionalism and commercial success. Without losing that professionalism I make particular note of the fact that a staff of fifteen, thirteen are Canadians who operate the station. This is something to be proud of.

The new Canadian Broadcasting Law which will shortly make this significant is undoubtedly the most important piece of legislation passed in the last four years. While not yet perfect it is a substantial improvement and will serve this country well. The new Board like the previous one I am sure, has been working very hard and I sincerely congratulate them for their dedication and interest in the affairs of this country.

Mr. President, the continued growth in the financial markets is encouraging. Of particular interest is the fact that we are considering to attract banks from further afield than the United States as there all the way are not planned in our banks. Total expenditure in Canada by the banks and trust companies totalled 241 millions as you would, and of course Canada has cost in line with over fifty million. Add the staff on the street and they are fully aware of our heavy dependence on finance and tourism. This has been true for years and will continue to be just as long as we continue to provide the ingredients which attracted investors and travellers here in the first place. These ingredients are stability, safety and friendly Canadians. The importance which we attach to these fragile and fickle industries can never be over-emphasized. They must be presented to our local workers, our local drivers, our shopkeepers and all others at every possible opportunity, because one telephone, one major report from General George Town by misled and misinformed people can cause us to lose overnight the benefits we now enjoy and have worked hard to build up.

Mr. President, the Honourable Financial Secretary went into much detail to point out the high percentage of Canadians employed in the various local businesses, and these figures were most impressive. While I am not over nationalistic, as I have said before, these statistics tell me that more and more Canadians are filling their rightful places in the job market. This is the way it should be. As enterprise continues to do business here, and while there are needs for key personnel to be brought in at certain levels, this must always be seen as a temporary stage so that Canadians can share in the development of our own country.

I believe, Sir, that Cable and Wireless is one company which has set a fine example in this regard and I would certainly like to see more of this type of Canadian involvement at the managerial levels.

Mr. President, I would now like to turn my attention to my areas of responsibility, the Portfolio which has been assigned to me which is the Portfolio of Tourism Aviation and Trade.

HON. M. SPARKY EDDIE (continued): Finally, I must thank the staff of my Department for the assistance which they have so kindly given me and the loyalty which they have shown since I took up my position some three months ago. I continue to count on their support and I am looking forward to working along with them during the rest of my office. I do believe that together we can accomplish much for our Government and for our people.

Yesterday, Mr. President, I made comment on the statements made by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town in his budget. He alleged that in 1994 the Unity Government had spent $712,682 but that this year the Portfolio of Foreign Relations and Trade administration had been brought up to date of that only $586,930 were being provided for expenses. He went on to say further that there would be insufficient funds to pay for electricity and maintenance, and that the Government would have to find over $100,000 to meet these obligations. Well, if that were really the case it would not be saying much for the previous administration, because this means of those that we are told there were no overfalls could be covered. However, Mr. President, the decrease in this vote is simply because several duty-free shops that were initially in the main estimate of this Portfolio were removed to their proper Portfolios. This is the reason for the large difference in the expenditure for that department.

Additionally, the Member should have taken notice, Mr. President, from the total expenditure of this Government under Personal Emoluments that electricity bills are paid by Finance Department and stationery is paid by Personnel Department. I can safely state that the Refurbishment of Foreign Missions and Trade Representatives will be available. However, no funds will be wasted because questions would be found to be quite unnecessary.

Mr. President, the Portfolio and Departments under it have presented sensible budgets which I am prepared to defend. However to reduce unnecessary Government expenditure some of the goals of this Portfolio for the next four years instead of the unrealistic ambitious which were originally laid out might prove prudent. I believe that with the support of my staff we can achieve this.

While engaged in looking at the already laid out plans during this meeting, Sir, that the year 1994 proved to be an excellent year for the tourist industry in the Cayman Islands. This is most encouraging to the staff of this Department and the Portfolio, for a job well done. Air arrivals were up 10.6 per cent and cruise ship arrivals rose by 14.3 per cent over 1993, we an overall increase of 24.3 per cent. It is highly anticipated that there will continue expansion to increase this figure and for our tourism officials' dedication and the quality of the product of tourism in the Cayman Islands.

For 1995 it is estimated that tourist arrivals to the Cayman Islands will continue to increase. Air arrivals are forecast to be 341,881 persons showing an 11.5 per cent. Cruise ship arrivals are forecast to be 810,957 for an increase of 7.6 per cent. It is believed, Sir, that this forecast is a realistic one and as in the case of all projections it is subject to some assumptions. The major one are that the economy of the United States maintains its steady expansion. Also it is hoped that the necessary exchange factor for the strength of the United States dollar against the pound Sterling does not produce a negative effect on tourist arrivals, and the tourism product in the Cayman Islands must be maintained to a high standard. These assumptions have to be made and kept in order for us to meet our projected targets.

MR. E. JOSEPH SCOTT (CONTINUED): With the co-operation of all tourism related businesses in the Cayman Islands and the positive approach to the continued development of tourism in our country, our Department of Tourism has an aggressive marketing programme arranged which is expected to produce favourable results again this year. The William Dollar Sports Fishing Tournament, Cayman Open Tennis Week and all local promotions for which plans are in place and progressing well.

A new Tourism Advisory Committee has been appointed with three sub-committees set up to deal with tourism products, cultural activities and tourism awareness. These Committees are responsible of a cross-section of local industry, additional initiatives and promises to be an asset to our tourism efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see the progress which is being made to make marina points in Little Cayman a reality, because I believe that this is the means of preserving our heritage which contributes to account for at least 50 per cent of our tourist arrivals, and which I feel must be preserved for the benefit of Caymanians as well for generations to come.

In a highly competitive tourist area overseas market we must continue very closely the services we provide. We must give fair exchange and fair value because the United States dollar is hard to come and they expect services to reflect for what they spend.

I am also happy to see that I support the procedure which is being made to consult and eventually build existing Relationship in the direction of home ownership which will enable that Statement to receive and handle cruise ship visitors. I think that West Bay is one of the most desirable in our islands and it is time that they received some help in that area. They have my wholehearted support.

A new advertising agency has been appointed for the Department of Tourism and Cayman Airways effective as of 1st April, 1985. Mr. Speaker, this change was not made for the sake of change only but it was felt that a new approach, new attempts and more ideas needed to be put into a revised overseas advertising programme for the Cayman Islands. That is just what we have. Source Offshore Communications Inc. is a creative advertising agency with extensive experience in travel destinations and airlines. They do not have representation in countries like Canada and the Caribbean which would present a conflict of interest. So we believe that they are the right agency for the Cayman Islands and for Cayman Airways. Mr. Speaker, this agency was selected after viewing and listening to presentations from nine advertising agencies for two days. Expert advice at no cost was also obtained by me whether to conglomerate in the Kennedy Triangle or move from the Texas location. So the committee to work with these presentations was composed of a real expert in tourism from Canada, the Managing Director of Cayman Airways, the regional sales manager for Miami, the sales manager for North America, the Director of International sales and marketing for the Department of Tourism and Cayman Airways, the director of tourism, the Principal Secretary for Internal Affairs and myself. I think we had a hard working, well experienced committee which was capable of giving us sound advice so that the selection of the agency would never be in doubt.

After listening to advice from committee members I took the decision and recommended to Government that the new agency be appointed. It was a proper and democratic procedure which I chose to use and which I understand never happened in the past with other appointments which were made of advertising agencies.

Add, Mr. Middle Income Housing: In our efforts for tourism in 1980 a strong public relations programme will of course support our advertising and special market promotions during this year. I may mention here, Sir, that it is the policy and intention of my Ministry to monitor very closely the performance of each of our regional offices to clearly ascertain what contributions they are actually making to the tourism, and what it is costing Government. The more effective to public relations works and I would point out here that after proper consultation, it was possible to save some $90,000 by rationalizing the arrangement which was made with the Cayman Islands News Bureau, and by arranging for the Department of Tourism London office to undertake with the public relations services which had previously been provided by the Kate Bureau.

As the past several years the State of Country has placed considerably to its cap its tourist promotion. Sirs, and we have put a small amount in the budget this year which I trust will receive Members' support, so that we can in the course of the year at least appoint a sales representative for Atlanta with a view to the day being able to open a sales office in that city.

Mr. President, good tourism results cannot be achieved on programmes without a good qualified and experienced sales force and tourist officials. The Department of Tourism is finding it increasingly difficult to hold on to good staff, not to mention being able to attract experienced staff as replacements. In addition to that no Caymanian would have been for the Department of Tourism overseas staff. We have therefore, Sir, had in for a small increase in salaries for this staff and I quite trust that this will receive Members' support at Committee Stage.

I come next to Aviation. It is true, Mr. President, that this department is manned by a well experienced and qualified Supervisor and other Caymanian staff of which we can all be greatly proud. The airport runs highly smoothly and gives excellent service. I find our Director of Civil Aviation a man who is good by the books and I personally appreciate that.

As you stated, Mr. President, it is intended during the course of this year to make an attempt to operate the airport on similar grounds as the Port Authority. Previously, landing fees can be collected and the Financial Secretary will hand over the taxes. By the time of your next Throne Speech you should be able to say the same for the airport operation as is now being done for the Port Authority and Turtle Cayman.

The new terminal, a much needed facility, stands as a tribute to all Caymanians as I exist on the day of the inaugural opening. It is a facility to be proud of and will undoubtedly contribute to our tourism boards mention because of the accommodations provided there. However, here again, I think it may be more building than we can afford for, and the operating cost has to be met. Hide-out only might come from the people who enjoy the use.

I would like to support wholeheartedly the comments made by the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac regarding the second Aviation. Our Brac aerodrome the second Aviation in the area. Altogether, this is what I am told by the Chairman Committee. Surely, Mr. President, the points made by the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac should be well taken and well considered by us. I have always been a person to always stress which I was never entitled to. The 2,000 Sovereign Cayman people who put us in here are well aware of the quality of person that I am. I do not seek to take anybody's seat. From then. This was not the intention. There has been a big elaborate opening costing some $10,000 in November. While I understand was a very successful function. Nevertheless, it was

MAY. P. DONALD BOUCHER (CONTINUED): a fact that the building segment ready to be occupied. I have seen the measures happen. I have seen the staff move in and start to work in buildings before they were completed and they had the official opening some time afterwards. However, this was totally the opposite. Government felt that since it had been opened prematurely and since all the facilities had been quite a bit and been completed, that when the day finally came that the terminal was completely to some important enough occasion to mark it as a special event. I don't claim that happening. I am sure that the former Member responsible for Tourism Quebec and Parks has worked very hard and I am sure that he got all the credit which he was entitled to when his term moved to Montreal. It just so worked out that on a breath of the elections I happened to be the Member in place at the time. Therefore I fail to see that if this was the way that the election went why anybody's name other than M. Jacques Bedard should have been put on the plaque marking the date on which the terminal was officially opened. This I really do not understand.

I was disappointed a lot to celebrate in this country. I am not a hypocrite and I have never tried to deprive anybody of anything which they were entitled to. I feel that I had as much right to celebrate the ceremony and to have a plaque put there that I was the Member in place on the day it was officially open the same as anybody else. I have no apologies to make for this to anyone.

I hate to belabour the point, Sir, but for the sake of clarity I must point out again because this came up time and time again in question time and through the debate, and I want one very plainly that the accurate page in Hansard and Bathurst Communication Limited and the Public Works Department for the ceremony held on 12th December unfortunately were due to the misconception of work in progress. There were other costs incurred. In other words because of the movement, the contractors had to stop what they were doing, clean up the place for the opening and then resume work after the opening. Mr. President, this was a most unfortunate ceremony because the building was completed and work was finished at that time. I sincerely hope that this will help to clear up this matter in the minds of this House and the public.

I hope indeed the Prime Minister of Quebec Province's recommendation for suitable cause of the new terminal I think that it is a fine suggestion and I continually until nearly this side of those are available funds.

In the course of 1980, Mr. President, as can be seen from the estimates, we plan to start the terminal in Ottawa that will possibly have funds and expect to be able to complete it hopefully in the following year. I want to give this honourable House my assurance that this is the only terminal in the Ottawa Valley which will be only opened once. I am sure that the people of Ottawa Area will welcome this because as the number of tourist arrivals grow there is a pressing need for a new terminal.

Mr. President, the Prime Department is another department officially operated by Diplomacy. Our Chief Fire Officer is an excellent administrator who controls the services of his staff. He runs a good operation and gets very little in return other than dependable fire-fighting equipment. His buildings facilities are poor and need improvements very badly. But he understands very well that there are not enough funds to go around at this time, so he does have to patiently wait.

MR. M. MOSES ROSES (continued): We have put in a small amount for a replacement water heater which he badly needs, a small amount for fuse units to be drilled which are absolutely essential for certain performance, and a few other odds and ends which I trust will maintain Members' support.

A final mention to assure the Hon. Roy and Salem this month have been set aside for the Bureau of Rice Women will remain. I spoke about the need for this in that high density area last time again at every opportunity at my disposal. We hope, Sir, to be able to at least clear the site and the building will come in due course as soon as funds become available.

Mr. President, I must come to Cayman Airways, the proclaimed petitioned "football,wicket of it is so, it has been a football by the whole team. It amounts to me that it has been used as a refuge for politicians and friends. Mr. President, Cayman Airways still always have my full support, as I see it as an essential service in respect of these Islands. I would like to see the ship come when because of problems or economics these Islands become solely dependent on any foreign air services to maintain air services for our people, our tourists and business community.

I have visited on both sides and I have seen the needs, and I do not believe that we should ever again be dependent on outside operators to provide these Islands with air services. I see this as essential to maintain achievable growth in the air industries on which we are dependent. I also see it as essential for maintaining our links with our sister Islands of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, and I see CAL, as essential to continue to provide opportunities for Caymanians who have shown the spirit of adventure as a service. However, having said that, the lives of our national airline and its future must be placed up to.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that any amount of political propaganda could strengthen the struggle Caymanian that I have everything but indifference and genuine concern for Cayman Airways, and that I will do all in my power to see it continue, so I like many others wholeheartedly.

Mr. President, much has been referred about my portfolio. I have learned what I consider very disappointing remarks. Perhaps it is fair that this position I have today is a bit worst for the lowliest boy that Michaelmill as some of the politicians realized me leaving their being unpaid in 1984. However, I can assure the public and I mean that they are aware of the contribution which I have made to Cayman Airways over the many backwardness, and that I too have some ability to provide the needs in my portfolio. I have already mentioned in Cayman Airways that I have helped to build up these air services before the Unity Flag was once heard of. I am not a braggart but I am not unfamiliar with chief aviation matters and proceedings. In 1972 I prepared a docket for the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States and represented Cayman Airways as the chief witness at the hearing in Washington D.C., which gained for the very first time a foreign carrier's permit which enabled Cayman Airways to take its rightful place amongst international services, that is Kingston & Montego Bay and Miami from the Cayman Islands to the United States of America.

In 1977 I was a member of the delegation which attended the negotiations in Bermuda II and while both the United States and the United Kingdom had airports in the area that are only permanently established in the negotiations were the Caymans for both sides, Mr. Speaker for the United States and Mr. Shackleton for the United Kingdom.

MR. M. MUSSA BAZIGA (Mauritania): Nevertheless, Mr. President, the performance of the Gajese Islamic Delegation is above praise and the results which were out were nothing to be ashamed of. We were proud to be host here, nor did we spend any time talking to blacks. She came for Guyana together and harmoniously and objectively discussed and headed to the United Kingdom and the United States delegates. As a result of that, the Guyana Embassy in addition to Miami was granted another United States visa of entry which is quite evident from a perusing of file. That other point of entry was Chicago or Houston, hence which has proved to be a good route for the citizens to the organization, and a good basis for this country.

In addition to the several United States visits of mine I would like to remind this House that it was the result of the Guyana Islamic Law at that conference which enabled the organization to come to thought about, because it was not our intention or our desire of Islamic Economy Legislation that before any additional comments were developed to affect Guyanese investments that these countries' opinions would be taken personally into consideration. So that is the proceedings for the two successive deputations which Guyana Embassy had organized to mark the fact that a conference was closed in 1983 of which so much talk has been made.

In 1971 I was again Guyana Embassy's witness at the United Nations Security which extended Guyana Citizens' operations powers to the United States for another five years. Shortly after that Russian was interpreted as a declaration. I have pointed this, Sir, not to show us, our lives not simply to point out that I am equally or more qualified than the former Member in question which matters, and will assure that Guyana Islamic representations are stood fully and to the highest authority.

I sometimes myself fully qualified to be the Member responsible for Foreign Affairs and Trade, and to guide, responsible for policy matters relating to the national Flag carrier's operation. The I,MF Guyana Embassy who put us here as their representative also feel that way, and as a my colleagues who voted me into Executive Council. I do not intend to allow anyone in or out of this House to enjoy that I am more receptive, discipline person.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that we have reached the end of discussion and I will ask the Honourable Second Official Member to move the adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. MINISTER OF HEALTH: Mr. President, Sir, in accordance with Standing Order 20(7) as read with Standing Order 20(9) I do now move that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. on Monday, 28th March, 1966.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. on Monday, 28th March, 1966.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 4.55 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., MONDAY, 28TH MARCH, 1966.

STAFF OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(MONDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1985)

Present were:

THE EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR C PETER LEACH, CMG, OBE - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS H WEBSTER, QPC,CBE,JP	PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR EXTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J MORRISEY, QC, LL.B	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C JOSEPHSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND INVESTMENT
HON PATRICK O SHANNON	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON JR ROBERTS (SPEAKER, MBE	MEMBER FOR LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AND TOURISM
HON CARL EVERETT C RICHARDSON	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON VASSEL O JOHNSON, CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND MARINE RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MCKEEVA HUGH	SEVENTH ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE EASTERN ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR LINFORD A PIERSON, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE NORTH SIDE ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CAYMAN BRAC
CAPT BARRY S MCCORMACK	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CAYMAN ISLANDS
MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIFTH ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SOUTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
MR W MARK BODDEN	SIXTH ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SOUTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
MR D ESSARD WILLIAMS	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF SOUTH SIDE
MR JOHN D MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE EASTERN ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1995) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MONDAY

10TH MARCH, 1995

1. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

(a) PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

(Meetings held 6th December, 1994; 9th and 23rd January, 1995; 13th and 27th February, 1995; and 13th March, 1995.)

TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE CHAIRMAN, THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN.

(b) BUSINESS COMMITTEE REPORT

(Meeting held 6th March, 1995.)

TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER.

2. CONSIDERATION OF THE DETAILS OF THE BUDGET FOR THE ENSUING YEAR AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1995) BILL, 1995

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(a) BILLS:-

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(CONSIDERATION OF SECOND READING DEBATED)

MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER

COMMITTEE STAGE

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

MOTION PROPOSED

RESUMPTION

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

THIRD READING

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(11) FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(1) THE ORGANISATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2004

(2) THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2004

(3) THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2004

(4) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2004

(5) THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2004

(6) THE LAWYERS LICENSING BILL, 2004

(6) MOTIONS:-

(1) GOVERNMENT NOTICE NO. 1/05
PUBLIC (CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT NO.) BILL, 2005 (BILL NO. 1 OF 2005)

TO BE MOVED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (HON. CHRISTOPHER MUNGER)

(2) GOVERNMENT NOTICE NO. 2/05
APPOINTMENT OF STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY HON. BONAVENTURE KYULE (SPECIAL MEMBER)

7. OTHER BUSINESS

(8) PAPERS' NOTICE:-

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 1/05
ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

HON. KATE MUSYOKA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE MINUTES OF MEETINGS HELD ON 5TH DECEMBER, 1962, 6TH JANUARY, 1965, 23RD JANUARY, 1968, 12TH FEBRUARY, 1968, 8TH FEBRUARY, 1968 AND 12TH MARCH, 1968 - PAPER ON THE TABLE 1

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 8TH MARCH, 1968 - PAPER ON THE TABLE 1A

CONTINUATION OF REPORTS ON THE NIGERIA RESERVE LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

HON. M. MORAY MACKAY 17

MR. JOHN DE MCLEAN 23

HON. MICHAEL O. DOMINIC 27

APPENDIX 38

HOUSE

19TH MARCH, 1998

10.00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed. Presentation of Papers and Reports. The Public Accounts Committee Report.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. EDMOND A. PIENAAR: Mr. President, in accordance with Standing Order 77(1), I, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, beg leave to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the said Committee on the Auditor-General's report and audited accounts of the Government of the Cayman Islands for the year ended 31st December, 1997.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

MR. EDMOND A. PIENAAR: Mr. President, in connection with the Report, I just wish to say it is my responsibility and duty, as Chairman to give the House and Honourable Members a brief summary of the matters highlighted in the Report and the recommendations thereof.

Mr. President, the Committee held its meetings on the following days -

(i) 6th November, 1997
(ii) 9th January, 1998
(iii) 23rd January, 1998
(iv) 13th February, 1998
(v) 27th February, 1998
(vi) 12th March, 1998.

Mr. President, within the terms of the Committee's reference and the authority contained in Standing Order 79 we summoned the Principal Secretary for Development and Natural Resources to assist the Committee in the matter, and we again wish to record our thanks for the valuable assistance received from him. Also from the Auditor-General and other senior officers connected to assist us.

Mr. President, while we do not all of the observations and recommendations made in the Report, perhaps one observation should be the following.

Item 30 of the Auditor-General's Report on Capital Fund. The Committee investigated the position of the commitments outstanding both on the Capital for the period 1972 to 1998. Following deliberations on a detailed report and breakdown of outstanding debts submitted by the Financial Administrator, the Committee, having noted that the efforts being made by him to ensure that payments are timely and properly made, recommends that every effort be made to determine methods of payments of Capital

MR. LINCOLN A. PEARSON (Westfield): I was not aware of any other than what was published in the Hospital.

The Committee further recommends that a cost-benefit analysis be carried out to determine the profitability of pursuing the principle of rates suggested by the Hospital Administrator as doubtful and facilitate an assessment of employees' time structure, does not warrant the value of debts collected. Further, that Government update its policies in conjunction with Health Services with regards to identification of paying and non-paying patients and to ensure, that proper means tests are carried out where patients state their inability to pay.

Also, Mr. President, item 32 on ... Expenditure - the Committee characterized the problem of outstanding accounts in the sum $1,248,000 for the period late to 1982." The Committee, in finding no explainable reason for outstanding accounts from up to five years to increase, recommends that immediate steps be taken to rectify the problem of outstanding accounts fees and that the collection of particular accounts for this purpose, as provided for under the Law, be paid immediately, and that such appropriate finding to do so, be struck off the register. The Committee further recommends that upon a company being struck from the register, any property existing in or belonging to that company be granted to the Honourable Financial Secretary for the benefit of the Island in accordance with the provisions of the Law. It was also noted that a substantial amount of these outstanding fees were in respect of Local Government ...

Item 43 of the Auditor-General's report on capital projects. It is the opinion of the Committee that, with respect to major capital projects, the Public Works Department be involved only in a supervisory capacity as its experience has shown that historically the private contractors are more expert and efficient. The Committee recommends that a fine Government projects be put to tender to ensure that Government receives the best value for money.

Finally, Mr. President, the item of the Report of project numbers to the Executive Chief with the numbers of paragraph 180 B, which properly was circulated from Mr. George Lagrenade for the enhanced project. The Committee noted that the said property had been purchased by Government for the value and revenue system, structure, for a sum of $380,000. The Committee investigated the matter to ascertain whether, in view of such disadvantageous terms various relationship of the land, the expenditure may have been incurred without due regard to waste and expenditure of Government funds.

The Committee's findings showed that the 74 per cent stamp duty was paid by Government to Mr. Phillip, resulting in a total purchase price for the property in the amount of $410,000. It is the opinion of the Committee that in light of the recommendations made by leading valuators, the price paid for the property was unjustifiably in excess of the market value of the land as agreed by Government's official valuations and the independent valuations from the private sector as above from the reports submitted by them -

(i)	Valuation by Mr. Donaldson of Lands & Survey Department - April 1988	$ 75,000
(ii)	Valuation by Brighton Enterprises - May 1988	$222,720
(iii)	Valuation by Mr. Peter of Lands & Survey Department - July 1984	$ 40,000
(iv)	Valuation by Mr. S Williams - July 1984	$ 99,000
(v)	Valuation by Mr P Smith - January 1988	$ 75,000
(vi)	Valuation by Mr A Peterson-Pomeroy 1988	$ 85,000

MR. DANIEL A. PEARCE (CONTINUING): It is noted, Mr. President, that the county withdrew placed on the property, excluding Creighton Properties' valuation of over $100,000, to $84,000.

The Committee recommends, Mr. President, that on future valuation should be considered through the Douglas County Department that where there is doubt and discrepancy, the County valuations should be corrected by Statement.

Mr. President, also coming from the meeting, the Public Accounts Committee thought that it is time this was discussed, but perhaps not resolved here that we review the terms of reference of the Public Accounts Committee which I think we will have the opportunity to do when we look at the standing orders at a while.

Mr. President, the Public Accounts Committee's Report has received the complete support of all Members of the Committee and this Report is the Report of the Public Accounts Committee to the House. Mr. President, I would therefore move that the recommendations contained therein be adopted by this Honorable House.

MR. S. ROSCOE BOSTELMAN: Mr. President, I wish to second the motion that the recommendations contained in the Public Accounts Committee's Report be adopted by the House.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the recommendations contained in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Auditor General's report and audited accounts of the Statements of the Crown Estates for the year 1982, be adopted. Standing Order 72(5), I think, applies, and the motion, having been seconded, is open for debate.

REPORT
OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

MR. S. ROSCOE BOSTELMAN: Mr. President, I wish to commend the Committee for having gone into the public accounts, but commit myself the adoption of that report. There are three areas mentioned in it that I would like to speak on.

One is the recommendation that there be a change in the valuation of properties bought by Government. Government should not have the sole right of valuing the land. Whether we buy land by private individuals where which stamp duty is payable. The system is questionable now for that the land is valued and if there is doubt about the valuation someone can be brought in where the Government Services could be called upon to give the final say. The system used in the past to determine the value of a parcel of land for stamp duty has been that you have some document taken on that piece. If some anything has been used unlawfully for a likelihood to have been the purchase of that parcel of land for the purpose - the permit which is the subject of a part of this report.

It is true that a Government official has been served in the valuation of land case by this Department of this parcel, unfortunately that is my opinion. The assessment of this parcel of land could be standing for a little over $8,000 an acre. This has to - Commerce was, in fact, was a view parcel assessed at $1,850 an acre, which, again, has to be considered. That piece of land is considered to which is known as Black Rock Bay, South. Next the very name is unfortunate.

MR. R. HARRIS: [illegible] It is county. It is not known.

MR. G. LEE: GORDON (CONTINUING): This parcel of land is also in an area which has been zoned since about 1977, as industrial land - zoned for industrial development. Anyone familiar with land values in Grand Cayman will know that mostly industrial land in the centre of George Town is much higher priced than residential property.

I do not want to give the names, but it is a fact that many people ask the adjacent property to this parcel who purchased and in fact parcel land by that person. It was purchased at a price of between $6,000 and $8,000 an acre. This was back in 1978, and it is suggested that this parcel of land is worth here about $2,000 an acre. It is also known that Hendrick Drive Block has been sold for $60,000 an acre. Other more Hicks, West Bay Beach North, in quite recent transactions land was sold for $40,000 an acre. We have not like to bought or sold for $5,000 an acre, or even less, as has been suggested.

It is time the public knew the truth about this piece of land. This parcel of land was purchased from Mr. George Seymour who owned it for many years and I have been told by Mr. George Seymour, and I have been given his permission to state it, that he knew at the time that he was selling this piece of land he was approached by, from a certain quarter, a parcel of land almost in the same locality on the North Sound Road. Mr. Seymour's objection to that because he did not want to sell that piece of land, while the money received from the sale of this parcel he has been advised by his accountant who stated that he was supposed because he was George Seymour and a known supporter of the most administration. What behind this was however is the fact that this parcel of land was not developed by Government. It was purchased by Planning Committee and at the time of the purchase Members were told the value of the land and Members agreed unanimously to purchase this parcel of land for the price specified. It was only after Planning Committee had agreed that some Members of that same Planning Committee think it to be the public or public meeting maintaining that the Government had accepted for this parcel of land. There was no advertisement. It was a fixed price. The land had been valued at $229,780 by a qualified real estate agent who had sold land in that area for many years.

We did not pay $229,780. This was the asking price of the vendor. We negotiated and there were discussions at the particular time. The Financial Secretary was very satisfied that this was a fair value and was able to purchase it for $220,000 less than the price asked by the owner of the land.

I have seen a list of county parcel of land in that block and I have the price of county parcel sold since 1978. I am concerned that the price we paid for this land, amounting in the vicinity of $10,000 an acre, was a fair value.

I have mentioned that as far back as 1978 land was sold for $2,000 an acre and in some of the recent transactions the land was sold for $40,000 an acre. So I am concerned that the price of $10,000 an acre was a fair price, in fact, if anything, it was considerably less.

Also if we assume that this land in only worth what the lowest value was it is worth, the land would be sold for $222,000 and I have a list of some more going at that figure and less. This how we do calculations.

MR. D. HAIG SIMMS (Queenscliffe): The owners would be very worth $60,000 and it is ridiculous to even imagine that one could buy a house for the George Town for $100,000. Mr Owen Evans then moved to have the matter adjourned and seconded Hugh Brooker Mr Brooker then interjected. There is the place by Council today where the vendor's asking for $1,000. I would like some of those who have condemned this purchase to go and find land for this price in this State.

The ratepayers have been unfairly dealt. I am not condemning the Public Accounts Committee because it was just its function and to make the statement on the information. What I am complaining is the wrong stories which were told during the election campaign. But, this is not stopping us doing good and the Government has done what should be condemned, but history will tell that decision might.

This Parcel was a good purchase. I am not ashamed that the purchase was considered. During the campaign we heard stories like the Government made a mistake. The worst a big headline "Government makes a mistake - another mistake of Government to steal this water and discharge sewers".

This orders had been called by the people who now run the Government, or at least by one of the members, on an unconstitutional debate.

MR. MACKNESS: We are not debating the debate, we are debating the purchase of this particular piece of land on the Public Accounts Committee and that deals with the particular purchase of this land.

HON. ARCHIES A. BOLITHO: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. D. HAIG SIMMS: This particular match the Public Accounts Committee has called an unjustifiable purchase, but there are no facts to justify the case that it is an unjustifiable purchase. The Minister responsible and the Minister in charge to assure that the Government must take steps to make sure that there is no waste or unnecessary spending of public funds because we purchased a piece of land for a valuable service in the future. It is a good thing we mentioned it, as a matter of fact in my debate, because there is no money this year to purchase land.

So, if we examine all the circumstances surrounding this particular parcel, we will see that the sale was justified. The price paid was a fair price. This parcel of land is ideally situated because it is close to the West End Beach and very close to the central part of George Town where it has to be served by the sewerage works. Government inevitably would have found a sewerage parcel of land in Pitt's Lagoon or Lyons area, or maybe even up behind Bridge Town, Beach Hill or West End. One can buy land in some areas for less than $10,000 an acre, but Government would have to get a reticulation plant to serve the West End Beach and Central George Town. So it has to buy a piece of land in this area, and when all the calculations of this sale are now has appraised any parcel of land in this area that will be purchased for less than $30,000. So this has been given another unjustified beating and I believe that Estimate Committee was justified in recommending the purchase and ascertaining the circumstances for this piece of land.

We have had a part of this Bill on the agenda. We knew the answer to it is by a close vote, but none of those things detract from the final satisfaction of the land. Some of them reduce the value to this owner which they have suggested should have been paid. We did not purchase this land to give the Government's requirements. We purchased it for a piece which will provide sewerage.

MR. G. SAID KENNY (CONTINUED): I was a Member of the Finance Committee that recommended this purchase, and unlike some Members who supported it at the time, I continue to support it because I believe it was a fair price paid for fine lakeside property.

The second matter I plan to speak on momentarily is the Report which is before the House, is the hospital issue. I note the comments on the ambulance and the amount of fees outstanding. I would like to say that I'm sure all rights for the Government to endeavour to collect the hospital fees, I cannot approve the endeavours used which only have gone about it.

I have in my possession a letter which was sent to a person who had obtained or had claimed in the hospital in Dauphin. That person left the hospital on the 24th of September with a bill of whose bill or so, and on the bill was mentioned that the money should be paid within thirty days. The lady paid the bill on the 26th of November, and on the 28th of November she received a letter threatening to put her in court if she did not pay the fee.

Is this what the Government is doing with the hospital fees? Here is a person who was given thirty days to pay the bill and although she had paid it, long before the thirty days were up, they were threatening to take her to court. I am absolutely taken aback by the Members of this House in this.

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the Member that what he was discussing is specific recommendations in the Report. The Member must help me by sticking to them and not dwelling into a general debate about anything that was mentioned in the Report.

MR. G. SAID KENNY: See, ...

MR. SPEAKER: See I really do not think that what the Member has been saying is relevant and I would have stopped him earlier, but I thought perhaps you were going to show us the relevance. He has failed to demonstrate it. Read now I shall drop his rather position.

MR. G. SAID KENNY: Mr. Speaker, a recommendation has been made in the Report and I think Government is relying upon that recommendation; but I am saying that the way they look and about it is wrong. Anyway I will not .....

MR. SPEAKER: Can you show me under .....

MR. G. SAID KENNY: ..... pursue the subject.

The third matter is that of overpayment. The Report correctly, Sir, mentioned that overpayment were unfortunately come a period to quarter that were not considered good accounting practice. It does not simply say that, but this is the meaning of it.

I would like to point out that this occurred simply because human negligence has gone in where we have been, according to the budget address, Government computer - and inside the old system of collection in dealing with companies is very difficult to track them all. This, I believe, will be corrected with the use of the computer and I think this is the reason why the Honourable Financial Secretary has shown that so many companies have been struck off for non-payment of fees. With computer billing, better track can be taken of them.

MR. G. LEIC BIGGS (CONTINUING): Mr. President, I would like to close and I hope that I have made my point that there was nothing wrong with the purchase of that parcel of land; and, if Government in the future does not make any worse investment than that one, we will not have the problems which I foresee in the years before 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. MRS. CHARLES J. STRACHAN: Mr. President, as a Member of the Port Finance Committee, which the Second Elected Member for Eastern Post has just said to approve of the sum that Finance Committee did approve of the $300,000 for the said piece of land. What he did not say was that the Committee was given given other information. All that the Committee knows was that the asking price of the land was over $500,000 and that they, the Government, had negotiated with Mr. Ingham and they thought the figure that is $300,000, and they thought at that price it was a good buy.

As a Member of Finance Committee we must be guided by the Chairman of that Committee and in the absence of any records of any other information, we must be guided by his decision.

The land, as I said, was quite swampy. I have a piece of land adjoining a piece of property which I happen to own near Smithfield just across the cane fields to the West Bay for $2,500 an acre. Therefore, that land would have cost $112,500 instead of $300,000. So it is very easy to determine, Sir, that the price paid for this land was excessive - there is no question about it. There is no road leading to the land. There is only a dirt road on the Member's side of it. We knew nothing about the accessibility of this land to Finance Committee. We were never told that the Land had no access to it.

The land which I just referred to which was sold for $2,500 has access to it by a paved road. So, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the Government made a blunder, and I cite Elmslie. So one can tell me that there are side issues and that's all wrong. Figures do not lie, Mr. President. They can mean how far we go. So when one makes a mistake, why not admit it? Why not be honest with the public and say, "Look, we paid $300,000 for it. Sure, we paid more money for the land than what it was worth". The public would appreciate this. We must try to cover up something that has been done.

Mr. Speaker, we have had Days of this present Government because we are going to be honest basically and open with the people at all times.

HON. G. HAIG BODDEN: On a point of order, Mr. President, is the Speaker sure we are debating this matter at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER: He has not told me, so I do not think he is out of order.

HON. CHARLES J. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, the second point I would like to touch on is the hospital fees. We had a personal experience with hospital fees. Our maid went to the hospital about two weeks ago. We paid the hospital fees. We got a receipt for it and that's last week, before last Wednesday, we got a letter and we were told, Speaking short, that that hospital fee was due. My wife had immediately kept the receipt and she went back and proved that the fee had been paid.

SEN. CARL E. ALEXANDER (REPUBLICAN): Mr. President, what I am suggesting here, sir, is that there is something wrong with the bookkeeping at the hospital and it needs to be looked into seriously.

Thank you, sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honorable Miss Crystal Watson.

SEN. CRYSTAL E. WATSON: Mr. President, I am not going to go into the contents of the report. I simply would like to congratulate the Chairman and the Minority Leader, Mr. President, that we have not had such a report from many years concerning the mental institutions of the five Members try new Members to this House. I congratulate them for tackling this task so early in the Session and hope for success.

I congratulate them, sir, and only then to continue to do a good job for this Committee.

SEN. MARIE E. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I too would like to congratulate the Public Accounts Committee for undertaking this study first before the start of this Legislature Assembly was appointed. It is a very healthy condition that a Public Accounts Committee chooses or undertakes over the work and, Mr. President, it is appropriate I suppose that since the last four years, there might have been a Public Accounts Committee because I know that it is something which the Legislature Assembly looks forward to in scrutinizing such a body as look at the financial activities which Departments, hence have been no Reports from such a body in such a long time.

Mr. President, I mainly rose from my seat because I could not resist hearing the old army tale again about the plane of many lord. Mr. President, I doubt that it on the principle during the days of electioneering and so I am bound to speak on it again at this time. We have that very, very, Mr. President, and the Deputy Chief the Public Accounts Committee has given the correct one. They have quoted figures which were used in earlier debates mal-misconceptions. And, Mr. President, two of the reports send this to this Government have used unnecessarily for many years in calculation of properties for stamp duty purposes. Therefore, it cannot be said that these new people who do not know very much about Corporate Land. One of the reports or announcements made from the Government and Survey Department and I think very great respect for the ability of the experts in those the determining land valuation. Also, there is certain income in the private sector, but, Mr. President I personally know and have personally been for many years to do like these jobs.

Now, Mr. President, some the valuation of these people do just known on the scale-price index? However, we the same take there to be a valuation by a sleeve magnifier of the Duty Plan and this valuation be given, Mr. President, some out of this world. And the Government need that and with the past Governments work under many business bodies invested and paid for that sort of valuation we probably would not have found very much left in the Treasury when we got here.

Mr. President, I am not blaming the number of that issue of land because eventually, if we would have entertained a million dollars from that money business group I would not have blamed him. However, here we have valuations given for a piece of land of $25,000, $40,000, $61,000, $75,000 and yet they would not accept these.

MR. HAROLD G. HOLDEN (continuing): They said, "No, we have it lot... if north City Schools is going to build a parking lot for it. We are going to pay you $200,000". Certainly anybody would have objected that Mr. Speaker, I would have objected if I knew it would be disposed.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a bit about the valuation of land in that area, so I was afraid to tell you, Sir, that some other Fair-Lawn properties land was sold in that area at $3,000 an acre. Mr. Speaker, it is not the sort of swamp land which we are talking about here which they paid $480,000 for. It was dry land as well and there was a lot of it. Mr. President, this piece of land which was purchased for $200,000 is the worst kind of swamp land which was still filled in that area. When we say swamp land it is all swamp land. There is no visible piece of dry land anywhere near it. Aside from that, Mr. President, it is directly to the north of their sewage plant which was further described when the purchase of said swamp land. Where they put a garden of $30,000 on, came from is beyond me. Mr. President, the only land which I know of which was sold for that kind of money was to the North Georgia Fair Grounds from the Saint Mary Beach area to the Lakewood Theatre. You could take a stone and throw it from the theatre on to that piece of land. Mr. President, let me say this. It was all dry land. I have not known any land to that area and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I would invest in Georgia Power and in that area for fifty years; I do not know of any land in that South George Fair area which was ever sold for that kind of fabulous price. Even access from Seven Hills Realty running to the North should invalidate as part of the Seven Hills Realty land to sold for this purpose. Mr. President, this particularly northerly North of the sewerage dump off there, right off George Fair. It is not off the Seven Hills Realty.

So, Mr. President, for the record's sake I hope that is the only piece that you possibly can or that piece of land in connection. I make this remark to know that I am not speaking till against him. Look in the Red Book and see what they had paid him - little more.

Mr. President, Mr. Public Accounts Committee mentioned hospital fees. Of course that has always been a bone of contention in the hospital because nobody up there wants to mention hospital fees, I am reminded of that. In the past Government I made an Ministerial Statement many different responsible for collecting fees of. There are two methods available, why, just locate it alone, this is how they did things, Mr. President, 'Just leave it alone'. I have people who have gone to that hospital, honest people who came to pay their bill and remark came by without any bill being requested.

The Honourable Chief Minister of Executive Council mentioned about a bill which was sent out and which bill had already been paid. There is all sorts of confusion up there, Mr. President. When one goes and looks at the staff there, one wonders what they do. I do not want to remark the Chief Secretary or any department of Government but, Mr. President, let me tell you this. I have visited several. I have observed the operation of departments in this Government and I can tell you that there is need for a great shake up in many of them. One thing they always must should how to spend the money which is allocated to them on a quarterly basis, because they have got to spend it before the end of a quarter. The does not matter how it is spent, they must spend it. I believe that it is time for someone to look at the filing systems of hospital fees which is charged up there for the services which are rendered to the extent of $1 or $2 per week.

MR. VASSAR [P. SIMMONS (CONTINUING)]: So we have not changed the budget very much for these expenses but I think that the public has a duty to pay the public that we do charge. I hope that in the coming months someone will look at that expenditure and try to military the waste from which you changed.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. V. HOWARD ESQ.: Mr. President, I had not planned to speak this afternoon as many real beverage from across the way. I decided I would say my piece too. I would associate myself with the thanks and congratulations offered to the Chairman and his Committee for the job which they have done and are doing. I would like to say that the Public Accounts Committee is a very important Committee. The first night person we did not vote on used from the Public Accounts Committee and the Government Secret and Ayins and Ayins, and we-some called us warm paired around a little. I've one did make reverse an excellent a wisp on his hand and some said that he was a mighty boy.

Mr. President, it was always back always to me what has happened and that took place in the buying of that swamp land. So anyone saying or even implying that this is a fair price for the tax-payers of this country. I just have to disagree, Sir, but we, they say that it is a fair price. We wonder the country has suffered. We wonder there is no money now in the Treasury. But we hear many complaints

Sir, I honestly say that this new administration when buying property will not rob the tax-payers as it happened in the buying of that swamp land. I promise the country that if ever a matter as such comes to Finance Committee I will not condone such manipulation of public funds.

Mr. President, several publications can be viewed, one for $21,000, one for $60,000, one for $85,000, one for $75,000, one for $85,000 and one which came from a county supervisor of the Unity Team administration for $225,000. But they say, Mr. President, that is not a fair price. Mr. President, that is ludicrous. I say, Sir, that they should be hung for it. They should be made to pay the difference between the true valuations and the outrageous price which the Unity Team Government paid with the tax-payers' money, wasting the tax-payers' money. And the Treasury has no money and they are still complaining, but that is some Unity Team mentality.

As I said and I repeat, I give the country my assurance that if ever a matter such as this comes to Public Accounts Committee or comes to Finance Committee, I will not condone such manipulation.

Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. M. BERNICE DORSON: Mr. President, I would like to first wish Honours Saying me the congratulations the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee on such a timely and comprehensive report. As a Member of the Finance Committee in 1988 which dealt with the purchase of the property which have occasioned so much discussion this morning, I would like to make it absolutely clear that at no time were the Members of Finance Committee given the valuation for this property which was provided by the Government Lands and Survey Department.

HON. M. NORMAN SCOTT (CONTINUING): At the time we were told that Government was desperately in need of this five properties that it had been evaluated by a reputable real estate agency that they had negotiated as strongly and put the price up to an acceptable figure, and that they recommended that it be approved. We could only follow those recommendations as they stand, but at no time was it ever suggested that this property had been valued by the Parks and Recreation for $75,000. I would just like to make that small contribution as a Member of the Finance Committee which dealt with this matter in 1984.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. D. DAVID WILSON: Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Public Accounts Committee I would like to compliment the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town on his usual eloquent, verbose and roundabout way in which he has produced a particular, distinctive and continuous approach to a political problem. Sir. The approach taken by this Committee was based on the facts and figures provided for us. The Committee was very much concerned by the discrepancies that is borne out in the recommendations, Sir. The Committee ultimately failing in its capacity of bringing its deliberations into the open to the House, Sir, felt that there had been to a certain extent some change in the way that the land valuation was arrived. Therefore, it made the recommendation that it ought to involve the Lands and Survey Department in the valuation.

We were not concerned, Sir, with who was involved with the valuation but merely with the figures which lay before the Committee. Sir, maybe even I, through my share in such a discrepancy in the evaluation. However, I believe that I am safe, Sir, because it seems to be from what I heard today a mobile piece of land. One minute it is located in West Bay South. The next minute it is supposed to consist George Town Industrial Park. So maybe that is where the inflated value of the disputed piece of land, as I believe it was, has taken place of itself because it depends on where we put it from one day to the next and where it was located with the relevance to buying the land. If we can find a piece of land which we are very much like that we might have something going for us.

As to the disputed land, Sir, I think the Auditor clearly illustrated what I have said all along in dealing with the hospital. That is bad management. That is why the Committee took the recommendations which it did. We have in a disadvantage, Sir, because there was little evidence available for us to view records. Because as has been expressed earlier there had been some time during which this Committee had not met, and tabled a Report in the House of Assembly. However, I would just like to deal Members' attention to a few other issues and recommendations made.

That is under Item 13, Advance Accounts, under Item 14, Control of Expenditure and Item 21, Supervision against Irregularity. I think that these kind of recommendations clearly illustrate the Cabinet and the approach taken by the Committee.

Thank you, Sir.

HON. MICHAEL J. ECKERT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I join with my colleague the Honourable First Official Member in congratulating the Public Accounts Committee for having presented so clearly its Report in relation to the finances of Government over this last year.

HON. MICHAEL A. ECKARDT (continuing): I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in my interpretation of section 22 of Standing Orders, he accepts that it will not be the only Report which they will present to honourable Members of this House.

I feel that they are being unduly unkind in only including six out with the past year, Sir. It is my understanding that there has been no Report in respect of the four previous years and I was wondering whether it would be their intention to go back and review the other years, so that the duties imposed upon them by this Standing Order which may not have been fulfilled by the new Public Accounts Committee will be fulfilled by this one.

MR. SPEAKER: Did the Elected Member for East End wish to speak? You caught my eye earlier and I have....

MR. JOHN B. JEFFREY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to be very brief. At the time of the purchase of the said plots of property I held responsibility for the Portfolio. I would just like to inform it on record, Mr. Speaker, that my Portfolio was asked for certain information, namely withdrawal from the Lands and Survey Department which I was also responsible for. The withdrawals were just and proceeded and at that point the responsibility was no longer with my Portfolio. I would just like to clear the Portfolio because I would not want anybody to put the idea that we took full responsibility for the purchase.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Third Official Member.

HON. RONALD S. JEFFERSON: Mr. Speaker, I too like some other Member did not intend speaking, but since everybody is having their turn I will take mine as well.

I would like to join the honourable Members of the House in congratulating the Chairman and Members of the Public Accounts Committee. I think that they have dealt with the Report of the Auditor General in a better fashion. They have made some particularly comments on some aspects of the Auditor General's Report. I think it is known that I should make some comments about that.

With regard to the Item 22, Company Fees indicating that the outstanding fees are a little over $1 million from 1976 to 1981, and their recommendations regarding steps to be taken in the collection, and also the fact that these Companies should be struck from the register as well the following comment or recommendation which indicates that any property owned by these Companies will be vested from the Crown and should be dealt by the Financial Secretary for the Government of the Cayman Islands. Mr. Speaker, since the passing the assembly of Company records has been a burdensome task. What we are considering the fact that there were over 19,000 company records under a year or so ago when a tremendous amount were struck from the Register as a result of the computerization process. To manually accomplish these files we employed people during the summer time. Mr. Speaker how many people we employed, Mr. Speaker, they never thought to be able to go through alphabetically those companies 'A' to 'Z'. We took many approaches to it. We decided maybe one group at 'A' and work down through the names until you reach the alphabet. We would give attention to the letter of the alphabet and determine would have to come to a stop because the workers from colleges who were formerly employed, who were working the ones who only work three hours, for instance, or evenings.

MR. JAMES C. GREENWOOD: (continuing) The fellowship year is really [illegible] and we would never get back to it, Mr. President. Therefore as I recall the process was not actually possible. As a result of the consolidation of the Enclave Registers we are now in a position where we can determine what fees are outstanding, and what Registered Office is responsible for the collection of them. However, we must bear in mind, Mr. President that the Registered Offices are not going to wish their hands into their pocket-books and pay these fees because the real responsibility for paying the fees rests with the shareholders. Until the Registered Offices receive the funds from the shareholders or beneficial owners they are not going to make any payment. There is now [illegible] £1.2 million owed [illegible] as mentioned in fact since that [illegible] 1,095 companies have struck from the records. This is all part of the exercise, Mr. President. In previous years when we were winding up the companies records we struck a [illegible] number of companies from the Register at that time of year. I suppose, nevertheless the exact number now, Mr. President, as I am not going to quite forget. And that we have also, since I say, dissolved Company Registers it is very to determine who owes how much fees, and working with the Registered Offices is possible. If after the Registrar of Companies decides that he has given sufficient notice to the Registered Offices and time given sufficient time for the Registered Offices to make contact with the Beneficial owner of the particular company, and its fee remains [illegible], we then strike the company from the Register. That is the process which is now functioning and it is the same process which is recommended in the Public Accounts Committee Report.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think [illegible] any other Member wishes to speak but before I invite the Minister to explain, if he wishes, his right of reply I think that it may be convenient to take our usual morning break. So I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes. Let us resume at 11.40 a.m.

AT 11.25 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11.40 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Deputy Chief Minister, the Deputy Chief Minister.

MR. LAWRENCE A. DUGGAN: Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank Members who supported Public Accounts Committee's recommendations, and also for any adverse comments which we may have had on the recommendations. It pertains to the importance and the necessity for such an Improvement Committee.

I would also comment on the recommendation made by the honourable Second Elected Member regarding the activities of the Committee. I agree that perhaps we should go back for another three or four years. The only problem there, Mr. President, is that we have been advised by the Auditor General's Department that prior to 1982 it would be highly difficult for us to examine the audited accounts. However, I will go back to him and see how far back we can go with our Reports.

MR. LEONARD J. FIELDS (CONTINUED): ... It appears, Mr. President, that the thrust of the Report which engendered most discussion were items 30, 31 and 32 of the Report which had to do with hospital fees, namely, fees and the purchase of property ICC - 2. I would like to make it abundantly clear, Mr. President, that our recommendations were directed not under the terms of reference contained in Standing Order 72(1) which leaves the Public Accounts Committee shall examine the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by the House to meet the public expenditure, and of such other accounts laid before the committee as the House may think fit".

It did not, Mr. President, extend to any ministerial responsibility and I would like to make that very clear. It is not our intention, Mr. President, to cast any aspersions or to try to ascribe motives for the purchase of the Post Government Buildings I am aware that facilities for the house are scarce that the Report on the 1965 estimates will be dealing with any criticisms of the present Government. So our problem, Mr. President, is independent. It is not in any way political and I think that it is important that this point be made very, very clear indeed.

There is no doubt in our mind, Mr. President, that the purchase of property ICC - 2 was carried out unsatisfactorily and unwise given. As I stated earlier there was an increase price given by virtue of the new valuation of $67,000.00 to cancel the policy, Mr. President, $413,000.00. I am not here to say that rights or wrongs of the matter earlier our recommendations should be accepted and our report be thrown out.

Perhaps, Mr. President, in future instead of the valuation being done through the Lands and Survey Department and negotiated by two outside valuations, maybe the Government should consider compulsory acquisition where this is seen to be necessary. This would avoid any doubt as to the question of favouritism or political considerations.

I noted the comments made by the Minister Members, in particular those of the Second Elected Member for Belize Town and those comments are well appreciated. There is just one point where I would like to make clear which perhaps escaped the Member. That is that the recommendations of the Committee were that the valuations should be scrutinized through the Lands and Survey Department, and where there is doubt and discrepancy by outside valuations. I accept now, Mr. President, where there could be any major objections to such a procedure. In addition, I feel that Government should consider compulsory acquisition in such cases if we are to avoid the possible of political considerations.

We have not proved this, Mr. President, as a additional feature because we have many hard and sudden and did point very clearly to the terms of reference on these appointments.

On the question of hospital fees, Mr. President, I feel that it is quite necessary for us to note specifically the recommendations made. In short my thrust in the minds of Members of the public I would like to make quite clear that the Committee recommends that every effort be made to reconsider methods of payment of hospital fees at the point of admitting. I think that I need to refer to quite clear also, that in cases where members of the public are unable to pay their hospital fees provisions are made by the Social Services Department to have these waived or otherwise granted. There is no attempt here, Mr. President, to oppress those people who cannot afford to pay the fees. Finally, I must agree with the Honourable Second Elected Member of Commercial District that more effort needs to be made through the hospital administration to collect the fees which are outstanding.

MR. LOWELL P. WEICKER (Continued). On this question of comity from, Mr. President, here again I am glad to note the comments made by the Honorable Third Ranking Member of Appropriations Committee, Senator Cotton, and I think the Committee and Congress as a whole will benefit from the Appropriations Committee's Department will become much more efficient through the implementation of computer services. However, I need to point out to Members that we are dealing here with block grants, or namely we are making a lump sum appropriation to four places from 1979 to 1981. Namely the Intergovernmental Affairs Department must know that that is an ongoing thing. They just have to be cooperating. So what we are debating very here, Mr. President, is that we would wish it. And also Senator Lowell and we have very friendly to the amendment that this will be done.

Mr. President, would I move to change the number of the Public Assembly Committee from eight members; and also the Members of this House for their kind attention, I commit this will see fit to pass this measure and this motion.

Thank you, Mr. President

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that the Report of the Public Assembly Committee on the Action Request's Report and Additional Amendments of the Appropriations Committee for the year 1981, and the recommendations contained thereto be adopted.

ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Agree.

MR. R. MCKENNA SMITH: Can we have a division, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well. Will the Clerk please do so.

DIVISION
SEC. 16

AYES

Hon. Donald R. Kramer
Hon. Michael J. Brantley
Hon. Benjamin D. Shanks
Hon. J. Norman Bolton
Hon. Clint Christian S. McDonnell
Hon. Ralph S. Johnson
Mr. R. McKenna Smith
Hon. Clifford A. Stevens
Capt. Kelly S. McDonnell
Mr. James M. Hodgson
Mr. C. Gary Dodson
Mr. D. Steven Miller
Mr. John B. McLean

16

NOES

ABSTENTIONS

Hon. Thomas Schaffhausen

2

MR. JAMES M. HODGSON: Mr. President, why was it necessary to have a Division Count when there was no one voting against the motion?

MR. PRESIDENT: Because a valid question that if a Member is going for a Division he must be satisfied now. Because I might have failed to have somebody actually come up.

MR. PRESIDENT (Interjection): The question did come up some before and my initial impression was the same as yours; that if I had not heard anybody say "No", there would be need for a discussion. However, it was obvious and agreed subsequently that perhaps I might not have....

MR. K. MORRIS RISK: It is noticed somebody does not, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am aware, I failed to have the Clerk's count. It was 18 ayes, 7 abstentions, no noes. Is that right?

MR. JAMES M. ROSSER: The Member knows how to move out angrily.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order. I am trying to have the Clerk said.

CLERK: I said 18 ayes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: 18 ayes, 7 abstentions and no noes, I overcome the motion carried.

THE REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED THEREIN ADOPTED.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 7(b), Business Committee Report.

BUSINESS COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. EDWARD R. ROSSER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of this honourable House a Business Committee Report of a Business Committee Meeting held on the 6th January, 1967.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

Item 9, Consideration of the Budget of the Supreme Council of the Apostolic Faith, 1967.

The Honourable Second Elected Member for Brooklyn (Mrs. Ivy Stewart) was speaking.

CONSIDERATION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE SUPREME COUNCIL AND SECOND ADDRESS BY THE HONOURABLE (MRS.) IVY STEWART, M.P.

MRS. K. MORRIS ROBERTS: Mr. President, when the House adjourned last Friday I was speaking on the subject of Capital Expenditure. I had unfortunately forgotten and what I like most about Parliament is the opportunity of talking and speaking but not shouting, but that quite rightly these expenditures must be weighed against the cost and other relevant matters.

I therefore note, Mr. President, maybe in the financial statements of Cayman Airways Limited and Cayman Alert Building Limited for the financial year ended 30th June, 1966 which have been tabled in this honourable House on 1st March, 1966. Given current political circumstances most people are already aware that the National Debt has obligations to service any heavy financial losses.

A perusal of the statement of Loss and Profit as audited by Price Waterhouse, shows that the Government Airline showed an operating revenue a total of $713,6 million for the financial year ended 30th June, 1966. However, operating expenses totalled $1.0 million, resulting in an operating loss of $300,000 for the year then ended.

MR. W. STEELE SCOTT (continuing): However, after financing costs of $3.45 million accruing additional under our five leases were added, this brought the overall net loss for the year to $7.25 million. I am quoting United States Dollars throughout, Mr. President.

This result then overtook with losses brought forward from previous years therefore made the overall accumulated deficit of Cayman Airways as at 30th June, 1981 $10,307,000. The financial arrangements of Cayman Air included also provision of accumulated deficit of $680,000 for the year ended 30th June, 1982, which when added to the accumulative deficit of Cayman Airways provided a gross accumulated deficit of $10,987,000.

According to the Balance Sheet of Cayman Airways Limited as final audit account ended 30th June, 1981 the total current assets of $4.4 million as against total current liabilities of $13.6 million. The company therefore had a working capital deficiency of $9 million and a shareholders' deficiency of $2.5 million as at 30th June, 1981. In other words, Mr. President, all the working capital of the company which Government had injected over the years had not only been used up, but the company was also some $9 million with which to meet current bills, in spite of the large advance.

This obvious position emphasizes the pressing need for both short and long term funds to be made available in order to support the operations of Cayman Airways in the foreseeable future, and remain in business. There can be little doubt that the Cayman Islands Government, the company's sole shareholder, will have to decide as called on from time to time to provide further help in the form of further loan finance or capital injection. This is a fact which must be faced and agreed by shareholders.

It might also be pointed out that as at 30th June, 1981 the Cayman Islands Government had already invested capital of $6.75 million, plus loans of $6.5 million outstanding to Cayman Airways. Additionally, the Cayman Islands Government has guaranteed Cayman Airways' loan commitments totalling for the two 737 aircraft which amounts to $7.5 million currently until 1988. It must also be noted that the $6 million also being for the BAC 1-11 aircraft is also held as an equity investment which arises on settlement for the nationalization of the Cayman Islands Government as guarantors of Cayman Airways' interest terms. Government also, however, I understand received loan interest on this amount account. These, Mr. President, are the facts revealed in the accounts of Cayman Airways which have been tabled.

The Opposition, Mr. President, congratulates those five senior citizens on taking an active interest by this Government and voice concern for the elderly men. Sixteen, taking their facts into consideration they have already completed through pensioners and other elderly men, however, could do this country to their advantage by over $3,000 yearly.

Mr. President, some news existing revenues have been identified and to be anticipated this the next financial statements will present a more favourable picture of the financial affairs of the Government airline. Additionally, a decision has been taken to lease at Cayman Air Building Limited to the revenue of this year as well as future we will be drawing on a rent of revenue.

It has always been my view, Mr. President, that Cayman Airways with its present route structure and equipment cannot make the best economic profits needed for it to even become viable.

MR. W. MICHAEL BLOUIN (continuing): ... of course, this has been the case from the very beginning and I am sure that had a proper possibility study been conducted by Government in 1977 this fact would have been established then. In any event some cost cutting measures have been taken with the view of reducing Ingersoll's annual loss and this is done, even when this is accomplished Government here to subsidizing the airline and provide for it for the short subsidy.

Mr. President, after we took office in November, 1984 we found in the financial statements the existence which I have previously outlined of the over $70 million losses. The country from projects we received was from discriminate, appeared to be deep dark with experts, the majority being non-Canadians who were earning high salaries and many of whom had never worked for an airline before to the best of our knowledge. There were bills to be paid immediately. The cheques were due. There were bills from suppliers. At this point I would like to clarify the accounting, shall I say, put forward by the former Liberal Member for Beaches Hon. when he claimed that this new Government is spending at the rate of over $2 million a month. I would like to place it on record that the only amounts which have been spent by this new Government have been the $7.8 million which was been spent on bills owing by Canpac already the order for the company to continue its operations uninterrupted. The other $2.7 million which he refers to is the amount taken from Nanaimo which has been allowed in the budget but which has not been spent. I think that point should be clarified to the public.

We also found that many of our new Canadians in management who were holding responsible positions were underpaid, and many times ignored. At question time the Second Member for Halifax West often mixed automatic questions and explanations on the re-hiring of the Lost Canadians in Canpac Airways. He seems unaware as I can only take this opportunity to assume him that there is a real policy in Canpac Airways that we do not discriminate for political reasons, and therefore they were not rehired for political reasons.

MR. JAMES M. BOSSIN: Mr. President, ...

MR. W. MICHAEL BLOUIN: Mr. President, that Member has had his say and I am now giving my....

MR. JAMES M. BOSSIN: The Minister is imputing...

MR. SPEAKER: Are you rising on a point of order?

MR. JAMES M. BOSSIN: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Under which Standing Order?

MR. JAMES M. BOSSIN: Under Standing Order 21. The Member is imputing that the....

MR. SPEAKER: Under what Standing Order are you rising on a point of order?

MR. W. MICHAEL BLOUIN: Mr. President, with due respect, Sir, I have Answered enough interruptions. That Member has had his say to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: If he is raising on a point of order and to establish no, you have to give way. (Agreed)

I think of order he must certainly himself first what his point of order is.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: No, that merely gives permission to read on a point of order. It cannot itself be a point of order. I think perhaps you mean Standing Order 33(6).

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Yes, Sir, that is the one, Standing Order 33(6).

MR. SPEAKER: No, I do not think that the honourable Member has raised a point of order.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: He did say that it was time for...

MR. SPEAKER: No, he made it quite plain the Government has not replied urgently for political reasons. It did not mention your Government. The Member may continue.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: I think I misunderstood them and I thank you for your help now.

MR. R. JOSEPH SAUNDERS: I think that I am fully aware of what I said, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly where I stand. I only that I have not a man looking in Cayman Brac that this Government has not hired anybody for political reasons nor has they been employed for political reasons. I made no reference to any sort of discrimination on the part of the Member.

Perhaps we have a well experienced and mechanical Chairman of the Board, and a Board of Directors comprised of businessmen and several efficient Government officials who are doing an admirable job in establishing the airline and endeavouring to keep its operations under control.

The Board is making commendable progress and combined with the efforts of management, which I trust shall be permanent, as I said before it is expected that some improvement in the financial position will be forthcoming.

I would also like to advise that the airline business is an ongoing venture and it is hoped to obtain private capital from political influence. Of course, Members can choose between Directors of the best managed services in the world. There matters will be forthcoming in due course.

Mr. Speaker, the future development of the airline although unfortunately expenses can be reduced. Future increased utilization of the new 737 aircraft which are operated operation of a high seat mileage like the 727 which is only utilized 25 per cent due to large mechanically driven by the difficulties of the airline. However, there are many overall considerations to be taken into account and the needs of the airline will be kept constantly under review.

SIR, X. BOSSY'S BOUNCE (CONTINUED): The extension of the Miami/Cayman recreation to Belize actually pursues and establishes Sister Republic developments will be represented through the United Kingdom Dependency Bermuda if so being represented, so that the citizens do not unjustly reprimand us for our wide varieties routes to and from the United States. I wish to assure the people of this country our Government that no stone will be left unturned to keep Cayman flying. We all look forward to the day when we will welcome the wings to bigger and brighter horizons.

Sir, Mr. President, brings me to the subject of the recreation of the recreation on the Miami/Cayman route which will expire on 1st April, 1985 if not extended. My own preference but of course cannot be sure until the time actually comes. Should this not be extended I know I'm absolutely no doubt that this would only further erode and further deteriorate the financial position of the airline, and I would like the opinion to the record that the carriage should be placed seriously in doubt. So we have placed a lot of emphasis on negotiating an extension of this recreation. Shortly after taking office it was discovered that approximately no action had been taken to negotiate an extension from the United States on this recreation. So immediately arrangements were made through the British Embassy in Washington for a meeting with the United States Government officials so that matters could be taken up and resolved and expedite one decision. This meeting was arranged and during the month of December a delegation consisting of the Hon Minister of Cayman Airways who is also the Honourable Member of Executive Council responsible for Communication and Natural Resources, the Managing Director of Cayman Airways, the Principal Secretary of the Ministry of Tourism Aviation and Trade, and the Director of Civil Aviation and myself met with the Chief Aviation Policy and Programme Officer for the State Department and the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs in the Department of Transportation in Washington, D.C.

The meeting was useful and effective and has been continuing ever since to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion, and we hope for the best. The concern expressed by the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac for the people of the Cayman Islands in regard to the extension of this recreation is very much appreciated, but I can assure him that this matter is being handled at the highest possible Government level at the present time. It is nevertheless unfortunate to note that as I have said before, no action had been taken to request an extension to the recreation until the new Government took office in late January, 1985. However, the previous Government, and particularly the First Elected Member for Sister Isles knew from 1983 that this recreation would expire on the 1st April, 1985. However, as I said no action had been taken so by, Mr. President, the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac also mentioned in his debate the negotiations which resulted in the present circumstances on which we are seeking an extension, and pointed out what help, if any, had been given by the British Government. There is no doubt that this recreation has been of great benefit to Cayman Airways and I should like to sincerely express our gratitude to all of those who helped to negotiate it. In doing a bit of research on this, although it is shrouded in some confidentiality I am pleased to say that the United Kingdom officials concerned. I can do no better than to quote passages which the First Elected Member for Sister Isles Hon. Haroldy gave at the time after he had visited Washington to represent the Cayman Islands case.

ASST. S. Rusk ACCRA (CONTINUED): He made a telephone call on 1st December 1965 to Mr. Rubens, the leader of the United Kingdom delegation which read as follows:-

> "Thank you for the support which you gave to the interests of the Cyprus Islands in the negotiations with the United States and for the courtesy you extended to the Cyprus delegation. It made a deep and favourable impression on all of us. We were happy to receive their compliments on their friendship to the Cyprus Islands."

Mr. Rubens replied on 3rd December, the actual date on which the United States agreed to the resolution although as of the agreement reached. A further telegram was sent on 17th November at the request of the Prime Minister from Sukkar Tuna which said:-

> "Thanks very much from your message. Your support for our Islands is very much appreciated by the Cyprus Islands people. Thanks to you, Union Delegations and Government, and have transmitted gratitude to you."

I have brought this to the attention of this House and drawn that for the sake of the record does still reflect the exact position.

Mr. Speaker, I have been dealing through the British Government on every practical occasion since 1960 and I, for one, hope there is to be real industrial and commercial life of the Cyprus Islands; the people and the problems, and I run only afraid of my experience with them. The present Government of Cyprus already had the Cyprus delegation in the Islands at which some field in Washington in 1959. Although there have been different versions of the outcome of this, I believe that our present Government can support what I have said with regard to the help we get from the British Government.

In brief and in fact, and I said so earlier and repeat it here, there are matters to be resolved of which the delegation from Cyprus put forward at the Islands II talks in 1959. This raised a second point in the United States for Cyprus Islands and it was also as a result of a Greek Cypriot campaign of letters which enabled this resolution to be imposed in 1952, that assisted greatly with it and I think that the outcome was satisfactory at that time.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there is a certain resentment in some areas to the British. However, I feel that many Greek who are aware of the people like the Cypriot intelligent enough to rise over this country. I trust that our people now more calm in the future will allow political propaganda to influence their decision to remain a Crown Colony of Great Britain. This has given us our stability and strength and must be given credit for the success of this country which is often imagined about.

Finally, Mr. President, Cyprus will be made during 1966 to welcome some form of light industries to the Cyprus Islands; industries which are non-polluting and labour intensive. I realise that this is not easy to do and it has been tried many times before. However, we plan to consider carefully proposals about which I would welcome help.

HON. R. MICHAEL SCOTT (CONTINUING):

...I have come to Belize, I believe, Mr. President, that our Labour office can easily be doing a tremendous job for these Governments and these countries as every Minister must be Government, not Democratic Party Members. I feel that they are failing a great deal. I know that the Labour Union has been confirmed by the Government. Obviously, I think that it has served a good purpose. We certainly expect to do more in the future, that of this machine fully we managed a simply, Mr. President, now because we had to consolidate the position right August by the number of unemployed we have in we could in this country. Because before the Elections all who could have from the Government was that there were only unemployables who were unemployable...Everybody could get a job here if they wanted one. So we certainly had to find out what the true position was when one of the promises. The other members I have stabilized before.

Nobody can tell me that 43 people in Belize City, 38 in North Side, 39 in George Town, and so on Belize are all really unemployables. I do not believe that, I believe that they are people looking for jobs and our Labour office has been able to place some of them. When the Government is borrowing money to put them all the unemployed. They have suddenly become unemployed and they are looking. What is the new Government going to do about this or where to?

I do not believe, Mr. President, that the only social well become allowed because Guyana is making a strong Labour movement has been weakened by one leader. However, there will always be those who will claim that most of all is the formation of a Labour union which could only serve to create disharmony and unrest between our people and businesses. The committee which has recently been established as a result of a Trade Union's Motion will resolve, I am sure, workable Labour Legislation which will provide the help and protection which our workers need. So I trust that a Labour union or any of the committee will never take place, as it will not serve the interest of the Caymak Islands and the people.

The future, Mr. President, may be brought by problems. They can only often get worse. However, in the time Diametric confidence I believe that the Guyana Islands will continue to grow from strength to strength through the free determination of our people to stand by what is right and proper for this land. I believe that the Cayman Islands will continue to remain the prosperous offshore financial centre and the preferred tourist destination in the Caribbean. I believe this week will be happy as we continue to offer stability, the same degree of safety and tranquility. Those we still have in this country. After all to make and come let us try to keep it that way. Then we will not only be politicians but we will be statesmen.

I support the appropriation Bill, Sir,

Mr. President, and I thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Would you like to retain your speech now or do it on going to be Thursday, and I would suggest to suspend proceedings for lunch in about a quarter of an hour? If you are comfortable now does any Minister like to speak. Would you like to start?

MR. JOHN D. MCLEAN: If there are no objections, Mr. President. If you prefer to suspend proceedings I could continue in the time when we...

MR. SPEAKER: Like to speak now. I think for me to do a short of you would The Elected Member for East End.

MR. JOHN S. MOMAGH: Mr. Speaker, for a while I think I misunderstood it whether it made sense for us to stand here and to debate this Budget Address, or to seem to me that the three Members of the Government are being treated in such a hostile way by the general Elected Assembly. However, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there are those on the outside who cannot take this liberty to speak and to call it like it is. Therefore, I shall debate this Budget Address with gusto.

Mr. Speaker, as we enjoy the Honourable Chief Official Member, the Honourable Financial Secretary has presented us with what I consider a very unimpressive Budget Address and he should be commended. However, Mr. Speaker, before entering into this Budget Address for debate please permit me to say a few moments on my personal feelings on the attitude and behaviour in this Honourable Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I was first elected to this Honourable Legislative Assembly in 1962 and in these years, Sir, I have never seen so much meanness, selfishness and hatred amongst Elected Members who should all be busy with the same goals in mind. Mr. President, sometimes I have to say to myself, "Why? Shame will to all evil." Mr. Speaker, one of the great things which a Member receives once he is elected to this House is respect of Assembly Rules which we should all abide and comply with. I feel, Sir, that this has not been done by several Members, because of it is the same they are openly fighting the decisions which went with the wish of a majority of Members.

During this session, Mr. President, I have heard insults. I have heard vile allegations. I have heard unparliamentary language. I have heard hilarious giggling and laughing, Mr. President, I have heard nasty words called to Nominated Members. Mr. Speaker, be it a measure or a good legislation it is my honest opinion that it is a shame for any of us to stand here and be political because I feel that we are elected here by the general public, and I would say the majority of the general public. To be elected to the House which we are sitting in Assembly here and have Members reflecting to such legislations given to the citizens of Cayman Islands.

Mr. Speaker, my second visit here was I may seldom Elected Members here. They are speaking, but at that time I was tempted to get to my feet and to say my piece. I honestly feel Mr. Speaker, that the Chair should have stopped a nothing and an open apology should have been made by the Member for such bad remarks and bad behaviour. We must realise, Mr. Speaker, we are no longer on a political platform. We now are in the Chambers of our Seat of Government and I will say that these sorts of behaviour must change for dignity is to be restored here. I refer especially to a Back Bench Member whom like House, Mr. President, the remainder of Members-Please with the behaviour which took place here. We must remember that they are to legislate the times when assembled here and the only people who listen us were known sitting in the gallery. Today whatever is said is heard on the radio all over the world. Have we ever stopped to think like, should we be doing, not only to ourselves but to our country and our people.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts for today here is for the faith which my people have placed in me and I think that I am right in saying that this was displayed quite clearly, loud and clear at the polls on the General Election in November, 1984. However, Mr. President, my people should warn me to do what I feel to right and I have endeavoured to do this since I have been an Elected Member.

MR. JOHN J. HOLLAND: (continued): Mr. Speaker, may I just bring up a point which I would like to touch on, or I should say a few points. I have personally seen redevelopment; I have seen numerous areas of the newly Elected Government. I have listed this all I could possibly do in my district and I would do the same here, Mr. Speaker. After the General Election by first speech here I made it abundantly clear that the electorate came out and I was requested to work with anybody who took up the new Government knowledging that we were elected for the betterment of this country and the people.

After the General Election, Mr. Speaker, the results were still pending and I took time to write to each of the Elected Members of Assumption Council. I say this at this point because quite unfortunately it was the Young Elected Member for Fort Rex parish and here when he mentioned that the Last Government should try to work with the present Government, this has always been my intention, Sir. I think I acquitted myself accordingly. I wrote to the Members. I received congratulations and I quite like the assurance that I was prepared to work with them for the next four years for the betterment of this country and our people. So when now, Mr. Speaker, now I have been appointed or promoted, this was done on the 21st November and so far I have received one letter. I must say that came from the Honourable Third Elected Member of Assumption Council and I deeply appreciated it. It helps to acknowledge the courtesy of answering my letter. I wished him well then, Mr. Speaker, because I felt that six months do not make a right and again I would be there in high office. It was merely wish to badger them but as I said my party is unwell me to perform as long as I am in this Legislative Assembly. I had various things I had wanted in my district and I did put in those which I would like to do for the years 1994 to 1998. Then for I have learnt through the unfortunate time since the Honourable Member mentioned that a while ago, the Honourable third Elected Member for Assumption Council was quite enthusiastic in having my letter acknowledging which was held by the Members. Again I am grateful to him for his contention.

However, Mr. Speaker, my argument is this. I feel that as an Elected Member for a district in these Islands that I should be given that much power. Even if a name had to be sent in as argued by the Leader Elect on the Portfolio I think I can live that much easier. That was the issue, Mr. Speaker, when I originally said I have been accepted.

In further this, Mr. Speaker, in now all since that a few weeks ago the Hon Minister was able to feature the two Executive Council visitors Ministers and certain representatives were featured on visiting them out there. After all my efforts to try and be work closely with the new Government I knew of who stood to my election and day after it had happened and the only person I know then, Mr. Speaker, was because he unfortunately, the other century, was elected and one of the windows there mentioned to me that the Members had been out there. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is very bad. We are all here and we should all be working together. It was that already I have named three times when I know have learned many notably by the new Government of a difference.

Let me go on to another point, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MACGUIGAN: Perhaps if you can resume on another point, unless it is your first point, it would be a convenient moment to take the Committee break.

MR. JOHN R. MacLEAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that case I will suspend proceedings. Before doing so, however, perhaps it may be convenient for the Chair if I mention one point. The honourable Member who was just speaking, the Member for Lasalle, did draw to the attention of the House his view that a Member who spoke during debate at the week before last, made some disparaging, inferences disparagingly to a former Member. The Member quoted the words that he would have expected that to have been ruled out of order. I did at the time consider whether it should be ruled out of order, and have subsequently considered the matter further with - I would find nothing in our Standing Orders which covered the point. They say that it is out of order to use offensive or insulting language about other Members, but they do not mention former Members. I looked at Erskine May, and their Lordships do that it is not out of order to make observations on behaviour of the Members, even if they are highly Unparliamentary.

It therefore seemed to me that I was not in a position to rule him out of order. That said, however, I would strongly endorse the sentiments expressed by the Elected Member for Lasalle. I would ask all Members to recall that they will themselves have view to former Members of this Body and that if a precedent of reflecting unfavourably on former Members were to become common, all present Members would have to assume that they some day would be referred to in that way. I would hope all Members recognized in the event that anything said within this House is privileged, and it seems to me to be undesirable that Elected Members should thereby be responsible for any Member to take advantage of the fact that a statement have to be privileged to insult someone else in a way in which he would not be entitled for fear of a libel action.

So, I would ask all Members to bear these points in mind and when appropriate, even in the heat of the moment, of former Members, to do so within the same sort of restraint which they would certainly be obliged by Standing Orders to observe of present Members.

So I just wanted to explain why I had not ruled the Member out of order, but to make those points for you in a manner of a way.

I will now suspend proceedings until 8.15 p.m.

AT 7:57 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

ROOMS RESUMED AT 8.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Finance Minister has the floor.

MR. JOSIE B. MATHIAS: Mr. President, let me thank you for your address just before Appropriations the House for hours. I am happy to know that you put forward those views and I hope they will be noted by them in the future.

Mr. President, when I accepted Seimone Lucky's speech to Statement 2, could the vice owners. I would like me to make on to the House President which I was not happy with.

Since recently, Mr. President, the Secretariat came to my attention to hold a public meeting. Again, Mr. President, the first knowledge which I had of this meeting was when I heard it on radio broadcast. It is my feeling, Sir, that as the representative for that area I should have been brought in on the plans for such a very important meeting. I should not have heard it on radio broadcast. Several members of the constituency of East End called on me to find out exactly what the meeting was all about and, Mr. President, I was unable to say anything because I knew nothing.

The Friday before the meeting, Mr. President, I was speaking to Minister Jones one of the Ministers, and it was then that I was told that this matter coming to my attention this morning. Mr. President, I was very much upset and I told the Secretariat. I said, it is not fair. I am in the Parliament to represent the people there, and I must take all the blame for not informing the people of these things and for the meeting as a whole.

Mr. President, what annoyed me most was to know that on the night of that meeting my people were told that I have resigned. It was a four o'clock one that I would not be there to come. My people were told that I was finished or how I was treated. Mr. President, I resent this sort of rebellion. It does not only show disrespect for me, but shows disrespect for the people of my constituency. I resent the handing out of documents that my people were not at all pleased with it.

I would have been quite too happy to attend that meeting, Mr. President, had I been invited but the fact remains that I was not. Anyway, how would it be for me to act on a platform and Mr. President, I would go on to also just how many others have we have been left out, but I will omit that for now.

The statutory Boards of Government were not saying that I have to be on my Board. Again, I am here to be on one, but I feel that it is unfair for my Minister not to have my input and representation on all Boards for my Ministry. I object of the Planning Board and the Central Tenders Board. Mr. President, I feel that from Ministry Boards to be completely operated we should have input from all areas of these Ministries, and I would urge that let us have at least some responsibility from my Members.

MR. JOHN R. SMILES (CONTINUING): Mr. President, this sort of attitude, treatment, hatred and revenge is quite evident before us today. It has destroyed other countries and I will say, Mr. President, if we do not disarm ourselves it will destroy ours.

Mr. President, let us now turn to certain areas of the budget for this country for 1980, and let me say that I am pleased to know that our Honourable Financial Secretary has been able to present this country with a zero position which leaves very little doubt in the minds of the people. When I make that statement, Sir, I refer to various other statements which have been issued to the local press by other Members of the Government.

It has been publicly stated, Mr. President, that our country was broke. It has been said from political platforms and to me, Sir, it was only time in an effort to mislead our people. We have never had a certain Member who has been responsible for the gross running of this country for many years state publicly that this country was broke, Mr. President. This remains me of Henry J. Brown when he made the statement, "If you cannot convince the people one way, confuse them". This is what was done, Mr. President. Our people were confused by the smart talking they had had to take whether or not the country was in a position, financially. Thanks God, Mr. President, that we still have in our midst a capable, responsible, dedicated and honest Chancellor who now controls the finances of this country, and I speak of no other than the Honourable Chief Official Member. Through his deliberations of the Budget Address, Mr. President, must have been put right to these falsehoods.

We heard that our country was broke but yet, Mr. President, when the Honourable Financial Secretary presented his Budget Address we were able to hear the truth that we have surpluses left from the last Government which are running deficient. We were told of the millions of dollars which were already spent and we have been told of the millions of dollars which will be used to balance the 1980 budget.

Mr. President, I am not disputing the fact that if the money from the Caymanian people is to be used, we should use it. This is the reason why they were put aside for a rainy day, but at least, Mr. President, we should be honest, speak the truth and admit the money was there. My honest opinion, Sir, is that the people of these Islands after having been misled are due the honour of having a statement issued by the new Member to correct that which was so misleading.

Mr. President, we are dealing with a budget which is going to influence, we hope added dimension prosperous on our people. It is a known fact, Mr. President, that the present Government made every effort to promise roses when they touched on the man on the street the highest. Today, where are we moving? We are moving there and many places. But we say, Mr. President, that it seems as if when the manpower are to materialize in the Chamber, there are those who find it hard to concentrate the remarks. Let me say, Mr. President, I can see that even because I have experienced what it is to sit in the Chamber in the position I am. I do not believe that there is one Member in this Chamber who was raised up as I was. At the age of six I was left without a father and if it was not for a good Christian, Mr. President, I would have either made it. So when I speak of the poor man, Mr. President, I can speak with authority. I know what the poor man is. I know who he is and I speak his language.

MR. JOHN F. KENNEDY (CONTINUING): Mark me now making today, Mr. President, is beyond question from constitutional standpoint that Democrats make large progress and support our stance. Therefore, Mr. President, that is more disadvantageous to us than that which has been stated up to the floor that is an effort to balance this budget.

We have talked, and I will mention a few. Republicans have on the amendment which will affect Department and Republicans alike who gotten up. Mr. President, let one man talk to that there is one Democrat who will not vote on the amendment. Sir, Chairman, it must come on to that little man when it seems as if we should not mention those votes at the airport. Sir, Chairman, it must come on to that little man when it seems as if we should not mention.

We see figures that go up by 100 per cent. Social Insurance now going up by 100 per cent, Defense Department by roughly three and one cent, Education Department by 23 per cent, Labor by 23 per cent, Interior by 22 per cent, Commerce by 22 per cent, Agriculture by about 800 per cent. Among only one thousand by 200 per cent, and we see Justice over 25 per cent being taxed. Treasury has also been increased, and we also see a 7.5 per cent for an additional appropriation. Mr. President, I was told recently a while ago by a public relations source of somebody who was just about to point a white ghetto and who have become disheartened because of some of these taxes which are being discussed here today. This plan has already taken a direction to create three choices. Are we going to increase some of this?

As I said, Mr. President, this budget before us is one which will not mean pleasure to the people of these Islands. I will further say that there is much discontent and uneasy among the people of these Islands. We sometimes do not, Mr. President, that our people are very peaceful and I would not agree more. Recently, Mr. President, when somebody gets their back against a wall they will retaliate. They will revolt.

Again, let me say like Robert F. Kennedy said, "A revolution is coming - a revolution which will be peaceful if we are wise." Why write. Why write. I think it is the duty of the members of this Responsible House to do whatever is needed to avoid such people instead of precautionary plan.

Mr. President, I join with the Second Floating Member for Nuuuga Town when he said that he would not support this way of spending funds to balance a budget. To me, Mr. President, it is what we would term as a "Holiday Mission" way of spending because the time has come when we should fight against reckless spending without precaution our people.

Another area which has been debated by some people in the public sector simply which is necessity, Mr. President, because of deep concern. We have heard much of the programs with the rural well-fields. We have heard of the privatization of some 15 million gallons. Mr. President, again I have received many complaints from inhabitants in this area and I am hoping this will stay away. I have received many complaints of the distribution of these water supply, and according to them it has since gone dry well-fields are established there. As I said, I hope they are wrong here, Mr. President. I do not think that we should wait until they are proven right. I feel it is now for us to do proper tests in that area, proper records, and make immediately clear that we are just faced with a problem since it has to be carried out of this Chamber.

We have also heard much on the well-field developments in the Northern of Saint Croix, my constituents. Mr. President, I feel that the well-fields there that are in the beginning. I feel that these new well-fields are developed in case we should continue as that was planned, and that is to first give the Department of Sugar and

MR. JOSÉ B. MELEAN (CONTINUING): Let them have a supply. Let us monitor it for a while, and if it is proved that there is an adequate supply and that it will not detrimentally affect the land in any way, then we continue to supply those areas.

Mr. President, I speak on behalf of the people of my district. We appreciate with the utmost gratitude but let me say, at the same time we are not prepared to see what Almighty God has endowed us with destroyed. It is a known fact, Sir, that that area of the Islands has already been known to receive less rain than other areas. So, therefore we depend more on our water supply. Let us be more vigilant on the story. I have no doubt in my mind that it would come very handy to set up proper day to day monitoring, and I feel that the gentlemen who is in charge is the one who knows what is to be done. However, Mr. President, let us go about this in the right way. Let us not destroy what can be very good to us in that area in the long run.

Mr. President, let me move on to another area which was mentioned in the Budget Address. I am now speaking of the Cayman Turtle Farm. It is quite pleasing to note that my efforts on this issue are in some manner about to mature. I am hopeful that where we are represented at the next meeting of CITES in Argentina that we will report the goal which we started off with. I am happy that the ban will be lifted and perhaps in the next Budget Session the Honourable Member of Breakers South with the responsibility will be able to come here and to point out to us the great advantages, and what we can start to appreciate the facility there and try to put it back where it was.

I am also glad, Mr. President, to learn that agricultural schools will be piloted in agriculture. I am also happy to know that it is the intention of the Portfolio to continue to work closely with the Agricultural Society.

Mr. President, it is my pleasure in the Portfolio it was an honour, a privilege and my pleasure to work hand in hand with the farmers and the people. I feel, Sir, that they must support it and I am glad to know that this will be continued. The farmer, Mr. President, although sometimes certain people look at him, he is a very outstanding and important person in any society. The farmer is one who produces the needs of every country, because it is a fact that we must all eat. It is my feeling, Sir, that in order for the plans satisfactorily to continue many of the day to day Portfolio requirements will have to be put aside, and the Honourable Member responsible will at some stage find himself out there alongside the farmer. I had to do so, Sir. Many times I ended up walking many with many things on my foot but the beauty of it, Sir, was that the farmers duly appreciated it. They put it on their feet.

Mr. President, there were several projects, several goals set for the Department. We started off the milk production programme. We started off the artificial insemination project. We started off the importing of animals to the Islands in an effort to help the farmer. We brought in chickens. We started innovator roads. We started meat inspection. We brought in women farms and sold them at cost to the farmer. Mr. President, the farmer deeply appreciated this and it is something which we cannot at this time pull back on. We have advanced to a point where we need to press forward, and I was pleased to hear the statement made by the Honourable Member I just right ago that it is the intention to do so.

Before moving to current projects, Mr. President, let me speak a little on Education and Health. Again, Mr. President, I feel that it is only right to pay compliments to the past Member for this Portfolio. I feel, Mr. President, that from the budget we can see that there are large figures to be spent in these areas.

HON. JOHN B. McLEAN (MINORITY LEADER): However, so-to speak the tax which is paid for this purpose is not more than a one thousandth part of what will be paid by our people now left to ignorance.

I am pleased to know, Mr. Speaker, that the standards of education in this country have reached where they now stand. We have given the budget this year to primary schools in Grand Cayman with a population of 2,5?? pupils, but a recurrent expenditure of $1.3 million or an annual cost per pupil of $1,237. We have the primary school in Cayman Brac with a population of 157 and a recurrent expenditure of $284,000, an annual cost of $1,810 per pupil. The Cayman Islands High School in Grand Cayman has 315 pupils and a recurrent expenditure of $1.0 million, an annual cost per pupil of $1,800. Cayman Brac High School has a population of 100 and a recurrent expenditure of $233,000, an annual cost per pupil of $2,700. Last and most important, Mr. Speaker, although it means that there are some in this Chamber from their constituents who disagree with the Cayman Islands Middle School, we have a population there of 324 pupils with a recurrent expenditure of $1.2 million, an annual cost per pupil of $1,255.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if there was a step in the right direction made, it was when it was decided to open up the Middle School. I wonder if the Member who spoke last against the Middle School would go out there and convince the parents the time country that the Middle School was something which Government wanted among us. I am certain that he would not get past the first parent.

Again, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the health services in this country are something which we can be justly proud of. I am not here to say that the hospital is being run 100 per cent efficiently. We find there are problems in most institutions. However, again let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it provides a service which we can be proud of. I agree with certain Members that we should have a doctor on call at all times, or I should say in the premises at all times. However, Mr. President, just because of one incident we cannot crucify the whole hospital.

Sometime ago we made loans this morning of hospital fees. Yes, I agree if they are fees which are outstanding we should make a figure to collect them. However, Mr. Speaker, I have right here outside while which were handed to a lady when she left the hospital, a lady who had suffered with heart problems and who became very upset when she was leaving. In fact she fell flushed in her hand and told that she would have to pay shortly.

I feel, Sir, that a proper system should be looked into for collection of fees. Again there are some who are unable, regardless of how small the fee may be, to take care of the fee or to be able to take care of the fee all at once. We may say that pertains with children here no problems, but in the case I am speaking of right now, Mr. Speaker, the lady has not. However, I have been told that they are in no better position than she is, and it is impossible for this bill to be paid all at once. So I would hope that one of the principles of the present Honourable Elected Member of Executive Council responsible for this portfolio will be to try to make some sort of arrangement whereby our people can be treated a little differently with these fees.

Let me briefly speak, Mr. President, on capital projects for 1975. I submitted, Mr. President, to the Honourable Elected Member of Executive Council this responsibilities for various Portfolios, and I will point out that the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council was not

MR. JUDY A. MIHAL (CONTINUED): Mr. Speaker, I do certainly have no responsibility for what I handed. I have from the budget, Sir, what certain projects which were started last year are included but, Mr. Speaker, I feel I had to make that there is not even one small project identified in the budget for my district.

In the last budget there were funds voted to purchase property in Cow Bay. I notice this time, Mr. President, there is not even a token vote, and the funds which were there have disappeared.

I am hopeful, Sir, that again when we go into Finance Committee certain commitments will be given and that at least one item specific for my district can be identified. This, Mr. President, would be greatly appreciated not only by me, but by the people of the District which I represent.

Let me say, Mr. President, in connection of my Budget Address that the Honourable Financial Secretary stated, and I quote:-

> "There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. President, that the Common Market is one of the most progressive offshore financial centres, and we have, in my view, all the ingredients of great things for these Caribbean and our people."

Mr. President, this is very encouraging to hear and I trust that we as Legislators will be mindful of this and endeavour to maintain the viability of this Country, and continue to maintain the stability which we have. Sir, that a good thing can hardly be destroyed.

We continue to show confidence in the neighbouring Islands, mostly Jamaica and Cuba. In this time, Mr. President, they were beautiful Islands too. They were nice Islands which had great potential and resources. What do we have? Mr. President, it is much easier to destroy than to rebuild. Any fool can destroy, but it will take time to rebuild.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HON. FRANKLYN: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. HAROLD D. HANNAH: Mr. President, first of all I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the very nice Throne Speech which you delivered to this Session. I would also like to thank the Honourable Elected Official Member for his Budget Address. Mr. President, as one who was the former Financial Secretary of this Government, who has involved in writing Budget Addresses, I am aware, Sir, of what is involved in writing these documents. In February, 1969, when I wrote my first Address it was at a time when the Administration was responsible for writing Both Addresses, the Throne Speech and the Budget Address because we were virtually the Government of the country as well.

Mr. President, the Throne Speech, and I highlight the Throne Speech because it forms precedents in the speaking tradition of the Legislature, is a novel in this country of British tradition. Mr. President, it sets the tenority of the Legislature formally in a very colourful ceremony, a very traditional speaking, and on this occasion it was followed by the Budget Address in exactly followed by this occasion. It sets out the programme for the year. It sets out many measures, and it gives a clear indication of the financial position of the country. So the Throne Speech and the Budget Address on this occasion goes in a very close mix of which the Throne Address has provided for the development and in the financial position.

HON. PERCY C. JOHNSON (CONTINUING): Mr. President, British tradition has served the mother country very well. It retains atmosphere of knights and palaces dear to that country mentality. Many of them go there to watch the traditional activities of that country. They watch the parade of the Queen's Birthday and the changing of the guard. They look at castles and they look at other attractive sights such as gardens, palaces and so forth. Mr. President, British tradition has also benefited the Cayman Islands. Our link with the mother country provides stability. It provides investors' confidence and it provides for us a Whitehall system of Government which is the best in the world.

Mr. President, the fact that we are a Crown Colony has benefited us big time for the country. A big bank the last fifteen to twenty years. From that tradition the country has established a standard of living which is, Mr. President, one of the highest in the region. So the Cayman Islands still hold fast upon traditions, especially since the last few years, as the envy of the Caribbean.

Most of the other Caribbean territories, Mr. President, have moved a little further away from that close contact with the mother country. They will want to be given up eventually. They want their internal self-government and their independence and so they begin almost a psychological separation between themselves and the mother country. They are their own boss. They change the way of life and the way of commerce, which is more always favourable to the investor. Mr. President, we have labeled our constitutional position on the platform from time to time. I know what the feeling of the people, and where I see the people I mean the majority of the people of these Islands, is expressing constitutional change. I hope, Mr. President, that with these statements I make this statement from my Government that we will be a Crown Colony for a long time to come. We have all to gain and nothing to lose from remaining a Crown Colony.

Mr. President, your Throne Speech and the Budget Address gave a stream of facts upon which the economic and social state of the nation can be declared. Mr. President, I will be making this numerous reports, touching subjects which have been touched upon during this debate and will be dealing with them briefly for the benefit of this Honourable House and the public of the Cayman Islands. I do not intend to speak for very long or, Mr. President, to be engaged in recriminations as were made early yesterday in this debate. Although still I be expressing myself I hope. There is no use in expressing ourselves and showing that we will constantly overlook the problems in them.

Mr. President, we heard and saw a lot of bitterness and fire. Black gentlemen they are still affect not troubled the ground we walk and I hope that they will remain there. Some Members of the Opposition said that they are treated as a hostile nation. But, Mr. President, some of them do not even come and communicate with us in the common-room.

Mr. President, we have heard a good and some shade of difference from the Opposition, misconception about the Budget and those Statements. Mr. President, one point which I wondered about which I heard them speaking are whether they really know what they were campaigning in the 1984 General Elections, that they were debating your Throne Speech or the Budget Address. Mr. President, and strangely and considerably contradictory and unwarranted attacks on a personal note against and I will repeat, Mr. President,

SEN. RUSSELL C. JOHNSON (CONTINUING): support be in the best interests of this country, especially one as small as the Cayman Islands.

Mr. President, some people seem to forget that the entire prosperity of the Cayman Islands depends solely upon our political stability. That is why it is so disturbing, Mr. President, that people who have so casually neglected in the 1984 General Election should attempt to disconnect the present Government and undermine political stability in this country.

Mr. President, understanding this document they are definitely trying to do. I understand, Mr. President, that they are pointing an old Committee of Forty-Four to find ways and means of toppling this Government and to call new elections. Mr. President, this information has come to me from numerous calls in recent times and, Mr. President, if that is so I am willing to nothing less than treason. I am going to appeal to you, Mr. President, in your capacity also as Governor and I am doing so before this Honourable House and before the people of this country, that that matter be investigated by the police. If it is correct, Mr. President, I would expect that those members of the Committee of Forty-Four be arrested and charged with treason.

I heard too, Mr. President, that they were attempting to fund people into George Town and surround this Legislative Assembly. They have great ideas about toppling this Government but I should advise them, Mr. President, to think and investigate they have not what they do.

Mr. President, it has come to our knowledge too that they are quite around saying that this will be the shortest lived Government in the history of these Islands because they are using their influence on us. However, Mr. President, we will not be intimidated. We are here as a duly Government and we are going to administer the affairs of this country as we should be done. We were put here by a large majority of the people of this country and we have been given a mandate which we will carry out. That mandate, Mr. President, I can assure you will not be thrown in the trash basket. We will be honouring that, Mr. President, in the backgrounds like this which has perhaps cost them lots of public money just shown out of office by an overwhelming majority of the people of this country. Mr. President, we are not going to just be pressurized; pressurized especially by a minority group, because that will not be in the best interests of this country. Mr. President, neither are we going to allow the political stability of these Islands to be undermined by a handful of people who do not care what happens to this country once they can get their own way.

Mr. President, I believe the majority of the people who put us in this Chamber will strongly resent any attempt by anyone to precipitate the unhappy of this new Government. The people who put us here, Mr. President, wanted a change. They put us here to do a specific job. They just us have to put the country back on the right track once again and, Mr. President, with God's help we will try to do just that.

Mr. President, I believe to some of the people here are busy drawing to pay the taxes. We heard members speaking about things which do not fit for their statute. Persons who had charge of those pensionable portfolios that were those eight years, Mr. President, are now coming in numbers and who have only been in office for three months.

SEN. PEDDICORD: I wonder whether this might be a convenient time to take our customary afternoon break. So I will suspend Proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 3.20 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

RECESS ENDED AT 3.48 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Debate be resumed. Proceedings are resumed. The Honourable Minister for Community Council.

HON. ROBERT G. BRIDGE: Mr. Speaker, during this debate the Members of this Honourable House mentioned many things. When we took office in November last year the people of this Territory asked us one thing. They asked us to control inflationary spending. They asked us to do that in order that we might cut expenses first to what is necessary, that we should do away with wasteful spending and relapse of public funds. Sir, Mr. President, that is what we have attempted to do in the three months that we have been in office. Mr. President, we have planned as far as possible this fiscal year which we are living at at this provisional time.

Mr. President, we are not a Government which will spend indiscriminately just by giving out figures. We have committed ourselves to do the best we can with what financing is available in Government. We have committed ourselves not to ignore our debts for which people to pay.

Mr. President, we had to go forward with a budget largely determined by actions of the previous Government, because, Mr. President, we learned in November that this year we will put forward a budget which will reflect the thinking of this new Government. Because, Mr. President, we know that there will be reduced interest in investors' confidence in this country and that consequently the economy will strengthen, and it will grow and so improve our income. Mr. President, we have reached a stage in our present way of life which we normally call the present system of taxation, of a very substantial nature.

We heard the Honourable Third Member say that it was not possible at this time to further tax the citizens therefore. Even with a few moves that we brought forward today largely the legal side of our operation, there are all sorts of moves afoot if.

Mr. President, I will be speaking about the fiscal system of this country at a later stage. Mr. President, you mentioned in your Throne Speech that there was an increase in the Civil Service staff due to demands in the services of Government. Mr. President, I have always been concerned about growth in the Civil Service without much control. My own opinion is that there a department requires an increase in staff that other things should follow. Systems and methods whereby that department should be examined to ensure that work can be minimized so that there is no need for an increase in the complement of staff. This occasion came about in the year 1974 when we ran in the budget a request for 25 per cent increases in staff. I immediately appointed three senior officials in my department and sent them all around to all the other departments to investigate the need for increases in staff. As a result of that exercise the request was cut to exactly one. Some three days, Mr. President, I instructed the Civil Secretary to re-examine job descriptions, methods, systems and what should be done to minimize the work load so that we could not have to face large requests for staff year after year.

HON. WARREN G. HARDING (continuing): Such exercise has not been come to yet. My own opinion, Mr. President, is that under the present system no staff place output service commissioner there who are there believe they (be may come along in should take on part of what they do. It is a sentimental mark to start with which the opposition rose in output.

Mr. President, I have from experience that there are a few departments in this Government headed by local people who have done exactly what I tried to point out a while ago. They have not been fortunate with large increases in staff. I can name those three departments, Mr. President. They are the Treasury, Customs and the Post Office. Mr. President, I have seen those departments asking for small increases in staff and they would be given the run around for months until an Order for staff they requested. Now these, Mr. President, these like are not granted by separate staff but by our own people. On the other hand I have seen other departments headed by executives who seem to have little difficulty in requesting additional staff. I remember with one of the local departments I spoke about a little while ago, not long ago the local officer was replaced by an outstate officer, and some months afterwards I happened to pass around the local office and I could scarcely see anybody in that post office.

Mr. President, Government has quite a lot of problems these days in connection. I would relate quite a lot of experiences which I have had in other departments of Government, personal experiences of these. It would not do any good here. Staff is your problem, Mr. President, and I suppose it. However, I believe that these are like the items which need to be looked at.

Mr. President, restricting of staff was mentioned in the earlier debate from the Opposition side. One Member said that the Public Service Commission was supposed to be an independent from the political part. Mr. President, these Islands are still a Crown Colony and they are a Crown Colony by of their choosing/ of the people of these Islands. Mr. President, the last election there was based on well on constitutional advancement. We heard from the people that they were more than happy with our Crown Colony system of Constitution. Mr. President, the Public Service Commission functions under a Law, a Law which has been legislated by the Members of this honourable House. The Public Service Commission was established to function, Mr. President, to safeguard between the Public Service and any political interference. Therefore, Mr. President, that is the reason for the dislike of the recommendation the Public Service operates. However, Mr. President, usually all Commonwealth countries, as far as I am aware, still operate this system where the Public Service Commission performs a very important function within the machinery system of Government, so I do not think that they have perceived a calculated mechanism.

Perhaps, Mr. President, the Member might want to see here a system which is peculiar used in the United States of America where successful politicians may replace actually officers at their whims and fancies. However, Mr. President, apart from the Member who spoke on the remarks he did about the Public Service Commission, I know that other Members of this honourable House do not share those same views. Our system of Government is quite good. As I mentioned earlier it has served us well in the past, in the present, and I hope in the future as well.

Mr. President, I will now touch on the financial position of this Government. It is quite well known, Mr. President, to all Members of this House that there was a declining economy perhaps from as far back as 1981. However, 1984 demonstrated this quite clearly.

HON. HAROLD O. JOHNSON (CONTINUING): So, when Montano speaks as they did earlier it is to my mind trying to defend a reactionary position. Mr. President, if it has been the fault of the new Government in just three months why did those brilliant financial experts who had charge of this Government for eight years leave it in the position they did? Why come bleating us these months after Johnson, scarcely enough time to see all the people in our Portfolio and to see what they are doing? Mr. President, when we are thinking about the financial position of this country we must bear in mind that we should not create monsters which we cannot control in this country. We are not too small and we have many limitations.

Nowadays, Mr. President, everything which we build here must be the best in the Caribbean and I am not considering this, Mr. President, because economically we build things which we can be proud of. However, Mr. President, even if we can find the cash money to build and to create things, what about the cost of maintenance of these installations and other machinery when they are completed? My mind runs back, Mr. President, to Cayman Airways. I will deal with that later on, I also think of the beautiful airport which we have just built. However, when we try to implement a few more measures we take flights, Mr. President, because one must appreciate the fact that one cannot operate such a large and beautiful installation unless the revenue justifies it, but there are people up there almost fit to be shot because Government has tried to raise fees slightly. So we have good things but we must also know how we are going to pay for them and service them.

Mr. President, I want to make it quite clear to this Legislative Assembly and the people of these Islands that this Administration in Government here is not a budget of this new Government. Neither is the Budget Address a document of this new Government. People may say what they want, we all have something to say about it and I will tell you what this now, Mr. President. When the Budget came to us it contained, Mr. President, a deficit of $1? million. It had included in it, Mr. President, advances which were made in 1984 and would be written off in 1985 amounting to $1.? million. It had included in it, Mr. President, expenditure for projects started in 1983, and a portion of those projects to be completed in 1985 was included in the estimate at over $? million. So as we carry over from 1984 the budget had in it $1.3 million.

Mr. President, when we looked at that budget we said to the honourable Minister that according to the remarks we had from the people of these Islands we could not present a budget in this House unless it was balanced. So we asked him to take it away quickly, to look on it and when it was balanced then he should come back and show it to us. Mr. President, he did so and I should say that he did a very good job of it. However, Mr. President, some men, I comprehend with less. It was perhaps one of the most difficult jobs which he had ever undertaken in his life, the former Unity Lane Government had made it so difficult for him. He came back, Mr. President, and he showed us what he had done. He had removed all the Reserves which were available and had diverted them to Revenue to supplement the shortfall. He had also secured with a few key measures and with that shop could produce approximately $895,000. We had balanced and pruned the budget and brought it down to what we see here now, Mr. President. To be put it forward with a small surplus balance of $15,?19.

Mr. President, I want to repeat this again for the benefit of my colleagues here and the public of the Cayman Islands. This budget is not a budget of this new Government and what is presented here is a penny out of the Unity Lane Government, We are not responsible.

MR. TERRY D. HUNTSMAN (CONTINUING): Mr. President, it is indeed knowledge to all that a budget for the new year is prepared and presented here in November of the old year so that it will be ready for implementation in the new year. Unfortunately because of the elections in November, this date was not possible and instead this has a cycle of every four years.

Mr. President, I will just touch a few of the figures in the recommended capital expenditures. It is odd and a bit of irony to me that across the Chamber in the Appropriations room that the budget for 1982 did not have anything new in it, and it did not provide what was expected for the poor people of these Islands. However, Mr. President, I would just like to remind the Members that the recommended expenditures for 1982 is $8,552,200 above the 1981 estimates. So they cannot say that the new recommended budget is purely focused on a playground problem. Mr. President, what they might have wanted to see in these recommendations is the type of money machine which they are accustomed to. However, that is not exactly so, Mr. President, because our Finance Committee knew that what we had on the front of our mind was principles and what was the best interests of the country. So rude the a-ha comes when finished by Chairwoman on other issue.

Mr. President, it will be noted that in the recommended expenditures many projects in Tortola, local people in this Chamber. I asked Members if they knew why that large percentage of projects was given to the top echelon of the Civil Service in 1981, and the reply was in order for a participatory process. I suppose, Mr. President, that in the years that I have been in this Honourable House never have I heard Members talk in one side of the mouth come off.

Mr. President, looking at the capital side of the budget we find that in 1982 total capital recommended amounts to $9,849,811. The capital put forward in 1981 in which so much was said, Mr. President, amounted to $15,118,808. That looks small but, Mr. President, when we examine the 1982 capital budget we find the large appropriations in there. The interest acceleration totaled at $5,197,709 and the cost of the Court Building, $1,221,168. The two sums make a total of $7,618,878 and when that is taken from the 1982 capital there is a balance of $2,730,933 which is little what we have put forward this year.

So, Mr. President, priorities have been taken into consideration and many members taken out of the budget. We would have liked to see the Virgin Gorda project and the Jost Van Dyke project, Mr. President, as we have now, the largest project which this Government is to undertake so far and that is the sewerage project of the Road Bay Beach, which is costed at the present time at between $10 and $11 million. That project will be on stream, Mr. President. Of course in 1982 there is only small portion of the work that has been completed in the budget and this is the reason why we have not put a large capital budget going forward. However, in my estimation, Mr. President, even if we call this the daily Town budget the estimate behind the recommendations is in accordance with our policy.

Mr. President, I will now speak on the Revenue. This is quite a subject. Mr. President, this subject are causing so many people to attack their Government negative saying so pause to wonder. Mr. President, I think that it is all in vain because any statement which I put my name to in a statement to speak and one which I will always defend. So I am explaining what we as a Government have put forward, exactly what the Revenue position is.

HON. MAGGIE C. HORTON (CONTINUING): Mr. President, we know that the Cayman Islands Government is not an impoverished Government. If we look at its assets, its land and its buildings and other assets, I am sure that we will see that it is a fairly well off Government. Mr. President, it is not small on the question of this Government's assets. So when one speaks about the financial position of a Government we must be compared always the cash position. I want to make it quite clear that that has been our stand on the platform and in this Government. We have been speaking about the cash position of this Government. On the platform I made the figures which were produced by Members of the past Government, and I showed from my calculations that at the time the Government had available cash of $3 million.

Mr. President, there are much accounting and all those big financiers came out with their suggestions and they tried to make me look small. When we entered Government we asked the Honourable Chief Official Member to let us have certain information relating to the financial position of Government as it stood on the 31st October, 1988. We took those figures, Mr. President. We analysed them and we got together a statement showing the surplus and deficit position as that time, amounting to $892,000. They were saying most of the time and even a month before the 31st October, that they had millions of dollars in surplus cash. We showed the General Treasurer, Mr. President, available cash of merely $3 million. We showed a Public Debt of over $13 million and if the amount loan had been added to it at that time we would have recorded the $16 million which have just been declared the Public Debt figure. We also showed some figures relating to Cayman Airways.

The proof of that, Mr. President, was that when the Honourable Chief Official Member decided to move what available cash was in Reserve to supplement the Budget all he could get out of it was $2.3 million. We heard what he said in the Budget Address. He said, Mr. President, that the balance of it was a deficit which would not be necessary because of the blending of those funds against the Loans Settlement Loan. Mr. President, that was still be whatever one likes, depositor, collateral or hypothecation and it is all the same thing. To reach that sum of money is not available for use until after the bank says you have it. That is what has happened to the most of the Reserves which the Opposition over there is talking we must us have.

Mr. President, had it not been for that, I dare say that the Honourable Chief Official Member would not have gone forward to recommend the few tax measures which he did. So, Mr. President, I have no regrets for any statement which I have made. I am not going into politics and making a statement which I cannot stand by. I have served this country for thirty seven and a half years in the Civil Service and two and a half years in the Military Service. I have a track record in this country and I am not going to change that record.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been hoping that you were ready for a natural break. We are in fact slightly over time. So I will invite the Honourable Chief Official Member to move the adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. ORRIN W. ARCHER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

AGREED.

AT 4.34 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., TUESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1992.

STATE CAPITOL
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND
21401

STATE CAPITOL A RECENT MEETING OF THE (1985) SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MONDAY

18TH MARCH, 1985

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR G PETER LESLIE, CMG, CVO - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS M PARKER, CVO, CMG, QC	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MAXWELL J BRADLEY, QC, M.L.A.	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C JEFFERSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON BENSON C EVANS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON R NORMAN MCCARTHY, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE.
HON CAPT CHARLES S KIRKPATRICK	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON PASCAL C JOHNSON, CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR F MCKENNA RUSH	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR EDWARD M RICHARDS, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT ANDREW C KIRKPATRICK	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SPOTTS ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF LESSER CAYMAN
MR JAMES M ROGERS	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR G HAIG BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D RICHARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR ARCHIE S MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ROYAL ORDERS & ROYAL MESSAGE AT THE OPENING OF THE FIRST SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

ZANZIBAR

16th AUGUST, 1956

COMMUNICATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE GENERAL ELECTION AND
ROYAL PROROGUING OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, 1956

INDEX OF CONTENTS

	Page
Consideration of the Debate on the Taxes Speech and Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1943	1
Hon. Francis C. Jabulani	1
Hon. Hamish C. Tembo	38
Adjournment	38

DRAFT

TEN HOUSE, 1965

10.00 A.M.

THE SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Prayers are read. Confirmation of the debate on the Throne Speech and Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1965. The Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH AND SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION (1965) BILL

HON. WARREN C. NISBETT: Mr. Speaker, when I finished yesterday afternoon as a result of the adjournment, I was just at that time through with the subject of Seamoss and as this morning I will go on to another subject, Fiscal Policies.

Mr. President, in the course of debate earlier in this Session I heard remarks passed that the tax system of these Islands was trailing fifty years behind and that the tax system was outmoded. I wondered, Mr. President, whether the speaker from the Opposition was thinking that he was in the Turks and Caicos Islands because I have always heard that that territory was some thirty to fifty years behind the Cayman Islands.

The fiscal policy of this country has been well thought out over the years. In 1959 to 1962 when the then Government sponsored the economic programme, including the programme, Mr. President, was a thorough examination of the fiscal policies of this Government to decide where over the next ten years it would raise the revenue, the level of revenue which would relate to the development of this country as a financial centre for tourist destination.

Mr. President, as a destination for tourists the Islands have done quite well. As a financial centre we have done much better and these developments were possible largely because of the management of the fiscal policies and the administration of the country generally.

The 1972 examination of the fiscal policy indicated that for the foreseeable future this country should not stray away from the indirect system of taxation. That policy is maintained to this day and I hope for the foreseeable future I have that that policy will be maintained.

The direct system of taxation such as income tax, estate duty tax, wealth duty and so on, although looked upon as the most equitable form of taxation cannot do our system any good. What it takes to implement a system like that and the returns would not be all that much, Mr. President, and the managing officers of direct duty may discourage from this country would add to the disaster. So we have no alternative than to continue with our present system of taxation such as taxes on imports, licenses fees from banks, annual fees from companies and so on. These are the main areas of our present revenue and this answers some why that we are treading fifty years behind in our tax system is really hogwash to.

HON. WILLIAM G. JOHNSON (Continuing): Mr. President, many years ago a suggestion was made that we abandon our British Caribbean territory. The British Government thought that too many small colonies were becoming too common and it was almost a duty placed within their small Commonwealth countries.

I remember back in 1970 I had to go to London and attend a meeting with the officials of the Treasury, the Bank of England and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to relate our particular situation in the Cayman Islands, and to plead with the British Government to have our financial industry plans because we had no alternative. Mr. President, the meeting was very successful. We had the full support of the British Treasury and the Bank of England and so from those days on we had no interference with our financial industry as you no the British Government is composed.

Mr. President, we have done quite well in this country. We are a small territory of one hundred square miles, with 16,000 people and a 200 million budget. To raise 200 million in revenue in this small country is no small feat, Mr. President, and so we have to be very thankful for what we have and what we are receiving. We have no doubt reached a saturation point where our individual sources of taxation is concerned. The Honourable Third Official Member said in his Budget Address that because $1.00 was not possible to tax the offshore industry this year, he had to consider other forms of raising a bit of revenue. Mr. President, he is quite right. At one time there was no bank license fee and within the last two to three years a fee has been introduced. Today's Class A licences fee is up to around $50,000. If we take it beyond that figure, Mr. President, we are going to price ourselves out of the market. Also if we continue to increase company fees, work permits and so on we will do likewise and it would be very unwise for us to continue raising revenue from that source.

What we must do, Mr. President, is to stimulate the economy so that activities here in all the areas of the economy can move on and produce more to the Government and to the treasuries, so that we will not need to think about taxation.

If there is any new form of taxation which can be suggested by anyone which will not discourage or interfere with the present types of things in the Cayman Islands, I will say, "Let's look at it". Seriously, Mr. President, I have been in this game for a long time. I have had the responsibility over that long period of time to find means and ways of raising revenue. I have even been accused in regard to a simple little pull out which members of the Opposition calling it income tax the height of stupidity.

Mr. President, it has been the experiment to find a diversification of the economy and to find additional sources of taxation. I understand to study the offshore insurance industry and very successfully, Mr. President. He determined in that year the Insurance Law which governed that industry put today the Cayman Islands is looked upon as the second destination in offshore insurance business. That, Mr. President, is working the country well. It has added to the economy and it has added additional revenues to Government coffers. It has been a welcome diversification of the financial industry. There are things we must look for which will presently assist the system as it is at the present time. Mr. President, I will be looking forward to any suggestions which anyone can make to the Honourable Third Official Member to improve our revenue system.

SEN. ALLEN J. ELLENDER (CONTINUING): Mr. President, I want to say a few words on Tuesday. It was one of my duty subjects many years back and I was Chairman of the Currency Board until I resigned in March, 1953. I heard the first Russian Sputnik. Some suggestions that perhaps Government should look at the possibility of buying some gold which would be a backing to the Dayton currency in circulation. Mr. President, this is not the first time we have heard that. The thing is that some people cannot learn. A number of years ago the same suggestion was made to me and rather than giving them an answer I went to the Bank of England and asked if they would write a paper on this subject. The reply was very short. It did not take any genius to decide whether a small system like the Dayton Board should become involved in buying gold.

Mr. President, what is wrong is better to be cautiously working. When our boys gold the only benefit he looks for is if after Sunday that gold the price of gold rises, then he is ready to sell his gold he will realize that inflated price. Then he knows that he has made a profit on the deal. Neither, an organization like the Dayton Board, Mr. President, cannot profit unless it has a ready market of course. By the little money which the Board manufactures for the currency in circulation and for the Reserves must be invested in cash or other in order to provide that steady income. Mr. President, the answer is not only if benefit to the Board, the Board gets from the accumulation however such year a certain sum of money in Government's treasury. I see in the budget this year a sum of $500,000 to be paid by the Dayton Board into Government's revenue. For a small system like that which was only established twelve years or so ago to be paying nearly a million dollars of revenue to Government today is also no small feat, Mr. President.

So what would happen if we had our Reserves in gold? We might run short of dollars from one day and eventually we might have to in the end because the price of gold fluctuates. Sometimes it rises and sometimes it falls. So I want to take it upon myself to tell Senators that buying gold is something we should not even dream about.

Mr. President, without objection I would like to mention relating to the Dayton Board to the bill that was introduced some years ago. Mr. President, that note is normally known as the $1 billion note. It was specifically segmented by the Treasury Department. Their opinion of it being a useful note to the country was because they thought it would be used for the Foreign Book Festival. They said that the bill was equivalent to $1bn, and that when nations need here they would buy the note. Until for one cent which cost they would have to pay as a subscription of the Foreign Book Festival. When I approached London about this bill some they asked me if I was to my good senses. I said that it was privileged and that was why I was taking it there. So in that sense they approved of it.

Mr. President, it was never liked by the public. It is out of the usual sequence of the decimal system because we use either a $1, a $5, a $10, a $20 or a $100 note. When we use any other denomination, Mr. President, it is of absolutely no use to people. It makes it difficult to calculate and to use for that matter. So if we walk around some today we find nobody with a $50 note, the banks do not use it, the Secretariat their officials whether commercially or privately, said that what he might want to propose to the next Parliament was to declare that there would be no more printing of the note, and to put it out to see whether it could be sold as a millionaire's

MR. ROBERT G. STANFIELD (CONTINUED): Also, I wish, Mr. President, that we could follow that suggestion and eventually replace that $40 note with a $50 note.

Mr. President, we have had quite a lot of debate here in this Session about the creation of a Monetary Authority which would ultimately lead to a Central Bank operation. Mr. President, the Treasury Board has made many studies of this possibility over the years. Reports were undertaken by the Bank of England on the subject for the benefit of the Treasury Board. In the last study, Mr. President, it was decided to try and see whether the Treasury Board could never since a viewpoint from the local commercial banks. It is quite true there no doubt the board could be given by a function which is equivalent to a Monetary Authority. For that reason an amendment was made to the Currency Act to provide that the Currency Board could accept deposits and make advances for the purpose of this clearing arrangement. However, Mr. President, when we tackled the local commercial banks on it we found difficulties. The banks had quite an unfortunate arrangement amongst them. It was costing them nothing. There were one of the small banks in the centre doing clearing through other banks and finding some difficulties in doing so. However, Mr. President, eventually they too were able to make adequate clearing arrangements. So it ultimately was not necessary to carry out that clearing arrangement.

It is not as simple as all that. The Currency Board would have had to improve its staff and duplicate the activities in order to do that particular kind of thing. Mr. President, nothing more than a branch. The Monetary Authority or a clearing bank usually are included as many activities. Fiscal and forecast they are involved in banking. Mr. President, it was always hoped that the Savings Bank which you have in mind would have remained there to become the nucleus of the banking operation for that Central Bank of it was decided that this was necessary. The minute I walked out of Government, Mr. President, the Savings Bank was demolished. So that possibility of an added activity for a Central Bank disappeared.

Another activity which is done through a General Bank is savings interest. We abolished exchange control in 1960, Mr. President, and I have that it is not the intention of anyone here to reintroduce that subject. So that number that is off the list.

Mr. President, some suggestion to another activity of a Central Bank may be one note that the present system of bank supervision is very satisfactory, as it operates within the portfolio of finance and investments. Therefore in our small system we would have no specific need of having the bank supervision given where it is, to put it into another separate institution.

The other function, Mr. President, of a Central Bank is to be the fiscal point where economic advice is given to Government. Naturally, Mr. President, one would have to employ professional staff to be able to give Government that sort of advice. As it boils down to the fact again, that under the present system the honourable third Official Member to the Government's economic and financial adviser. If advice is required beyond that level then we have to look outside those Islands. So that again does seem as for a long time to come.

The fact is, Mr. President, as the Currency Board concluded several years ago, for the foreseeable future it would not be necessary to consider the operation of a Central Bank in the Cayman Islands.

Hon. Maurice H. Stans (continued): By the time we get to be necessary to operate on to convert the Currency Board into a Monetary Authority that has already been done and all we need to do is to change the designation; and on the system to take over banking and the rest of it. We operate on three banking theories that is a Central Bank function. So, therefore, we find the organization of a Monetary Authority to be consistent I should say that there is absolutely no need for one at the present time.

Mr. President, much use made of exchange control here but records was obtained for a while in the Opposition. Exchange control was always known as a very technical subject. It was always known too as being one of the main safeguards to the banking of our financial centre have been kept in 1966. Mr. President, in 1966 we appointed review the British Exchange Control Law as it was applicable to Jamaica. Of course Jamaica was applicable as the Cayman Islands being a dependency.

At that stage we found that in order to promote our financial industry it was necessary to relax some of the Exchange Control Law which would grant to investors certain privileges which the British Law did not provide. So we have responded to Government to introduce a new Exchange Control Law. The proposals went to the Legal department, the Finance department, and eventually to the Privy Council. Nobody wanted to see this new Exchange Control Law. The British Government could then they had given us one and if we did not like it we could do the job ourselves, so it came back, Mr. President, and the Administration at the time said "We handle to me and said, "Take it your baby".

Within three months we had recommended a new Law, the regulations, the order, the notices, the lot and it 1969 those were introduced. When they came to this Honourable House the Members said that it was too technical a subject and they could not understand it. Anyhow, they said they would accept it because they had confidence that it was well prepared and well presented.

I am just pointing this out, Mr. President to give an idea where exchange control came from. In 1972 when Sterling floated, exchange control in the United Kingdom also commenced. It was only the United States and a couple of other countries like Switzerland and Malta which allowed exchange control within the country of Sterling. The Cayman Islands, Bahamas, Bermuda and all the other Commonwealth countries were told that they must do their own exchange control.

It was at that time, Mr. President, that I personally was used to establish exchange control in these Islands and the following year in 1973, I went to London and examined this to establish exchange control. It was the British Government by ourselves and they asked us to give them our views to stick it down.

The following year, Mr. President, in 1974, we were anxious back to London to discuss the subject and I remained alone with the former Minister Secretary, Mr. Porter. We met in the Bank of England with the Treasury and Finance and Commonwealth Office personnel, and we discussed the subject. It was at that time that the British Government announced that they had agreed that the Cayman Islands could establish exchange control.

Mr. President, unfortunately we did not get around to doing the job until today, three and Companies Law at the time we had a provision making provision to all companies particularly non-residents under exchange control. And we at that time abolished exchange control we would have lost a tremendous amount of income from these non-residents

MRS. HARRIS of Oklahoma: companies because they would automatically have recorded as being an industry company which for some would be than that of a non-resident company. Of course I am not interested in hearing this amount of testimony. If we might have this legal department sit with all the other people which we could find to study this and name of qualifying exchange control without having that reason.

We believe would be his forward, Mr. President, until he left him. Therefore additional, some said that exchange control be foreign by the bank and agreed to. When we said we suggested that we could not allow Mrs. Chairman to do that until we were still keeping on having to find ways and means of changing exchange control. So I went to the Chairman-Designate and I said to him that we must add some more, the two of us, and we must find a means of qualifying exchange control with being our economic. Mr. President, it took us about three months and we believed not be carried. Eventually we found a way out when under the Foreign Exchange Control Law we invented there a corporate of non-resident company which would enable to raise not development exchange control but under the Local Corporate Control Law, which would allow all non-resident companies whether they were designated or such under exchange control or not. So they would recognize to pay that fee. Then we were forward, Mr. President, and we established exchange control.

There is a long history behind exchange control but Hong Kong is got out of it.

Mr. President, we heard mention made here of unemployment in those islands, especially over the past year and I agree with it entirely. I know a lot of people in the construction field and others who have been out of jobs. Mr. President, it has been clearly said here by the Opposition that there has been a down turn in the economy for a little while ago. Whether they wished it or not is for us to be clearly seen by everyone that that is correct.

Mr. President, what I was a bit concerned about is that the Party Government would have known that there was this down turn in the economy and that there was unemployment in the country. They had a golden opportunity to remedy this and to help all those poor people over which have been dwelling recently here in the past two years, but they did not. Mr. President, to have $6.6 million and buy a prefabricated building is something which I cannot understand. The Government has a lot of land. To just by the Government Administration Building the Government made more to buy additional land in that particular vicinity for further expansion of office accommodation. They was recommended a few years ago that this Government Offices would be centralized in that area as far as possible. That was not done, Mr. President. Instead they went and bought a prefabricated building with a small amount of land around it and limited our parking facilities.

Now, Mr. President, that $6.6 million could have been spent in the country. Our poor people, those poor unemployed would have had jobs. That building would have taken about a year and a half to build. It would have still been under-construction. It would have given local materials some business. In fact it would have given everybody some business. One can imagine the benefit, Mr. President, of $6.6 million circulating in the country, especially in poor times. When we talk about the poor we must not think of them on the one hand and they think of ourselves on the other. We must be considerate with our views and do our utmost to help them.

HON. JAMES M. MORRIS (Opposition): Mr. President, the Honourable Third Official Member said that the total cost of the new airport terminal which included the central tower, would be $10.7 million, and not as estimated by Public Works Department which was $15 million, and as mentioned by Caribbean Development Bank at a cost of $16.4 million.

Mr. President, I am sure that the Honourable Third Official Member did not mean to mislead this House. I have been involved in the airport terminal development myself as Financial Secretary. In fact the feasibility study which was undertaken, Mr. President, was during my time. It was undertaken by a Canadian group, paid for by the Canadian Government at a cost of Cdn. $250,000. Mr. President, I do not believe that any opportunity was expressed by this Government to the Canadian Government, for that grant and I would like on behalf of the Government on this occasion to record Government's grateful thanks for that feasibility study and the payment for that study by the Canadian Government.

It was because of that feasibility study that Caribbean Development Bank decided to assist the project by a loan. So whatever others might have thought about the study it had the useful purpose in that development.

Mr. President, the proposal for this terminal was that the central tower should be built first and then the terminal building. Along with that development there was to be a parallel taxiway on the north side of the airfield towards the sea. Mr. President, in the estimates made by public Works Department and by Caribbean Development Bank that parallel taxiway was included and if the cost of the project up to this stage just below three millions, then the reason for this is well known. It is because the project is not completed in its original approved form. That parallel taxiway, Mr. President, I understand cost in the vicinity of $2 million. So if you add $2 million to the $14 million, we have the $16 million.

HON. JAMES M. MORRIS: Mr. President, maybe after I think it is necessary for the House that necessary, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that it is any more unnecessary than a great deal of what have been spoken in this debate. In this debate I make use of the customary, allowed Members to worry quite fine and wide.

HON. M. MONTAGUE JONES: On a point of order, Mr. President, under Standing Order 23(1) the Members present in this Chamber during a debate should not read books or newspapers. I think the Member should pay attention to what is happening, Sir.

HON. JAMES M. MORRIS: Mr. President, it has been a habit of this House since I have been here, for thirteen years, if a person wanted to take a look at the morning newspaper he was allowed to do so. I do not know why this Member is such an authority as to all of a sudden.

HON. M. MONTAGUE JONES: Mr. President, they have been asking that we follow the rules. Now if one Member has to follow the rules everybody has to follow the rules.

HON. D. HUGH SPOONER: Mr. President, first for the information of the Chair, I am working on a speech which I am going to make pretty soon. There is nothing against working notes. The Member seems to think I am reading and working. I am actually making notes.

MR. PRESIDENT: What the standing order was is that Senators would not read books, newspapers and letters while they are addressing the business before the House. I have always followed that idea that Members who are reading, are reading something which does relate to the business of the House. I know that Members read newspapers. Newspapers usually contain something which relates to the business of the House. Whether they are reading that part of the newspaper it is difficult for me to determine.

MR. JOHN H. STEVENS: Now the parliamentarian of the Senate I happened at the time he spoke to be reading, "The Republican Arkansas commissioner debate".

MR. PRESIDENT: I think we should continue with the debate.

MR. HARRY P. HAMMAN: Mr. President, thank you for your courtesy, Sir. I did not get up out of my seat and interrupt anyone while they were speaking. They spoke for three days and I sat still and listened. I do not intend to speak for three days because that is filibustering.

Mr. President, when I was looking forward on March, 1982, the Senator who was then the Elected Member of Executive Council responsible for Tourism Aviation and Ports took over the planning committee which was looking after the airport terminal, as I pointed out of the picture. I mention that, Mr. President, so that it quite clear that I am aware of and I have knowledge of the background of this project.

Mr. President, much was said about the new Post Office which is now under construction. However, for the benefit of this honourable House I must make it quite clear, Mr. President, that the Post Office has been the subject of a feasibility study from a long time back by the British Post Office authorities. The recommendations was made for the re-siting of that Post Office and the site recommended for the new Post Office is the site behind the Public Library. So there is no reason for anyone to believe that this is a new thought where Government is concerned. Now that the Lands Building has been bought and is standing all the surplus staff of Government there is no need to construct the cost of development for a Post Office Building other than first thought of. This is the reason for the diversification to a multi-storey car parking and Post Office facility together.

Mr. President, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that our parking in central George Town is a unbearably lousy. Neither do there any doubt in the minds of the people that there is need for a new Post Office where additional land space will be available. There is absolutely no space in the old building, Mr. President, to install additional boxes at the present time. There is always a big list of demands for new boxes. However, most boxes are just a small part of the need for a new Post Office. There is no parking around that building. For people to go there they have to park in other people's parking lots.

The facilities within the building, Mr. President are small and invalid, and when we look at the improvements and expansion of other Government offices we cannot but accept that the Post Office too is in need of expansion and is need of a new environment. The question of where it will go I know Mr. Speaker, depends on Government's ability to finance them. However, I can assure this Honourable House that if the need is there for these facilities and this Honourable House is prepared to approve it, and

MR. WARREN G. MAGNUSON: ...we can find the reasons to raise them. What the requirements will be just now,

Mr. President, much was said about the Housing Development Corporation as well. We came across just what it did a few months ago. We considered this when we got to these old properties that happened to the fiscal government during last year. There were originally people considered low income who had property whose value was over $200,000. They had a mortgage of $70,000, $80,000 and even $100,000, they were taken up to $40,000 or less. They were given loans to rehabilitate other homes.

Mr. President some Government provided to establish a Housing Development Corporation one would have thought that this would be help those people who could not negotiate a mortgage with the private institutions. I am sure that many of those in the unfavorable locality who have entered home from the Housing Development Corporation would go to private institutions and raise loans. However, Mr. President, that is something which is unobtained. The new board has been determined to raise fresh efforts to raise additional money and to maintain the present schedule, and to decide what a Government Housing Development Corporation should really be doing, and the sort of responsibilities when it should be undertaken. Because if we walk through the middle, towards and length of this country today we will find a lot of need. I am just saying Mr. President, that we want you considering that money be given to people who cannot repay it. I think this is really misconstrued by Government and that need anybody ashame that I am sure that is still going to continue this scheme. However, Mr. President, we must not go, helping those people who can help themselves. We must think always the poor, those people about which we much has been said in this house.

MR. JAMES M. BECKER: Mr. President, I rise on a point of explanation under Standing Order 32(2).

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member has given way to the Hon...

MR. JAMES M. BECKER: In following the debate of the Honourable Member he seems as though he is trying to cast a different meaning to what was done by the Housing Development Corporation. Under the guidelines and those powers, we are empowered to give mortgages in areas where the people had assessed evidence of less than $25,000, with a maximum amount of $25,000 to be loaned. As far as I am aware there are known any guidelines nor does either in law, regulations or otherwise which said anything about the net worth of a person. I am sure having looked over the list of some of the people who received mortgages, if any of them had a net worth of $150,000 it was probably a consideration by land which was not readily available. It was not assessed again. Governments have had mortgage schemes which were not quite effect under the Housing Development Corporation. One year the Housing Development Corporation Law and the other one was the scheme which was giving all the Bahamas down for the people and people could not receive a mortgage in the private market, or they could not afford to pay high rents.

To be more completely different types of housing schemes, and to my understanding that it was in trying giving to a person who had $150,000 net worth. I do not accept that should be the thinking there. There was a Town Committee and many unemployable people around in all which was responsible for seeing where the mortgages went. I only wanted with the Member to explain that there was anything wrong done under our administration in regard to the Housing Corporation. That is what he is saying to impute wrong-doing he has already, and I have grave objection to it.

HON. VASCO G. PENNACCHI: Mr. President, I was about to finish what I started. I was told by one of the banks who had participated in the Housing Development Corporation that the Corporation had apparently entered into negotiations with those banks in granting mortgages to people who could very well go to those banks and obtain loans. This was ascertained, Mr. President, by the records we found there. If that is the case, I would like to know whether the banking fraternity in those Islands, who can see their office banks which have not yet materialized may fund to the Housing Development Corporation will be reluctant to do so, because they now provide cheap money, five per cent money which is obtainable at nine per cent. They are certainly not going to welcome this cheap money for the Government to enter in competition against them.

That is the reason, Mr. President, why I spoke of what I found there as I did. Certainly it is the case that we will have to remedy it. We have not had the time or the opportunity yet of re-examining their guidelines or their policies, but this will certainly be done before any more mortgages are considered. We must give unto to the feelings of dissenters Members, Mr. President, the investigations which commissioned these firms and we intend to do just that.

Mr. President, I know that the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council has already covered quite a lot on the Seamen II Agreements which was negotiated in 1977...

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder before the Minister starts on what is evidently going to be a new topic, if it will be convenient for us to take our customary morning break. I will therefore now suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes and would ask Members to be ready to resume by 11.30 a.m.

AT 11.30 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

AGAIN RESUMED AT 11.45 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. The Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council?

HON. VASCO G. PENNACCHI: Mr. President, I was going on to speak on Seamen II but before I deal with that subject I want to mention the Public Debt.

Mention was made by a Member of the Opposition that in 1977 this Government had a true position of slightly over $3 million and that in 1978 that position had grown to $7 million. Apparently he thought that it was bad management of the then Government to stand by and see the Public Debt grow at that rate. However, Mr. President, I would remind this Honourable House that in 1976 to 1977 we began implementing an economic plan for this country which would establish the infrastructure and on which future growth would depend. In that infrastructure we had to provide a number of services and accommodation.

MR. WOODS of NORTHUMBERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the Chairman in which we now sit. That was another one on the list. Since we built the warehouse across the road, the police establishment, and the Government Administration Building recently known as the Glass House, we built pieces of new secondary school and of primary schools around the Islands. We rebuilt a portion of the hospital. We built the George Town port which was opened very soon after the new Government took office in 1977 and, Mr. Speaker, we began paving all the roads in the Cayman Islands.

I am sure that anyone who walks around the Cayman Islands today will see such these beautiful appearance, and Parliament has seen the services which have been established, many of them have given Government receipts for the administration of 1978 to 1979 and the loan which had been created during that time, and nothing can be done without money.

The economic plan was based on spending into positive. A large portion of that year is to come from business and a portion of it from Government sources and loans. Mr. Speaker, the circumstances of these periods have caused the economy well. When the new Government took office at the end of 1976 they took over a very strong Government cost a very strong Government. They needed only to wait for the revitalization of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, no one can ignore unemployment in Cayman in the economy. That comes by equity and the most cycle which had been forecast at that time, I knew that we were only out of a terrible recession, late to start between 1975 and 1976. That proved to be correct, Mr. Speaker. The unemployment started in 1975 and by 1982 it peaked. As I explain fiscal why economists in these visiting to Cayman what they did in their country during those periods the economy.

Mr. Speaker, another statement which was made by the Opposition was that in 1979 the Government spend 12 per cent of its economic in spending terms. Mr. Speaker, please before that it was mentioned that it is the usual policy of all economy must be given more than 12 per cent of the economic in spending terms. As all times while I was in the Office of Financial Secretary I made this quite clear and made it known for many years, and I was never put allowed the Government to move in a position until money that policy.

Mr. Speaker, I took the 1978 estimates and examined them with it was the Opposition could come up with the figure of 12 per cent. I cannot find those figures. The 1978 approved estimates contains on pages 78 to 82 that the total cost of spending the funds that were granted to $20,836,836. For some calculation, Mr. Speaker, on page 21 indicates that the estimated expense for 1978 was $21,812,980. If the percentage is taken from that spending is nowhere near 12 per cent.

MR. S. KEN JACKER: On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for giving way. I would like to say that the total spending was the total spending was not the total spending of spending the debt plus about a certain percentage of recurrent revenue. I am not talking about total revenue.

MR. WOODS of NORTHUMBERLAND: Mr. Speaker, I wish those people who speak about financial would pay their home attention about investment any more. There is no special revenue for this figure which I am providing. I provided $22,822,800 in the estimate of recurrent expense for 1979.

Hon. Gilles G. Bourget (Stormont): Mr. President, if we look at the level of unemployment today and the kind of persons we find that the percentage of commission does not rise above five per cent or six. It was clear in my mind that the cost to the Government of providing the long term unemployed is only half of what the estimated commitment is. So it is we are trying to play with figures to deceive the public and discredit this Government. Shame. Shame, Mr. President.

Mr. President, another point which I wish to make is this. As the honourable Third Official Opposition Budget Address has made that the actual of the Public Debt so far is $19.4 million. However, he also mentioned that if the Sterling adjustment were made accordingly to the present rate, that the Public debt could be only $11 million. Mr. President, let me say this. Since we are going to consider the public debt at some specific moment, because that we have legislatively kept in balance of some other specific matters why we must take into consideration the increase value of the present value of that debt.

Mr. President, may I remind Members of the Honourable House that the gravity of the Pound Sterling vs United States dollars is worth $2.40. We have seen fluctuation of currency over the last ten years which now could mostly tragic. We have seen already the pound Sterling fluctuate and privacy back to some heights. I not depends on the economic conditions within the country. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the pound is going to improve. In fact it has started to do so. I would not be one to advise this Honourable House that we should underestimate the Public Debt. We must keep hold of this and so far as I am concerned we should look at the Public Debt as it stands at the moment time. That figure is $19.4 million.

Mr. President, I should state that it is not a reflection on the honourable Third Official Member. The statement which he presents is provided to him by some of the experts, and I am sure that he agrees with me that the parity of the Pound Sterling is worth $2.40. The extent to the rate of what the fluctuation in that currency will be is a guess or so.

The Opposition used this, Mr. President, to underline what they looked at as the Public Debt increment during their office. However, the fact is that we raised loans from time to time which increased from the 1970 to $19.4 million at the end of 1974.

MR. CLIFFORD A. PEARSON: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would care to let me elucidate under Standing Order 31(1)(b) on a point which was just raised.

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the Member have patch long as I should now rise somehow.

MR. CLIFFORD A. PEARSON: Mr. President, I think it is important that we clarify the point raised by the Member just now. As the member has said I too do not like to volunteer but I think it is a little misleading here. Are we discussing future events, or what happened five years ago, or are we discussing the 1975 Budget? I believe that when we are considering the indebtedness of the Public Debt we have to consider the date. The Public Debt is being considered. If we were going off our Public Debt at the end of 1974 we would reasonably be taking the exchange rate of the normal Sterling to the parity of that currency, and it would not necessarily be at the rate it was originally negotiated. I think we all know that the Pound Sterling is even below the value of the Cayman Islands dollar at

MR. LEROY A. STERON (Queensland): Mr. President, I take point of view. So far as I suppose that the Postal Standing is still equivalent to the party of 3.30 to the United States dollar I think is a matter of misleading. I believe that the honourable Prime Ministerial Member was quite correct in valuing our Public Debt at the then going rate because we are considering the period under review, and that is due to the fact that it may be at some future date. I quite agree with the Honourable Senate Elected Member of Executive Council that it is possible that the pound may remain its strength and by break at 2.40 at some future date. However, right now the situation is not that. The situation is now that it is much weaker, so that when we are considering the revaluation of assets in connection to pounds Sterling we have to consider the correct under review.

Thank you.

HON. HAROLD G. BURROWS: Mr. President, I am quite aware of what statement the Member made and I understand what he is saying, if we were going to consider the explanation being made in 1975, then I would agree not to go by including the entire loan portfolio. I do not agree with it and it does not matter what anybody terms to say about it. That is their own opinion. I am expressing my own opinion.

Mr. President, these explanations in the minds of members do no good to this debate. I did not interrupt with anyone while they were speaking there and talking about 1976 and beyond. I am surprised to think I have been misled by the provisions about seven days and I have a right to do so. I am not disagreeing with them. I am here quietly to my seat. I do not know why all of them must get up and want to give explanations

MR. LEROY A. STERON (Queensland): Mr. President, under Standing Order 84(1)(b) I should like to clarify further what he said.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member has not given way I am afraid this time. I think in fairness he might, there are too many of these....

HON. HAROLD G. BURROWS: I am not giving way, Mr. President.

MR. LEROY A. STERON: May I remind my friend, Mr. Minister, Standing Order 84(1)(b)?

MR. PRESIDENT: You may remind your friend under Standing Order 84(1), the right of explanation.

MR. LEROY A. STERON: Thank you, Sir, under Standing Order 84(1).

HON. W. MCKEEVA CHASE: I think the Member had begun to sit down, Mr. President. Yes, the Member has sat down.

MR. PRESIDENT: And you intervened to give way? Perhaps I misunderstood. You were still on your feet at the time when I adjourned....

HON. HAROLD G. BURROWS: I was going for you, Mr. President, but I didn't see it you ask me so.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is up to you to decide if you wish to give way so that he can misinterpret the matter now. Alright.

MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER. Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: No, we cannot have more than one at a time unless Jesse is a point of order.

MR. D. TENNY HOOVER: Sec, Sir, mine is a point of order under Standing Order 32(1)(a), "On a point of explanation for my personality, Sir, really.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, a point of order only be allowed because we have already got somebody on a point of explanation. If you have a point of order you may raise it. Then the Elected Member for George Town.

MR. EDWARD A. RICKETTS: Mr. President, I am somewhat surprised at the Honourable Fourth Elected Member for Executive Council because as I said it is not a habit of mine to interrupt Members while they are speaking. I just felt that it was necessary at this time to elucidate the matter which he now discussing. Because like the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council I too take more umbrage for having some financial knowledge. So, when I speak I think I speak with some authority also. What I am saying here, Mr. President, is that it is not a proper procedure to point an accusation that the Public Debt of this country as we are considering now, should be taken as being on the record.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member did say that before you spoke.

MR. EDWARD A. RICKETTS: That's no excuse.

MR. PRESIDENT: Let's move on. That point already.

MR. EDWARD A. RICKETTS: The Second....

MR. PRESIDENT: If we continue to interrupt, the Member gets up and says one thing and so on, we should never get on with the debate.

MR. EDWARD A. RICKETTS: I was going on to say, Sir, that my interruption at this point in time was because I feel that any matter in the House should be seriously, since the public can listen to and feel that is a correct information which is being passed on that. This information which was given is probably a distorted picture.

MR. PETER A. JAMES: Mr. President, I have been accustomed to the public of the Cayman Islands for a long time and I have, up to now, Mr. President, that they still understand what I am saying. I am not saying to present a distorted figure. I am not guilty of that in this House. I present a straight figure and a straight picture, and the true facts. This is what some people do not like to hear.

Mr. President, as I said earlier the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council has outlined quite well and quite succinctly the proceedings of the Seventh Session of 1977. However, as I was requested to be the leader of this delegation I think I should also have something to say about it. Mr. President, this agreement, as these negotiations were between the United States Government and the British Government. It was not a Cayman Islands affair. We have a Cayman Islands and Honduras

MR. ROBERT G. [illegible] (CONFIDENTIAL): represented by the United Kingdom at these negotiations. He gave expression to sorrow at the death of the State Department and to [illegible] the British delegation. He said that and, Mr. President, the leader of that team has already been mentioned. There were four members, the Managing Director of Defence Finance who is now the Honorable Secretary of Defence Economy, the Director of Civil Aviation, Mr. Corporation and myself.

As has been, Mr. President, said by the head person of the leader of the United States team, Ambassador Ford, we have given the opportunity of addressing that meeting. We gratefully took the opportunity to do so, one by one. The procedure, at the end of the second day the United States delegation handed their decision to the leader of the British delegation. Ambassador Ford mentioned it to me. The Americans offered us two options or courses of action, Model and Purple. We considered the Ministry and said to him that we could not go home and tell the Government that we accepted only two points out of eight points which we had originally asked for, and that they should reconsider their decision. They said to us at the end of the Bilateral way they handed over their decision, if that time they offered us three [illegible] of two, Model, Purple and New Orleans. They said that because we were [illegible] already operating on Purple in our telecommunications system, that they would allow us to operate only two of those points at any one time.

They asked the note to explain that what the extent to which they would go. Mr. President, with the knowledge of the British team is [illegible] went to the hotel room, telling the British delegation and asked them if he was prepared to believe a word by the United States Government from us. He said yes he was quite willing to do whatever he could to assist us. We did agree, Mr. President, the [illegible] Cyprus delegation, and for hours we worked on [illegible] together on a note to the Ambassador which we thought would bring some resolution from the United States Government. My reaction that we had gone outside of the negotiating room was that as a matter to be considered by the United States Government alone.

We returned the room. We assembled at four minutes afternoon, and then we have explained that it was in order to send it to the British Embassy and the [illegible] of we agree to send signed it and handed it to the British Ambassador. We told us to go home and he would communicate the reply to us in the morning. We came back and discussed that to the Government. We had a [illegible] from the British Ambassador the day after [illegible] home to Polish he said that he went to the State Department. The Secretary of State was not in but we delivered the note to his deputy, we said that in about two weeks we could receive a reply.

The reply came in exactly two weeks, Mr. President, and was that the United States Government had considered our submission. We had rejected [illegible] the two points which included Atlantic City, Philadelphia, Miami, Detroit or Dallas and Los Angeles. The United States Government rejected those points. They said we Miami, New Orleans and in addition to, Mr. President, they gave us Boston, Baltimore or Washington. They said to us that we could operate any two of those five points at any one time.

Mr. President, since we [illegible] to [illegible] this Government we do not wish to dispute. The Minister said that we had gone abroad and we had the prerogative rights of the United Kingdom; that we had gone and discussed the matter back there,

HON. MICHAEL D. DOBBIE (CONTINUING): and that we had arrived safely between the United States and the Philippine Republic some seven days into Hong Kong. Mr. President, that could not be further from the truth. I am surprised, Mr. President, that I represented the Government with my back to the fullest extent, and that we brought back missiles which could not have been achieved or obtained otherwise.

As I said to make it quite clear that every opportunity that the First Elected Member for Public Works gave to discuss these negotiations it was by way

I have no fears about responsibly this Government anywhere or any time.

Mr. President, I want to speak a few words on Cayman Airways. It is one of the happier subjects which we have in this country. It is one which is very concerning to the Member because of past mismanagement and because of the difficult financial situation in which the airline finds itself.

Mr. President, I look a lot about Cayman Airways, especially since the early days. From 1984 to 1992, for nine years I was a Director and the last of those six years I was the Chairman. Mr. President, in those days it was the opinion of the Government that Cayman Airways was a small operation and could be accounted because a self sustaining airline. For a small country with a small local population to become an independent entity is one of the most difficult situations any company can find itself in.

It was because of that, Mr. President, that Cayman Airways was tasked with LOCAL airline of Cayman also in the final nine years of its operations. Many bad things have been said about LACSA. We have met and heard it once and once again, Mr. President, I am prepared to tell this Honourable House and the people of the Cayman Islands that LACSA has served this country well. They are business people and they like to make the best of businesses. Moreover, they also loved the Cayman Islands and they contributed much to this country, which what some people would like us to believe.

Mr. President, one of the difficult things which brought about the split plans of Cayman LACSA is that there were local people involved in that airline who could not be disciplined. They were not prepared to be disciplined under the LACSA administration.

Mr. President, LACSA was responsible for the whole staff and the makeup also of the airline, but LACSA employed what Caymanians were available then. Cayman Airways was operated by a board with the majority Caymanians living here by Caymanians. So where decisions within that airline were concerned, they knew really the market of the Cayman Islands.

Mr. President, what happened from 1992 was that the management of the airline when we took over the management again in November last year. A lot of difficulties existed, Mr. President. The accumulated debt of that airline which is a direct responsibility of this Government because we are the shareholders of that airline, was unbelievable. We joined in the records of the airline at the 30th June, 1994 an accumulated deficit of US$12,887,203. Mr. President, that accumulated loss was done since before the control of that airline.

It was good grounds for closing up the affairs of that company. Mr. President, had the company been wound up that date would have been the responsibility of this Government. When we talk about the financial position of this Government we must not forget the accumulated debts in that airline.

MR. HARRY S. TRUMAN (CONTINUED): Besides these accumulated debts, Mr. President, we found there a deficiency since the strike had depleted accounts at these hospitals of over $5 million. The Veterans Administration estimated that they had gone over $3 million.

That was just the worst of it, Mr. President. When we examined the accounts of the strike we found that they had an accumulation of debts, including what was owing to hospitals of approximately $7 million. We made it the public statement which was issued after we took office that these accumulated debts amounted to $5 million but, Mr. President, taken to the grocery man, officials of those to re-examine the position and they came up with an accumulation of debts of approximately $7 million and not $5 million. When we got into the picture, Mr. President, we found a most serious situation there. The basic payrolls for the veterans' was due within a few days. Most bills for the oil company were there and the oil company was just about to take action against the utilities. We found many urgent bills that needed to be paid and if many of these were not paid within a few days the whole power facility would happen to the utilities. We went to Congress and said that it was their responsibility to help and we needed some money to pay these urgent debts.

The Congress appropriated approximately $2.4 million and, Mr. President, a few of those bills were paid. There are still a lot of debts owing. We think that the owners in the United States have earned a just settlement against allowance for debts amounting to $700,000 or $800,000. These have not been passed by the Legal Department for processing. It is very likely, if we work day shift and the utilities have not got the money, Congress will have to come to the rescue. Considering the worst that can happen in that case of the 70% can be solved in the United States.

Mr. President, there are many cautious writers. In 1947 when the Government decided to release $11 million to the utilities everybody breathed a sigh of relief. The debts owing by the utilities would be repaid and the electricity then used by the utilities would become their investment property. For the first time the utilities would have valuable assets. A part of that money was loaned by the utilities and a part was injected into the equity of the company. The managers of the utilities were told by Senate Committees that they should not embark upon diversification of 70% because it had already been shown that that was a very expensive gimmick with increased labor costs and weight wars, and an attempt which took a lot of justice.

Mr. President, there was no need to mobilize the 300 I-11s that were lying on the line. It was a time for reconciliation and patience. The principle of unions uniting embarking upon the lines for more electricity. However, unfortunately those funds were released, Mr. President, those on positions of responsibility embarked upon security which Governments provide them to do and eventually purchased the 70%, as should I say turned them.

Mr. President, it is the experience of nations that these utilities can never make into a profitable attraction or even a break even attraction for some time, because these electricity are very expensive to operate. Mr. Mr. President, that is going to be something to be looked at, and a decision will have to be taken on when to do the same with payments.

The aircraft which were expected for Canadian use for 707 aircraft. Whatever the case might have been these aircraft would have proved this until gimmick very well, it turned to be too "big lower", Mr. President, and so we got our foreign funds.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGS (CONTINUED): Mr. President, the other thing which we invoked up on that claims was really unbelievable. Mr. President, we found that premises had been made to stage from a wholesale clearance from out going before. People were getting nervous and starting to walk out of the studio. We had to stop this. In fact, Mr. President, that although there are good studio management staff, all the top production ones held by conservatives. Mr. President, when it comes to Conservationists the agitators have it appears that there are only student words, but the words are not criticized by actions.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGS: Mr. President, I inquire as a point of explanation in regard to the Congressional Record.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is the Senator willing to give way? It is up to the Senator speaking whether he will give way as a point of explanation.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGS: Mr. President, I have given a lot of "ways" already. People have asked what they had to explain. I have explained. I am saying what I have to say there is now. I do not see where there is any need for explanation.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Senator is entitled to become a private under Standing Order Rule 4, he states.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGS: I reserve my right, Sir.

MR. JAMES H. JOHNSON: Mr. President, this has been decided this morning and a statement has been issued by the Board of Directors. I re-emphasizing of the serious aspects of the administration has also been mentioned. We are hoping, Mr. President, that that will answer the morale of the problem, which we feel very much as you there. The attached people working from the nights to the lower grades because Govt. already has not in a position to consider giving whatever might be the case. It is just the same action staff here in our opinion fairly well made. There have got to be adjustments along the way.

Mr. President, we are hoping to minimize the losses of Negro Airways, and we hope that the various steps that have been taken so far will enable us doing that.

Mr. President, I am sorry for stealing up of my address but I am afraid that is my fault a little longer than what came as available before the speak you know.

MR. PRESIDENT: If you have finished the part of Negro Airways and have another thing which you wish to say in connection of the like our facilities here.

So I will suspend for deadline until

X:00 p.m.

MR. JAMES H. BOGGS: Well, could I give me a point of explanation at this point, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: I have you gave me notice that you have going again. Will you not to have this statement?

MR. JAMES H. BOGGS: No, Sir, I will not do have this statement.

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well, sir. I will let you make your point at this stage. I draw your attention to the terms of Standing Order 24(2). You must not intervene now unless you wish to challenge your former position by new argument.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: No, Sir, I will deal just with the few points he chose to.

I am a little shocked to hear the manner in which the Minister approached the debate, but I guess I will have to deal with that at a later point. However, he spoke about Telecommunications. Now, if we are going to Telecommunications the airport, Mr. President we cannot do it just for the sake of putting Communications into jobs which we hope they can fill. We have tried till lately to have as many people of Caymanian origin, Beloners and others in, whether or not we could possibly have. I think every record of the Minister will bear that out; the way that we fought under the previous administration to get them. However, there were certain principles which if our considerations could not be fulfilled with the arrangement which is had. If we look at the proposed Flowchart which I see in the Newspaper today it makes one wonder whether we are going to the right direction now, when I hear of the action which they have recently taken against the Daily Managing Director.

Also the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council spoke about the $10 million saving. It is not $10 million saving, it is $18 million on Cayfair and a lot of this has increased at the time when the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council was the Managing Director of Cayman Airways. We do notice aware of this of it.

With regard to the PAP and PEP schemes, it is a matter of personal opinion. We could debate for ages which would be the best one for the country. We have had evidence done by different consultancies. Some say the Perkins when was the PEP. It depends what we are looking at in regard to expansion of the airline routes. We cannot expand it with the PAP and we cannot compete on the airline route with the PEP as far as employing price Caymanian Airlines which has proven not to be fit on the run.

HON. F. JOSIAH BODDEN: Mr. President, I would like to give a point of order relative to remarks made by the last speaker, Sir, if I may.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please you were mentioned, sir.

HON. F. JOSIAH BODDEN: Alright, in regards my position as Managing Director of Cayman Airways was the present while I would like to say this. The financial statements of Cayman Airways will reveal that up to 30th June, 1990 the accumulated deficit of the company at that time was approximately $292.8 million. I mentioned from Cayman Airways on the 18th December, 1990. The accumulated deficit to be [illegible] which was $37.8 million. That is a vast difference and I think that this should be clearly understood in the minds of this House.

MR. DARIO M. ESCOE: Mr. President, I did not like to intimate that the Member was responsible for it. I was merely enlightening that he be aware of what was caused the difficulties in Cayman Airways.

MR. PRESIDENT: I would that proceedings would be suspended until 2.15 p.m., and I now so suspend that.

AT 12.44 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 8.22 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. VINCENT O. ODUBEKO: Mr. Speaker, I will sometime ago put one question on the marine park proposal. I regret to say the Opposition that the proposals which we were getting forward were somehow too extensive, and that we need to take a good look at it before it is implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the marine park proposal was put forward by the Lady Hale Government back in 1986. The consultative exercise undertaken the proposal was obtained by the former Minister responsible for Agriculture and Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, what we are now putting forward to the public are the proposals which we feel at the stage when we got into office. The marine park will be implemented under a regulation, and the regulation can put forward to Executive Council to begin to close up the many things which we found held in the office.

When Executive Council looked at the proposals the Minister said that it is my view that we must still go ahead the whole thing was put to the public and they had a feedback from them to evaluate what they thought of the proposal and whether they would support what was put forward.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing. The marine park proposal has been taken to fit the interests of the Cayman Islands. Although the park arrangements will not be extended to Lower Land Little Cayman at this stage, although perhaps in another phase. We still have people in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman who thought it was a reasonable proposal as it is. Mr. Speaker, they have accepted that Cayman Brac and Little Cayman in general the mooring park system to protect the waters around those islands also.

In due time, Mr. Speaker, a report will be made of the public's reaction and this will be presented to Executive Council again when we will review the matter and decide whether it should be implemented, and to what extent.

Mr. Speaker, we are enthusiastic to receive on input from the public as will show opinions of individual interests, and reasons which are not designated as classified coasts and unexplored. Executive Council need a public input to these opinions of individual interests so that when they are implemented we will have the entire acceptation of the public in doing so.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the marine park proposed will be acceptable very beneficial to these Islands. For one thing the diving here has been developed right here. We just to be sure they the conservation aspect. It's only will the other businesses which are found there are protected as good as you will find anywhere. It has been said that is to only the great barrier reef of Australia which can be compared with our waters.

Mr. Speaker, this will serve three Islands well. It will promote tourism here, economically speaking. It is something which can preserve the clear common benefit in these Islands because perhaps of dollars here to go around during the summer months. The many things to happen in the smaller Islands, Mr. Speaker. The diving there is excellent and that is one attractive people of people there. I have no doubt that

HON. HAROLD G. ROBINSON (CONTINUING): In the months and years to come it will mean those Islands will [illegible] tourist traffic there.

It is for this reason that we must look very carefully at the establishment of marine parks and ensure that it is implemented without due delay. I think it has the support of the entire Cayman Islands and there can be no doubt about the pride we have in these Islands.

Mr. President, a Member from the opposition said that I had also sent up a trial balloon in talking about the proper restrictions. Well, call it what he may it was really not a trial balloon. It was an urgent need to place restrictions on the properties in three areas of these Islands, one in Grand Cayman, one in Little Cayman and one in Cayman Brac, because the people were overlooking entirely about the developments being done to these properties, especially during the spending period. It was discovered that people were going in there and indiscriminately with dynamite, rake and [illegible] destroying large numbers of these properties. It was therefore necessary for that immediate restriction. What happened is that the press release went out to the radio station and for some unknown reason the press release was changed around somewhat and a wrong impression came to the public which is not true at all. However, Mr. President, that was corrected soon afterwards and when the public knew what the provision was, they were satisfied.

We went to Cayman Brac on the 11th Elected Members of Executive Council and met with the public of that Island and explained the Government's action to impose these restrictions. The people there were very happy with what had been done. So whether it be a trial balloon or not it is not, Mr. President, we as a Government take appropriate action when it is necessary. We do not hesitate to step on the shelf to stay there until they become natural.

We found a lot of things there, Mr. President. One was the Regulations to the Water Authority for which was passed back in 1982 without any Regulations. So it is difficult to implement any control where ground water is concerned without those Regulations.

Mr. President, speaking about ground water, the Elected Member for East End had a lot to say about the East End well. Mr. President, when we entered Government we found that the development of the East End well was still underway. In fact this had been approved from the middle of last year and had the Water Authority had a good working machine, perhaps the well would have been in operation before. So we cannot be blamed for opening up the East End well.

Mr. President, shortly after taking office we understood that the East End people were getting somewhat concerned about Government taking water from the wells. So we thought it would be reasonable to meet with the people of East End, explain the whole thing and see whether we could reconcile matters. We knew, Mr. President, that there was an Elected Member in East End. I requested my Principal Secretary to contact the Member many days before the meeting was to advise him of the proposed meeting with the people of his district, and to ask him if he could be with us at the meeting. Well, Mr. President, my information is that the message was delivered. Unfortunately because I was busy with many public engagement I did not encounter the Member myself but my Secretary who had worked with him for a long time and who, I know will be the man who I have the job of speaking with him. If the Member did not get the message it is possibly not my fault.

MR. MARCUS G. STONE (CONTINUING): ... did not attend the meeting, Mr. President, but we still met with the people and talked to them. Mr. President, they are not only complaining about the wells. They are complaining about other things as well. However, Mr. President, that East End has the largest lens of the country. It has a capacity of producing nearly one million gallons of water per day if the wells are properly developed. The wells are four hundred miles in area, eight-eighty feet depth of fresh water. They have so much water in that fresh water lens building that the sea from the land somebody. If a few gallons are taken from it and with the ten wells which are now established there it is hoped that about ninety thousand gallons a day will be taken from it, there is no way in the world, Mr. President, that that small extraction from those wells can damage them.

Apparently, Mr. President, the people were promised by the Duty from Government that water would be piped from those wells into the district of East End. I saw nothing on record, Mr. President, but it is understood that that was the promise made to them. Mr. President, if the Government has the capacity to do so I do hope that if a promise was made; that promise would have been fulfilled.

Mr. President, the Government has spent $150,000 in East End developing those wells last year, and now besides that Government is already in East End a budget item of money to develop a whole section there which is going to come from the budget this year over $250,000. A figure which has already spent on that project last year. So it must be understood, Mr. President, that Government's capacity and capability of doing things is limited at this stage. Just like any other person who got a few shares of the market. Mr. President, I understand that the matter has now been responded and the people are satisfied that the extraction of water there will not damage the lens. The Water Authority still has the responsibility and authority to see to the many ways they are doing with other leases. I am sure that if there is any misuse of authority these people at any time that the Water Authority will take appropriate action to avoid further damage.

Mr. President, the Government is studying at the present time on a number of important issues. As mentioned during Budget Debate, and also recently by the Honourable Second Elected Member of Economic Growth, one of the projects which we have promised we shall. The visit to London recently cleared the air with the British Government and the issue that we placed squarely on the table of importance on that particular subject. We can hope, Mr. President, that before long we will have some news of the United States' decision pertaining this matter. As soon as any information is received we will be pleased to inform the House of this Honourable House.

Another important matter which is now under review is the re-negotiation of the Security Agreement, Mr. President, this is a very sensitive subject and it would not be wise to make any further public comments at this time. However, I can assure this Honourable House that we have been assured by Britain that the highest possible representation in the upcoming talks.

Mr. President, another matter of some importance to the one now before CITIES, the Commonwealth Trade and Development Agency is to be held in Antigua in April of this year. The subject to our bid to have the base in the United States lifted is the establishment of formal trade privileges into that country, a ban which was imposed a few years ago.

HON. HASSAN O. JOHNSON (COMMISSIONER): We are glad, Mr. President, having study sufficient time to examine these two provisions the best possible implementation of Civil Law 7 (1972) will be issuing the Supplementary to this meeting. We found, Mr. President, that the many members of that establishment representing perhaps between or slightly overstaffing, were all responsible for establishment of establishment agencies of which this Ghana Textile is one. Because of this there was a general feeling that whereby the Ghana Textile was created it especially as in the Civil Service and Civil Employment should be protected.

However, Mr. President, we have had people out speculating to ascertain the objectives and the whole committee which are members of CITTED to explain to them what the Ghana Textile means economically than from the Civil, and the fact that the Ghana is making a very considerable profit like. I am happy to say that we have made steps forward after these interviews and I am hopeful that at CITTED we will be able to remove the two Private Members for a decision.

Mr. President, one can never tell in, business in a conference like this, but judging from the many questions we have tackled to already, including Nicaragua and Costa Rica, the United States, Canada and some of the big countries, we have got their support and I am very optimistic that this in which our right will be able to accomplish other objectives that is support the Ghana proposal. For a refreshing agenda will be in the best interests of these Islands.

Mr. President, much was said here about the fact that we were increasing the revenue to increase revenue and the fact that the First Session of the new Government. However, Mr. President, like to put the fact that we have increased in a new legislature. I have been in this Assembly for seventeen years, and is also my responsibility during that time to provide new revenue to supplement the budget. There were always proposals in nearly every year of a Budget Meeting.

Mr. President, in 1977 on the 2nd March when the new Government came into power, revenue measures were introduced, and I would like to read from the Budget Address of the 2nd March, 1977, the measures which were introduced and what was said at that time, and I quote from page 22:-

> "In addition new revenue would have to be introduced to ensure that the economic position was not disrupted and matters would there be certain additional expenditure. Of course it is not to easy task collecting new revenue from a hapless ground but the present situation, therefore, is merely to increase our present revenue. The following measures envisaged to produce a total of ¢105,000 are the following:-

(a) Road Traffic Fee:	¢631,000
(b) Airport Departure Tax:	1133,000
(c) Cigarettes:	¢ 80,000"

As you see, Mr. President, that in 1977 the then Government which was now in the middle Government received to split. Mr. President, ¢105,000 in those days was quite a lot of money in contradiction to the value of money today. But the few measures introduced in this Meeting amount to nearly around ¢300,000.

MR. WALTER E. JOHNSON (CUMBERLAND): Is it worse to me, Mr. President, that there is no good reason for objecting to new taxes at this particular time.

I agree with what was said that the measures being introduced should not be used to hurt the little man. So much was said about this, however, here, Mr. President, in March, 1977 we have cigarettes too, and also liquor, beer and wine. The little man uses these too. So we must be consistent in our arguments and statements.

Another thing I would like to say about measures, Mr. President, is that mention was made of the cigarette revenue which was introduced recently. A number of measures were introduced, especially cigarette stamps. I would like to say that whatever has been introduced there, they were introduced before we took over as Government. So we are not to be blamed for what were given decisions on our shoes, and I think this has to be made quite clear.

Mr. President, I know that the staff of this Legislature have done a tremendous job. On Monday we will be the ones to say whether these measures are treated well, and that the business people will like the measurements. I want to thank them very much for this. I want in particular to say this, Mr. President. I have attended meetings in this House for some seventeen years on the part, and in relaying the first message which came to me for my comments. I read it, Mr. President, and to me it is one of the best measures which has been presented in this House to my knowledge. Mr. President, it is a measure which should not embarrass us if I found it in any Library in the world. I am afraid that I could not say the same about past Governments. So I want to congratulate the Clerk and her staff on the very excellent work which they are producing.

Mr. President, we heard in this House derogatory statements made against the Government. Mr. President, I wonder at times what the politicians mean by the past Party Government. Mr. President, if we do not look forward for the peace we must keep out of their way. If the press slanders us we have sue them. The press is an institution run by people like ourselves. After all, Mr. President, the newspapers and the radio added our daily morning broadcast radio, providing us and keeping us informed of local and world events. The people and people in this Chamber and outside should cooperate in encouraging us things which would one day proudly replace favour in the pages of these newspapers and in the air waves of the radio. So why attack the press. Let us appreciate what they are doing.

Mr. President, I said in my earlier in my debate that this budget was not actually our creation and I explained why I made that statement. It is not meant to be a reflection on anyone. We have just entered into Government. We found many urgent matters to deal with and we were presented with the budget which we actually had time to look at. We made it quite clear that we were not prepared to go forward with one unless it was balanced, and we expressed that decision to them to produce just that. I am glad that just, Mr. President, that I made the statement that the Budget was not ours, because actually it was prepared and presented to us to look at.

It brought out to reflected the thinking perhaps of what some planned when the past eight years of administration. The politics and the views of a new Government cannot always be the same as those of the old Government and therefore, to take some time to, from this into a new presentation. I therefore said that a new budget of this new Government would be the most logical to be presented in November, 1985.

SEN. PASTORE of RHODE ISLAND: Mr. President, I respectfully ask to be excused and thank the Honorable Chief Official Worker for the work which he has done on this budget. It is no easy task in these days, especially when there is confliction going on all the things which people would like done, and all the things which Government itself would like to have done. It is what we have and which is rightly owing the various services of Government, and to particularly certainly those who will receive it to be steady a great task. Therefore I want to thank the Honorable Chief Official Worker for his work and for what he has devoted to presenting the budget as we see it.

Mr. President, we have to recognize that we must have some stability of the financial operation of Government. We must insure that there is sufficient control over expenditure and sufficient discipline in the collection of Government's revenue. We must endeavour to manage the country's economy in a manner to ensure continued economical prosperity because, as I said this morning we have no other alternative than to stimulate the economy. It is only by doing so that this country can expect to maintain and at first sufficient revenue and funds to continue financing the many needs of Government.

Mr. President, the wind of change is blowing and it is blowing in every direction. We must be able to keep abreast of these changes. I shall support wholeheartedly, despite the Honorable Workers of this House, despite the cuts, despite the private sector to continue to maintain to maintain to prohibited and reasonable stability. This is the only way for peace to come.

Mr. President, the Honorable Members of these islands must be of other impression to all of us. There is no use in looking in different direction. We must all head in the same direction and all of us must participate in the way or another to the growth of these islands. So we must go forward with this in mind.

Mr. President, I would like to thank you for your Throne Speech. It was a great pleasure to listen to and we have that the programs which you have mentioned for this new year will bear good fruit for this country.

Mr. President, I suppose your Throne Speech and I also support the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1965.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Although it is a few minutes earlier than the time we customarily take our afternoon break it may be more convenient to break now rather than to break into somebody's speech. I think I am right that the Honorable Chief Minister of Executive Council looked up if he was catching my eye. Am I right that he plans to speak and to speak for another hour when ten minutes are up? I think perhaps let us take our break right now as will all get our seats back.

AT 3.25 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3.38 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. EDISON J. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with your remarks who congratulated you on your previous Throne Speech delivered here on the 1st March, 1966. Unlike the First Elected Member for Golden Rock I have no difficulty in performing in your absence as I experience myself, Mr. Speaker. When one refers in any formal speech to Her Majesty the Queen the term Her Gracious Majesty is used. Since your Throne Speech is undoubtedly a message delivered on behalf of Her Majesty, the accepted performance is to use a gracious speech. However, Mr. President, I can understand what Member's difficulty because in my opinion he would still like to look into country as far away from the British Throne as possible, as he has expressed on the past. The people of this country know this only too well.

I also wish, Mr. President, to commend the Honourable Financial Secretary on his Budget Address, delivered in this Honourable House on the same date. His speech was short, lucid, informative and timely. Mr. President, I feel Members and especially the two Elected Members for Golden Rock need to have a long short memory. The majority of what they said, especially the First Elected Member for Golden Rock, was basically what they have been saying since 1962, and more especially since June of last year. What causes me to think they do not seem to realise that the people did not accept their position in November, and they will not accept it now.

Mr. President, we all remember that the Unity Team were lost to the television and unable to say to call this study and is floored. I would like that statement, Mr. President, to a broken record and I think the Unity Team and their spokesman should employ a new song writer.

The only substance I heard from the leader of the Unity Team in his contribution was his statement that she will commit be allowed to sap the cap. However, it appears to me, Mr. President, that he has not yet realised that in the context of Government, he is now the odd man & may possibly see it that.

The First Elected Member for Golden Rock, Mr. President, does not seem to understand that he lost an election in November last year. He said that the supporters of the present Government, Mr. President, are paying lackeys of means. See, Mr. President, it is true that on the morning of the 11th November last year, I saw quite people crying for joy. For the sheer joy, Mr. President, of being relieved from the stranglehold which the Unity Labour Government held over this country. People are happy again, Mr. President. They feel free to talk and discuss matters without fear of reprisal and victimisation as was the case under the past Government.

Above all, Mr. President, I feel that the population is happy that under this Government they can look forward to a time when the menace of unemployment will not arise as the ugly head in this country for a long time. It is possible, Mr. President, that this is one of the reasons of tension which we fairly do enjoy these days and is not pleasant to any sensible person.

MR. SPEAKER'S CONSTITUENCY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said over the past two weeks about the financial statements of the officers of the Government as at 31st October, 1964, signed by the four Members of Executive Council. It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that just as early as December last year the two Elected Members for Belize Town in particular were attempting to say that the present Government was spending money recklessly and using up all of the country's Reserves and that in fact we had already used the entire £6m deficit envisaged in such a short time. It was for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that always that the problem was set out, and it was incumbent upon me to give a simple version of the typical Jane Austen situation of the country which most if not all of the people could understand.

To the best of my knowledge it has been the practice to which be a statement of affairs of the Government the most recent position, because after all that is what is available for spending. We do not see balance sheets of Government in the sense of any other company where profit and loss is stated. The Receiving Stage are a cash balance sheet. So, Mr. Speaker, with this understanding which we understand to have been given to the Bank saying that no deposits would be encumbered during the life of the loan the Power Authority and the Government position given as at 31st October, as well as the Loan Account which was the same position of Government as we see it, that is the Loan was unencumbered position up to that date. This showed a clear indication of £1.8m million pounds which had been spent on the Government of approximately $4 million.

In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, the mere fact that the Power Authority have activated interest as one year since the deposit were in proof that the Bank applied the loan as being secured by cash. Whether we say that the funds are hypothecated, assigned, encumbered or what-so-ever is playing with words, Mr. Speaker. We are dealing with the true and final position of the free Reserves of the country.

Mr. Speaker, the Financial Secretary Mr. Bradley Dean have sought to misrepresent this statement by saying that it had to be there or we could not have taken the $2.8m million to transfer to Belmopan for the 1965 Budget. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Financial Secretary in reply to a question in this Meeting has said that funds from Caribbean Development Bank Assistance to Belize Limited amounting to $1m of the Bank were received in late December. If the statement is looked at, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that the way we put it forward, only the monies that we would have that the Reserves would substantially increase. So of course would the National Debt.

It matters little, Mr. Speaker, if the Recurrent Account shows a deficit of $1 million as the Budget said if that Reserve Account is in reality committed to various other purposes or items. It is like saying, if it is perfectly possible, Mr. Speaker, to have a Drawing Account of $1 million and on the other hand have an Advance or Loan Account of $1.5 million. The answer simply is that you do not have a deficient account of $1 million, but your real position is a deficiency of half a million dollars if you have a loan of $1.5 million, particularly if the deposit is used to secure the loan or advance.

The other point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, on the question of Revenue is that the $2.8 million approved by Finance Committee in December was in fact not all spent. It is my understanding that as at the 31st December only $900,000 had been spent on the repayment of Current Liabilities.

SEN. HARRY C. EVANS (CONTINUED): I understand that the payment covered the lease and a payment on account to the city. The other accounts were still being identified at that time. It should be remembered, Mr. President, that whatever bills were given to be paid at that time which necessitated the selling of a Pittman Committee Meeting for the Members' approval were debts or bills which were incurred and left unpaid by the Bailey Cope Government. They were not debts which were incurred by the present Government.

It is also known to many, Mr. President, that while $2.5 million has been budgeted to be taken from Revenue into Recurrent this year, that transfer has not yet taken place. If the year is to be good as I hope it will be, I hope that it will be found unnecessary to make that transfer on the final results. The fact is, Mr. President, that this Government has not yet been able to spend any funds on any new capital projects, and it will not be able to do so until after this budget has been passed. So, Mr. President, any change in the actual surplus of Government between November and the 31st December, 1983, (whether the eliminations incurred by the loan raisers, not by the Government of Nauru.

Mr. President, that is possibly an good a time as any to show that the economy of this territory was in a state of stagnation during 1983, and that is due to a deliberate decision brought on by the policies of the present Government which Government. If we examine the summary of revenue at page 10 of the 1984 estimates we will find that during 1983 imports duty fell short of the budgeted target by $612,000. Taxes also short by $317,000. Licences fell short by $324,000. Sales taxes by $1,880,000. This fall in sales, Mr. President, represents a fall in spending revenue and business profits, and also of wages. Since the wage freeze there. Port fell short by $590,000. Departure taxes were by $34,000 for a total shortfall in projected revenue under these heads of $4,440,000.

Mr. President, if is to be said this all be justified and that under the Hockey Government we have such receipts as bank and trade licences, investment licences, and that is how Government taxes figures can below projected revenue for 1984. In the case of investment licences the figures are below those for 1983.

Similarly under the heading of Fees we find on item Company fees. This again, Mr. President, is below projections and below the actual collections of 1983. Mr. President, these are the areas which were taxed and taxed heavily during the Hilty Team administration, taxes in the pocket, Mr. President, these taxes cannot be raised further without jeopardising the continuance of that business. We must consider, Mr. President, whether the fall in revenue under these items during 1984 is not in fact the evidence to the high taxation placed on these activities by the Hilty Team government.

It does not take a genius to see that if we are to maintain the services at these present levels for our people, there will have to be some form other than those traditionally raised, that is sales, trust and other companies mentioned here. To get a truer picture of the finances in 1984, Mr. President, under the Hilty Team Government we must note that expenditure in 2024 increased $1,34.,656 from surplus and $3,221,096 from Recurrent Revenue for a total of $8,810,157 from Surplus and Revenue, plus $7,063,274 from loans for a total expenditure of $15?4,?56,?31 in increased funds. Yes, Mr. President, a spending spree of $12,152,?31 in increased funds. Yet still the people said, "No", they couldn't have had enough!! Now three months later, Mr. President, these people has the gall to cry so that we must remain in the dark.

MAY. PRICE (Georgia): It should also be clear, Mr. President, why the decision had to be taken this year not to budget for any such item; moreover, necessarily if those loan funds would not be received immediately for some time.

However, Mr. President, that is not the total picture. There is not possibly zero from the figures in that column; $1.2 million was spent during 1964 and charged to Advance Accounts to be applied to specific goods from this year's estimates. This included the payment of $900,000 on behalf of Guyana Airways Limited which I mentioned earlier, Mr. President.

In addition, there is an element of uncommitted capital works carried forward from 1964 estimates to approximately $1.2 million. So, Mr. President, it must be seen quite clearly that it was not an easy task to balance this budget and to select priorities for our capital expenditure. It should also be clear by now, Mr. President, that there was no alternative to raising additional revenue to balance the budget.

These reasons necessary, Mr. President, cannot in my opinion be categorized as acceptable or appropriate. Finances for hotels have not been increased since 1964 and the increases proposed in this budget are quite moderate. The steep duty on a cheque amounts from five to ten cents cannot, Mr. President, be considered burdensome to the masses of ordinary the life-blood and of the little people as I have heard some members say. Again, Mr. President, the discrepancy between is minimal and should not result in increased costs in any case. It certainly will not result in any increased cost to the little people of this country. The increases on liquor licences, Mr. President, are in all fairness aimed only at hotels. The one increase, Mr. President, which has sometimes unfavourable has been mentioned and indeed the increases are so moderate that it will be difficult to pass them on to customers by appreciably rises to individual items on drinks. In the case of a discrepancy the increase is less than 25 per day and with the administrative costs, Mr. President, this is not a great increase. The most is seen for the cocktail, the increase is less than $1 per day. With the hotels to be roughly 50 per cent and so on down the line. Duty on cigarettes, Mr. President is increased by one fifth of one cent per cigarette or four cents per pack. This will undoubtedly be passed on to the consumer, Mr. President, but nonetheless cannot be considered a necessary or single item and the increase is not a large increase.

Regarding the revenue measures, Mr. President, I would also like to point out that the position was applies to our foreign exchange.

Mr. President, there is another function being played by the Electoral Machine for Boards that has not been mentioned which I would like to bring some light on. They are fond of saying that at the end of last the whole exercise charge was 12 per cent of the current revenue. Mr. President, that is not the case. It might be argued that the debt encumbrance if it had all been for from 1970 might have been as much as 12 per cent. I have not had an opportunity to look into that. However, it is that calculation is not right because some have not considered the cost of those used early 1964 when the internal revenue would have been much greater.

They argue, Mr. President, that the 1965 to 1970 Development Loan the terms for them to repay. That is true, Mr. President, but that Government left the country from the projects undertaken by those terms to repay the loans.

MR. SPEAKER: (INTERRUPTION) The Hon. Member for Selkirk-Transcona knows that the question should be directed to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately like so much of what he says, this is not the case. The authority to change cruise ship passengers a landing tax is contained in a bill passed in June, 1979, prior to the utility from going to power. The tax was levied in June, 1980 to take into effect on the 1st January, 1981. It was done in this way to give the cruise ship companies notice so that they could include it in their cruise brochures, and it would take effect after the new dock became operational. Mr. Speaker, from 1981 the revenue from this source was then used to help defray the operating costs of the Winnipeg Harbour Authority and to pay the debt charges. As at the present, Mr. Speaker, as the 30th September, 1984, Government had collected $1,504,765 from this landing tax.

Additionally, up to the end of 1983 the port had made contributions to $7,223,394 to General Revenue over and above the repayment of the loan. Mr. Speaker, between 1977 and 1983 profits from the currency Board transferred to General Revenue amounted to some $8,007,320, whether lumpy from the now-Unity Government.

Some Noble Gesture on the government to the taxpayers seems to be overwhelmingly justifiable. So, Mr. Speaker, it would be safe to say that the harbor regulations by the Lyon-Unity government were reprehensible on many intolerable terms, that is with long assessment periods and low interest rates and with the penalty provisions which could inadequately reimburse the taxpayer, no burden was left on anyone by that Government, or all the country. Mr. Speaker, I could challenge the Unity Government to show just one single unreasonable in their term of office which resulted in a revenue generating project. Above all, Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure which underlined the Unity-Turner economy development was put in place by the 1977 to 1979 Government, not by them. They only were elected, Mr. Speaker, to live on the fruits of others' labours, but would not dissent in such a way as to be of the most benefit to all. Let this tell us that understandings was not of unlimited proportions for all.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most amusing statements which I have heard lately, the winner of this debate was made by the Hon. Member for Selkirk when he said that he was alarmed by the growing prison population, and that he favoured front end-line work for a more form of public service. What I assume he meant to say, Mr. Speaker, was more term of community service. However, Mr. Speaker, the Member must believe that people have been stole Manitoba because it was by and his colleagues who in the Throne Speech of 1977, provided that all such offenders had to go to prison. By subsequent amendments, Mr. Speaker, they legislated minimum sentences for all persons from the normal offences to most drug charges, Mr. Speaker.

This Government has pointed out on page 2 of their book previous speech, Mr. Speaker, that it intends to remove some of the present provisions for mandatory sentences. We intend to provide the courts with wider powers to make community service orders as an alternative to prison sentences where the requirements for community service orders have been set in place. Mr. Speaker, this is regarded as a matter of priority and urgency.

THE SENIOR U. STATES (continuing): Mr. President, the First Elected Member for Roseau South must have been attempting to be unobtrusively funny at this point in his speech, because while he knew we also understood to deplore the present Government on the methods of communicating a new Constitution Agreement as he called it, I presume he means the Independence Treaty which is developed as being negotiated. He said he could sometimes be taken into account was the case when the negotiations went like and all the rest of it. However, Mr. President, I wonder if the First Member just really speaking from experience, because it is my understanding that when he should have gone to London to take part in the first negotiations, he got as far as New York and eventually ended up in Seattle instead of London.

Another point which would be noted here, Mr. President, is that as his colleague the Financial Secretary pointed out that in his opinion there is little evidence of there being any finance industry to phase Dominica today. The need being investigated to look to the tourist trade of the future, in other words, Mr. President, business which flows by sharing the skies of the noisy Concorde/Boeings.

Mr. President, members and the country have no need to fear about the negotiations. We will do as good a job as is humanly possible on them. Above all we will be afraid of good solid advice, Mr. President.

The First Elected Member for Roseau South said that he was right the people were supporting the programme of the last Government at Carib, because in sometimes Dominica did. Mr. President, the member should know that there are no programmes we shall be that successful. Not even the First Elected Member made for that purpose. It is my opinion that we a happy by accident, mostly as a consequence just before election time. It is our intention to achieve the best result possible out of the country, Mr. President, but it will be more after a reasoned and sustainable policy has been established regarding the future. It will not be that policy, Mr. President, to create false or unrealistic hopes in the whole time before of the Government.

Mr. President, in spite of the explanation which I gave regarding the qualifications which was used to explain the connection with the Duty Island Agency, the First Elected Member for Roseau South suggested that I had to accept responsibility for it because I am responsible for all that happens in my Ministry. Mr. President, how about that Member's memory must be. Does he not remember that both he and a former Member in charge of this Ministry discussed all locations of the Cayman Airways' newly acquired Boeing 727 which now put into the service time long years before the elections? They had both been in their responsible Portfolios for approximately eight years and therefore responsibility. However, I am surprised to have all knowledge of my Portfolio after only one week in the office. But misfortune and unreasonable this is, Mr. President.

The same Member said, Mr. President, that the Middle School was a new idea in education to the Dominica citizens introduced by the Mailey Joseph Government. Mr. President, upon that he not so just. The Middle School concept was always a part of the educational system recommended in 1970. If one goes back to the very first report which was done for and accepted by the Government of the day, known as the Williams, Mitchenson Report, we will find that that report included the Middle School concept.

HON. DATUK H. BUJANG (SOUTHWEST): Mr. President, it is perhaps as well that I accept the warning here to try to shock some people back into reality and cause them to realise that the Middle School which was undertaken by the Ulu Ivan Government is not the final and complete answer to our educational needs. We are faced with large capital outlay in the very near future for education, in my opinion, if we are to provide quality education for the children of this beneficiary. For example, Mr. President, the construction of the Middle School has not just been completed and yet the population of that school is already in excess of what was required for it when it was constructed. The Sungai Kua Primary School is very near to capacity in all age groups and already overcrowded in others. Other Malaysian primary schools also need additional classrooms and facilities so, Mr. President, we should reconsider our priorities and ensure that for the foreseeable future there will only be a maintenance school building programme in progress.

The Ulu Ivan Government did not finish or complete the needs in education any more than the Government before them in quite possibly until this one.

One final point on education, Mr. President, is that the First Minister from Ulu Ivan sought for the establishment of the Lighthouse School. Mr. President, that again was started June-1979. The very name signifies its origin. It was started in the Middle Ulu Ivan hall by the Lighthouse in Ocean Bay. So, Mr. President, the Ulu Ivan Area Committee again speaks for that school.

The Ulu Ivan Leader, Mr. President, sought to take credit for the establishment of the medical clinic at the Ulu Ivan Settlement Area. I would just like to remind him, Mr. President, that that came about because of a Private Member's Motion which I brought to this House about two years ago. I do not know why it took two years to until December, 1984, for the facility to be completed.

Mr. President, the Second Minister for Health tried to make it appear during his presentation that less money is budgeted for Social Services this year than was spent last year. That is not so, Mr. President. Last year only $834,581 were spent on Social Services whereas this year it has budgeted $1,861,891, almost twice the actual expenditure in 1985. Mr. President, I too would like to see much more provided under the Social Services vote because I realise that we need more social workers and counsellors out in the field. I realise that we need vocation in the various sports, and we need to give more assistance all around. However, Mr. President, we have to work with what we have.

Medical services have come in for quite a bit of public ranting this debate, Mr. President, but I would censor the Minister by saying that I give to this House my undertaking to make first an inspection of medical services during this term as I did during my first term in this Position. Mr. President, I think I enjoin making Members that when the Jesselton Hospital in 1972, the most that was $15 per day and the total cost of hospital stay including fees and laboratory work and medication was $10. Yet the Duty Team returned. Today, Mr. President, thanks to the fee increases instituted by the Duty Team Government early last year, the Trinity people of this country are now paying $50 per day for a room and a ward to the tune can cost up to a total of $75, depending on the investigation treatment. Sometimes an admission to that room is for any medication.

HON. HARRY S. ESKINE (CONTINUED): I would like to remind Members, Mr. President, that the large crowds of parking people in front, on or near shopping malls which exist solely for the collection of fees are intended simply for that administrative purpose. It is not a tool employed by this administration, or instituted in this administration. However, Mr. President, in spite of all of that we did not create people to work, now do we intend to do so. We are more responsible than that and, Mr. President, we do not suffer from anything fewer.

Mr. President, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town asked to see the first price in the Financial Secretary's speech that 130 condominiums were registered in 1982 as compared to 70 in 1983, he also said that 1982 was a good year for condominium development. However, Mr. President, the Financial Secretary said 130 condominiums were registered, not built. Those 130 condominiums could have been built at any time and they do not in any way reflect activity in the building trade during 1982. If one refers to the planning permissions one will see the true story where the rates of development do show dramatically.

Further, Mr. President, the 130 condominiums which were registered did not in any way reflect upon what could have been collected from the 4 per cent condominium tax which was enacted in December last year, because that 4 per cent tax was collectable at the time of the approval of the planning permission for the condominium project, and not at the time of the registration of individual units being developed.

Mr. President, it is true that during the campaign people of West Bay were told that many offices would be made to get them a fire station, and that promise will be kept, Mr. President. West Bay will have its fire station. It will also get the Lucaya jetty and hopefully room in the prisons, Mr. President.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town is quoting his comments on the motor consumption registration now being published for the necessity of the public understood the regulations to say that there would be no fees flowing from Members to South Sound and would be the effect that someone who stated to obtain a green from the Commissioner of West Bay would be heavily penalized. Truly, Mr. President, that Member knows better than that. As has been said, those regulations as published were done some time in July. Mr. President, one fact is that this finding of permission from members is a point unascertainable up to the public hearing since the West Bay Road, so the serious risk of investment in West Bay is a blue thinking area. So there is no question of anybody having penalized for buying in order a green or the Shedrow in West Bay.

Moreover, having said that, Mr. President, I would hasten to add that the staff from the Portfolio have been going from district to district explaining comments on the regulations, and it would be my explanation to see what changes made to the regulations as a result of those comments. As I said Mr. President, those charts which are being used, I understand were an enclosure from 1982 and I would be very happy to answer a statement from the First Elected Member for Bodden Town that he thought it was time that we have three months notice in prison. It would serve to me that if we really discovered with them he would have done something to change them within that time. It is my understanding, Mr. President, that nothing was done because the opportunity did not exist to alter to the regulations unfortunately at that time.

HON. EDWARD P. MORRIS (CONTINUED): Mr. President, the Floor Leader for Bodden Town also said that it was his opinion that if the present Executive Council made the regulations under the Marine Conservation Law, the public would likely be prohibited from entering in the area. As far as I am concerned the only time when the rights of the Caymanian people is going to be taken away, Mr. President, was when Government property known as the Mr. Hirst property was sold by the Duty Free Government to build condominiums. It is my understanding that this land was sold to be used by a Member of Government included. It was said, Mr. President, that that land was sold for Caymanians to settle on, but it proved very suitable for condominium development once it had left Government's hands.

Mr. President, the Floor Leader for Bodden Town also said that a new development plan is now due. I wonder why this Member did not give this motion which was put on the 1977 development plan from that was not brought to this House. If he was so concerned about the development plan being revised, Mr. President, why did he not do something about it? The revision was due from 1982. I am suggesting, Mr. President, that he was quite happy to allow the revision of that plan to which would affect wholesale.

MR. SPEAKER: We have reached 6.30 p.m. and unless the Member proposes to finish speaking within the next minute or two, I think we should move the adjournment.

HON. GEORGE A. HAIG: I would be finished in five or ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think Standing Orders would permit me to override quite that much latitude.

I think that we will move the adjournment. If Members will feel that you should be allowed to continue for ten minutes no doubt they will vote against adjourning now.

We will move the adjournment and maybe they will vote against it, in which case you suspend Standing Orders to allow the Member to continue for ten minutes. I do not think I have that much latitude under Standing Orders.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any Member wish to speak? Question is the same as a Member to suggest that instead of adjourning we continue for ten minutes, if any Member objects to do that.

HON. GEORGE HAIG: Mr. President, the Member has criticized that he would speak about the Marine Laws. We have been on this Bill for a second Reading time and I think if we can get one speech out of the way then afterwards both Members have an idea if we should do so.

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Mr. President, that is so, but we have an Executive Council Meeting to attend after this which might take us a long time.

MR. SPEAKER: That only affects certain Members. Does any other Member wish to comment?

MR. W. MACKAY JONES: I think we had better finish now, Sir. I have a recommendation that I would like to make. Besides that I might like the First Elected Member to be here...

MR. G. GUIDO QUEREZ: On a point of order, Mr. President, this Member must stand up when he is addressing the Chair.

MR. PRESIDENT: He is absolutely no more.

MR. F. HOWARD ROSE: Yes, Sir. I realized that would have got to him, Mr. President. He has been keeping quiet all afternoon making his plans. He has come now to take us!...

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order.

MR. F. HOWARD ROSE: I am recommending the Honourable First Elected Member of Belize District to carry on tomorrow morning. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I will put formally the question that this House do now adjourn. It is there is a majority against that I would suppose what a separate question be put that we continue for ten minutes or so.

The question is that this House do now adjourn.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 4.55 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, 26TH MAY, 1971.

[illegible] MEETING OF THE [illegible] SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

[illegible]

[illegible]

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR G [illegible], CMG, OBE - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS M [illegible], CMG,OBE,JP	FINANCIAL SECRETARY, MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL A [illegible], QC, JP	LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR SOCIAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS E [illegible], JP	SENIOR EXECUTIVE MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON DENNIS M [illegible]	MEMBER FOR HUMAN EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M MICHAEL [illegible], MBE	MEMBER FOR [illegible] AVIATION AND PORTS
HON CAPT CHARLES E [illegible]	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND [illegible] ADMINISTRATION
HON MARGARET D [illegible], CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MCKEEVA BODEN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MR CLIFFORD A [illegible], JP	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT MARRY M MYRTLEWHITE	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF LESSER ISLANDS
MR D MARCO BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D RICHARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JULIAN D MCCOY	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

CROSS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE FIRST SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
MANITOBA
30TH MARCH, 1965

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE SPEECH FROM AND
SECOND READING OF THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CONTINUATION OF THE OPENING ON THE CHOSEN SPEECH AND ADDRESS

Hon. Steven D. Stucke 1

Mrs. D.D. Stotter 3

Rev. T.C. Hoffbeck 9

ADJOURNMENT 22

WEDNESDAY

30TH MARCH, 1966

10.00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. The First Elected Member of Executive Council.

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON THE MOTION ENTITLED AND THE BUDGET ADDRESS

HON. HERBERT O. FRANCIS (CONTINUING): Mr. President, the Members from Bonavista Bay, knowing the fact that she by-pass road behind Goddels Cove do not provided for in these Estimates, and accordingly to them, it is a dire necessity.

Mr. President, I am left to wonder if this road was so essential why the Members did not see to it during their term of office.

The matter of the interest to be received on deposits during 1965 has been mentioned and the Second Elected Member for Bonavista Bay sought to use this fact that we have in fact getting a considerable amount of money as interest on deposits, to show or to sustain his argument that meant that a large free balance was left on revenue account.

Mr. President, whether an undertaking has been given not to withdraw the deposits or not, would not stop the interest from accruing on deposits....

MR. O. WADE BOWDEN: I rise on a point of explanation, Mr. President, under Standing Order 34(2).

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member has given way, as you may. I think it is Standing Order 34(1)(b) under which you should rise. Standing Order 34(2) is if the Member speaking declines to give way. The Member has given way. So, under Standing Order 34(1)(b) you are rising to misinform some matter.

MR. O. WADE BOWDEN: Mr. President, the Member is misleading the House. I did not say that the interest showed that there were free balances. I said that the interest of $800,000 showed that we had to have substantial reserves and if we used the current interest rate of 4 per cent we would need to have $20 million in cash to earn $800,000 in interest, and if the interest rate was 10 per cent we would need $8 million. I did not say that it proved that the reserves were unencumbered. I said that it proved that reserves were there, which he is maintaining are not there.

MR. HERBERT O. FRANCIS: Mr. President, if the Member had waited maybe he would have had his question answered.

Mr. President, the point I am making is that interest to be received will not come along from reserves. During the year there will be times when surplus funds will have been collected and when they are not needed they will naturally be put on deposit, so interest will come from that source. It does not necessarily reflect a fixed amount of money throughout the year on deposit. For example, Mr. President, the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council in response to a question during this meeting pointed out that up to the end of February over $10 million had been collected for the year and surely some of this money is on deposit, while it is not needed, gathering interest.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think....

HON.EDWARD O.BRANCH (CONTINUING): Third Official Member, Mr. President. Sorry about that.

Sir, Mr.President, I am sure that that money would not be left as free balances in any bank - it would be placed on interest. So the point I am making is, Mr.President, that there is no almost noticeable balance that amount above for interest to be collected and a fixed routine of payment account during the year.

Mr.President, the Member from Golden Town also said that the future of the country looked black, dark and disheartening. But nothing could be further from the fact, Mr. President. That was the case up until a few months ago, but the future of the country looks good at this moment. Several large building projects are scheduled to start in the next couple of months which will stimulate employment in the construction industry and this will create an upswing in the economy generally and the most encouraging thing about these developments, Mr. President, is that they include, for example, one large hotel which will provide employment for many Bahamians once it is finished and put into operation. The initial most concern all Bahamians at this time, that is, the future employment opportunities for Bahamians and this, to my knowledge, is the first hotel project to come forward in several years and hopefully all will go well and we will find employment for many Bahamians as a result of this undertaking.

Mr.President, as regards the few revenue measures which have been put forward in this budget, I believe them to be necessary and not repressive to the general public, but should this view be wrong, Mr.President, I am man enough to admit my error and I am sure that all Members of Executive Council are large enough or big enough to admit their error, if, by experience we find that any of these measures have, in fact, worked more detrimental effects on the public than we anticipate and we would do whatever is necessary to correct the situation.

But, Mr.President, it does no good to the country to have people going around, stirring up the people unnecessarily. In my District, for example, Mr. President, people are being told that Hotel Corporation is being increased by $50 in this Session and that it will now cost $550 to go to the Capital. Mr.President, these great sums not been touched - there has been no increase nor are any increases contemplated in these areas.

When will these irresponsible people stop trying to stir up the populace unnecessarily, Mr. President?

The Unity Team tried every trick in the book to win the election in November, 1967, Mr. President. They brought in the Colonels; they used an unfortunate patriotism and they opened the Airport Terminal Building prematurely, now they are at it again. However, Mr.President, it is my opinion that all the king's horses and all the king's men will not put Unity together again.

The revenue measures have been dubbed penny-ante measures - if this is so, Mr.President, but in the next breath can these Honourable be so oppressive to the little man?

At the same time, Mr.President, the Unity Team Government, only last year, effected several increases in the necessaries, namely in cents - postages were raised from 3¢ to 5¢ locally, air mail was raised from 20¢

HON. ANTHONY G. ZUCKERMAN(CONTINUED): to 414 and 259 to 354 - so these people are speaking with forked tongues.

During their term, Mr.Speaker, petrol tax was increased from $2 to $10, car licences and drivers' licences were increased - duty on alcohol, wine,beer and cigarettes were increased....

MR.SPEAKER SAYING: Mr.President, again, under Standing Order 24 (5) - our Ministers have mentioned on 253 a score from 1975 which the Member put them up: before he left - we have minor changes that. Why do he misleading the House?

HON.DENNIS O.SMITH: Mr.President, to carry on, duty was also increased by 5¢ a gallon on gasoline; hospital fees were increased; work permit fees were increased and I as Deputy, Mr. President, just right every possible tax and fee was increased at some stage during their administration, so I do not know why it is so much o ask to make a few increases during this budget.

The areas we have sought to raise our revenue from, Mr.President, were thought to be those that would be least burdensome on the average person. We could not return to the days of taxing basic and essential items - the fact on them now to the point where any increase would make their deductions unacceptable and we would have more than we could gain.

The conversation of bounds was mentioned, Mr.President and there was charge of nepotism. Mr.President, I ask only say that in appointing Members to the Board an esteemed ability and if these persons appointed happened to be relations of Members of Government that is purely coincidental, Mr.President. It is impossible to have the whole of the Cayman Islands on the Boards. There are other good people out there who could have done a good job and possibly others have still come on Later Boards, but in appointing the present Boards, Mr. President, we did what we thought to be right. It was not based on political considerations or family ties, as was suggested.

Mr.President, with those remarks, I support the Appropriation Bill, 1986.

MR.SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Hon'ble Official Member.

HON.A.B.FOSTER: Mr.President, I would like to congratulate you on a fantastic and complete Throne Speech which was so ably delivered. I would also like to congratulate the Financial Secretary on his Budget Address.

Mr.President, nobody knows better than I how much hard work some put into this Speech and Address. The Budget, Sir, is a right one and I sincerely hope that when Finance Committee goes into it further it that they will not attempts to do any more cutting or any more additions.

We heard from the Hon'ble Elected Member of Bodden Town how much cutting had been done in the Recurrent Expenditure which was quite true and I sincerely hope that no attempt will be made to cut any more.

Mr.President, as I have said before, a lot of hard work was put in to this Budget Address and in a short time and I would like to congratulate the Financial Secretary and his staff for all the hard work that they have done on this, Sir.

HON'BLE S.SINGH (CONTINUING): Mr.President, I do not intend to get into any political fights but there are a few general matters which I must deal with.

Mr.President, the Cayman Islands have a unique economy - an economy based on tourism and the financial industry. An economy that you would not find in many of the other West Indian Islands. A dependable economy, Mr. President - a steady economy. However, the industry has to pay careful attention to their operations because one problem and the whole industry can be lost - it is disturbing, Mr.President. It is unsafe. The Department of Government is very demanding and they must keep pace with proper staffing and proper organizations, etc.

The financial industry, Mr.President, requires plenty of services from the Government. If we did not have the financial industry our Registry of Companies would not be such a big Department; if we were not in insurance, we would need an Insurance Inspector and staff; if we were not in the banking business we would need a Banking Inspector and staff - these are services which the Government must provide otherwise the economy could collapse.

The industries in the outside are developing and they want things in a hurry, and they want things immediately done. As a result, Mr.President, our Civil Service has to be unique in order to service the industries outside there.

Now, Mr.President, we have heard several comments about the size of the Civil Service and I would like to bring to the attention of Members of this House a few facts that relate to the size of the service.

I think the total posts established is around 1217 of which the Police Department have 287. Now, Mr.President, this number is necessary because when the British Defence Force left the Caribbean, the West Indies, all responsible men were given notice that we had to upgrade our Police Force to handle any internal problems.

Again, in our unique economy, the Police force plays a great part, in commercial crime and other operations.

Education - 275. Education is comparatively young in the Cayman Islands - it has only been in the last 20 years that we have attempted to upgrade our education system to take our men from the axe and put them behind desks. This has not been easy to persuade the seventeen year old boys , to leave the sea or not to go to sea and try to get an education. But, since God the economy of the world took care of that, because tourism and shipping dropped to virtually nothing. So we were able to muster persuasion our youngsters to go to school.

Mr.President, we cannot neglect education here,Sir - this is our lifeline for the future and although the amount seems big we still see the results in years to come. We cannot expect to see results in a year or so, because even they have gone through our system here, if again we can persuade them and if they have the capability, to go on to further education, it is still another five or six years. When they do come back, they need the practical experience, so it is going to be a long while yet before we can see how many of the senior assignments in the top management will Caymanians.

Thirdly, Sir, is our Personal Health Service - 186. Another section which we have tried very hard to improve, with more modern equipment, therapeutic people have to be trained to use them and to improve the service as a whole.

MR. E. FOSTER (CONTINUED): You, Mr. President, these three counts for 622 more than half an hour short half of the total service. You can hardly now cheat the Senate of such is not surprised in any way.

Right on this morning this time they are asking for - Five Minutes to vote for a five minutes on Quorum Call. Whatever we approve these things we must bear in mind that additional staff will be needed.

There are many other Departments that I could consider not represented by any means.

Mr.President, on the 15th of this month we had on payroll 2198 Civil Servants, five hundred and seventy of them Typewriters, 478 secretaries; the 770 Commissions representing 35 per cent. We must be economical or 3 per cent of the authorized amount.

Estimates received in the 1965 budget was 200.85 million but this included a capital element of some million and Statutory obligations, pensions, Police and Canteens pensions,etc. amounting to $21,000 and $16,000 respectively, giving a total of $37 - million. Expected Revenues of about (31.1 million, have previously which amount for about 21.2 million and went be received back from rent about $820,000, totalling $28.5 million, less pensions,etc. at $142,000 and $70,000. Leaving the actual Expected Revenues at around $28.3 million. Thus Mr. President, of the 31.1 million waters accounts, is about 27.7% of the actual revenue and I would be wrong, but I believe sometimes around 1961 or 1962 the former Financial Secretary said that Personal Emoluments was about higher part of the actual revenue. So, Mr.President, it would seem to me that we are already in the right direction to have dropped down a bit.

Mr.President, the Minister from North Side suggested and I and I think, I would not be opposed to that but I would like to hear in reply to him a question to find a decision on the Motion now -

> "Since have been paid for job satisfaction and knowledge and without corruption, how sometimes members of the Government departments into these can feels have shown that the number is just a waste for that job".

Mr President, sir, Mr Speaker. Some one asked you we still have time to remember on 8 and 9 steps. We have enough expenses on the agenda to withdraw those studies or to make the necessary changes rather than to waste money on a report who is going to come here and tell how wrongly that has been.

The hon Member, Mr.President, talked about baby, why children or people and then he went on to talk about a Semi-Circle. In the 1964 Estimates Report, many many allowances were taken away, even our 5% ; myself telephone allowance which I pay until Government get the token back. Now Mr.President, if you take away my home then you will really have the Semi-Circle.

Mr.President, as has happened since the past few years, we have already tried to have our Civil servants, as primary affect to have more pay and we thought should be given [illegible] these problems, even now today, Mr.President was mentioned. I was just when the Civil Servants should accommodate their leave for the old

MR.S.P.FOSTER (CONTINUED): months and I am sure the former Financial Secretary will remember that. Now the maximum leave is 28 days.

Mr. President, it has been a hard, hard job trying to explain people, Supervisors, from the private sector to think in the service and anything that would discourage those that we have got back from staying must not be thought of.

Mr.President, any qualified Supervisor can get a job in the Government provided there is a vacancy. What we have no qualified Supervisor we have no other choice than to take those who are already connected to Government or who are entrepreneurs.

At this stage, I would like to thank the Second Elected Member of Executive Council, whom I did not have the privilege of hearing here on Friday, as I was absent, but I took time off last night to listen to the broadcast. I would like to thank him for his views about the Civil Service. He did not say anything that was untrue.

Mr.President, the radio and media can be the most wonderful help in a country or it can be the most discouraging thing in the country. We, over many years of thought, have Radio Cayman take place and I am not saying from a moment Mr.President that it is perfect, but it compares favourably with the radio in other West Indian territories. I do not think that I could understand or agree with the suggestion from the Elected Member from North Side that it be put out to a statutory Board and be out on its own, managed by a Board and, as he said, "but the politics from be gone".

Mr.President, I do not believe in subsidising anything when it is working good. Radio Cayman has practically been built up to where it is paying its way and putting a little money in the Treasury for the last few years, and Mr.President, I would say it would be very dangerous thing to privatise it. Radio Cayman is owned and operated by the Government, non-political and out of the whole staff, there are only two expatriates - let me have that clear.

Mr.President, on Monday afternoon, the Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council said, and I quote, Mr.President, it will be noted that in the Recurrent Expenditure that not a penny, $200, played any part in this increase. I asked someone if they knew why the increase, that large increase of salary was given to the top echelon of the Civil Service in 1992 and the reply was in nature for parliamentary purposes. I suppose, Mr.President, that in any there is no need for elected members such explanations will become only one side of the coin once again.

Mr.President, I do not know who the someone was that he asked, but I would let him know why the increases in salaries was given, and Mr.President, I quote the first part of the Salaries Review -

> "There are two main categories of Civil Service salaries in Cayman - the common price index, the private sector salary movement".

And, Mr.President, I would like also to quote from this Member's Maiden address of 1988 on the Civil Service,

MR.D.E.CESTAT (GOVERNMENT): Because of the rise in inflation as highlight by the Cost-of-Living index, Civil Servants will be awarded a compensating salary increase in 1989 if the proposal is approved by this Honourable House. A constant review of Civil Service wage structure is necessary in view of the movement in the economy which may well have similar adverse effects as in the period prior to the present moratorium when many Civil Servants switched to the private sector because of better wages. With the present inherent economic position which may very well continue on a rapid growth over the next few years, Government could be faced with the problem again of losing some of its good staff to the private sector. It is therefore in the best interest to ensure that a wide disparity does not develop between the wage structure of Government and that of the private sector'.

Mr.President, that was just what was happening, Sir. If the increase had not been given we might have had no service today.

Regarding the party that Member spoke, indication to me that the three Official Members were bought by the four Elected Members of Executive Council. Mr. President, I have worked with the Member all my life and he should know that I cannot be bought. Let me assure the Member that he has been completely and ridiculously misled. How could he believe such a thing, Mr.President? Furthermore, the motorbike rumour was done and the cannot make long before the Preliminary Recording Bill even came to Executive Council. I hope the Member will not put this type of thought to the Legislature again.

Mr.President, I think at this time I would like to sound a bell of warning. God has blessed this country - so have prosperous for the last 40 years. I have worked with Members for the past 17 years and more directly after I became Chief Secretary, with the Members of the Legislative Assembly and Executive Council, for the past 8 years. All have worked hard - if they did not work so would not be in the position that we are today.

We can be proud of our Islands - we have made strides of progress in the last 30 years. We have good roads, we have good schools and facilities; we have good medical services; we have good shipping facilities for both Islands, we have good airports, airstrips and one good hospital. We hope to get the other one later this year. Good telephone and telex services - all of the infrastructure that a country needs and a good service is here.

The Third District Member in his address said that this should be a year for talking about and I agree with him, Mr.President, and we must take it altogether. This has been a long sitting session, possibly the longest session of this House in history - there have been many embarrassing questions - many embarrassing statements and, Mr.President, I hope that all Members have got the frustration fought out of their system and that from now on every Member of this House will work together for the betterment of the people and the country and with one common goal.

Mr.President, what we have here today did not come by itself, it came through a lot of hard work, and co-operation from the people and all those concerned. In my estimation, Mr.President, we have not scratched the surface yet, but if we continue on the trend and with the attitude that has been displayed during this meeting, we are going to face down-fall. We will go right down, but if we co-operate and work hand in hand with one another I do not know where we will ever stop.

HON. E.R.POSTLETHWAITE: Because the people do just hearing about us - Just Monday we met and the good members that we differ and there is no doubt in my mind that we can get more Members in the coming years

Mr.Speaker, the Opposition people are full of pride and I know that they would like to see this House working in harmony with each other. Now that they are able to have speeches, sometimes, on the radio, I can only say from the feedback that I have got the public is very upset. I ask Members, Mr. Speaker, to please - nowhere let me ask questions that are worthy of a good member - but do make speeches that will encourage our public.

Mr.Speaker, I support the Appropriation Bill, 1995.

MR.SPEAKER: Any other Member wish to speak? Then I will invite the Mover to exercise his right of reply if he wishes.

HON.P.C.SPEIGHT: Yes, Mr.Speaker, thank you very much.

Mr.Speaker, I join other Honourable Members of this House in congratulating you on your Maiden Speech, Sir

I am grateful for the kind words of Honourable Members on the Budget Address. Just lastly on step with the Hon. Official Member I think I, too, would like to clear some concerns off by where he said.

Mr.Speaker, as I listened to the debate on Monday, there was so many shots taken at me for some time I thought I was an Elected Member on the Opposition side, and I thought the Fourth Elected Member of Council had confused me as such.

On Monday, Mr.Speaker, as I listened to the Fourth Elected Member of Council, I was not sure myself whose Budget this was. He said it is not his Budget, and I think he went on to say it was not the Budget of the Elected Members of Government, but Mr.Speaker, the Third, Second and First Elected Members of Council, who, maybe confused, did not give that impression to me at all. I was left with the impression, Mr.Speaker, that the 1995 Budget is without any of it belongs to the Official Members. But, Mr.Speaker, when the matter is pressed to me, I do not mind at any time to say what the position is on my side.

The 1995 Budget does not contain provisions of $1.3 million to cover sums on the Advance Accounts, because, included in this figure is for the $750,000 for Capital Projects which are approved by Finance Committee to be placed on an Advance Account. Therefore, Mr.Speaker, who are to be carried against the 1995 Budget, that is the Advance, is approximately $550,000.

The 1995 Budget does include ongoing projects from 1994 of approximately $3.4 million. Some of the projects is to be funded in this way, Mr.Speaker, are Stanley Civic Centre, the Mare Harbour Airport Terminal Building, Prison Buildings, School Buildings at the Mitre School Complex, Sports Complex, Water and Sewerage and $200,000 for Office Furniture for offices at the House, Income Administration Buildings, and new Terminal Buildings at the Airport.

HON. T.C. ASSEMBLYMAN (CONTINUING): Since on-going projects, Mr. President, are really nothing new. If it was not for the on-going projects, perhaps the staff of Public Works would have to be laid off every four years.

Mr. President, some members talked about the Capital Expenditures being cut in half. Capital Expenditure carried forward on any year is the amount of work that can be financed by revenue, borrowing to some extent, through our general revenues and taxes. In the last years the total budgeted Capital Expenditure, for example, 1982, was $21.2 million. In 1981, when we had so much cash to spend, Mr. President and the Revenue was coming in much beyond the budgeted figures, it was $31.1 million, and during the years of moderate growth 1982 and 1983, because we had accumulated the cash, Mr. President, we were able to do capital works of $18.6 million in 1982 and $19 million in 1983. But included in the $18 million in 1983, Mr. Speaker, is $2.4 million of borrowing.

When the Government has sufficient revenue we can do many projects. However, when the revenue is not available to do $13 million dollars' worth of capital works we can only do what the revenue can afford and, Mr. President, if we depart from this policy we are headed on the road of destruction, in my view.

As the Financial Secretary of this Government, Mr. President, it is my policy now to put forward an unbalanced budget and as long as I stand here, Mr. President, or sit here, I am not going to budge an inch from this position of unbalanced budget.

Mr. President, the many comments on the short-fall during the implementation stage of the budget of $17.7 million is also nothing new. I have been in Finance and Development for 12 years and I remember very clearly when the previous Financial Secretary, as the acting Governor, raised his hands out to balance the budget. We must keep in mind that it is not only the Honourable Members of this House who hear demands from the public; those kinds of Departments who have been talked about, Mr. President, deal with these demands every working day of the year, and their budget proposals seek to deal with these demands. The public, in my view, Mr. President, quite rightly expect to get more and more services without looking into consideration where the revenue is going to come from to finance these additional services that they are requesting.

The Heads of Departments, Mr. President, cannot have been very responsive to my request to trim the budget, during my short term as Financial Secretary and I am very grateful to them for it.

In the final analysis, Mr. President, the increase in the 1985, recurrent expenditure over the 1984, position as set at page 58 indicates that an additional sum of $2.8 million dollars, but $2.7 million dollars of it is Personnel Emoluments costs. Now I have just as we were talking about the approved budget for 1984, compared to what is to be approved here for 1985, and that the revised figures include a part of this $2.7 million, but figures do not lie, Mr. President, if we look at the figure approved for 1984 against what is to be approved in 1985, the Personnel Emoluments section is $2.7 million. The increase is $2.7 million, which means, Mr. President, that the Heads of Departments have managed their other charges into $971,000 below the 1984, figure and I think this course is commendable in my view.

MRS.P.C.GEORGACAS: (CONTINUING): Mr.President, there were also some comments about the Currency Board, amendment of the Currency Fund - there is no answer about (i) section 4 of the Currency Law lays down the statutory conditions and requirements for the Currency Board to follow when dealing with the investments of the Currency Fund, and as explained in the Budget Address, $7.3 million is invested in U.S. Treasury Bonds and as Honourable Members are aware, these bonds are guaranteed by the United States Government. The remaining funds are placed on fixed deposits with local banks in Grand Cayman and in the United Kingdom.

Another item, Mr.President, dealing with the currency and notes, a point was made that I had suggested that it was my intention to recommend the issue of a fifty dollar note by the Currency Board and Government. That is correct, Mr. President, it is my intention. A general guide for changing that notes is what when one has notes around 80 or 75 per cent of the currency notes in circulation a new denomination should be considered and issued.

Mr.President, on Monday as well, the Fourth Elected Member of Council spoke, and he was joined by the First Official Member earlier, and I would not want to be repetitive, I can state it is clear in the minds of the listening public at this time, but I would only resolve my comments by saying that quoting one part of it - "I asked someone if they knew why the increase, that large increase of salary was given to the top echelon of the Civil Service in 1984 and the reply was in return for a parliamentary pension". He went on to say "I suppose,Mr. President, that is why there has been so much heated debate over the Pensions Bill because only one side of the coin was off".

Mr.President, I am also, like the First Official Member, I do not know who that member is, who replied the Fourth Elected Member in such a way, but it is an indication that the Official Members and perhaps other Senior Members, were part of a deal to get their weighted and well-deserved increases.

Mr.President, I have been running my Riding Remarkably for the past 27 years and I can hold my head high and I can go to sleep each night knowing that my conscience is clear - there is not one person in this world who can produce any evidence that will say that Tom Jefferson took one cent - not one, Mr.President.

I worked in the early days of my life on ships, sailing around the world, for three and a half years; I have served two years in the United States Army; I have spent eight years of my life working in the Post Office in the accounting field as a little recruiting clerk, all the way up to Manager of the accounting section. I am not bragging, Mr. President, it is not my policy to brag about what I have done, but I think this is worth mentioning. And taking all these points into consideration and the number of people I have come across in my life and the number of businesses dealings that I have had in the Cayman Islands. There is no one, Mr.President, who can in this world can say 'I bought Tom Jefferson', and I worked with this Member for the last 14 years. He could not buy me and neither can anybody else.

I have served this Government, Mr. President for almost 14 years and I am pleased to have the opportunity of serving my people; I hope the Good Lord blesses my health to perhaps give another fourteen.

I have some declaration to my people, Mr.President, I have some views about where Caymen should go, and I had Christian parents, Mr.President, who taught me principles.

Mr.President: Those principles I have by and
remember which are by, but I am sure, Mr.Secretary, that as long
as I am sitting in any office, whether it be Government or whether
it be private sector, no one during my life-time will be able to
orient a finger and augment or with guidance, that I was brought.
I am not for sale, Mr.Secretary, there is no price - there is no
price.

Mr.President, Angelo has
proof of any wrongdoing by any Cook Islands. I ask him to pro-
duce it, and if he does not have any proof, I ask him to be
quiet, and not to try to damage the good names of other people.
I like openly welcome to criticise politely reasonably anyone, and
more particularly, Cook Islanders because we cannot as Cook
Islanders, all of them, have a big footsteps.

I would like to underscore, Mr.
Secretary, that as long as I am present in this House, I will
defend the Cook Islands Party when wrong action, whether by
members or otherwise. You know, Mr.Secretary, some people do
not know how good they have it. Like some of us escape the
Cayman Islands Cook Islands with one dollar in the pocket, and
I would suggest that at the end of the session we will go all
enlightened and we should all congratulate each other.

Now I know, Mr.President that the
Prime Official Member quoted figures from a newspaper article,
but I would just like to quote the figures from the 1986 Estimates.
The total number of Cook Islands in employment for 1986 was
1239 and, Mr.Secretary, if we were to deduct the Cook Islands
in the Police, Education and Health Departments, that is, in
those Departments, the number would be reduced to 849 Cook Islands
for the whole of Government.

While we are all saying and
just to ensure this Government does not become the enemy of the
people, or all the boys at the middle, we must all bear in mind
as well that the kind of service as indicated by the Prime
Official Member, that we are offering to the international world
and to the public of the Cayman Islands, requires a good deal of
money. Any why the Registrar of Companies does not suggest to
an attempt to register a company within a short period of time,
because the international companies like to take the aftermost
flight, you hear a lot about it. You hear it until you get
tired of hearing it.

Mr.President, the Fourth Elected
Member of Council indicated that we should not incur recklessly
our public debt. And no another statement be made we simply are
here under-pinned our public debt and this by there I will
agree that the penalty of the colonel to the U.S. is $3.00 - Mr.
President, unfortunately, I cannot agree with the Member because
the Public Debt is not valued at $3.00 - it is valued at the
Cayman Islands to the pound Sterling, and my financial secretary
Mr.President, I am just passing it so it is in the Estimates)
does not allow me to say or to agree with the substance of the
statements that he made on the Public Debt.

Another statement be made, Mr.
President, and I hope I am not speaking too wrong, that I was not
to blame because my Statement Paper had criticised me. Mr.President,
my Staff bring matters to my attention for a decision and on other
occasions I issue instructions to my staff. My staff sometimes
forget to me and I appreciate that lapse. They have, in my view,
worked on many occasions, Sir, as they say, the call of duty
without any remuneration whatsoever. But, Mr.President, I am

[illegible] equally logical to them, was this decision to restore the Public Debt ceiling and I have full responsibility for it, because I believed the circumstances would be quite still there that is the right thing to do.

Mr.President, allow me to make a question - which is the proper responsibility procedure - is it to authorize the amount of the Royal Stocking loan or to decide that it shall expend money, using the term loosely as Sir Donaldson, 1965? Perhaps, Mr.President, by looking at borrowing authority. And can you explain a re-examination account in a more accounting system. The balance sheet might consider that even Privatization. Public Debt is not a quick term but a legal mixed of paper transactions that accurately mirror of money.

Before some misunderstanding arises, Mr.President, under the account or expenditure outside a somewhat like of accounting system, I re-emphasize account would have been met, but in my view, and looking my point of implying under an accounting system you cannot get up a Re-Privatization account. Also be assured, Mr.President, and again I say, in my view, to do else the Index of Public debt is the borrowing entitled in the loan agreement and to other things (some using the term Public Debt) of both parties.

- Then we re-examine what we have done, Mr.President, we find that the difference in the privatization is approximately $1.4 million, and I found my discussion on the Royal Stocking because it is one that is worker to explain. There are other issues in other countries, where that U.S.dollars this is why we assume it's a difference of $1.4 million. In Government accounts for the first time will show the finest public debt in Commonwealth, less expenditure the borrowing between and other figures after work given-and explanations from various bodies who have made the loans. Consultation was discussed with the Auditor General also outside and spoken and but in objection and further reinforced that Public Debt should be shown in borrowed.

Mr.President, it should be finished in a few minutes, there is only one financial security in this Commonwealth I think it is fair that Members should show some support for the poor, even if they do not like the person who is presently holding the post, Mr.President, and as I mentioned earlier, I stand by my principles and my Christian principle taught me and the expertise which I have acquired through the academic process and although the school of hard knocks.

Mr.President, I do not consider making accusation of this kind, but I am only human. If I am criticised you can be certain, Mr.President, I can defend or explain.

Mr.President, on a more general and possible note, these salaries are, in my view, on the generously used, but if we are not careful our politicians, as we have heard during the last 10 or 15 days, and perhaps even further back, will be the only financially and create the instability that we have been speaking about for the last 20 years. And Mr.President, I do not believe there is anyone in this House who is going to disagree with me that if the stability goes so goes everything else.

Mr.President, I begin at the early stage of my speech, by saying that I would take up what the First

MOV. U.S. [illegible]: Official Reader said in the speech- that he - I hope that all of us here and outside will get out of our system, shrug off our chest, and Mr. President,, I am prepared to let bygones be bygones, and let us get on with running this country, because if we get involved with politics, we are not going to have any time to run the country.

Mr. President, I would like that you have been patient with me and I thank you very much.

I am reminded by my learned colleague, that I am to propose that this will be read a second time.

QUESTION PUT: Whether Bill be read a second reading.

HON. PRESIDENT: The Motion is that a Bill entitled A Bill for a Law to appropriate certain additional sums for the purpose of the financial year 2015, be read a second time. Will those in favour please say aye, those against no. The Ayes have it.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 83, paragraph 3, the Appropriation Bill has already committed to the Finance Committee, and hereby observe that Members I feel that the Finance's normal procedure at this stage has been for the adjournment to be moved by the Minister of Finance for the House to be adjourned to a date and time to be notified by the Clerk. Now to be so, the adjournment has been, until Finance Committee has completed the examination of the estimates and the Appropriation Bill and until the staff of the House have had the opportunity to put together the report of the Finance Committee and the House has resolved to order for the report of the Finance Committee to be taken and for the Finance Bill to be read a third time and then the remaining business has been proceeded with.

So I would caution that the House will right to follow the normal practice and shall revise the Minister Official Member to move the adjournment accordingly now.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. U.D.Pillay: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House to a date and time to be advised by the Clerk.

HON. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House be now adjourned to a date and time to be advised by the Clerk. Will those in favour please say aye, those against no, the Ayes have it.

Before we actually close, perhaps it would be convenient if I just checked that it will suit all Members to make sure the customary morning break and for Finance Committee to meet for twenty minutes only? Would that suit Members? I think that will suit Members so that Finance Committee will meet and we can as the morning break in case.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 11.55 A.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED TO A DATE AND TIME TO BE ADVISED BY THE CLERK.

SEVEN OPENING A BRIEF MEETING OF THE (1995) SESSION

OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

- FRIDAY

22ND MARCH, 1995

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR G PETER LLOYD, CMG, OVO - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS R PORTER, CPO,CBE,JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J GALLOWAY, QC, LL.B	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS D PEPPERDINE, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON DENSON G EBANKS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M NORMAN BARKLEY, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES L KIRKCONNELL	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATION WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON VASSEL G JOHNSON, CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MCKEEVA BUSH	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR LINFORD A PIERSON, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT MARK S MCKEEVA	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CAYMAN BRAC
MR G ELTON BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D BERNARD MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN B MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING & BUDGET MEETING OF THE (1965) SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FRIDAY

22ND MARCH, 1965

2. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(a) BILLS:-

(1) THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(CONTINUATION OF SECOND READING Debate)

THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER CONTINUING.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(2) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(3) THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(4) THE LIQUOR LICENSING BILL, 1965

COMMITTEE OF BILLS

(5) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(6) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(7) THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(8) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(9) THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(10) THE LIQUOR LICENSING BILL, 1965

MOTION RESUMED

REPORT ON BILLS

(11) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(12) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(13) THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(14) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(15) THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(16) THE LIQUOR LICENSING BILL, 1965

THIRD READING OR BILLS

(17) THE EXPROPRIATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(18) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES, POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(b) MOTIONS:-

(1) GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 1/85 - ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE CHIEF ELECTED MEMBER

(2) GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 2/85
LOANS (CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK) CAP. 1977 (LAW IF OF 1977)

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER

(3) GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 4/85
APPOINTMENT OF STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995 - CONTINUATION OF SECOND READING DEBATE	
HON. ERIC G. BROWN	1
HON. CHARLES L. MCMICHAEL	2
MR. LINCOLN A. PIERSON	3
HON. HARRY C. JOHNSON	4
THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 - STAGES AND SECOND READINGS	18
THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 - STAGES AND SECOND READINGS	18
THE LICENSING DISCRETION BILL, 1996 - FIRST READING	31
SECOND READING	31
THE DEFAMATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 - COMMITTEE STAGE	40
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (PRIVILEGES, POWERS AND IMMUNITIES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 - COMMITTEE STAGE	41
THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 - COMMITTEE STAGE	48
THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 - COMMITTEE STAGE	59
THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 - COMMITTEE STAGE	59
THE LICENSING DISCRETION BILL, 1996 - COMMITTEE STAGE	59
ADJOURNMENT	61

[illegible]

[illegible]

10.50 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Marine Conservation (Amendment) Bill, 1985. Continuation of Second Reading debate. The Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council.

THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

CONTINUATION OF
SECOND READING DEBATE

HON. BENSON O. EVANS: Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I was saying that this Bill would enable us to make Regulations which should improve the image of the Cayman Islands in the eyes of others and help us with our quest to get the ban on turned turtle products lifted. This effort has been going on now, Mr. President, for eight or ten years and I think that it is time that we endeavour to endeavour to try to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion. The farm has been operating on limbo for far too long and the potential for development at the farm is too great to ignore it. At the height of its commercial operation it employed well over a hundred Caymanians, and hopefully that figure can soon be seen again. It behoves us to do all we can to get the farm back to full operating capacity as that we can find employment for our people. We cannot have the farm back to full operating capacity if we do not get the ban lifted.

Therefore, Mr. President, we must take into consideration potential there is envisaged to the fine people who might be affected by any Regulations which would be brought in under this Bill.

The question of the increase in fines, Mr. President, was touched about and the fact that the fines have been increased to $5,000 does not mean that every conviction will warrant a fine of $5,000, so the inference to arise from increasing the fees is fine but to be realistically right it does not follow that because the fine is increased that it will be taken. So long as it is within the law, Mr. President, "not exceeding" I am not concerned with the amount. I believe that the judiciary will administer justice with mercy.

The points have been made, Mr. President, and I suppose it is that the nine Caymanians in this country have now shown their concern for the preservation of our marine life as well as anyone else. It appears to me that for too often, Mr. President, a cause is selected and it is used and used and used until it is exhausted and its attraction ruined. I believe that the nine Caymanians should organize some organization and register that they can get their income taxes, and very their areas which they are accountingly. They must also, Mr. President, show concern and consideration to the people of this country who actually depend on fishing as a livelihood and others who are concerned about fishing in the effort to support their income. I have had many complaints where dive operators recklessly and blatantly took a fisherman's fish pots and thereby

SEN. EDWARD G. GURNEY (CONTINUED): Thank Mr. President, this is not building good will for the New Zealand at all. They act as though they own the sea, and I believe as the Second Ranking Member for Mark Ray said, that the time is ripe that for the Regulations some consideration be given to whether or not these regulations do what I feel they do not do as well. I believe that the dive boat operator should have to show the same courtesy and concern for a fishing boat that they would be given as the fishermen or any other boat operator has to what the dive boats when they have commenced their operations. Again, Mr. President, this brings me to another point which I have hoped happened as a working point. That is that the dive operators fly their flags when they do not have divers aboard. It is impossible for a boat operator to hail what they should do. Often these boats are anchored or moored many fathoms to the underlying shore the boats must come through if they are in search the scene. So I believe that we ought to take some action with these dive boat operators as well.

Mr. President, I realize that this will do not prove to be pleasing to all but I think the time has come. Mr. President, when we have to decide whether or not we're going to have conservation policies or whether we are going to play both ways. What is needed in my opinion, Mr. President, is discipline on the part of all of us. After all discipline is the only thing which distinguishes one from an animal. If we are going to weaken our benefits from our marine resources then we are going to have to discipline ourselves and all who attempt to take them. Or we will loose our marine life and environment is destroyed. It is unthinkable that unless conservation methods are adopted we will lose the very thing which we are seeking to cultivate. We cannot take hurried measures, Mr. President. We have to be serious about this and face the challenge, and do what is necessary.

As I said yesterday and I think to hours repeatedly, CITES is concerned about all our efforts at conservation, not just for the ocean turtle. We have drawn attention to our diving attendants and, Mr. President, those who have expressed themselves to diving destinations once the seas are watching to see what efforts we are making to preserve our marine life. I have been told that unless something is done and done very quickly we are likely to receive some very bad publicity so far as our conservation efforts are concerned, and also cause our attraction as a diving destination.

Mr. President, with these remarks I support the Marine Conservation Bill before us.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES E. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, the Bill before this House, a Bill for a law to amend the Marine Conservation Law, 1978, Law 18 of 1979 is a straightforward Bill which seeks to give the Governor additional power to make Regulations which would ensure more protection for marine creatures, control methods of fishing in certain areas, and prevents the taking of young marine creatures indiscriminately. As I have said it is a straightforward Bill and I support it without hesitation.

Mr. President, if we Honourable Elected Members this Honourable House the opportunity would try to complete it. Mr. President, it is about time that the appropriate accept their responsibilities and become constructive operation instead of being destructive as they are today. The trick of the matter is that they

<u>GOVERNOR CARRUTHERS INTERRUPTED (CONTINUING)</u>: did not have the chance to get to bring this bill to this House because they refused getting an adverse resolution in November last year. Meanwhile, Mr. President, there has been time that they might just as well have introduced it because holiday is here did not help them.

The need for marine parks in the Cayman Islands was established many years ago and we feel that the time of acting about them has long passed and that positive action must be taken now while we still have something to preserve. Marine parks have been established by many countries all over the world in order to preserve, protect and conserve the underwater environment so that everyone will benefit.

The results show that the Cayman Islands have been for many decades of turtles which inhabited our Islands. We thought we were going to preserving by protecting them but today we all know the result. Turtles are almost extinct in our waters. Lobsters and conch are fast disappearing too, Mr. President, and it is our duty to make every effort to save them from the destructive and indiscriminate fishermen.

In order to achieve our goals it is necessary to establish marine parks, create areas where fishing is prohibited and areas where line fishing is permitted. Replenishment areas will have to be established where, lobsters or conchs may be taken for a period of years. There will also have to be an environmental zone where fishing or interference of marine life is prohibited.

The Bill also aims at increasing the maximum penalties for breaking the law from $500 and/or six months' imprisonment to a fine of $2,000 and/or twelve months' imprisonment. I consider this amount be modest and we still need the cooperation and assistance of our people in order to make our officers a success. Implementation without enforcement is useless and it is to point that our people be enlightened to the fact that all of us will be personally some of the good things to come only for our children and their children.

The opposition is quite aware that action must be taken now. The benefit of the study from Environmental Law that marine parks should be established in Grand Cayman and gave valid reasons why they were necessary. With your permission, Mr. President, I would like to read a message by the Cayman Islands Government Information Services on the 7th June last year, and in connection with environmental works urged by Mr. J.C. Snipes. He said:-

> "Now is the time for a new drive, focused on the designation of territorial underwater parks for the Cayman Islands. There are two reasons why this concept should be given real impetus. In the first place three-fourths of the tourists who come to our Islands had said much to our scenery and fish abundance. They come to enjoy our reefs and our marine life and it is essential that this environment should continue.
>
> The second reason and the only way in which this environmental attraction can survive and be maintained is that there must be a place where our fish can breed undisturbed. It would be a place where fish would be. Nothing goes in and nothing comes out, meaning that you cannot throw anything into the park and you cannot take anything out.

BOB. CAPT. CHARLES D. ALEXANDER (CONSERVATIVE): Mr. Speaker also pointed out that many Caribbean Islands like Martinique and Guadeloupe, Trinidad and Tobago have developed national endowment parks, and points like Mr. Peterson in the Florida Keys, Block Island off Ct. Coast, and St. Croix, Virgin Bay have become tourist magnet attractions. Mr. Speaker says:-

> "There are people, and it is time we had a similar conservation attempted, especially because of the overcrowded type of vacations who have fallen in love with our Islands."

Mr. President, it is alarming to hear the witnesses which is being expressed in this Chamber today. As I said before the Unity Task Government planned to take action to do just what we are trying to do now. To prove the Unity Team's involvement with marine parks I further beg your permission to read some paragraph from the Cayman Islands Government Information Booklet on who established the zones for Grand Cayman's park system.

> "They have involved over the years from recommendations by many users of the sea and have formalized in their present form by the Marine Park Committee which included:-

Mr. Glenmore Ebanks	charter boat operator
Mr. Carlton Bush	South Sound fisherman
Mrs. Dianne Graham	Eagle End Plantation diver, underwater photographer and concerned citizen
Mr. Gerry Matthew	former operator Cayman Dive Lodge, East End
Mr. Arlen Evans	dive and charter fishing operator
Mr. Tom Pearson	dive operator
Mr. Hans Eldemire	former dive resort operator
Mr. Danny Jackson	former Director of the Port Authority
Mr. Paul Bomba Banger	former Chief Agriculturist, Fauna and Survey Department
Mr. Kearney Cowan	Ministerial Secretary, Lands, Works from Development and National Resources
Mr. Joe Ebanks	Government Fisheries Officer"

and last but not least-

Hon. John McLean	Former Executive Council Member for the Portfolio of Agriculture Lands and Natural Resources"

Hon. Mr. Speaker.

It is a disgrace for the opposition to see this issue not to defend and side up the people against the present Government which they wanted to do the same thing but did not have enough backbone to tackle the problem.

MR. CALEB BOGGS (Delaware): Again this is political strategy, Mr. President, but it will get them nowhere. If ever I have seen people dig their political graves with their tongues it is now. It is happening right here in this honorable House.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense has said that the small fishermen would be destroyed by this bill. I totally disagree with this misleading statement. ... There are only a handful of fishermen who are operating fish and lobster pots for a living on our islands and they are the people who are destroying the marine life of their islands. They must be stopped. The space gun is the most lethal and destructive weapon, not only to fish but to humans. There have been cases of space gun explosions reported at the Hospitals. If these space guns are not banned completely they will ultimately destroy the marine life of our islands.

Mr. President, I am reminded of a slogan I heard a few years ago. "If you must shoot the deer, shoot pheasants". Mr. President, we must take no halfway measures to stop the destruction of the underseas environments and the marine creatures living there. Let us take whatever action is needed now before it is too late so that we may be sure to save our children and grandchildren will be able to say, "thank God we had wise and courageous statesmen who saved not only our islands from financial disasters, but our marine life from destruction".

Mr. President, I support the Bill wholeheartedly.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Georgetown South caught my eye.

MR. JOSEPH A. PIGGOTT: Mr. President, this amendment seeks to increase the regulation making power of the Governor enabling the prescription of closed seasons for the taking of marine creatures.

The point I would like to make, Sir, is that this is not a completely new concept. Part IV of the Marine Conservation Law, 1970, Law 19 of 1970, already provides for the restricted marine areas. I think, Mr. President, for the benefit of the public they should know that section 10 of this law states:-

> "The Governor may designate areas of Cayman Waters to be restricted marine areas under the management of the Board for the purpose of marine research and development and such areas shall be clearly demarcated and shall be closed to all members of the public save Wardens of the Board."

It further states, Mr. President in section 11(1):-

> "The Governor may designate certain areas of Cayman Waters to be marine parks".

In view of this, Mr. President, I see very little need for amendment to this Bill as far as the establishment of marine parks is concerned. What I am disturbed with, Mr. President, is the notice of amendment which has never to action by Committee Stage. This amendment, Mr. President, should in my opinion create some amount of hardship. However, I have spoken to the mover of this amendment and he has given his assurance that this will be given another look at.

Mr. Lundgren (continuing): I believe, Mr. President, that if we completely prohibited the use of spear guns we would create some amount of hardship for our people. As the Hawaii Division Leader for Rod Boy said yesterday there are many of our fishermen and charter boat operators who depend on the use of spear guns to make a living. Mr. President, I believe that is why the section 12 of the Marine Conservation Act, 1974 (i) the specific part mentioned should be placed on the use of spear guns. It states in this section, Mr. President, that:-

> "Whoever takes any marine life with the aid of a spear gun in Cayman waters is guilty of an offence upon that the use of a spear gun -
>
> (a) (i) by any one person in one day for human consumption only six fish or less per day;
> (ii) five lobsters or less per day in accordance with section 8;"

Also, Mr. President, the Regulations under the Marine Conservation Act, 1974, that is the Marine Conservation Regulations, 1978, give authority for the Marine Conservation Board to issue a certificate for any individual who wants wish to use a spear gun to take marine life in the waters of Cayman provided under the section which I have just read. So in so specific have to the Law already, Mr. President, about the sort of control which should be placed on these forms of marine wastes.

The problem I see with this, Mr. President, is not the existence of the proper Regulations, but it is the absence of outlawing the Law and Regulations before us. I believe, Sir, that if more vigilance is placed on the control and policing of this Law and the Regulations under the Law, we would not be talking about the problems which we are experiencing today.

I make no secret, Mr. President, and I make the statement to mention that I am an avowed conservationist. In fact, Sir, that if individuals are allowed to destroy our wild life, be it marine life or other, we will in my mind very soon be where. However, while have not passed the test, Sir, that there are some of our people who depend on catching certain marine life for a living.

I speak as in the Lower and District and I know that it was a way of life for people who depended to go out on the morning to catch the fish for dinner, who cannot take this away from them, Sir. If a method of getting this animal of food is by the use of spear guns I feel, Mr. President, that a proper way and reasonable way should be to impose whatever restrictions are necessary. Personally, we should not impose a total ban in the use of spear guns. It is our view, Mr. President, that they can use these to fish, but those of us who have had any amount of experience at fishing will know that we will go out there and therefore what amount of fish we were going to catch in a day. The speak gun is perhaps a bit more sophisticated and this is perhaps the reason why it is used.

Mr. President, some time ago I was invited to sit in a Committee formed to establish the marine parks system. I found it very easy to accept the invitation because of my feelings towards the protection of wild life. Mr. President, while I am speaking on this subject I think that in future this Honourable Assembly should consider enacting proper legislation to protect our bird life, because I too have seen an indiscriminate waste of

MR. EDWARD A. FERNOS (COMMENTATOR): this type of wild life. I have seen people go out and shoot for the sake of shooting and not even try to find the birds after they have shot them. This is also true, Mr. President, of the marine life.

A few days back I was on our waterfront near Fisherman with whom I came out. It was upsetting, Mr. President, to see the waste of the little "giggle eyes" on the beach. Some of them were drifting on the beach and nobody even bothered to pick them up because they were so small.

I have heard also, Mr. President, the indiscriminate use of seines where breakfish which are a sports fish and cannot be eaten have been caught and just left to die. I cannot support this type of behaviour Mr. President.

Section 25 of the Law, Mr. President, secures certain Regulations and it is noted that it is the intention to re-letter certain paragraphs of this section to take into account:-

> "(i)prescribing minimum sizes below which marine creatures may not be taken;
>
> (ii)prescribing closed seasons within which marine creatures may not be taken;
>
> (iii)prescribing areas within which marine creatures may not be taken;"

and also:-

> (o)prescribing areas within which fishing by certain methods only be permissible;"

The question, Mr. President, of marine parks also arises. This concept of life is not unique to the Cayman Islands. In many other tourist destinations it has been seen necessary to establish such parks. In the Caribbean region there are parks in the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States Virgin Islands, Southern Florida and the Florida Keys. Mr. President, the reason why these parks were established was to protect marine life.

The plan creates, Mr. President, four types of zone which occur only 37 per cent of our shelf area around Grand Cayman. This amounts to only 29 square miles. That means that 63 per cent of the waters around this Island can still be used without the similar restrictions contained in the four zones.

The zones are non-fishing zone, line fishing zone, replenishment zone and environmental zone. I will not go into the details of these zones, Mr. President, as I covered these quite comprehensively in my budget debate. However, I feel, Mr. President, that it is fair to the people of the Cayman Islands, I also feel, Mr. President, that it should be accepted as a matter which has been given acceptable thought. The Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council mentioned some of the notable individuals who were involved in the study. It was done on a very serious and scientific basis, Mr. President. These zones were carefully selected by some of the leaders in our country. Contrary to what the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council mentioned I do not agree, Mr. President, that it is the fault of the line operators. This is not my understanding. From what I understand the line operators are very much interested in protecting our marine life. As a matter of fact they have had us in this

Mr. LORENZO A. TYERMAN (CONTINUING): Mr. Speaker, I can understand this, Mr. President, as they have a very strong vested interest in the preservation of our marine life. I also do not believe, Mr. President, that any of the official dive operators would deliberately destroy fish pots. I believe that if this is being done it is perhaps being done by divers, but not necessarily divers under the control of official dive operators.

I had to smile, Mr. President, when the honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council said it was alarming to hear the honourable Acting Minister for this House today, when in fact the only other speaker was the honourable First Elected Member for Executive Council. However, I am sure he meant since the recent election.

Mr. President, the other area of this Bill which I would like to comment on is section 5 which seeks to repeal and replace section 25 of the principal Law. Section 25 of the principal Law stated:-

> 'Whoever contravenes any provision of this Law or any regulations is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding $500 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or both.'

Mr. President, it does seem rather unreasonable that this amount has been increased to $5,000 even though I agree that in order for us to get the people of this country and visitors here learning our laws with respect and paying attention, we have to ensure that the penalties are severe enough.

One saving feature of this Offence and Penalties clause is that it does say 'not exceeding $5,000'. The honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council made this point very clearly. It can be up to that amount, but not exceeding it, which means it can be much less. I like it, Mr. President, that this would depend on the magnitude of the offence which our Judiciary would see it fit to have to use the maximum penalty.

Mr. President, the Second Elected Member for West Bay stated that we must allow our fishermen to continue in their traditional form of fishing. Sir, I could not agree more. However, my question is, Sir, how will they be able to continue in their traditional form of fishing if the marine life is left to be destroyed? There will be no fish for them to catch.

Mr. President, it is in the interests of the people of the Cayman Islands and of the Cayman Islands as a whole. I believe, Sir, as I said in my debate on the Throne Speech that any Law or the Government must do things which can enable the people to live with them and do well. If we make the penalties under this Bill too harsh on our people we will be finding them to have to break the Law. I believe that any form of legislation must be in the interests of the people and the country. If we find that any section of our legislation is proving harsh, then it is our duty to make sure that we correct it.

I believe, Sir, as I said earlier that the amendment to this amendment which would seek to put a complete prohibition on the use of spear guns and or operate other methods of catching fish or marine life may be totally harsh and, Sir, I will have much more to say on this in Committee Stage.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I support in full for a Law to amend the Marine Conservation Law, 1978 but I do not necessarily give my blessing to the amendment to this amendment Bill which could seek to prohibit the use of certain methods of catching fish or marine life.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak? Then the Mover of the motion may wish to exercise his right of reply. The Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. Miss G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, first I should like to commend the staff of this Honourable House that they apply to the Honourable Third Official Member for more money to replace these chairs. I would suggest that they re-stock durable chairs which can withstand weights of over 200 pounds. For when we sit in them we know not where we will fall at the present time. There are many collapsing from day to day.

Mr. President, I would like to thank all those Members who made contributions to the debate on this very important Bill which is before us, a Bill for a Law to amend the Marine Conservation Law, 1970. I am sure that there is not the need for me to comment very much on the substance of the Law and the proposed amendment to it in Committee Stage, for there have been many strong expressions of marine conservation who have given their blessing to the proposals here except for a few areas which I will comment on.

Mr. President, it seems that certain fractions of the opposition speak from an ill wind of life and pay little attention to the need for certain over-exploited marine life round these Little Islands. All the rhetoric which came from those speakers in the opposition gave no support, Mr. President, to the proposals put forward in this Bill. They were just finding fault with everything everywhere, and paid no heed to what is in the best interests of the people of these Islands. There was one Member, Mr. President, who said that he had nothing to do with this Bill, probably like what he said about the question of that sheep ling which he had nothing to do with after the collection came from the Lands and Survey. Mr. President, if I as the Member responsible for Lands and for the question of land, I must accept that responsibility until the deal is concluded. He should not abandon his responsibility half way through the game.

Mr. President, we were hammered on the head with this Bill by the Second Elected Member for South Town. He declared that it is the worst Bill which has come before this House. Of course political platforms could say more than that if it was possible because anything could please the Member more than to accuse the public with anything which we introduce in this House. As I understand it, Mr. President, they are drinking alcohol hour and insulting the public against all the measures which we are discussing in this House. They sit on the platform. They walk on the streets and they mislead the public.

Mr. President, let me say this. The measures which we are bringing to this House are measures which are strongly supported by the public. The opposition still think the proposal to prohibit spear guns, sarkos and nets are not serious. Mr. President, these proposals are emanating out of the proposed marine park system, and I wondered whether they would like to accept responsibility for the introduction of marine parks around the waters of these Islands. This is a matter which was put forward by the United Town Government as the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council has just mentioned.

Mr. President, in talking around the proposal for the establishment of marine parks we commenced the various discussions on all aspects of control within these park areas, Mr. President. I have on record here the first meeting in East and

MOV. MIKEL O. GUNDERSON (CONTINUED): on the 21st February this year one of the petitioners here requested that Government look seriously into placing a ban on machine coal drill mats. This is coming from the district of Sept Ems. I'm assume they might not use space guns up there that much as they did not mention space guns here. . .

Mr. President, we came next to Mont Joly on the 25th February, and we have on record that the people requested that Government look into the possibility of preventing space gun firing. If this could not be done in such a manner a special license for special individuals in special areas be investigated only. They also at that same meeting, Mr. President, requested that Government look very seriously actions into precluding or prohibiting drill mats and scrims, and if that could not be done that somebody be put on the use of this type of apparatus.

Mr. President, we move to North Side on the 3rd February. There was a strong plea for nuclear only, a ban on space guns and two, a ban on machine coal drill mats.

Mr. Speaker, on Dublin Road on the 25th February, there was a strong plea there for the Government to take early action to preclude, most certainly but preclude space guns, drill mats and scrims. I wonder sometimes, Mr. President, who the Elected Member for Dublin Road represents in this House, whether it is the people of Dublin Road or the people of Pressure Zone.

Some morning since George Town on the 25th February, at the meeting here, Mr. President, there was also a strong plea for the banning of the use of space guns. So, Mr. President, although we have dealing with serious points in these serious meetings, you can see where the minds of the people are when we talked about aspect of nuclear life here. But there is the public, Mr. President, there is a strong decline in any control placed on this. People have spoken, Mr. President, that the growth of the population and the growth of the need to feed these people are becoming greater each day. People must feed first. However, Mr. President, if they are allowed to go into the oceans and scrape the bottom; take all the young cuttles they can find, take all the small baby lobsters they can find; take all the young conchs they can find, and go on the land and scrape out of the holes all the little crabs they can find, even those which are protected, and one imagine in a very short time from now what will be the position when one looks into the waters around these Islands. It is bad enough now.

In my opening address on this Bill I mentioned some of the conditions now existing in certain areas on the periphery of the use of these Islands. We need not come here and become compliments just for the sake of politics. We have a responsibility to the public and to the people of these Islands. When we go on the platforms outside this House we are acting on our political pledge whatever we say. However, when we come here, Mr. President, we have a responsibility to ourselves, to the public, to the country and we should not sit here and fiddle our time away just for political reasons. We must give our best to the country. That is the reason why we are selected by the people to represent them here, not to make here and spend the whole session trying to promote our political image as projected at the end of the Session when our performances are finally judged by the public.

Mr. President, I am sure that there is no need to pretend that there is not a cause to completely ban space guns, machine coal drill mats, because apart from what you have

HON. HARRY R. ANDERSON (CONTINUED): heard in this Committee. Now you need to only walk up the streets out there and pose the question, and you will hear a lot there. However, Mr. President, we do not want to take dramatic action if it is not going to please the Honorable Members here. In that case I will be quite prepared to recommend at Committee Stage that we look at the proposal to ban power guns, rather and pull nets. At least where power guns and nets are concerned we should place a restriction whereby only those people who can obtain a license which must be provided by Regulations under the Law would be permitted to use those instruments for fishing purposes. I would hope, Mr. President, that if that is agreed and instead of prohibiting the use of those instruments that the licenses be given to only responsible people so that we do not have little boys running all over the place with spear guns and destroying the bit of marine life which is left around the waters.

The restriction should also be for recreation users, in other words people should not be permitted to jump into George Town Harbour and start using spear guns or take their catches out there and operate the scene which we heard about, but that they go outside the populated area and use those things.

I know, Mr. President, that a strong plea was made for the four operators because without the use of the spear gun to catch a lobster or fish, then the boat would serve little purpose to their customers, and so it might affect the livelihood of those boat operators. It is for this reason that we would try to retain the prohibition on trolley spear guns and salmon and pull nets.

Mr. President, a lot has already been said about these proposals and I am hopeful that the Honourable Members will appreciate the need to introduce these measures, and that they will be given their grateful consideration.

Mr. President, I recommend the amendment to the Marine Conservation Law, 1978.

HON. MACGILLIVRAY: The question before the House is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Marine Conservation Law, 1978 be read a Second time.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

HON. CAPT. CHARLES S. MACGILLIVRAY: May we have a division, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I will ask the Clerk to carry on.

DIVISION

NO. 16

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis E. Foster	Mr. E. McKeeva Bush
Hon. Michael J. Bradley	Mr. T. Eric Bodden
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	Mr. John D. McLean
Hon. Benson O. Brooks	
Hon. W. Norman Bodden	
Hon. Capt. Charles S. MacGillivray	
Hon. Vincent C. Ashton	
Mr. Edmond A. Pierson	
Capt. Mabry G. MacGillivray	
Mr. D. Lennox Miller	

10 | 2

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion agreed.

BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING AND PASSED BY MAJORITY

MR. SPEAKER: I think perhaps rather than start on other Bills at this stage, it may be a convenient moment to take our customary morning break. I will therefore suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes until 11.30 a.m.

At 11.17 a.m. the House adjourned.

House resumed at 11.30 a.m.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Item 3(a)(2) the Interpretation (Amendment) Bill, 1986.

FIRST READING

THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

CLERK: THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986.

MR. PRESIDENT: A Bill for a Law to amend the Interpretation Law be deemed to have been read a first time and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986.

HON. MICHAEL J. DUDLEY: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill shortly entitled the Interpretation (Amendment) Bill, 1986.

Mr. President, the system of Law which we operate in these Islands is governed by regards general principles by our Interpretation Law. One of these general principles in the Interpretation Law acknowledges the power to create offences and penalties under other legislation in respect of regulations. That is to say, Mr. President, that when in any other Law there is a power given to make regulations, that Law itself may spell out in detail the full maximum punishment which may be imposed by regulations made under it for breach of those regulations.

If this is not done, then what there is simply a provision giving a power to make regulations, then to determine under those regulations what can be imposed as a penalty, one has to turn to our Interpretation Law.

The particular provision of the Interpretation Law is section 27 of the Interpretation Law, Chapter 70, and that reads in relation to this proposed amendment:-

DR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY (CONTINUED):

"Where a law confers power on any authority to make or issue regulations, the following provisions shall, unless the contrary intention appears, have effect with reference to the making, issue and operation of such regulations -"

"(b) the regulations may provide in respect of a breach of any of the provisions thereof that the offender shall, unless the law otherwise provides, be liable to such fine not exceeding twenty-five pounds, or to such term of imprisonment with hard labour not exceeding three months, or to both such fine and imprisonment, as may be therein prescribed;"

So the Legislature when enacting any law, and they have passed many laws in the past, use to it to state specifically spell out the penalties under regulations. If there are not spelt out, we always have to look at this section of the Interpretation Law. In our Laws, in many instances the penalties are not spelt out for breach of regulations. So that in many instances, and the last one which came to my attention was in respect of the Airport Regulations Law concerning which my colleague will also be moving the Second Reading of an amending Bill at this Session, there was no provision for breach of regulations in the Law itself. So we had to turn to this.

This at the moment provides a penalty of twenty-five pounds which by the International population when our dollar system was brought in is $50. So it provides for a fine not exceeding $50 or three months.

This Bill before the Honourable House proposes to increase these in relation to the fine very substantially from $50 to $1,000, and in relation to the imprisonment from three months to twelve months. Last Monday giving effect to notice which I made in honour and say that this is a terrible inference; it is a terrible thing we are doing to give such powers, but no just say that we are not doing so nowadays when one considers the increase in the cost of living and inflation, with any degree of security. I have done a little research, Mr. President, and the present provision of $50 and three months' imprisonment is contained in our Interpretation Law. That Interpretation Law in respect of this section has not been amended since the revised edition of the Laws of the Cayman Islands was published in 1963, which means that as at the 12th December, 1962, some twenty-one years ago the provision then was twenty-five pounds or $50 or three months' imprisonment or both.

I thought should I look a little bit further back and I did. As we all know, Mr. President, the Laws which existed to us during the time that we were associated with Jamaica were the Laws of Jamaica in that regard. I went back to the 1953 revised edition of the Laws of Jamaica. I went to Chapter 191 which is the Interpretation Law, and that Interpretation Law which was enacted in June 1953 revised edition enshrined, provided that there should be in this section twenty-five pounds or three months' imprisonment or both. However, it was not 1953 when these figures were put in. The figures went back to the 10th June, 1933 when the Interpretation Law of Jamaica, which applied to us was made.

I am sorry, Mr. President. I was out of time. I should not research any further back without perhaps going to Jamaica.

SEN. MITCHELL J. DOWDLE (CONTINUING): However, it is interesting to note that on page 2 of the Cayman Islands somebody did research here and the origin note relates back to Law XVII of 1966. If I had researched back to there, Mr. President, I think it is at least possible that I would have found in that statute of 150 years ago that the committee considered that would have been twenty-five pounds or three months' imprisonment. So if any Member after me gets up and says this is a horrifying statement, just let them think what twenty-five pounds would have bought forty-two years ago, and what twenty-five pounds would have bought 150 years ago, and one shudder that would have bought much more than $2,000 in this day and age.

Mr. President, in all the legislation which I am involved with in this House I try to maintain a consistency and a relationship between the fine imposable and the imprisonment imposable. The calculation which I have in previous legislation found which I have attempted to put in such my monetary penalties were brought up to what there should be a correlation between $2,000 and twelve months' imprisonment. You remember, Mr. President, that there is an attempt to bring a large number of our laws which do not give specific powers or specific penalties by regulations because they were drafted many years ago and were drafted in a particular style at that time when the tendency was to look at the general power in the Interpretation Law into line. The intention of this Bill is in relation to such laws to provide that regulations do make these laws; and are penalty fines up to but not exceeding $2,000 or imprisonment up to but not exceeding twelve months' imprisonment or both fine and imprisonment. It does not mean that when we make regulations under such Law that we will automatically put those in for the maximum or the imprisonment. By consultation we will have a sense of proportion and a sense of justice and the regulations for these offences will be made maximum of some smaller amounts.

In relation to serious offences against regulations they could be then increased up to the maximum. My Honourable colleague when he is introducing the Airports Regulations (Amendment) Bill, 1982 will no doubt, and I am not trying to anticipate his speech, point out to this Honourable House that in the case of that particular Bill it was thought that even the modest figures which I am proposing are more inadequate and insufficient, and after careful consideration the Government in the case of breaches of these regulations under that Law thought that it should be beyond this modest increase and should be $5,000. Because again as he will no doubt point out, we can have regulations the breach of which can cause horrific consequences. We need sometimes which are requisite such major substantive legislation to deal with the dangers and the evils which may occur. Under the Airports Regulation Law if there was an offence against regulations at the moment which caused the death of two or three passengers and crew of one plane, all that could be imposed as a fine would be twenty-five pounds or $50.

That is a startling example, and a graphic example. I will not bore the House by saying what other ones we could elucidate. I am saying that what we are trying to do by this Penal Amending Bill is to establish the principle that the Government of this country when it is making regulations under laws which have that specific penalty for regulations in those laws, ask in its judgement and its discretion make the offence be of such a nature that a fine of up to but not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment up to but not exceeding twelve months or both such fine and imprisonment be imposed.

Mr. President, I commend this Bill to the Honourable Members.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Interpretation Law be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. The Second Elected Member for Dodick Town.

SECOND OR SUBSEQUENT READING

MR. G. WILT DODICK: Mr. Speaker, my objection to this Bill has been partly urged for me because the Ultimate Clause by the Honourable Official Member already point out that there is a strong reason why the fine put in case of imprisonment have not been changed for 120 years under this Law.

In 1826 in 1826 the fine was twenty-five pounds and when the Legislature enacted the Law in 1845, or when there was a change, the fines still remained at twenty-five pounds and the imprisonments at three months.

Even when the Law was last enacted sometime twenty years later in 1865 the fine remained the same although the value of money had changed and twenty-five pounds in 1826 would not buy what twenty-five pounds bought in 1865. It is my belief that the reason why there was no Ordinance was simply because the Interpretation Law as the Member correctly pointed out would be used to provide the punishment where no specific punishment is in the Law. So when a Legislation was made which did not have a specific fine, or a Law was made in which there was no offence for which there was not a specific fine, we would then go to the Interpretation Law. This would not be changed however if it were changed to an astronomical figure we would undermine the whole principles of our Law. Because the Law and the Legislature therefore the offences should be made by the Legislative Assembly. In regulations we have the same thing. The original Law would provide the specific penalties for the regulations and this Law would only be used in those rare cases where there are not a specific provision in the Law.

What really happens in a regulation made by Executive Council is the absence of a specific penalty is that the Executive Council in making the regulation really takes on the powers of the Legislative Assembly in that they create offences by the regulations. They impose fines and they sometimes people to imprisonment if a person is convicted of the offence. So I believe the reason why these penalties have been kept so low for the last 120 years is because we do not want to put into the situation where the Executive Council would really be the body enacting people to prison and putting on heavy fines without the sanction of the Legislative Assembly.

I do not think we should interfere with this principle, particularly at a time when we have seen the Legislative Assembly giving to the Executive Council some powers they never had. We have an illustration of that in the Bill which we just debated where under the Statute Conversation Law the Government just put forward an amendment which if passed will give to the Executive Council the power to make more regulations than they could have made before. Since the Government is grasping the opportunity to make as many regulations as they can get away with without the Assembly therefore having a chance to say that the figures are too high or low, it is wrong. However, I will agree, Sir, that perhaps there is time to increase the penalties under the Interpretation Law. Although of the 120 years it has remained at twenty-five pounds I would think that we should move cautiously.

MR. S. KILFOYLE (CONTINUED): Sankaty on increase from 500 to 1,000 would be sufficient because we do not want to put, and the Legislature Assembly would not put into the hands of the Executive Council the authority to impose such fines. However, I am more concerned about the imprisonment side of it because under the existing law the Executive without the authority of the Legislative Assembly, or without a specific provision in the law, could send a person to prison for three months. If we change this to a year we will make that the Executive Council can send a person to prison for a year for a very minor offence. Or at least they can make the recommendation which the court could accept a recommended person to prison for a year.

We could have a very odd situation. It could be putting in more people designated for somebody else, or some very trivial matter and the Executive Council, because they find there there is an appropriate provision in a particular Act might create an offence of a very minor nature. The end result would be that a convicted person could go to prison for up to one year. So it is very dangerous for the Legislative Assembly today to increase what has not increased to by the amounts in the amending Bill. For example the fine would go up twenty times. It would go up by 2,000 per cent and the imprisonment would go from three months to twelve months.

I believe that the Executive Council should put in their regulations the penalties and not in specific Acts, and in the odd cases where there is no specific penalty they should use the Interpretation Act. However, because the Interpretation Act can be so widely used they should not be given the authority to make regulations for matters which are not specifically specified by the Act under which the penalties could be so issued.

The new Executive Council has given us by its amendments which they have brought and by its actions which they have carried out, that if we put this Legislative power into their hands they will use it. All their actions have shown that they will use whatever authority is given to them under the Act and regulations. Removal of administration of the Legislative Assembly allows this important matter to be shifted from the hands of the Assembly into the hands of Executive Council.

So I disagree with the increases proposed in this Bill but would be willing to support an increase of 100 per cent on the fine, leaving the three months' imprisonment term as it is. If there is a matter which the Legislative Assembly feel should carry a penalty of more than three months' imprisonment, but the Legislative Assembly make a specific case, put that put a specific provision in the Act whether it be the Interpretation Act or the Marine Conservation Act, but they should not leave it in the hands of Executive Council, because we should be passing the buck to them for doing the things which I think the Legislative Assembly should retain whatever power it may have.

So do not make a Government by regulation, we make a Government by Legislation. I cannot support the increases proposed, particularly that which would result in imprisonment of twelve months for a very minor offence under a regulation.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to speak I would like to recognize the right of reply of the sponsor.

HON. DOUGLAS A. GRUCHY: Mr. Speaker, it has been a short debate on this short Bill. I have listened as I always do with great attention to the speeches made by the Honourable Second Elected Member for Labrador.

MOR. RICHARD A. ROLLINS (CONTINUED): Speak. I may inadvertently, Mr. Speakerpro Tempore, have done him an injustice in a debate on a previous topic, the Reserve Conservation Tax, when I inferred that he was anti-conservationist. I think now he is demonstrating that he is a conservationist and that he likes to preserve the 190 years old writings of our legislation, riddled though they may be with the death-watch beetle and woodworm, as definitely likes to preserve them. Or perhaps, Mr. Speakerpro Tempore, he is more a geologist than a conservationist because he likes to see those wonderful fossils embedded in our legislation.

However, be that as it may, Sir, I think that since he has indicated that he would be prepared to see some changes in the Bill by virtue of this section of the Interpretation Act, I take it and am confident that since that is his attitude he will vote for the second reading of this Bill. Having then voted for the Second Reading of this Bill, he may attempt to persuade the Honourable Members of this House in Committee Stage as he is entitled, possibly to file and prepare for him as he does, to reduce the figure $2,000 to the figure $100 and reduce the figure of twelve months back to the figure of three months.

However, Mr. President, there is another matter which bothered me as I spoke, a matter which I cannot allow to go unanswered. That is when we do agree that this Assembly is doing it properly Executive Council has the power to impose fines and the power to send people to prison. Mr. President, as will know that this Legislature passed back in the Government passed Legislation through some time as Government-in-Council, but that there is no power inherent in this House or in the Government or Executive Council to impose fines or to send people to prison. That is a function of the judiciary of these Islands, a function which reposes in the hands of these Islands.

This Legislative Assembly can pass laws imposing maximum fines and maximum imprisonments. Executive Council through Governor-in-Council can make subsidiary legislation which provides that the maximum penalty is no more than one half the maximum penalty is no more months' imprisonment. However, Sir, unless there are restrictions such as the provision in the Misuse of Drugs Law where the Legislature has thought fit expressly to create subsidiary legislation upon terms of imprisonment, then the courts of this land, whether they be the Magistrate's Court or the Grand Court can look at a Law and see what the penalty fine is there, can see what the maximum imprisonment is there, and can impose a fine or imprisonment of any amount or terms up to there. There is such power under the Evolution of Offenders Legislation that they can without imposing a fine, or without sending them to prison, place a person on probation.

So let me make it clear to everybody in these Islands that the effect of this is not to give Executive Council power or ability to send anyone to prison or to fine anyone. It is merely giving the Executive Council power to prescribe in a way which is appropriate the regulation making power of offences, so that when those offences are committed the judiciary in the Islands having considered the matter knows what fine or what imprisonments up to the limit is appropriate for the circumstances of that event.

Mr. President, Sir, I commend this Bill to the favourable views. If there is a division, Mr. President, I will ask for one.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Interpretation Law be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: May I have the division please?

DIVISION
NO. 15

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis E. Foster	Mr. G. Wade Seddigh
Hon. Michael J. Bradley	
Sen. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Sen. Senator C. Rhonda	
Sen. M. Norman Haddish	
Sen. Capt. Charles L. Kirkconnell	
Rev. Miguel O. Johnson	
Mr. Rainford L. Pleasant	
Capt. Henry E. Kirkconnell	
Mr. D. Edward Keller	
10	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

RESOLVED BY MAJORITY: BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. PRESIDENT: (Amendment) Bill, 1995. Item 2(a)(i) The Airports Regulation

FIRST READING:

THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

CLERK: THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Airports Regulation Law (Revised) be deemed to have been read a First time and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING:

CLERK: THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995.

HON. M. NORMAN HADDISH: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Airports Regulation Law (Revised).

Mr. President, the object of this Bill is to amend the principal law so as to provide that regulations made under the Law can provide maximum penalties of two years' imprisonment and $5,000 fine for breach of such regulations.

This Bill, Mr. President, is not being put forward as a revenue earning measure, but laws and regulations must be seen to provide a definite deterrent to would be offenders.

MAJ. C. RAIG BOOTH (CONSTITUENCY): The present Airport Regulation Law made such a long list of acts which are prohibited, and many of these can be quite serious as will be seen.

In section 7, for example, there is the obstructing or interfering with the proper use of the airport. There is the boarding or attempting to board any aircraft without the authority of the person in charge of it. There is tampering or interfering with any aircraft or anything used in connection with an aircraft which could involve the tampering of an aircraft or the stealing of an aircraft from any of our airports. There is also any act causing or tending to cause an outbreak of fire, which could be arson for example. I think there are many serious acts which can be considered as offences.

For any of these the present fine on conviction is a maximum of $50 or three months' imprisonment as has been said previously, and this is considered totally inadequate. These amounts, as was said previously, coincide with the Interpretation Law. Additionally, even the proposed amendment to the Interpretation Law which has been put forward and very ably explained by the Honourable Second Official Member, is considered inadequate for some of these acts which could be considered as serious offences.

Mr. President, we are presently operating a recently completed new airport terminal. We are handling an ever increasing amount of passenger traffic. Material movements and public activity in and around our airports is also on the increase. All of this naturally presents a growing need and demand to exercise stronger controls for the protection of property, safety of the general public and the orderly and unhampered use of our airport facilities.

We must have laws with adequate penalties for violations so that proper respect is encouraged and maintained, otherwise these will be ignored or taken lightly by the general public. Instead of law and order we could then have a chaotic situation developing which we do not want and cannot afford.

This amendment, Mr. President, sets a maximum which enables the court to use its discretion based on the gravity or seriousness of the offence committed. I am of the opinion that this must rest with the courts to see that justice is carried out.

Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is timely. I believe it is necessary and reasonable, and I ask all Members to give it their support. Because respect for authority at our airports, the main gateways to our country, must be preserved and maintained.

I thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Airports Regulation Law (Revised) be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

MR. C. RAIG BOOTH: Mr. President, again I must object to this, another plea from the Executive Council to increase the penalties under regulations which they may make. I would like to say that I will understand the necessity that the Executive Council does not send people to jail. What I said in my debate on the other

MR. G. ALLEN BOWDEN (CONTINUED): Sir, I was simply that if we allowed that they would then have the power to make a regulation, the end result which would be that if a person were convicted he merely, they could be sent to jail for up to one year.

Here they are even talking for more because they are seeking to send people to jail for two years, and seeking to impose fines of $5,000.

I agree with the Member who moved a bill that there are some inadequacies covered by section 2 of the old Law which are serious offences, and perhaps should have more severe penalties than was sought. For example, he mentioned anything to do with the hijacking of a plane. In the Law there at the moment for regulating aircraft, motor vehicles, the submersion of persons and of animals, and among animals within the area of the current which could be a serious matter. However, there are also in this section some very simple offences which I would not like to see a person pay a $5,000 fine for or go to prison for two years for.

For example the section 2 of the original Law there is provision for appointing and regulating the use of parking places for motor vehicles. It would mean that if a private person went up to the airport and parked in a taxi rank, that person could go to prison for two years. This has to be changed. It has to be rectified. We never know what else they may put into regulations because they have about that they have the ability to bring some strange matters into being. So, while I would agree that there could be an increase in maximum fines for offences under the regulations made under sub-section 1 of the revised Law, I would not agree that we should give them the authority to make a regulation whereby they can send somebody to prison, or the subsequent conviction in the right would result in two years imprisonment, and where a fine of $5,000 could be imposed as a result of the regulation which they make.

Section 3(1) says they have the power to make regulations:-

> "for any matter appearing to the Governor in Council necessary or expedient for the purpose of giving due effect to the provisions of this Law."

It means that they could make any new regulations under the original Law. It could be very simple to return, and yet the community still would give them the scope to put in the regulations these heavy fines and heavy terms of imprisonment.

Under section 3 of the original Law they can even extend the powers to deal with motor vehicles using the public roads, and they are responsible:-

> "(f) for prescribing and regulating the payment and collection of fees for or in relation to services rendered or facilities provided at an airport;"

So if a lady went to there and had forgotten her purse, and was unable to pay the fifty cents parking fee, she could be put in jail for two years. This has to be rectified. This is not the type of penalty which should be imposed for that type of offence. However, I do agree that there are some offences which are very serious offences, and the penalties could be increased, but we would be failing in our responsibility to the public if we allowed this to happen, that a person who fails to pay the fifty cents parking fee at the airport would go to jail for two years and be fined $5,000.

MR. D. BASIC REGGOW (CONTINUING): I wonder how many years we have gone back beyond 1987 before this Bill. Perhaps the most amendment which will come will be to keep somebody for not paying the parking fee.

So the conclusion sought under this amendment are two matters and what should be done, in my opinion, is that we should take section 3 of the Airports Regulation Act (Revised) and spell out in each specific case the penalty which should be attached to each offence under each section. However, the Government is not saying to do that. They have done nothing as to amend it so that:-

> "Any regulations made under subsection (1) hereof may provide for contraventions thereof punishable on conviction by a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for two years, or both such fine and imprisonment."

I understand that the court would have the authority to fine the person less than $5,000. The court could fine the person $1, or not impose the fine at all. The court could send the person to prison for one day, or maybe not even send him at all. However, it still carries that there is a possibility that for any offence under this Bill that the person could be asked to pay a fine of $5,000 or asked to serve a term of imprisonment of two years, or even both of them.

I think we are going too far. I know the Executive Council, particularly the Elected Members believe that. They are capable of doing all things, and perhaps they are right. However, as there is responsibility to the electorate of this country, not to delegate unreasonable sentence, sentence which should be by legislation. I think it is wrong to amend this Bill and pass it, and we put in there words which can be used on which could even be abused, because once we pass this Law Parliament has no control over the actions of Executive Council. There is no parliamentary control at all. The regulations could be passed without our knowledge and we have no way of having any control over the contents.

We have on our books the Traffic Law which recognizes that there are many categories of offences such as careless driving, reckless driving, speeding, and the Traffic Law sets out specific penalties for each offence or each category of offences. I think this should be done here in the Bill which we are discussing, the Airports Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1988 because of the many varied offences which could be committed. We should strive to make it impossible to prescribe penalties suitable for each category of offence, and to regulate the conduct of people.

This can have an extremely wide range of behaviour. It might be somebody just leaving his tarpon and shooting some employee who probably needed to be removed, or the conduct of the person might be that of a person who is trying to stop the Airport, which would be altogether different. Even under this Bill we can send both people to prison for two years, and we can fine the person. When I say so, I mean when he reaches the court just the same I have an erudite lawyer who tells him,

So, we should be losing of our sight here today and give this theoretically dangerous high level of power into the hands of the present Executive Council, or any other Executive Council which may follow them.

The Member referred upon the fact that this Bill is not a revenue raising Bill, but from the higher limits of the fine I would say this Bill would will be a tremendous source of revenue. Because not only is a person committed

MR. G. RITZ POOLE (CONTINUING): to pay the $1 assembly tax at the airports, but I believe that if he failed to pay the registrations would not? Why should he have to pay $1, why if he failed to pay the $1. That is how misdemeanor this Bill is. I would hope that since this has been such a long Monday that the Executive Council Member responsible for this Bill will withdraw this registration Bill from the House, and go home and come back with an amendment which will provide for penalties which are suitable for the offenses. If there are one or two offenses which are of a petty nature that warrant the imposition of such a petty fine, perhaps I may support it. However, looking at it now, it smells trouble to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply?

HON. W. MCKEVA POOLE: Mr. President, I heard the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council say this morning that if the Holy Book, the Bible were brought to this House by this Government, the Opposition would try to prove it wrong. I wondered why he said that but now I am convinced that he was right.

Mr. President, this Bill clearly sets out that it is a maximum penalty of two years' imprisonment and a fine of $1,000 which we are seeking. The power and authority of Executive Council has been enhanced as into which Member for Bodden Town and a Member of Executive Council. It has not changed, how are we to possibly be simply subjective with the more severe and authority than he had when he was there. He mentioned about bringing forward eventually something to do with Hansard. I believe that we are answerable our Constituents Government, and we certainly have demonstrated to the public of these Islands that we are against hanging. In fact, the erection of the gallows at North-Sound prison has been removed. So I really think it is stretching the imagination to try to put an answer to the public as any Government which would go to extremes.

We have set out the maximum there and I believe in the application of powers. I know that the Member has pointed out that in section 3 there are many simple offences and this is quite true. However, I trust the court to use their discretion as such. I think this has been done in the past, and we are confident to accept the courts to carry out justice in this country. There has been no reason for us to doubt this.

Therefore, Mr. President, I still feel this Bill before the House reasonable and I would expect that it would be fully supported.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Airports Registration Law (Revised) be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: CLERK AND MACE

SIR. ALTHAM J. BRADLEY; HON. W. MCKEVA POOLE: (SIMULTANEOUSLY) May I have a division please, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the Clerk to call a division.

DIVISION
No. 17

AYES

Hon. Dennis D. Foster
Hon. Michael J. Beasley
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson
Hon. Benjamin G. Shanks
Hon. W. Norman Hodgin
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Mitchell
Hon. Yvonne C. Atkeson
Mr. M. Holcombe Dusk
Mr. Lafayette A. Stevens
Capt. Henry S. Pinkerton
Mr. D. Blanks Miller

11

NOES

Mr. C. Craig Hodgin

1

ABSTENTION: Electoral Number for East End.

MR. SPEAKER:

PAIRED IN FAVOUR:

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the motion carried.

BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

I think now we have reached a convenient time to take the lunchtime break and I will, on resumption, suspend proceedings until approximately 5.15 p.m.

AT 28.40 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 5.15 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
Item 2(a)(6). The Liquor Licensing

Bill, 1985.

FIRST READING

THE LIQUOR LICENSING BILL, 1985

CLERK: THE LIQUOR LICENSING BILL, 1985.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to repeal and replace the Liquor Licensing Law (Revised) to amend it, have been read a first time, and is set down for second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE LIQUOR LICENSING BILL, 1975

MR. DESMOND R. FOSTER: Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill for a Law to amend and replace the Liquor Licensing Law, 1974.

Mr. President, when I took over the chairmanship of the Liquor Licensing Board I was never so confused in all my life. In addition to the work for those were at least eight amendments. I immediately found it very difficult to administer the Law. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, there was a Committee of this House set up last year to look into Liquor Licensing Law with a view to bringing to the House a suitable Law whether by the one I am bringing today.

However, Mr. President, the Committee had as many as six Committee meetings to arrive that all that got done was an amendment to this Bill which was brought last year. This only made it worse because it was one more amendment to add to the list.

So, Mr. President, having been urged by the Board as well as other people, we decided to wholesale revise the 1974 Law, and in addition we made two major changes. These two changes were for the consideration and issuance of the Liquor Licensing Board, and abolished the absolute prohibition on the granting of licenses in respect of premises situated within a distance of a mile of any church, school or clinic rights.

Apart from these two changes, Mr. President, the Law is almost identical to what it was before. Of course it embodies the amendments.

Mr. President, we have had plenty of representation from the local people with their properties in George Town within a quarter of a mile of a church. They argued, Mr. President, that because the area in Seven Mile Beach was urbanized and they were residential, they were not given a fair opportunity to make a living. They also argued that there were existing places closer than a quarter of a mile to a church and there were no complaints whatsoever. I sympathize with them, Mr. President, because property in Seven Mile Beach is not cheap as it is a tourist area. They were also operating restaurants so that a tourist and if they could not even serve alcohol a lot to them.

We also had strong representations, Mr. President, from the people of the area about the same restriction of a quarter of a mile from a church, school or clinic centre. Because, Mr. President, I thought the area people would have been more than I would not have could then not, and a strong precaution for all of them, Mr. President, is in section 7(1) and (2). This says:-

"7.(1) A Board shall not grant a license unless satisfied that the premises in respect of which the application is made -

(a) have been plainly marked and lighted;

(b) have an adequate fire extinguishing system;

(c) comply with the town and regulations affecting buildings, town planning and public health;

HON. DENZIL D. FOSTER (CONTINUING):

"(d) are situated at a location where they will be of service to the public; and

(e) will not cause inconvenience to the occupiers of neighbouring property.

(2) In considering the suitability of premises for service to the public, Boards shall have regard to any representations made by or on behalf of the Commissioner, the Chief Medical Officer, the Chief Fire Officer and the Executive Secretary of the Central Planning Authority...", and this is the crux of it now, Mr. President, "...as well as members of the public who may be directly affected by the grant of a licence."

Cayman Brac and Little Cayman have their own Board and Grand Cayman has its own Board. So, Mr. President, if for instance there was an application for a licence to be granted to anybody with premises within a quarter of a mile of the church, or neighbours of any sort, or members of the public who might be directly affected could make representations to the Board. In short, the sole discretion is placed in the Board here. So as far as the Brac is concerned, Mr. President, or even Grand Cayman, they might for them to private hair not been taken away.

I feel sure, Mr. President, that if an applicant applied for a licence and anybody, or neighbours of the neighbouring property were going to be inconvenienced, the Board would not grant such a licence. Mr. President, I trust, Sir, that the people who made representation from Cayman Brac will understand this position very clearly. The safeguard has been left there for the full discussion of the Board."

Mr. President, the other major change was in the composition of the Board. We had thought to make the Chairman be a magistrate or a justice of the peace, and to have a Deputy Chairman and three other members, all of whom should be appointed by the Governor-in-Council at his discretion, for such period not exceeding five years. That is the Board for Grand Cayman, Sir. The Board for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman will consist of a Chairman who will be the magistrate or justice of the peace. The Executive Commissioner will be Deputy Chairman, and there will be three other members all of whom will be appointed by the Governor-in-Council.

Mr. President, this change is very desirable, Sir. Firstly, it will avoid our having to resubmit to come to the Legislative Assembly every year for the appointment of members of the Board. Secondly, it will put the chairmanship in the hands of a more judicial person instead of it being a Member of Executive Council.

Mr. President, I think that this is a sensible change. I think we have sufficient justices of the peace. However, if it is found, Mr. President, that there are not sufficient justices here in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman he will certainly appoint one.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that I could have the support of this House on this Bill because it will give us a piece of legislation which is workable and fair to all. There are plenty of safeguards in the Bill for inspections by the Medical Department, Police Department, Fire Department and Planning

HON. DARRYL B. FOSTER (CONTINUING): Departments. With all these qualifications, Mr. President, I am sure that the Legislature would have to be found suitable after they were completed satisfactorily.

Apart from those two changes, Mr. President, the Bill is virtually the same as when enacted before. I would like to emphasize that the people of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, and those concerned here have the need to worry, because section 5(1) and (4) does provide for the issuing of a licence at the discretion of the Board, and gives members of the public and adjoining neighbours ample leeway to complain or to make representations.

Mr. President, apart from that, Sir, I feel it is a good Bill and very necessary at this time, and I commend it to Members.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to repeal and replace the Liquor Licensing Law [Revised] be read a second time.

The motion is open for debate. The Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, I rise to support a Bill for a Law to repeal and replace the Liquor Licensing Law [Revised].

Mr. President, a Bill for a Law to repeal and replace the Liquor Licensing Law [Revised] is an effort by Government to provide a new Law which will incorporate all the amendments made to the Liquor Licensing Law, 1972. Over a period of ten years from 1972 to 1982 there have been eight amendments which have made the old Law difficult and confusing to administer.

The new proposed Bill, when passed into Law will remedy these problems. There have been a few changes made which will increase on the old Law and will ensure that justice is meted out to one and all in an equitable manner.

The composition of the Boards has been altered and we will now have a representative or a director of the posse as their Chairman, instead of a Member of Executive Council. In the case of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, the District Commissioner will not be the Chairman but will be the Deputy Chairman. We will also have a representative or a director of the respective Sea Chairman.

These members will no longer be nominated by the Legislative Assembly every year. They will be appointed by the Governor-in-Council to hold office or his pleasure for such periods not exceeding five years as he may determine.

The other changes in this Bill is to abolish the prohibition on the granting of licences in respect of premises situated within a quarter of a mile of any church, school or white centre. The Bill seeks to give the necessary authority to the Liquor Licensing Board to control where premises selling alcohol may be situated. It will also give the public the right to object and prevent any such premises from being established near a church, school or white centre.

Section 5 on the Bill reads as follows:-

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL (CONTINUED):

"8. (1) A Board shall not grant a license unless satisfied that the premises in respect of which the application is made -

(a) have exits plainly marked and lighted;

(b) have an adequate fire extinguishing system;

(c) comply with the laws and regulations affecting buildings, town planning and public health;

(d) are situated at a location where they will be of service to the public; and

(e) will not cause inconvenience to the occupiers of neighbouring property."

Further, Mr. President:-

"The Board shall have regard to any representations made by or on behalf of the Commissioner, the Chief Medical Officer, the Chief Fire Officer and the Executive Secretary of the Central Planning Authority as well as members of the public who may be directly affected by the grant of a license."

The Board as stated earlier will have the authority to determine where premises selling alcohol may be situated. It will regulate the hours when any intoxicating liquor is permitted to be sold and to whom they are allowed to sell.

The issuance of premises selling intoxicating liquor have to conform to the law and while in the new regulations, or laws there likewise.

I would like to state that I have received strong representations from the people of my constituency and I share their concern for the future of our Islands and people. Having said that, Mr. President, I will do my utmost to see that the members of the Legislative Assembly understand that the control and decisions are in their hands. The Board of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman cannot have to follow what the Board of Grand Cayman may or may not do. There are problems in Grand Cayman which do not exist in Cayman Brac or Little Cayman, and if the Board for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman is vigilant and careful, and administrates the law properly, we will avoid the pitfalls and difficulties which exist here in Grand Cayman.

Mr. President, I would like to assure the people of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman that this Bill when it becomes law will not allow persons selling intoxicating liquor to do as they wish. Here control and discipline will be able to be exercised over those persons permitted to sell alcoholic beverages than was allowed under the old law.

The Legislative Assembly Board of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman will be made up of people from these two Islands just as it is at present. The Board will also have absolute control over the number of outlets and where they are allowed to be situated.

Mr. President, I feel that our people will appreciate what has been done and that when this Bill passes into law we will have a stronger and better law for our Islands.

Mr. President, I support the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Elected Member for South Side.

MR. D. FARIS WILSON: Mr. President, I think to offer my support to a Bill for a Law to repeal and replace the Liquor Licensing Law (Revised).

I believe, Sir, that this Bill is long overdue. I have heard many complaints about the inefficiencies of administering the old Law and the accusation which it contained. The most glaring anomaly in the old Law was the quarter mile restriction. Some people felt that because no new licenses could be granted under that restriction they were being unfairly treated when premises which had been previously licensed were re-licensed, because I do not think the old Law provided a grandfather clause for a renewal of a license.

Some months, Sir, I would like to congratulate and compliment the new Government for their courage in bringing this Bill forward at this time. They are taking a lot of blame in this Meeting, but they appear to be sticking to their guns.

I believe that the old Law created a lot of hardship in ancillary areas. I have heard of instances where people were paying up to $100,000 and, Sir, there is a false economic exist, and an unnecessary brake for any Corporation in assembly up a new business, whether it was a restaurant, hotel or bar.

I think it is a pity that the former Chairman who had presided for the past eight years, has not been here when necessary, because I am sure he could give us much insight into the problems which he found in trying to administer the old Law in its complex form.

Further, Sir, I hope that when the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council brings the comprehensive Traffic Law the House which is allowed under that Law will be such that it will carry the corporate picture and their birth date, and it will be in the form of a permit type so it can stand the whole test which the Liquor Board requires of. Because I think if the license is going to be given the responsibility of not selling liquor to eighteen year olds I think it would be a good thing if the Chairman could carry the person's birth date and their picture. Then it would provide a form of identification which could be used to prove that that individual was in fact eighteen years old or older.

Mr. President, I would like now Board structure. I am glad to see the Board being removed from the political arena and somewhat so to speak. I think it also enhances the performance of the Board by removing the quasi-problems of the Chairman to those of a magistrate or a Justice of the peace. I believe, Sir, that this is desirable to dealing with an complex a Bill. However, Mr. President, I cannot fully agree with the tenure of office of the Board members. While I realize that a tenure of five years would in practice remove the Board Members from political interference even further, however no Executive Council would re-appoint a new Board if they are appointed for five years since the life of an Executive Council is only four years. However, I believe, Sir, that with a five year tenure and the option to be eligible for re-appointment, we could have some problems in that people who serve that long on Boards might tend to develop a kind of king-of-the-hill mentality, or a bolder than thou attitude as we have had in some of the Boards over the past years with members having long tenures as Chairmen and members of the Boards.

MR. S. EDWARD NEVILLE (CONSTITUENCY): I am also glad to see, Sir, that section 6 thereof states that:-

"6(1) A Board shall hear and deal with all applications and matters relating thereto and may grant, renew, vary or revoke any licences.

(2) In hearing an application a Board shall -

(a) sit in a place open to the public;

(b) hear on oath any person who desires to be heard in any matter relevant to an application; and

(c) record a summary of the evidence given before it."

I think it is very important that the Board is going to be meeting in a place open to the public because public hearings will not only be done, but it will appear to be done. In saying that, Sir, I am not implicating in any way that decisions taken by the Board before in closed meetings were not justified. I just think that if a person is in a quasi-situation open to the public, he feels better and feels that he is being given a fairer chance. I also think that this will give those people who may object to someone getting a licence a better opportunity to have themselves heard and to cite their grievances before the Board.

Sir, I am also happy with section 6(5) in that:-

"(5) A Board's decision shall be determined by vote."

Section 7, Sir, deals with the nature of the licence and I support these subsections:-

"7(1) A licence is a permit to an individual person or to two individual persons jointly, who may or may not be the employee or representative of another named person, to participate with this Act, by virtue of -

(a) such interlocking licences;

(b) to such quantities;

(c) to such persons;

(d) at such times;

(e) at such premises; and

(f) subject to such general conditions,

as may be specified therein, and shall be in the form prescribed by the Schedule."

I think this Bill gives a long way, Sir, in making clear what the nature of licences is; what the qualifications of licences are; what the requirements for licensed premises are. It will therefore give applicants a clear perspective of what they are required to do, and they will know what criteria they have to meet.

MR. S. PEARCE MINIER (COUNTRY): I agree with section 8(1) and (2) as clarified by the Member piloting the Bill, the Honourable Senior Official Member. I think it is very important that section 9 lays down those requirements for licensed premises. I have been in a number of licensed premises which do not presently adhere to all of these requirements and:-

"9. (1) A Board shall not grant a licence unless satisfied that the premises in respect of which the application is made -

(a) have been properly zoned and lighted;

(b) have an adequate fire extinguishing system;

(c) comply with the Local Government regulations affecting buildings, town planning and public health;

(d) are situated in a location where they will be of service to the public; and

(e) will not cause disturbance to the amenities of neighbouring property."

It has also, Sir, already identified the categories of licences, and I am also happy to know that the hotel licence has been reintroduced. Section 10(1) says:-

"10. (1) There shall be seven categories of licences, that is to say:-

(a) distribution;

(b) package;

(c) multi;

(d) hotel;

(e) temporary;

(f) restaurant; and

(g) wine and beer."

Now, Mr. Speaker, section 11 deals with the hours for sale of alcoholic liquor. Here again, Sir, I would like to see the hours a little more liberal. I see no reason why we cannot have the hours of opening to the discretion of the Licensee. To me, Sir, it is not really consistent to say that a licensee has to close at 18.00 on Saturday night because it is Sunday morning, and yet he is allowed to open at 10.00 on Monday morning. Sir, if we are arguing on the one hand that the licensee has to close because it is a Sunday and we have certain inherent restraint for a Sunday, then I do not see why he is allowed to open at 10:00 a.m. the next day, when most churches are just beginning to conduct services. So, Sir, I would like to see the hours left to the discretion of the licensee. If that is not possible, I think that maybe the Board in its wisdom the hours could at the very least extend them from Monday to Friday to 2.00 a.m. and on Saturday night to 3.00 a.m.

MR. D. SHAW MUTCH (CONTINUING): I say this, Mr. President, for several reasons. I am a keen cricketer, Sir, so I have no desire to encourage the hours proposed. Because, if I go back my wife to a game or a night-club on a Saturday night, we do not usually get there until 9.00 p.m. to 10.30 p.m., and that does not give us much time to enjoy ourselves. Besides that, Sir, at 12.00 a.m. or at 11.60 p.m. no more alcoholic beverages are served. The night-club is closed at 12.00 a.m. and I am put on the street with the person who is intoxicated or drunk. Now, Sir, I believe that if the places are left open until 4.00 or 5.00 on the morning that person who came there to drink would stay there until 4.00 or 5.00 on the morning and drink, and I would leave at 12.00 or 12.30 a.m. with my wife and have a little night cap on the way home, because I know that the drunks have been trying to get their last call. So I would like to see, Sir, the hours of opening left by the Commission.

The applications and what is required for an applicant to apply to be granted a license is clearly defined under this new Bill, Sir. The steps to be taken to qualify for the granting of a license are clearly laid out in section 12. Section 12.(1) says-

> "12.-(1) Every person desiring to obtain a new license other than a temporary license or to vary an existing license shall, at least twenty-one days before a licensing session to which he is to make application for the form provided in the Schedule to the Ordinance of the appropriate Board provided -
>
> (a) the category of license desired;
>
> (b) full details of the premises in respect of which the application is made including a plan;
>
> (c) the name and age of the applicant;
>
> (d) the proposed specified hours; and
>
> (e) such other relevant information as the applicant desires to submit to the Board."

It goes on in subsection (2), Sir, to say-

> "(2) Every applicant shall, twenty-one days before making an application, supply a copy of the proposed application to some convenient place upon the premises named therein and send copies thereof to: -
>
> (a) the Chief Medical Officer;
>
> (b) the Commissioner;
>
> (c) the Chief Fire Officer; and
>
> (d) the Executive Secretary of the Central Planning Authority."

It goes on to lay out other requirements which the licensee needs to do to get started a license. I think these kinds of detailed requirements give the licensee a better opportunity to obtain a license and provide some of the discretion as when and whether the granting of licenses by any board.

Mr. E. Wilson Miller (Leeward): I am also happy, Sir, to see that educational or temperance licences have been provided. It is true to say, Sir, that the market only to raise money or a function in Cayman is to sell liquor. Second to that is food. The Lioness clubs in this country are providing a very worthwhile service, and it is very important that they are allowed to have these occasional licences to raise funds to be put back into the community into social services, elsewhere.

The Bill goes on, Mr. President, to provide for the control of minors and disorderly persons. This may still please much responsibility on the licensee, and the onus for the respectful and lawful operation of the premises. It clearly defines the rights of the licensee although it increases his responsibility and, Sir, the Bill even provides for people through the country who may have been convicted of offences involving drunkenness. It says in section 37(1), Sir:-

> "37(1) Where a person is convicted by any court of an offence involving drunkenness or in which, in the opinion of the court, the drunkenness of such person has been a contributory factor and such person has within the previous three years been convicted of not less than two other such offences, the court may, in lieu of or in addition to any other punishment imposed, declare such person to be a prohibited person for the purposes of this Law and place such person under restriction for a period not exceeding one year."

Mr. President, I support this section of the Bill and the onus it places on the licensee to assist in restricting this person from consuming alcohol. Drunkenness, Mr. President, is a social disease. It is a sickness which needs to be treated. I would like to see enforced somewhere, Sir, in having that person a prohibited person, that that person be encouraged or maybe even made to under the Law to undergo some rehabilitative treatment, whether that means joining Alcoholics Anonymous which might be of some help to him or some other treatment. However, drunkenness is a very serious disease and I think it has to be treated as such. I believe that naming such a person as a prohibited person for the purposes of this Law may in fact help in treating that person for his disease.

Mr. President, the abolition of alcoholic prohibition within the quarter of a mile of a church has my full support. I do not believe that as at legislators our legislate morals, Sir, and I feel that if somebody wants a drink, it really does not matter whether the bar or restaurant is located within the quarter of a mile of a church, or whether it is fifteen miles away. If he wants that drink he is going to get it. I believe, Sir, that those people who consume alcohol should have equal rights under our Constitution to those people who do not and who go to church. I have never supported the absolute prohibition in granting licences to worthwhile establishments within the quarter mile limit, because if we are going to have that prohibition in the Law it is going to be enforced and not be the laughing stock it was under the old Law in that it applied only to those people seeking a new licence. Then, Sir, we might have to restrict the building of churches because some of the Christian fanatics could actually close down all of the alcohol dispensing facilities in the Islands by building churches within a quarter of a mile of each establishment. I think if we are going to prohibit one side we should have to prohibit the other, so I do not think any prohibition is necessary at all, Sir.

MR. D. EDWARD HEFNER (NORTHERN): I have no fear of supporting this section of the Bill, Sir, because I think it is the people in my district at a public meeting. I explained what the Law was going to do, and I made it quite clear that we were going to lift the prohibition on a quarter mile zone. I knew that it is a vote, Sir, amongst the people because I had one person in the crowd who objected. The vote was 42 for lifting the prohibition and one person against it. Most of those who abstained, Sir, made it a point to approach me after the meeting and tell me that they were in favour of removing it. But because of their positions in the church bodies in the district they could not publicly identify with the removal. So I have no worries about supporting this, or most of my colleagues.

I am glad, Sir, that the new Government has had the guts on the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council said this morning, to put it into the Bill. Sir, it has my full support, and if other Members find it possible to support my idea of liberalizing the House and letting them be at the discretion of the Members, or at the very least ameliorating [illegible] staying open until 2.00 a.m. on Saturday and I o'clock on Sunday morning I would be very grateful, Sir.

So with those few remarks, Sir, I support the Bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member wish to continue....? Ah, the Second Elected Member for George Town.

MR. LESLIE A. TIBBETTS: Mr. President, as the Deputy Chairman of the Higher Licensing Board for Grand Cayman I feel that I would be remiss in my duty this afternoon if I allowed the opportunity to pass without debating this Bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, with the exception of the two principal alterations in this Bill, the balance of the Bill is merely a consolidation of a number of amendments made over the past nine years. So I do not see the necessity to have to go back all the details of this Bill as we have been working with it in one way or the other over a number of years.

The two principal variations are the consolidation and removal of office, and the abolishment of the quarter mile restriction. As understand by the Honourable First Official Member of Executive Council, the mover of this Bill, I too am aware of the many representations made by certain individuals from Cayman Brac and perhaps locally. However, I believe, Sir, that our duty in this House must supersede the personal feelings of a minority. Our duty is to endeavour to legislate laws which will be in the best interests of the majority of the people in the Cayman Islands.

I am very pleased, Mr. President, with section 3(d) and (e) of the Bill which states that the Chairman of the Boards shall be nominations or members of the House. Mr. President, in Grand Cayman at present we have no problem with this because our present Chairman is a member of the House and also the Deputy Chairman. I am sure, Mr. President, that the same could be true always for Cayman Islands. While I agree with the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council that perhaps the people in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman could be left to do as they please, I believe that the Law should apply to all alike. I believe, Sir, that when we put the Chairmanship of the Higher Licensing Board

MR. EDMOND A. EFFENDY (CONTINUING): whether it be an Orual Cyprus or Cyprus Rhodesian or Little Cyprus into the hands of a Muslim of the Press or a magistrate that we are talking about here honourable men. We are not talking about men who have no interest in this country and I believe that the objectors to the Bill should bear this in mind.

Mr. President, the Member for North Side raised a very important point in that he stated that under section 5(2) of the Bill the hearing of an application of the Board will be heard in a public place. The Board, Mr. President, is not attempting to hide anything from the public. Any member of the public may, with the permission of the Chairman, come in and listen to the proceedings provided as I said he gave his permission. Section 6(3)(b) states that every person who desires to be heard in any matter relevant to an application shall be heard on oath. Mr. President, I do not think that it is asking very much for our people when we have so much doubt in their ability to do what is in the best interests of this country. The only part of this Bill, Mr. President, which I feel perhaps could raise some amount of fear is the section to do with the abolishing of the absolute prohibition on the granting of licences within the quarter mile limit of a church.

Here again, Mr. President, I see no reason why there should be any anxiety on the part of the churches in this respect, because our Boards are comprised of honourable people; intelligent, reasonable and knowledgable, Mr. President, religious individuals. So they have an interest also, Mr. President, that nothing is done to harm the people of this country. It also states, Mr. President, in section 6(1) of the Bill that:-

"6. (1) A Board shall not grant a licence to any person unless it is satisfied that such person is -

(a) of good character, and entitled to the Board a certificate signed by the Commissioner showing his record of criminal convictions (if any) over the preceding fifteen years;

(b) over the age of twenty-one years;"

So we are not dealing with people who are not mature, Mr. President. We dealing with mature, intelligent individuals.

Also under section 8(3) it states that objections will be given very serious consideration. Section 8(3)(a) states that:-

"A Board shall not grant a licence unless satisfied that the premises in respect of which the application is made -

(a) will not cause inconvenience to the occupiers of neighbouring property."

I think it is important, Mr. President, for the public to understand that the Board will not just sit there and grant licences right and left, but that it will take account of any objections made by members of the public and the immediate vicinity of the church. However, I think, Mr. President, that it is unnecessarily for members of the church to sit back on a matter like this and let the other businessmen in this country applied because they have no confidence in members whom we have appointed to run these Boards.

MR. LAWRENCE A. PETERSON (CONTINUED): The Elected Member for North Side raised a very important point. The Government is going to be giving some consideration to the location of these Liquor establishments and other Liquor establishments should be located. However, should anybody suggest to them whether they are permitted to put their church next door to a Liquor establishment. There seems to be some amount of inconsistency in this, Mr. President.

I realize, Mr. President, that this is a political hot potato and this is why up to this point in time nobody has had the guts; our Legislatures have not had the guts to bring this forward because they are afraid that they will lose votes on the election. However, win or lose votes I am going to support this amendment because whatever I do in this House I feel it to be done in the best interests of the majority of the people of this country. We cannot allow political considerations to cloud our judgement and I believe that may likewise have been made to Members of the House that if they support this, then they will not get the support of the churches. I believe that this is wrong and I want to compliment the Government generally in power for having the guts to put this forward; in particular I compliment the Honourable First Official Member. He does not have any votes to give, but at least he is subjected to the same criticisms from members of the public, and the prohibition members of the Republic".

Mr. President, I support this Bill wholeheartedly. Again I would like to congratulate the Member for bringing this forward.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

CAPT. KENNY S. RISPROHAM: Mr. President, the Bill now before this Honourable House, a Bill for a Law to repeal and replace the Liquor Licensing Law (Revised) is a very necessary Bill and I support it.

I have seen the need in the Honourable mover of the Bill also from a RCIT which we should all understand. With the eight or more amendments it was difficult if one was not a lawyer to really understand it properly. This section in one sitting now will certainly make it easier to understand for all the people.

I support the composition of the Boards as listed in this and I should like to say to the Honourable former Elected Member for George Town that in Cayman Brac for many, many years we have had a Justice of the Peace on the Chairman of our Liquor Licensing Board. It has been properly administered.

We, are the existing minimum in Cayman Brac and are very grateful to the Honourable mover who has gone to great lengths to explain the provisions of section 8. I share the concern of my people, as voiced here by the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council, my colleague from Cayman Brac. We are concerned that our society improves and does not deteriorate in the social structure. However, I am encouraged, and I shall attempt to convince my people, that this gives us the necessary initiative. I am a member of the Liquor Licensing Board for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman will certainly do all that I can to see that this can be administered fairly to all.

I would like to call the Members' attention to a provision which I think is most important in this Bill, which is section 7, sub-section (2):-

SUBJ: MOVED S. KIRKCONNELL (CONTINUED):

" (6) A fence may be erected or removed without consent of any permittee designating the whole or any part of the licensed premises as a bar but no fence shall be so erected designated as a bar unless it is capable of being locked off from the rest of the premises in such a way as to deny access thereto to persons other than licensees."

Mr. President, this is a provision which like all of the bill which needs serious amendment must be rejected. In many premises one does not know when one is in the bar or restaurant area, or when one is in the lounge, and it must be made this section can be looked off.

Other provisions in this bill as carried over from the previous law, are very necessary for the proper, orderly operation of a liquor licensed premises selling intoxicating beverages. I feel the provisions in this are adequate and I look forward as a member of the Board, as I would, to administering it to the best of my ability.

With these few words, Mr. President, I support the bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. W. MERRILL HUGH: Mr. President, I had.....

MR. PRESIDENT: Oh, I am so sorry. Well, I think perhaps it may be convenient to take our afternoon break.

MR. W. MERRILL HUGH: Then I have not risen, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I will give the Member his opportunity to speak once we are suitably refreshed. I will suspend proceedings for about fifteen minutes.

AT 2.58 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

ROUSE RESUMED AT 3.30 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. MERRILL HUGH: Mr. President, I suppose the title of I read the comprehensive Liquor Licensing Law, not because I am in favour extensive of the sale of alcohol, but because whether I like it or not people who want to are going to use alcohol. As responsible legislators it is our duty to regulate the sale and distribution of alcohol in our society.

I am not foolish enough, Sir, to believe that this Bill, needed though it is, will cure the ills of alcohol use and alcohol abuse in our midst. Many people, including influential people in my constituency and from elsewhere in the

MR. W. HENRY [NAME OF RECENTLY] Patients have made representation to me the Little Bell. I have informed to them repeatedly and in many of the cases I share their concern. However, Sir, as I will also as a legislator it is my duty to do here what I believe to be in the best interests of the country. It is my firm belief that while this honourable House can and should set a moral example for the country, we cannot and I am sure should not seek to lay to not ourselves up as moral judges of the country.

Mr. President, I am all glad about this I would love to see everyone in church on Sundays, not because I am any strong conservative Christian, neither, Sir, am I to be taken as a fanatic Christian, not by any means. I like to believe that I am more a moderate. Regardless I have been all this House and before, have called me a hypocrite and they will surely all always please hypocrites. However, that is why for those who truth. I am no hypocrite, Sir. I go to church because I am not afraid to see myself as I am, and I am satisfied that I am in church of which I really am. When I am in church, I see real truths. I see genuine honesty. I see real love on a scale. So these people who might call church goers hypocrites and for this reason stay away from the church does are afraid to come in because they are afraid to see themselves as they are. They prefer to have a few drinks on Saturday and be free to worry anymore until Monday in the afternoon and say what a "good boy am I". You, Sir, they live in the world of make believe, the world of sham.

Having said that, I do not believe, Mr. President, that this country would tolerate it if we came here and tried to pass a law prohibiting the sale of alcohol within the country. Further, Sir, it is my belief that if we did pass such legislation it would be ignored by the populace just as it was ignored when an attempt was made years ago to enforce such a law in the United States. I am sure, Mr. President, that the older heads all remember those episodes. Many of them worked in the Cayman Islands which formed the illegal liquor runs into the United States' coastal ports. What type of legislation, Sir, would the smugglers and prohibition out of whatever good and lawful minions.

Some people have asked me, Mr. President, how am I to be so strongly opposed to young men and women while consuming the use of alcohol. I believe, Sir, it is fair for me to say that in the same meaning of the word I consider neither alcohol nor was guns or the use of drugs such as ganja as addictive. However, Sir, I and the rest of this House were elected to guide the country and to pass legislation here to afford that guidance.

I was born into a world using and abusing alcohol. As far I have read of the presence of the world since the time of Noah's flood. I feel that it was here even before that time. If no one then today has succeeded in abolishing the use of alcohol in all this time, it is unlikely that I or this honourable House will be able to do so. However, we can and will, Sir, with this Bill if it is passed, try our far as is possible to regulate the use in our society..

Mr. President, I am very well aware of the results of alcohol abuse. I see it around me every day and everywhere I look. Maybe I am a victim of the abuse of alcohol. The abuse of alcohol often results in social problems which we must also deal with. That, Sir, is my reason for supporting most of the provisions in the Licensing Laws we have just dealt in the Budget Address. I say that, Sir, because the increased fees for package licenses, in my opinion, are ridiculous. I do not know whether this is the place to say it, however, although I am not discussing the

MR. W. HOLMES BROWN (CONTINUING): from what they should be compensated, the fee on my opinion is uncertainly ridiculous. I have also had many representations from people in my district. However, knowing the Government I understand that it was a mistake and that it will soon be changed and the fees will be at a different structure. So I hope the Opposition will take note.

So as one, Sir, contrary to what some people may think there are packages stores which are not owned by the two monopolistic Wholesalers and these independent package stores have made difficulties competing with the Wholesalers. In some instances the Wholesalers have a package outlet in their stores. We have small package stores in the islands which are not in the commercial and tourist related areas and there is one package store in Hope Bay and two in Bodden Town. Those stores, Sir....

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Member is tending to talk irrelevantly about people of fees which really do not arise directly out of this Bill. They are a separate issue which has been debated separately. Unless the Member can very soon explain in what way he relates the points he is making to the Bill which is now under consideration I shall have to bring him back to the Bill itself or stop him.

MR. W. HOLMES BROWN: Thank you very much, Sir. I was just coming to a close on what I was saying. All I want to do is make the point, Sir, that the fees which have proposed are very dramatic, and in my opinion unrealistic. I maintain....

MR. SPEAKER: It is not part of this Bill.

MR. W. HOLMES BROWN: Yes, Sir. I am attempting that I did want to get the point across. I believe I have made my point. Thank you very much, Sir. I abide by your ruling.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of the quantum which prohibits the granting of a license within the quarter mile radius of a church, school or state institution into the 2nd and I believe I am right in saying this, after licenses had already been granted in some places within that quarter mile radius. So Sir, whatever could be done seeking to prohibit has already been done.

I wish to say, Sir, that I will agree with this motion only because under law the Board will have to meet in the public, have representation from individuals or groups which would include churches and other civic organizations. It would be impossible, in my opinion, under the provisions of the law for one man-person where local intolerance might and violence could disturb church services. I could never agree with that and I hope that the people in Bodden Town will take that into consideration. I do not have any objection against granting a license to an enclosed business where people can sit down decently and have a decent meal, and if they want to have a glass of wine I am agree with that, Sir. Our Caymanian people have suffered. I myself have been a victim of this and I know what they are going through so I can support the idea as I said, hopes that the Board will take this matter into consideration.

Mr. President, it was just years before, in 1967 when we had more restrictive legislation brought to this House concerning liquor licenses. I would trust that under this Bill we would never have to face this sort of situation.

MR. W. MARSHALL BASS (CONTINUING): As the poem reads I believe who said, "A good law is one which holds whether you recognize it or not, a bad law is one that cannot,however much you croak it. All too often the old law fails to hold".

Mr.President, the watchword of this Government is responsibility and accountability. The Higher Education boards created by this Bill will consist of reasonable and responsible persons, people who will examine every application on its merits. Mr. President, we have heard much talk about the appointment of Boards since this new Government has been elected. I signify nonetheless a new item my nomination....

MR. PRESIDENT: I hope we are going to keep to the present title.

MR. W. MARSHALL BASS: Yes, Sir, but does the Bill not talk about Boards?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, but that does not give the Member licence to talk about the possible appointments to other Boards on various occasions.

MR. W. MARSHALL BASS: I am only talking about the Higher Education Boards. Mr. Mitchell being, Sir, is a member of the Higher Education Board for Naval Dayton. With respect I am dealing with that, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, you satisfy me but really what you should be addressing to the question of whether in principle the kind of provision in relation to the appointment and composition of a Board for which the present Bill provides, is in your view right or wrong. This is not the place to advance arguments or speak on question on members or particular appointments.

MR. W. MARSHALL BASS: Thank you, Sir. You may be right. Anyway, Sir, I just want to say that this man is an honest man and I believe that he knows what he is doing, and I have confidence in him to do right by this country. What is why I said that the watchwords of the Government are responsibility and accountability. That was the point I was trying to make. Anyway I still abide by your ruling.

MR. PRESIDENT: Having made your point, I guide accordingly.

MR. W. MARSHALL BASS: However, Sir, even before the application is considered by the Board the Planning Department must approve the site, and the Health Department and the Fire Department must also give their approval. It does not seem to me to be a one step procedure, Mr. President, and I do not require to find the responsible people on our Planning Board or the Fire Side and Health Departments giving any such approvals where it is not merited.

Perhaps, Mr. President, once this Bill is passed the Government can of Government, I believe, will have a clear and unmistakable piece of legislation, legislation, Sir, which they can-and I hope,they will enforce.

Mr. President, there are more sink-aways or unlicensed alcohol outlets in this country than there are licensed outlets. In some cases they are almost on the doorsteps of the churches, schools and other centres. Many of them, Sir, are situated under a two

MR. M. MORGAN ROSS (CONSERVATIVE): In the back yard somewhere, and all too often the axe is found down once hand in hand with the illegal sale of alcohol. Those are the planes, Sir, which in my opinion nonetheless have so many social problems in that they have absolutely nothing to gripe at any time irrespective of who, as long as they have the money to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care to say too much on this Bill but I cannot help but believe that the initiative must lie square of these planes. Just how often I would ask, do we see anyone brought before the courts. If there's a problem on the old Lot I hope they will have note taxi and understand that new and workable legislation is being passed by this House and the Members of this Government, and the people of this country expect them to enforce it.

Mr. Speaker, I propose that it be my duty as a legislator to do here what I believe to be the best interests of our country.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I support the Bill and suggest that we now go right into Committee since the explanation has gone. (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order.

Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Leader wish to exercise his right of reply?

HON. PETER F. POCKEY: Yes, Sir, very briefly. I wanted just like to refer to the points made by the Elected Member for North Side, and to say to him that because the Government has the power of opening at the most unusual occasion, we will bear in mind the remarks which he has made on that.

Apart from that, Sir, I would just like to thank the Members very much for supporting the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend and replace the Liquor Licensing Law (Revised) be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now go into Committee to study a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Defamation Law (Revised) and other Bills.

THE DEFAMATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

COMMITTEE STAGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

The House is now in Committee. The Defamation (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF LAW 29 OF 1968.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the question on Clause 8, perhaps it may be convenient at this stage just to ask whether the House will agree that in connection with the procedure we have been adopting recently, the Honourable Second Official Member should be empowered to approve any parking, appropriation or similar excess which may have occurred since the printed version of the Bill. That saves the Committee from the task of having to identify each one and to approve the commencement. Perhaps I can just ask those who agree with that procedure sometimes, to say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: As no one dissents, for this Bill and for other Bills which we are considering today in Committee, the Honourable Second Official Member is so empowered.

The question now is that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill. If no Member wishes to speak I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 8 AGREED.

CLERK: Clause 9. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22 OF THE PRINCIPAL ACT.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 9 AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR AN ACT TO AMEND THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that the Title stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What instructions is this? For a Law to amend the Interpretation Law (Revised).

No Standing Order of the Legislative Assembly, (Immunities Powers and Privileges) (Amendment) Bill, 1982.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: Clause 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1, stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1. AGREED.

CLERK: Clause 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3 OF LAW 22 OF 1966.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (EMERGENCY POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) LAW (REVISED).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the title stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS CLAUSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That concludes a Bill for a Law to amend the Legislative Assembly (Emergency Powers and Privileges) Law (Revised).

We have next to the Marine Conservation (Amendment) Bill, 1982. Before I invite the Clerk to start on that perhaps it may be convenient to deal with the objection of Members to Standing Order 58(6), the effect of which is essentially that if a new clause is proposed to a Bill, then discussion of that new clause and the proposal that the clause be added to the Bill after all the clauses in the Bill have been considered. I am bound to confess that I had hitherto overlooked that provision, and I suspect that in the past the practice has crept in of taking a new clause in the place in the Bill in which according to its number it ought to come instead of first discussing all the clauses in the Bill and then at the end discussing the new clauses. However, since paragraph (6) of Standing Order 58 has come to my notice, and since it is mandatory rather than permissive, I think we should observe it. Therefore all the amendments of which I have been given notice, I think relate to new clauses.

Anyway, we will go through the clauses in the present Bill in order and then come to any new ones.

THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 34 OF LAW 12 OF 1978.

HON. ROBERT G. DONOVAN: Mr. Chairman, that Clause 2 be deleted in the amendments proposed are accepted as Clause 4. So there are two clauses to go between Clause 1 and this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Am I right that the position is that Clause 2 stands part of

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... knowledge of the note which I have got....

MRS. MARGOT G. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir, there are some pitfalls inherent in it. You are quite right.

HON. MICHAEL J. SHARLEY: This does possibly go with what I have been hearing a Backbencher say to Standing Orders, because the difficulty as I see it is we have to wonder the Standing Orders to which you referred, Sir, only amount to this, that things are done on the smallest possible quorum that we will do just enough and put up the new notices on the Bill. Whereas if I am....

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would not be necessary if we did not put on the new clauses.

HON. MICHAEL J. SHARLEY: That would not be necessary if we did not put on the new clauses. This is the point that I think, having gone back, perhaps on behalf of the Government here now, to take just one, that we will have to reconsider this one to receive the things which have been in between.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry. I did not realize that, well, maybe when we have a Committee on Standing Orders it will have to look at Standing Order 58(6) and alter it.

Put as for the remaining the two amendments which have been proposed on the assumption that we keep all the clauses later. If we don't we do not add the clauses, then we will have to come back to Clause 2. Would the Honourable Minister Member of Executive Council care to confirm that he wishes to make the two amendments to the existing Clause 2 which were circulated in his name?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE: Yes, Sir, if that is the procedure I agree with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think according to the present Standing Orders it is.... So the two proposals are that the full stop should be substituted for the words "on 31st 1975" in the marginal note, and "period not" should be substituted for "March Consolidation Law, 1978" in the first two lines.

I will put the question first that Clause 2 by amended as proposed.

QUESTION PUT AGREED. AMENDMENT AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the question that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT, AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AS AMENDED AGREED.

HON. MICHAEL J. SHARLEY: Perhaps the Clerk could note that there are three small typographical errors in that clause and I will undertake with her and tell her what they are.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3. REPEAL AND REPLACEMENT OF SECTION 25 OF THE PENSIONS LAW.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . Perhaps just to explain to Members so there is no misunderstanding, Clause 2 will also automatically be renumbered if we call the new clauses. However, for the moment we take it as Clause 2.

If no Member wishes to speak on it, I have....

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, Sir, but from my own clarity I believe I circulated an amendment to Clause 2 of the proposed amendment which is now replacing Clause 2. So maybe I should....

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we come to that. After we have done those three there will be a proposal for a new clause. That is what then shall be debated your amendment to that new clause will come in.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Alright, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not entering your memos.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Alright, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was saying I have not had any proposed amendment other than the amendments relating to Clause 2. So unless any Member wishes to speak I will put the question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

DR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Now, I think, Sir, we come back to....

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the new Clauses before us....

DR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, I have a proposed Committee Stage Amendment I was given notice of by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council, It was a proposal to insert a new Clause 2. Perhaps it will be helpful if I just read it so that Members can certain what we are talking about. It has a marginal note, "Amendment of section 12 of Law 12 of 1978", and then the new Clause 2:-

> "Section 12 of the Marine Conservation Law, 1978, in this Law referred to as the principal Law, is amended -
>
> (a) by deleting everything between the word "offence" in the second line and the full stop; and
>
> (b) by substituting "prohibited" for "restricted" in the marginal note.".

I have also had and I must say this quite right, notice from the Elected Member for North Side and the Honourable Second Official Member that the amendment which I have just read out be itself amended by adding a new subparagraph which would read:-

> (c) by the addition, immediately following the word "whatever" in line one thereof, of the following words - "save & except in his possession in the Cayman Islands or".

MR. CHAIRMAN (CONTINUED): I have also been given notice of another amendment by the Elected Member for North Side. That amendment is to substitute for sub-paragraph (a) of the proposed new clause:-

> "unless licensed by the Board who may for good reason licence such contravention as to possession and use as he may think fit";

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Mr. President, I think if we allow the word "prohibited" in the marginal note we cannot then say that the exemptions can be licensed. Should not the word "unauthorized" remain as a marginal note?

HON. VALDIS O. MCWATCH: Mr. Chairman, I believe (b) in number 2 of the proposed amendments could very well fall away if we accept the recommendations of the Elected Member for North Side, because in fact exemptions would not then be prohibited but would be restricted as they are in the law at the present time.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, Sir, if we were the right of the mover of the original amendment and of the Elected Member for North Side and of the Members of the Bench, if I could try to take the opportunity after you have formally put the amendment to the House to clear what the position of the Law would need with of both the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council's amendment and the Elected Member for North Side's amendment so the amendments were all joined. I think the procedure as it has to be under Standing Orders, Mr. Chairman, and if you put the question I would then attempt to deal in as it would be if something was joined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it would be easily possible under Standing Orders if it is necessary for me to put the three questions separately. However, I do think it would be helpful if Members still knew what the effect would be if their wished were both to the original new clause and to the two amendments to it. I am hoping that we can complete the business fairly soon and I am neglecting the fact that it is just after 6.30 p.m.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Can we adjourn and complete the business right down the list to the Liquor Licensing Law, Sir? Could we suspend Standing Orders?

HON. VALDIS O. MCWATCH: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could read to you what the amended section of the Bill, that is section 14 would read?

MR. Chairman: That would be very helpful I think.

HON. ROBERT J. VIBERT: The marginal note would remain the same, "Use of apparatus restricted". The section would read:-

> "Whereas has a apparatus or taken any narcotic life with the aid of a apparatus in Cayman Waters unless licensed by the Board who may in generally such licence make such restrictions as to possession and use as he may think fit";

Something is missing there.

HON. CHARLES T. KENNEDY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring your attention to Standing Order 10(1). If we wish to continue we should put a motion....

HON. WILLIAM G. JOHNSON: I hope I'll get a few words out there, Sir, it reads:-

> "Whenever has a specimen or takes any marine life which the old of a specimen in Canada Waters in policy of an offence unless licensed by the Board who may in granting such license make such conditions as to possession and use as he may think fit";

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, let us reconcile things. Why I formally move the suspension of Standing Orders in order to have the Committee Stage of the Bill presently before the House disposed of. That will get it that far.

HON. CHAIRMAN: I think it is perhaps as well to do that. I had been hoping that we would only take three or four minutes beyond the moment of interruption and the Standing Order 10(1) does allow us that amount of license. Possibly, it may be that we are going to take another five or ten minutes. Perhaps therefore we should put formally a motion that Standing Orders be suspended. Can that be done in Committee or do we have to resume the House? I think possibly it has to be the House which suspends Standing Orders. I do not think a Committee can do it.

So I think I will resume the Chair.

House resumed

HON. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

I wonder whether the Honourable Senator Most Official Member, whichever you like would like....

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(1)

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, Sir, I should like to propose the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the Committee Stage of the Bill shortly entitled the Marine Conservation (Amendment) Bill, 1980 to be disposed of. I would say, Sir, in addition that having disposed of that, it may be possible that some other Senator may wish to move a further suspension of Standing Orders for a limited purpose also. However, I think if we go that far we will see how long it takes.

HON. H. MACKENZIE GUAY: I would suggest that we try to finish what we have here in Committee now.

HON. CHAIRMAN: So you mean the Committee Stage of all the Bills?

HON. H. MACKENZIE GUAY: Yes. I think we should try to do that, Sir.

HON. DENNIS G. STEVENS: I agree with that, Sir.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: I accept the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House that the Standing Orders be suspended so as to enable the Committee Stages of all the Bills to be completed this evening.

HON. MICHAEL J. DRAPEAU: Of all the Bills on Today's Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. I meant on Today's Order Paper.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. STANDING ORDER 19(2) SUSPENDED TO ENABLE COMMITTEE STAGE OF ALL BILLS ON THE ORDER PAPER TO BE CONSIDERED.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee will resume.

COMMITTEE RESUMED

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

HON. JAMES P. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose that the Honourable Second Official Member decide with those amendments because they are somewhat complicated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure. Have all Members understood? Because I think the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Committee did read out how the.....? No?

HON. MICHAEL J. DRAPEAU: Not correctly, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well. Would it be the wish of the Committee that I should invite the Honourable Second Official Member to read out how the section of the Law will read if the Committee approves the new clause proposed by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council, the amendment to it proposed by the Elected Member for North Side, and the amendment to it which he himself proposed? Then the Committee will understand what the position is going to look like if we agree to everything which has been proposed.

HON. S. BERARD MILLER: Yes, Sir.

HON. MICHAEL J. DRAPEAU: Mr. Chairman, if all these amendments and amendments to amendments were passed the section would read, and I will go slowly:-

> "Whoever has a weapon in his possession in the Yukon Territory or takes any member of the public the case of a weapon in respect to which the said of a weapon in respect to which he does not possess a valid Firearms Licence issued by the Board who may be lawfully such Licence make such conditions as to possession and use as it may think fit;"

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does all Members of the Committee understand that?

HON. JAMES P. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir. What is the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sure that is the effect of the new clause and the amendments. Now, as I mentioned before, for technical reasons to comply with Standing Orders, I have to put the questions one at a time.

MR. CHAIRMAN (CONTINUING): Firstly I will put the question that the new clause be added to the form proposed by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council, secondly that that new clause be amended in the manner proposed by the Elected Member for North Side, and thirdly that the amended clause be further amended in the manner proposed by the Honourable Second Official Member. Then I would have to put the clause as amended. If the vote is "aye" for all those things the effect will be what has just been read out. Since therefore....

MR. K. MORESBY SIDE: May we speak on it, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you may speak. You may speak to each of the parts, on the clause, on the amendment, and on the second amendment. So the first question is that a new clause 5 as proposed by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council should be added. Does any Member wish to speak on that?

MR. K. MORESBY SIDE: Just a question, Sir. Fees are talked about here. Will the Law say what sort of fee will be charged?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think we have talked about fees quite seriously.

HON. MISS M. MORESBY: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing there about a fee, unless my eyes are bad.

MR. K. MORESBY SIDE: No, I am sorry. They are not talking about fees, but they are talking about a license. I guess to get a license everybody is going to have to pay.

HON. MISS M. MORESBY: Perhaps I could remind the Member with the permission of the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council. Under the law as it stands at the moment the regulations making powers contained in section 84, subsection (h) says:-

"The Governor may make regulations -

(h) fees to be charged by the Board for receiving applications and granting licenses under this Law;"

So there is a power at present contained in the Law to charge fees for granting licenses, and I think the proper course would be for the Second Elected Member for West Bay to make representation as to the amount charged for those licenses to the appropriate Committee.

MR. K. MORESBY SIDE: My understanding of the Regulations is that in the Regulations a fee will be....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Law gives power for a fee to be prescribed for a license by regulation. That is the way it would be done and the Honourable Second Official Member was suggesting that you should make representations to the Committee about what the going rate would be a reasonable fee to charge for a license of the kind which we are now contemplating.

MR. FLOOD O. DARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is very likely that a fee will be charged for the license because we license to make sure without a fee. However, I am sure that the Secretary's Council will have enough to deal with on the question of the fee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would think that perhaps this is really not a revenue measure and the fee would be used to cover the administrative costs of issuing the license.

MR. W. MORGAN SHUSTER: Yes, with that in reply to my comment, just knowing that they are not just following I am hoping that they are not going to charge too much. (LAUGHTER).

MR. EDWARD A. FITZROY: Mr. Chairman, will sections 16(c)(1) and 16(c) remain in the text? It is right that the amendments deal with up to "three fish". This is one part of the Electoral Reform for South Africa motion. The rest of that paragraph says:-

"Save that the use of a speargun -

(a) (i) by any one person to take for human consumption only not more than one fish;"

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will remain.

MR. EDWARD A. FITZROY: It will come under the honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council's proposed amendment.

MR. EDWARD A. FITZROY: This section of the Law will be deleted?

MR. D. CRAIG MILLER: Just section 16(1) and (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall try to explain matters but let me try again. If the Committee votes in favour of the two clauses, the Elected Member for South Africa's amendment to 16, and the Honourable Second Official Member's amendment to 16, those two technical effect will be a new section 16, the wording of which will be as read out by the Honourable Second Official Member earlier.

MR. EDWARD A. FITZROY: I understand that, Sir, but that would be first change the whole wording of section 16, because as I understand it the two amendments would read:-

"Whosoever have a speargun in his possession in the Cayman Islands or takes any marine life with the aid of a speargun in Cayman Waters is guilty of an offence unless licensed by the Board who may in granting such licence make such restrictions as to possession and use as he may think fit;"

This really does not provide for any number of fishes which may be taken by any one person in one day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It leaves it to the Board.

MR. EDWARD A. FITZROY: It leaves it freely will open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It leaves it to the Board.

MR. LEONARD A. STEPHEN: Alright.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Board would have right to do that, and we would be breaching the Board to put a reasonable limit on....

MR. LEONARD A. STEPHEN: Alright, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ....and only so because those people who reasonably needed to have exemptions at all.

MR. LEONARD A. STEPHEN: This is the question, Sir, which I was just a little afraid of, that it should be properly controlled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, now what I put the question then that the new clause stand part of the Bill, that the new clause be agreed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Secondly, I will put the question that the clause be amended in the manner proposed by the Elected Member for North Side. Unless any Member wishes to discuss that I will put that question.

AMENDMENT I - That the Clause be amended by the deletion of the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (a) thereof, and the substitution therefor of the following -

"and substituting therefor "unless licensed by the Board who may in granting such licence make such conditions as to possession and use as it may think fit".".

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I will put the question that the clause be amended as circulated in the Bill proposed by the Honourable Second Official Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I will put the question that the clause as before amended be added to the Bill. It will now be as read out by the Honourable Second Official Member.

AMENDMENT II - That the Clause be amended by the deletion of ",", immediately at the end thereof and the substitution therefor of the following -

"; and

(c) by the addition immediately following the word "weapon" in line one thereof, of the following words "that a person has in his possession in the Cayman Islands or".".

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I will put the question that the clause as before amended be added to the Bill. It will now be as read out by the Honourable Second Official Member.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. NEW CLAUSE 2 AS THUS AMENDED AGREED TO BE PART OF THE BILL AND CLAUSE 2 AS AMENDED AND PASSED, RENUMBERED AS CLAUSE 3.

MR. LLOYD A. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman, I would just a bit more slowly on one point here because I want to be able to explain this bill to my people. Am I to understand, Sir, that may then a certificate or application is granted, that that will create automatically how many fish or bushels a person may take, because it would seem as though the Board would already be there, and you use to have to write in on each occasion for each person asking for an application would seem pretty onerous.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: I think the Board might establish a general principle of what they would contemplate, and have a consistent policy that each license when granted would give a standard consideration for a reasonable number. That would be my hope and expectation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRAIGMILE: I do not think the Board would expect each fisherman to simply every day before he went out and caught a fish for dinner or how many fish he could catch that. I think they would say that for instance we would restrict up in the Tuktoyaktuk or Aklavik fish or whatever might be the case. So the Member says I hope they would be consistent in what they would grant to different people.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Board will establish a policy which they will run on a yearly. It is very likely that that policy will be examined quite carefully before it is put into effect.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mrs Clerk ??

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am most grateful to the Committee for their help in getting me through that.

We now come to a second proposed new clause. This second proposed new clause was contained in the Committee Clerk amendment put forward by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council, and it was a proposal which sought to insert a new Clause 3 amending section 25 of the principal Law. It has not been....

MR. PETER J. PUNCHESS: Mr. Chairman, it was just an amendment to Clause 24. It is not a new Clause 25. It is just an amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it is a new Clause 3 amending section 25 of the principal Law.

MR. PETER J. PUNCHESS: You are right, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I did not say that I would help myself, so But that is what it is. I made not even any proposals to insert it, therefore....

HON. MUSSER E. GORDON: Well, we have all commented on the passages, Sir, but nobody made any specific recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not too sure from the....

HON. PETER J. PUNCHESS: Nobody made any specific recommendations. I know that it was mentioned thereby the Police.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that....

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: There have been discussions and I do not think there was any criticism to formally move an amendment to the amendment.

MR. J. KEITH MILLER: No, Sir, as long as it is clear that parks and golf links do not include a skating rink for example, then I have no problems with the amendment as proposed.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: The Member has been reassured?

MR. J. KEITH MILLER: Yes.

MR. Chairman: In that case the question is that a new Clause 6 amending section 16 of the principal Act be inserted. Perhaps for the record I might be read out what that new Clause 6 will read. It will have a marginal note:-

"Amendment of S.16 of the principal Act."

The Clause itself reads:-

"6. Section 16 of the principal Act is amended by deleting "dollar for dollar for human consumption or fish basis" in the second and third lines."

Does any Member wish to speak on the proposed addition of this clause?

MR. LEONARD A. FISHOOK: Mr. Chairman, it is just why I should think this morning the elected Member for Hall Bay who is not here now did express concern for the welfare of the people in that part of this area a complete prohibition of the use of seines in this district. A lot of people depend on seines for a living for domestic and commercial needs. I am not trying to speak on the basis of that but the fact that I am here the situation which exists in that district. I wonder if we could not make a similar amendment for the use of seines. I am not too familiar what gill nets but we could have an amendment for the use of seines as we did with crossbows. That could also be controlled in a similar manner.

MR. W. ROBERTS EVANS: I would agree with that, Sir. I have had some people say the same thing to me and I am concerned, not that I believe there are dozens of people in my constituency using seines. However, the seine is used and I believe it does provide a livelihood for some people. Since we say that one can license a crossbow I feel that maybe the same provision should be made for the seine. I have never seen gill nets so I do not know what they would look like. I understand they are not a good thing so I have no qualms about that. However, the banning of the seine in my constituency would cause some hardship and I feel that we can make some provision for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Member has to move an amendment, we have to give leave to do so as legal advice to be sought to make an amendment to the proposed new clause in view of addition to the amendment moved by the Elected Member for South Side in respect of crossbows, would the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council whose clause it is be prepared to accept it?

SEN. WALTER G. HARRISON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will accept it.

MR. D. LEWIS MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think that the difference here, Sir, is in the potential damage which can be done to marine life. A specimen, once when it is released can only take one fish at a time. I have spearfished marine and I believe one of those who has caught fish in salmon. I do not think it is a matter of easy to say widely used in the Islands today. If we allow the netting net to continue to be used I think that an amendment of this is because salmon might be fair distance from what we are trying to achieve, because of the potential damage which a purse net can do in that it is going to take everything which swims in the water, whereas a specimen will only take one fish. That is my only reservation about licensing a marine net. We cannot have the same protection for the use of a marine net as we have for a specimen because it is going to be very difficult for somebody servicing a school of fish to only take one or eight fish. The way the nature that operates is that it is pulled under the school of fish after surrounding them, and they are lifted out of the water or if it's a harvest. It is going to be very difficult to restrict the quantity. What is going to happen is that whoever is receiving the fish is forced almost to take the whole catch. I have seen people say at times, for instance in a school of pelican fishes because of the nature surrounded, to release the school so they could light it out of the harvest. Once there is one species, Sir, it seems that the fishes fall the water and one does never get it back on the ground it like to keep fish or else. So one wishes takes all or takes none.

That is my concern and I think it is going to be difficult for the Board to put a restriction on it even at the species where it can only already can only take ten fish or five lobster. To try and work that kind of a thing there a fish net and a seine net is going to be very difficult for the Board to establish and control.

MR. P. MORGAN ADAM: I think, Mr. Chairman....

DR. ROBERT G. DARROW: Mr. Chairman....

MR. CHAIRMAN: One at a time. It was the first the Second Elected Member for West Bay who first caught my eye.

MR. M. McNEIL ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I am the Second Elected Member for George Town now asking that a seine net be licensed to take a few fish. I would be stupid to believe that, Sir. I have seen the seine nets in action. What I am saying is that I feel that we can license the amount of fish - I am sorry seines. I am getting mixed up with fish - as we are doing with the shrimpers. The purpose of licensing the shrimpers is so that the authorities have some control on the amount of shrimps. I do not think it is the amount of fish, it is the amount of shrimps we are talking about. I am saying that there are people who have to use the seine net for a livelihood. There may not be dozens as I said before but there are people, and I feel that we have to take those people into consideration.

Now, I think I stand as on the Bill but I feel that I should have my say here on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

SEN. WILLIAM S. JORDAN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that I should make my position clear. I said I would agree with the amendments provided the majority of the members agreed with Mr. Anderson, and my remarks that I spoke were strongly against the conversion of water rights and the administration of boat laws on the Yellowstone Lake to salmon fish. If it is so that the Committee recommends a similar amendment to that now with the Legislature, it is very likely that the conservation committee is going to place a little more restriction on water so that we have they will not be able to operate in places like George Lake Reservoir.

REP. MICHAEL S. KADAS: Would I, Mr. Chairman, through you ask my fisherman colleague exactly where native trout are mostly used. The point is that there is a chance here which says that they might not be used in Quake Lake and Cabin Creek and Hebgen and they think our fishery besides of 300 miles. They are in fact under the Interpretation Clause only the semi-tropical waters. So it is only a three mile limit which we are dealing with from the shore. There is no restriction whatsoever placed in this Bill on the use of any type of bait under our fishery Division. I do think that the use of native trout is a valuable method of culturing fish, and if we are attempting to conserve our inland waters, the inland waters could be conserved by a law only within the three miles. There is still the ability for fishermen to use their nets outside the three mile limit.

MR. LAWSON A. BIGGER: Mr. Chairman, I believe of the Members present here I have as much experience as the other men in the use of seines, because I grew up on an area which used seines exclusively for a living. While I agree, and as I said this morning I believe in conservation and in a conservationist, I think we have to be practical with any legislation which we attempt to pass here. The legislation should not only be something which we feel is going to accomplish a conservation objective. It should be good for the people and I believe that it would be enjoying water knowing if we prohibited the use of seines in the eastern waters of the Yellowstone. The people there not only rely on the waters for recreation but for their living, but the reason why they use the nets is so that they can get sufficient fish to sell and make a living.

So, while I feel that the seine nets should be closely scrutinized, I believe that to prohibit the use of seine nets would be a big mistake. I will have to the making of the majority of the Members that I would like to point out that we should be very careful not to be too hasty hereon and investigate on this.

MR. W. MURRAY SIGH: Mr. Chairman.....

REP. CRIPPEN: No, you are going to have to wait for me to quit you because I know about three people who want to speak with the time. The Most Blessed Member for the Forest Reserve has not had a go yet.

REP. ROBERT E. KIMMONSBACH: Mr. Chairman, I rise into the Senate Proposed Section for George Lake. I feel that if we Minutes it is not enough of and they will only Minutes people when they feel with them in a proper manner. When it will be easy to prosecute those who are taking it illegally. If we can give the person who used a Spearfish a Minutes, I feel the Warden will be inclined give one to the entire operation.

MR. P. KENNEDY RICE: Mr. Chairman, the swings which are being used in my constituency are the most dangerous. That is the only place although I guess they are used in South Ireland too. However, where I see them being used most is in the most dangerous. I think that we must take these people into consideration. We cannot just legislate just because we can legislate....

MR. CHALONER: Despite Mr. Kennedy it has a long time and have not actually got the final amendment about the matter yet. I think it would be not unreasonable both on the right track we had better stick on amendment....

MR. J. EDGAR WILLIS: If I could just answer this....

MR. CHAIRMAN: ....and come back when the time comes....

MR. J. EDGAR WILLIS: Could I just answer the honourable General Officer's question which he asked about swings. Sir? I think most swings have to be used in such a way which the seats and they have to be between pleasure like four feet. Most swings are only three to three and a half feet deep as they go from the supports to the bottom. So they have to be used within the seat and the depth is usually about three or four feet of water. That is why they are so dangerous.

COL. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, if the proposed new Clause 7 is before us, would it be in order for me to move under Standing Order 27 and read with Standing Order 52(2) an amendment to that proposed new Clause which would be in failure -

> "That paragraph 2 of the notice of amendment be amended by the addition immediately before the full stop thereof of the words -
>
> 'and by the addition at the end thereof of the following -
>
> Unless the appropriate authority licensed by the Board who may be granting such licence make such conditions as he may think fit',".

What then would be the amendment, Sir, would be that the section in the Act of the new Clause were passed, and my proposed amendment were passed, would then read -

> "Whether such or attempts to use any swing or gift ride for the purpose of taking monies left in Dublin Airport be guilty of an offence in accordance with licence by the Board who may be granting such licence make such conditions as he may think fit."

I think this would meet the point that people may have accumulated circumstances in a certain area which would grant themselves of accurate circumstances, the property of the Board in obtaining a licence. However, the Board would still be able to make conditions as to the use.

I have mentioned that, and I apologise to him for not consulting him, with the consent of the amendment, the honourable Fianna Fáil Elected Member of Executive Council, and I intend subject to his views on it.

MR. CRAIGHILL: Could I just make one comment. As I understand it there was no Member who spoke in favour of the provisions of the bill now.

HON. ROBERT G. BOURGOIN: Yes, Sir, I was just going to move that we debate "Bill 102" then do.

MR. CHILDERS: I think that's only going to be the exception. I don't see how to restrict Bill 102 in the Committee so that the contents of the Bill prohibits casino and bill 102. However, if there were to make an exception granting in the case of licensed casino nets only I think that is what Members were arguing for.

HON. MICHAEL F. HOLLETT: Then perhaps it would be better, Sir....

HON. GEORGE D. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if maybe the Honourable Second Official Member could include in that amendment something to the effect that, "But the provisions of Bill 102 prohibition does not extend to casino nets and roulette...". What I am looking for is a word that means bay nets.

MR. W. MORGAN: BLACK: That is normally known as a blackjack.

MR. D. DONALD MACKAY: I think so long as they are not mentioned in the Bill they cannot be contradicted. However, I agree with the Member, and I make the amendment.

HON. GEORGE D. HICKMAN: When exercise me, Sir, is that the Attorney-General made reference to the taking of fish nets. I would have thought that this section referring to the small-mesh nets that we are now referring to. If we have that assurance that the interpretation will not apply to whom I am happy.

HON. ROBERT G. BOURGOIN: We are only placing restrictions on casino and bill nets, nothing else.

HON. MICHAEL F. HOLLETT: Perhaps to meet the point which the Honourable Member has raised in relation to bill nets, instead of the words which I read, "unless an exemption otherwise licensed by the Board", if those could be deleted from my original proposal and instead "as a juvenile" put in. This would then read:

> "PROVIDED that the Board may in exceptional circumstances grant licences for the use of casino nets and in granting such licences may make such conditions as to possession and use as it may think fit.",

This would make it quite clear by using a procedure that it would be only casino nets which the Board could in exceptional circumstances license, but they could not do it to bill nets.

MR. CHILDERS: Do you have the wording of that which you can subsequently give to the Clerk so that....

HON. MICHAEL F. HOLLETT: I think the Deputy Clerk being a learned gentleman could take it.

MR. CRAIGHILL: What I will do....

HON. NICOLAS J. BRADLEY: Perhaps she could move it out in full afterwards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I will do if I may is to follow the procedure which we followed in respect of the last Clause I which has already been added. First I will deal with the addition of Clause 3 as proposed by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member. Then, secondly, I will deal with the amendment to that clause proposed by the Honourable Second Official Member. As it will be in two stages and Members may speak on either, although in fact we have done most of the speaking before I.... So, first then the question is that a new Clause 3 be added as proposed by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council. Unless any Member wishes to speak I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE THREE A DULY MADE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Secondly, I will put the question that that new Clause be amended as the same proposed by the Honourable Second Official Member. Unless any Member wishes to speak I will put that question

"That the Clause be amended by the addition, immediately before the end thereof, of the words -

"and by the addition at the end thereof of the following proviso -

PROVIDED that the Board may in exceptional circumstances grant licences for the use of motor cars to persons who in the opinion of the Licensing Board Members may make such concessions as to necessity as they think fit."

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the question that the Clause as amended be added to the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. NEW CLAUSE 3 AS AMENDED ADDED TO THE BILL AND CLAUSE 3 AS PROPOSED RENUMBERED CLAUSE 4.

HON. MISS G. JOHNSON: I wonder if I could have the words of that amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will ask the Deputy Clerk to let you have them after the Meeting if we may.

HON. MISS G. JOHNSON: That is fine, Sir.

MR. D. RONALD MILLER: Mr. Chairman, could....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, my understanding of the wording of Standing Order 51(5) is that having added these new Clauses, which will automatically be taken to renumber the Clauses which we discussed earlier. We do not have to recommit that or agree to carry the numbers on anything else. The process is taken care of for us.

MR. MICHAEL J. MURPHY: My apologies. I thought you were doing Clauses 6 to 10. I am sorry. I was attempting them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that we have done Clause 5 so unless you want to go through with the rigmarole of reconsidering it....

HON. SENATOR O. ROBERTS: We both missed our chance.

MR. RICHARD J. BRADLEY: It may be a typographical error (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is Clause 6 to 15 stand part of the Bill?

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 6 TO 15 AGREED.

CLAUSE: CLAUSE 1. POWER FOR SALE OF ACCOMPLICE LIQUOR.
CLAUSE 10. APPLICATIONS FOR LICENCES.
CLAUSE 11. VARIATION OF LICENCES.
CLAUSE 14. QUARTERLY SITTINGS OF THE BOARDS.
CLAUSE 15. TEMPORARY LICENCES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 11 to 15 stand part of the Bill.

MR. D. EDWARD WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to section 11(3). It says:-

"A board may grant time to time, by notice published in two consecutive, broadly equal issues,"

I would like to speak to there that the issue in left to the discretion of the licensee. (LAUGHTER AND SOUNDS OF DISSENT).

I withdraw that amendment, Mr. Chairman. I see I am not going to get any support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think you are going to get a lot of support.

MR. D. EDWARD WILLIS: (LAUGHTER). No, Sir. I withdraw the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moreover, normally if Members want to move amendments to Bills, two days notice should be given. It is really much more convenient for the House if that can be arranged. We cannot discuss I know, and I....

MR. F. MORTON SHAW: Two days?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to be flexible.

MR. F. MORTON SHAW: Two days?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it is two days for amendments.

HON. MICHAEL J. MURPHY: Standing Order 63(3).

MR. D. EDWARD WILLIS: It is alright, Sir. I withdraw the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: We have now got Clauses 11 to 15.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSES 11 TO 15 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 16. COURT MAY MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING LICENCES.
CLAUSE 17. OBJECTIONS BY THE PUBLIC.
CLAUSE 18. GRANT OF A LICENCE.
CLAUSE 19. OCCASIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.
CLAUSE 20. CONDITIONS OF HOTEL LICENCE.
CLAUSE 21. CONSOLIDATION ETC., OF LICENCES BY MAGISTRATES COURT THE CASE OF 12.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 16 to 21 stand part of the Bill. If no Member wishes to speak I will put this question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 16 TO 21 ORDERED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 22. DISPOSAL OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR TO DRUNKEN OR DISORDERLY PERSONS IS FORBIDDEN.
CLAUSE 23. SUPPLY OF DRUNKEN AND DISORDERLY PERSONS.
CLAUSE 24. RIGHTS OF LODGERS.
CLAUSE 25. PROHIBITION RESPONSIBILITY OF LICENSEES.
CLAUSE 26. PENALTY ON ANNOYANCE ON LICENSEES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 22 to 26 stand part of the Bill. Unless any Member wishes to speak I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 22 TO 26 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 27. STANDARD.
CLAUSE 28. CLOSURE OF PUBLIC PREMISES IN CASE OF RIOT OR APPREHENDED DISTURBANCE.
CLAUSE 29. ADMINISTRATION OF UNCLAIMED GOODS.
CLAUSE 30. POWER TO SEARCH PREMISES.
CLAUSE 31. PENALTY ON INTOXICATING LIQUOR TO BOARDS SCHOOL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 27 to 31 stand part of the Bill. If no Member wishes to speak I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 27 TO 31 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 32. PENALTY ON UNLESS STATED = SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR.
CLAUSE 33. RELEASE OF PRISONS ON SETTING OF BOND.
CLAUSE 34. NOTICE OF CLAIM TO COMPENSATION.
CLAUSES 35. CONSOLIDATION AND SUPERSEDING.
CLAUSES 36. REPEAL OF ACTS, ETC., AND APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 32 to 36 stand part of the Bill. If no Member wishes to speak I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 32 TO 36 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 37. PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS FROM CONSUMING INTOXICATING LIQUOR.
CLAUSE 38. OFFENCES BY LICENSEES.
CLAUSE 39. LIQUOR NOT TO BE CONSUMED IN PREMISES IN CERTAIN CASES.
CLAUSE 40. : GENERAL PENALTY.
CLAUSE 41. INSTITUTION OF PROCEEDINGS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 37 to 41 stand part of the Bill. If no Member wishes to speak I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSES 37 TO 41 TO STAND.

CLERK: CLAUSE 42. APPROPRIATION OF PENALTIES ETC.
CLAUSE 43. PUBLIC REGISTRATION OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR NOT NECESSARY IN EVIDENCE.
CLAUSE 44. PROOF OF LICENCES NOT NECESSARY.
CLAUSE 45. PROTECTION OF OFFICIALS.
CLAUSE 46. POWER TO MAKE REGULATIONS.
CLAUSE 47. REPEAL AND SAVING.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 42 to 47 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 42 TO 47 TO STAND.

CLERK: SCHEDULE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Schedule stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE SCHEDULE WAS AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND AND REPEAL THE LIQUOR LICENSING LAW (AMENDED).

MAJ. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: That should read "LAW" instead of "Licensing". It is my fault, Sir, but I think that it is a typographical error and that attention should be drawn to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Amendment Clause stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: That concludes proceedings in Committee on a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Defamation Law (Amended) and other Bills. The House will resume.

HOUSE RESUMED

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Since we have suspended Standing Orders to complete the Committee Stages of various Bills which have now been completed, I think the adjournment should follow automatically.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS H. TYNDALL: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m., Monday, 25th March, 1985, pur.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. on Monday.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 6.28 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., MONDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1985.

STATE BUDGET & BUDGET REPORTING BY THE (1995) SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(FUNDS)
2018 REPORT, FOUR

CHAIRMAN MEMO:

MISS ELIZABETH JANE HOWARD, JOW C SETTER STORE, LOWE, CHAIR — PRESIDENT

SPONSORSHIP AGENCIES

MRS DENNIS M FOSTER, CHAIR,CHAIRMAN	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNET AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS
MRS MICHAEL H WEAVER, QC, LL.B	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
MRS DENNIS C CHAPMAN, CA	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
MRS MELISSA D EVANS	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
MRS V MORGAN BOOLEM, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM ATTRACTION AND TRADE
MRS CAROL CHARLES A KIRKCHAMBERS	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATION WORKS & INTERNET ADMINISTRATION
MRS MARGEL S JOHNSON, CPA, CA	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MCGREEVY-LOUGH	SECOND MINISTRY MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF STATE WAY
MS ELIZABETH A DIBBOCK, LLB	SECOND MINISTRY MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF LEDGE OCEAN
CAPT MARTIN S MCMAHONMOLL	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF PARISH ISLANDS
MR G IRVIN HICKSON	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN ISLAND
MR JOHN E MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GREAT END

BUSINESS OF THE DAY

STATE OPENING & ADDRESS DELIVERED ON THE (1985) SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MONDAY

25TH MARCH, 1985

1. QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 44- WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE WHETHER ANY ELECTRONIC WAVES-DISRUPTING DEVICES HAVE BEEN PLACED IN TELEPHONES IN THE CAYMAN ISLANDS WITH GOVERNMENT APPROVAL?

NO. 45: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE WHAT LEGAL REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET BY OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES IN THE CAYMAN ISLANDS BEFORE THEY MAY PLACE ELECTRONIC WAVES-DISRUPTING DEVICES ON TELEPHONES IN THE CAYMAN ISLANDS?

2. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(a) BILLS:-

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(CONTINUATION OF SECOND READING DEBATE)

REPLY BY THE HONOURABLE THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER

COMMITTEE THEREON

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

HOUSE RESUMES

REPORT THEREON

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(b) MOTIONS:-

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 5/85
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 1985

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FOURTH ELECTED MEMBER

3. PERSONAL EXPLANATION

BY THE SECONDLY ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN UNDER STANDING ORDER 31.

4. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(a) BILLS:-

REPORTS THEREON

(1) THE DEREGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(2) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(3) THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(4) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(5) THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(6) THE LIQUOR LICENSING BILL, 1985

THIRD READINGS

(1) THE DEREGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(2) THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (IMMUNITIES POWERS AND PRIVILEGES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(3) THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(4) THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(5) THE AIRPORTS REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(6) THE LIQUOR LICENSING BILL, 1985

(b) MOTIONS:-

(1) GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 1/85 - ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FOURTH ELECTED MEMBER

(2) GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 3/85 - LOANS (CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK) ACT, 1977 (CAP 1) OF 1977)

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FIFTH OFFICIAL MEMBER

(3) GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 4/8
ADJUDICATORY OF STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Condolences	1
The Sheep Scab (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Confirmation of Second Reading Debate	2
Government Motion No. 2/56 - Development and Planning (Amendment) Regulations, 1956	2
The Defamation (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Report Stage	3
The Legislative Assembly (Emoluments Powers and Privileges) (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Report Stage	5
The Marine Conservation (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Report Stage	6
The Interpretation (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Report Stage	6
The Adoption Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Report Stage	7
The Adoption Proceedings Bill, 1956 - Report Stage	7
The Defamation (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Third Reading	7
The Legislative Assembly (Emoluments Powers and Privileges) (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Third Reading	7
The Marine Conservation (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Third Reading	8
The Interpretation (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Third Reading	8
Division No. 18	9
The Adoption Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1956 - Third Reading	9
The Adoption Proceedings Bill, 1956 - Third Reading	9
Government Motion No. 1/56 - Assessment Committee	10
Government Motion No. 3/56 - Loans (Caribbean Development Bank) Law, 1977	11
Government Motion No.4/56 - Appointment of Standing Select Committee	13
Private Member's Motion No. 5/56 - Labour Legislation - Appointment of Chairman and Quorum	14
Personal Explanation	15
Adjournment	16

MR. PRESIDENT: Items to be adopted.
Proceedings are resumed.
Questions. The Second Financial Member for Golden Bay.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND FINANCIAL MEMBER FOR GOLDEN BAY: TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER REPRESENTING THE TREASURY AND ENERGY, CERTAIN:

MR. 44: Will the honourable Senior Official Member advise whether any electronic value-added gaming devices have been placed on telephones in the Cayman Islands with Government approval?

ANSWER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless there is any supplementary I will ask the Second Financial Member for Golden Bay to ask the next question.

THE SECOND FINANCIAL MEMBER FOR GOLDEN BAY: TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TREASURY AND ENERGY AFFAIRS:

NO. 45: Will the Honourable Member state what legal requirements must be met by any law enforcement agencies in the Cayman Islands before they may utilize electronic eavesdropping devices on telephones in the Cayman Islands?

ANSWER: The legal position is complex and not altogether clear. The probability is that authority would not present be required from Court could be given by the Governor under section 3(2)(b)(ii)(cc) of the Confidential Relationships (Preservation) Law. But in fact the matter is beyond doubt it may be desirable to impose specific legal requirements in the Telephones Law, and consideration will be given to amending it for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no supplementary we can move to Item 5 on the Order Paper, the Firearms (Amendment) Bill, 1994, consideration of Second Reading resumed. When we broke last Wednesday this Bill the Honourable Third Official Member was about to, or had just begun to reply. I invite him to continue.

BILLS

SECOND READING: FIREARMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1994

CONSIDERATION OF SECOND READING RESUMED

HON. JAMES M. KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. President. The Honourable Members are aware, perhaps are not currently aware to anyone other than Honourable Colonial Members and the Governor point of view being brought to this issue.

HON. JEROME C. JEYARSON (CONTINUING): As a result of proceeding the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1980 to this House we have received many representations from many different sources. Mr. Speaker, this Stamp Duty Law is a very technical one, and in order to look at the number of points made during the representations it is our view, Mr. President, that under Standing Order 58 I should move to make a motion to withdraw the Bill from the House at this time. In order to fully properly the points put forward by the people who have made representations, we need adequate time to do so.

Mr. President, it is my view that this matter be studied adequately and that an amending Bill be brought to the House in the May sessions.

Thank you, Mr. President.

DR. LEWIS DE SOUZA: Mr. President, I second the motion, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not sure whether the Member duly formally actually made a motion. He communicated his intention to do so.

The provisions of Standing Order 58 for the information of the House are that the Member in charge of a Bill may make a motion for its withdrawal, either before the commencement of Government business, or when any stage of the Bill is reached in the order of business. It is therefore perfectly permissible for the Member to make this announcement a motion and I will request his answer as moving one.

The question before the House therefore now is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1972, should be withdrawn. Does any Member wish to speak to that?

HON. C. WILLIAMSON: Mr. President, I would only like to say that my heart has been filled with joy to see this Bill withdrawn, because as I mentioned in my debate which was lengthy, and I will not go back into that, this amendment proposed here would drastically push back the development of our economy. I am glad to see that the Government including the Elected Members of Executive Council have seen the light. I fully support the withdrawal of the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: I should not wish the Honourable Member to be unfair. He may have been absent. I noticed he was out of the House for a moment at the time when the Honourable Third Official Member spoke. The Bill is being withdrawn for review to be further studied and reconsidered again. Now, the Member does know. Very well. Unless any other Member wishes to speak I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 58 THE BILL WAS WITHDRAWN

MR. PRESIDENT: Item 8(b), motions. Government Motion No. 5/81. The Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

MOTIONS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 5/81

DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1981

HON. MISSES C. JEYARSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to formally move Government Motion No. 5/81, Development and Planning (Amendment) Regulations, 1981:-

MRS. VESTA G. ROGERS (CONTINUING):

"BE IT RESOLVED that, a draft of the Development and Planning (Amendment) Regulations, 1970, having been laid before it, this House does this day approve the same.".

SIR, SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council wish to explain? I think it would be convenient if he would do so at this stage.

SEN. DAVID O. JOHNSON: Mr. President, attached to the motion is a draft of the amendment to the regulations of the Development and Planning Regulations.

The purpose of the motion seeks to the Legislative Assembly is that regulations under the Law cannot be made by Executive Council until they have been put to the Legislative Assembly for consideration. So the proposed amendment to the regulations as now presented by this motion was the authority of the Legislative Assembly will be sought for the recommendations that I proposed here.

Mr. President, I am sure that the question will be asked why are we moving this motion. We are moving no amount of $, Sir, but before I explain the reason I would like to say that I am sure that the Government will be quite glad to lobby [illegible] for specific interest groups. To that, Mr. President, I would reply that that is quite correct. We do have investment groups for whom we now provide [illegible] of subsidiary legislation. First on the list, Mr. President, is the Hyatt Regency. They are building a hotel in Grand Cayman which will be known as Hyatt Regency Hotel, and of course the owners are the Britannia Hotel Cayman. However, it also interested is that we have other large International companies. One one in particular which I would like to mention is Commonwealth International Limited of the United Kingdom. Commonwealth International Limited, Mr. President, is owned by Trafalgar House of the United Kingdom as well which is a very large operation in the United Kingdom. Trafalgar House of the United Kingdom, Mr. President, is a publicly company with annual turnover of the order of one thousand, one hundred million pounds per year. Mr. President, their subsidiary Commonwealth International Limited operating here has a turnover of approximately one hundred and twenty million pounds per annum. These are very big operations, and they will have a minority interest in the Hyatt Britannia Hotel. Also, Mr. President, they are going to do the complete refurbishing of the Hyatt Britannia Hotel.

The financing for that particular project is in the order of $25 to $30 million. Also, Mr. President, Trafalgar House of the United Kingdom is the owner of about 15 Cunard International hotels around the world. They are the owners of the Cunard Line with vessels like the Q.E.II, Queen Mariner and other large passenger liners. They are in shipbuilding. They do construction, civil engineering, steel engineering and petro-chemicals. So they are very large, Mr. President, and they have the capacity to inject quite a lot into the economy of these islands. They are the first investment group in this particular interpretation, because, Mr. President, in the dealings of the Hyatt Britannia Hotel they have got certain pressures put to us which were requested by the Hyatt Regency. When they do a first class hotel anywhere it must be up to their standard.

Unfortunately, the education tax of the complex are to be less cost the law will only provide a minimum of 20 year. Mr. President, this motion seeks to remove the restriction and place it in other terms. However, before I leave that particular subject I should say that the owner of the Hyatt Britannia Hotel will

HON. PAUL J. JOHNSON (Continued): not be the only one which will exceed the 55 foot limit under the planning regulations. We have a building, Mr. President, just behind the Legislative Assembly building which Government now owns and which is known as the Knox Building, which exceeds 55 feet in height. There are the radio station aerials also exceeding 55 feet. There are many other structures, masts and other forms of buildings which also exceed the 55 foot limitation. So this amendment to the regulations will not only cover the Royal Fortescue Hotel development, but will cover a lot of things so that they will not breach the planning regulations.

Mr. President, another special interest group, of course in the Islands, are those who we have heard so much about in this House during this session. We mentioned, Mr. President, that there is unemployment in the Islands at the present time. In fact we have seen this from a period way back into last year. The extension of this powerhouse project will give quite a lot of employment to these Islands, these people.

The project is to start on the 1st May if planning permission is granted, and the plan is that it will be completed for opening in December next year. Whether this will be possible or not, Mr. President, that is the present programme or plan of the developers. So, during this period there will be a lot of people employed there. I am sure that it will attract the unemployed from the two smaller Islands and all the qualifications in this Island, that is those who are not employed at the present time.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that this is a very attractive development for these Islands. I dare say that if the past Government had been able to attract a first class hotel like this to the Islands a while ago, perhaps it would not have denied the honour of building this group.

I am sure that a number of this membership will make quite a contribution to the economy of these Islands, and will make quite a contribution to the coffers of Government generally. So, Mr. President, I will commend this motion to this honourable House. It seeks to amend Regulation 2(1) and it is for the purpose mentioned in (a) to make the necessary provisions which I have just mentioned.

The brief amendment is attached and I am sure that all Members have read it and understood what it intends to provide. So, Mr. President, I will commend this motion to this Honourable House.

HON. PRESIDENT: The motion before the House, Government Motion No.9/84 is:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that, a draft of the Development and Planning (Amendment)(Regulations, 1984, having been laid before it, this House does hereby approve the same.".

The motion is open for debate. Does any Member wish to speak? In that case I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 9/84 PASSED.

HON. PRESIDENT: There is on today's Order Paper as a personal explanation, but until the arrangements I propose to defer that until slightly later in today's proceedings. So I will take next from a Government Business, Bills, Reports.

[illegible]

THE [illegible] (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996

[illegible]

HON. [illegible] P. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to report that a Bill for a Law to amend the [illegible] Law (Revised) was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGES AND [illegible]) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996

[illegible]

HON. [illegible] P. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that a Bill for a Law to amend the Legislative Assembly (Parliamentary Powers and Privileges) Law (Revised), was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly set down for Third Reading. The Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council, he need I think.

THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996

[illegible]

HON. [illegible] M. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, there have been quite a number of amendments to this Bill, The Marine Conservation (Amendment) Bill, 1996. I thought I would have received the amendment from the Legislative Assembly earlier so that I could have it in my possession. However, Mr. Speaker, there were certain amendments to the Bill.

Two sections were moved to the principle Bill. The second section was corrected. The new Clause 3 which was the amendment to section 11 of the main Law read, Mr. Speaker:-

> "Whenever [illegible] in his possession in the Cayman Islands or takes any marine life with the aid of a speargun in Cayman Waters the Police Officer [illegible] by the word [illegible] may in granting such license make such conditions as to possession and use as it may think fit;"

MR. SPEAKER: If I may interrupt the Member for a second. I think that what he has read out is the section of the principal Law as the Bill appears once the amendment has been made. He has not actually read the clause of the Bill which was passed. I do not think it matters but I think that is it.

HON. [illegible] C. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the original clause of the Bill is [illegible]...

MR. SPEAKER: What I am saying is that the new Clause 3 of the Bill as proposed in Committee I think would start, "Section 11 of the Marine Conservation Law, 1978 (in this Law referred to as the principal Law, is amended -", is I have right?

REV. [illegible] R. [illegible]. ...ree, Sir. There is another amendment as well, Mr. President, an amendment to section 15 which now becomes a new Clause 2 of the Bill. What is as I said, Mr. President, amending section 15 of the Bill by deleting from the original section 15 the words "other than for human consumption or fish bait is guilty of an offence", and replacing those words with..."Mr. President, I am sorry about this, Sir, but I cannot follow what is here. (LAUGHTER)

REV. MICHAEL J. [illegible]: Mr. President, I do not know whether it is the usual procedure on this stage, but in consideration of other [illegible] I have before me words "As Committee Stage was passed with numerous amendments" have suffered. I think....

MR. PRESIDENT: I thought that was our intention too nonetheless. I do not think that it is the invariable practice to read out the full text of every proposal. I think it would suffice if the Member were to report that the Committee had examined the Bill and passed it with amendments, the effect of which are to introduce a new Clause 2 which amended section 14 of the principal Law, and a new Clause 3 which amended section 15 of the principal Law, and had recommended the other clauses accordingly. If the Members are content to proceed on this basis, I think that could be taken as sufficient.

REV. FRANCIS X. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. President. The Bill was amended. Clause 2 of the Bill as it stands is the original [illegible]...Mr. President, I am not too clear of the wording of the various amendments. It is the intention of the Legislative Assembly which have not been circulated, but which will be, there are certain amendments which took place in the Bill, Mr. President. Clause 2 and Clause 3 mentioned in the Bill with certain other amendments. There have been other sections inserted which deals with the amendments to exercise is not mention in of the same. Section 14 was recently, Mr. President, to place certain restrictions on the use of the spearguns as a technical matter. That is the substance of the amendment. In addition to [illegible] amendment was made. In this regard a form was placed on file note and the notice was also mentioned except for a licence which would be granted by the Board.

Those additions to the Bill, Mr. President, were accepted by a Committee of the whole House.

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

THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985.

Second Reading

REV. MICHAEL J. [illegible]: Mr. President, Sir, I beg to report that a Bill hereby entitled the Interpretation (Amendment) Bill, 1985 was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

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

THE AIRPORTS AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

FIRST READING

HON. M. KUMARA PONNAN: Mr. President, I beg to inform that a Bill entitled to Bill for a Law to amend the Airports Authority Law (Revised) was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly read down for Third Reading. The Honourable Minister Ministry Matter.

THE LAKSHAPANA (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

SECOND READING

HON. GAMINI P. WIJESEKARA: Mr. President, I beg to propose that a Bill for a Law to repeal and replace the Lakshapana Law, 1979 (Revised) was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly read down for Third Reading. Third Reading. The Defamation (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

THE DEFAMATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Defamation (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

HON. DENNIS H. FOSTER: Mr. President, I move that a Bill for a Law to amend the Defamation Law (Revised) be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Defamation Law (Revised) be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (PRIVILEGES POWERS AND IMMUNITIES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

THIRD READING

HON. DENNIS H. FOSTER: Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Clerk should read the Bills first. I think that is the normal procedure is it not? No?

HON. DENNIS FOSTER: No, Sir, that is finished now.

MR. PRESIDENT: Accordingly to my notes the Clerk reads the Bills first and then the mover of the Bill moves the Third Reading. I think that is the normal procedure. Perhaps the Clerk or the Honourable Second Official Member can guide me.

HON. DENNIS H. FOSTER: I think that I am wrong.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think so. I think the Clerk should read the Bills first.

CLERK: The Legislative Assembly (Remuneration Powers and Privileges (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

HON. DENNIS M. PUSTEY: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill for a Law to amend the Legislative Assembly (Remuneration Powers and Privileges) Law (Revised) be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Legislative Assembly (Remuneration Powers and Privileges) Law (Revised) be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVES A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE MARINE CONSERVATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Marine Conservation (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

HON. PAGENT C. MORROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, Sir, that a Bill entitled the Marine Conservation (Amendment) Law, 1995 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Marine Conservation Law, 1995 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVES A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Interpretation (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill for a Law to amend the Interpretation Law (Chapter 70) be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Interpretation Law (Chapter 70) be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

HON. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, I would like a division on that Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk please carry on.

DIVISION
No. 32

AYES:	NOES:
Hon. Dennis W. Foster	Hon. G. Wing Dodson
Hon. Michael J. Keating	
Hon. Thomas O. Jefferson	
Hon. Benson D. Brooks	
Hon. H. Norman Dodson	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkpatrick	
Hon. Vassar G. Johnson	
Mr. Richard M. Pierson	
Capt. Moby B. Kirkpatrick	
Mr. John D. Nelson	
10	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

ACCEPTED BY MAJORITY: SENATE AGREES & SENATE SECURITY AND PASSED.

THE AIRPORTS REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL, 1995

THIRD READING

TITLE: The Airports Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1995

HON. K. MORGAN KOCEM- Mr. President, I move that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Airports Regulation Act (Revised) be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a BILL for a Law to amend the Airports Regulation Act (Revised) be given a third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE LIQUOR LICENSING ACT, 1965

THIRD READING

TITLE: The Liquor Licensing Bill, 1965.

HON. DENNIS W. FOSTER: Mr. President, I beg to move, Sir, that a Bill for a Law to repeal and replace the Liquor Licensing Law, 1974 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a BILL for a Law to repeal and replace the Liquor Licensing Law (Revised) be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Item #(b), Motion, Government Motion No. 1 of 1996.

HOUSE

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 1/26 - APPOINTMENT (CONTINUED)

HON. MAJOR G. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Government Motion No. 1/26, Appointments Committee. Mr. Speaker, it is a requirement under section 7 of the Words Act, 1974, for the Legislative Assembly to appoint two members to the Management Committee. This takes place every four years. The appointments should have been made in December on the first sitting of the Legislative Assembly, but this was overlooked. This motion is now seeking to make those appointments. The motion reads:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House do nominate two persons to be members of the Management Committee under subsection (2) of section 7 of the Words Act, 1974 (Act 10 of 1974), to hold office for four years from the date of their appointment."

MR. SPEAKER: Before I invite Members to speak if they wish to do so, it may be helpful if I could just ask the mover to clarify one point about which I am uncertain, and Members may please be enlightened. What is the two persons mentioned here in the Members of the House of Assembly, or is it open to the House to nominate anyone?

HON. MAJOR G. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, it has been usual in the past to appoint two Members of the Legislative Assembly to the Committee. I think the last appointment was in fact unanimous. I would put forward the names before the nomination is put to the whole House.

MR. SPEAKER: However, as I might be misunderstanding that although that has been the practice it is not a statutory requirement that the nominees be Members of the House. It is a practice but not a requirement?

HON. MAJOR G. JOHNSON: That is correct, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that Government Motion No. 1/26 be passed. As the Member has just read it out I will not read it again. Does any Member wish to speak? In that case I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 1/26 PASSED.

HON. MAJOR G. JOHNSON: If the....

MR. SPEAKER: Can the Member guide me about procedure. Do we now need nominations?

HON. MAJOR G. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Member anyone to nominate?

NOMINATIONS TO ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE

HON. MAJOR G. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir, I will nominate the Second Elected Member for West Bay and the Elected Member for North Side.

MR. SPEAKER: So you happen to have with those Members so prepared to accept nominations? I see the Second Elected Member for West Bay is aware and he can speak for himself.

MR. B. HOUSTON BYNOE: Mr. President, I accept the nomination.

MR. PRESIDENT: And the Elected Member for North Side?

MR. HAZEL G. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Are there any other nominations? If there is no other nomination, the Nominations are now closed. Perhaps I should formally put the question that the Second Elected Member for West Bay and the Elected Member for North Side should be nominated members of the Assessment Committee under section 7, subsection (1) of the Rents Law, 1975.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, THAT THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY AND THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE, BE NOMINATED TO THE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE UNDER SECTION 7(1) OF THE RENTS LAW, 1975.

MR. PRESIDENT: The two Members are accordingly so appointed.

Government Motion No. 3/85, The Honourable Third Official Member,

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 3/85 - LOANS (CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK) LAW, 1977 (LAW 17 OF 1977)

MR. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to move Government Motion No. 3/85 entitled Loans (Caribbean Development Bank) Law, 1977, (Law 17 of 1977) and in moving, Mr. President:-

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Legislative Assembly of the Cayman Islands, pursuant to subsection (1) of Section 8 of the Loans (Caribbean Development Bank) Law, 1977, that the Assembly consents to the borrowing by the Governor in Council from the Caribbean Development Bank of the sum of seven million United States Dollars, on such terms and subject to such conditions as have been agreed between the Governor in Council and the Caribbean Development Bank for the purpose of a sanitary drainage system to serve the Shoal Bay South area of Grand Cayman."

The first works of this project, Mr. President, is the construction of a sewerage collection network of approximately 4.7 miles of sewers, a sewerage pumping main of approximately 3.0 miles long, a main pump station to supply a portion of the treated effluent to a nearby golf course, three manual and electric chambers to house the pumping and effluent pumping plant, and a sewerage treatment plant with a capacity of 450,000 gallons per day.

The type of sewerage treatment plant, Mr. President, is under consideration. The Water Authority and the Caribbean Development Bank both agreed that this is the best and cheapest, as the system offers further extensions since it is modular in operation and construction. It therefore goes hand in hand with the project facility because of environmental and maintenance problems.

The project's estimated total cost is US$10.5 million, or a Cayman Islands Dollar equivalent of $8.7 million. The project will be managed and executed by the Water Authority.

MR. JAMES C. SUTHERLAND (CONTINUING): Government has agreed to contribute C.I.$2.8 million, which would represent roughly 28 per cent of the project's cost. As mentioned by the motion, Mr. President, Caribbean Development Bank has agreed to lend on concessionary terms approximately U.S.$7 million. This total of U.S.$7 million in funded within the bank by two sources. U.S.$5.3 million is being given from their ordinary capital resources, and U.S.$1.7 million from their special fund resources.

Some of the terms and conditions are: that repayment will be over fifteen years with three years moratorium, and the interest charged is a combination of soft and hard rates, 4 per cent and 10 per cent. Also, Mr. President, I mentioned the fact that the Government, on the whole authority, has specifically earmarked a provision for management fees. Unfortunately we will recall that in the process of dealing with the budget in the Joint Finance Committee meetings, the point that was approved which will form part of this project management team.

The main justification for the project, Mr. President, is the elimination and prevention of a sanitary and environmental hazard along Seven Mile Beach. It is an area which is well known to us as it is our tourist development area, an area which is undoubtedly important to the future development of this Island's economy.

Mr. President, a second beneficiary programme that has been carried out by the Water Authority will be the proposal that on discharging treatments of effluent pollution is taking place along Seven Mile Beach. The other is also affected at times by other problems associated with the malfunctioning of a treatment plant which is inefficient or perhaps the wrong capacity.

Mr. President, I ask Honourable Members' support of my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Honourable Gentleman is Motion No. 3/95 dealing with loans from Caribbean Development Bank under the Loans (Caribbean Development Bank) Law, 1977 (Law 17 of 1977).

Do the Member have already read out the terms of the motion I shall not read them again. Does any Member wish to speak? In that case I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. QUESTION AGREED TO. 3/95 PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that this may be a convenient moment to take our customary morning break, so I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11.15 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11.40 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
Motions. Government Motion No. 4/98.

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 4/98

APPOINTMENT OF STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE

DR. DENNIS A. HUSBAND: Mr. President, I beg to move Government Motion No. 4/98 standing in my name, Mr. President:

"WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly's Standing Orders, which presently regulate the procedure of said Assembly relating to Bills Assembly Bills, were made in 1978 and have not been amended since; and

WHEREAS it is considered appropriate that there should be established a Standing Select Committee to reconsider the present standing orders and to recommend to this Honourable House, having regard to current circumstances and all proposals for amending standing orders that have been made by honourable Members, what amendments thereto are necessary or desirable;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, in accordance with Standing Order 76, that there be established a Standing Select Committee entitled the Committee on Standing Orders which Standing Select Committee shall consist of the Hon'ble Speaker and shall continue as a Committee of this honourable House until the Legislative Assembly is next dissolved in accordance with Section 47(1) of the Constitution of the Cayman Islands, and that the said Standing Select Committee have function to take generally to reconsider and propose to standing orders and amendments particularly to consider the proposals contained in Standing Orders Bills, Bills, Bills,

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUING): What I think ought, in my present view to be now explained by Members because we have now by accepting Amendment Motion No. 8/86 provided for the establishment of a specific Committee, a Standing Select Committee to deal with Standing Orders. I think that the matters which formed the subject both of Private Member's Motion No. 1/85 and Private Member's Motion No. 6/85 should both be referred to this Standing Committee which we have just appointed. So perhaps part of the decision task will be to examine those specific matters.

ALLOCATION OF CHAIRMAN TO STANDING ORDER COMMITTEE

MR. SPEAKER: It falls to me, I think, to accommodate with Standing Order 82(3) to nominate a Chairman of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, and I shall nominate the Honourable Nurse Official Member in the Chairman of that Committee.

QUORUM
STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE

MR. SPEAKER: I have an idea that I may often get a quorum bell. Maybe the Honourable Second Official Member may inform me whether I cannot do anything in Standing Orders which prevents me to do so. If I am wrong will I please either give-notice to Parliament, perhaps such as Committees themselves normally their own quorums, I would be grateful to be corrected. I am not sure. I do seek to remember achieving a quorum.

MRS. MICHAEL J. QUIGLEY: I think, Mr. President, that for a Committee of the whole House, whether a Select Committee or otherwise, I think again to the normal number for a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: Going to the quorum for meetings of the House. I think that seems would be a reasonable quorum for a Committee of the whole House such as this Standing Select Committee is to be. Unless any Member has any objections I will advise that seven should be the quorum for that Committee.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 6/85
LABOUR LEGISLATION
DISCONTINUANCE OF CHAIRMAN AND QUORUM

MR. SPEAKER: There is one other matter which I should I forgot to deal with at the appropriate time. Private Member's Motion No. 6/85 which was passed some time ago dealt with the appointment of a Committee of the whole House to study and make recommendations with regard to labour legislation. I did not at the time at which that motion was passed make a nomination under Standing Order 82(3) of a Chairman, because I think I simply forgot so to do. I now intend to nominate the Honourable Second Official Member, having discussed the matter both him and with the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council. I think that is right.

I suppose that the quorum in that case since it has to be a Committee of the whole House is the same.

As far as I can discover there no rules there are not any other Committees in respect of which I should be nominating a Chairman or setting other matters.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that the agreement which the House entered, the Second Elected Member for Eastern Area, I was half-serving until slightly later in the order Paper the personal explanation which appeared at Item 2 on it. I was indebted to make his explanation.

MR. S. RAY DOLDGE: Mr. Speaker, this statement is made under Standing Order 21. On the 22nd March a Member of this House made a statement which seemed to imply that the speech which I had made in the Legislative Assembly may have been responsible for causing the Bank to be put on the report by the Australian press that the United States of America. The true position is that the Bank was imposed by the United States of America in 1978 the entire complexion changed; the status of the Bank from a threatened to an endangered species. Thank is not generally allowed if an answer is given ..... announced. The first was published in June, 1971, as Sessional Publication 22E3971, while 20th, 1974, Cabinet a total ban on commercial trade in any species and also included a Mauritanian enterprise.

The speech referred to on Wednesday, 22nd March, 1965 had been made on 5th September, 1973, two months after the registration of the Bank, and could not possibly have caused Legislative action taken a couple of months earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: The terms of Standing Order 21 are such as to preclude debate on personal explanations of this kind made. However, the Second Elected Member for West Bay did rise to question the explanation of course what was said on Friday, and I agreed that if he wished he could make plain one point as to whether he had intended to imply that the Second Elected Member for Eastern Area misquoted.

MR. T. RUSSELL COLE: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I will just read from a transcript of my speech made in the House on that day, and the part which I will read says:-

> "The Member knows interrupting but, Mr. President, he has to take the blame for a lot of the trouble we are in today with Cayman Banks being because one of his statements here calling the newspapers "newspaper", Mr. Speaker, I do not think helped us in 1970."

Mr. President, that is what I said. I did not say the Member was responsible for the ban, but in my humble opinion I still think he caused a lot of problems for us. That is my opinion. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

Any questions relative to the Order Paper. I will invite the Honourable Third Official Member to move the adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. BENJ. H. POWERY: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this House until Tuesday, 31st May, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do adjourn until Tuesday, 31st May, 1975. I believe that the Honourable Third Official Member wishes to speak.

MAY. SHIRLEY C. JEFFERSON: May, Mr. President, having been in this House for the past 17 working days of this month I just thought, Mr. President, to offer our gratitude to the Clerk and her staff for the manner in which they have helped us with the proceedings. I am sure, Mr. President, that they have worked on many evenings and perhaps even weekends to make sure that the minutes were prepared and that the Order of the Day is as it was to be.

Mr. President, they have processed some of the most distinguished guests which we have had here, and my grateful thanks are due to the Clerk who has expeditiously gone to the depths of the law chains which broke up under my weight.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sure that we would all wish to thank the Clerk for taking proper action to have the Government Store williness. (LAUGHTER).

Does any other Member wish to speak? If not I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 11.10 THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., TUESDAY, 21ST MAY, 1984.

SECOND MEETING OF THE 19TH SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TUESDAY
3RD MAY, 1983.

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR C PETER TROTT, CMG, CVO - CHAIRMAN

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS P POTTS, CVO,ODE,JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MITCHELL J BRADLEY, QC, ED	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS
HON THOMAS O JEFFERSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON LEONORA O EDWARDS	MEMBER FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M ROSHAM BARNES, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES L RUTHERFORD	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON VASSEL O JOHNSON, OBE, JP	MEMBER FOR AGRICULTURE AND MARINE RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR V MACKEITH BURN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MRS SHERMA I DUNCAN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MR DENNIS A PETERSON	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END
CAPT ROBIN S MCMILLAN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF SPRING ISLAND
MR JAMES H BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SEVENTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR G HAIG BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR D RICHARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN D MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE EIGHTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

* ABSENT

SECOND SITTING OF THE 2ND SESSION
OF THE 33RD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

(FIRST DAY)
THURSDAY - 31ST MAY, 1995

ORDER PAPER

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF PARENT'S DECISIONS

(1) FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

(Wednesday 30th May, 1995)

TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER, CHAIRMAN OF FINANCE COMMITTEE.

(2) SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL - ANNUAL REPORT 1994

TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST UNOFFICIAL MEMBER.

2. QUESTIONS

THE SECOND STARRED ANSWER FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF EDUCATION

NO. 49: WHAT IS THE NUMBER OF NON-CITIZEN ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW AND WHAT NATIONALITIES WILL BE AFFECTED BY THIS?

THE SECOND STARRED ANSWER FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST UNOFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 47: WHICH ONE NATIONAL PARTY INVESTED THE GOVERNMENT HAS NOT ALREADY ESTABLISHED A SHORT-TERM ECONOMIC POLICY TO ENCOURAGE INVESTMENTS IN THIS COUNTRY, AND, IF SO, WHEN THIS WILL BE ANNOUNCED?

THE SECOND QUESTION ANSWER FOR ORDINARY CLASS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THIRD UNOFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 48: WHERE THE GENERAL COURTS MARTIAL ACT PROVIDES THAT, SENTENCES HAS BEEN PASSED BY THE COURT-MARTIAL BOARD AND CERTAIN TRIBUNAL, DURING THE PERTINENT STAGE OF THIS PROCEEDINGS AND THE TOTAL PLACED ON ESTIMATED LEGAL COSTS?

THE SECOND STARRED ANSWER FOR ORDINARY CLASS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 46: IN VIEW OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEW CARIBBEAN EXTRADITION ACT, 1994, (LAW 24 OF 1994), WHICH THE LEGISLATURE STATE IN THE SCHEDULE STATUTES OF CARIBBEAN NATIONS WITH WHICH SPECIAL EXTRADITION TREATIES HAVE BEEN SIGNED BY CARIBBEAN NATIONS, AND, IF NOT, WHY NOT?

7. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(1) NOTICES:-

(a) GOVERNMENT NOTICE NO. 5/81 - CAT - TANK CHANGEOVER

(b) GOVERNMENT NOTICE NO. 7/81 - AMENDMENT TO ELECTRICITY ACT

(2) BILLS:-

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(a) THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(b) THE MATRIMONIAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(c) THE MONETARY APPROPRIATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(d) THE GRAND COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(e) THE CLERK OF THE COURTS AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (WOMEN) BILL, 1981

(f) THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(g) THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(h) THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(i) THE PUBLIC HOUSE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(j) THE METHODS OF SERVICE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

(k) THE REGULATION OF OFFENCES BILL, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
AGENDA	1
REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 3RD MAY, 1986	3
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ROYAL OLYMPIA ISLANDS POLICE FORCE, 1984 - LAID ON THE TABLE	8
QUESTIONS	8
GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 6/86 - CERTAIN AIRPORT SERVICES DULY GRANTED	17
GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 7/86 - AMENDMENT TO ELECTION LAW	31
THE HEALTH PRACTITIONER'S (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	33
THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST & SECOND READINGS	38
THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	39
THE UNIFIED COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	42
ADJOURNMENT	43

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly be in Session.
I invite the Honourable Edgar Ospaton to say prayers.

REV. CANON COOPER: Let us pray.
Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.
Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, these Princes of Wales and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and righteousness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Government of our Islands, the Members of the Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high offices.
All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake. Amen. The Lord's Prayer.
Our Father, which 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.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
The first item of business on today's Order Paper is the presentation of Reports and Papers. The Finance Committee Report.

PRESENTATION OF REPORTS

FINANCE COMMITTEE

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the Finance Committee Report for the 2nd May, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. Speaker, the Meeting on the 2nd May, 1985 approved the following supplementary appropriations:

1. HEAD 5 LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
SUB-HEAD 05-028 - PLANNING.....$7985,000

To provide for the recruitment and gratuity of the Cayman Islands Law.

HON. THOMAS C. PEARSON (CONTINUING):

3. HEAD 7 - PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.....CI$100,907

Provided for the establishment of six Medical Officer Departments.

5. HEAD 10 - FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
SUB-HEAD 07-013 - FOOD CONTROL.....CI$ 98,850

These funds are to assist the cost of public relations that Government officers contact services in the United States by Grey and Company Public Communications International, Inc.

4. HEAD 10 - FINANCE & DEVELOPMENT
SUB-HEAD 07-019 - CAYMAN TURTLE FARM (1983) LTD.....CI$199,000

To meet the financial requirements of the Cayman Turtle Farm through May, 1986.

Again on the Motion, Mr. President.

6. HEAD 10 - FINANCE & DEVELOPMENT
SUB-HEAD 07-020 - CONTRIBUTION TO
TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND AGRI STUDY.....CI$ 6,378

Provided to assist the Cayman Islands Agricultural Association for the employment of one Agricultural Consultant.

The total supplementary expenditure appears, Mr. President to CI$3,134,189.

Additionally, Mr. President, Financial Secretary advised that the sum of CI$137,000, initially granted to the Housing Development Corporation to assist 'mini-v.' applicants, be utilized as equity participation in the Company rather than the loan as previously granted.

For the Plant Replacement Programme it was agreed that a loan agreement between the Minor Government Fund and the Cayman Islands Government be formulated in the following terms as the principal sum of CI$2,000,000:-

- a 2-year moratorium effective 1st January, 1985
- 10 equal annual repayments
- interest rate of 6 per cent

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 67, paragraph (4), the House is pleased to have approved the above motion.

Hansard (ibid). The Royal Cayman Islands Police Annual Report, 1984.

ROYAL CAYMAN ISLANDS POLICE - ANNUAL REPORT 1984

HON. BENJAMIN A. COLLIER: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the Royal Cayman Islands Police Annual Report, 1984 which has been circulated. Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

Item 3. Questions. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BOROUGH TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER OR SUBSTANTIVE HOLDER

MR. ASK: Would the Member kindly tell the present policy for the admission of non-Caymanian stonemason-at-law and what maximum number will be approved in 1966?

ANSWER: The policy of the Cayman Islands Government in relation to the admission of non-Caymanian stonemason-at-law is as follows. Non-Caymanian stonemason-at-law will be admitted as previously in the Cayman Islands in such times, in such numbers and for such periods as will best ensure a balance between the need adequately to service and develop the local aspects of our offshore financial and other commercial enterprises and the need to protect the present and future interests, not only of Caymanians at present qualified as attorneys, but also those other Caymanians who are presently studying either at the Cayman Islands Law School or abroad for qualifications entitling them to practise here.

The Government of the Cayman Islands has not set any arbitrary maximum number upon the admission of non-Caymanians. All applications will be considered according to the above.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

HON. J. A. MAC DONALD: Mr. President, I would like to ask one supplementary. As the answer does not specifically mention criminal matters, would the Member say if consideration will be given by the policy to provide for criminal lawyers and for lawyers who practised in the courts, as many times it is difficult to find such a lawyer.

HON. MICHAEL J. EBANKS: Mr. President, the question as answered by me and the answer as given by me related to those non-Caymanian stonemason-at-law who engaged in the practice of attorneyship on a residence basis there. There is a provision, Mr. President, whereby instead of a general admission to practise law here there is a special admission given. This special admission does not require the approval under the Legal Practitioners Law of the Government-in-Council in respect of a non-Caymanian. It is the applicable rule to be admitted for a particular case or for a particular specific limited purpose which is stated in the application. Such application for admission under a special arrangement are made to the Chief Justice, who is satisfied that the person has the necessary and appropriate qualifications and admissions are made accordingly.

It is not the intention of this Government to seek arbitrarily to limit the right of an accused person to have the lawyer of his own choice.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary I will invite the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town to ask the next question.

THE SENIOR MINISTER MAKES NO SPECIFIC REPLY TO ANY THE MEMBERS WHO SPOKE IN THE DEBATE AT EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

MR. EZ: Would the Member advise whether the Government has yet formulated a private-sector economic policy to encourage investments in Belize currently, and, if so, when this will be introduced?

ANSWER: The general economic policy of the Belize Industrial Development Incentives Act, encouraging investment generally in export industries, and, therefore, also, inter alia, employment creating activities, is contained in the five-year economic development plan, which is published from time to time as Government's Policy Paper No. 4 passed in the March 1985 Meeting of this Honourable House.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. EDWARD A. LINDO: Mr. President, a supplementary. Would the Minister state if any plans or policies other than those which have been in existence for many, many years have been formulated recently to stimulate the economy, and why has this Government not yet come out with a policy statement?

MR. MICHAEL C. ESPERANCE: Mr. President, the question which I heard the Minister of Finance say earlier this year indicated to me the intent to have an investment plan. If the Member has a different interpretation of it he would clearly his point.

MR. LEONARD A. FINNEGAN: Mr. President, I do not think that it is necessary. I am talking about a short term plan, by definition of a short term plan, that is not a five year plan. I am looking about a short term situation which could be remedied either a period of say a year or a time. I am asking whether any economic plan or policy has been formulated for the next twelve months, not for five years, because in this day and age, it is unthinkable for us to foresee for five years?

MR. THOMAS C. ESPERANCE: Mr. President, the Leader of the Opposition knows very well. We do not think it necessary to have a short term plan for twelve-month duration, five years at a time.

MR. G. PETE COLLINS: Mr. President, can I ask the Member, with reference to his statement that the investment policy remains in effect, is it correct to say that the new Government has adopted the policies of the last two administrations still remain to encourage investment?

MR. EDWARD C. ESPERANCE: Mr. President, I think that at least the Member of Government from the Stann Creek area has been stated me saying that this administration still insist on the investment policies that, or achievements.

MR. G. LEO PECH: Mr. President, can I also ask if it is correct that the new Government still not intend to put forward a short term plan, and is anticipating what they found on the assistance?

MR. ESPERANCE: I think really it effect that has been announced because the Member has explained that to regards to a short term plan and has said that the budget is the annual plan.

MR. LEONARD L. FERGUSON: Mr. President, with regard to the answer given by the Member regarding the definition of a short term economic plan, I am afraid that I cannot associate myself with that definition because the budget is not an economic plan. It is a statement of receipts and expenditure for a particular period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member must ask a question. If there is a question arising, as long as it comes quickly I will allow it.

MR. LINFORD A. FERGUSON: I just wanted to clarify the misinformation, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that there has been a supplementary question asked on that because it was really a statement by the Member. I thought it was going to be turned into a question so I allowed him to proceed for a while.

If there is no further supplementary I will invite the second Elected Member for George Town to ask the next question standing in his name.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER OFFICIALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 98: Would the Member state whether any decision has been reached on the Esterley Sports and Civic Centre, giving the estimated cost of this development and the value placed on estimated labour costs?

ANSWER: The Esterley Sports and Civic Centre comprises a bowling centre, civic centre, athletic facilities and a small hotel. The estimated cost is US$6.4 million.

An 8% hotel facility under the Hotel Aids Law (Law 2 of 1976) for a reduction in the customs import duty on all imported materials and equipment and the athletic facilities and civic centre could be an enhancement of youth facilities, Government granted an import duty reduction to 7.5 per cent on all imported materials for the project.

An estimated cost of labour to construct the project is at hand, but the total estimated construction cost including expatriates is US$6.2 million. A rule of thumb is that the labour portion is approximately one half of the project construction cost.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. LINFORD A. FERGUSON: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member state whether the 7.5 per cent on imported labour would be in excess of the amount of labour costs?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I am not sure that I can accurately answer that question, but I would assume that if the labour cost is approximately US$3.1 million that the reduction in customs import duty would not reach that figure.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. Speaker, maybe I can just clarify why I am asking that, to help him answer me a little better. If the import duty of 7.5 per cent on the materials imported is less than the wages of labour, perhaps we are being penny wise and pound foolish by not having allowed the project to go through with an exemption of the 7.5 per cent. This is the reason why I was asking this question. Perhaps he could answer me now?

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not quite sure what you are asking him to answer.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: I was trying to speak to the Honourable Minister, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Still, he has already answered to the effect that the 7.5 per cent is so low it can be judged very much less than the labour costs. I think that you were explaining why you had asked him this question. I am not sure whether you were asking him a supplementary question.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: The point is, Sir, from my understanding...

MR. PRESIDENT: I have given a statement about your ... the matter, but what is your question?

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: I think that the purpose of asking questions in the House, if I may make a statement, is so that the questions can receive proper answers. Unless I can clarify the questions which I am asking, it is impossible for the Member to answer. I am not just asking a question for the sake of asking it. I want a proper answer. What I am asking about the 7.5 per cent import duty is the answer which I want to find out is whether the 7.5 per cent which would have accrued to Government as revenue would have been in excess of the amount of labour which the project would have provided this country?

MR. PRESIDENT: That has been answered, has it not?

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, may I further my explanation. Sir, even the answer received here it says that no estimated cost of labour to implement the project is at hand, therefore the answer that the Member was given is just a rule of thumb as he says. However, the rule of thumb is that the labour content is approximately 50 per cent of the project construction costs. The project construction cost is estimated at US$8.4 million so...

MR. PRESIDENT: No, US$8.2 million.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: ...US$8.2 million, so I take it then that 7.5 per cent import duties would have been US$0.7 million or more.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, I do not think so at all. The estimated labour content in this estimate would be US$2.1 million.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Right, and the question which I am asking is whether the 7.5 per cent which would have accrued to Government in revenue is in excess of the US$0.7 million?

MR. FISHBOURNE: Well, I am sure that now have been said. It was not and I do not see how it could possibly be.

MR. LINFORD A. FIELDING: Mr. President, I wonder if it would be possible for you to allow the Member to answer, Sir?

HON. THOMAS C. JACKSON: I thought I had answered it, Mr. President. If we go by the rule of thumb it is basically divided the construction cost of $8.2 million in half, half for the materials and equipment and half for the labour content. Now if we take 7.5 per cent of $4.1 million it is not going to equal $3.1 million.

MR. LINFORD A. FIELDING: Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this. There is a journey for asking this question and I will have to explain that I got the answer I am seeking, otherwise I will deny it. However, it is for the public as well as for myself. We are not talking of 7.5 per cent of $3.1 million. I understand this Member knows that. It is 7.5 per cent of the total materials involved, whatever value be thereon to place on that. The $3.1 million as he had said is the 50 per cent of the construction costs, which approximates the labour cost by rule of thumb.

Mr. President, he does not have to because that last 7.5 per cent of $4.2 million is certainly not $3.1 million.

HON. THOMAS C. JACKSON: Mr. President, the total construction cost of the project is $8.2 million. If we use the rule of thumb which says that 50 per cent of that value be the labour content, it means that the other 50 per cent, the $3.2 million must be the cost of construction and equipment. So if we are going to take 7.5 per cent of anything we have to take it of the $8.2 million, not $3.5 million, because we do not subject duty on labour content, Mr. President.

MR. LINFORD A. FIELDING: A supplementary, Mr. President. Am I to understand, Mr. President, that there was a definite discrepancy in the amount of duty which would have been collected at 7.5 per cent as compared with the amount of labour which would have been provided in the estimate by the Works?

MR. PRESIDENT: I really think that that has been answered already several times.

If there is no further supplementary I will invite the second Elected Member for George Town to ask his next question.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE CHIEF OFFICIAL MEMBER OR EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 98: In light of the provisions of the new Citizenship Provision Law, 1984, (Year 23 of 1984), would the Member state if the foreign spouse of Caymanian women will be given equal rights with the foreign spouse of Caymanian men, and, if not, why not?

ANSWER: Under section 18(5) a spouse of either sex is treated equally.

<u>ADMINISTRATOR:</u>

<u>MR. EDWARD A. GARMATZ:</u> Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state Government's policy regarding the issuing of self employed permits to the foreign citizens of Communist areas?

<u>HON. DENNIS M. ROSSER:</u> Mr. President, that is a matter for the Canadian Immigration Board, Sir.

<u>MR. G. MALC ROGERS:</u> Mr. President, may I ask since the law is that all foreign spouses of Canadian people are treated equally, how it is that a Canadian woman married to a foreign man finds it difficult for her husband to get a license to drive a taxi, and is told by the Protection Board that she will have to fire a company and employ him herself, and if this doesn't seem to be against immigrants?

<u>HON. DENNIS M. ROSSER:</u> Mr. President, perhaps the foreign male spouse has not complied with the section as yet. Once he has complied with it I see no reason why he cannot apply for status of he is an eligible person. There particular questions which are in the regulations are unconnected. There is no doubt. However, perhaps he has not fulfilled the requirements of this section as yet.

<u>MR. LINCOLN M. ALEXANDER:</u> Mr. President, Section 15(5) of the Canadian Bill of Rights deals with status, the acquisition of Canadian status by grant. My question, Sir, is dealing with self employment not with status?

<u>MR. SPEAKER:</u> I think that your supplementary question was the same. Your supplementary dealt with self employment. I think that it is perfectly true to say that your original question dealt with rights, and if the answer was restricted to the granting of status then you are perfectly entitled to ask whether it either proposes the treatment be equal.

<u>MR. LINCOLN M. ALEXANDER:</u> I am sorry that that is the impression which was gained from my question, Sir. It is intended to deal specifically with work permits, or gainful occupation licences. In the supplementary it was dealing with the self employed persons of foreign spouses of Canadian women....

<u>MR. SPEAKER:</u> Well, if you read the....

<u>MR. LINCOLN M. ALEXANDER:</u> May I ask the Minister if there is a policy which has been set that the Canadian Immigration Board deals with this? So should know if there is a policy to this effect.

<u>HON. DENNIS M. ROSSER:</u> Mr. President, the Immigration Appeal Board, which was established by the Canadian Immigration Board which was established I cannot recall right now which section it is, or if there is a section which deals with that particular matter. However, I am pretty sure that there is something in those directives which have been published that importance is given to spouses. However, I think the Member knows that Mike has always been a help to the citizens with their problems, and it has got to the stage so everybody knows where the good business is being controlled by Immigration, that is why, I am sure, either many applicants from the Local Immigration Board offices, that the board probably took many more of those self employed licences which the Board elected Member for Dundas has referred to.

MR. LINFORD A. KINSEY: Mr. President, would the Member state whether any priority in consideration will be given to work permit applications from foreign spouses of Caymanian women in the light of section 10(6) of the Caymanian Protection Law?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, all I can say on that is that the Protection Board since it came into being this year has worked quite rapidly and they process their applications as fast as possible. They do not have long delays. I really do not interfere with the Board. We put them there to do a job and as far as I am concerned, Sir, they are doing a pretty good job.

MR. O. BASIL BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if he will give the House his assurance that he will look into what the Board is doing? Because in the case which I mentioned, if the person had followed the advice given the person would have committed a criminal act. The person was ordered and given six days for a Trade and Business Licence, and told that if she took that out and paid the $50 she could have her husband to operate a taxi for her. This is not so. She would be guilty of having him without a work permit and he would be guilty of working without a work permit. So there is something wrong in asking if the Member will give the House the assurance that he will find out what is happening in the case of discrimination against the spouses of Caymanian women.

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, the Member knows exactly what is wrong, for, because I just told him. The best assistance at the airport was getting to a stage where it was being controlled by Jamaican people. This is a move the Protection Board obviously had to make to get some proper organization up there. If the person complies with the provisions in section 10, the straightforward thing to do is to obtain status and then he is free to do as he likes.

MR. D. HENDERSON SCOTT: A further supplementary, Mr. President. The Member spoke about taxis and I just want to let him know that it is not only taxis which are involved here. There are a lot of other people involved in other businesses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member must not make statements. He must ask questions.

MR. LINFORD A. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, a supplementary. If the Caymanian Protection Board is a Government Board I would like to ask the Member whether it is fair to assume that the questions asked here should be answered in the Legislative Assembly?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Would you repeat the question?

MR. LINFORD A. KIRKCONNELL: The Caymanian Protection Board is a Government Board. Is it fair to assume that questions asked here regarding the Caymanian Protection Board should be given an answer in the Legislative Assembly?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, this is what I have done. I have given the answer.

MR. LINFORD A. KIRKCONNELL: With respect, Mr. President, I have been told that the policies and the policies of the Caymanian Protection Board and Government rule the Board.

HON. DENNIS M. SPENCE: Mr. President, let me see if I can explain, Sir. There are a Cooperative Protection Law, Regulations and Procedures all published. It is my recollection. I do not recall what to do, Sir. Neither does Executive Counsel. If Executive Counsel has another directive to make they will make it and publish it. I do not go sure there is every meeting in the last day of the meetings. I do not interfere with them. However, Sir, the policy is, and every Member knows this, that we must try to provide for our Cooperative Plans. If there is an excess of funds the employee they must give the Cooperative preference. This is what the Members want. I am sure that is the objective of the Board.

MR. LEMUEL M. TIMSON: Mr. President, my question was not dealing specifically with funds. My question was a general question. I wanted to know whether or not the Cooperative Protection Law which gives priority to the records of Cooperatives, whether the foreign nationals of Cooperatives would be given priority consideration. This was my question, and also whether there are objections to this effect. The matter is "open" or "closed" to foreign nationals?

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect your question originally is about discrimination on grounds of sex. That is my understanding of it anyway. If the foreign spouses of Cooperatives would be given equal rights with the foreign nationals of Cooperatives, also. So it is a question not about terms or other such restrictive clause of employment, or about some qualifications under the law. It is whether these rights are given equally, and about protection considerations. It is not large about discriminations on grounds of sex. I will specifically refer the Honorable Board Member to answer whether it be the case that there is no longer any discrimination on grounds of sex, because I think that all has been removed so far but maybe other terms or to do with the like. Specific employments, to do with terms or to do with the like.

MR. LEMUEL M. TIMSON: Mr. President, may I?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Honorable Member may.

HON. DENNIS M. SPENCE: No, Sir, there is no discrimination, no discrimination whatsoever.

MR. LEMUEL M. TIMSON: Mr. President, one supplementary question. I am dealing with the supplementary for that which has to do with priority consideration being given to foreign born Cooperative women. I am dealing therein right of priority 12(5) of the Cooperative Protection Law which gives priority consideration to those employable for the grant of status, whether the same consideration will be given with regard to employment locally, because I am aware that there are a number of foreign spouses, namely: wives, who cannot get a job in this country, even when it self employment permit.

MR. SECRETARY: I think that if you want to put what you may better put down a specific question about it because it is developing quite a long way from the exact rights question which is what you put down.

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I will answer it, sir. If there are jobs available they are going naturally way to give Caymanians priority. If there are more jobs available then the foreign spouses will get them. Everybody in this country has been screaming for the last six months since things have blown up a little bit about the unemployed Caymanians. We must look after them first.

MR. RICHARD A. PINEDA: Mr. President, I will conclude this supplementary. I appreciate what the Member has said. I am not talking about the foreign spouses of Caymanian women as opposed to Caymanians. I am speaking about foreigners and whether foreign spouses of Caymanian women would be given priority over other foreigners coming to the country? This is all my question was all about, not as opposed Caymanians.

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Yes, Sir, I agree. I think how it would work is the Caymanians first, the foreign spouses and then the others who come on their own.

MR. PRESIDENT: We have had your two answer you wanted now at three?

If there be no further supplementary on item 4. Government business. Motions. Government Motion No. 8/95.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MOTIONS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 8/95

CAYMAN AIRWAYS LIMITED - BANK GUARANTEE

HON. W. MCKEVAN BODDEN: Mr. President, I beg to move Government Motion No. 8/95 which reads as follows:-

> "BE IT RESOLVED that this House does this day approve the provision of a guarantee by Government to the Royal Bank of Canada, Grand Cayman, in respect of the amounts which that Bank of Cayman Airways Limited; up to a maximum of two million Cayman Islands dollars."

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion before the House, Government Motion No. 8/95 is:-

> "BE IT RESOLVED that this House does this day approve the provision of a guarantee by Government to the Royal Bank of Canada, Grand Cayman, in respect of the account which that Bank of Cayman Airways Limited, up to a maximum of two million Cayman Islands dollars."

The Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

MR. W. MCKEVAN BODDEN: Mr. President, the financial problems of our national airline is well known to all Members of this Honourable House. It has been dealt with many times in the past, most recent on the occasion which were tabled at the Meetings in March I am sure that the financial difficulties of Cayman Airways Limited are no cause to anyone.

MR. [illegible] (continued): Nevertheless, in this particular case, I have to explain what prompted this notice. Cayman Airways had been using its aircraft facility at the Royal Bank of Canada which was guaranteed by a letter of Comfort from Executive Council to the tune of $1,500,000. However, this amount was many times exhausted due to the need for additional working capital. Since August, 1984 the overdraft actually increased to $1,811 million which amount has been fully utilized ever since that time.

At that time a written assurance was given to the Royal Bank of Canada by the former Honourable Member of Executive Council responsible for Tourism and Trade and the then Chairman of Cayman Airways, which stated that of the overdraft facility of $1.5 million was not reduced to the former level of $500,000 by 31st December, 1984 then a Government Guarantee would be provided in early 1985 to support the aircraft facility which was made available to the airline.

The Royal Bank of Canada has advised this morning and has served notice that it requires at this time a formal Guarantee from Government to continue to make the aircraft facility available to Cayman Airways. Based on Cayman Airways' weekly cash flow report this overdraft of $1.5 million at the Royal Bank of Canada is absolutely necessary in order to operate. The company is meeting its debt obligations.

Additionally, the Board of Directors of Cayman Airways have recommended that the airport be increased by $500,000 which would be used mainly as a reserve equipment and large recuperative debt facility at short notice. This sum cannot unfortunately be used until the specific authorization of the House of Cayman Islands. It is intended to use this as a provision in the event of any unforeseen debts arising.

In the past six months efforts have been made to improve the financial position of the airline and while some degree of progress has been made, the fact remains, Mr. President, that Cayman Airways still is and it will continue for a very heavily dependent on this direct and continued financial assistance from the Cole Government the Government of the Cayman Islands.

Mr. President, this motion is some extent indicates the responsibility of our Government and Cayman Airways. I feel it can recommended made by a Member of the next Executive Council which of necessity should be honoured. I recommend this motion and would ask other Members in their wisdom to do likewise by giving this motion their full support.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is now open for debate. Does any Member wish to speak? The Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

DEBATE ON GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 9/85

MR. KENNY G. ROWLAND: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this motion for the Honourable House to guarantee a Guarantee to that Cayman Airways can operate on overdraft at the Bank to a limit as stated in the motion, a maximum of $2 million.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I would be safe in saying that Cayman Airways has become from a few years ago something near to a multi-million pound sick of Government.

HON. EDGAR D. JOHNSON (CONTINUED): Cayman Airways had become established since 1977 when it was set up by the then Government to operate the existing internal airline of the Government. Mr. Speaker, the Government considers to that though that because of the size of the Cayman Islands, the size of the population and size of the travelling public, and with many obstacles such as the possibility of airline operations, it was not necessary for any more airlines like Cayman Airways operating as an independent entity should exist. Before that, Mr. President, it was linked to equity and operations with another airline which was in fact bankrupt. However, other Members thought differently. In consultation to those Islands we like to be big and this costs money. So Cayman Airways was taken off as a side to be operated more as independent entity owned solely by the Government of the Cayman Islands.

There were many criticisms at that time, Mr. President, that the airline would have to be heavily subsidised by this Government if it were to make a success of its operations. Although the public use declined from time to time as the true financial status of the airline, and the public was led with the belief that the airline would be a viable operation economically; the Government would not have to put money into the airline; everything would be fine; the airline would in time pay big dividends to the Government. It was under these misrepresentations, Mr. President, that the airline continued growing at the detriment of Government's finances and Government's finances.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that after that decision was made by the Government, that all Caymanians and this Honourable House stood by those decisions and hoped for the best as far as the airline operation was concerned. We acquiesced to, Mr. President, because a national airline is a very prestigious thing within a country, especially a country so small as ours. I am sure that in other country one does look to into this venture. However, we did not we are still making quite a lot of mistakes into producing results and first class personnel for the country. However, Mr. President, an airline operation is always a little different from other things. We have employees flying in the sky increasing pay-in over one point to another. These aircraft have to be kept up to proper standards in maintenance and services, and it the operation becomes very expensive. If the revenue likely cannot meet the overhead costs then of course somebody must pay the bill. In this case it is the Government.

Mr. President, it was no surprise to me when I entered Government to examine Cayman Airways accounts almost immediately, and to find that the airline was in what I term a very serious financial position. I am sure that many persons in these Islands understand that too. However, there are many other on the Opposition's side who believe that we took over a gold mine, Mr. President, I must reiterate again that in November when the Government we found that the airline was running at that time a back deficit of $7? million. In other words the airline equity had wiped into a deficit of some $6 million. Now in this world the wisest commercial operating use a formula as the yet to many others.

Needless that, Mr. President, even if the equity had been used to finance the other part of the operation it would not be so bad, but we found that there were debts owing by the airline, some of which very confidents. The first check that we made disclosed that these debts amounted to around $8 million, but later on we found other things that after we went people in there to re-check those amounts, because it that was nobody knows what the position was.

MR. KISSEL of SOUTH DAKOTA: I understand that they had never traveled with a budget. They scarcely know between one million dollars and another what the position was; that is to say on a current basis. So when we ask people to come to look at it they come out with a further disheartening figure of $7 million debit.

Also, Mr. President, when we went into Government we found that the aerodrome was sparsely [illegible] which existed during the course of 1939, and it went on. The Government [illegible] the service a whole new slew [illegible] of this as I need not go over that part of it. However, that bank overdraft amounted [illegible] to get in there we found that it was a case of $2 million.

Well, Mr. President, you are [illegible] million of deficit. You can add $7 million to [illegible] debts outstanding, and now you add over $2 million to overdraft, and that will give you the total adverse position of this airline at that particular date. Mr. President, at the present time the loan [illegible] except for losses over the months since last year. The debts [illegible], that is the working debts of $7 million have reduced slightly because we got a little money from Government in December to take care of some of the early moneys once which would have applied the million had they not been used at that time. From the airline [illegible] to have instituted, as the Postmaster there has been a slight improvement in the financial position of the Company where it can pay a bit of the debt. However, the bank overdraft, Mr. President, has not improved very much because we think for 1939 it will be $7,951 million.

Mr. President, in asking Honourable Members to support this motion before we do so Englishmen must understand and appreciate the fact that Cayman Airways is 100 per cent owned by this Government. We must understand also that the obligations of Cayman Airways are the liabilities of this Government and the people of these Islands.

Mr. President, another thing which I want to make quite clear here is that this adverse and serious financial situation in Cayman Airways was not a creation of this present Company [illegible]. I am sure that it is the desire of all those in this Chamber and the people of the Cayman Islands that Cayman Airways continues flying. As I said before it is a very precarious undertaking to begin in any country and we must do our very best to keep it going. However, Mr. President, I must tell you that we do have a ray of hopefulness either than the serious financial position of the airline. We have reason to think who seem to give [illegible] thought to the airline's financial position and in all I would say that Cayman Airways position is not [illegible] the serious financial position.

What will happen in future as the airline will depend on the discussions of this Honourable House, either we will find the money to meet some of the capital needs of the airline, because we are going into the service normal which unfortunately this one has to take for first operation. We have made arrangements, architects, pilots [illegible] I am sure are hoping that the situation at the end of the season will [illegible] so Honourable as in other years. However, as must keep that in mind, Mr. President, we must realize that that is an obligation which we must keep only keep in mind from time to time and we will be appearing in this Honourable House at regular [illegible] and when there are urgent matters to bring to your attention.

I would ask Members to support this motion. The airline must maintain operating this circuit which has developed itself in a position to [illegible] more money to assist this undertaking. That is the only way out there now, Mr. President.

SIR. KASEM S. KHAIRAT (Counsellor): I therefore leave the matter in Members to give it their due consideration, as I believe it needs to be given.

I support the motion, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that this may be a convenient moment to take our customary morning break. I will therefore suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

At 11.15 A.M. the House suspended

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11.40 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Does any other Member wish to speak, if not I will put the question. The Second Elected Member for George Town.

MR. BENJAMIN A. PITCHER: Mr. President, Government Motion No. 4/85 seeks to restore the pensionable age of this honourable House for a Commissioner up to a maximum of fifty retirement for Cayman Airways. I feel, Sir, that I would be remiss in my duties today if I did not take the opportunity to speak on this very important motion especially, Sir, after the remarks which were recently made by the honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council, which if I may paraphrase appeared to me to be an obituary on Cayman Airways.

It appears, Sir, that this important Department of Government is already dead. This is the reason, Mr. President, why I felt constrained to ask the questions I did today. It was mainly because of the economic situation which prevails in this country and I believe, Sir, that the honourable Second Elected Member for Executive Council spoke straight into the point which I was trying to make, which I found myself unfortunate to do. So that as it may, Sir, I think it is unfortunate for the Cayman Islands today that the economic situation of this country has never been as it is today, Sir.

This nice opinion particularly to Cayman Airways. It was therefore surprising to me that a bill was brought here which had the net effect of reducing the viability of the airline. This bill, Sir, increased from 55 per cent to 100 per cent the liability on the pensions. As a result the airline has suffered, and suffered badly. In discussion with many of our hotel operators and tour representatives, and our economic operators they have complained bitterly of the increase in cost in bringing people to this Islands on Cayman Airways. One would have thought that with the economic situation as we are in today that every effort would be made to make this airline as profitable as possible. I would like also thought, Mr. President, that it would have been a request from the Government before a motion of this nature was brought to this House.

MR. ETHELBERT A. EDMONDS (OCEAN-HILLSBORO): As I understand it, the purpose of this report was to give us an idea of the present situation, financial and otherwise, of the airline and then what we can expect for the future. From the glowing reports made by the Chairman of Cayman Airways I am wondering why this matter is being brought to the House.

When I recall, Sir, one of the major issues discussed in the recent campaign was that Government or any group forming the Government would find ways and means of putting the airlines out of the area it was in. The share, that estimate about something of an accumulated deficit of $12 million. We have heard that on top of this there were twenty debts on the amount of approximately $7 million, not to speak of the overdrafts at the bank.

My question, Mr. President, is what specifically is Government doing to better this situation. I am personally tired of hearing complaints about what the old Government did. I am not interested in what the old Government did. That is history. We know what the old Government did. What the people of this country want to hear is what we are planning to do for this country and for the airlines.

We also have about the kinks which were made with Miami airlines in the past. We are speaking in 1985, not the 1970 or 1980 or years past. Our major concern today is what will happen to this country from here on for the next four years, and the next four years not as us. This is why, Sir, it seems so ridiculous to me when I hear people advocating a five year development plan for this country. We can hardly see beyond six months. What are we talking about? I want to hear where we are going over the next year or so. How long will it take us to formulate a five year development plan? Why has this Government not already come forward with a policy statement as that includes one more of the policies of this new Government? This is what we want to hear, Mr. President.

I see we are coming here every session asking for supplementary appropriation on the guarantees for this or that with respect to Cayman Airways. The question, Mr. President, of my other fears regarding our economic development and where we are going to support the economic base of this country, is that things are so bad today. There are many, many people out of work and Cayman Airways is perhaps one of the biggest employers. Even though we are operating at a loss, if we cease to operate Cayman Airways tomorrow we would have many, many other people out of work in this country. Cayman Airways is a very expensive as a Government department.

And so concerned with the specifically reasons of Cayman Airways, are we not in a position to help the people of this country? If the better is the case, Mr. President, then we must assume the responsibility of having to subsidize the airline.

The last speaker said, Mr. President, that the Opposition because they are believes that Government took over a gold nugget. Mr. President, I believe that I am in capable of reading a balance sheet and financial statement as any Member in this House, so I would not have considered myself with the feeling that we were taking over a gold nugget if I am indeed referred to as the Opposition. I have not.

Mr. President, whether we want to accept it or not Cayman Airways is the pawn that owned by this Government. We have to take the responsibility. We cannot shirk our responsibilities. We cannot abrogate our responsibilities. We cannot pass them on to other people. This Government owes each person individually myself and our duty is to see that things are made better. It is going to take time and I know that the people out there do not expect to see miracles overnight...

MR. LINCOLN A. FERGUSON (CONTINUING): However, we cannot sit like the ostrich, keep our heads in the sand and continue to blame history.

Mr. President, if we in the Legislature Assembly are to be expected to scrutinize supervising Cayman Airways or any other non-profitable organization in this country, or department in the Government, I feel that it is only fair that we should be given all the facts. We should be made ready to the reasons which are made by the agencies such as Customs and others, so that we can see what is happening; so that we can determine from ourselves whether we can support these type of decisions. There are many knowledgeable people in the Legislative Assembly other than those who form the Executive Council and I feel, Sir, that it is unfair for us to be asked to support things like this without giving us the type of information which the Executive Council has on Cayman Airways.

I have no choice, Mr. President, but to support this motion. I could say that I am not supporting it but then it would not give the Government time to look the problems around as we hope to see. So I will support this motion but with reservations, Mr. President, with reservations that the subsidies on the present scheme will never be profitable. It is often said that we have taken away the most profitable operations of the airline which was the cargo operation. What were we thinking about when we decided to commence the cost of bringing cargo in the land this country? Again I say, Mr. President, that our priorities are way out of line in my opinion. The people who suffer from these cuts are the real consumers, not the supermarkets, Mr. President, because all they will do is pass them on to the consumer. As a result they have decided not to ship by Cayman Airways any longer and they are using the shipping lines.

I see sometime,Mr.President, to make it unbearable for the airline to make a profit we will have no choice but to shortly shut the airline down. We have also told, Mr. President, that the million was allocated from time to time and told that Cayman Airways would be a viable, feasible entity. Perhaps that was said, Mr. President, but I would again state that it is not in any way subscribe to that view, neither do I associate myself with any of those workings and failures either of past or present Governments. I deal with the facts and the fact. Before we broke to that estimate time, 1984 Cayman Airways had a $17 million deficit with $7-million in grants alone, and the equity of the airline was totally wrecked. This is what I want to see us as a Government achieve, and desist from giving back doors connections of past Governments. That is helping nobody. We are dealing with today. We are dealing with 650 people out of work.

Mr. President, while I can understand the scheme, certain financial problems of Cayman Airways may not have been known through the present Government's existence, I am also appreciative of the fact that it is our duty to try and make this better.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to state that I more than many can fully appreciate the dilemma that the airline has been through. I am also aware of the situation which existed when the book, a book of budgetary provisions of the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council mentioned. However, I envisage the long term: the airline having a more profitable venture. I do not think it will be totally unprofitable, not under the current route structure and with the present equipment which we have. However, I think that it would be made more profitable. I also believe, Sir, that we must examine very closely the situation of Cayman Airways, in exchange whether better with the present monopoly which we see today we could be in a lot of trouble with the airline.

MR. LEROY A. PETERSON (CONTINUING): Mr. President, as I said, somewhat hesitantly and with reservations I support the $2 million added to today's bill in this motion.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Clerk may read the next item.

MRS. CATHERINE D. GORRY: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to support the motion, Sir, which has been brought to us for the transfer of $2 million overdraft with the Royal Bank of Canada. Although we have not been able to anticipate our requirements any past Government I think perhaps, Mr. President, that it is only fair that we keep before the minds of the public that this accumulated debt which we are faced to meet is of our own making. I do not wish to see this prolonged and tiresome debate continued but I think now and again we might like to jog the memories and minds of our Caymanian people in that regard.

I feel, Sir, that the present Government is doing the utmost to see the country make a sound economic footing for the future. I am not sure that we will ever see it become a profitable venture but I would hope to see it at least become a business which can be run at least on the break even point.

I support the motion, Sir, only with those few reservations in mind that if on the next finance, any additional loans or a reduction of two, if it is found that the airline is continuously not making any progress or is not profitable and having able to be run on its own rather than Government continually putting in more to cover it and in kept in the red, then I think perhaps we might be wise in trying to invest Cayman Airways completely and bring that money for a much better purpose. It would seem to me that these millions of dollars can be used and can pay a lot of salaries for a lot of people in other areas of Government. It would seem to me that one should finance or encourage a diversification of Government income or another.

I also must say that I was disappointed to learn that there has been a shortage in the amount of cargo which has been flown over by Cayman Airways because of the increase which has just been enacted here. I feel that the Attorney General have no problems at all about getting sufficient cargo to bring over, and it would seem to me that the only disincentive to our people having to pay a lot more for what we consume here is for the businessmen who have used Cayman Airways to use the airfreight lines to get a better deal. However, this in turn takes away from Cayman Airways and this is the last thing which we need to see happen here. It needs all the help it can get.

I know might not there is not much one can do except support this, and I think I will support the motion for some time yet. However, I would suggest that if anyone has a business which has proved not to be profitable, and it does from time to time, profitable it is commonly to be quite a weight around one's necks here, I think we might do look at it and although it is not of our making, and although this present Government cannot be blamed for it then why should not something which we find ourselves in to be a burden and we sometimes it a great loss.

You have to do one thing for one to run a noble house, but if one finds out that the insurance and the upkeep on it is too expensive one might as well invest in a Rolls-Royce. If one finds out that the Rolls-Royce is not what one needs then one should [illegible] Leave the Rolls Royce part somebody else and let them like over all the upkeep of it.

MRS. DOROTHY E. CRESSY (GOOSEBERRY): I feel that Guyana ought to proud to be. We might be small from Grenada. It is my understanding that we have to see that people are employed. That is common knowledge. I feel that it is about time we realized that we cannot be the number of people who are working with Guyana Airways be employment. It was same like perhaps we are keeping hundreds out of employment because of what we mean it contribute to the airways.

Sir, I would like to suggest that [illegible] I mentioned that hopefully the present Government and the Board of Directors of Guyana Airways are looking at this very carefully, and will perhaps not wait for four years before they decide whether or not we get rid of it and try something else, in order to avoid the Government from making so considerably low in their handling of it.

I would like to congratulate the Chairman and the Board of Directors of Guyana Airways. I feel they are really attempting a lot of time and effort in trying to make this thing come satisfactorily. However, on the other hand it seems as if as of now things are still not going too well.

Mr. President, I would like to support the motion that I give it my wholehearted support at this time bearing in mind what I have just said.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply? The Senior Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. K. KOUSOUL HUSEN: Mr. President, I am sorry that I must oppose this Government Motion No. 8/75. I have my reasons for opposing it. Before November last year I spoke out many times about the case with which the former Government came into this Assembly, came and brought large sums of money in, the airline's coffers such which Members of the House had no control, and about which we are hardly get information. I was elected to this House to help remedy the use of public funds under the present relationship between this Government and Guyana Airways, after said to be a financial liability company. I am unable to support my motion.

I have heard a lot about the people about the value of Guyana Airways and I appreciate this, the contribution to our development and our economy. However, Sir, there has to be a limit to the amount which we can afford to pump into this thing as said Government pleases. It is said, Mr. President, that a rose by any other name is still a rose. Let us not make any mistake about it, whether it be called a guarantee, a loan or a gift it is the taxpayers' money which is being spent by people who have not elected to spend this money anyhow.

I believe that most of us have expected that Guyana Airways will always be a losing proposition here. Sir, before this Member makes another plunge for money to have to ask us some figures as to what the exact is involved or be.

The last pump, Mr. President, has already been spent to keep Guyana Airways flying. This motion is for Government to guarantee another 2½ million or double that since breakdowns of the planes are there pumping people into and eventually running on that grounds principle. Mr. President, when we could perhaps appropriate some funds with a few last resort emergencies, emergencies which we have been unable to provide because of this thing which are not national goods.

HON. M. MARSH DYE (CONTINUING): My national pride extends very far, Sir. My national pride is to see our people better housed and better trained, and until I see some progress in these areas I cannot in good conscience approve anything for Cayman Airways from the Public Treasury.

I mention, Sir, that this $2 million is not directly from the Public Treasury and that it is only a guarantee but as I state, Sir, so far every single guarantee given by the previous Government had to be made good from the Treasury of this country. I say no, Mr. President, Government should guarantee $2 million at this time for the Housing Corporation. I believe so that these people who are unable to appreciate the lending institutions in this country will be able to get a better house to live in, will be able now that the rents is coming to sleep in a roof which has not been ours.

Mr. President, what a burden for national consequence on our national people. I realize that the Government, that the present Honourable Member responsible, that the present Ministers are doing and have done good work since they have been elected. When we took office there was no budget for a thing, for this $22 million of debt. There was no budget, Mr. President, yet they are screaming now telling us that they are the best managers. Not they had no budget for a national airlines with $22 million of debt. The airlines needed to have some dimensions. We needed to know what was happening in the airlines. The present Government have done a study, a study which I hope to see. I would like to see the report, Sir. I know that the experts down in the Bahamas people will not be satisfied like the report which we had here in 1982 which Government spent a lot of money on. This Honourable House is elected to find out if we as Members on this side must be kept up to date with what is going on here otherwise, Sir, I will second home and always say no.

I find it hard, Sir, not to look back at the past. As far as I am concerned, Sir, we learn by our mistakes. Everything has a past, everything has a present and everything has a future. The position of Cayman's national airline today is a direct result of the past. And this we not say do not look back at the past? We have to look back at the past Mr. President, the Cayman people forget and elect those people who make such good managers that they did not have a budget for $22 million debt for the Caymanian people.

Mr. President, I do not intend to say any more on this motion but I am saying that I cannot support it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for the Sister Islands.

HON. MARY S. MCTAGGART: Mr. President, I rise to support this motion. I have listened carefully to the debate here today and I would like to remind Honourable Members that the Cayman Islands do not rest on the shoulders of the Island of Grand Cayman, but they include the two smaller Islands which depend entirely on our communications by our national airline Cayman Airways.

It is convenient for us to get to hospital and other needs. I fully realize the financial responsibility we have placed upon this Government and will continue to place, but I feel that we must also look at the benefits which the Cayman Islands have derived from our national airline and certainly will continue to do so in the future.

HON. HENRY S. KIRKCONNELL (CONTINUING): We are in an area where just simply to maintain our present position, only if we can keep it in the hands of foreign citizens completely I think that the future of our tourist industry will be in jeopardy.

Therefore, Mr. President, I congratulate the Honourable Member responsible, and the Chairman and Members for the efforts which they are making to help Cayman Airways to be more profitable. I feel that it is understood that every Caymanian and everyone who says that they love the Cayman Islands should patronize Cayman Airways to their fullest extent, for it is only by patronizing Cayman that we will help to alleviate the deficit which it is incurring each day.

With those words, Mr. President, I support the motion.

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

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, the airline is about ready to celebrate its 10th birthday and since that first year, we either maintain an efficient and reliable air service to the Cayman Islands or we have the heads of the clock brought back to the days when we had an air service. All people of my vintage will remember those days when there was no air service; when we depended on a motor boat or a sailing boat to connect us to the outside world. We can boast that we had no airline, but we also did not have a lot of other things. We had no paved roads. We had no electricity. We had no telephones. We had no microwave links. We had no direct radio. We had no weight restrictions. We had nothing.

I recollect from the beginning that the airline is the most important organization in the Islands economy. There are many things the Government could do without money but we must have money for essential purposes, for the hospital, for the police and I could go on and on. These departments could Government money to run, and the airlines is not unlike them. I believe that we are in the position we are in today, the position of being the best country in the Caribbean and the best country in the world that I know of, simply because we have the guts to know that communication is the key to success in an island economy. Air service, telephone, telex, radio communication and good services are the ingredients upon which Islands will prosper or will fail.

I recall in 1972 when we had a conference here, one Member from the British Virgin Islands said that Caymanians should be proud of their air service. He said that, "We in the Virgin Islands are feeling ourselves. We believe we have an air service. Our Government owns a part of LIAT, but LIAT does not give us the service which Cayman Airways gives Cayman. When it suits them they comply. They do not always. Our principle cannot depend and our businessmen cannot depend on this type of service".

The reason why the Cayman Islands were into the airline business was because as I said my many years ago, several decades ago at first, this Government has told that British Airways would no longer service the Cayman Islands. The Government of that day did what was right. They founded an airline which still exists, although it has undergone many changes.

I would not like the people who have listened to this debate to get away with the idea that having an overnight is something new from Cayman Airways, something which recently became necessary. I remember in 1972 the airline was having problems. It got into an such bad condition that Assembly took refuge to give a $50,000 overdraft to them, although Cayman Airways had an account which was bearing over fifty thousand dollars a month through Barclays Bank.

(2.) B. THE AVIATION CONTRIBUTION: The Government had to have the assistance from Airways International so as to enable them to get the aircraft/which Pilgrim at that time was the majority of $600,000 and has since increased to $800,000, and the action today will jeopardize:

As to look back on the people who run the airline a year ago or two years ago and to say that they are responsible is wrong. It is not supported by the facts. The true picture of Cayman Airways is that shareholders will not have been increased since many years and are not the doing of a single year.

I wonder when the people will ever be told about the responsibility of Cayman Airways and the circumstances which forced the Government to put 100 per cent of Cayman Airways. The truth is that the Bermuda II Agreement which was entered into by this Government with the United States and other connected countries has a clause in it which says that any British overseas territory from the Cayman Islands or from any Caribbean territory into the United States must be majority owned and effectively controlled by the nationals of the country or by the British Government. It could not continue today the relationship with LACSA and fly the Miami route or the Honduras route. So whether we like it or not there is no choice. This Government or Cayman Airways having been put that airline. If it was owned by LACSA or any other foreign carrier we would not have the right under the Bermuda II Agreement to enter the United States.

It is true that in 1977 there were rumours of the airline becoming a profitable venture, although at that time it was not. Then again the whole world knows what happened. When the Arab world held the Cayman Islands, the United States and all the rest of the oil consuming people to ransom for the oil which they were using. The fare of all airlines including Cayman Airways became the fare of leading airways, because the market of oil had risen many times and there was no way that any airways using Arab fuel could ever make money again. I believe that this was the most serious problem which Cayman Airways. It was a problem felt by all the other airlines and the biggest item of expenditure of the airlines became the fuel bill. The airline has not yet recovered and probably never will.

The Member for West Bay said that this new Government has not done very much to increase the profitability of the airline, and I agree with him. I thought the Bill introduced and passed in this House in March of this year, which increased the duty payable on air freight. I thought another Bill we were bound to have passed through the morning, in order to assist the airline. However, I did not mention at the time but might I now say that about seven weeks in some thought this country. We had hurricane in the meantime. We have people demonstrating on the streets. They are no longer happy to be taken by the promises the Government has elected enough to place the cost of living going up by 10% or 15 percent. I wonder when they are going to learn the facts and the good advantage to having that Bill taken as this we can assist in as that the airline was attempting to provide a portion of the air freight which is so vital for the very existence of the airline.

I could mention other areas in which the new Government has taken hundreds to put the airline into bankruptcy. Let me just touch on the question through Cayman Brac. We have lovely runway on the Cayman Brac but we had been told from the start the old DC-3. With the introduction of the jet service we need more money, but the new Government came along and doubled their salaries by increasing the flights so that the flight there had to cause might in Cayman Brac in the absence of the airline. I wonder when they are going to answer that.

Mr. S. Gold Bond (CONTINUED): One Member referred to the coal mines, the strikes which had been over. And I think that there is reason to like that. Because when the new Government took over, the mines had some pressing problems. However, they were able to solve them by coming to the Finance Committee and getting the Finance Committee to agree to vote $5.6 million out of the measures which the old Government had left behind. In November this year when they must come there will not be any Estimates at the rate they are going through them, because they come in March this year and ask another $5.6 million to balance Government's 1976 budget. If we are going to spend $5 million every two months, $30 million isn't bothering me either, however. So there is need for the mines to be open now, because the day of reckoning is coming. Quebec through its Hydro is suffering because the Government will not nationalize the economy. The Government is building up resentments. The Government is doing everything to increase taxes and take money out of circulation, and so decrease the economy. This is the problem we are suffering from.

Some Members seem to feel that if we shut down the mines the Government would have money for necessary social programmes. I think that they're being very short sighted. We are not prospering in spite of the mines, we are prospering because of the mines. The day that we do not have a realistic mentality we will have no banking business, and we will have no resources. These people want to travel and they want to travel fully. They want to travel when they choose to travel. They do not want to travel if some other mines have been working here once a week. So our economy has been concentrated by the activities. We import about $20m the mines and pay the money to pay other people salaries, because without the mines there would be no money. I have said this many times and my feelings on it are just as strong as they were back in 1972, and in 1973 for that matter and in 1980 when I had my whole political life on the table in an effort to nationalize the mines and to stop the madness which had started in this country to shut it down, the problems, the threats in the press and the demonstrations. There did that, the Government of the day was strong enough to say that they would keep the mines, because I believe that people who would shut down the mines would destroy our economy if they could do it. This is what they will do if we let them do it.

So the mines must be open, but the Government has problems because the question of $11 million lost by the previous administration has dwindled to about $7 million overnight by my reckoning. The shareholders have swallowed the surpluses and so there will not be the problem for Dennis Stevens to fall back on whether the Government does more in the next six months than it has done in the past six months.

The mines came to the present viability because of the backing of the Government, the backing of a Government which had cash. I mentioned when we were elected in 1977 that the mines would not even get a $50,000 guarantee. So back in the Telegram would lead money to buy the first SDC 1-11 and that changed dramatically. By the time we were purchasing the 737s Swan in the Islands were showing where the Government is not in on the business. This is why a Government which had been transformed from bankruptcy to prosperity had brought about. It brought about a change in the Government attitude of the bankers so that Royal Bank of Canada was ready to lend the money to buy the SDC 1-11, and this Government was able later on when we had enough surpluses to take the risk from the surpluses and pay off the bank for the SDC 1-11. However, I am afraid that the present Government is failing far behind in that every action taken since November has been to depress the economy.

MR. G. HEATH BROWN (CONTINUED): ... only Cyprus revenue but other revenues, some of them not Government owned, will be feeling the wind of the economic recession which the Government has put on which there can be room for it, and the revenue will suffer somewhat next year because there will not be any Government to modify the plans we there had been under the eight years from 1970 to 1984. So there is need to study the Budget hypothetically, because they are more problems which can only be cured by some schemes or the Budgets would start to bring, and modify it only the means.

So the solution has problems but there is no way out of the dilemma in which the present Government finds itself, but to come here and seek the approval of this Government to increase the standards at the back so that the airline can continue to operate.

The Member said many guarantees made by the previous Government had to be made good, or something like that. What a credit to the Government of every guarantee made would be made good. However, I do not think that the statement is correct because as my knowledge there are many guarantees made by the Government which have not yet been made good. We guaranteed a loan for Cyprus Airways and we have not made it good. We guaranteed all of the payments on the loans for the 737s and it is my understanding that the airline itself has met a few of them, although the Government may have put up some cash for some of them. I could go on to other guarantees and loans which the Government made, I think that this is what a Government is for. I think that we promised a flight for Cyprus Rose. I know that we have that on the table but this is what a Government is for. What I am mentioned about is a Government which is not going to be able to find the cash when there is a call for cash.

I support this motion, Mr. President, and I trust that the few remarks which I have made will have an effect on the Government and will at least get them to sit down and think about where this country is headed, and to tell us how they are going to have the cash in November like prior that they found there in November, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member wish to exercise his right of reply? Do you wish to speak? Well in that case shortly we shall not get the debate on the motion finished before lunch. I think perhaps it might be convenient if we suspended proceedings for lunch now and we again at 2.30 p.m.

At 12.30 p.m. the House suspended

EC785 Document AT 3.20 1.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. GEORGE O. SOARES: Mr. President, in the beginning I had no intention of speaking on this motion, because as the mover said it is to be a great saving for Government on obligations which had been placed on Government some time ago by the previous Constitution of the country, in that it provided a million dollars had been bought on a letter of Comfort with an undertaking that if the amount of the overdraft ever rose above that a guarantee would be given to cover the approval by the 31st December, 1984. The bank is now asking for the appropriate cost of Government's responsibility to be removed so here is an opportunity to give the guarantee.

However, referring to the debate as it went on I thought that I would make a few comments. For example, Mr. President, it was said that the majority of Cayman Airways being owned in the present fashion, or in the present state, that is 100 per cent ownership by Government. The Bermuda II Agreement, Mr. President, is not something new out there in left field. If we remember, I happen to have kept a copy of the Bermuda II Agreement. I have a fair memory for remembering what I have read, and there was no obligation on the part of this country to have 100 per cent shares of Cayman Airways in order to retain the rights to fly into the United States. In the Bermuda II Agreement Cayman Airways was designated the Bermuda carrier between the Cayman Islands and the United States as it was presently constituted, that is 50 per cent owned by the Government and 50 per cent by Eagle. The one requirement of that Agreement was that that position, that is the 50/50 per cent ownership did not overlap the lifetime of that Agreement.

So when the Member says that it is time that the people be told the truth about the Bermuda II Agreement, that is the truth. Those are the facts. The Member might have been led to believe otherwise but I happen to have studied myself on the opportunity to read the Bermuda II Agreement. Naturally there is always the admonition in the Bermuda II Agreement for improvements to the ownership by the Government concerned or by nationals of the Government concerned, but the one provision was that the location did not deteriorate. It is to my understanding that after the Bermuda II Agreement, as was before, there were negotiations with Eagle, which was prepared to produce even further the ownership in Cayman Airways and still continue to provide the airport for the airline.

Whatever might be said about Cayman Airways, Mr. President, I do not believe that is one of the most which has been the problem until the airline. It is the cost of financing the airport which became or continued owner-ship, or whatever by Cayman Airways owned by the Government. Why the airline did not continue operation prior to 1979 when it was reorganized was because they loaned the airport and did not own it. Therefore they did not have that extra debt servicing burden,

HON. EDMUND G. BROWN (CONTINUING): I am not saying, Mr. President, that the arrangements with LAWCO were the perfect arrangements, but certainly financially as far as the ability to borrow money is concerned it is quite obvious from the situation which we have today where the airline has accumulated, as we have heard, something like $32 to $33 million worth of debts.

Mr. President, we also heard that the present Government was doing nothing to encourage development and use west of it. We had made no policy statements. Well, Mr. President, in my opinion the Cayman Islands are on the threshold of a very substantial increase in economic activity, by that very mechanism of getting rid of the Government. Most people of any Government are required to make statements as to what the Government possibly or the people exercising the Government back accountability in their own right. However, this Government came in with accountability with Members possessing responsibility in their own right, and when we leave office at the end of 1984 we will go out with accountability. We do not have to make any statements about us are now going to change the Constitution to get internally self-government or independence and the rest of it. I think our position is well known on that. As for development, Mr. President, development has not just slowed down since the 18th November, 1984. Anybody who knows this economy will tell you that long before that the economy was on a decline. In fact when we were debating the budget it was proved that Government had failed to make the estimates of revenue by some three and a half million dollars, which was proof positive of a decline in the economy.

When we may be in that there will be an increase, and within a few months this should be evident even to the most prejudiced people. We have not deliberately done anything to slow the economy, nor will we do it, but we will seek development consistent with the ability of the country to absorb it. We do not seek development which is illusory.

It was said that the present Government has used more than $2 million of reserves from the previous Government. Mr. President, this is not so. It is true that Government went to Finance Committee and asked for something like $2.2 million to pay the debts of Cayman Airways which were pressing at that time. It borrowed approximately $1.2 million but to my knowledge only some $800,000 was spent from that figure. The other $1.4 million which would not used in the interpretation of the estimates to balance the budget for that year is certainly up until this time only a bookkeeping figure. No money has actually been transferred out of the treasury nor used to the best of my knowledge in the payment of any bills. So that $2.2 million remains there and will be used if there is not an increase of revenue over anticipations to compensate that $1.4 million hopefully to be spent. It is my belief that by the 31st December we will have received sufficient revenue from Government activity to not have to touch any reserves which the previous Government might or might not have had.

One mention, Mr. President, only that the airlines was a necessity because prior to having the airline we did not have any electricity; we did not have any telephones; we did not have any air-conditioning; we did not have any running water, or the rest of it. The thing about that is, Mr. President, that to the best of my knowledge those amenities all came before 1977 when the airline was incorporated in the present form.

MR. EDWARD O. EDWARDS (CONTINUING): So what I am saying is that while it is good and possibly desirable to have an airplane, the way we first got to where we owned and operated seven such. Because and I make no apologies for that, Mr. President, whatever little title we may claim to a limit to which this country can spend on a national defense. The other factor which I think that we should bear in mind is that the bigger our responsibilities, the less discretionary we should become in our own activities. In other words when we had a few responsibilities to the country we can do what we should be able to finance out of normal operations and profits, but the more interests that we have coming to the islands, the more attractive the responsible business to an individual citizen to have on the scene either by himself or in conjunction with the Government or with the national airline.

So, Mr. President, it does not follow that the country has to always keep that kind of a two-to national airline from us to exercise a certain discrimination.

The other point to what concerned first I would like to make is by describing the greatest single growth increase in tourism in this country took place, I believe it was in 1972. Certainly it was before 1977 that there was an increase of some 40 per cent by air. That was not with the airlines in the present form.

It was said, Mr. President, that in 1977 Cayman Airways could not become $10,000. I do not believe that was the problem of the airline just yet. I believe that again data back to was unreasonable when we have discussion in Cayman, that seems it has to be said it will have to be said.

Mr. President, I was just speaking and mentioned the figure which I quoted as having been used to pay Cayman Airways debts from the $6.5 million bought. I quoted a figure of roughly $600,000. I have been told by the Honourable Third Official Member that it has been $800,000 more that in January $800,000 more spent, making a total of $1.4 million altogether spent to pay Cayman Airways debts. That is the point of light how been drawn out of the Honourable.

Having said that, Mr. President, I would go on and say that this Government is confident that development is on the offing. It is going to be encouraging improvements to the country and when the funds flow in to the airport, this Government intends to see that those funds are used in the best advantage for all the people in these Islands.

The motion before us as I said is simply, Mr. President, is one which as I see it we have to consider. It is a commitment which was given previously, namely that it is being considered by a further new which the Caymanians have asked for in case of emergency. With the sense while I have been making out of the remarks I believe that that is a wise decision and I should commend to support this motion, and give the assurance that it is to my belief that the Honourable Member, the Chairman and the Right of Opposition will not spend this money until they are satisfied that it is right and economical that they do so.

Thank you, Sir.

HE. CHAIRMAN: Unless any other Member wishes to speak I will now put the matter to the vote to ascertain how it may be?

HON. D. MILTON ROGERS: Yes, Sir, I would not like to miss this opportunity. Mr. President, this is my fifth year of being a Member of this Honourable House and there is no doubt that if we were to select a politician people we can select everything to do with Cayman Airways.

MR. P. RAMAN TODOUR (Guyana): I can assure you that it is indeed to make a lively debate. In me it has never failed in the past. I doubt that it will fail in the future and from me it is an encouragement because it is a timely confirmation of the importance to this country. It can truly be said that, no Guyana Minister has ever made a speech that I can assume you or anyone else that since Government took the initiative over in December, 1976, it has certainly promoted many local airline experts. Everyone has their knowledge of the story and the truth. I believe that I have as much knowledge as the next man in dealing with the subject.

I never thought that this simple straightforward and clear motion, more or less formalizing what the previous administration had done, would have been taken so far. However, if we must deal in the past we must all remember that it has rightly been said that those who forget mistakes of the past have to repeat them.

There has been much a ado that occurred in the speakers before me that I feel that without belaboring this topic it is only right that I should comment on a few remarks. In corroborating Cayman Airways and the position it has worked out today it is true to say that the time was just approximately when it was becoming necessary and more desirable to own and operate our own airline. This is my opinion, Sir. We had many Guyanese who took in the wider context of the scene. They had gone to the United States and they had been trained as pilots, and they were looking for jobs. However, what was used as an excuse in 1977 should not simply; that is regarding the recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States. They said specifically in 1977 that comfortable, safe and effective airlines should be operated over Cayman Airways as any other British country wishing to operate to and from the United States. However, I can assure you that my colleagues was not. The Civil Aeronautics Board did not say what it considered a substantial amount; nor would the Civil Aeronautics Board have formed Government into taking out a responsibility by without more careful examination.

So, Mr. Speaker, there was no real reason why the airline had to be taken over in the circumstances in which it was in December, 1976. Nobody can refute this. I respectfully submit, had it been assessed not by the Government of that day in 1977 would have revealed then what they have learned now. We have gained of experience which could not be taken over in the circumstances and equipment today. It was then that it might remain the same today.

It was mentioned earlier and like to point, if someone takes the time to check the Hansards of this House, that the public was told in 1977 when a similar motion for privatization was being put through that Cayman Airways would make a contribution to the Treasury of this country rather than to take any money out of it.

It was also said then that in 1977 Barbados Bank refused to make a loan of $20,000 to the airline. It is my recollection, Sir, that this refusal was made to the Government of the day, not to Cayman Airways as a company.

When making comparisons of which Governments did what, and in studying the history of Cayman Airways, it ought to be borne in mind that Government's investment in Cayman Airways in August, 1969 when this country was formed was only $20,000.

MR. K. MUNGA BOSEN (ACCRINGTON): It is true that through the good Government we put in increase the budgets as and when necessary. It must also be remembered that the airlines under the Kenya Airways and up to December 30th, 1977, amounted a subsidy to Government of £22,000 in 1976. This was a requirement of the Airlines which were taken from retained earnings of £143,331. Without speaking irresponsibly I think this Government has a long to go before it will require any form of financial being borrowed under the present arrangements. Mainly now where that,

We are ready to talk to the Government of Cayman Airways. Anybody who tries to point out the importance to me is only promoting to the contrary. I represent which Cayman Airways and I have always maintained the importance to this country. The final decision was mentioned this morning. This is a very Government link to always maintain and I was amazed when the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac said that he wanted to mention this House that the Cayman Islands do not own Cayman Is Cayman Airways is important to maintain this link with our Sister Islands. It is also important for the development of tourism. This is common knowledge, and it is also important for jobs for Caymanians.

We are ready to talk to the Government of Cayman about the serious financial situation in which this country has been placed. When I talked the accounts up to June, 1978 to this Honourable House in March this year I took this again decided to explain the situation which the accounts revealed, and I was very serious about the serious financial situation in which our national airline was finds itself.

A point was raised regarding the Auditor's report. I was also in undertaking to this House, Sir, that the Auditor report will be tabled in this Honourable House, and before the Long.

There was also a point on the passages to Cayman on any flights which took place in March this year. An assessment was made and it was by approximately that general cargo rates brought in by sea in the world approximate very little smaller, that they were practically the same. The Member said that cargo is the most profitable operation for the airlines. I would like to differ, Sir. Cargo is important to the airlines. Any means of persons originated by air will be important. However, it should be clearly pointed that there cargo is not the most profitable operation for Cayman Airways.

Therefore, I do not believe that the attempt by the Opposition to pin the Australia-based on Cayman Airways is a bill which was passed in March of this year will produce well with the general public, at least those who will read and think about it.

The question was also asked about what documents do exist. The final thing which we have also in regard to Cayman Airways is a short working discussion on the contract on economic grounds either from individuals. We have also received more high salaries non-Caymanians who were not making any contribution to the airlines. We have re-examined contracts to Cayman Brac, and although I do not have figures to back this up it is a fact that the losses encountered on the Cayman Brac to Miami services which were there up until April this year were much heavier than losses since we have re-scheduled. The new schedule to Cayman Brac combines the international and local services all on the same flights and this is found to give the island a better service, and is also bound to make this operation more economic.

MR. H. KOLYN (CONTINUED): We have also reduced spending accounts and expenses for other groups. Although my commitment I am telling the Honourable Minister that when the accounts for June, 1985 are presented this year, we can expect an improved picture.

It is true that we have acknowledged and re-emphasized the importance of Cayman Airways but nevertheless, Sir, the fact remains that Government must at some time and place answer the question can they actually afford a national airline, if so, it must be accepted that the airline must be subsidized. Once this amount has been arrived at a decision must be taken as to how long this subsidy can be maintained.

I can assure this House that no information is withheld from Members. The accounts for June, 1984 as I said before were tabled in March; and the accounts for June, 1985 will most likely be tabled at the Meeting of this House in November. By this I do not mean to imply.

One Member spoke about the Housing Corporation. I would like to point out to him that the Housing Corporation also enjoys the benefits of Government assistance in the form of guarantees. So I hope that when it comes to subsidy he will change his mind.

There have been many beautiful remarks about the Residents of this country and much debate has arisen about them. However, Mr. President, it is a matter of fact that had the debts of Cayman Airways been paid up there would be no problem to know whose responsibility it is looked at. I am not an accountant nor an expert in finance, but I can add two and two to get ninety nine or the closest one.

Mr. President, the overdraft facility of $3 million with the Royal Bank of Canada is still needed. It is needed to avoid embarrassment. It is needed to preserve the reputation of the airline in dealing with the travelling partners. It is this of a commitment which must be honoured for the sake of the airline. I know that there has been talk about the closing down of the airline. I do not know whenever that thought. It is true that what was guaranteed was the discontinued manner in which it was taken over without a proper feasibility study, and the serious financial consequences which followed for this country. That I cannot talk about, but nobody else disputed the fact that it was good to have our own national flag carrier. I hope that I will not live to see the day when our airline has to be closed down. However, meanwhile nobody said that I also realize that funds must be found.

Again it was asked what were we doing with the airline. Sir, if the previous Government has been struggling with this airline since 1st December, 1977 and extensive financial relations are found by us when we took office in November last year, how can it be expected that the new Government produce a miracle here overnight in six months. It is the this is most unreasonable. Talking about taxing one's head like an animal, that is one of a classic example.

Mr. President, I would like to thank Members who supported this motion unanimously, and those who supported it unconditionally. I again commend it to the House and would ask all Members to support it when it comes to voting.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House, Government Motion No. 6/86 reads:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House does this day approve the presentation of a guarantee by Government to the Royal Bank of Canada, Grand Cayman, in respect of the covenant with that Bank of Cayman Airways Limited, up to a maximum of two million Cayman Islands dollars."

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NO

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: May I have a division, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well.

DIVISION NO.12

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis M. Foster	Hon. W. McKeeva Bush
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Hon. Truman O. Bodden	
Hon. W. Vernon Seales	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkconnell	
Hon. Rudolf G. Johnson	
Mrs. Daphne L. Orrett	
Mr. Linford A. Pierson	
Capt. Mabry A. Ebanks-Wilkins	
Mr. G. Haig Bodden	
Mr. J. Edward Miller	
Mr. John D. McLean	
11	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO.6/86 PASSED BY MAJORITY

MR. SPEAKER: The next item on today's Order Paper is Item 4(b), Government Motion No. 7/86. The Honourable Chief Minister.

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 7/86

AMENDMENT TO ELECTIONS LAW

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move Government Motion No. 7/86 standing in my name which reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS His Excellency the Governor, by proclamation dated 21st January, 1986, dissolved all Members of the Legislative Assembly and the Supervisor of Elections to make comments or recommendations in light of the 1984 General Elections for amendments to the Elections Law;

AND WHEREAS a number of Members, including the Supervisor of Elections, have made in their comments and recommendations;

HON. DENNIS FOSTER (CONTINUING):

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honorable House appoint a Select Committee of the Whole House to study these recommendations with a view to preparing an enabling Bill."

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion before the House is Government Motion No. 7/86, the text of which has just been read. Does the Honourable Prime Official Member wish to speak to it?

HON. DENNIS A. FOSTER: Mr. President, there is not much more I can add to the motion, Sir. It is what Members indicated that they wanted during the last Meeting on the Meeting before, I am not sure which. This will give us a good opportunity while it is fresh in our minds to go through the Electorate Law and recommend amendments. We can get it done and passed before the next elections.

It will also give Members an opportunity who have not made any recommendations to do so at the Committee Stage. Hopefully, Sir, we will get an Electorate Law which everybody will be pleased with.

I recommend the motion to everybody, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is now open for debate. Does any Member wish to speak? If not then I will put the question that Government Motion No. 7/86 be approved.

DIVISION PUT: AGREED.

HON. D. BRIAN MILLER: May I have a Division, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, if you really want one but I will ask the Clerk to...

DIVISION
NO. 32

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis A. Foster	
Hon. Richard J. Woodley	
Hon. George C. Jefferson	
Hon. Joseph O. Ebanks	
Hon. W. Miriam Bodden	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkconnell	
Hon. Samuel A. Johnson	
Mr. W. McKeeva Bush	
Mrs. Sophia G. Prevost	
Mr. Linford A. Pierson	
Capt. Mabry C. Kirkconnell	
Mr. G. Haig Bodden	
Mr. D. Brian Miller	
Mr. John B. McLean	
12	0

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 7/86 PASSED.

MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 89(3) I shall nominate the Honourable Second Official Member to be Chairman of the Select Committee. For the information of any Honourable Member not at this time Members of the House, the Honourable Second Official Member charged the Select Committee which was responsible for clarifying the present Situation(Sp). I think it will probably be helpful. Is that not right?

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: I was just thinking, Mr. Speaker, that if the members of the previously planned Select Committee by the result in another Select Committee, it might be helpful for another Member to chair this one.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I think the Standing Law on the whole seemed very well indeed. There are, nevertheless, inevitably a few minor changes required. I am not sure. Maybe the Honourable Second Official Member can guide me. I think that I normally do try to have a chairman. I am not sure what it is in Standing Orders which gives me the right to do so. However, perhaps I can take it that it is a long-standing practice.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: The precedent has existed, Mr. Speaker, in the past Sessions now having it done, the notion arising if the Select Committee deliberating itself. However, in each case it has been given.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, in that case I think I will leave the Select Committee to determine it itself. So I will simply nominate the Honourable Second Official Member to be Chairman of the Select Committee in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 89(3). However, we will leave the Committee to determine its own chairman.

We move on to the Order Paper at Page 7(vii), Bills First and Second Readings.

BILLS

THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995.

MR. SPEAKER: A Bill entitled The Health Professions (Amendment) Bill, 1995 is deemed to have been read a First time and to set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995.

HON. HENRY O. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill for a Law to amend the Health Professions Law, 1974 (Law 79 of 1974).

The Memorandum of Objects and Reasons, Mr. Speaker, is that the Bill seeks to confer on the Health Professions Board the power of providing advice on conduct or ethics for members of the health profession.

HON. GERRY O. ESSENE (CONTINUING): Mr. President, section 9 of the Health Professions Act, 1974 presently makes provisions for the Health Professions Board to be responsible for the professional disciplinary of health practitioners registered to practice in the Islands. However, presently there is no guidance or action board is to what are the expected standards of conduct or ethics of members of the health profession. This has been seen as a gap in the legislation for some time, and this short amending Bill seeks to remedy this deficiency by conferring on the Board authority to provide in such a manner as it thinks fit, rules for enforcement of the health profession in standards of conduct or ethics expected of them.

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that this Bill has the full support of the medical and dental associations of the Islands. In fact, work has already been started on a code which will undoubtedly be adopted once this legislation is in place.

I therefore beg Members' support for this short Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Health Practitioners Law be given a First Reading. The motion is open for debate. The Elected Member for North Side.

DEBATE ON FIRST READING

HON. D. IZZARD HILLIS: Mr. President, I wish to support a Bill for a Law to amend the Health Practitioners Law, but I would like to make it clear that since I am one of the professionals who might be disciplined under this Law I will abstain from voting on it for the vote.

However, I do believe, Sir, that it will improve and enhance the quality of care available in the Islands. I think it will be good for the medical practitioners to adopt a code of ethics and codes of conduct. I think that it could help in preventing malpractice and other such things in the medical profession. However, I believe, Sir, that the amendments should be further strengthened and that the Board should not just be allowed to give advice. I think that if they are going to adopt a code of ethics, it should be quite for members which can be used for disciplinary action. Unless the Regulations provide that this code of ethics, whether it be the United States code, the British code or the Canadian code if and when it is adopted, if broken will engender an offence, then like amendments be useless. If will like Hansard can say, Sir, is to advise members that they have to abide by a certain code of advice or code of conduct, I do not see where it will really help in improving the quality of care.

I think that it should be part of the licensing procedure that when one applies from Cayman as a health professional, one agrees to adopt these rules of discipline, or code of ethics as it may be. It should not just be that the Board only has the power to give advice.

So with these few words, Sir, I support the amendment. However, as I said I will abstain from voting, Sir.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. LEWIS A. DAVIS: Yes, Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator who spoke and all those others who supported it by their voluntary.

In respect to the point raised by the Majority Member from North Side, it was my first reaction when reading the bill to agree with him. However, as I read a little further I realized that section 8 places the Board responsible for disciplining professionally the registered practitioners. Section 10 sets out in detail the procedure of disciplinary proceedings and on reading I found that this is the way that the disciplinary procedure would be most appropriate. So, I am satisfied that this is a good beginning and a great step forward where we are at the moment. The deficiency at the moment seems to be that there is nothing to say to the practitioner what he expects of him in his profession in the Cayman Islands. We are blessed in that we can draw from the experience of many other countries and embody them, as a code of ethics and conduct for the Cayman Islands.

So I believe that it is a great step forward, and again I thank Members for their support.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Health Practitioners Law be given a Second Reading.

SECRETARY: AYES AND NOES.

MR. D. EVANS MYLES: May I have a division please?

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the Clerk please....

DIVISION NO. 11

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Dennis M. Foster		Mr. S. Haig Bodden
Hon. Michael J. Gompertz		Mr. D. Evans Myles
Hon. Benson O. Ebanks		
Mrs. M. Norma Bodden		
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkconnell		
Hon. Vincent G. Johnson		
Mr. W. McKeeva Bush		
Mrs. Zephna D. Conolly		
Mr. Rolford A. Pierson		
Hon. Aubrey G. Kirkconnell		
Mr. John D. McLean		
11	0	2

CLERK: Twelve ayes, no noes and two abstentions.

MR. PRESIDENT: Could you read those numbers again?

CLERK: Twelve ayes, no noes and two abstentions.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that that can be right because there were two Members not present and not noticed. I think it ought to adjourn again and the proceedings and so much of I have omitted correctly. I do not think that the Honourable Third Official Member was present, and certainly the First Elected Member for Nairobi West was not present.

CLERK: You are correct, Sir. The Honourable Third Official Member was not present. Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it is better again and the adjournment as I ordered it. In any event, however, the motion is carried.

BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it might be convenient if we took our normal adjournment break. So I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 3.17 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

SITTING RESUMED AT 3.42 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Bills. Item 7(1)(b).

THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Maintenance Law (Revised) is deemed to have been read a First time and is set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986.

HON. ARTHUR O. ANYANG: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Maintenance Law (Revised). The Memorandum of Objects and Reasons, Mr. President, Sir that this Bill seeks to increase the amount which may be ordered to be paid under section 5 of the Maintenance Law (Revised).

Under the provisions of the Maintenance Law (Revised) as Members are aware, this is an all-embracing Law and there is an obligation for children to be maintained, and children to maintain other persons such as parents and grandparents in certain circumstances.

MR. BESSE D. SIMMONS (CONTINUING): There is also provision made for the Secretary, for persons entitled to receive such reimbursement payments to speed up enforcement of these payments through the courts. At the moment the maximum payment capable of being ordered through the courts is set at $50 per week. For some time this has been considered inadequate both by the courts and the Institute and welfare departments, especially in the light of today's cost of living. So the purpose of this clause including Bill, Mr. President, is to give to the courts power after investigating the needs of the individuals involved when the reimbursement order has been or is about to be made, to increase such payments up to a maximum of $60 per week in respect of each person who may be entitled to maintenance benefits under the order.

I would like to stress, Mr. President, that this is a maximum. It is not a compulsory maximum, and the order might only be made after careful enquiry is made into a person's ability to pay.

With those remarks, Mr. President, I commend this short amendment to the responsible consideration of Members. I would only add that the Bill be considered a reasonable régime by those responsible for administering this type of aid or payment, or whatever one wishes to call it. This correction is adequate and supports the régime of Bill.

I thank you.

MR. PEPPITONE: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Maintenance Law (Revised) be given a Second Reading. The motion is duly open for debate. The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

MRS. GEORGIA I. QUESTEL: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this Bill, Sir. In fact I stand here to represent those unfortunate women of this country who have been saddled with the responsibility of maintaining children when the fathers, many of them are unknown they have, to be honest, lewd or otherwise, and forget that they were an integral part in those children being born to this world. I feel, Sir, that this increase in the amount of money being sought here, as was outlined by the Honourable Elected Member of Education Council, might be a difficult sum for some men to raise if they had one, three or maybe four children, especially if they had children living in a home with them and then they had to be responsible for maintaining children outside the home. However, the Member has explained that the courts would look more into each person's ability to pay the maintenance thereto. So perhaps those might be some who might not be able to pay the $60. They might not be able to pay that amount of money that they received in wages or salaries during the month. However, in today's society it is a well known fact that both husband and wife work and if that child is in school from eight o'clock or 8:30 or 8:45 I do not know until

Mrs. Joanne T. Dusty (continuing): Mr. President, in today's society we must recognize that a woman can only do so much and no more. She has the care of the child at home. She has to watch over it. She has-to-use single tax welfare rather than financial needs, and I feel that it is only fair that the cost of this counting should be shared responsibilities and that this will be given a fair evaluating by those who are writing to this honorable house, realizing that there are many children and others today who are suffering because the mothers cannot because everything. In many circumstances, unfortunately, they are women who are not capable of giving and are making a big mistake. In fact more of them are leaving their small children that it is almost impossible for them to leave the home.

May since the Standing Fills on Social Services and Social Services Responsible that has a burden to help some of children while we have seen more and more there working their salary inadequate or unfair. Children are suffering. Mothers are suffering and government has to shoulder some responsibility which it should not have.

With these few remarks, Sir, I wish to say that I wholly support this Bill and I hope that the other Members of the House will give it an likewise.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose have right of reply? The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. M. HARAPIAK (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to see Government taking this amendment and I quite it my support. In the Student Addresses and Throne Speech debate I had this to say which the Bill before us, and I quote:-

> "Another cause of disappointment to me is the Medicare. Less for this ministry. I would like to see this fiscal approved and attempt-showed to bring it more the line with the present day cost of living."

Sir, the amendment before us does do just that. It will increase the amount from a measly $80 per week to $90 per week. All of us in this country understand the high cost of living. If I have learned, every one of us is a family man. We have also mind to be as good by each. Mr. President, what an disgrace. Yesterday we say these poor people, who little more than there are. We know do not what the first thing about budgeting must be finished the giving rough.

What would $80 a week do for a child? This is long overdue, Sir, and will go a long way in helping those families whose fathers leave them without providing for them, leaving them in the money of the world and in the hands of the already overloaded Social Services Department in this province.

Many times, Mr. President, that not even bother to pay in for the $80. It is a sad criticism but, nevertheless, they did not pay. I have heard many of them say, "I cannot go through the hassle of the courts to get a measly $80". This amendment, I believe, will make them more happy. It is a substantial increase but it is the well needed one as I pay you to do. It will not only help those who have children but it will help the economy. I believe and I hope that I am not wrong here, of those people who are not receiving anything from husbands or who have left them unnecessarily.

MR. K. MAXTON DOUGH (CONTINUING): I remember well a case we had some time ago where I think her husband gave her kind of maintenance. She was there, Mr. President, telling the judge that her husband only gave her $50 a week or $55 a week if I can remember correctly. The judge told her that she had been living beyond her means and that the Court has no choice only really to give her $60 a week. The poor woman, Mr. President, had a problem with keeping up and the judge who did not seem to be hearing what she was saying. She replied, "Sir, but I am also working in this house".

Mr. President, that is the kind of chauvinism which exists. Where she was working hard to assist her maintenance. In case only getting her $55 a week. Under the Law he should really only have been giving her $50 a week but she also cooking in a hurry he owned. However, this is the case of our poor people when they go to court without any kind of representation. Maybe that is another area where we need to look strongly at.

Sometime, not to continue the debate on this Bill I give it my support. I do not believe it should where exactly it is not now. But for a second point I may that my Honourable have to March along reinforced the unacceptable kindness of the Government towards this section, but I am happy that the Honourable Former Electoral Member of Lacoustic Council has come for to bring the Bill and he knows that he has my support.

I thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless any other Member wishes to speak I will ask the mover of the motion whether he wishes to exercise his right of reply.

HON. PRINCE D. FIDDES: Mr. President, only to thank Members who supported the Bill we I hope that Bill, both in speaking and by their silence. I hereby thank personally each that the Bill be put to the vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Be then move the question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Maintenance Law (Revised) be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 2(d)(v).

THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995.

MR. SPEAKER: A Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Summary Jurisdiction Law, 1973 be deemed to have been read a first time and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRIGAN: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill shortly entitled the Summary Jurisdiction (Amendment) Bill, 1995. As Members will have seen from the copies of legislation which is to be laid to date at this meeting of the Legislative Assembly

MOV. MICHAEL J. MINOGUE (Newtownards): I rise about half of the clauses currently before the House, and the next Bill which is to be dealt to give a Second Reading to today or early tomorrow, contains similar provisions which seek to provide for the duties of persons appointed as Court Marshals within this Law and under the Crown Court Rules.

It is the intention, Mr. President, in due course to propose a similar short amendment to the Courts Act to provide similar powers and duties of marshals in respect of that Law.

Mr. President, at the present time there are a number of duties to be carried out by officers which are presently carried out by officers of the Royal County Police Force. As a result of a reorganisation of the police force and of the duties of police officers, it was decided to a matter of policy that instead of there being police officers in attendance, that there should be an exercise of the powers which are contained in section 19, subsection (2) of the Summary Jurisdiction Law, and similar provisions in the other Laws, empowering Court Marshals to carry out those duties which the police officers formerly had in the courts when the courts were sitting.

The necessity for this short amendment to the Summary Jurisdiction Bill and for the amendments which will be also necessary to be brought before this House to the Crown Court and the Court of Appeal Laws, is that whereas by virtue of these officers whose constables have got certain other powers, whether the provisions and the amendment which this Bill seeks to make, the constables appointed as marshals of the court would not have those powers. It is in order to facilitate the retirement of police officers or other duties and to substitute, parallel with similar powers, that this and the other provisions in the other two Bills which will come shortly are necessary.

As Members can see, it seeks to add a new subsection to the Summary Jurisdiction Law to provide that a person shall hereafter appointed as a marshal, in addition to the powers and duties conferred on him by the courts, be under the Summary Court Rules specifically have the power to administer oaths to witnesses on all matters before the court or in connection with any proceedings pending before the court, and either the jurisdiction of the court out the order or discretion of the court, the power to maintain order in whatever manner to take any person into custody and detain such person until the rising of the court. Whereas persons appointed as marshals shall have all the powers and immunities of justices appointed under that subsection which gives the court the power to appoint justices.

MR. PRESIDENT, this, I think, is a proper step to enhance the duties of the duties where they are confined so that they can be given duties of other people. I think, Mr. President, that no Member here will have any quarrel with this or the similar provisions. It enables the police to do their other duties. It gives the persons appointed as marshals in the court the same powers as the policemen have before, and I commend the Bill to the Members of this House. It has not with the approval of the Judiciary.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Summary Jurisdiction Law, 1975 be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. The Hon. Elected Member for West Isle.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

MR. W. MACKENZIE BOWELL: Mr. President, this Bill before me I believe is asking for the unanimous, as I understand it, of the House for the second reading. If I am wrong I will give way to the Honourable Second Official Member and he can explain it to me. I find it hard to support this Bill. I realize that we are a dependent country. We have about 100 police I believe but I cannot understand it, Mr. President, why all of those years the police have been carrying out those duties with no extra cost to Government, no additional expenditure, yet all this will be necessary, more money to come asking for in November. I cannot support this, Mr. President.

The police as I said have been doing this all these years, and if we had a reorganization then I believe that they could find time to do that. New management on the police force must manage it.

Mr. President, if there was something to be explained here some of the people we have there now, then I will more readily approve this Bill. I will remember last year being present a Justice, a Stipendiary Justice by the Bailiff of the court. I do not know where he got it, but you can believe that he was on Government time. This was during the campaign, Mr. President.

I cannot support it. So I said it will be calling for more money and more unnecessary. I say no.

MR. SECRETARY: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply?

HIS HONOUR THE PRESIDENT: Mr. President, I think the best answer for the ordinary contribution to the Second Reading debate on this Bill. I was asked to answer one specific question and that was whether this Bill merely be enacting appointments to the Civil Service. The answer, Sir, is that this Bill would not be making appointments but seeks to give powers to persons appointed for a reasonable term. The first and the particular burden this complaint is that instead of those having to be on shore at present, trained and qualified members of the police force who might be better and more suitably employed in other occupations doing the duties for which they are trained, these persons would be employed in the Courts by civilians on the same manner as civilians are employed in other jurisdictions. Thus it would be possible for law and order, procedure and decorum to be kept in the courts of this country by civil servants, leaving the police force free to do their other duties outside.

I would think, Mr. President, that instead of there being grave inconvenience to Civil Service personnel as has been alleged, that we would reap much of judicious appointments and of the system of employment of persons in so far as it might be properly used, that there will be a saving to and benefit to the Government of this country. The persons appointed as magistrates would be appointed, if they were to be appointed on judicial appointments, or if they were not that other persons could be brought in and employed as magistrate in the Civil Service in a part time capacity, for the hours of the day that the Courts are in session.

I consider, Mr. President, that this is not a retrogressive step, but a step forward leaving the police fully free to perform the duties for which they are primarily intended. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion to [illegible] this for a bill to amend the Summary Jurisdiction Law be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES:

MR. K. McKENZIE SMITH: May I have a division please, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Will the Clerk please call a division.

DIVISION
No. 12

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis A. Dooley	Mr. K. McKenzie Smith
Hon. Richard J. Hindley	
Hon. Thomas C. Jeffcott	
Hon. Wilson O. Adamba	
Hon. K. Noreen Seddon	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Silvercorn??	
Hon. Ronald S. Jonsons	
Hon. Douglas I. Ormsby	
Mr. Bernard A. Pearce	
Hon. Henry V. Silvercorn??	
Mr. G. Andy Seddon	
Mr. J. Russell Wilson	
Mr. John B. Watkins	
17	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

BILL, STATE / SECOND READING.

Item #(iii)(d).

THE GRAND COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE GRAND COURT(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Grand Court Law be placed on the Order Paper and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE GRAND COURT(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995.

HON. MICHAEL J. ECKERT: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill shortly entitled The Grand Court (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

Mr. President, this is a Bill which is another short motion having cut the jurisdictional limits in C.I. The first substantive clause is one which has already been debated in the Second Reading of the Summary Jurisdiction (Amendment) Bill, 1995, and that is a provision to provide under the Grand Court Law in

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRIOTT (Gibraltar): Mr. Speaker of matters and hearings of the Grand Court, the Bill has proceeded as far as it already received a Second Reading hearing in respect of the Rules (Amendment) Bill, 1968, in respect of the Summary Jurisdiction (Appeal) Bill, 1968, in respect of the Summary Jurisdiction (Appeal) Bill, 1968, in respect of the Summary Jurisdiction (Appeal

HON. MICHAEL J. MASTRIANI (CONSTITUENCY): Mr. President, Sir, when going the sections which are the subject-matter of this amending Bill have been brought to this House with the approval and the support of the Members, not only of the Leading Side of the Legal profession, I recommend this Bill to the favourable Members.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question to that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Penal Code Law be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

HON. C. RATU BOSEN: Mr. President, I am generally in support of the Bill, with the exception of section 21 which deals with the appointment of the members of the Fijian Committee. I find fault with section 21(1)(a). I agree with the Chief Justice today, the Chairman and the Attorney-General having a member only "who persons who are entitled to practice as legal practitioners before the Court, who shall be appointed by the Chief Justice". Anyway, I do not like further consideration with the Queen Islands Law Society", because we have in the Cairns Islands, I understand, some lawyers who are not members of the Law Society but who, nevertheless, would be worthwhile people to sit on this Committee. If the appointment is made by the Chief Justice only after consultation with the Law Society we might find that some of the outside who do not a member of the Law Society would probably rather be recommended for consideration on the Committee.

I would like to see the last two lines of subsection (a) deleted from the Bill so that the appointment would be of two persons who are entitled to practise before the Court, appointed by the Chief Justice. I submit, however, support the appointment being made after consultation with the Law Society.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. S. SAKIASI MITIME: Mr. President, I would like to support the Bill for a Law to amend the Penal Code Law. I hope, Sir, that these rules will override the procedure and performance of the courts. I hope that it will help the the process of justice because I get a lot of complaints about how long it takes to get cases through the courts. I believe that justice delayed could well be justice denied.

I support most of the Bill, Sir, except that in section 21(a) I would like to see added after the words "approved by the Governor the Council", the words "and published". I think that it is only fair to let the lawyers know what the rules are before they go into court.

I support the Bill, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply?

HON. MICHAEL J. MASTRIANI: I thank my learned, Sir; I should like to thank the two Honourable Members who contributed to the Second Reading debate on this Bill.

In relation to the first Member who spoke, may I merely say that the amendment contained in the Bill is expected to overcome the mechanics of the present position which is contained in section 21(2) of the

HON. NICHOLAS J. BRADLEY (CONTINUED): present law which was the Grand Court Law (Law 8 of 1975). The law provided as this Bill does that the two legal practitioners shall be appointed by the Chief Justice after consultation with the Cayman Islands Law Society.

May I make two points in relation to this. First of all the persons who are entitled to practice shall be appointed by the Chief Justice. They need not be members of the Cayman Islands Law Society to be eligible for appointment. Secondly, the Chief Justice is obliged to consult with the Cayman Islands Law Society but the process of consultation does not necessarily mean coming upon the advice of the Law Society. In fact, Mr. President, the membership of the Rules Committee at present consists of the two persons ex officio, the Honourable Chief Justice and the Attorney-General, and Mr. John Stafford who is not a member of the Cayman Islands Law Society, and Mr. Frank Sutton who is. I feel that the powers of appointment have been examined fully in the past. I feel that it is useful for consultation with the only organised body of attorneys which there is in these Islands, and I am personally of the opinion that the phrase "after consultation" should remain in the Bill.

With regard to the suggestion made by the learned speaker on the right I have certainly no objection, subject to the wishes of my colleagues in this side of the House, to accepting a Committee Stage amendment to the effect that Rules of Court shall not have effect until published in the Gazette.

With those short remarks, Mr. President, I commend this Bill to Members of the House.

HON. PRESIDING: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Grand Court Law be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

HON. PRESIDING: I do not think that it is unreasonable considering on another Bill here. Perhaps the Honourable First Official Member may like to move the adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow.

HON. PRESIDING: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow. Unless any Member wishes to speak I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 6.30 P.M. THIS HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, 28TH MAY, 1986.

SECOND MEETING OF ONE HUNDRED SECOND
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

WEDNESDAY
22ND MAY, 1991

PRESENT WERE:

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER, MR G PETER KEOWN, CMG, OBE - CHAIRMAN

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS B PORTER, OBE,QC,JP — FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

HON MICHAEL K BRADLEY, QC, MLA — SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION

HON THOMAS C JEFFERSON, JP — THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

HON PENELOPE D LEDUNG — MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

HON K HUGHES DICKSON, MBE — MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

HON CAPT CHARLES L KIRKCONNELL — MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON MARCUS C JOHNSON, OBE, JP — MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR P RONALDS EDUN — SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY

MRS CATHRYN E SMITH — THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY

MR LINFORD A PIERSON, MP — SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN

CAPT WALLY H STOAKLEY — FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE

MR G HAIG BODDEN — SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE

MR JAMES M RUTLEY — FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EASTERN DISTRICTS

MR TRUMAN M BODDEN — SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EASTERN DISTRICTS

ABSENT

MR JAMES M RUTLEY — FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SOUTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN

(Due to emergency operation)

QUEEN'S PAPER

WEDNESDAY

28TH MAY, 1980

1. QUESTIONS

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR SOUTH DOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND SECRETARY, NORTHERN IRELAND OFFICE, A QUESTION ABOUT

NO. 50: WHETHER THE NORTHERN IRELAND ASSEMBLY ARE BEING GIVEN BY GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE PROVISIONS FOR THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE OF NORTHERN IRELAND?

THE RECORD SHOWING MEMBER FOR CROYDON SOUTH TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

NO. 51: WHICH THE NORTHERN IRELAND ASSEMBLY FOR DETAILED CASES OF CRIMINAL MURDERS AT THE MAGHABERRY PRISON HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFULLY PROBED AND WHETHER THE PROPER ARRANGEMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO PROTECT OTHER PRISONERS FROM CONTRACTING THIS DISEASE?

THE RECORD SECRETARY MEMBER FOR BRIGHTON TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 52: WOULD THE NORTHERN STATE NATIONALIST AND CONSERVATIVE HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE ADVANTAGES OF ADOPTING DECIMALISATION OF LIVING COAL AND WHETHER AN EARLY STATE TO BE INTRODUCED?

THE SECOND SECRETARY MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 53: WOULD THE NORTHERN STATE NATIONALIST THERE IS ANY OUTSTANDING DEBT OWED TO THE CROWN OF OFFICIALS AND THE PERIOD THAT HOWEVER TO FIRST DECEMBER, 1984, AND LAST PAYMENT TO BOTH STATES, IRISH, AND, IF THE ANSWER IS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, WOULD THE NORTHERN STATE THE AMOUNT DUE AND THOSE PERIODS?

THE SECOND SECRETARY MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND SECRETARY MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 54: WOULD THE NORTHERN STATE WEAR THE POSITION TO MAKE REFUSE TO THE CLOSED SHOPS PLACE NOW THAT THE BAN IN THE USE HAS NOT BEEN LIFTED?

THE SECOND SECRETARY MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND SECRETARY MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AFFAIRS AND SPORTS

NO. 55: WOULD THE NORTHERN STATE NATIONAL THE CENTRAL AND BUSINESS MEETING WAS ATTENDED BY REPRESENTATIVES?

THE SECRETARY MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FOURTH SECRETARY MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 56: WHILE THE NORTHERN STATE NOT THE DECISION WAS TAKEN TO DISCONTINUE DISTRIBUTION OF ANIMAL FEED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO FARMERS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY?

THE SPECIAL MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE PARLIAMENTARY UNDER SECRETARY WHETHER ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN LONDON AND DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS

NO. 64: WHETHER THE DEFENCE COUNCIL WHAT STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN AS A RESULT OF THE RECENT MEETING HELD WITH THE STAFF OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENTS, AND AGENCIES, CONCERNING WORKING HOURS AND THE SUGGESTION PUT TO THEM, AND WITH WHAT RESULT HAVE ENQUIRIES PROCEED?

THE SPECIAL MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE PARLIAMENTARY UNDER SECRETARY WHETHER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 65: WOULD THE SECRETARY MEMBER STATE THE AMOUNT OF REVENUE COLLECTED FROM 1ST JANUARY, 1965, TO 31ST MARCH, 1965, DURING CONSTRUCTION WORKS FOR THE SAME PERIOD FOR 1964?

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS:-

(i) COMMITTEE STAGE

(1) THE HEALTH PROTECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(2) THE MATRIMONIAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(3) THE COMPANY REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(4) THE DRUGS COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(ii) ADVICE STAGE

(1) THE MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(2) THE APPRENTICE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(3) THE COMPANY REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(4) THE DRUGS COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(iii) FIRST READINGS

(1) THE PENSION PRACTITIONERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(2) THE APPRENTICE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(3) THE COMPANY REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(4) THE DRUGS COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

(iv) FINAL & SECOND READINGS

(1) THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (POWERS) BILL, 1965
(2) THE CONSULATE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(3) THE DOMESTICS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(4) THE APPRENTICED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(5) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(6) THE HOUSES OF STATE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(7) THE APPRENTICESHIP OF APPRENTICE BILL, 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT	1
QUESTIONS	1
THE BRIDGE PHOTOGRAPHER'S (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - COMMITTEE STAGE	14
THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - COMMITTEE STAGE	16
THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985 - COMMITTEE STAGE	16
THE GRAND COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - COMMITTEE STAGE	18
THE HEALTH PRACTITIONERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - REPORT STAGE	20
THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - REPORT STAGE	20
THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - REPORT STAGE	20
THE GRAND COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - REPORT STAGE	20
THE HEALTH PRACTITIONERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - THIRD READING	22
THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - THIRD READING	21
THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - THIRD READING	23
THE GRAND COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - THIRD READING	23
THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (CHANGE) BILL, 1986 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	23
THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	25
THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	27
THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	29
THE ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST READING	30
THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986 - FIRST READING	47
REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1986 - FIRST READING	47
ADJOURNMENT	47

PRETORIA

23RD MAY, 1956

10.00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.

QUESTIONS BY HON. MEMBERS

MR. PRESIDENT: Before calling upon the Second Elected Member for George Town to ask the final question I should like to inform Members of the House on case any of them may not have already heard it, that the First Elected Member for Bolton Town was taken seriously ill yesterday; that he collapsed in Miami, Arizona and is, I think, still in Intensive Care in a hospital in Miami, although his condition is quite satisfactory.

I am sure that all Members of this House would wish that our colleague may have a rapid and complete recovery to be conveyed to him and to members of his family. I assume that that is the wish of the House and I will ask that arrangements be made for a suitable message to be sent.

QUESTION: The Second Elected Member for George Town.

QUESTION

HON. GEORGE TOWN SECOND ELECTED MEMBER: Will the Member state what efforts are being made by Government to provide employment for the growing number of unemployed?

ANSWER: Recent statistics from the Labour Office reveal that there is a decreasing number of unemployed. However, it is naturally Government's policy to offer every possible encouragement in order to encourage and attract development of new light industries and to expand existing ones.

The Department of Trade and Industry has taken measures to ensure that local businessmen make every effort to recruit locally before considering new applications for work permits.

Efforts are continuing to attract light industries.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

HON. LEONARD A. PHILLIPS: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state what efforts have been made recently to attract light industries, and what are the types of industries?

HON. E. ARMAS SCOTT: We have a committee, Mr. President, which is considering ways and means of attracting light industries such as pharmaceuticals and others by encouraging or taking certain advantages in regard to taxes, which will encourage outside industries to come here and our present light industries have as I have mentioned, oil pharmaceuticals and others which are non-polluting.

MR. ROBERT A. STRONG: A further supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member state the number of individuals unemployed from the latest statistics available, whether that was at the 30th April or thereabouts?

MR. PRESIDENT: I really think that if the Member wanted detailed information of that kind it should be sought in a substantive question. However, if the Member can answer I will allow him to do so.

HON. R. KOSHY GEORGE: Yes, Sir, I anticipated that there would be some supplementaries of this nature and I am able to answer this. I think that the Member is referring to my question of the answer which deals with, "the Labour Office record that there is a considerable number of unemployed". He did a labour survey on February of this year. At that time based on the number of unemployed persons who registered, the number was 176. The unemployed commanding to the Labour Office on 30th April was 114, and I am told that 70 per cent of these 114 persons are in the manufacturing field and I recognise most of these might be absorbed in the new projects of the new Steel which are been started.

MR. C. JOSEPH GEORGE: Mr. President, the Member mentioned that advertisements have been put in several publications. I would ask if the Member will tell us what publications have been used?

HON. R. KOSHY GEORGE: Sir, President, I did not say that advertisements had been made in several publications. I specifically said a newspaper which was commanding circulation in the Trichur district.

MR. C. KOC JOSEPH: In that case, Mr. President, can I ask what publications will the committee advertise in?

HON. R. KOSHY GEORGE: These publications have not been published to the committee as yet. There are one or two individuals who will be making recommendations as and when needed.

MR. PRESIDENT: As I think that there is no further supplementary I will invite the General Electric Member from Kerala Hour to ask the next question.

THE SECOND SUPPLY MEMBER FOR GENERAL WORK IN THE ABSENCE FIRST SUPPLY MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

*70. (a): Would the Member state whether the reported escape of certain inmates in the Mavelikara Prison have been ascertained fully and whether the proper precautions have been made to prevent other prisoners from escaping like this?

ANSWER: There has been only one such case. At the present time there is no available cage for keeping, but the problem is satisfactorily solved. The technical department has advised that there should be no need of any other permanent contractor to fix up here.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. C. ACHU JOSEPH: Mr. President, can I ask if this officer's power to employ technical facilities with other prisoners?

HON. DEWAN R. RAGHAVAN: The answer is no, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: As I think that there is no further supplementary, question No. 58.

THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES MARQUIS FOR QUESTION NO. 58 FOR THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

NO. 58: Would the Minister state whether any consideration has been given to the advantages of adopting Daylight-Saving time and whether he can expect this to be introduced?

ANSWER: Considerations are given to adopting daylight-saving time in the late 70's and at that time it was considered that there were no overriding advantages to be gained by the introduction, but the position will be kept under review.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. LEONARD M. FIRESTONE: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state whether any study or survey has been carried out which was carried out in the 70's, to determine the reaction of the private sector to the introduction of daylight-saving time?

HON. DENNIS A. FOURIS: No, Mr. President, I do not think the matter has been gone up since being asked, Sir.

MR. LEONARD M. FIRESTONE: Mr. President, a supplementary. In view of the answer given to the primary question that the position will be kept under review, would the Member advise when we can expect to get a report and I mean recent review of this question?

HON. DENNIS A. FOURIS: Mr. President, what I hope to do is I think daylight-saving time in the States starts sometime in April and ends some time in October of I am not mistaken, Sir, so I would want first prior to that date we are sure in the midst of it now, get that information perhaps to give something in the newspaper where we can get a feed back. After that the Government can make a decision.

MR. C. RAFE FOSTER: Mr. President, can I ask the Member if he will make the survey as soon as possible whether that leaving it to April? The reason for that is that if we leave it until April it will be necessary to adjust all the airline schedules and get them printed. So could he do the survey as soon as possible?

HON. DENNIS A. FOURIS: Yes, Mr. President, I will.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless there is any further supplementary we can move on to question No. 59. The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 59: Would the Member state whether there is any outstanding debt owed to the Customs Department from the period 1st November to 31st December, 1964, and 1st January to 30th April, 1965, and, if the answer is in the affirmative, would the Member state the amounts due for those periods?

SPEAKER: The procedure for the collection of import duty is as follows:

(1) Duty is paid when goods are cleared.

(2) In the case of large weekly importers, a deposit is placed with the Government equal to the duty on goods imported.

This latter procedure allows importers and other large importers to clear their goods speedily, reconciling later with the documentation as formally given the goods and pay the duty.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. W. MASIPINA NIUE: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Minister say what sort of time limits he gives to those people to that they can pay?

HON. ISAIAH S. LEOPONG: Mr. President, he seems to already have the money. It is just a matter of the large importers informing the documentation to return to the Customs Department and those that deposit against the duty payable.

MR. U. MOKOVA SUES: Mr. President, I do not know if I am hearing right but I still do not think that my question has been answered. The question says what analysis does the Government have. All I have been told with respect, Sir, is the procedure. My question is what is the amount? There should be a supplementary. Are there any other people besides the large importers? I think unfortunately were mentioned.

HON. THOMAS S. SAEMANE: To the best of my understanding, Mr. President, there is nothing else.

MR. MICHAEL A. SISIOKO: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Minister could specifically state the amount which was outstanding. My understanding of it may have this clarification, Mr. President, is that if the money is in dispute it do not actually form part of Government's revenue until it is paid into Government's revenue. It is just held in deposit. Could the Minister state specifically the amount outstanding at the period stated in the question?

HON. THOMAS S. SAEMANE: Mr. President, it is difficult under the procedure to say at any particular time what amount is outstanding within a month, or within a period of three or four months. The procedure is such that Government is always in the favourable position because it has a deposit equal to the duty which is later cleared by documentation.

MR. U. MOKOVA SUES: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder whether the Honourable Member would give me an undertaking that he would at least supply me with information as to the amount which is due as of this period, in other words right now the 22nd May?

HON. THOMAS S. SAEMANE: I can easily give that undertaking, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minot.

SEN. D. ROBERT KELLER: Would the Member state whether the amount in dispute is the actual duty or some sum over the actual duty?

SEN. THOMAS C. DOSPOROUS: It is the majority of these, Mr. President if I am not a half-dozen the duty payable.

SEN. D. ROBERT KELLER: Mr. President, a further supplementary. Can the Member say how many ship consignments are back on warehouse?

SEN. THOMAS C. DOSPOROUS: Mr. President, I cannot think I have them in the warehouse.

MR. D. ROBERT KELLER: A supplementary, Mr. President. Did the Member state that there was actually no duty outstanding at the time?

SEN. THOMAS C. DOSPOROUS: Mr. President, given the procedure it is quite clear that it is difficult to say that there is no duty now, because even the duty which is claimed, as we are hearing both these things they are subject to rebates. If a rebate is made and the importer pays $100 rather than $150, there is $50 due.

SEN. LINFORD A. PETERSON: Mr. President, is the Member stating specifically that he does not have objection or his views to any duty which is owing?

SEN. THOMAS C. DOSPOROUS: No, Mr. President, that is not what I am saying. Under the procedure it is difficult to ascertain whether a few days now provide all the details. That is all that I am saying.

SEN. D. ROBERT KELLER: With respect, Mr. President, this question has been in quite a few days now, and if the Member is suffering, in the question, some lack, I think, on this, as the Senate has given an undertaking that he would supply the bill; on receipt of verbiage I am satisfied, Sir.

SEN. THOMAS C. DOSPOROUS: Mr. President, with due respect I was not referring to the Second Senator Minot for three day. Actually what I am referring to is that the amount of time given to the Department to look into details on an annual fourth period.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question No. 64.

THE SECOND SENATOR MINOT HAS NOT GONE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR EXECUTIVE COUNCIL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNAL ASSOCIATES.

QUESTION: Would the Member state what the position is with respect to the Cayman Turtle Farm now that the Government of Jamaica has withdrawn?

ANSWER: Honourable Minister responsible for Finance of the Cayman Turtle Farm Ltd. (CTFL) at its meeting in September of last year, explained the farm's marketing problems. Consequently, which subject to the approval of the Legislative Assembly, were to keep the operation going and promise to abandon possible at that it may prove an economic venture in the near future.

Areas of Department mentioned were:

(i) Tourist attraction. Over 50,000 visitors go to the Zoo yearly and this or present provided the main source of income. However, considering this number is only of surprising income. The Board will consider a number of areas which can provide additional attractions.

(ii) Provide more meat for the local market. Which Lusaka being a Copperbelt people find and a meat with the lower cholesterol, mineral should increase significantly if the products be available.

(iii) Produce a second generation breed. This is possible in the near future and such a development would legally provide CZSZ modern countries, including the United States of America, to help the ban against the Zoo's product.

The Zoo can rightly be considered as in of national importance and therefore the reason to not only keep the Zoo alive but promote the operations largely for the benefit of the country.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. CLIFFORD A. PINFOLD: A supplementary, Mr. President, I wonder if the Member could tell us some whether there is any intention to invite a report on the outcome of the CZSZ conservation in Livingstone?

MR. PAUL G. SOMMERS: Mr. President, the report was tabled with the Secretive Council on the same day I returned to office. It is entirely up to Secretive Council if they would like to table that report here.

MR. CLIFFORD A. PINFOLD: Mr. President, with respect, Sir, as a matter of requirement as the Chitly Zoo should not this honourable House be privy to this reports?

HON. PAUL G. SOMMERS: Mr. President, following the tabling of this report in Secretive Council press release were made alerting the public of those interest who were very interested on the matters and they figure of the Zoo of the question. However, as I said before I have no prerogative over the discretion of Secretive Council, now it is entirely up to Council if they would to table the report here.

MR. CLIFFORD A. PINFOLD: Mr. President, if it was by right, Question that I would have thought that what a Member as Represent as the Chitly Zoo that the Members of this legislative Assembly should have as much right to view that report as Members of Secretive Council, there indeed it is time the status of zoo to make up the legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member must ask a question, not make a statement. I do not think that was a supplementary. I think it was a statement, it could have been termed that a supplementary quite easily.

MR. EDWARD A. DILLON: Mr. President, my apologies on that. Would the Member give me the understanding that the report will be distributed to this Legislative Assembly at the next sitting of the House?

MR. ERNEST C. MANNING: Mr. President, I will submit the request to the Executive Council, Sir.

MR. E. GRAND MILLER: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state what effort he made to solicit support among other members before the conference?

HON. ALEX H. HARRIS: Mr. President, when the new Government took office in November we reviewed many other submissions looking for necessary action, the Pointe Pleasant case being one of those. At that time we went ahead to appoint legal representation and this was followed by a programme of the Dupont Colonies to assist the appeal through lobbying of some of the Ottawa members and the committee of the two Houses. We received very good support from three quarters who were of some concern to us; sometimes you might not have been getting their support to the extent you would. So we were fairly sure that we had gained some support from those sections. This was followed, Mr. President, by a very strong programme in Edmonton. We had a very strong Ukrainian team which we joined there, and this team along with our legal representatives formed a working body. We worked night and day because we determined at that time that the cause was going to be a very difficult one to undertake and therefore earned the confidence.

Mr. President, we also went as far as to arrange a social gathering of the delegates. We had around 100 delegates in that period. They came all very friendly to us, also the Edmonton delegate, and we thought again that we had gained confidence from that particular activity. I can assure the Member here, Mr. President, that no stones were left unturned in getting Premier Ross and Mr. Hepburn -- those who were strongly opposing our point -- that the Crown Pointe case had not all the evidence laid down by Ottawa for a resettling proposal.

MR. G. RAY SPEECH: Mr. President, as the proceedings of Ottawa are usually open to the press and the proceedings are usually published afterwards, can I ask the Member why the Executive Council has withheld this report so secretly?

HON. ALEX H. HARRIS: Mr. President, as far as I am aware the minutes and proceedings of Ottawa are available only many months after the meeting.

MR. G. RAY SPEECH: Mr. President, can I ask the Member if the press was represented at the conference?

HON. ALEX H. HARRIS: Yes, Mr. President, there were many members of different agencies and newspapers at the meeting. The Edmonton newspaper covered articles about the Dupont point on this.

MR. STEPHEN A. STEFFE: Supplementary, Mr. President. In view of the Member's apparent reluctance to make a report to the Legislative Assembly on the outcome of the Edmonton Ottawa meeting, I wonder if the total body of this Legislative Assembly will be future be canvassed to approve supplementary expenditures on this Pointe Pleasant

HON. MAGGIE G. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, as for the case of Cayman Airways Ltd. surely this property of the Cayman Islands Government. When proposals are put forward later for financial assistance the Members of this Legislative Assembly will have to consider these proposals responsibly. It is not an private body which we are dealing with. It is an undertaking of the Government and people of these Islands.

MR. RICHARD A. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, this is precisely why I am asking for a report to this House, because it is owned by Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member must ask a question.

MR. GILFORD A. PEARSON: My question is coming, Mr. Speaker. In view of the answer which the Member has given, how can we reasonably be asked to approve supplementary expenditure on the Sunset Fund if we cannot be given a report of a meeting which the Member attended in Argentina which dealt primarily with the customs for the Turtle Farm.

HON. MAGGIE G. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in his first place the report which I referred to a while ago was my own personal views of the outcome of CITES, together with our participation at that meeting. The formal report of CITES is a document which is issued by the Convention itself. If my report, on what I have presented to Executive Council is required to be laid on the table of this Honourable House then I have no objection to do it. Mr. Speaker, because what I have said to Executive Council can be said to this Honourable House and to the entire population of these Islands.

MR. GILFORD A. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, could the Member state whether the personal report differs substantially from the actual proceedings of the CITES meetings; the reports be made to Executive Council will form an integral part of the whole report which he will produce?

HON. MAGGIE G. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, as I am duty on the table of this Honourable House the report which I have made privately and whenever the formal reports be received from CITES I can also lay that on the table. If that is the wish of Members I do so with the permission of Executive Council.

MR. GILFORD A. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. As the leader of the delegation which went to Argentina, is it fair for us here in the House to assume that he would have brought back an official report of the happenings of the CITES conventions?

HON. MAGGIE G. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of what we are referring to as a formal report. I said that I have submitted my own personal report as leader of the delegation, and that the formal report ultimately to the proceedings before CITES will be presented by CITES and reviewed at some time in the future. If that is required to be laid before the House that can also be done.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that we had probably better move on to the next question, otherwise we will remain to complete the questions. The second Starred Number for this Day, Question No. 22.

AN RECORD SHOULD MEMBER FOR HOLY WAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE LEADER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM ATLANTIC ...SO TRADE.

MR. SS: Would the member state whether the Secretariat and Research report was accepted by Government?

(NONE): As far as I can ascertain this report was never formally accepted by Government since it was presented in 1981.

QUESTIONS:

MR. D. RICHARD MILLER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Member state if the consultants were paid the full contingent price for the report?

HON. M. DONALD DOYLE: Mr. Speaker,...

MR. SPEAKER: I think that there is another question over there. I am certainly aware that there is a rule against anticipation. The question is not clear for today but the Second Elected Member for West Bay has submitted a question about the cost of the report.

MR. D. RICHARD MILLER: I was not aware of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for West Bay? I am not sure whether you are trying to catch me out or not.

MR. M. MCKEEVA BUSH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have a supplementary but I am trying to check back on the Business Paper I have. A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Member state whether Members of this House will be able to see a copy of this report?

HON. M. DONALD DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is similar to a question which has also been put on by the Member.

MR. SPEAKER: I was trying to find my copy of... Oh, I have not had this yet. For as much supplementary question there. Would the Member state when the Secretariat and Research report will be made public? I think that what you were just saying is correct and we would be really anticipating what you have yet done for answers anyway.

MR. M. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. Speaker, he could answer it now, that would save us some time next time.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I think that as you have just a question just there, and I am sure that there is a misapprehension which I have not looked to yet, to find how well would the question be asked. It is on Business Paper No. 2 I see, though I do not think that I have had a copy of Business Paper No. 2. The Business Paper No. 2 been circulated to Members yet?

HON. DENNIS A. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I believe so. Yes. It was circulated yesterday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I was disinclined against that, because I have not had it. Each Member has Business Paper No. 2? Yes. Alright, I will consult the Clerk later. Have not had the time

MR. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN: My apologies if your hour has been kept short. Then we will get how one might speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I have carefully been at that I do not seem to have one. So, is there any further supplementary? Yes, the Elected Member for North Side.

MR. D. EARLE ANDERSON: Could the Member state how it is possible for Government not to accept a report which it has commissioned to receive at a price?

MR. M. MICHAEL MANLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure I can reply to that as it is possible for the report not to be accepted. What I envisage if a report being accepted by Government is if Government considers a report to be unsatisfactory. I imagine that there is a formal presentation to Government and Government at that stage decides whether they will accept the report, not unreasonably because they will implement all of the proposals. However, it is my understanding that the way in which this particular report was being presented to Government being part of Economic Council which is the official side placed up to the Meeting. Consequently the report then was placed on the Secretariat of Economic Affairs and Trade.

MR. W. MORRISON BUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Government...

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry? I do not think I heard you right. Elected...

MR. W. MORRISON BUSH: Supplementary, Mr. President. So the Government do have the report. Am I to understand that they do have a copy of the report.

MR. M. MICHAEL MANLEY: Yes, Mr. President, they have personal copies.

MR. W. MORRISON BUSH: At least, Mr. President, I was not personally to give us a report.

MR. SPEAKER: Gentleman! I think perhaps we had better move on to the next question. The Elected Member for East End.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR EAST END AND THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND CO-OPERATIVES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

QUESTION 55: Will the Member state why the decision was taken to discontinue delivery of animal feed from the Department of Agriculture to farmers throughout the Island?

ANSWER: No decision was taken to discontinue the delivery of feed to farmers throughout the Island. This practice was done on a voluntary basis and need in the past and is still being continued, but not with the regularity as before.

The reason being that the Department has been unable due to the severe drought which we have been experiencing over the past several months also from the Department's inability to keep their vehicles under normal conditions.

The warehouse was being kept unstaffed for extended periods when staff were also making deliveries. This inconvenienced farmers who had to make unnecessary visits to the department before obtaining supplies. Warehouse staff were told not to make any commitments to deliver feed during this busy period, just to encourage farmers to collect their purchases. This was to ensure that the warehouse remained open to immediate customers.

QUESTIONS:

MR. JOHN B. KELLY: Mr. President, it is not a supplementary but I hope that you would permit me to say that although I am pleased to hear from the Minister that this has not been discontinued, this merely was not what was said to me when I called at the Department. No apologies were given for that. However, I am happy to know that this service will be continued.

MR. LINCOLN A. PINCOCK: Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary for clarity, Sir. The answer stated that this practice was done on a matter of courtesy and need. Would the Member state whether it was done on a matter of courtesy or on a matter of need? You cannot have both.

MR. WILLIAM G. DOMINEY: Mr. Speaker, this is one time that both applied, courtesy and need because of the long drought which significant farmers over the past period of time only one cent or so. We did not have sufficient staff or warehouse accommodation to support large quantities of feed or to provide the warehousing assistance to many people on the warehouse while delivery was made. There are only two staff there as far as I understand. So, we had to do both on a matter of courtesy to buy up children some feed, and at the same time loose the staff in the warehouse to attend to those other farmers who were coming there to pick up their feed.

MR. JOHN B. KELLY: Mr. President. I wonder if the Member could say when this practice was first started? Was it since the drought this year or when?

MR. HAROLD G. DOMINEY: Exactly what practice, Mr. President? I am not too sure.

MR. JOHN B. KELLY: The Member's answer, Sir, stated, "this practice was done on a matter of courtesy". I am talking about the practice of delivering feed to the farmers.

HON. HAROLD G. DOMINEY: Mr. President, as far as I am aware this practice was in force before my time as the Member for the Bonavista.

MR. G. MIKE ADAMS: Mr. President, yesterday in the Member was questioned during the routine drought. Can I ask the Member why the deliveries were not increased rather than curtailed, since we would be the logical thing to do in a drought.

HON. HAROLD G. DOMINEY: Mr. President, if the department had staff at the department then deliveries could not have been curtailed. I explained that before.

MR. D. EDWARD HILLS: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member state whether this question of following food is static? Is it new?

SEN. EARL S. JOHNSON: Mr. President, that is correct. It is a new service offered by the Department.

MR. RAYMOND A. SPEARS: Mr. President, a supplementary. Would the Member kindly explain briefly if she weighed on the balance if she decided to advertise the delivery of cooked food to persons through out the Island, or whether if she decided that to encourage the aged, would have Social Security?

SEN. EARL S. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I think that Government has given consideration to provide the food and sell it to persons at a nominal price. The delivery of the food actually whether persons is for us I have when we went to buy sandwiches from the airline we go there and buy it. So, perhaps one also suggested to go to the Agricultural Department and pick up their food. We did it as a matter of courtesy in some cases, Mr. President, where it was difficult for some persons to come and get the food.

MR. JOHN A. MALLERY: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would say whether he is aware that this is one of the things which was done some time ago to encourage farming in these Islands?

SEN. EARL S. JOHNSON: Mr. President, anything which we do in the Agricultural Department is a matter to encourage farming in the Islands. The Government spends quite a lot of money in the Department to provide various facilities and supplies namely to necessary agriculture in the Islands.

MR. LAWSON A. PAIVINE: Mr. President, the Member stated that it was the practice as a matter of courtesy. However, from the answer he has just given it would appear as though it was a policy of Government. Would the Member state whether this was in fact a policy of Government, or just a courtesy of the Department or the Secretary?

SEN. EARL S. JOHNSON: Mr. President, let me say this, Sir, I have conferred with my policy in the Agricultural Department in the same manner that I have been there. Whatever the question is asked, that is what I stand there.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that we had better move on to the next question. The Elected Member for East Sepik.

QUESTION NUMBER 208: ASST SEC TO ASK THE PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS OFFICER, HEADQUARTERS OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL INSPECTORATE FOR COMMENTATORS NAMES AND STATIONS ARE STATIONED

NO. 57: Would the Member state what steps have been taken as a result of the recent meeting held which the staff of Public Works Department, and himself, concerning working hours and the Association out to Wapoa, and have they been informed thereof?

ANSWER: There were no steps taken to reduce the working hours, as it is being proposed, from 44 to 40 hours per week at the Public Works Department. Therefore, there was not an weekly wages of the employees and it was not necessary to inform the Minister.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. JOHN B. McCLELLAN: Mr. President, as a result of the recent events, would the Senator say whether he feels that it would be better to enlighten the staff of what he have just put forward to us, other than this hanging over their heads?

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Mr. President, the Chief Engineer of Public Works has the duty of employing the staff, that there is a change. There has been no change and I am not involved on the day to day operation of Public Works Department.

MR. JOHN B. McCLELLAN: Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator has said, but as he is aware this matter did go a little further than the day to day operation of the Director of Public Works Department. So as to put in his opinion better for me to move this amendment now and for all matter there to have to hanging in the air.

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Mr. President, I think what the Member is saying to enhance is that plans have to be made for when the funds supposed have been exhausted. In reply to his question I will answer that, Sir, because we are making plans now to submit a supplementary request for funds to carry us from the 1st September. The funds which we have left to implement the Public Works Development are now working on a supplementary request for funds which I will have to submit to the Honourable Financial Secretary, and he in turn will have to submit to the Finance Committee for their approval.

MR. JOHN B. McCLELLAN: Very well, Mr. President, I am very glad to hear this. I hope that this is going to work out as there hanging about, and I hope that a result of this answer today that the Member will undertake to direct the Director to get on to the staff.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order. The Member must not make statements. I thought that he was going to ask a supplementary but I was caught out. He may possibly have the time to ask his last question; but if you ask question No. 58 quickly we might get ... his answer. Sir.

THE ELECTRIC POWER FOR EACH END OF NEW TOWN DEVELOPMENT SCHEME OF ELECTRIC POWER

58. Q.S: Would the Honourable Member state the amount of revenue collected from 1st January, 1965, to 31st March, 2005, giving comparable figures for the same period for 2004?

ANSWER: The total revenue collected from 1st January to 31st March, 1965, was $78,956,400 compared to $78,237,787 for the same period in 1964.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. C. MATS SMITH: Mr. President, may I ask how the surplus revenue at the end of this period, 1965 compares with 1964?

MR. PRESIDENT: We are after 11.30 a.m. actually, but I will allow this one supplementary to be answered if the Member has the information.

MR. THOMAS S. KLEPPE: Mr. President, simple science is a very relevant subject sometimes, Sir, and I am not in a position right now to answer that question.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that it was really a supplementary, and it is after 12 o'clock.

Item 2 on today's Order Paper is Government Business, Bills, Committee Stage. The House will now go into Committee to study the Health Protection (Amendment) Bill, 1974, and other Bills.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

THE HEALTH PROTECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1974

COMMITTEE STAGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee. I shall now call a Hon to second the Health Protection Bill, 1974.

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF LAW 18 OF 1972.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding further perhaps I should say what I should have said to the beginning that subject to the views of the Committee, I wonder whether we might agree to the procedure which we normally adopt with Bills. That is that if there are clearly technical or similar errors, rather than call attention to them and have the Committee agree to correct them, we shall impower the Parliamentary Counsel Officials Member to make whatever corrections may be necessary when the Bill is printed as a Law. The only amendments which will be put to the Committee will be amendments of substance or significance. Is that agreeable to the Committee?

HON. DENNIS N. KNOWLES: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, let us proceed on that basis then. I think that is the practice which we normally adopt, but I like to have the Committee's endorsement for it on each page. I assume that is agreed....

HON. WARREN C. JOHNSON: We cannot hear....

HON. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN & ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We cannot hear, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am so sorry... Can you hear now.

HON. WARREN C. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was saying that I would assume that this procedure which we normally adopt will apply throughout the Committee Stages of the Bills which we will be considering today. So it is the procedure that the Honourable Nominated Members are entrenched by the Committee to make any necessary corrections when there have been printing errors or anything else of the kind.

The question now is that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS LAW, 1973, (LAW 10 OF 1973).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE BILL WAS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A Bill for a Law to amend the Medical Practitioners Law (Revised).

THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE MAINTENANCE LAW (REVISED).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A Bill for a Law to amend the Summary Jurisdiction Law. (Law 10 of 1975).

THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

TOPIC: CLAUSE 8. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 10.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 8 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. DE VALERA RISE. Can we have that division, Sir?

DIVISION NO. 58

AYES	NOES
Sen. Dennis E. Eagleton	Mr. D. McKeown Cash
Sen. Michael F. Gravel	
Sen. Thomas C. Hefflefinger	
Mrs. Rogers C. Clarke	
Mrs. K. Maureen Tydings	
Sen. Capt. Charles S. Richenmell	
Sen. Vernon G. Johnson	
Sen. Stephen E. Young	
Mr. Richard A. Thomson	
Prof. Mabry B. Mathewmell	
Mr. C. Percy Ledden	
Mr. G. Gaylord Nelson	
Mr. John B. Williams	

13 — 2

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare that the Committee has passed that Clause 8 shall stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 9 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE ATOMIC CONTAMINATION LAW. (WAR TO BE TAXED).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A Bill for a Law to amend the Atomic Court Law.

THE ATOMIC CONTAMINATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: ... AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CHAIR: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 9.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Perhaps the Clerk might note that I am bringing the Ombudsman's salary back to the statutory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One....

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: One superintendent annum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3. SUBSTITUTION OF SECTION 9.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

HON. E. GRAND MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if I could just speak to the Chair in part on amendment to section 3, subsection (4) to add "and published" after the "Lieutenant in Council".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. The amendment that I think Stanley the Senior Executive Assistant did you note? I believe, am I right there the Honourable Second Official Member said that he was to introduce to that? Or have I not pronounced correctly?

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: That is correct Mr. Chairman. I see no objection to it and it is in reasonably non-controversial I have no hesitation in endeavouring to assist the Members. In that regard, Mr. Chairman, is what is presently in a Committee Stage amendment that is really intended? Because if the notice is an addition to subsection (4) it provides that the only notice which is effective until published in the Gazette now notice which presently under paragraph (a) page of the Ordinance. I think that is why he has intention to provide that no notice should have effect until approved by the Governor in Council.

MR. E. GRAND MILLER: Yes, Sir, no notice should have effect. That is what I mean.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No notice should have effect until they have been published.

MR. E. GRAND MILLER: Until they have been approved by Governor in Council and published.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Am I right that as the clause is it presently worded the only notice which would go to the Governor in Council would be the notice proceeding that?

HON. E. GRAND MILLER: We have no such information (?) then, Sir, and say that the notice do not become effective until....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had not understood. My understanding yesterday was that you wanted notice to be published, not that you wanted also notice to go to the Governor in Council.

SEN. S. FRANK MORRIS: No, Sir, I was merely interested that all the rules of the Court are published so that people will have the information as to what the rules are.

SEN. CRAIGMILE: Yes, that is what I had thought. You are not seeking to ask that all opinion in addition to Executive Council, simply that they should be published before they take effect. I am not sure that we can do it in the way that you suggest. I think that it would have to be a new subsection, maybe (e) or (f).

SEN. MICHAEL J. MCGRATH: A new subsection, yes

SEN. DENNIS E. FOSTER: In addition, Mr. Chairman, I do not see the sense of just publishing the fees of the Court. They might just as well publish the fees and the cost of the legal proceedings as well. That is more important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that the intention is that all the rules should be published, which is reasonable.

SEN. MICHAEL J. MCGRATH: Perhaps it might meet the intention of the gentleman if the amendment if enacted that the proposed new section be amended by the addition immediately following subsection (d) thereof of the following new subsection:

> "(d) Rules of Court made under this section shall not come into effect until they have been published in the Gazette."

Would that meet the approval of the Honourable Members?

SEN. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where would that come?

SEN. MICHAEL J. MCGRATH: Subsection (f).

SEN. MICHAEL J. MCGRATH: That would have the effect, Mr. Chairman, that no rules of Court shall have effect until published in the Gazette which I think is what the Honourable Member wishes.

SEN. G. EDWIN MILLER: Yes, that is what I am seeking, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could the Honourable Second Member for Western Division read that once more?

SEN. MICHAEL J. MCGRATH: If I can remember it:

> "(f) No Rules of Court made under this section shall come into force until they have been published in the Gazette."

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the question now before the Committee is that Clause 3 of the Bill be amended by adding to the proposed section 31 of the Bill a subsection (f) which:

> "(f) No Rules of Court made under this section shall come into force until they have been published in the Gazette."

MR. SULLIVAN (CONTINUED): I will put the question that the motion be amended as proposed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT AGREED.

MR. MILLIGAN: I should perhaps formally second that the amendment to the motion, and to be moved without the normal notice thereof.

MR. MICHAEL J. MURPHY: I would like the Member of this House to second something that is my understanding that this amendment was moved by the Ex-Armed Members for North Slue and not by me.

MR. J. KEITH MILLER: Does he already have me, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I think that you just now could have moved it. I think that is quite right. Since then the Elected Member for North Side sought and was granted permission that not withstanding the provisions of Standing Order 24(2) an amendment be moved without the usual notice having been given, and that it was the Elected Member for North Side who then moved the amendment which has now been seconded.

I will now put the question that Clause 2 be amended as part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AS AMENDED AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE CANADA COURTS LAW. (CLAUSE 2 AS AMENDED)

MR. MICHAEL J. MURPHY: I move the Motion which accepts have the motion the amendment please be amended?

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I just did. The question now before the Committee is that the Bill as amended Clause as part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL STOOD AS AMENDED.

MR. SPEAKER: That concludes consideration by Committee of Bills entitled the Marine Insurance (Amendment) Act, 1985 and other Bills. The House will recess.

RECESS TAKEN

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. I think that before we continue with Bills on the Order it may be convenient if we now take our customary evening break. So I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11:31 A.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 10.10 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Item 2(1), Records of the Committee Stage of Bills. The Honourable First Elected Member of Legislative Council.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL (LIMITATION) BILL, 1965

FIRST READING

HON. DENSON D. DEANES: Mr. President, I have to report that I duly received a Bill for a Law to amend the Privy Council Act, 1962 was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

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

The Privy Council (Limitation) Bill, 1965.

THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

FIRST READING

HON. DENSON D. DEANES: Mr. President, I have to report that I duly received a Bill for a Law to amend the Maintenance Law (Revised) was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

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

The Summary Jurisdiction (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

FIRST READING

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, I have to report that I duly received the Summary Jurisdiction (Amendment) Bill, 1965 was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

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

The Grand Court (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

THE GRAND COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

SECOND READING

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, I beg to report that a Bill shortly entitled the Grand Court (Amendment) Bill, 1965 was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed with one amendment, namely the insertion on Page 2 in that part of it which deals with the newly to be inserted section, section 21, of a new subsection which reads:

> "(2) No rules of Court made under this section shall come into force until they have been published in the Gazette."

MR. PRESIDENT: The bill is necessarily laid over for third reading.

Item 5(d)(1). Third Readings. The Clerk will state, Does the Clerk call the Bills?

THE SCHOOLS DESEGREGATION AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Schools Desegregation Amendment Act, 1994.

SEN. DENNIS D. DENNIS: Mr. President, I beg to move that a bill entitled a bill for an Act to amend the Schools Desegregation Act, 1974 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is, Does the House to read a Bill for an Act to amend the Schools Desegregation Act, 1974 be given a Third Reading and passed.

DIVISION DEMANDED: AYES AND NOES

MR. S. SPEAKER ASSISTANT: May I have a division, Sir?

DIVISION
NO. 22

AYES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Kenneth M. Mwalwa	Mr. J. Jacob Miller
Sen. Michael J. Swallow	
Hon. Thomas S. Wajilemon	
Sen. Benjamin C. Shumba	
Sen. F. Norman Dodson	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Mirkomanyi	
Sen. Michael S. Johnson	
Mr. P. McKenzie Ouko	
Hon. Daphne M. Ongoti	
Mr. Winfred M. Mbarak	
Capt. Wesley S. Mirkomanyi	
Mr. P. Ndiy Bolder	
Mr. John B. Nelson	
19	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried,

BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: The next bill.

THE MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1994

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Maintenance (Amendment) Bill, 1994.

HON. DEREK H. LUCAS: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Maintenance Law (Province) be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Maintenance Law (Province) be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL READ A THIRD TIME AND PASSED.

THE SUMMARY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Summary Jurisdiction (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRITY: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled the Summary Jurisdiction (Amendment) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled The Summary Jurisdiction (Amendment) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

HON. M. MICHAEL HOUSE: May I have a Division, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well.

DIVISION
NO. 85

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis L. Foster	Hon. M. McKenzie Black
Hon. Michael J. Harrity	
Hon. Thomas C. Jeffcock	
Hon. Derek H. Lucas	
Hon. M. Norman Pridden	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Underwood	
Hon. Ronald W. Wilkins	
Hon. Daphne L. Orvill	
Hon. Winford J. Wiseman	
Capt. Mary E. Winchester	
Hon. G. Percy Jordan	
Hon. D. Samuel McKee	
Hon. John A. McLean	
13	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

BILL STOOD A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE GRAND COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

SECOND READING

CLERK: The Grand Court (Amendment) Bill, 1966.

HON. MICHAEL J. GRADDY: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill already entitled The Grand Court (Amendment) Bill, 1966 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that a Bill for a law to amend the Grand Court Law be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Item 7(a) on today's Order Paper, the Final and Second Reading of further Bills.

THE COURTS OF SMALL CLAIMS AND DISTRICT COURTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE CLERK OF THE COURTS AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to regulate the powers of the Clerk of the Court and the Deputy Clerk of the Courts be deemed to have been read a First time and to be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE CLERK OF THE COURTS AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966.

HON. MICHAEL J. GRADDY: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill already entitled the Clerk of the Court and Deputy Clerk of the Court (Amendment) Bill, 1966.

As Members of this House will be aware the amount of work and the complexity of work which comes in the course of the Stephen Islands has increased very substantially in recent years. It was not many years ago that it was necessary for there to be only one Judicial officer in these Islands. Then the Grand Court was established and now Grand Court Judge, the Chief Justice was appointed, and there are magistrates also.

With the increase among of the Cayman Islands and with the increase in appellate litigation, the volume of civil and commercial work has increased greatly, and a large amount of that work is in the Lower Courts. As the work has been increasing amount of work handled on the Magistrate's Court so that quite frequently the necessary progress of the work there both civil and criminal, is held back the substantive magistrate and the acting magistrate working at the same time in different courts. The increased complexity and volume of this work has resulted, as in many other areas, in increased amounts of documentation which sometimes have been of very little significance only by the Judge or the magistrate.

MR. MICHAEL J. DUGGER (CONTINUED): The Administration should not feel forced this House to believe the Judges and the Magistrates of the Superior Courts do either lack, or personally harbor an attitude of disrespect, in many cases routine documents which emanate from their offices.

Clause 2, and I will read it, Mr. Speaker, says that:

"2. Any acknowledgment or other document, subpoena, summons or other form of process of any court established by any law or subsidiary legislation and required to be signed by a Judge of the Grand Court or a magistrate may be signed by the Clerk of the Court or the Deputy Clerk of the Court, and a signature shall for all purposes be as valid as if personally made by such Judge or magistrate."

The intent of this is, Mr. Speaker, that the large volume of routine work in signing documents shall under the discretion of the Judge or magistrate as the case may be, be signed by the Clerk or Deputy Clerk of the appropriately legally appointed to be able to assume properly the documentation which requires to be signed. It will free up the services of the Hon. Administrative Clerks of that Court Will take a load burden of administrative work actually from the Hon. Judges of the Grand Court.

The second provision in this Amendment - to authorise the work of the Courts here, and the normal administrative duties to take all processes:

"3. Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law or any subsidiary legislation made thereunder, the Deputy Clerk of the Court shall for all purposes have, exercise and duties conferred upon the Clerk of the Court by any Law, and any such assistance as for all purposes be valid as if authorised by the Clerk of the Court."

Again, not only to spread the burden of work quickly among the Administrative officers of the Court there is another function for that, and that is that since there is only one person in the jurisdiction as Clerk of the Court who is presently the substantive Clerk of the Court he cannot be in two places at the same time in order to give persons the documents to be signed, the necessity to seek some to appoint the Deputy to act. There are cases where persons responsible in relation to the Clerk of the Court are necessary to be executed at very short notice.

One example which Members may feel, because it is a sweeping notice like the Cayman Islands is the matter of arrest, which is a function which must be carried out in very short notice. The third clause of this Bill which is the subject substantive one which I have been referring to would give the Deputy Clerk powers of the Clerk to carry out such functions.

Mr. Speaker, the intention of this Bill is to regularise and execute not only the workings of the courts here, but the process of justice in these Islands. It has been entrusted by the Judiciary. It has met with the approval of Government, and I commend it to Honourable Members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to increase the salaries of the Clerk of the Court and the Deputy Clerk of the Court be given a Second Reading.

The motion is not open for debate. If no Member wishes to speak I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 3(a)(iii).

THE CURRENCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

CLERK: The Currency (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Currency Law (Revised) be read a First time and do set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: The Currency (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

HON. THOMAS C. SPOTTSWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Currency Law (Revised).

Mr. Speaker, this is a very small amendment but quite important. Section 12 of the Currency Law deals with the restriction of notes, and under section 13 of the Currency Law which was repealed, it dealt with the restriction of coins. This small amendment, Mr. Speaker, brings into section 12 the restriction of coins and notes.

I think that should basically all that I have to say on this item, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Currency Law (Revised) be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. The Elected Member for North Side.

QUESTION PUT:

MR. D. EDWARD MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I support the motion but I would just like to have the Member identify that the Government is not going to include the ornamental coinage or coins for jewellery, etcetera.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to speak I will ask the mover of the motion whether he wishes to exercise his right of reply?

HON. THOMAS C. SPOTTSWOOD: Only to state, Mr. Speaker, and thank honourable Members for their support, whether currently or by their silence, and to assure the Elected Member for North Side that with the Department of Cayman Islands Currency going into operation as the law now the traditional ones.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Currency Law (Revised) be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AYES, NONE; A SECOND DIVISION.

BY PRESIDENT: Does anyone object?

THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Companies Law be allowed to have had a First time and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985.

MR. JEFFREY C. ECKERTSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Companies Law (Chapter 22).

This amendment to the Law is being put forward in connection with another Bill which is coming forward, the Exploratory Bond (Amendment) Bill, 1985. In the past the Registrar of Lands has taken advice from the Legal Department that a company could not own land. That decision, Mr. President, was primarily set aside by the present Chief Justice and the attempt here, Mr. President, is to ensure that an alien company receiving any foreign company not registered in the Cayman Islands should not own land. If we have a foreign company, Mr. President, which is registered in the Cayman Islands, then this amendment does not apply to that company. It is only a foreign company such as U.S.X. wishing to purchase land in the Cayman Islands when it is not registered here which will not be allowed to do so under the name U.S.X.

Of course, Mr. President, they could set up an ordinary, non-exempt company and own that land. The reason for this, Mr. President, is that if we allow the alien company to own land or to hold land, there would be no possible way that the Registrar of Lands could police or monitor the effect for stamp duty. In other words, a company such as U.S.X. or any other foreign company registered in any part of the world whether it be the United States, Canada or the Caribbean, if it is not maintained in the Cayman Islands, then we have very little jurisdiction over it. It could change its shareholders every day, and the net effect to them to stamp duty would be unbelievable. This is the reason for this amendment, Mr. President. However, if the foreign company registered in the Cayman Islands then this amendment does not apply and it can hold land.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Companies Law (Revision) Bill be given a Second Reading.

The motion is open for debate. The Second Elected Member for George Town.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

MR. C. RAJU JOSHUA: Mr. President, Sir, I will before the Senate states in the Memorandum that it is complementary to the Cayman Legal Practitioners Bill, 1983. This Bill is follow on the Order Paper. From what I heard in the introduction of the Bill I cannot see why we can not dealing with the principle. Like first I would rather be debating the Cayman Land Amendment Bill, 1986 before the Bill which is here, as that Bill has some very important provisions which I think that we should deal with before attempting to pass a complementary Bill. In order to ensure why is present there Bills and perhaps bringing up clearly the controversy which we are beginning to touch.

I understand the remarks of the Member who introduced the Bill but I cannot agree with the contents. I can see no reason why a foreign attorney-at-law practicing here should not own land because if the foreign country bought the land it should not sell the land; it could not transfer the title without going through the land office here. It is here that almost Nations in the company would change but the only reason I think was why we must have this absolute control is that in the future we plan to see land, then if we are going to encourage land that we must have absolute control. This is the great fear which exists in the Legislature currently today, and this may be also this page of the Budget Mins, the fact that we can partially prohibition on the ownership of land by foreign investment could there may why investment which this country needs. I cannot understand what has happened to the Government. I cannot understand what the present Government which has been elected to preserve the economy and to do today with privatization is doing and why they have not been able to make one forward step. Many steps have been introduced for an investment or for the giving modification to the investor, every step they have made has been opposed again them. This investment to the Company law to a dangerous amendment and only on Pandit would they have a provision like Clause 2 of this Bill.

However, I am being very kind because I am asking my anger for the Bill which is to come, because that is the main Bill.

In Clause 2 it reads:

> "that if a foreign company ceases to carry on or have a place of business in the Islands or otherwise ceases to be a foreign company or fails to comply with any of the provisions of this part, any lands held by, vested in or belonging to it shall thereupon and without notice pass in the Financial Secretary for the benefit of the Islands."

This is complicated without notice, I cannot understand it. If the certificate without notice was come having the post manner to give them ninety days notice. We are wanting a democratic president to the parliament for to the left. Those Bill come on the Registered Land Amendment Bill, 1986.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak?

HON. GLEN CHARLES LEACHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, in support of Bill for a Law to amend the Companies Law (Chapter 22). I have no intention, Sir, of speaking to debate this Bill but I think that a few things which have been said need some correction.

MR. CAPT. CHARLES L. [illegible]: I do not see this bill, Sir, as dividing any people, or the first step towards [illegible] I have read [illegible] Commission, what we're going to run this country with, if we allow foreign corporations to operate here, could run just as those foreign countries, should they? I'm sure that's the Government has [illegible] necessary to stop, and I would have thought that this Nation could have been this up a night of getting more money for the Canal Zone and the people, rather than to blame it and say that we are hooked for a hand out that we are providing ourselves, by denying many foreign ships from our country. I can assure the Member, Sir, that his remark about [illegible] being a retrogressive step in the development of the Panama Canal is wrong and, I hope, Sir, that in the not too distant future we will have had to [illegible] those words many, many times.

Mr. President, with those few remarks I support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the gentleman yield?

MR. CHARLES L. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank Members once again for their support of the bill. In reply to the Second Distinct Member for Dundee Town, particularly on his point of complexities without notice which he stated in the way that we did our own [illegible] days notice, Mr. President, the Chief Architect that this Bill does not come into effect until the 30th September. If my memory can right I would have expected that to be around 1st July. In addition the fact that this bill has been spoken about on Radio Cyprus and in the press, I would have thought that particularly adequate notice had been given.

One other point, Mr. President, the Member said that he was no reason for the ships not to hold land. I am also aware that he is particularly the fact that if do this can [illegible] ships would not be [illegible]. In my view, Mr. President, any [illegible] we make on our books should be [illegible] to pay [illegible] duty, when other Companies have to pay.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that [illegible] a Bill for a Law to amend the Shipowners Tax be given a Second Reading.

DEPUTATION SUIT: AYES AND NOES

MR. CHARLES L. [illegible]: May I have a Division, Mr. Speaker?

DIVISION
NO. 24

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Dennis F. Foster		
Hon. Michael J. Hartley		
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson		
Hon. Reuben O. Adams		
Hon. W. Bonnie Smith		
Hon. Capt. Charles L. [illegible]		
Hon. Vincent C. Phillips		
Mr. S. Nicholas Snell		

DIVISION
NO. 54
(CONTINUED)

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTION
Mr. Daphne D. Orwell	Mr. D. Ross Boulden	Mr. Richard D. Plows
Capt. Henry R. Kingscourt		
Mr. D. Russell Millsap		
Mr. John D. Nelson		
13	1	1

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

STILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it will probably be convenient if we now suspend proceedings for lunch until approximately 2.15 p.m.

AT 12.50 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2.17 P.M.

MR SPEAKER: Please be seated, Item 8(a)(i).

THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: A Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Registered Land Law (Revised) be deemed to have been read a first time and to be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Honourable Member who I understand was down to move this Bill, may I be allowed to move the Second Reading of a Bill shortly entitled the Registered Land (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Minister said when he presented the last Bill, the Second Reading of which took place yesterday morning, namely the Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1985, the only effect of this Bill which seeks to incorporate into the Registered Land Law a new section 169A stems out of a recent judgement in the Grand Court.

HON. ROBERT A. BELAIR (COMMISSIONER): Mr. Speaker, on the judgment of the Privy Council which was given by the Chief Justice on the month of February this year, the Honourable Chief Justice there was an appeal made by a foreign incorporated company against a decision of the Legislature of Canada, under the Companies Act, the mere fact of having land could not carry with it the duties of carrying on business in the Province of Canada. Therefore, even a company had power, even though not registered as a foreign company under the Companies Act, to hold such land.

Mr. Speaker, the historical background in this case, I think is necessary to be set out in order that it can be clearly understood by Members of this House and by the general public that there is no basis or justification at all for what has been carried out heretofore by reason of this Bill. What happened in this case, Mr. Speaker, was that a Panamanian registered company which did not have a place of business here and had not commenced to carry on business here, and which had no connection with Crown Lands except that it intended to be registered as a corporation of a parcel of land, sought to register that parcel.

It had been the policy of the Registrar of Lands not to register such instruments from such companies, and in doing so the Registrar was following policies which had been established by the Legal Department as long ago as 1952. It had been a consistent policy in accordance with that section of the Land Registry Act to refuse to register land transfers in the name of alien companies unless such companies were registered as a foreign company under section 198 of the Companies Law.

In his judgment the Honourable Chief Justice said and I quote:

> "The position therefore is that at common law an alien company was not registered or registerable as a foreign company under Part I of the Companies Law has power to hold land in these Islands but it has capacity to do so under the law of the country in which it was incorporated, unless by the provisions

I continue quoting from the judgment of the Chief Justice:

> "There can be no doubt that the previous view has been that such a company could not hold land here. That is evident from a memorandum of objects and reasons to the Bill for the Land Holding Companies Expiry Dissolution Act, 1967 and the practice which grew up in the Department of the Registrar of Lands."

I continue quoting from the judgment, Sir.

> ...which purports to be alien corporation which is not a foreign company as defined there would appear to be no restriction presently in force against land in these Islands. The capacity of an alien corporation which is not a foreign company as defined,"

I should like to quote only briefly from a final paragraph of that judgment:

MR. MICHAEL J. MURPHY (CONTINUING):

"If it be decided to proclaim an older corporation which is not a foreign company from among Lesotho a whole amendment of the Companies Act would obviate this."

It was, Mr. President, merely to bring the Law into line with what had been envisaged to be the legal position and the accepted administrative practice that the Companies Act and this present Bill is dealing brought. There is no intention whatsoever to enact that the power of any foreign company either to form a subsidiary here and register the subsidiary here to hold land here or otherwise deal here, or to convert a foreign company from registering as a foreign company under the provisions of our Companies Law and again quickly formulate.

What we have sought to do by these two Bills, Mr. President, was to maintain the danger which could arise and I think would arise by reason of the fact that if the Law were not changed unscrupulous foreign companies seeking to business here; having no connection here; having no place for service of documents here could purchase land and by a whole transfer from one foreigner to another of the shares of these companies, avoid the stamp duty which any other transaction effectively transferring land should attract under our Law.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that this Bill is brought before us. When this very Bill is moved the Registered Land Law seeks to do, and I read, Sir, s.

"164. (1) Notwithstanding that it may be impossible to do so under the Law of any other jurisdiction or by the memorandum of association or whatsoever name so called) a body corporate (by whatsoever name so called) which is not -

(a) an existing company as defined in subsection (1) of section 2 of the Companies Law;

(b) formed and registered under the Companies Law; or

(c) registered as a foreign company under part VIII of the Companies Law,

has no power to be registered or a corporation or in any other manner to hold land in the Kingdom."

A natural question arose as to why until after the 30th September if such companies have failed to register as a foreign company here, or failed to transfer the land to a local company or to some foreign company registered here, or failed in fact to take any steps whatsoever to bring themselves into compliance with this Law, that they the property which they have chosen not to comply with the Law should vest in the Honourable Financial Secretary for the benefit of the Kingdom.

Now I, Mr. President, make no apology whatsoever that it is not the intention in any way to penalise the ability of foreign companies to acquire land here; to own land here; to transfer land here. It merely seeks to make it quite sure that we have who these companies are; that they are registered here; that they have a place of business here, and that they are amenable to the Courts duly constituted for which Courts the Attorney

HON. MICHAEL J. FRASER (NORTHUMBERLAND): I might say that while as the legislation will now, is merely seeking to bring into law the administrative procedure which has heretofore existed.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I commend this bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is since a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Registered Land Act is placed on a second reading. The motion is open for debate.

SPEAKS ON SECOND READING

MR. C. NAT PERRY: Mr. President, when the Bill which we really seek before this Parish Council I am still not convinced that the foreign participation contemplated in this Bill was in the best interests of this country. I am totally against the removal by which the Executive Council have handled this whole matter.

This is an important Bill and to come to us, when we the whips only came on the job May which is sufficient time for Members to peruse the Bill and study it. However, the press copy or the Parcelled copy which is the publication to the public came out on the 3rd May which was a Friday of last week. Saturday, Sunday and Monday is a holiday so the public had no opportunity at all to study this Bill.

The Members on the business panel had no opportunity to study it and to acquaint their people during hours to know exactly what this Bill means, and I would like to know why there is this undue haste. Every other Bill which Government is putting up, whether it be increasing of pensions or the building of schools are to be placed on Open like and the public can and does receive many benefactions from the newspapers and the radio just to acquaint the unfamiliar which they are shifting from the interests of the public.

However, here is an important matter like this to be held back until the last minute, because every single somebody knows that the Meeting for the 21st May was fixed a long time ago by you, Sir. It was the duty of the Government to give the public time to study such an important Bill. It says on the Parcel copy of the Bill that it was received on 1961 May and everybody knows that if this has to be distributed by mail there may be some people to whom this has been mailed who may not yet have received it. So it has been very unfair to us so that the public could understand it.

The Bill seeks amongst other things to exempt land owned by an alien company or a foreign country which is not mentioned here. It seems to discriminate the land. It seeks to confiscate it. It seems to take for our own use and ownership without any notice at all to the landowner. Now I know that the Bill will not come into effect until the 21st day of September, 1961 just the same as the Corporation Bill would not come into effect until 31st December, 1961. However, this is not binding to the Government. They might take to only the day which the law comes into operation. The owner of the land in Australia or New Zealand or the United Kingdom may still not know that our Government has passed such a law, because he will never read in your newspapers or anywhere. I think that there is an obligation on this Government to send a notice in writing to the owner of any parcels of land which may be involved and subject to acquisition on the 20th day of September, 1961.

MR. G. WILL ROWLEY (CONTINUED): This is the point which I wanted to make to the Corporation Tax Amendment Bill debate, although my debate was brief, but I have spoken who are not resident in the Falklands may not know and would nevertheless appreciate, or would never even dream that the Government would pass such a law.

This Bill is a good Bill. But, why? I know that it will, also will prevent foreign companies from coming into Falklands to invest their money, or register as a Falkland company here, or purchase shelf companies as a Falkland company here, or purchase shelf companies as a Falkland company here, or purchase shelf some other valuable asset of being here. We do not want this at this time. This country is now suffering from lack of investor confidence and the Government must take actions which will restore their confidence, and not take actions which will further the investor away.

This will have a psychological effect of thinking why should we invest. When looking at this of a company, are the Ocean Sole Servicing Company invited to do business here they may find they cannot purchase land, and otherwise cannot be established a Falkland. Under this new Law they would not be able to purchase the land unless they had registered the company here or set up a subsidiary company. So investor-confidence will begin to go. Businesses like it does as no good.

I mentioned the other year during one of my speeches on the Corporation Tax Bill, 1985 and that was that the notice given to be unnecessary unless this notice is a practice by the Administration of the Islands, because to what knowledge we would need absolute control. I understand what has been said about making sure that Government officials are given duty. Everyone knows that Government will discuss the stamp duty because of the price of the land to be transferred, this duty can only be charged on the Stamp Duty Office of the Land Registry. It is true that shareholders of the company could change but the rights would remain with the company and could only be changed at the office in Stanley Town. So if the Attorney-General should then withdraw the new Alien duty.

Talking about land already owned by foreign people, because I believe that Falklands would be sought by the Chile as well, whether any action is taking to the remark cannot help us. We know that this has been one of the great people have lost their investments in Cuba. People have lost their investments in many other communist countries who will take it in communist Cyprus when this Bill goes into effect. They will lose it without notice and they will just go home one day and learn his name reading "Sequestrated by the Government of the Cyprus Islands - Expropriated here, sorry". Can this be the image of this country any good? I am asking that the Elected Members of Executive Council to withdraw this Bill and as mentioned the good name which has been built up of these Islands being an investment promotion area, by - just two decades.

I have noted in my notes that the ... contributions in the Development Plan, 1985 regarding land was not being implemented but by and by the way Government over these Islands. Under this plan land would be acquired for certain purposes. There would be white areas; there would be green areas; there would be land which could not be developed, which basically means that the people would lose their ownership. Here we have an instance where people who own land will then the ownership as the land is just the same. It does not matter whether they live in under the 1985 Development Plan or whether they are going to live in under the 1985 plan, in the opinion of it which are greatly losing rights, assets and ownership.

MRS. M. KATE ROBERTS (continued): This is a bad Bill but I will close by repeating the statement that the worst part of it is the complication already existing. The fact that the provisions of the Act coming into effect in January next December does not give comfort to a Londoner who lives abroad. These people who have gone from and who have already made their arrangements to vote for the Lord Mayor of George Town, and then should by these proposals they might have to come out

MR. LAMBERT: (Northern Marianas): Another point, Mr. President, to that with matters of importance such as we have before us, perhaps more time should be given to Members to study these bills. I move sir, that under the Standing Orders seven days be required. However, perhaps now that we have a Select Committee on Standing Orders we should consider fourteen days or more, because many of these matters should be taken to the public. We are dealing with a number of issues on this floor which should be brought to the members of the public, and we find ourselves in the disadvantageous position of having to legislate then after the fact. We go to our people and we tell them what we have done, whether they like it or not, forgetting that we are not their masters. We are their servants.

Mr. President, if 'APC' knows or understood in these islands with 100 whereas does the exercise of 10 per cent of that economy affect adversely the sub-strata of that economy? The definition of a foreign body corporate is really lacking in this bill. The Memorandum of Objects and Reasons gives no definition of what is meant by a foreign body corporate.

Section 1241, (3) on prohibition on certain banking corporate holding land states:

> "Notwithstanding that it may be expressed to do so under the law of any other jurisdiction or by the memorandum of association by whatsoever name or initial a body corporate by whatsoever name or initial which is not -"

and it makes the various types of companies. In this way a foreign company registered under the laws of the Cayman Islands is prevented from owning land till of the Territorial Sea.

However, no explanation is given to that. I have heard other than either company. Are will the Japanese the person who is not legally trained? The person who is not a Government servant and one who is not privy to our discussion here, having no this bill know what we are talking about? For the information of many of my hons, non civil servants making up this country are legally trained people but they are nonetheless the people who bring funds to this country.

Mr. President, I will not prolong my remarks on this bill. I repeat this bill as I said earlier is lacking in many respects. I feel that the whole idea is sustained by the necessity of this bill is a good one. My objection is to the contents of the bill. I feel that any Memoranda of Objects and Reasons given to a bill should be sufficiently clear as that there is no doubt remaining in the minds of people reading a bill such as this. In the present form, Mr. President, respectfully I am unable to support this bill. The reason for this, on the my notes, conflict with regard to the Corporate Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1976 was the same which I elucidated. It was because both of these are complementary and I felt that one hinged on the other. However, of the two bills this is the more complex.

I should here, Sir, that the Members on the Government bench should get to grips the Memorandum of Objects and Reasons somewhat clearer so that these reading bill know exactly the intention of the Government in putting this Bill forward.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. MASGUTANI: The Third Elected Member for West Sepik

MRS. LORRAINE L. PRICE: Thank you, Mr. President. I do not think too much in any regard this bill has to support the bill. I think that the answer has adequately considered it and I think that it should be noted that this bill is not one which affects Cayman-ese nationals such as ours, for instance, the Turtle Conservation Bill or the upcoming Tattoo Regulation. This is something else which directly affects Caymanians and it is hoped put to remind to the public for so many months so anxious that they can make their contributions, or whatever, that I can see the point in having this published just in advance. However, this particular bill will be before the House today affects foreign companies. It is already contained here. Any maybe there might need to be some further explanation of it. However, I am not sure that it is necessary.

So the bill before us as I see it is not one which really requires a lot of input from the public as such. Currently any foreign company not registered here, theoretically if one have had an agreement which was essentially not for the good of this country and we need to manually make a determination as there is not regular basis - who knows how many times that could have been brought from one company to another because of differences changing and then we'd have to - then I feel that it is time that we have it rectified.

However, seeing they've have urged the 30th September at which time this bill will be into effect, then it would seem to me that any foreign company would have had ample time and is not registered here should have at least in front responsibilities, be it a form of business or otherwise. These people would certainly have known that this bill is going to be in effect at that time. I would think that they would get in touch with whatever foreign company owns the land, and they would certainly be aware of it by the 30th September. I cannot see that they would not have sufficient time to comply the stipulation and to comply with the law.

I cannot see why there is any reason why I would disagree with this if it is clearly explained, as I said I am aware of those foreign companies who are here. Now we are not talking about foreign companies with employment in the Cayman Islands. So those are companies which we would have absolutely no control over what so ever as to be not dive in for our Executive Authority Rules. So I suppose that if there is a loophole here we need to try to rectify, Mr. President, and as I would like to support this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. PAPPA T. RANKIN: Mr. President, I rise to support this Bill, the amendment to the registered land Law. We have heard a lot of explanation over the Opposition. One said that this was confiscation without notice, a monopoly etc. Mr. President, this bill seems to be an easy way for the opposition; as he came to explain he really framed the negative side of the Bill.

MAY, Right O. MANUEL (Independent): Mr. President, it was also quite clear that the public knew what the person was going Cabinet with Members of Executive Council for not properly advising the Bill before it was presented here.

If my memory serves me well, I read about these Bills in the press first last week and I also heard it on the radio. Furthermore, Mr. President, the people who are most interested in these Bills, members of the public and the Unions have contacted Members on this Government Bench to query why such a piece of legislation which could embarrass us [illegible] public should introduce such amendments. I dare say that we like the only opportunity of hearing first and speaking on these Bills. [illegible] rather we see the amendment to the Constitution which is completely [illegible] to this one.

Mr. President, while previous Governments sought [illegible] to get these matters to the public because we do not feel that it is right to put forward any measure [illegible] public input. I do not believe that we have an excuse for amendments. I am satisfied that the Bill was published and that there was sufficient time for these matters to be dealt with by the public.

Mr. President, before the people voting was made that a foreign corporation would not [illegible] owned by a foreign corporation could be prohibited, the Registrar of Land had passed to register [illegible] as companies. People understood the position. There was a test case in court and the court ruled that under the present laws of the country, a foreign corporation could not [illegible] here.

The reason why the Bill already mentioned and which the honourable Third Official Member [illegible] why these amendments were brought here. It is feared that if [illegible] the banks of foreign corporations they will be encouraged not to [illegible] other and the story. Only aspect of it that must mark the Treasury of these Islands.

Mr. President, the Bill is not referring to [illegible]. It is not dealing with foreign persons, it is dealing with the foreign corporation. The interpretation of a foreign corporation is contained in the Companies Law and I do not think that it was necessary to spell it out in this Bill again.

Mr. President, it was said that if this Bill happens [illegible] investment confidence would be lost in the Cayman Islands. I do not accept that, Mr. President. One thing I am happy to [illegible] the 15th November, last investment [illegible] are strengthened in this country, and I have not heard anything to the contrary until now. In fact a lot of [illegible] coming in to the Islands and we have seen a large first class hotel [illegible] construction. Mr. President, that is encouraging confidence. So I think that we must ensure that this Government [illegible] measures which would change that particular aspect of the economy.

It was said by, Mr. President, that this might be the beginning of a system to [illegible] land taxes. Well, of course the Government can say anything since they do not have all that expertise in the wings of the Government Bench. Perhaps that is the same suggestion as was made not us long ago in these Chambers that the proposed [illegible] of many years ago, when mentioned to the people they would have [illegible] financial stability. It is quite a joke that the one who was talking about this once had the responsibility to build the financial [illegible] in Turkey here.

HON. TASKER G. EDWARDS (NORTHERN): Anyway, the speaker on the last occasion knew the what was best for these Islands.

Mr. President, the Bill clearly states that if a further nomination does not fix the salary that they will be given a reconsideration period to the 30th September, 1968, to declare their interest. I do not think that the Government could have been blamed in these considerations. Mr. President, it also says that no alien is made, that at the end of that period the property will vest in the Financial Secretary, and be subject to disposition by the Executive Council, having until for such people with the assent of defence authorities which were also vested in the Financial Secretary and subject to disposition by the Legislature Assembly, and later by the Executive Council, many of those assets included lands.

The Government, Mr. President, was in existence and had no desire to take the land or assets of these companies. The Government would always say, "pay up all the outstanding fees which you owe and we will return the assets to you". Some of those assets consisted of large amounts of money and land, as I said. So the Government hardly had an intention of confiscating anything from anybody. The same attitude, Mr. President, I am sure, will be maintained as far as these Bills are concerned.

We have the Government duty to perform in this country and that is to ensure that the attitude of the Government and the responsibility of the Cayman Islands as a financial centre remain and strengthen. So it behoves this Government to do everything in its power to create investors' confidence and acceptance here. I myself see me doing something to change our own position.

So I am not condemning the Opposition for putting forward their case. Naturally I should like in my presentation to put forward the positive side of what we try to do in this Government.

Mr. President, if this Bill goes through I will be writing to the Registrar of Trade to request if from that he sends notification to any foreign company trading here in the Cayman Islands of the possibility of them with as that they will have sufficient time to make proper arrangements for winding down operations, if there are any owned by foreign corporations at this time.

Mr. President, we must also be looking at the position of foreign ownership of land in these Islands and the measure taken to going forward to consider one of these. Mr. President, when foreign companies own land here they go off and you never hear anything from them again. The property is sold up and as I said yesterday you never hear nor see from them. This is something which we should guard against. There is no objection to foreign companies owning land, this is foreign companies registered in the Cayman Islands or foreign nationals. This Bill is seeking only to deal with what is determined under the Ordinance now as a foreign corporation.

Mr. President, I support this Bill and I have no fear of it damaging the Cayman Islands' image in any way. The Bill is quite normal and I support it.

HON. HENRY C. ADAMS: Mr. President, I have no hesitation in supporting this Bill, Sir. Over the years I have learned to appreciate the intrepac of the Legislature of some people's minds. However, I must say that in today's climate they have been compressed by artificial dimensions of their ability to read things into a Bill which are not there.

HON. DENNIS D. KWANG (CONTINUED): This is my view, Mr. President, in a very simple way. I thought that the record had made it clear why the BIA has disapproved. There is nothing nonconsistent about this action. It might be that it is so simple that it is going over the heads of some people who are looking for much more sophisticated reasons behind the bill. It looks to me to see how anyone could read into this bill any attempt to deprive the Government to impose a land tax, when in fact what the bill is seeking to do is to discourage the ownership of land by a particular type of company. It should be made very clear here, Mr. President, that this refers to corporations or companies, not to individuals. If a foreign national wants to own land in the Cayman Islands there is no restriction on that being done. They simply register the land the same as any Caymanian would do.

However, having said that, even if there was provision in our laws for foreign nationals not to be easily registered as owners of lands in this country it would not be any moral protection. What I am really saying is that we are one of the few countries where privately nationals can purchase land unrestricted and without permission. Maybe that is something that people with good imaginations would like to think about the effects of it, to occur to some. I am not particularly one myself but I am merely saying that other countries might feel it necessary to introduce such legislation. This certainly was the intent of this bill. As explained, this bill only affects one type of company. That is a company registered as International Business Company in the Cayman Islands and then not registered to do business in the Cayman Islands under the provisions of Law Part VIII of the Companies Law.

The Member said that he would like to see difference the census changed but, Mr. President, that is the whole reason why, more years ago after the Legislature had two some idea effect and the Companies Law was in being, and much activity was taking place in real estate, the Land Holding Companies Equity Always Transfer Tax was introduced. This was to prevent people from including land in the name of a company, transferring the shares in the company thereby transferring the land and circumventing the figures of the stamp duty.

So, if someone is suspected that value has to be placed to incorporate a company in Canada and that company is allowed to own land in the Cayman Islands, and then that person can transfer the shares in that company to Joe Jones thereby transferring the ownership of the land without paying the stamp duty, then he is going for problems, and he is asking Government to deprive itself of revenue and to make himself out of one and stone out of another. It is very clear how that this bill is seeking to do and it should be made very clear that they have not really given to foreign companies the right to business in Cayman. To the best of my knowledge the case cited in the media of the bill was the one solitary case where a foreign company did not register in the Cayman Islands and might be cut land in the Cayman Islands. In fact, they had obviously paid the money, bought the land and it was found that on the eight interpretation of our law the company could not own the land. This legislation is seeking to plug that loophole.

One Member said that there was no definition of a foreign company. Mr. President, section 163 of the Companies Law makes it very clear what a foreign company is, and there is no similarity between a local company and a foreign company with the others.

MR. JOSEPH C. SCHULZ (COMMISSIONER): A foreign company is merely required to register if it wishes to exercise the privileges of the Companies Law, a company who is incorporated elsewhere which registers the Memorandum and Articles of Association have only the intention of doing business. We have many of them across the place. All of the major banks would be registered as foreign companies since they are incorporated elsewhere. To find us see that little notice on the door, I believe, "Registered in the United Kingdom" or "Canada" as the case may be. It is an all black letter with the print of it. It is required under the Act.

This Bill is making it, as I said, impossible for other companies or the ordinary Cayman registered company to claim that exemption because it is a sales tactic now used by our Caymanian Insurance Agents and the only definition I suppose which could have been used - which in this sense means that it has not represented here. It has no legal right in the country as I would say that under the present circumstances. It should be made clear, Mr. Speaker, that this does not prohibit as I see it a foreign company from carrying land in the Cayman Islands. It is not complicating the land of any foreign company registered in the Cayman Islands.

What it says is that any foreign company which ceases to be registered in the Cayman Islands and the rest of it, will forfeit the land to the Treasury. This is no different to a company having struck off the Register or having dissolved. So there is nothing sinister or unusual about this, Mr. Speaker. It is not seeking to take any land which I would suppose is known to be registered in this country. This is why if previous companies might have got through and registered a piece of land, I would imagine this is why the notice is being given. However, the actual provision I would also say that really no notice would be given, because to my knowledge it has been the custom of the Registrar of Lands not to register as the proprietor of any piece of land any company which is not incorporate or registered in the Cayman Islands. It just is his refusal to so register the land on which the instrument was given. This now seeks to regularise the position which has been practised all along.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think should not be alarmed or become disquieted by believing that all of a sudden Government is out on a land grabbing spree and is going to confiscate all of the land owned by foreign companies or foreign individuals in the country. I am amazed to hear the Member question the difference between this type of company and any other company and wonder what happens to land owned by those other companies. If it is in a land holding company in name only of the shares are transferred. There is an obligation on every company to make a return once they fall inside the description of a land holding company. So there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that there is a world of difference between ordinary companies and the company, the ambit which is the subject of this Bill.

Section 2 of this Bill makes it very clear what is being talked about. If I may be permitted to read the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, maybe it will answer many things:

> "land" includes messuages but it may be enlarged or restrained by the interpretation of enactments by which any company or association may be entitled to a body corporate by whatsoever name so called or not - "

It is significant that the Bill contains here "enlargement of construction by whatsoever name so called" and "body corporate by whatsoever name so called" because it indicates that there are bodies corporate which

SEN. BARROW (D. Cobb) (CONTINUED): So the explanation I've received is that we have different terminology for the registration of corporations and the body corporate. However, to put it at its most basic there are two sections which are note:

> "(a) an ordinary company, as defined in subsection (1) of section 3 of the Companies Law;"

briefly that means that if the company that offers its first foreign company did not register for corporations and associations with the Local Registrar it would not be considered ordinary company, or if I'm not note:

> (b) formed and registered under the Companies Law; or
>
> (c) registered as a foreign company under part VIII of the Companies Law,"

To whom:

> "has or ceases to be registered as a corporation or in any other manner to hold land in the Islands."

So once the foreign company complies with the existing Companies Law and registers locally, then we have no problem. It's one item. It is only in the case of a company incorporated somewhere in Timbuktu which elects that it's now not time to half of the Cayman Islands without being registered here, and keep transferring the shares of the company without paying any stamp duty. That company has to worry about this bill.

I say that we would not be doing our jobs if we did not pass the legislation which is before us, which will stop that invasion of persons to that type of company the ability to buy any small land in the Cayman Islands without the payment of stamp duty. To have no right will cause that type of person to own land in the Cayman Islands anyway. It might be some money.

So, Mr. President, I have no doubt that persons who would want to be home [sic] Cayman Islands will understand what this Bill means, and I am sure that this Bill is not going to cause any loss of investment confidence in the country. In fact, I think it will enhance the confidence in the Government of the country.

With those remarks, Mr. President, I support this Bill wholeheartedly.

HON. SPOTTSWOOD: We are already sixteen [sic] years than would find making our statutory afternoon break. I hope it's obvious that the Member was coming to the end of his speech and found that I was mistaken. I think perhaps we might suggest proceeding for a further eleven [sic] three hours, and suggest that we may be put back to ten minutes.

AT 3.30 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Does any other Member wish to speak? The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, I have approved the Government's Motion in this Meeting but I want to all good constituents accept this Bill. I should say that not being a lawyer I would like to hear these Bills for a longer period in order to study them properly. However, I give my support to this Bill.

Mr. President, I have listened to the opposition and I have listened to the Government Bench. I cannot see where anyone in their right state of mind can say that this Bill is a contradiction to the Government's policy. I see where it can help the country. I do not think there is anyone here who could keep any of these companies registered here. It is only allowing those companies who are not registered here in this country the opportunity to register; pay the penalty of $50 to the Treasury now for the Treasury like $.5 per cent stamp duty when it wants to sell the property and therefore become a duly registered company in this country controlled, Mr. President, by our Caymanian law. It would certainly make Caymanians people who want to use the Cayman Islands as a laundromat; ground for their dirty money. They might not wash this Bill but up a little grove of wood and then launder the money through here.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that this Government is in any sense towards Caymanian ownership. I do not believe that they have any vision for any part of land law. Why, Mr. President, they know that they don't run Cuba. I believe that the Members of the Government Bench have better sense. I look over there, Mr. President, and all I see are intelligent people. Very hardworking chaps. There are only politicians, no statesmen. I do not feel, Mr. President, that we train in this country any different from the look of any industrial Yankee. I have every hope that within a few months this country is going to take off again. Yes, Mr. President, right now is my feeling a little slow period but this will not occur just overnight. The economy of this country has been down for about the last two to three years. We have gone all over the Caribbean. We suffered the loss of investor confidence when investors in the past bought land here but found out that they had no land. We suffered the loss of investor confidence when investors brought money in this country and when they found out that they had some land. We suffered the loss of investor confidence when foreign investors bought condominiums in this country, but when they got here they were told that they had none and had to go to court to get them.

Mr. President, where are the measures why our economy look this downward trend. How are the Opposition get up and say that this real Government is causing the investor to lose confidence? Mr. President, some of them have a track record. They have been in Government for eight years and we have just taken over for a mere nine-and-a-half-months.

Mr. President, it is not fair to look at the past but we must look at the past. We learn by our mistakes, Mr. President. Mr. President, the Opposition has talked about nationalization. The only time nationalization began in this country was during the previous administration. They nationalized

MR. M. BOWERS QUAN (TRINIDAD): Our Government attaches as much importance to the Bill as the Government of Guyana. This is a nationalization. The only time that nationalization was mooted in this country was when the former Elected Member for Dedrick Jack joined ranks with a number of the Honourable Members in the previous Government suggesting the nationalization of Caribbean Bauxite Company. Mr. President, that is the Indian way. Even while they agree with Socialist schemes, the Guyanese people are known for, precedent. They realize what is happening and I am sure that the people realize that their Government which they have elected by a tremendous victory is doing the best. When they help free the straight and narrow way "Panjo" will help us back when back on the track again.

I support the Bill, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable Third Official Member.

MR. VICTOR C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, what a difference twelve months make. First I am the mover and now I am supporting the Bill. However, I am very grateful to my learned friend for moving into the mind of moving the Bill.

You will agree with me, Mr. President, it is a Bill for a double check the Registration Bill. I have no doubt whatsoever that this Bill will cover effect the financial industry in the way. It will ensure no damage as will, Mr. President, in my view.

The Registrar of Lands incidentally operates on the three main laws when he deals with, the Registered Land Act, the Stamp Duty Act and the Land Holding Grant Ordinance Cap Land. In this area we are dealing with a country. There are a number of companies on the books, Mr. President. There is the ordinary Non-Resident company. There is the Exempt company and there is the Trade company. The reason for this Bill, Mr. President, and the effects of the Bill cause some of these companies any serious uneasiness.

In the areas of the Bill already introduced the Registrar of Lands, unfortunately for many years has refused to register any company wishing to purchase land at the Cayman Islands which has no registered office here, or else not registered in the Cayman Islands. While carrying out his duties, Mr. President, when a company presents him to purchase a parcel of land in the name, the Registrar requires documentation from this company that it is registered in the Cayman Islands, be it a certificate of incorporation or what have you. If it does not have this documentation he refuses to register the land in the company's name.

Prior to February, 1965 this was the operation. The Registrar refused to register any parcel of land in the name of a company which was registered elsewhere and has no registered office or what have you in the Cayman Islands. In February of this year the Learned Chief Justice ruled that that company could hold land in the Cayman Islands. Therefore, Mr. President, there cannot be many companies of this kind which registered land without one of the Although through the negligence of the Registrar of Lands and his unfortunate of dealing with the registration of land in companies as in Guyana, I would assume that we are dealing with only the one case which came before the Learned Chief Justice.

HON. MICHAEL O. LEAVITT (CONTINUING): The bill which is before this House today is seeking to re-establish the provision prior to the Supreme Chief Justice's decision. That is what a company, let us call it an alien company, must do before it can engage in business in the Cayman Islands. That company which will come here in the Cayman Islands. The main reason for that, Mr. President, is that we have no way of collecting stamp duty from a company which has no obligation to report anything whatsoever to the Registrar of Lands. Therefore, we will have no knowledge when the company changes shareholders.

Mainly, all it is the modification as set it, I would prefer to see the bill that the time will be moved to the Financial Secretary from the Cayman Islands Government. Mr. President, if we examine the Companies Law, Chapter 22 which has been on the books since 1961 or 1962, and look at section 179, if you would permit me, Mr. President, it reads:

> "Any property vested in or belonging to any company,"

I am relating all of this to a company which is struck off.

> "struck off the register under this Law shall thereupon vest in the Governor of the Islands for the benefit of the Islands, and shall be subject to the disposition of the Legislature."

Since that time, Mr. President, the word Treasurer was changed to Financial Secretary and the disposition was changed by the Governor in Council.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is nothing new about vesting of property in the Financial Secretary. I can think of no instance, Mr. President, during my time in the Department of Finance and Development that Government had ever taken any property from any company struck off the register. What generally happens is explained by the honourable Member Elected Member to that the Government receives the directive or description of the company in case that the fees which were due Government, and depending on what type of company we are talking about there are penalties also involved, penalties of several notices, Mr. President. Once those fees are paid Government makes the decision to restore the company to the rightful owners.

The reason for the Bill as I said before, Mr. President, is simply to show what we see as a very dangerous loophole in the payment of stamp duty and the collection of duty.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HON. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? I know the Member which to reply?

HON. MICHAEL J. DALEY: I think, Mr. President, I would be doing less than fulfilling my Ministerial responsibility to this Bill if I failed to reply to the debate which has taken place so far.

Mr. President, I have listened very attentively to the very eloquent which have been made in relation to this short Bill. I have in my opening speech endeavoured to make it quite clear that the Bill is merely designed to ensure that there is no ambiguity in the interpretation whereby the responsibility for the payment of stamp duty upon the effective change of ownership of land can take place.

HON. MICHAEL J. SHARRY (continuing): Members on this side of the House have explained and illustrated so amply the present situation and the great delinquency that there is no need for me to do anything further in pleasing the debate than to emphasize that hopefully this Bill and the exemption Bill the Corporate Investment Bill, have been made necessary because the family held belief for many years in this jurisdiction that a company which is a foreign unregistered company which purchases land in the Cayman Islands was not held to be so by the Grand Court, who held that it was just for purchasing land and registering it did not involve such a foreign unregistered company in carrying on business. That having enjoyed this decision and until this Government successfully appealed against the administrative decision of the Registrar of Companies not to register the document in the first, no such foreign unregistered companies were entitled and registered as owners of land in this jurisdiction. This anomaly must have been the first it may be that it is the only one. However, in order that this anomaly and any others that there may be must be made crimpels this Government has taken the unprecedented step of introducing in the Legislative Assembly two Bills one Bill entitled Legal Steps and the Registered Land Law. Both Bills have provided that the provisions really being debated here should not take until some four months time, the 30th September.

It is that time within which each foreign unregistered company which, upon having given us the assurance that they will not offer business in these Islands or offend by these our Bills, we seek to put on their own property then, if they have no land we have a duty for them.

What this Government in this legislature seeks to assure the, Mr. President, that necessary machinery are not carried in a manner contrary to the will and spirit of the legislature.

Mr. President, one other matter before closing I feel is worthy of comment. The Honourable Second Elected Member for Bodden Town has stated that one responsibility in presentation of this Bill to the general public is that the Association of Bylaws and Notices did not make its responsibility clear that the effect on application by me by my opening address would be. Mr. President, it is always a matter of balance in laying responsibility in relation to Legislative Language in a Memorandum of Objects and Reasons the effect of legislation without having to go so far and find oneself in the situation that the Memorandum of Objects and Reasons on face is many cases is far longer than the Bill. However, I do take note of the point and do concede to the responsibility for drafting Memorandum of Objects and Reasons appropriate with a Bill that persons reading the Bill and reasons will have as far as possible a clear understanding of the basic principles underlying the Bill which is encompassed.

I feel that if we are put in a Memorandum of Objects and Reasons to spend about "by" and for every Bill that the effect of such a memorandum would be explained. However, I have taken the point and I will endeavour to do so.

Mr. President, Sir, I commend this Bill to the House.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Registered Land Law be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOS.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: May we have a division, Sir?

DIVISION NO. 26

AYES:	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Dennis M. Foster	Mrs. G. Haig Bodden	Mr. Clayton A. [illegible]
Hon. Michael J. Bradley		
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson		
Hon. Duncan C. Ebanks		
Hon. W. Roman Bodden		
Hon. Capt. Charles L. McCormmell		
Hon. Vassel O. Johnson		
Mr. W. McKeeva Bush		
Miss. Zephyne L. Ebanks		
Capt. Henry S. McCormmell		
Mr. D. Kneeland Miller		
11	1	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

AGREED BY MAJORITY: BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. PRESIDENT: We have approximately ten minutes before the normal time for ending business. There may be either a short time to start a Second Reading debate on the Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1998 which would normally be the next one. I'm wondering whether though it might be helpful if we took the First Readings of the three Bills which are down on the Order Paper. This would enable us without having to suspend Standing Orders to take the Second and Third Readings on the same day at a later stage in this Session if it deemed by be convenient so to do. It will not take us very long to deal with the three First Readings if we do them in succession. Is it felt to be convenient to Members?

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps when you take the First Reading, just immediately after the First Reading of the Penal Code (Amendment) Bill if I could with your permission mention to Members a typographical transposition of words which has appeared in the green copy, otherwise it will be unintelligible to Members?

THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1998

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1998.

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps the Honourable Second Official Member would like to direct the House's attention to the printing error which has occurred.

MR. RICHARD J. DOYLE: I am very grateful, Mr. President, for because I thought that the honorable Members were doing their homework tonight and come with fine contributions, as I am sure that they will be very busy homework tonight, that it would require a certain amount of confusion.

If Members would turn to the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh page of the printed text of the Penal Code in the green copy they will find on page three section "(2) This section does not apply to a sentence for any offence whatever", which has three clauses that appear there, but should appear as (a), (b) the third page of the green copy which was handed, "(c) section 207".

Perhaps I can do it another way, Mr. President, that if Members turn to the third page which is section 197, that is the third page on the right hand side right at the top. Immediately before that (2) they would find right over in the margin "(2) This section does not apply to a sentence for any offence whatever". On the seventh page which would which I have read out, "(3) This section does not apply to a sentence for any offence whatever" should be deleted. The (a), (b) (c) those were renumbered in consultation I presume.

If any Member is still in doubt I will show it to them afterwards.

MR. SPEAKER: You will continue? Did I hear a Hon to second the Motion? Does he wished to have been read a first time and to set down for Second Reading.

If we could now take the First Reading of the main Bill.

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the House of Assembly Act (Revised) be deemed to have been read a First time and be set down for Second Reading.

THE REGISTRATION OF ELECTORS ACT, 1968

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE REGISTRATION OF ELECTORS ACT, 1968.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to disqualify persons who have not been ascertained of the certain offence for periods of years to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of their previous convictions, to amend the Law of Defamation and for purposes connected therewith be deemed to have been read a first time and be set down for Second Reading.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS M. FORTE: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of the House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

Perhaps before I put the question I could just say to Members in case any of them have not heard that unruly noise emanating from a member I have passed the information that it may be convenient, at least to many Members, if tomorrow we plan to break for lunch at 12.30 p.m., because a number of people interested in what appears have expressed. So I give notice of that so that Members may make their plans accordingly.

I will put the question that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO. AT 4.27 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M. TOMORROW, FRIDAY, 23RD MAY, 1986.

SECOND MEETING OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

SUMMARY
22ND MAY, 1988

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR G TAYLOR ESQUIRE, CMG, O/B - PRESIDING

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS R POTTER, CVO,OBE,JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J BRADLEY, QC, LLD	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS G REYNOLDS, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
HON BERNICE C BUCKLE	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON R WINSTON SOUNESS, MBE	MEMBER FOR SOCIAL EVOLUTION AND LABOUR
HON GARY SOLOMON C KENNEDYMITH	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
HON MICHAEL G DURNFORD, CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M RUSSELL ROSS	ELECTED SELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MRS KATHRYN J OGBURN	ELECTED REPUTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR LAWRENCE A STEVENS, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT WILLIAM M MYRTLE-HAMILTON	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR C KENT JONES	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST NORTH SIDE ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END
MR D KIRKLAND MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR. JOHN B MCLEAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RED BAY

APOLOGIES

MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN

QUESTIONS

1. QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BOOTHIA WISHES TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

NO. 58: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT THE COST WAS FOR DRAWING UP PLANS FOR CARPETING THE CORNER BUILDING, THE CROSS BUILDING (LAST RENOVATION), AND THE ADMINISTRATOR BUILDING (LAST RENOVATION).

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BOOTHIA WISHES TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

NO. 60: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO EXPEDITE THE ARRANGEMENTS OF TRANSPORT FOR THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, DURING THE COMING JULY SESSION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, 1966?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BOOTHIA TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

NO. 61: WOULD THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, DURING THE COMING JULY SESSION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, 1966?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BOOTHIA TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR CONSERVATION, WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION.

NO. 62: WOULD THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR CONSERVATION, WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION STATE WHETHER THE LEVEL OF NOISE CREATED BY AIR TRAFFIC AT THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT HAS BECOME SUFFICIENT TO NECESSITATE REPORTS AND DOCTOR'S CHITS BEING ISSUED TO EMPLOYEES IN THAT DEPARTMENT AS NOT CAUSED FROM TOXIC SUBSTANCES OR FUMES IN THE DEMONSTRATE WORKING ENVIRONMENT OF SUCH EMPLOYEES, AND THE NAMES OF THE INDIVIDUALS OR INSTITUTIONS THAT CARRIED OUT THESE TESTS?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM, AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 63: WOULD THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM, AVIATION AND TRADE STATE WHETHER ANY REPRESENTATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE TO INVESTIGATE COMPLAINTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MADE BY VISITORS TO THESE ISLANDS REGARDING THE HIGH RATES OF ACCOMMODATION AND THE HIGH COSTS OF AIR FARES TO AND FROM THE CAYMAN ISLANDS?

NO. 64: WOULD THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM, AVIATION AND TRADE STATE WHAT REPRESENTATIONS ARE BEING MADE TO ENCOURAGE AND PROMOTE MORE CHARTERED AND PACKAGE TOURS TO AND FROM THE CAYMAN ISLANDS?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER ANSWER FOR WEEK DAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AFFAIRS AND ENERGY

NO. 65: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER GIVE COST OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND HOSPITAL REPORTS MADE

NO. 66: WOULD THE HONOURABLE STATE WHEN THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCENIC SURVEY WILL BE MADE PUBLIC?

THE ELECTED MEMBER WHO HAS BEEN ASKED TO ANSWER THE HONOURABLE NOMINATED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 67: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER GIVE DETAILS OF THE TESTS HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT TO ASSESS RATES IN THE LOWER VALLEY DEAD AREA WHERE DOMESTIC WELLS AND WATER WELLS FOR CATTLE HAVE GONE SALTY?

NO. 68: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE GOVERNMENT HAS TO ENSURE THAT ADEQUATE AMOUNTS OF WATER CONTINUES TO FLOW FURTHER THAN IRRIGATION FOR UNDERGROUND SUPPLY, AND HOW SOON WILL THIS BE ESTABLISHED?

2. OTHER BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

(a) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.8/86
TREATY BETWEEN AUSTRALIA OR FOREIGN NATIONALS

(b) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.9/86
PAYMENT MORTGAGE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICES DURING LUNCH HOURS

(c) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.10/86
CONDUCT OF GOVERNMENT OFFICES DURING LUNCH HOURS

(d) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.11/86.
PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR AND CIGARETTE ADVERTISING ON THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

(e) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.12/86
STATUS OF PUBLIC TRUST

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS:-

(1) COMMITTEE STAGE

(a) THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (CHANGE) BILL, 1985
(b) THE CURRENCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986
(c) THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986
(d) THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

(54) SECURITY INTERESTS

(1) BILL CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (CHANGE) BILL, 1988
(2) STAFF TRAINERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(3) BUS CONDUCTORS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(4) THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

(55) PUBLIC HOLIDAYS

(1) BAIL CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (CHANGE) BILL, 1990
(2) BAIL CURRENCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(3) THE CONVENTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(4) BAIL ADJUDICATORS LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

(56) ARMED RESPONSE

(1) BUS PANEL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(2) THE MINISTRY OF POWER (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(3) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1988

(57) CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

(1) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(2) THE MINISTRY OF POWER (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(3) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1990

(58) FISCAL POLICY

(1) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(2) THE MINISTRY OF POWER (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(3) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1988

(59) TAXING POWERS

(1) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(2) THE MINISTRY OF POWER (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(3) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABBREVIATIONS	1
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO.5/65 - SINGLE DERMOID CONTAINING 32 FOREIGN BODIES	28
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO.6/65 - DOCTORS AVIATION AT NOONDILLA	31
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO.10/65 - OPENING OF CONSTITUENT STRIKES DOUBLE LOCK BOOM	33
PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE NO.11/65 - PROHIBITION OF CIGARETTE AND CIGARETTE ADVERTISEMENT IN THE CAPAVA TERRITORY	35
ADJOURNMENT	41

THURSDAY

23RD MAY, 1985

10.08 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Questions. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 69: Would the Member state what the cost was per square foot of carpeting the Treasury Building, the Courts Building (first renovation) and the Administration Building (last renovation).

ANSWER: The cost per square foot of carpeting the following buildings was as follows:-

(a) The Treasury CI$2.25 sq. ft.
(b) The Courts CI$2.49 sq. ft.
(c) The Administration CI$2.68 sq. ft.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. M. McKEEVA BUSH: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member say whether Public Works Department carried out this renovation, or whether it was a private company?

MR. PRESIDENT: By "this renovation" do you mean provided the carpet, because if you are talking about something quite different than it is....

MR. M. McKEEVA BUSH: The carpeting, yes, Sir.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the answer is that the carpet was supplied by a private company.

MR. M. McKEEVA BUSH: A further supplementary, Mr. President. Can the Member say what private company it was? Is that available?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Yes, Mr. President, it was Paramount Carpeting.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary I will ask the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town to ask the next question.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 80: Would the Member state what steps have been taken to investigate the allegations of bribery made by the Non-Attached Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council during the Budget and Throne Speech Debate in March, 1985?

ANSWER: In order that investigations may commence regarding allegations that any criminal offence has been committed, a complaint should be made to the police authorities. Once such investigation has been completed, if the matter is sufficiently serious, a police file is forwarded to the Attorney-General for consideration as to prosecution. No such police report has been received by the Attorney-General and no complaints regarding alleged offences of treason have been received by the police.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. BAIC BOOTH: Mr. President, may I ask a supplementary. Can the Member say if Honourable Members of Executive Council will make sworn statements to the police or any investigation they may have regarding this matter?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that is a question which can be properly addressed to the Honourable Second Official Member. It is not something within his responsibility. If I understood the supplementary might you were asking whether Members of Executive Council would make sworn statements. Am I correct?

MR. G. BAIC BOOTH: Yes, Sir, because this is such a serious matter. If they have information they should make statements under oath to the police.

MR. EDWARD A. PICKLES: Mr. President, a supplementary. In view of the answer would the Member state whether the allegations made by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member in the Budget and Throne Speech debate were without foundation?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a question the Member can properly be expected to answer, that is the Honourable Second Official Member.

MR. G. ALLY BOOCOCK: Mr. President, can I ask the Member if he will ask the Police Department to investigate this matter?

HON. MICHAEL J. HANDLEY: Mr. President, as previously stated the procedure is that if any individual believes that a criminal offence has been committed a complaint should be made to the police. If the Honourable Member has knowledge of any such offence I am sure that he will in a good citizens make a report to the police like any other citizen.

MR. G. ALLY BOOCOCK: Mr. President, my question was asked simply to get some knowledge. I heard something in the Assembly which I take it that the Member was making allegations responsible for the veracity of the statements.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that the Member has probably made his point. Would he like to move on to the next question?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR DOLOUR: (CONT'D) ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER OR ANOTHER MEMBER OF COUNCIL

NO. 61: Would the Member state what sorts of treason have been committed by Miss Constance of 44 mentioned to by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council during the Budget and Throne Speech debate 4th March, 1965?

ANSWER: No inquiries have been received by the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force concerning allegations of treason allegedly to have been committed by any persons on Island.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if he can state whether Government has a list of the members of the Committee of 44 or has any idea of its composition?

MAJ. MICHAEL J. GRADDY: To the best of my own personal knowledge I do not have a list of the members of the Committee of 44, but I would be very interested to receive one from the Honourable Member if he wished to give me one.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, since this matter was started by Executive Council they are the ones who should have the list. I am asking the Member of whose Executive Council of which he is a part started this business, will he give us the names? Or is it that no Committee exists? I think he has a duty to the public to tell them and not try to dodge the issue.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not quite sure whether there was a question in all that. It sounded more like a statement to me.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, since you mentioned it, I did make a question.

MR. PRESIDENT: It was well connected.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: My question is what arose the talk about the Committee of 44 was started by the Executive Council will he tell the Assembly whether a Committee in fact exists, or whether it was just a statement of the imagination of Executive Council?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think with respect that the supplementary is clearly objectionable. It says that talk was started by Executive Council. Talk was started by one Member of the House and I think that the substantive question which you have put does make clear that it was one particular Member of Executive Council who in the course of a speech referred to the Committee of 44. It was not Executive Council as such, so the supplementary I think would have to be disallowed.

MR. CARLTON A. FLOWERS: A supplementary, Mr. President, and it will be a supplementary, Sir. With anything as serious as an act of treason in this country, certainly the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force would have known of this. In view of the importance placed on the deliberations of this House, should any honourable Member be allowed to make statements without foundation?

MR. MICHAEL J. MYERS: ... hypothetical. Mr. President, may I say that not a very significant question?

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, I think that it is a question which can be answered by reference to... I would point more to being asked the question. Perhaps I was being asked the question, because, Standing Order 28(2)(b) says that if a question... does, that is if a question contains a statement of fact the Member shall make himself responsible for the accuracy of the statements. I think that there is probably something else. I cannot find it at the moment, but I think possibly there is something....

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Standing Order 28(2)(g) additionally...

MR. PRESIDENT: That relates to questions. That is what I had in mind first. Oh, Standing Order 28(2)(g). Representation of opinions. Yes.

HON. LEONARD A. STEVENS: Mr. President,...

MR. PRESIDENT: Standing Order 28(2)(g) says that a question shall not contain an expression of opinion.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: I think, Mr. President, that the many hypothetical questions of the Honourable Members appear to be well considered as the Minority of the Committee of 44. (LAUGHTER).

MR. S. ALEC DOUCETT: Mr. President, can I ask the Member of the Committee of 44 behind the Elected Members of Executive Council to be advised to the House?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the whole answer is in your remark. (LAUGHTER).

HON. LEONARD A. STEVENS: Mr. President, the point that I was making, Sir, and I can see them, this could be dealt with under Standing Order 28(2)(g) as hypothetical, but the statements which were made in the budget debate by the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council was certainly news thereat. My question was enquiring whether such statements as certain as Leader should be just glibly made in the House, because we have a public out there who are listening to the deliberations of this House?

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary I will invite the Queen Elected Member for Georgetown to ask his question, Mr. Ed.

THE QUEEN ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGETOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND HOUSING: (Continued)

MR. ED: Would the Minister state whether the tender of tents issued out at the Public Works Department were applied for by a Division Engineer only stating that the amount applied for in this Department was not enough for his purposes in the immediate working environment of that employee, and the names of the individuals or institutions that received such tents?

ANSWER: The matter is presently under investigation by experts from the United States Administration, and the results of these findings will be submitted to the Congress when received.

It is anticipated that in each of the coming two years, a release will be made. However, the matter is one which is not justified at the present time.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no supplementary let us move on to the next question.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR CENTRAL TOWN (THE HONOURABLE JOSEPH EDWARD) (MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FORESTRY): REGISTRATION FOR TOURISM ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

NO. 82: Would the Member state whether any efforts have been made to investigate complaints which have been made by visitors to these Islands regarding the very high degree of accommodation and the high costs of air fares to and from the Islands?

ANSWER: No formal complaints have been received by Government from visitors on these matters. However, discussions have been held with hoteliers and the difficulties regarding the cost of accommodation and air fares which have resulted in very attractively priced packages being made available to the travelling public.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: A supplementary, Mr. President. Perhaps this supplementary might have needed some time for the Member. If not, I will bow to your ruling, Sir. Would the Member state the number of arrivals by air for the first quarter of 1986, and how this compares with the corresponding period in 1985?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not truly think that that is a supplementary. I dare say that the Member will be prepared to get that information for you. However, I cannot allow it as a supplementary. It does not arise out of the answer.

HON. E. CLYDE FOSTER: Mr. President, this is the subject of another question which is put forward by the Second Member for East End, which will be dealt with on another day.

MR. PRESIDENT: To be truthful I had forgotten that.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Mr. President, I have another supplementary which perhaps the Member could supply the information or do me if the right hon. Member could state what information is readily available. What the Member feels the average time spent by travellers using hotel accommodation during the first quarter of 1986?

HON. W. MCKEEVA BODDEN: Mr. President, if the Member is referring to the average length of stay, it is between four and five days.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MRS. LORRAINE T. OLIVETT: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to ask a supplementary here. Could the Mexican state whether or not he was able to carefully read and observe what was printed in a recent issue of Time Magazine regarding the American invasion in the type of destruction they are looking at now private-wise?

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not sure that that is really a supplementary which carries out of this, though not having seen the article I do not know. If it was an article about refreshments perhaps.

MR. LEONARD A. STEVENS: I think that it does carry out of the question, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: You do?

MR. LEONARD A. STEVENS: If I may, Sir, the article which was in the Time Magazine was the part of answered by question, referred to the facilities which had been adopted now in the American public in furnishing to Europe because of the language and the cheap cost there and communication which they are getting there. This is why I am putting the question, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I see. Well I will....

MRS. M. MORGAN BOLTON: Yes, Mr. President, I read the article in fact it was actually brought to my attention by the Second Planter/Member for Georgetown originally. By the way, in London Department that we are dealing with a highly progressive, hard headed worker. This is the reason why we have not been following and are trying in an effort to make our package known to the Cayman Islands more extensively known.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question no. 24?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE ADMINISTRATOR GENERAL WHETHER HE CONSIDERS THAT THE RESTRICTIONS FOR TOURIST ARRIVALS AND STAYS

NO. 24: Would the Minister state what efforts are being made to encourage and promote more charters and package trips to and from the Cayman Islands?

ANSWER: Cayman Airways has been negotiating with charter operators for charters to operate to and from points in the USA and Canada and the Cayman Islands. Arrangements have been approved for a number of charters from the USA and Canada. Such agreements were granted after careful consideration of their effects on the continued economic health of the Islands, having due regard to the fact that it is desirable to have the Cayman Islands benefit from tourism charter operations in the Caribbean.

Alternative package tours are currently in the marketplace and are already monitored and reviewed as necessary.

INTERPRETATION:

MR. G. ILLO ACOSTA: Mr. President, the amount payable that Guinea Africaine is seeking to have allocated into Canada and the United States. Can the Member ask if the present equipment, that is the F27 jets, will be able to handle the Canadian charters?

MRS. M. BERNICE PICKUP: Yes, Mr. President, the F27 aircrafts can handle additional charters, and as the charge begins to materialize you exercise Canada with no problem.

MR. LINDSAY A. PIERCE: Mr. President, without asking for exact figures, could the Member state whether the Turks and Caicos and New York charter routes have been successful for Cayman Airways?

MR. PRESIDENT: I really do not think that that is supplementary, because your first question was "what efforts are being made to encourage and promote more charters multi-million tours". I think that if you want specific information about past performance on a route you will need to put down a question about it.

MR. LINDSAY A. PIERCE: Thank you, Mr. President. The nature of the supplementary related directly to the previous question in that if the Turks and Caicos and New York charter routes were successful, it could be assumed that there would be an expansion in this service. If they were not, then perhaps further considerations would be given. This is the reason for the supplementary, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I can understand the reason, but it still does not mean that it obtains into the answer given. If you read standing orders you will find that it has to, in fact, be a completely precise question but it would sometimes seem as a supplementary question. The Member really be that Members who answer questions cannot be expected to be ready to supply information which does not directly arise out of the answers they give. Anyway, I dare say that the Member will be prepared to attempt to make that information available to you in due course. I am not sure.

HON. H. HUBERT SOLOMON: Yes, Mr. President, I can make that information available, but the original question was in fact dealt with otherwise and package tours to and from the Cayman Islands, so I think that you are quite right to request a supplementary in connection with Turks and Caicos and New York charters. However, if the Member is desirous of having this information I can supply it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question no. 22.

THE SPEAKER ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER/EXECUTIVE MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AIRPORTS AND TRADE

NO. 22: Would the Member state what the cost of the Lakehead and Monarch Report was?

ANSWER: The cost of the Lakehead and Monarch Report was CI$37,450.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. H. MARSHALL BUSH: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member say whether the report was accepted by Government?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that this is a supplementary. In any case I think that that question was asked yesterday and it was answered yesterday?

MR. H. MARSHALL BUSH: I was just trying to get him to repeat it to make certain, Sir. Anyway, Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT: Are you satisfied...

MR. H. MARSHALL BUSH: Could the Member say whether Government will take the report?

MR. PRESIDENT: I thought that was asked that question yesterday and had an answer to it. Let us try the Elected Member for North Side now.

MR. D. RICHARD MILLER: Yes, Mr. President, in light of the answer given yesterday, could the Member...

MR. PRESIDENT: Which yesterday are you talking?

MR. D. RICHARD MILLER: No, yesterday.

HON. MICHAEL J. GRADDY: That is not a supplementary.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, nonetheless let me make sure that it is a supplementary which arises out of the answer to today's question.

MR. D. RICHARD MILLER: Yes, Sir. Since this report that Cabinet has now there may have been reports which Government might have in existing this amount of money which are not going to be accepted?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that the Member can be expected to answer that question. It is not merely a supplementary. You could ask a substantive question to that effect if you wished.

MR. H. MARSHALL BUSH: Mr. President, whether supplementary, I am not certain if it is permitted as a supplementary, but let me try to....

MR. PRESIDENT: You may try.

MR. H. MARSHALL BUSH: Could the... tonight, Mr. President, I would just ask this question too. Of course anyway,

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, if nobody else is going to ask another supplementary you may ask another question now. Go now.

MR. H. MARSHALL BUSH: Mr. President, you see, if I may say so, this is when we get our questions still up.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST BAY TO ASK THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY REPRESENTING THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND MARINE

NO. 86: Would the Member advise when the Lawnching Aid Research Report will be made public?

ANSWER: Government is studying this report which was a part of the Government development plan completed in 1982.

The report will most likely be tabled at the next Meeting of the House in September this year.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. M. MCKENZIE BUSH: Mr. Speaker, Sir. I wonder whether the Member could let us on this side of the House see this report before September?

MR. A. PEARCE'S REPLY: Mr. President, if request is given by Executive Council I have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary question no. 87, the Elected Member for East Bay.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 87: Will the Member state whether any investigations or tests have been carried out in areas close to the Lower Valley Lane area where domestic wells and wells used for cattle have gone salty?

ANSWER: Ground water quality is being monitored approximately on the water levels throughout the Island at a three monthly interval.

Since October, 1982, 26 domestic wells have been monitored in the Lower Valley area. The programme was started at the end of the wet season just before the development of the well field commenced and the most recent tests were carried out in March of this year, 4 months into the dry season.

During this period, October, 1982 to March, 1983, the salinity of these domestic wells has risen by an average of only 6 per cent, from 280 parts per million chlorides, to 298 parts per million, well within the 600 parts per million level recommended by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO).

This change occurs normally during the dry season and returns to normal during the end of the wet season. The water authority do not value of any domestic wells in the Lower Valley area increasing in salinity to the extent that they can be considered to have gone salty, that is, above 600 parts per million. The water tables usually occur at this time of the year, the dry season, as a result of tidal influence on the ground water level.

The situation with regard to some specific wells in the area is somewhat different. There has been some intrusion over a number of these wells to the North of the Lens and just South of the perimeter of the swamp. These are shallow wells that can be affected by the lowering of the water table.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no supplementary. Oh, yes the Second Elected Member for Golden Lane.

MR. G. SAIZ BODDEN: It was such a long answer, Mr. President it took me some time to read it. The question which I would like to ask is with regard to the shallow cattle wells. Could the Member say if there is any evidence that the salinity has increased because of the canals; or is it because of extraction of ground water?

HON. VASSEL G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, the answer is that there has been no indication from the tests carried out that these wells have gone salty because of the extraction from the Lens. In fact before the development of the Lower Valley Lens the Water Authority expressed its concern as to the effects of canalization on the integrity of the Lens. Hydrologists were brought in to study the situation and the initial major endeavour the people might have some determined effort. A recognition was placed on the canalization in the area and data is still being collected. It is hoped that enough data will be available by the end of this year for a more exhaustive report.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary the Elected Member for East End may ask question no. 88.

THE ELECTED MEMBER WHO HAS BEEN GIVEN LEAVE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SPOKESMAN REPRESENTING THE MINISTRY OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING MATTERS:

NO. 88: Will the Member state what plans Government has to ensure that another means of water supply is identified besides that supplied from underground supply, and how soon will this be identified?

ANSWER: Government is investigating the possibility of providing desalinated water as an alternative to ground water to supply the most densely populated areas of the Island, George Town and West Bay.

One of the most promising sources is the waste heat from Caribbean Utilities Company's generations. Government and Caribbean Utilities Company have entered into a joint venture to fund a consultative study to investigate this proposal. Full proposals are expected to be prepared within the next two months.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. G. SAIZ BODDEN: May I ask, Mr. President, if the new source of desalinated water is adopted by Government, would it be an alternative to the ground water supply, or would it be supplement it?

HON. WILLIS G. HUNTER: Mr. President, if it is possible to supplement later, now the source I have just mentioned, namely the water head of Caribbean Utilities Company's generators, this will be in addition to the small water resources being used at the present time.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary to the one to Item 2 on today's Agenda, Private Members' Motions, namely Member's Motion No. 4/85. Before the Member rises Hansard, I think that I should bring one point to be noticed and that of the House. I found meeting me this morning an amended version of the motion. The Member had told me that he might if it were possible to amend it, but the Standing Orders do say that five days notice of motions has to be given. I think, therefore, that the procedure that the Member has to follow is very basically the motion as it was first moved and as it was circulated to Members five days ago, and then each Member is free to do as he wishes in connection with the version which is circulated this morning.

Let me put it another way. I do not think that it is right or would be in the knowledge of the House to allow a procedure that a motion gets circulated to Members, and then on the very morning on which it is going to be debated a revised version of it which might be substantially different is presented to the House.

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS: Is that a...

MR. SPEAKER: Yes?

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS: I was wondering, Sir, whether that meant that you were interpreting Standing Order 24(2) so that the amended motion materially alters the scope or principle of the original motion?

MR. PRESIDENT: Oh, thank you, I am not sure that I had been reading Order 24(2). Is there anything that might have been omitted by mistake?

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS: It was that the original.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry? It says motion shall run from the time that the original motion was given. I see, yes. Alright, Bill, so that case I think that I am entitled to allow the Member to move the motion.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, it states that Standing Order 24(2) shall apply in that case, which says that not less than one hour's notice shall be given of an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Standing Order 24(2) says that Standing Order 24(3) shall not apply.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Oh, shall not apply. Sorry, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. So, provided that I am satisfied that the amended motion does not materially alter the scope or principle of the original motion, I may allow it. I think that on that basis, the amended version that you have had circulated today may be allowed. Contrary to what I stated earlier, you are entitled to move the version which was distributed this morning.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 3/85

ISRAELI PERSONS CONVICTED OF NAZI ATROCITIES

MR. W. HOWARD RUSH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move private member's Motion No. 3/85 standing in my name.

HON. GILBERT S. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall you...

MR. W. HOWARD RUSH: Mr. Speaker...

HON. HOWARD S. BUTLER: Perhaps it would be helpful if we were told just how the benefit of the...

MR. SPEAKER: I think that be is probably going to read it out now.

MR. W. HOWARD RUSH: Yes, Mr. Speaker;

"WHEREAS the historical possibilities of this Commonwealth are becoming increasingly;

AND WHEREAS the nation has become a fundamental element in the development of other nations;

AS IT REQUIRES that the United Kingdom Government be requested to take immediate steps to negotiate treaties with the countries of origin of the said persons for the purpose of repatriating them to their native countries; and that, pending the negotiation of such treaties, all possible steps be taken to ensure that as far as possible these organizations are not kept in our prisons;

AND AS IT FURTHER REQUIRES that the United Kingdom Government be asked to give such negotiations top priority, and that a progress report be made to this Honourable House at the next regular Meeting by the Honourable Member whose private bill this subject fills."

Mr. President, the Colonization of the Arctic before we I am sure must be obvious to all Members of this Honourable House and to all Bermudians as well.

A few years ago Government undertook the project of providing urban facilities in this nation. The project entailed a large expenditure, as I understand it somewhere in the vicinity of $2 million to date. At that time Government promised and assured the people that new homes were being done to replace those that were demolished. One of their prime reasons for the project was to prevent Bermudians merely from becoming involved in repeated criminal activity. Crimes was committed particularly about our youthful offenders. At the time this project facilities in this country could only accommodate 12 offenders.

MR. H. HOLMES SMITH (CONSERVATIVE): The present facility at Montebello was intended to comfortably accommodate 81 inmates. Earlier this year at one point there were 117 inmates incarcerated. A great proportion of these are from outside this colony, consisting of offenders coming from murder to rape, including drug trafficking and burglary.

Many of these consider, in my opinion, are a hardened criminal type from which we should be protected our own youthful offenders. But it is a fact that the vast majority of the Caymanians presently serving time at Montebello are there for minor drug offences such as possession a small or lesser of ganja, or for some other drug related crime, in my opinion, such as theft or an obvious attempt to secure the drugs to satisfy their growing habits.

One of my constituents pleaded that more was to be taken for a different and more effective approach in the most possible ways our young people. Until our Government seems to be only concerned about constructing these young people, housing them in conditions rather sectarian prescribed by this Honourable House, and taking them to Montebello to join the growing number of hardened international criminals, filling up the limited facilities at Montebello.

In my mind's eye, Mr. President, I see our young people coming out from prison at the end of their two or three year sentences better educated in criminal ways by these hardened international criminals. By doing else, one, would be expected when these youths are locked up with these people day after day, week after week, month after month, only to be with no rehabilitative programmes. Then we wonder, Sir, that they have to rob their own many Caymans.

Had the last Government, Mr. President, not left the treasury on the verge of bankruptcy my opinion many perhaps would have been no valid reasons for these incarcerated criminals to pay their debt to our society. However, we all know that there is no money now for that. Nor is there any money to be seen for the rehabilitation programmes which is desperately needed in order to return our youthful offenders as a useful place in our society.

I am not only going to blame Keating for these things, Mr. President, but the responsibility rests squarely on the shoulders of the new Government to provide these things and to stop these things from happening. Beyond all of this I do my opinion, Sir, that rehabilitation of any prisoner can be better accomplished in his own environment where he can have visits from family and friends with whom he can communicate.

The purpose of this action, Sir, is to urge Government through the relative security, with all speed to seek some agreement whereby these prisoners will be returned to their native lands to serve their sentence. In the meantime this Government might examine the possibility of decentralizing some of the prisoners serving time for minor offences, whether it would be after they have served a part of their sentence or whatever. However, that is left to the Government. They must find a solution.

Mr. President, in the Estimates for this year there is an income of $1,303,880 allocated for the prison service of this country. That is a large expenditure. If the figures which I have been supplied with are anywhere near correct we are already spending like $10,000 per month to maintain these prisoners. This, Sir, is a very substantial sum; a very substantial part of the revenue budget something in the region of $120,000 per year.

MR. P. KEATING (DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER): Mr. President, it is my feeling that this money could be much better used in rehabilitating our own people up there. On our visit to Rarotonga just last week, Sir, I was quite surprised at the number of people up there who I will not call by their name did not come to my eyes when I saw the education, and the unemployment, Mr. President, because some people have named it a hotel and you could count it that is a certain extent. However, Sir, whereas last census was somewhat of 12,000 and we see the discrepancy we have a figure for unemployment we see a sum for pensions and we see another sum for the people, Mr. President, this touches the soul of this little country.

I hope, Sir, that I have made my thoughts clear to all Members and I beg their support in unanimously passing the name of the motion. The motion is very clear, it is asking Government to ensure as far as possible that non-Cook Islanders are not kept in our prisons. I think that it is possible, Sir, I want to make it absolutely clear that it is not my intention to deprive our society of those pound of flesh from foreign offenders, so I do not want to hear anyone saying what I am trying to take them away from. However, we have to do something and as I say it is up to the Government to do it. I do not want to deprive society of those pound of flesh which is rightfully theirs. When these people have disadvantaged ourselves in this island way. However, lastly I am more than concerned about the number of foreign prisoners. I am more than concerned about our juvenile recidivists. Whatever, most important, I am concerned about our growing need to prevent and to rehabilitate our own offenders.

Mr. President, just in case some of the Democratic Members might be thinking and saying no, let me say it clearly that human progress is relative economic and predictable case, Sir, a look at history reveals that no social science rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. Every step towards the goals of justice requires scientific and energetic, the lifelong devotion and painstaking efforts of dedicated individuals. Without persistent efforts time freely becomes an ally of the resurgent and primitive forces of irrational emotionalism and social destruction. This time in our history, Sir, is no time for apathy; no time for complacency. This is a time for vigorous and positive action. All I am asking Government is to step up their speed. I know that they will be saying that they are trying. They are doing something. All I am asking is for more speed, more faster and faster.

I am asking Democratic Members to say yes to this motion. Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is Private Member's Motion No. 6/85. It is now open for debate but before we resume the debate on it I think it may be convenient to take our customary morning break. I would like to suggest that the break be fifteen minutes, because I believe that a number of Members would like to break for lunch at 12.00 p.m. So I suggest that we suspend proceedings for not more than ten minutes.

THE PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Honourable Floyd Crouter.

DEBATE ON TRUDEAU MEMORIAL MOTION NO. 2/83

MR. DENNIS F. PORTER: Mr. President, I rise to support the motion in the amended form. Perhaps instead of waiting until the most opportune time to give a progress report I can give it this morning, Mr. President. Members are aware of the long-standing arrangement which we have had with Canada whereby our prisoners, that is to say Canadian prisoners may be sent back to Canada and they accept them willingly. However, this has not been a reciprocal agreement, and we have been negotiating with America for the last four to five months to see if we can get them to provide legislation whereby Cayenniens sentenced in America might serve their term here. We are still negotiating with them and we could then reply in the manner. As far as the United Kingdom is concerned there is provision there in their laws for Britishers sentenced, say here, to be sent under certain circumstances to serve prison sentences in the United Kingdom. We have never had an opportunity to look into this out before, but I am sure that to be workable if the need ever becomes necessary.

It is about January this year through our British Embassy in Washington which is the capital of Honduras we asked them to approach the Government there for the purpose of enquiring whether they would agree to make arrangements for the exchange of prisoners. At that time we had no fixed views. We sought a response from that Government.

Other countries, Mr. President, it is now informed to late 1983 by the Foreign Office that the Council of European Convention on the transfer of sentenced persons had been signed by the United Kingdom. This Convention provides a framework for transfer of the kind which we contemplate. Signatories to this Convention include the United States and Canada, as well as many other European countries. Others may sign it in due course. We were also prepared to assist the United Kingdom to sign on our behalf and we have replies shortly here. As a result this will enable the United Kingdom to ratify the Convention and to enter into parallel arrangements. Our understanding is that the ratification is close about now. In fact it may have already taken place and is under the Cayman Islands. The United States is expected to ratify this Convention some time later this year.

So, Mr. President, this has been done already. As to the timing this is not up to me. We cannot control that. We have to wait until these things have been completed and the necessary action taken by other Governments. It is inevitable that there will be unavoidable delays but we have gone a long way towards what the motion is seeking to do.

Mr. President, what is I said is a short progress report on what has been done already. However, I would like to comment on a few other matters which the mover made. I should like to comment on his plea for more flexibility for our officers. Mr. President, this is a humanitarian, sensitive topic. I, Sir, think that we will need the input from many experts to know how to tackle this. Balancing these matters is tasking them out in Africa is not the answer, Sir. Possibly the answer lies not out in Africa but while he was on Exile the international authorities

MR. DENNIS H. ROSTOW (CONTINUING): I am sorry if I said something which, logically I should not have said, Sir. Most of our families do share [illegible] simple, they are not sheep ahead for smoking a pound of gravy, Sir. I'd be more surprised than that. The majority of them are beautiful, educated and it is going to take a lot of effort to [illegible] them. Not only that, Sir, most of them know what try to make you believe that this is their first offense and if they are not they will simply add it to their [illegible] charges have consecutive as long as your arm. These people need a very definite type of help which I do not know if we can provide here right now

I agree, Sir, that we should try to be away with a case that we might just [illegible] simple for [illegible] purchase. However, Sir, I think that if the [illegible] made a proper check he would find that most of them are the first simple case not to [illegible] a crime, Sir. There were people in possession of it. They were pushing it and making money out of it instead of giving out and making an honest living by getting an honest day's work for honest pay.

It is my opinion, Sir, that the great majority of our people in these are too lazy to work. They want to make money by [illegible] drugs, easy money. However, this is not as easy possible as [illegible].

Mr. President, as I said, Sir, I support the motion and I recommend it to the other Members.

MR. MISSISSIPPI: The Second Elected Member for George Town.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I rise in support of Private Member's Motion No. 6/85 which seeks to establish a treaty between countries of foreign persuasion. The main point raised today, Mr. President, and one which was raised by the previous speaker addresses the question of what is the purpose of incarceration? The Member mentioned that it is very little use having with some of the inmates at the Northward Prison and while I partly agree with the Member I nonetheless feel that this is a matter of a philosophical view of the problems which are being experienced by our people who are sent to Northward Prison. The problem as I see it, Mr. President, is a two-fold one. When a person is sent to Northward Prison there should be two basic reasons in mind, one is punish him for his unlawful acts; for his offence, and the next argument is against the probability that prisoner on performing him so that he may be released back into society.

On the importance of the motion, Mr. President, I am quite happy to hear the short progress report from the Honourable Official Member that a reciprocal agreement is indeed being made with foreign countries and that we hope to be a party to such a Convention, and that we will be able to have a bilateral agreement under the underlying Convention.

The Private Member's Motion No. 6/85, Mr. President, suggests that the United Territories of the Northward Prison are being overcrowded. This is one of the basic reasons for the motion before us which seeks to send foreign inmates back to their foreign land.

Also, Mr. President, it is the case that because of the high percentage of foreign inmates at the prisons Government's financial funds are being strained to the limit.

MR. LEOPOLD A. PIERRE [COMMISSIONER]: Answer, Mr. President, I wonder what would be the position of the Caroline Islands today if America took the attitude of sending back to us all our citizens in opposed schools. I believe, Sir, that before we take any action in this matter it must be handled at the very highest level and this is why I am pleased to hear this Bill is being given consideration by Government at the very top level. This cannot be followed by just emotions. We must take a very sensible approach to this matter.

We have experienced who knows that what is happening at Northward Prison is indeed the best service we can give. However, my question, Mr. President, is this is it indeed the best we can give? There are no rehabilitation programmes at Northward prison, no very limited rehabilitation programmes. Why did not our Government in March allocate a part of the funds set aside for the Northward Prison to be utilized for implementing the rehabilitation programmes there? Why were our inducements more in expending the prison cells? Mr. President, in my view this is a very retrogressive step. We are saying to our people, 'We will build bigger and better prisons to lock you up in'. By providing with the manner after the fact. Our primary focus should be on keeping as many away from those offenders or potential offenders as the term implies. We should be providing more funds for our social services, so that people of venture could go and work with these people, but not the way we do it to them 'We will show you who is bigger. We will show you that if you offend you will be pushed in prison and left to rot'. Mr. President, instead of taking a positive approach to the problem we are taking a negative approach. Unless we offer the type of programmes which will indeed rehabilitate our people they become institutionalized. They come out into society and as a result they find themselves getting back into trouble. This should not be only concerns. They come back into society, and how many of us here would be prepared to offer them employment. They find themselves in a vicious circle society and inevitably they find themselves back in the house of Northward Prison.

A week ago, Mr. President, a number of the Members of this Legislature visited the Northward Prison and while there we took pains to give to the Director of the prison for the work he is doing with the limited facilities available to him, much more can be done, Mr. President. It is somewhat impotent to expect without the needed financial support from this Government. We visited prisoners. We had the opportunity to sit and listen to them as they expressed their views, and the main theme set amongst which came to us forcefully was their urgent need and want to do something. Most of them realize what they have done wrong and that they must be punished for their wrong but, Mr. President, they were crying out for some form of rehabilitative programmes. They were suggested to us, Mr. President, that the little limited woodwork which they were doing they were deprived of doing. What will the message be, Mr. President? Will we continue to expect the present inadequate accommodation or will we take the pro-active and realistic approach that it is important for us to deal with this matter at the grassroots level?

I thank you, Mr. President, and I support that the Second Elected Member for West Bay North and the Leader who has just risen has walked around. We are not talking about such animals, Mr. President. We are talking about human beings in that prison. We are talking about a facility in which one of us here might find ourselves in the future, especially if the visions of Drugs have gone through.

MR. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS (CONTINUING): Parliament told us, Mr. President, that the many letters which they wrote to check facilities were being stored in the garbage bins. Other parliaments went above and beyond the letters in the garbage bins; a bad reflection, Mr. President, on our prison system. Other parliaments, Mr. Speaker, went to the point where, of the Bank of Barbados, the secretary of state or whatever, they were being looked up in their cells for up to 23 hours.

I was happy, Mr. President, to hear that the Government has taken to heart the problem of remand prisoners. I think that this is a possible step forward. It was envisaged, Mr. President, for remand prisoners to be held in Northward for weeks on end pending being heard in the courts. I was the statement to be innocent until proven guilty, but the presence in the penitentiary where a man is held on remand without even being told when he will be heard. So as I said, I am happy to hear that this matter is being taken into hand.

At least 50 per cent of our prison population knows the age group of males 20 years of age, and those people who are kept in Northward prison will be quite frankly ruined spending their terms. However, what will be their attitude when they come back into society? The question, Mr. President, why I bring these points up is that in my opinion the greatest problem in Barbados today is not overcrowding caused by juvenile remands. The biggest problem in Barbados today is the lack of rehabilitation facilities for our people so that they can be rehabilitated and come back into our society and not just stagnate there and come back into prison after two or three weeks out of prison.

Mr. President, we continue to consult supplementary expenditure, to provide budgetary provision in our annual Estimates and to raise taxes to expend facilities, but nowhere are we frankly attacking the most needed area which is presently our young people in the future.

I was talking to an economist or whatever he want to call him, who spent about ten years in Jamaica. The route which he is employed by today he learnt while he was in prison in Jamaica. We thank the Jamaican Government for allowing him the opportunity to learn a trade while he was incarcerated.

Mr. Speaker, another vexing problem at the Northward Prison is the classification system of these prisoners. Their facilities are not all unlike facilities like we have exist in the Cayman Islands. A lot of these prisoners are people who are constitutionally deprived people who are victims of a society, and people who do not have facilities and resources here to serve up to Northward Prison. Some of them walk in the prison to pay their fine, and their daughters and their husbands and whatever. Many times when it is raining these poor people have to stand in the rain and get wet because they have no car or bus or vehicle to get in, like reasons being. Mr. President, that there is no facilities which they can get, even out of the rain.

I repeat myself, Mr. President, when I attempt to describe the Members of the Legislature the night to where the prisoners when they feel it is necessary. We have now been told that the prisoners have to request that we come particular, while the prison authorities unilaterally adopt this practice as their rules? Will they use it at that Members are promptly advised when appointments requests to see them? Mr. President, this is a problem about which I feel very strongly but I know, Mr. President, that it is the wish of the House to leave here at 12.00 p.m.

MR. LEONARD A. STANDOW (CONTINUING): As before closing I would wish to say, Mr. President, that I do not see the matter problem as that of overcrowding because of foreign inmates. I see the major problem of a lack of rehabilitative facilities at the Northland Prison.

Mr. President, I approve the motion, Private Member's Motion No.8/85. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak to the motion? The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. J. ERSKINE SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to support Private Member's Motion No. 8/85. I would like to congratulate the mover of the motion. I think that he is continuing to espouse to us his Party's views which he told us about in the Budget Session. It seems as though the Second Elected Member for George Town is getting me very mildly. I would also like to congratulate Government on the action they have taken in this regard. If they can continue to be successful in their attempts for repatriation of foreign prisoners as mentioned before, I think that it will go a long way to alleviating some of the problems which exist at Northward Prison.

However, Sir, I would not like to see deportation alone adopted as a method of punishment for foreign criminals who come to these Islands, because in the international drug trade that results in a very minor form of punishment indeed, and we would have the international traffickers flocking to our shores if their only form of punishment was going to be deportation. I believe that they should be imprisoned for their crimes but I support the notion that they must be repatriated to serve their sentences in their homeland, there are many advantages in this to our society.

So, I support the motion, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right to reply?

MR. K. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. Speaker, I know that some of the honourable Members have commitments at 12.00 p.m., and I might be a little longer than five minutes in my reply maybe 12.55 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, you try.

MR. K. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank those Members who have expressed support for this motion by speaking and to recognize not me but thank you to those who cast down and kept quiet, and hope that they will be moved to support the motion. Also, I wish to especially thank the Honourable First Official Member whose Ministry has responsibility for the prisoners report but given as the most regular Monday of this House, so I am expecting that now too.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the Treasury is concerned it is not safe as to this Government. I realize that when I first thought about the motion with your help, Sir, that while I was speaking to it would not be an easy task, especially since we are not a self-governing country. Whatever one wants the Queen's representative in this country and that is his name. The treaty will fall under, Sir. However, let me say, Sir, that I am expressing that all possible because he moved so that we can get somewhere on this issue.

MR. P. HARDEN also (inaudible): Secretary, as I said in my responsible, that is our Government, for the beauty that Government must take whatever steps necessary to do what the Union asks if Government is going to succeed it. The Union says that passing the requirements of each a treaty, that all possible steps be taken to ensure that on for as possible non-Indemnities are not kept in our prisons.

Mr. President, I do not want one single Member of the Government side to interpret this motion if what the Union asks is not going to be accepted only. Let us not push ourselves. I do not want to be proud of the book why build. I have done a good job in presenting it. Certain it that we want why action we must get.

Mr. President, I am really worried that kind of measure always saying, and saying only. Mr. President, I do not asking Government to just let out anyone. I know full well that when a person is incarcerated in prison for committing an indemnities we only stipulating that if he was going to rehabilitate, if that is that this country really wants, instead of wasting a million to say that he have a purpose or to attend treaty or every years, I realize that with these kind of people, nothing that we do not the matter. I realize that when they go there they must pay their price and I thought that I had said that. I know that there are many steps for many different reasons. I believe my colleague was trying about somebody learning crimes before his come into us, that he was - I see the Honourable Deputy Official Member laughing but I am not going to let my friend - he was taken up for committing acts before his more recent finding. Because, I am not going to say, that he was guilty either. It was wrong of the Member to do that. That was taken from my constituency and he went to court quickly by the courts before we say that he was guilty.

Mr. President, as I said the motion asks that Government must take all possible steps to ensure that as far as possible non-Indemnities are not kept in our prisons. I do not care whether they are from Canada. I do not care whether they are from Pakistan. I do not care where they are from, but if they are here and it is any possibly $10,000 a month, $120,000 a year, we must do something about that alternative, because we cannot more and more. Our people want more and more, and $10,000 could go a long way in alleviating many of our problems which we face and which we do unfortunately are getting on to generally.

I think that I have made my point very clear. Government must know Indian, Pakistan and Asian countries. I do not want to mean, "I am saying, I am saying" they must have Indian, and Pakistan, and Asian. I hope that all Members are going to say yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I will put the motion to the vote.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, SENATOR MADAM'S MOTION NO. 9/88 PASSED.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now just after 12.30 p.m. and as I mentioned earlier I will suspend proceedings until approximately 2.30 p.m.

AT 12.30 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED.

HOUSE RESUMED AT 8.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Private Member's Motion No. 8/85.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 8/85

DOCTORS' ROTATION AT HOSPITALS

HON. EDGAR NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move Private Member's Motion No. 8/85 entitled "Doctors' rotation at Hospitals" which reads as follows:

"WHEREAS the present arrangement for coverage of emergency and casualty at the hospitals by doctors, i.e., a doctor being on call, appears to be unsatisfactory to the public;

AND WHEREAS as confirmed in answers to questions during the Final Opening Meeting of the 1985 Session of the Legislative Assembly, all doctors employed by Government whose general duties are defined encompasses casualty duty;

BE IT RESOLVED that the doctors be rotated in such a way as to provide at least one doctor on the compound of the hospital at all times;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Government take such action as early as possible."

MR. K. MASSEY BUTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

HON. E. EDGAR NELSON: Mr. Speaker, the fact that a doctor is not physically present at the hospital 24 hours a day, and especially at night, has been a bone of contention in this country for as long as I can remember.

The service in the region today with a doctor being on call at night is no better than it was in the 1950s when there was only one doctor on the Island, because he lives that matter first on the hospital compound.

In March this year, in answer to a question which I tabled, I was told that there are presently two doctors employed full-time at the hospitals. According to the estimates, that represents a salary figure of $200,000. I was further informed in March that the average daily clinic attendance at the hospital is 80 patients, and that it was broken down that each doctor would see approximately twelve patients.

Now, Mr. Speaker, taking this consideration the advances and the new forms of technology which are available at the hospital to assist the doctors in their diagnosis and treatment of patients, I believe that seeing twelve people per day is no great work load. In fact, Sir, as most the doctors are being paid, my personal opinion is that it is a great under-utilization of a very expensive resource.

I can remember, Sir, speaking in that Legislature when one doctor was as busy as 80 patients per day, and he did not have the technological facilities which are available today.

MR. E. EDWARD GRANT (CONTINUED): What is, he had to spend much more time than a doctor does today in ascertaining what the complaints of the patients were, because his diagnosis was largely subjective.

I can remember when there were three surgeons at the hospital, and when we talked for 32 hour strikes they told that they would give doctors to provide the service. When there were six doctors and the service was taken for they could that they needed nine doctors. Now, Sir, they have ten doctors and I expect them to say that they are going to need fifteen doctors to provide the service. However, I do not believe, Sir, that they need any more than the ten that they have. Now as I believe that it is the most logistical problem to retain them as we do provide an adequate service to a problem, and to work much harder for more than 37½ hours a week, because, Sir, in 1970 the then honorable Administrator and Leader Counsel said such a noble role for the physicians. Each doctor was required to work no more than 37½ hours per week, and this day immediately following the announcement of salaries he was given no alternative but to go to the Herald, or whatever he wanted to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come for action. I also believe that the Acting Minister of Health is going to continue on these grounds. However, like my colleague who became elected Member for West Bay, I get a bit impatient at times, and I think that the time for decisions on these matters to be at hand. I believe that the resources are there to deliver the service. I can see no reasonable reason why this service cannot be delivered. I am speaking in this motion, Sir, for fulltime to do this as early as possible, Sir, and as early as possible to me, Sir, would be practically the 1st June. So can somebody or you remind me if it is a good time to adjourn? I was sorry.

So, I am asking fellow Members of this Assembly to support this motion. I believe that with their support the Honourable Member responsible will find a way to deliver this service which is very badly needed in our community, Sir.

Thank you.

HON. SECRETARY: The Honourable Miss. Elected Member of Executive Council.

DEBATE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTION NO.8/85

HON. BERNIE O. EVANS: Mr. President. I sincerely and I agree that it is desirable and it would be nice to have 24 hours a day coverage by doctors at the hospital, and I have no problem with the spirit of this motion. However, I am not sure that I can say that I support the motion in the entirety because of the way in which one of the first resolved resolutions is worded. That is:-

> " BE IT RESOLVED that the doctors be required in such a way as to provide at least one doctor on the compound of the Hospital at all times. "

As the mover of the motion has said, the question of a doctor being on the hospital compound 24 hours a day has been a item of contention for many years. I have been misquoted by at least three medical officers which indicate that it is not possible or desirable to attempt to restore the present system of doctors on such a position. The argument given is that emergency services would of necessity suffer because while it is true that in the answer given to the Member he was told that all doctors share duties and on-call at the Hospital, the answer in the question also said that doctors served to their mid-specialities

MR. BEGGS: In a few areas, these special units of management on Saturday or Sunday were simple to give to us, and developing to the point where those doctors are just about fully utilized within that area of specialty. I personally would like some opportunity to study the situation to ensure that we rotate the doctors in the fashion sought in the resolution, would not lose ultimately on the service.

I am fully in agreement with providing a doctor 24 hours a day and in fact, Mr. President, can assure this House that the doctors at the hospital all agree that it would be desirable as well. However, it might be that in order to achieve this we might have to use service doctors to do, optionally for the Canadian ones.

I believe the Member moving the motion will appreciate that once the people in the doctors have to feel threatened. One cannot look at the hospital in the same fashion, that one can look at the running of a private doctors' clinic, because it is that clinic the doctor is only basically responsible for making that clinic. However, the entire health services of this country are different and, in fact, our hospitals, and this includes the operation of the detached clinics. So, I am simply saying the running of the hospital with the running of a private clinic.

I am told that the average number of hours worked by each doctor, for example, Newfoundland like 50 hours per week. I also, Mr. President, would like to see rather than restricting service at the hospital on a 24 hour basis, the number of visits paid by doctors in the detached clinics increased. I believe that the interests of the country can best be served by the Member of this motion will accept my assurance on behalf of the Government that it is my desire to see as quickly as possible 24 hours' coverage in the hospitals, however in detached clinics, but that the motion should not be pressed to the passage from, which if accepted would mean that we are saying that we are going to provide this service by magic. Notwithstanding, Mr. President, this might result in rather than improving the service, a much depleted and inferior service.

I am sure that what the mover, Honourable Member for Grand Falls, the Minister of Health and Member for Bonavista North has not been fully considered, Mr. President, and I would ask that in the interests of all concerned, and in the spirit of cooperation that the Member, having made his point and having shown his concern, and I am sure that other Members would want to do the same, would not move to tie the Government's hands as to the way in which this objective would be achieved.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to say that I give the Member my assurance that it is my wish and it is my intention to use a clinic on the hospital compound 24 hours a day. But as to how that is to be achieved I would realize that many individuals in this matter that within some given time I be assured of best faith by not achieving that result in the way in which the motion seeks to achieve it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for Mount Pearl.

DR. K. MARSHALL BUSH: Mr. President, at the outset of this motion I wanted to give my support to it. Mr. President, the Second Elected Member for Mount Pearl and the Elected Member for Mount Scio made reference to this motion. We should have brought this motion in the Throne Meeting.

MR. W. MACKENZIE BOWIN (GOOSE BAY): There is a mistake, Mr. President, because our health care in this country is high, which I may point with. Now, Mr. President, I see how interesting this might have been if I could be going to be right, that I am put here as a duty-room I will not think my responsibilities regardless of how many focus are made on all the Government benches.

Proper health care, in my opinion, is the single most important component in any developing country. I would say that health care in this country today, while we are paying millions of dollars it is not what it has been a drop in our people. One only needs to talk with his constituents, to talk to his people to see how dissatisfied and to hear the horror stories about our hospitals. Personally, Sir, I am pleased to attend the hospital. I cannot tell people to go there because I myself do not have confidence in it. That is not to say that there are not some good doctors there, but it is my that there are some who are lacking in their approach.

The trouble in our hospitals did not begin today; did not begin with the present Honourable Member; did not begin yesterday. It began a long time ago, but finding the solution to the problems lies clearly on the shoulders of this present administration if we are going to be a caring Government; if we are going to be a Government for the people.

I have had my best experiences with the hospital going back to 1972 but where and because that part is the part that many of our people may have suffered and are suffering because of carelessness and inadequacies at the hospitals.

Mr. President, there are times in our society who are able to go overseas and pay for medical assistance, and not afford, that I say, many of us who cannot afford to go overseas have much confidence in our system that we seek our Government hospitals. Many times after the condition of our people has worsened after treatment at the hospitals, and their health and their lives are endangered if they do not get better treatment, they are literally told by doctors that Government will not help them with overseas medical expenses.

Mr. President, there was given the Government (inaudible) in the region of $600,000 on overseas medical expenses.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that I should remind the Member that we are talking about emergency evacuation. It is not really a matter about hospital services generally and I must ask the Member to ensure that his speech is relevant. I am sure that he will bear in the relevance of what he is saying to the motion, that I hope that he will show it quickly.

MR. W. MACKENZIE BOWIN: I was just going to say, Mr. President, that the $600,000 we spent last year, in my opinion was spent by reason failure at the hospitals. I realize, Sir, that we are discussing emergency treatment and I would give just some personal stories of what to what the people want. If that is what we want to have in here, I can do that, Sir, because as I said I have had my bad experiences at the hospital, but I felt that this was a good time to bring out some of what needs to be brought out about the hospitals. I feel that I would object my responsibilities, as I said before, if I do not say the things which I have said. Now, I may be wrong but if you say that I must decide, I will do so.

MR. PRESIDENT: What I am saying to the Member is that it is unwise to introduce a motion the passage of which would prevent debate about the quality of medical services now taking place, and it certainly is unwise to do so. However, what we are debating now is a motion the purpose of which is limited to preventing average 84 hours a day, seven days a week by a doctor normally on the hospital's payroll. This is a much more limited question and really during the debate on this motion the Member's contribution should be relevant to that particular motion and should not cover at large everything to do with the quality of medical services and such facts.

MR. EDWARD A. GIBBONS: Mr. President, just as a matter of clarification, if the motion before us is seeking to expand the services at the hospital so that we have 24 hours a day service, would it be considered that the service is broadening, or is it out of order for the Member speaking to make reference to the situation which now exists at the hospital which would constitute this expansion?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that if the Member would use his imagination to the fact that there is no service now available, what he was saying would be relevant. However, he has not been doing that and it did not appear to me that he was doing so.

MR. DENNIS A. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think that Standing Order 30 covers it.

MR. R. HARRIS BUSH: Mr. Speaker, they might as well have it now, because they are going to hear it.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am afraid that I will not hear that. I was reading Standing Order 30.

MR. A. MACKAY BUSH: Yes, Sir, I will just look to the motion, Mr. Speaker, we are seeking for a doctor to be at the hospital complex at all times. I submit again that if we can ever have 24 hours a day, we can get much worse service than what we are getting now.

Anyway, Sir, I hope this people go to the hospital at 4 o'clock on the morning with all the conditions of a heart condition. When he gets there the nurse is sleeping and he has to knock and then go to the doctor's house. The nurse will have to phone over to the complex until 4 o'clock when he comes to do his round. So, Mr. President, it was a good thing that this was not a good consideration or we would have been dead! Anyway,

Mr. President, I think the Honourable Miss Director of Recreation himself should not want to admit he is so lazy they have a lot more work than they used to get done. However, we are only talking about 12,000 people and not thousands of thousands of people. Some of the citizens here have come from larger hospitals to other countries and have had larger work loads. So it is not that they are used to still hospitals and they should be able to cope quite well with a 24 hour shift.

It looks as if I am not going to be able to say too much of what I wanted to say but let me say this, Mr. Speaker. We are finding ourselves of the problem that this morning we spoke of $2,700,000 a year roughly for health care. Whether we put a doctor there 24 hours a day which will help the situation, you, or whether we possibly the situation at the hospital completely, there is no easy looking alternative.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak?

HON. DENNIS R. COCKE: Mr. Speaker, I really did not intend to speak on this, Sir, but after listening to the amount of garbage which has been spoken there I cannot neglect it, Sir.

HON. R. HARBERD KNOX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker...

HON. DENNIS R. COCKE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. Sir, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I'm not the enemy on a point of order... You have nothing on a point of order?

HON. R. HARBERD KNOX: Yes, Sir, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Under what section?

HON. R. HARBERD KNOX: I guess that it is section 64. Should we be able to refer to what some hon. Members have or say?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that privilege is the...

HON. R. HARBERD KNOX: I just think that I had sat down a little while, Mr. Speaker, and watched him out.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it out of order to use offensive or threatening language about other Members or to quote improper motives to them. However, I think that you are allowed to tell them what they said is rubbish or garbage and I would not regard that as unparliamentary.

HON. R. HARBERD KNOX: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll bear it in mind.

HON. DENNIS R. COCKE: Perhaps I have appropriate now, Sir, though to explain. This has been used in this Parliament for many years, Sir.

The problem is, Sir, that although sometimes people on this side mix up their faces, when their faces are ugly then they are good looking people, but the speaker is always ugly, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is unfair for statements to be made like, "Our conditions in the hospital are deplorable"; "Carelessness and deliberation at the hospital"; "Human failure at the hospital". Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite this Member to go down to any of the other Caribbean territories such as Belize, Anguilla and all those places, and let him see the medical conditions that they get there. I think our hospital, Sir, is a unique little place. It gives good service; good attention, and although I agree with the motion of this motion that there should be a doctor there 24 hours a day, this could be a good service. At present what happens is that the doctor stays there until midnight. If at midnight nothing has come in he goes home but he is still on call, and in most cases it takes him ten minutes at the longest to get to the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, we should be grateful for what we have, Sir. We should not take this supercilious attitude and criticise everything. I think that it is nothing short of a disgrace, Sir, for Members of this Parliament to be condemning every service that there is in this country.

HON. DENNIS M. ROBERTS (CONTINUING): This morning we heard about the prison. I shall sometimes that I could give him the opportunity to go and do better.

MR. LINDSAY A. KERSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this motion, some enough I intended to support it in its present stage. However, I too agreed it is an insult when a senior Member of the Government Bench, an Official Member would refer to the remarks of a Member of this Assembly as garbage, rubbish or nonsense. That is actually how opinion may be is entitled to his opinions, but we were elected by the people of this country and we are not subjected to the whims of the Member of the Government Bench who is an Official Member of this Government. We were not elected by this country but by the people of this country. It is our right to bring to the attention of this House things which we see going wrong, and I take it as a proud result, such has happened. My interpretation of these remarks would seem to prove or to suggest that he was out of order even though it may not be regarded so by the Chair.

We are not talking about Anguilla. If he is satisfied with what is happening in Anguilla then he may go there and reside. This is Grand Cayman or the Cayman Islands. We are talking about Grand Cayman. I was a Parliamentary Secretary for Health and Education for two years in this country and I too know that there is a lot needed to be done in that hospital. I am not here to carry down the hospital, but we on Assembly Members are here to make things better, and to have some Member because he is hurt by the remarks of a Member on this side may to say down the Member on this side. As far as my remarks went this morning about the prison, I am sorry that I made his feelings, but what I am standing here for, if he wants me to desist from finding out information about what happens at the prison, then he should take the appropriate Order and I will have no reason to make my remarks on the prison.

However, we are not debating the prison now. We are debating increasing the conditions at the hospital. I would be the first one to suggest or to grossly that we have good doctors at the hospital, but the Member was also a Parliamentary Secretary for Health, Education and Social Services and I believe that he would be willing home that the truth of he said that things were good or he is trying to make them out to be. Perhaps he has got some friends in the hospital where facilities he would hate to hear.

We are here to represent the interests of our people and I congratulate the Second Elected Member for West Bay for having the guts to mention the points which he did, and also the Elected Member for South Side for bringing this matter up.

We are not perfect. It is a disgrace, I know was the adjournment moved by the Honourable Minister. I wonder if he really understands the meaning of the words. It is not a disgrace when we try to promote the interests of our people. It is not being argumentative when we try to provide for the people in this country. Let the Member tell you why the little boy who was taken to have his leg cut off at the hospital. But also if he got a second opinion he found that all that was needed was a simple operation on the bone marrow and he can walk with the leg again. They can tell you without that, and the impression that the public had to start get a better face that doctor to get a reference.

Such language, unbecoming. We are not here to accept the insults of the Honourable Member of the Government Bench. We are here to represent our people and any time in this House that I see such unnecessary attacks, I am going to be the first one to get up in defence of a speaker and in defence of myself.

MR. ANTHONY A. FIGUEROA (CONTINUING): The Honourable First Elected Member of this House is not a representative of the people. He is a Civil Servant.

MRS. JEAN W. FRANCIS: On a point of order, Mr. President, the Member must mean the Honourable First Official Member.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that he means the Honourable First Official Member, yes.

MR. ANTHONY A. FIGUEROA: I apologise to the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council. I do mean the Honourable First Official Member. The point of order is taken. My apologies.

The Honourable First Official Member stated that the Second Elected Member for West End was quoting rubbish and also referred to the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac, because he stood to embellish things we see wrong in this country. Mr. President, I do really do have the nerve to get out there and fight an election campaign, then it will be time for him to get up in this House and criticise the Elected Representatives.

Mr. President, I support the motion before this House.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MRS. ARLENE E. ORTEZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I had no intention of speaking regarding the motion before us. I would like to go straight down the middle here. I am not taking sides with anyone. I support the motion wholeheartedly. I also agree with some of what my colleagues from West Bay said. However, I think that I would be unfair if I did not speak what I found to be my experience.

What is that the services which I have received at the Cayman Islands Hospital over many years have been good. There have been times when I have gone to the hospital and I have complained that a doctor was not there, because I felt that the case which I wanted to have by the doctor was serious enough in my opinion or to warrant him being there. This is one of the reasons why I wholeheartedly support that a doctor should be there, and I feel that this must be adequately and satisfactorily by anyone who is employed at that hospital when they take up such employment.

If one wants to say it from statistics by Caribbean Ministries, Cable and Wireless or whatever, if one has to be there at a certain time one has to be there. I feel that when it comes to a matter of someone's health, and it could be a matter of life and death, it is no more than giving the patient or the person in hospital, who is relative of the patient the security of knowing that a doctor is there. If for no more than that, that doctor should be on that compound. So that particular part of the debate here, Sir, I wholeheartedly support.

To say that the services at the hospital are no good or whatever issue might have been used, I cannot support it. I only that there is room for improvement but I have lived in the United States for nine years, and if you think the services at the Cayman Islands Hospital are the worst, then live in a foreign country for a while. Not because one can pay for a plane ticket and go to Florida should be qualified that one is going to get the best service available. It is just, because of the size of the hospitals, some people, more people can be in there and one is not getting another.

MRS. MARIE L. CORBET (CONTINUING): I have known this to happen. I have read about it. One thing I have to say is that we in the Virgin Islands have to be thankful for what we have. It is one thing to come here to represent our people, but to destroy what we already have is wrong.

I plead in behalf of the nurses that, on this other hand, they do not agree with anyone destroying what we already have. I hope that the Members of this House will understand what I am saying. I am not talking alone with anyone but I am saying here that I represent those people in the hospital as well as I do anyone who are in this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Senator wish to speak? Does the Senator which he recognize his right of reply?

MR. D. DONALD MOORE: Yes, Sir. Mr. President, to answer my friend, if any one asks up a hornet's nest which these four walls like I can. In the Committee the whole thing was discussed in minute. I have simply tried to speak according to what we know. It has been recommended by certain individuals and I have taken some leading for it. However, Mr. President, I do not believe that at any time you will ever have the real experience of the raising in this Chamber as has happen. That, Mr. President, is on record to my intelligence. It is not right to the people I represent, and it is not right to my own integrity.

Now, Sir, I did not want to get into ill of the faults of the hospital, but since it is such I would suppose we should all be grateful and retain that place with humility and hey. The Senator can speak the greatness of God which works within the confines of that institution. It is time that everybody told it the way it is, and I believe, Sir, that I am as qualified as any individual in this country to criticize, whether constructively or destructively, with health care institution in this world.

We have some good people in the hospital, Sir, but the hospital has some serious problems. It is unfortunate, Sir, that within the past week unfortunately I have had some personal experiences in that place which have led to, in one instance, the loss of life to a member of my family. They with you, Sir, that the doctor gets there in ten minutes. I have been to that hospital in a private, Sir, and I have sat in that casualty department for two hours waiting for a doctor to come and see me. We have not shown yet, Sir, as the nurse told me to go home and come back the next day.

Now, Mr. President, I am not a doctor and would never want to be one. However, I believe that I have something about my own health. I am not going to get out of my bed at 2:00 a.m. in the morning and drive 25 miles in case a doctor if I believe that the Honorable can tell me until 8:00 the next morning. Mr. President, the nurses advise which that hospital now as treatment to the Philharmonic strikes to my shoulder and chest which got weak. I can talk now to my people with my afternoon to Town Hall and make a hundred such speeches. Every time we hear that they are bigger and newer, but I have a person story about that place to be aware that the one before. That hospital needs to be straightened out, Sir.

I cannot, Sir, accept the Member's assessment that doctors are presently working 40 hours per week because, Sir, if they are working 40 hours per week this morning the number of patients which has been submitted to me, they are operating on hour and a half with each patient.

MR. D. SQUARE NORTH (CONTINUING): That is a waste of time. I have been to that hospital at 11 o'clock on the day and could not find a doctor to talk to.

Mr. Speaker, the emergency for medical care is created in a large extent in the mind of the patient, not always on the diagnosis of the doctor. The patient would feel infinitely better if a doctor who in fact composed what he advised, Mr. President, for 65.7 million a year there are no more excuses. I have heard excuses as I told you in my opening remarks. When there were those doctors they needed five. When there were six they needed nine. Now they have ten and the Member tells me he thinks they still need more.

Mr. President, I do not believe that nothing the extreme chiropractors do such I say as to provide a doctor in that capacity be lumped a thing to demean from any of the specialty utilized. To the best of my knowledge, and I speak subject to correction on this, most of the specialty clinics up that hospital are paid once a week. Nevertheless, I think some half an hour's and things like that, but what do the doctors during the other part of the week? They give us all these things to justify their salary, the bridge. I agree with the Honorable Member, Sir. I would like to see the doctors' visits to the disturbed teenage, however, Sir, that will not affect the role of the hospital. If a doctor is seeing the patients in the psychiatric to be not seeing them in the hospital. So the work load at the hospital is going to be reduced by necessity the work load of the clinics. That is no reason not to put them on a role. If these people are sick, put them on shifts.

The usefulness of getting this done, Sir, are not my problem. I am sure it is. I have myself to point to have caused management at the hospital, expert management in the Civil Service. We should be grateful for what the Civil Servants do for us. I am saying, Sir, that it is time for the service to work this out because I am telling you today, Sir, that it will be done. If it is not done in the very near future I will do it and publicise it for the people of this country.

I am always willing to compromise, Mr. President. I do not get up on the floor of this Assembly to make brinkmanship points. There is a need at this psychiatric for a doctor to be in the hospital 24 hours a day and the need must be reviewed. That is what we are in the confines of this Chamber for, to have given them their request in the budget. If they, nevertheless, the young doctors, that is not my problem, Sir. There are those fifteen Members I say. Send the young ones back. Let us get the right ones. We want a doctor on that complex 24 hours a day, and I do not think that is carriage, Sir. I think that is a serious need in that country which needs to be addressed, not in the 1st May, 1st September. It should receive priority, but you know, Sir, sometimes we have used this thing until they provide us finally with a room in their whole which they believe is a heavy attack, and the doctor tells the nurse over the phone, "Give him a dose of Epsom and send him home". It is nothing but a hangover and headache". That is what, Sir, we will get around.

I do not think that any of us are supposed to wait for that time. I suggest again we bring in responsible health but it can happen to the best of us, Sir. One minute one man is diagnosed in this place. Mr. President, you know I went home since 21st November and if there is one thing which gets on me, Sir, is the ability of some people in this House to change their comfortable salaries to suit themselves, when they are talking about how good our standard of living is compared to the United States, and when they are talking about how good a hospital is to be compared to Anguilla and St. Kitts.

MR. D. SCOTT MILLER (CONTINUING): As you know that I made a report some weeks ago that they had bought in people from diaries to evaluate the health services, to melt up what good health services we had; how evaluate the equipment; how evaluate the X-ray machines were. Well, council! You have been dismal! We do not have been asked to examine", of course they do not... We know what their equipments problems are. They cannot afford to buy it. Why not bring somebody from the Middle American summit which has equal equipment to tell us how the equipments is being utilized, Sir.

We have good people in the hospital. The problem is getting that thing together as a team to deliver the quality health care which this country needs. You know, Sir, I was a bit hesitant to accept the Honourable Member's undertaking that he was ready to provide the answers. However, after the protection of the Leader of Government business, I cannot take that from him, Sir.

Either, Sir, they are going to improve the position or its stands, or they are going to accept it as it stands. Therefore they are going to provide that service to the people of this country.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that we have reached the customary time for the afternoon break, and I will therefore suspend proceedings for approximately ten minutes.

AT 3.15 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

AT 3.32 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
Private Member's Motion No. 2/05. MRS

Those in favour please stand up.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES:

MR. D. SCOTT MILLER: May we have a division, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that it should be held if we have a division, yes.

DIVISION
NO. 28

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Mr. W. Mackenzie Bain	Hon. Dennis H. Mercier	Mr. D. Scott Miller
Mrs. Sophie I. Omari	Hon. Michael F. Bradley	
Mr. Wilfred A. Pierson	Hon. Maxwell C. Heffernan	
Mr. D. Scott Miller	Hon. Ransom O. Semple	
	Hon. W. Newman Seddon	
	Hon. Capt. Charles L. Nicholson	
	Hon. Russell S. Johnson	
	Capt. Henry E. Nicholson	
4	8	1

MR. SPEAKER: Did the Second Elected Member for Bowden raise a point of order? I did not hear it as I was absent.

CLERK: He mentioned, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I disclaim the notice then.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 9/80 DEFERRED AT MADCURRY

NOTICE OF STATEMENT

HON. EDISON D. JAMES: Mr. Speaker, before you move on to the next item on the Agenda, may I make a brief personal explanation? My intention to make a statement concerning the withdrawal of this statement, Mr. Speaker, is basically the reason for the vote which Government has given earlier on this motion. The statement will indicate that we suppose the 24 hours a day doctor service but should not subject the restrictions imposed by the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. I do not think that the Member should make his statement now, which is more in the nature of a debate, and I have looked up Standing Order 80(1) and he is required to give no notice, he may make a statement. So he may make a statement tomorrow. That is the order.

MR. M. MACKENZIE SCOTT: Can he say he expects it of he will not just vote for it?

MR. SPEAKER: That will be something for him to explain tomorrow.

HON. M. MACKENZIE SCOTT: I am very disappointed in hearing the explanation, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I am afraid that you will have to wait until tomorrow. He has given no the notice and he can make his statement, and it will be on Wednesday's Order Paper as Private Member's Motion No. 10/82.

The Second Reading for March 26th.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 10/82

CLOSURE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICES DURING LUNCH HOURS

MR. D. ARNOLD NILSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. 10/82 entitled "Closure of Government Offices During Lunch Hours". It reads as follows:-

> "WHEREAS there are certain Government offices which serve the public that are closed to the public during lunch time and this can cause undue hardship to members of the public;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that Government take steps to have these offices open continuously to the public during lunch time to enhance the service rendered to the public."

MR. W. MASEBEYA SUSU: Mr. President, I beg to second the Member's Motion No. 10/65.

MR. D. BANDA MULUBI: Mr. President, I think the last one and a moment's worry. This one is going to be a backing.

Mr. President, there are certain offices in Government which serve the public, for example Lands and Survey, the Immigration Department, the Licensing Department, the Traffic Department, and I believe Investigation Department as well. These offices, Sir, are generally closed to the public for the lunch-hour. Some are closed for longer than one hour. In fact the Lands and Survey office is open only four hours per day to the public.

Now, Mr. President, the Lands and Survey office is the control hub of a lot of development; so a lot of the business transactions which take place in this country, and to only be open for four hours a day, I believe limits the service which it can offer to the public.

Other places like the Post Office are closed from 12 o'clock to 2 o'clock, and in many instances, Sir, there are many people in this town who the only opportunity they can get to pick something up from the Post Office or to get those documents or do any business with Government Departments is during their working hours.

Now, Mr. President, I know that I am going to be told that I do not like the Civil Service and that the Civil Service is doing a good job, and that I should be grateful and be satisfied with what we get. They are really not getting anything for what they are doing you know, Sir. They are working long hours and they haven't gotten no pay. We are trying to take away their fringe benefits, their telephone, and the Financial Member for North Side wants to take away their allowance. You have to believe I do, Sir, and I am preparing this motion for November.

However, Sir, be that as it may I believe that when the administrative section of Government is resuming approximately 30 per cent of the national income, I believe that provided the necessary resources be here these offices open during the lunch-hour period to better serve the public. I know my hon. Minister during the lunch-hour break with only two members of staff, Sir. So I think that it can be done on a very right schedule. I believe, Sir, that although Government sends how taken a decision to the word minute, they can relate the staff which these offices so that they can stay open for the lunch-hour period. I believe that the publics at large in this country will be appreciative of the service which they are given during lunch-hour.

So, without further ado at this time, Sir, I would conclude and I would beg, Sir, the Members of Government to support this motion in order to render a better service to the people of this country.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Member's Motion No. 10/65 is now open for debate. Does any Member wish to speak? The Honourable Minister Official Member.

DEBATE ON PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 10/65

HON. DANIEL K. KOSAM: Mr. President, I rose to mainly with the object of the motion, but I would like to point out a few facts for the Member's benefit. Of course I am generally aware that he knows these already. However, I will take them in the order in which he mentioned them.

MR. CHARLES P. TROTTER (CONTINUED): Roads and Survey. Mr. President, those hours are laid down in the Registered Land Rules, Section 101:

> "The Registry will be open for the transaction of business with the public between 10 a.m. to 12 noon and 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. on Monday to Friday inclusive."

Mr. President, I would like to point out that there is a section behind this, Sir. A person or persons may visit between 10 a.m. and 12 noon and negotiate transactions regarding lot of fifty-one to be done. The time is spent by that staff doing that work so that they can return the transactions to them possibly the next day or the day after.

Similarly in the private sector, banks close at a certain time, 2.30 in the afternoon. This does not mean that the staff goes home but there is plenty of work to be done, accurately and accountably and everything done. I spoke of one of them go home before 4 o'clock.

If we are to open Roads and Survey Department from 8.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m., what time then does the staff get to do the work? Nevertheless, Mr. President, I will look into that and see what can be done. If anything can be done the Rules which have to be changed.

The Hon. Minister is a Statutory Instrument, Mr. President. We really do not have anything to do with it, but I think that the problem there is insufficient employees at that Registry Room. Most sometimes should that during that time of fifty-one some. So to make sure which that they close at 12 noon-4 p.m.

Similarly with the Lands Department, Mr. President, there is a lot of after-work. All the work is now a complaint and has to be looked in there, and the complaints which are to be made. I think, Mr. President, if officers are open until noon during the day, people who have other jobs want to come their lunch hour to come and get their business done at Government. Government should separate counter for private officers in lunch-time to do their business. They are closed.

However, in that as it may, I think that one must learn to understand that there are reasons behind that, Mr. President, I will augment the motion in the spirit in which it is presented. Sir, and I will attempt to look into this and see what can be done. However, I cannot make any promises as to results, Sir.

I am not sure that I can explain about the 60 per cent of the national budget going to civil servants, Sir, but I feel, on the other side, they work for what money they are paid, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Yes the Member of the motion which is... is the Second Elected Member but what I say seems to catch my eye or mine. I am not sure, Mr. Is the Elected Member for Marsh Side wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. P. EDWARD MILLER: Yes, Sir, I would not deny an opportunity for the world, Sir.

Yes, Mr. President, I seem to have a problem here with motions. In March I brought one about the Registrar. I brought one a while ago about the hospital and I have just brought one about the Government officers.

MR. D. FRANCIS MILLAR (Government): It seems that if I could get the private enterprise separated from the body I should have no problem. Everybody can support the spirit of all of these resolutions, but they cannot support the body of the motion. Now, I have a little problem understanding that, Sir, but I guess that we had better let sleeping dogs lie.

I know, Sir, that the hours for Lands and Survey Department are half done in some areas, but I believe that these rules can be changed. I do not fully accept that they need all of that time to complete the transactions, because there is more than one person in most of these offices, usually it is not the same one front who deals with the public who do the transactions in the back.

Another thing which I have a little problem with, Sir, is there employees in Government. Now, Sir, I am a supporter in my business for one reason or another to take work serious. However, it seems that the employees in Government is requiring more staff than the normal procedures. As for the land-authority, if it is a Statutory body then might the Minister responsible would give me an undertaking that he will see that it is close for lunch, because my observations there indicate that they have two receiving clerks and they have two receiving clerks on the other side of the warehouse. So it is quite easy for them to send one receiving clerk and one receiving clerk for lunch 12.00 to 1.00 and the other one 1.00 to 2.00 to keep the facility open. As for the privilege to overspend, I think that this is controllable with strict management. If the people are working they should replace them, not send them for lunch.

However, Sir, I guess that we live by the sword and we die by the sword, Sir. So, some people bet per hour it is the vote and see what happens.

MR. PRESIDENT: Let us indeed put it to the vote.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 10/95 PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion passed, unanimously. (LAUGHTER).

Private Member's Motion No. 11/95

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 11/95

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR AND CIGARETTE ADVERTISEMENT IN THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

HON. RALPH E. COMEAU: Mr. President, I would like to present Private Member's Motion No. 11/95 regarding the prohibition of liquor and cigarette advertisement in the Cayman Islands. I am not sure whether I should do this now, but I would like to change, if possible, the wording of this slightly, which I shall do now and....

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, now we had this this morning and in accordance with Standing Order 24(7), a Member who desires to move a motion standing in his name may give an amended notice of motion if such an amendment does not, in my opinion, materially alter the scope of any principle embodied in the original motion. However, the amended notice shall not affect the date on which the original notice was given.

If you tell me what the amendment was, I could tell you whether in my opinion it is admissible.

MRS. DARLENE L. OLSEN: Alright. It should read-

" WHEREAS medical and scientific evidence has proven that the use of liquor and cigarettes is highly dangerous to one's health;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honorable House take immediate steps to appoint a select committee to study the possibility and practicability of either introducing legislation or by some other means prohibiting the advertising of liquor or cigarettes by local radio and television."

MR. PRESIDENT: Has that been typed up, and are there copies of it or not?

MRS. DARLENE L. OLSEN: No, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Could you for that same reason withdraw the resolution, since already as that Members would take it home and as that I would have it done?-

" BE IT RESOLVED that this Honorable House take immediate steps to appoint...."

MRS. DARLENE L. OLSEN: Withdraw a select committee to study the possibility and practicability of either introducing legislation or by some other means prohibiting the advertising of liquor or cigarettes by local radio and television."

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps I may read it out now just so the record that I have got it right. The preamble will be the same with the clause starting, "WHEREAS". It would continue-

" BE IT RESOLVED that this Honorable House take immediate steps to appoint a select committee to study the possibility and practicability of either introducing legislation or by some other means prohibiting the advertising of liquor or cigarettes by local radio and television."

MRS. DARLENE L. OLSEN: Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is it "liquor or cigarettes" "liquor and cigarettes"?

MRS. DARLENE L. OLSEN: It is "liquor and/or"....

MR. PRESIDENT: "Liquor and/or cigarettes"?

MRS. DARLENE L. OLSEN: Yes.

MR. RICHARD J. MARSHALL: No pictures?

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, it was the effect of the things which you wish to make is that the clause, instead of intermediately legislation is to appoint a Select Committee. That is practically it, and I think that is perfectly acceptable to Rules of Procedure Order 81(2). In other words, therefore, you may move the motion as you read out and table that. I will suggest you do getting formally moved it now you have in fact read it out. If the Secretary will assist if you can then speak to it.

MR. LAWRENCE A. WILKINS: Thank you.

MR. W. MARSHALL BUSH: Mr. President, I rise and speak on seconder of the first motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: All.

MR. W. MARSHALL BUSH: I think that I am right.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is quite true. I mean if you have not agreed to second this amended motion, then the motion would fail and another seconder.

MR. W. MARSHALL BUSH: Mr. President, I wish you had given me a chance to explain myself, Sir. Yes, I have not seconded this motion, but I was not informed that this motion could take place. Seeing as I am beginning to worry a little bit in Committee the time might run out I might destroy something. I therefore commit second the motion for it to move.

MR. PRESIDENT: Can the mover make another seconder?

MR. LAWRENCE A. WILKINS: Mr. President, I second the motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: In that case, I declare the motion by the amended Resolution unanimously, and the Deputy Electoral Officer for West Bay may speak to it.

MRS. DAPHNE D. CARRITT: Thank you, Sir. Mr. President, the Constitution and the Code around through the use of Cigars and cigarettes is mainly until where to use Members of this Honourable House. However, our awareness of the problem should be seen to trigger some action on our part. I think that the order to control their effects by discouraging those use one of the first areas which we need to tackle would be advertising.

I have noticed, Sir, that on local radio and on billboards in certain parts of the Islands, there drugs, and that is what they are - drugs, are being advertised. Especially on Radio Cayman the way in which advertisements are put forward, for instance this one on cigarettes where a young, seductive model of a young woman encourages us to use cigarettes is to be a cool thing to do. I do not see how anything can be cool with fire on the other end.

When again we have all the advertisements for liquor which is so favorable as any drug there in on the market today, and I feel that it is time that we do all we can to see Government the use of cigarettes, especially amongst young people.

Mr. President, it is a well known fact that when advertising was permitted on the Radio Cayman on radio and television many years ago for both liquor and cigarettes, it was found that on television between the hours of 5.00 and 9.00 in the evening, that was the time that most of the advertising took place. The men behind the liquor and cigarette companies use to grasp the attention of the young persons, the ones, knowing that sooner or later a child or a young person looked on the habit of either smoking or drinking, one probably has a customer for a lifetime. Although the most fortunate that lifetime may be rather short.

I feel Sir, that it is not only highly detrimental to the user, but as most of us know, cigarettes affect the people that are around in contact with the smoke.

MRS. CATHERINE D. CRIER [CONTINUING]: I have quite a few facts and figures here on this. I notice that the Congressional Congress is already this year, even a big secretary like Cronin is trying to please our veteran organizations as much as possible. It is noted here that the Selective Service also is also a cause of concern and higher through certain operating groups in many cases, or their title being served by this. I feel that any such cause should be discouraged. I am not sure how we go about it. I think that the people of this country need to be educated on the dangers associated to cigarettes smoking and use of alcohol.

Also, Sir, I am concerned that cigarettes are made available to small children as it is. I should not go into how and where is a vending machine placed to be made there. They can walk them out and get them quickly. Knowing the advertisements on the radio on seeing it on a billboard they are tempted to try to use them. It is destructive to their health and if some restrictions on the Cayman Islands today, there has been a steady increase in the use of both liquor and cigarettes among our young people.

Now I notice here this onion in a large city like Gloucester in the Middle Kingdom, it is the view of the Selectmen Committee who is considering a ordinance for setting penalties for anyone who breaks the law and sells cigarettes to children. I think this is something which we need to look in here. We are unfortunately there to see it when we allow any smoking on the radio and on billboards.

I have been told that some states and cities have outlawed these advertising cigarettes on liquor, but because South Dakota elected to, there was hardly any money in the state burning down the money they necessary for advertising, because it was going over the air anyway. I am not sure that I support that particular theory, but nevertheless it was done.

Already it is found that smoking is one the number one public health problem. It is responsible in the United States for almost 250,000 premature deaths a year. We live next in the Cayman Islands and our population is a lot smaller. However, what I am trying to say is that the same effects will take place amongst our people.

Now, the Surgeon General knows is saying that it is not just a nasty habit, Mr. President, it is an addictive drug. Nicotine is an addictive drug. In fact the National Institutes on Drug Abuse has said that it is the most addictive drug in our society. All the things which have happened to our down smoking in public places came about largely through grass roots action, and I feel that the concern of citizens in our country today should appeal to us who are in this House to do what we can to curtail the advertising of liquor and cigarettes. There are many large organizations over the world today who are trying to see if they can eradicate in public places a smoking and I can see why. I feel, Sir, that I would hope anyway that the fellow Members of this honourable House will see to it that we do our best to keep this from the young and from the cause of our young people, because they are worth it. It is really unavoidable, and we need to take steps to see that an appreciation of it is done.

What I would like to remind Members of here today is that we not only need to see about the dangers of advertising, but there needs to be some proper steps taken to see that our young people and children are educated to the dangers of cigarettes, so that they will realize that in today's society it is sometimes a means of not being accepted in one's peer group. It is sometimes a means of one feeling grown up, but the dangers of this need to be brought to the attention of our children.

MRS. GILLIAM L. CHRISTIS (GOODMANSVILLE): I might like to read here just something which came from a constituent regarding the person who was writing to a magazine there. He went on to say:-

"As a long standing sufferer I must question the wisdom of threatening good American corporations in an already saturated market. Tobacco manufacturers may dispute the scientific findings, but I personally am in no doubt as to the sufferings caused by the smoking habit. I know I am preaching to my own choir... I say this but I would ask Congressmen for the sake of humanity to think of diversifying into other product areas before going ahead with any more investigations."

This constituent writes also regarding efforts he wrote this letter to take cigarettes.

I also have received an article in the Readers' Digest just a short time ago. It was entitled "The Death of a Salesman", a very prominent surgeon in the United States. He had an interview with a writer from Readers' Digest. He gave a long story. He was a family man with children. He had a good income and had accidentally come to his attention, but the last sentence he uttered to that writer was, "If only I had quit smoking twenty years ago."

Mr. President, the evils of smoking are plagued with us in our society. Someone mentioned that to use economic data of a heart attack because of the results of smoking is one thing, but to see a sufferer like for years with emphysema should discourage anyone from smoking. These are the things which we need to advertise. We need to advertise what is caused by an unborn child when his or her parents smoke, and the danger to anyone. What we need to give to advertisement on our radio and first class to a society today; that is the something which is completely not welcome by the non-smoker, and it is something which we in these Islands need to invest more, because in larger countries all-out campaigns are being brought about for the discouragement of both the advertising of liquor and cigarettes.

Mr. President, what I'm of this motion is to see that this Government does everything possible to discourage the advertising of them, and in addition to that, to do everything possible to encourage the education of our children and young people from kindergarten on up, of the dangers of cigarettes and alcohol.

I would like to put the support of this House on this motion. I had spoken a few preliminaries and mentioned here. For instance, in Georgia they have a campaign and that by the year 2000 they want a smokeless state. They would like to get people to stop smoking. I understand that this is something which is beginning to do in many other parts of the world. However, what I am saying is that we know the dangers of it and I would like to have the support of the Members of the House on this motion.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is Private Member's Motion No. 11/96 in the name of the Third Elected Member for East Bay at the time we moved.

The motion is now open for debate.

The Second Elected Member for George Town.

SENATE OF PUERTO RICO JOINT RES. 13/55

MR. LUIS MUÑOZ M.: Mr. President, on account of this motion I feel that I should be excused of not answer the motion brought up this Monday, the Chief Elected Member for Rest Day.

The motion seeks to appoint a Select Committee to study the possibilities and practicability of introducing or by some other means promoting the admendment of Liquor and/or Liquor Control by the local Legislature.

I would have wished, Mr. President, that the motion was somewhat wider, not to only include Liquor but tobacco products. I feel, Mr. President, that while we should legislate for the morals of people, that as a Government it is our duty to set the right example for the people of this country.

Mr. President, many of the members may view this as a religious issue. Some might feel that it is a motion brought by a religious denomination but, Mr. President, I would like that we should view this much more seriously, not even this as a matter of such deeper concern. We have made a lot of speculation in our laws for permitting the use of drugs. Mr. President, alcohol and tobacco are perhaps the most pernicious form of drugs there is.

I am not here to say, Mr. President, that we must ban the use of alcohol and cigarettes, because I feel that this would be taking away the rights of the individual to use it as he deserves. I think that the Senate of this House will also be one supporting the legislation of Liquor Licenses in this country, because I fully appreciate the type of our economy, and I also recognize the rights of the individual. So I am not here advocating, Mr. President, that we should ban this activity, as many misunderstood. I am saying, Mr. President, that as a Government we should help to suppress the consumption of alcohol and cigarettes, because I feel personally, because I am very closely associated with the United States of America and the lives of men who do work. The Magazine or other impressed literature, as well as television the trend in the United States today is to do away with the filthy habit of the use of alcohol; to do away with the cigarette purchase. Sports today are having wide and keen interest in terms of sports on the radio, not only because it is more fresh air but because it is much more healthy. I am not suggesting that I, as men perhaps have a terrible voice whatsoever I am known like any of me, but I am suggesting that the exercise involved are very, very important to one's health.

I am suggesting that any form of smoking is extremely dangerous to one's health, that what is up to some of the people is they used to have an early demise. Therefore, Mr. President, are defined as people who have to suffer from cardiac diseases mainly because people who have to suffer from the contamination of other smokers. That is why today in the United States, Mr. President, in many States about that where persons in the world they have smoking and non-smoking areas, more or less in public transport, like planes, the buses, you name it, because they realize that we can get as much disease from the surroundings as a fraction smoker as we can by smoking.

I would like to see the day in the United States, Mr. President, when public places are divided into smoking and non-smoking. I have talked a lot with a number of friends smokers, people who are professional smokers, people who are informed carcinogen of alcohol, and they also would have good to say about it.

MR. LINCOLN A. PIERCE (CONTINUING): Some people believe that the only way that one can quit smoking is cold turkey. My thought smoking. This is a failing, Mr. President. The overindulgence which one in the tobacco that causes people to start smoking, and the use of tobacco in any form can cause cancer.

We glamorize; we are all the pastors. A lot of children are led to believe that smoking is a sign of maturity. As soon as they reach thirteen or fourteen, they feel that if they can hold a cigarette in their hand they are big men or women. I have even seen in the market recently where tobacco for children was packaged in such a way as to give the psychological effect to the child that he is smoking a cigarette. That is wrong, Mr. President.

Statistics also show, Mr. President, that 50 per cent of auto fatalities are blamed through the abuse use of alcohol. As for those of us here who feel that this is a fundamental religious matter, we are fooling ourselves. It is very important to this country and to the people of this country that we do all in our power to discourage the use of alcohol and tobacco.

Mr. President, I give this matter my full support.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honorable Idaho Elected Member of Leadership Council.

SENATOR CHARLES L. KEEPSOMEBODY: Mr. President. I have no difficulty, for, in supporting the motion as amended, and I am very grateful that it will be going to a Select Committee where we can all sit down and discuss this matter openly and frankly.

I realize like the remainder of the motion said, the danger which cigarettes and alcoholic items throughout the world, and for our own delights. I for one, Mr. President, became addicted to cigarettes, and I know what I am speaking about. I am speaking about what somebody else did. I am speaking from experience and it is one horrible addiction for one to have. I would not wish anyone, not even my biggest enemy, to become addicted to cigarettes.

Most of this glistening and glamorous advertising which we are hearing on the radio and seeing on television, cannot attract me again or deceive me, but it can deceive the young and innocent people in our society. They are impressionable. We have all been through that stage, and as the Senator said previously. They believe that smoking or holding a cigarette in their hand makes them a grown person immediately. Nothing is further from the truth.

I have been told of a young child going to the shop behind who is now singing a very advertising haunted him on Radio Caprom, and this innocent said to me. "This is what is the meaning Impressions in our society, and something which Government should take steps or to stop this type of advertising on the right."

In the United States every time of cigarettes carries a warning to the people that it is dangerous to their health. In the United Kingdom, radio and television have banned from advertising cigarettes, and I think the press too. We should do all that is within our power to help to educate our children about the dangers of using tobacco and alcohol. I realize, Mr. President, that we cannot legislate morals, but we can also stop assisting those who are selling harmful products to our children. We must find the problems of today and do our utmost to find solutions which alleviate and uplift our people, and stop assisting others who are selling drugs to the young and innocent people in our society.

I thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Minister Electoral Member of Executive Council.

HON. W. RUSSELL BOGGS: The Honourable Minister Electoral Member of Executive Council.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sorry. The Honourable Minister Electoral Member of Executive Council.

HON. W. RUSSELL BOGGS: Mr. President, I rise to support this motion and I would like to congratulate the mover of the motion on having so well chosen to make her presentation.

I am pleased also that it will be sent to a Select Committee where an in-depth study can be made, and it can be known at first hand by people as to what we can produce some form of legislation which will bring about the desired results.

Many people use, for instance, Family Planning but I suppose that is another "to page to advertise", and I believe, Sir, that that slogan is still true today, because the Bahamas and Nassau especially spend millions of dollars every year in advertisements to acquaint the public that they should healthy, and to promote their tourists.

The point has been made that other countries with sophisticated means of keeping entertainment down, are taking measures to prevent the spread of this and to control it in order for their people to have better health, on which there can be placed no monetary value, but which on a Government all the way value all for the reason which is stated in English pension. Many times we like to imply that we are the other countries. We have adopted some of the bad things. We have forgotten some of the environments. I feel, Sir, that it is time that we adopt some of the good things which can help to improve the quality of life in these islands we live.

With these few words, I support the motion and look forward to making a contribution when it goes to Select Committee.

HON. ARTHUR H. FOSTER: Mr. President, I promise you that I will be very short, Sir. I would like to support the motion, Mr. President. I only hope that when we are in the Committee Stage of this thing, that the management and press will be added, not only Radio Cayman and the Broadcaster. Just for information, Radio Cayman Radio announces up to the tune of $20,000.00 a year. I am quite willing to donate that loss, but if only I could convince myself, Sir, by non-advertising of business premises and things that it would stop regular loss broadcasts by either one of the two.

I think that we have got to be realistic. It is just like the illustrations given about Cayman Airways during the fortnight a few days ago. They are the losers. The only loser on this radio deal will be Radio Cayman. However, if all the rest lose too, - on quite agreeable.

Mr. President, having said those few words, I support the motion, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak?

HON. F. WILTON BODDEN: Mr. President, I rise to intervene of speaking. However, listening to the debate of Government Business, who is suggesting, Mr. President, that we include consideration of this, I would like to give a brief history of this motion as I understand it.

MR. W. MARKHAM RYAN (CONTINUING): Were the motor-boats to be used for recreating the nation, newspapers and private enterprise were included. Mr. President, I hope that I would succeed the motion if private enterprise was not included in the motion. If this is going to be the attitude of the Committee when we get to Committee Stage that we include private enterprises I will have to vote no.

Mr. President, we must help private enterprise in this country. No Government cannot tell a newspaper or any advertising firm what to do. Just because Government is trying to tell us what we must each do, private enterprise must live it.

I think that is wrong. If it is I had convenient to be working, and I think that Members must decide in their minds whether they are going to defeat Government's motion which is asking private enterprises to stop doing what they originally should do if they want to. I know that the house has the responsibility to what we do and I hope that also one explain to me whether she will be voting to include private enterprise or not. I will then be able to make a note according to my conscience.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Actually the Honourable Second Official Member was the first to catch my eye. I only noted the...

HON. NICOLAS J. PERALTA: Mr. President, Sir, I agree with the opinion that this motion should be referred to Select Committee, but I think my Honourable colleague has missed on this picture a very valuable point. My opinion is objectively be a bad thing for Government to do something but practically unavoidable for the private citizens to do it.

I think, Mr. President, that if the introducing of aggression and expediting legislation be, to be real so. Government cannot abandon themselves from the duty, if they are to be a duty, to prevent the public from their own weakness or carelessness, merely by saying that "no one is going to do it, but it is right for anybody else to do it".

I would strongly support my colleagues in saying that if a Select Committee is to be fruitful and to be to my use, that it should examine all forms of subventions of tobacco, liquors and alcohol products; examine the practice and procedure in other jurisdictions to see the value which have been achieved there and to see what needs to be done generally in regards enforcement of these drugs.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, the Honourable Elected Member for Executive Council.

HON. PERCY C. RENNIE: Mr. President, I support this motion, Sir, and I am pleased to know that it is going the Committee route. The one aspect of the motion as originally presented which gave me some concern was partially removed by the Honourable Second Official Member when he mentioned the amount of expenditure which follow Customs for this type of enforcement. It is not that I am concerned about the loss of this revenue per se. However, the revenue has obviously been taken into consideration in our estimates, and I would hope to have that we did anything which would have other consequences whereby we would be losing exactly the amount involved.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not know. I have not quite enlightened idea but also did not intend me to understand, what revenue is brought into the Customs Division from the use of the petitioners whom the application to the Customs.

REP. EDWARD O. BENNETT (CONTINUING): I know mentioned in the first three that I have used the new optional building that have one or two advertising billboards within the building. I am not sure whether any of those ever relate to alcohol or tobacco, but if they would have an impact on the amount of revenue involved. So, what we are considering on this motion, Mr. President, we don't know which necessarily determine the amount of revenue which will be involved; what amendments we will have to make from this during the next year. So, if perhaps together in the caucus that we can do it anyhow, we could possibly just put it in this year, providing that we are not bound by that time constraints.

It is a fact, Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: Does the Member expect to be some time? My watch has gone a little slow and I had been disobeying the moment of intermission. However, if you are going to be a long time then I think we cannot finish tonight.

SEN. EDWARD O. BENNETT: Not more than seven two minutes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Alright.

SEN. EDWARD O. BENNETT: It is a fact, Mr. President, that the advertising of tobacco and alcohol seeks to stimulate the appetite and as mother Nature sometimes grows people to believe that it is the new thing to use it. I think that as a Government, if we are going to take the interests of our young people suitably into consideration, Government should be seen not to encourage the advertising of these drugs.

I support the motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: If no other Member wishes to speak, perhaps I could... You wish to speak? Well, in that case we normally finish tonight..

HON. MASSEL G. MOHAMED: Mr. President, I would like to speak on the motion, but not this evening, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I had hoped that we might be able to finish this motion tonight but plainly we shall not be able to.

ADJOURNMENT OF DEBATE UNTIL TODAY

HON. DAVID S. OMAMO: Could I ask for a suspension of Standing Order, Sir, so that we can complete this Statement which...?

MR. PRESIDENT: There is no hurry in asking. I do not know whether Members will wish to stay on longer to complete this particular motion this evening, but if one or two Members may wish to speak, it may mean quite a long statement.

MR. W. KOSKEY: I feel that we should postpone the Standing Orders, Mr. President, so that we can continue Members' business. I do not think that it will be that long.

MR. PRESIDENT: In the meantime, in view of the fact that Assistant Minister Mr. Moi sought the Chair, in order to accommodate with the suspension of Standing Order 82, that Standing Order 19(1) be suspended in order to enable the Minister to be concluded today. Is that what the Member had in mind?

MRS. DIANA S. CROSS: Yes, I did. I....

MR. SPEAKER: I thought it was.

MRS. MICHAEL J. BARTLEY: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, to my fellow colleagues is that many times, if it had been the character of the motion to suspend Standing Orders, perhaps a little explanation would have been given to Members who only spoke very briefly.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I do not think that the Member could have reasonably foreseen that the debate was going to be very long in ending this evening. The Honourable Member for Crescent Council should be aware, briefly or not as the case may be.

HON. MARGARET C. SCRIVENER: Briefly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak, only right the Member of the motion shall be entitled the right of reply?

HON. MARGARET J. BIRNEY: Sir....

MR. SPEAKER: Briefly or at some length?

HON. MARGARET J. BIRNEY: I will make it brief.

MR. SPEAKER: So, the other reason I am just trying to advise Members is that while they vote on your motion for the suspension I am not sure how long they may expect to be kept here if they vote in favour. The Chair is reluctant to put a question of this kind after five minutes to twelve but I wonder if the Member of the Executive Council have told me if he intends.

MRS. MARGARET J. BIRNEY: Not more than a minute or two Mr. Speaker, since you explain that to me again please. I am not sure that I understood exactly what you were trying to tell me.

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding was that you told me that you would like to move that Standing Orders be suspended in order to enable the debate on your motion to be completed.

MRS. MARGARET J. BIRNEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Members will have to vote on your motion to suspend Standing Orders. Before they vote, I thought that it might be helpful to them all to have some indication of how long we should be staying here if they intend to pursue your motion. The Honourable Member for Crescent Council says that he wishes to speak briefly also apparently wishes to speak. Each Member is entitled to speak right of reply. You have each said that you will be about five minutes. That means that we should not be here for more than another fifteen minutes if people vote in favour of suspending Standing Orders.

MRS. MARGARET J. BIRNEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Does that make it clear?

MRS. MARGARET J. BIRNEY: Yes, you have.

MR. SPEAKER: Sir....

MR. M. MAHESH BHAT: In addition to that motion, Mr. Speaker, there was another motion to continue so that we could finish Private Members' business today. I check up on it. We have one more motion left which should be short also and we could finish it today.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is perfectly possible to move a motion that we should stay for two hours on Private Member's Motion No. 11 as well, but I doubt that you would find the same support for that. I think let us vote first on the Third Elected Member for West Bay's motion. If later anybody wishes to move another motion, to suspend Standing Orders as the remainder the question. So, I will put the motion by the Third Elected Member for West Bay that Standing Orders be suspended in order to enable the continuation of the debate on Private Member's Motion No. 11/95.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. STANDING ORDER 10(2) SUSPENDED TO ENABLE THE CONTINUATION OF PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 11/95.

MR. PRESIDENT: On that note I will ask the Honourable Fourth Elected Member for Prospective Council to finish.

HON. FRASER S. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Private Member's Motion No. 11/95 as amended. Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in supporting this motion which deals with the dangerous drugs, regardless of who may use them. I think that what the motion is asking for is reasonable and that we might strengthen ourselves a bit more by trying to remove from societies anything which is harmful to them.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is not going to affect the smokers in these Isles to any great extent because these few people who still smoke in pubs might yet find their way to the stores to buy their cigarettes. Those who take a drink can still find a way of obtaining it. They do not have to listen to the radio or look in the newspaper or elsewhere to see who is selling cigarettes and where they can find the drink. Therefore, as far as advertising is concerned I cannot see that it will affect one of them if that is discontinued.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that Government should take the lead in setting an example in cases like this. However, I do believe that if that example is to be set by it has to be legislated by this Honourable House, that there should be no discrimination as far as the percentages are concerned, to say that it must only affect Government and nobody else. I think that it should equally affect the board because what is not good for Government is also not wholesome for the rest of the society.

As far as Government's contributions are concerned it could be loss of revenue to some extent but, Mr. Speaker, if we are doing something which is good and something which is beneficial to the society, especially removing from the society habits which are very dangerous to individuals and to others, then the little revenue should be the least consideration in the recommendations which are being made.

Government's profits although they make some money from this form of advertising but, Mr. Speaker, if this motion is not allowed to take its course of elaboration in Legco I do not think that this is going to have it, however I think at the present time the motion has a lot of advantages.

MRS. PAULINE E. GRIGSBY (CONTINUING): The fact is that they were making fairly good income from this source to the extent that the institution has now become a self financing one. So, if they have to force this form of advertising, I am sure that it can be replaced with other things.

Mr. President, liquor has been very detrimental to the individuals and have brought a lot of heartache to the homes. I can prove what is being proposed in this motion, and I want to congratulate the women, in my opinion a move in the right direction.

I therefore support the motion, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Miss Mineral Maiden for Hot Springs.

MRS. PAULINE E. GRIGSBY: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to thank those Senators who gave their support, and to those who brought to the forefront ways of the various ways this action should put the interest of the whole Senate.

I am glad that it is going to Committee stage because, Mr. President, I can assure you that any area on which information can be brought to bear to control gambling of liquor and cigarettes, I will do my utmost to see that this is done. I had one person tell me that she had a child who would that when the representative came from Radio Clayton to the ring across the Emerald Mountain. I have had other persons complain to me and say, "You know, that is one of the things which should not be on radio". One of Radio Clayton's close friends had a quiz where he says, "If it feels good, do it". Well, I do not necessarily subscribe to that because many things we like feel good, for instance when you have a minor toothache you go to the dentist affects which matter.

I realize that this will be a loss of revenue to Government, but from what I can gather from Radio Clayton, they have no new advertisements to put on there that they either have not had too much programming after all.

As far as the newspapers are concerned I really honestly cannot see how they should be exempted from this, because there is not that much competition. If all advertising by newspapers is done by one or two companies, possibly three. I feel sure that the Little Club Publicity, and other organizations which want to see these signs removed out on the Islands, would be able to lend their support and perhaps take up some of the slack in Radio. Clayton and the newspapers as far as advertising is concerned.

We want to ensure, Mr. President, that we do not have so many shops on these Islands what is good for our people. This is not really something new. This is being done in many countries. For instance in the United States in the state of Virginia, right now there is unrest, but we see, I think it is the police and fire service and teachers in that state, I believe that it got a job where one has to pay a penny to the dollar in the different income departments. They do not have unions unless they can show their application form to the effect that they have if they smoke they have shown risks. This is simply because they have found out that it is costing them so much for health care, absenteeism, insurance.

Mr. President, it is my desire to do my best for this country. As far as cutting cigarettes is concerned or any other body, I will be working in that direction. However. What I see that is hurting our people, especially children and young people, I particularly on that issue, and regardless if the also votes for this motion I would like to say that I feel my intention to seek to step in every way possible any advertising of liquor or cigarettes locally.

MRS. DOROTHY J. OLSEN (ASSISTANT): Thank you, Mr. President, and I thank every Member of this House for their support. I hope that those who did not might have seen otherwise which the last few minutes.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion before the House is Senator's Motion No. 11/95 as amended both by committee by the Senate at the time she moved it.

Before I ask Members to vote on it there is one point which perhaps I should have brought earlier to your attention. That is that the motion as now amended reads:-

> "BE IT RESOLVED that the Honourable House take immediate steps to appoint a Select Committee",

and so on. Standing Order 86(1) says that the House may appoint any of its Members to be Members of a Select Committee, and so on. However, neither in this motion on which we are being asked to vote, nor in that Standing Order does it say how the House shall go about the task of choosing who it is appointing. My impression during the debate on this motion was that a majority of the speakers were assuming that if a Select Committee were appointed on the terms of this motion, it would be a Select Committee of the whole House, of all Members. I was going to invite the House to vote on the motion on the assumption that it is intended to be a Select Committee of the whole House, if that is agreeable to the mover of the motion.

MRS. OLSEN (ASSISTANT): Yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that we do it in that way then. In that case I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES:

MR. P. MCKENZIE (SR): May I have a division, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes.

DIVISION
NO. 25

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis E. Foster	Mr. P. McKenzie (Sr)
Hon. Michael J. Murphy	
Sen. Thomas C. Hoffmann	
Hon. Samson G. Shemilt	
Hon. W. Noreen Dodkin	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkpatrick	
Hon. Manuel C. Johnson	
Hon. Daphne L. Arnett	
Mr. Lieutenant A. Pierson	
Capt. Henry G. Kirkpatrick	
Mr. G. Edward Miller	
11	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 11/85 TABLED BY HONOURABLE

MR. PRESIDENT: One final point. Standing Order 58(2) provides that I may nominate a Chairman of the Select Committee, if I do not make a nomination the Committee shall elect one of its own Members.

Now, like I think most Members of the House, I was slightly taken by surprise to find that this motion was going to call for the appointment of a Select Committee. I have not had an opportunity to give thought to the question of who might best Chair it. I do not therefore propose to nominate a Chairman. However, what perhaps by leave of the House I may do, is to invite the Honourable Hon. Elected Member of Executive Council to be responsible for convening the first meeting of the Select Committee at which a Chairman can be appointed by the Select Committee. This does not make him Chairman, but it does mean that the thing gets off the ground. Otherwise the danger with no Chairman is of nothing ever happening.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, Standing Order 58(2) says that if you have not appointed a Chairman, "the Member with the longest, continuous membership of the House, shall appoint".

MR. PRESIDENT: Oh, well that too may make difficulties. Sorry, which Standing Order? Standing Order No....?

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Standing Order 58(2)-

"The first sitting of a select committee shall be held at such time and place as the chairman or, if the Presiding Officer has not appointed a chairman, the Member with the longest, continuous membership of the House, shall appoint."

MR. PRESIDENT: One difficulty there is the Member with the longest continuous membership of the House is I think you regarded as being the First Elected Member for Bonavista Town. In view of his present illness it will probably make for great difficulty.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Why do you not appoint Mr. Pierson?

HON. DENNIS J. FOOTE: I second that, as it's a good leader, Sir.

MR. LEONARD A. PIERSON: No, I think that the honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council would be the proper person.

MR. PRESIDENT: If the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council was available to Chair the Select Committee, I would be quite happy to appoint him. If he is....

HON. DOUGLAS J. ELLIOTT: I am not available, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Pitching? (Inaudible).

HON. DOUGLAS J. ELLIOTT: I am not available, but if it is felt that I should do it, then I will be happy to do it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, I think perhaps in that case it might....I thought I had found a neat solution until the Honourable Deputy Speaker dropped me up.

MR. M. MAKEBA BUSH: Under Standing Order 78(6)... One more question, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Standing Order 78, or 78(6)?

MR. M. MAKEBA BUSH: I guess, Standing Order 78, subsection (8),

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes?

MR. M. MAKEBA BUSH: Committee, it says:- As I do understand that the Select

> "shall be confined to the matters referred to it by the Senate, and to any extension or limitation thereof made by the House".

So I do understand that the motion as it is framed, the Committee can only work according to the wording of the motion?

MR. PRESIDENT: One would be the interpretation of the Standing Order. You will have to ask the Chairman of the Committee to rule exactly what the Committee can do. However, that seems....

MR. M. MAKEBA BUSH: But this seems to be the place when you are appointing the Committee.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, the Standing Order is there to govern.

MR. M. MAKEBA BUSH: But the House. I do not know whether the Standing Order would have any power in a Committee.

MR. PRESIDENT: If you are asking me whether the Standing Order applies, then the answer quite clearly is yes, the Standing Order does apply and the deliberations of the Select Committee are limited to the matters referred to.

MR. M. MAKEBA BUSH: To the motion? To the motion?

SEN. HONOURABLE J. BRADLEY: No, Mr. President....

MR. M. MAKEBA BUSH: As I clear the understanding it is the motion, Sir?

SEN. HONOURABLE J. BRADLEY: No, Mr. President, Sir, it is not like Hansard in that the motion because as it stands, the motion having been passed is the only matter referred to by the House. However, I think it is the feeling at least of certain Members that may that the Select Committee has been appointed, that the House may think fit and proper to widen the terms of reference which it can do.

MR. PRESIDENT: Oh yes, but until the House has widened the terms of reference, the Select Committee cannot unilaterally widen its own terms of reference. I think that that perhaps answers the point which the Second Elected Member for West Rift was seeking to make, and he is quite right.

MR. W. MARVIN WATT: Yes, that is what I was trying to find out. Whether actually they are...

MR. PRESIDENT: The House has charged a Select Committee with a certain task. The Select Committee cannot shoot off and undertake a quite separate or additional task of its own motion.

MR. W. MARVIN WATT: Thank you very much, Sir. I was just wondering whether we were going to try to curtail the freedom of the press here by saying that they cannot acquiesce.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that if you labour the point you may find that the House is divided as to exactly what happens. The adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS A. FOSTER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 4.09 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., FRIDAY, 26TH MAY, 1989.

SECOND MEETING OF THE 93RD SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

BISMARCK
SIXTH DAY, 1973

SPEAKER PRO TEM:

THE SECRETARY WILL CALL THE ROLL, MR. CLERK - PRESENT

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS

GOV. WILLIAM L. GUY	STATE EXECUTIVE OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
LT. GOV. ROBERT J. WILLIAMS, JR., ESQ.	SECOND EXECUTIVE OFFICER: RESPONSIBLE FOR STATE COMMUNICATIONS
SEC. THOMAS S. ANDERSON, JR.	STATE OFFICIAL: RESPONSIBLE FOR RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS
SUPT. EDISON G. SEARLE	ADDRESS FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
ATT. GEN. ROBERT BOBBIN, ESQ.	ADDRESS FOR JUDICIAL AFFAIRS AND CRIME
REP. CARL CHESTER L. BLANCHARD	SPEAKER FOR INVESTIGATIONS WORKS AND STATISTICAL ADMINISTRATION
SEN. ALBERT G. ROBINSON, JR., ED	ADDRESS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

SENATORS MEMBERS

MR. W. THOMAS SMITH	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST SENATORIAL DISTRICT OF WEST DAK
MRS. DARLENE E. GREEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST DAK
MR. LLEWELLYN A. FRANKLIN, JR.	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND SENATORIAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL DAK
CAPT. HARRY A. BLANCHARD	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF LOWER DAKOTA
MR. W. BLAKE BURGESS	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT OF LOWER DAK
MR. W. EDWARD WILLIAMS	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH DAK
MR. JOHN A. WALLACE	SECOND MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

REPRESENTATIVES

MR. JAMES W. BOOKER	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT OF LOWER DAK

O R D E R P A P E R

FOR

FRIDAY

JUNE 3RD, 1983

QUESTIONS

THE SPEAKER EXPECTS MEMBERS FOR ORDINARY WORK TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTION MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

NO. 69: WOULD THE MEMBER LIKELY THE FIGURE WHICH HAS JUST BEEN COLLECTED FROM ONE MEMBER REGARDING ADJACENT PARKING LOTS?

NO. 71: DURING THE MEMBER STATE THAT THERE IS NOT ENOUGH ROOM FOR HANDICAPPED PEOPLE AT THE CLINICS AND THAT NUMBER OF DISABLED PEOPLE HAVE RECENTLY DISCONTINUED TREATMENTS IN THIS NEW TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT?

THE ADVISED MINISTER MEMBER FOR FINANCE TODAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 71: WOULD THE MEMBER KINDLY HOW LONG AN INDIVIDUAL CLAIMED EXEMPTIONS TO RENT TO PERMANENTLY IN THE DWELLING WHICH OTHER IN WHICH EACH ITEM IS OWNED AND SO LONG SINCE 20% MUSEUM AND WHETHER ANY SUCH PERIOD HAS TO BE CONTINUOUS?

THE EDUCATION MINISTER NOT WANT AND TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR FEMALE MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR POLITICAL AFFAIRS AND SPORTS

NO. 73: WILL THE MEMBER STATE THAT FORMIDABLE FORCES A PROSECUTION OF DOUBLE ALLEGIANCE TO WHOSE ALLEGIANCE FOR THE PERIOD 1ST DECEMBER, 1944, TO 31ST MARCH, 1948?

NO. 74: WILL THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER THERE HAS BEEN A DECLINE IN TOURIST SPENDING IN ITS CLINICAL ALLERGIES AS A RESULT OF THE LOSING OUR EXPERIENCE?

NO. 74: WILL THE MEMBER KINDLY HOW THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF TOURIST ARRIVALS FOR THE YEAR 1983 IS?

THE SECOND MEMBER FOR SCARBY STATE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 76: WOULD THE MEMBER KINDLY HOW GOVERNMENT IS ADVERTISING IN THE LOCAL MEDIA THE SERVICE STUDENT OFFICERS?

NO. 77: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHAT WAS THE TOTAL COST OF THE TELEVISION BROADCASTING UNIT TO DOMINICA AND WHAT WERE THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES OF EACH MEMBER OF THE TEAM?

NO. 77: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHY IT IS NECESSARY FOR MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY TO SIGN A BLANK BACK TO-BACK TO VOTE THE BUDGET, AND DOES THE SAME APPLY TO MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL?

5. STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST SECRETARY MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE.

6. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS:-

(i) COMMITTEE STAGE

(1) THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (SCHEDULE) BILL, 1985
(2) THE CURRENCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(ii) RESPONSE SESSION

(1) THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (SCHEDULE) BILL, 1985
(2) THE CURRENCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(iii) FIRST READING

(1) THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (SCHEDULE) BILL, 1985
(2) THE CURRENCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(iv) FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(1) THE OFFICIAL SECRETS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

(v) SECOND READING

(1) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE ARREST OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

(vi) COMMITTEE STAGE

(1) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE ARREST OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

(vii) RESPONSE SESSION

(1) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE ARREST OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

(1) [illegible] TAXES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988
(2) THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MISCELLANEOUS) BILL, 1988
(3) THE REGISTRATION OF COMPANIES BILL, 1988

PUBLIC BUSINESS

MOTIONS:-

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

(a) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 19/88 - [illegible]

(b) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 20/88 - REGULATION OF LIQUOR AND CIGARETTE ADVERTISING IN THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Questions	1
Statement by the Hon. Deacon D. Blake	10
The Clerk of the Courts and Deputy Clerk of the Courts (Powers) Bill, 1986 – Committee thereon	15
The Currency (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Committee thereon	16
The Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Committee thereon	20
The Registered Land (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Committee thereon	21
The Clerk of the Courts and Deputy Clerk of the Courts (Powers) Bill, 1986 – Report thereon	61
The Currency (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Report thereon	85
The Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Report thereon	86
The Registered Land (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Report thereon	86
The Clerk of the Courts and Deputy Clerk of the Courts (Powers) Bill, 1986 – Report thereon	88
The Currency (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Third Reading	88
The Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Third Reading	89
The Registered Land (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Third Reading	89
The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – First & Second Readings	89
The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Second Reading	47
Adjournment	97

FRIDAY

26TH MAY, 1966

10:00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Questions. The Second Elected Member for George Town. Question number 68.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND PORTS

NO. 68: Would the Member state the amount which has been collected from the newly refurbished airport parking fees?

ANSWER: Up to 16th May, 1966, the sum of $12,828.00 had been collected from car parking fees at the new terminal buildings.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Honourable Member state how this amount corresponds with the budgeted revenue for that particular period?

MR. PRESIDENT: I really think that that ought to be something the Member himself could find out by looking at the Estimates, and you are not allowed to ask questions that are not within the manners one available in published records. If it is not in the Estimates, then you are entitled to ask it. If it is in the Estimates, then you are expected to look the answer up yourself.

HON. W. MCKAY BODDEN: Mr. President, I can say that it corresponds favourably with the amount that has been estimated to be derived from this area of revenue.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, if I may, Sir. The purpose of this question is to solicit certain information from the Honourable Member, and that is the relevance of asking the supplementary. I can appreciate what you have said, Sir, but I do not think it is very helpful if I am to go unprepared for a budget to try and find this information. The supplementary follows on the primary question.

MR. PRESIDENT: What Standing Order is it ? I have been trying to find the Standing Order; I was relying on memory - (1/1/1) (a) says is that a question shall not be asked the answer to which can be found by reference to available official publications. And the point I was making to make sure that if the printed Estimates give the information for which your supplementary asked, then the supplementary was itself out of order. If they are not (the printed Estimates) broken down in such a way as to give that information, then you are certainly entitled to ask the question.

MR. PRESIDENT (INTERRUPTING): I truthfully do not know whether the previous Statements are broken down in that way, but perhaps I could help both you and the Honourable Leader of Executive Council by asking whether the Honourable Elected Member of Executive Council could provide you in writing with the information your supplementary sought, if that information is not already available in the printed Estimates.

HON. W. HOWARD BOGGS: I see no problem with furnishing the Member, Sir, if that satisfies him.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would that be satisfactory?

HON. GARFIELD E. GRANT: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Honourable Member be able to say here whether airport parking fees are payable by employees at the airport or will the vehicles be free of charge?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is a fair supplementary.

HON. W. HOWARD BOGGS: Mr. President, I presume that the Government is referring to employees who work at the terminal buildings, and if it be so, fees are payable by those employees. However, the Cayman Islands Corporation have set a special rate, which, if my memory serves me correctly, is $5 per month for employees who work at the terminal buildings.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary, Honourable Member 76.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR GREATER GEORGE TOWN (MR. JAMES BODDEN) ASKED THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

QUESTION: Would the Member state the cost per square foot for renting space at the airport and the number of businesses which have recently taken advantage of the new terminal premises?

ANSWER: The cost for renting shop space at the new terminal buildings is as follows -

1. First Floor

(a) Departure Lounge - $24 per sq.ft. per annum
(b) Main Concourse - $18 per sq.ft. per annum

2. Second Floor

(a) Terminal Shops - $12 per sq.ft. per annum
(b) Office Space - $10 per sq.ft. per annum

One business has discontinued operations in the new terminal building.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask the Honourable Member if he is aware that this rate of rental at the airport is much higher than many of the prime office and shop areas in downtown George Town?

HON. W. ROSWELL BOWDEN: Mr. President, may I say not more than this is much helpful because I think the average square foot price for where the main areas in downtown George Town would probably be between $20 and $25 per square foot. However, I would point out to the Member that these rates were set prior to 11th December, 1984.

MR. G. SAIG BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Member telling the House that they have blindly put in rates that have not been estimated even before the terminal was completed?

HON. W. ROSWELL BOWDEN: Mr. President, no I am not telling the House that we blindly took any decisions, because, as the Member will recall, supposedly the terminal was completed and opened before 14th November. The rates which we have applied were carefully examined by the Cayman Islands Corporation and considered to be fair and reasonable.

MR. G. CRAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, I wonder if the Honourable Member could tell us when he had the opportunity of this examination.

HON. W. ROSWELL BOWDEN: It is not in relation to the original question, but it was on 21st September, 1985. The reason I made that point was because the Member asking the question in previous meetings had indicated that it was opened prior to that in December some time.

MR. T. ALTA RUTTY: Mr. President, may I ask the Honourable Member if he is talking about the first baptism or the second baptism of the building? (Laughter)

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not really sure that you can ask that. So, we will have the Elected Member for North Side. (Laughter)

MR. D. EDWARD MILLER: Could the Honourable Member state what the above mentioned by the one business which was closed, has been filled or not.

HON. W. ROSWELL BOWDEN: Mr. President, I am not certain whether it has been filled or not.

MR. TIMOTHY A. TIBBETTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the Honourable Member state if any of the tenants in the terminal have complained to him or his portfolio of hardships as a result of the high rental costs?

HON. W. ROSWELL BOWDEN: I suppose not, Mr. Speaker, that any formal complaints came made to the Director of Civil Aviation. I have not received any myself. I do know that there have been discussions taken, by some of the shop owners, to negotiate with different positions within the terminal in order, probably, to give them better business opportunities. However, no formal complaints have been received by me.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Elected Member for North Side I see Sir.

MR. D. EDWARD MILLER: Could the Honourable Member state if there is a waiting list of businesses to get into the terminal? Are there a number of applications in hand?

HON. W. ROSWELL BOWDEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have several companies which are still interested in working at the terminal, and there is a list.

MR. RICHARD A. PIERSON: A supplementary, Mr. President. Would the honourable Member give his undertaking to examine the situation, and if it is found necessary, also, to consider abolishing the airport parking fees and reviewing the rentals.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think the part about airport parking fees can be a supplementary question to this, but the rentals on the rentals can.

MR. W. RICHARD BOWLBY: Mr. President, we can look at the whole range, but the fact remains that we have a very nice terminal. As I may have said and it has to be paid for. This is a matter for the Corporation to deal with. I can say to the Member that we will look at it again, but I could not make any commitment here that we would be willing to reduce the rates as they are at the present time, because as I have said before, we have a very expensive terminal to operate and it has to be paid for. I am certain that the appropriate calculations have been made in additional rentals.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question number 21.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR IMMIGRATION AND EMPLOYMENT MATTERS:

NO. 21: Would the Member state how long an applicant granted permission to remain permanently in the Islands must spend in them each year in order not to lose that permission and whether any such period has to be consecutive.

ANSWER: The provisions of the Immigration Law, 1984, relating to loss of permanent residence by virtue of absence from the territory, is contained in section 44 of that Law at paragraph (2).

Mr. President, I realise that Members may not have this Law in front of them so for their benefit I will just read it -

"44. The Board shall declare that any person who has been granted permission to remain permanently in the Islands has ceased to enjoy such permission if any of the following circumstances, that is to say -

(a) he has been ordinarily resident outside the Islands continuously for a period of two years;".

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JEFFREY A. EBANKS: Mr. President, a supplementary. Would the Honourable Member state the minimum period required to be spent in the Islands in order not to lose this residence?

HON. JAMES U. BODDEN: Mr. President, the Law says if a person stays out of the Islands continuously for a period of one year, it shall be lost. It does not say the minimum time. So I was only suppose if a person was here for one week out of each year, he would not lose it.

MR. LISTON A. PITTMAN: Am I to understand, Mr. President, that if someone receiving permanent residence under section 93 and 94 of the Immigration Ordinance, Cap. 62, were out of the Colonies for one day a year that he would still be considered to have permanent residence?

HON. DENNIS D. FINGER: It would seem that way to me, Mr. President. It says if he is continuously outside of the Colonies for a period of one year. If he is in the Colonies for a few days a year, he will not lose it.

MR. LINTON A. GUTTERIDGE: Mr. President, my question is to get information which I consider useful, because I have been asked this question before. Am I to understand that an individual receiving permanent residence need only spend one day in the Colonies per year?

MR. PRESIDENT: That question has been answered since how it was?

MR. LINTON A. PITTMAN: Mr. President, I am seeking a specific answer.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no .....

HON. NEVILLE M. ROGERS: Mr. President, it seems to be a matter of legal interpretation. My interpretation is the same that if an ordinarily resident does not choose to go away for two or three years a year, that is fine. However, if an ordinary resident wants to also just only choose to come here for a day or two, I think it could be considered that is not ordinarily resident here.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think the questioner is going to be able to obtain from legal advice (laughter) an interpretation of the Law from the Government Bench. It is for the courts to interpret the Ordinance.

MR. LINTON A. GUTTERIDGE: Mr. President, ...

MR. PRESIDENT: If you need silence or there need advice on simple legal points of this kind, I think they should be referred to their own lawyers.

MR. EDWARD A. PEARCE: Mr. President, I am not seeking advice for my clients. I usually go to my lawyers for that. The purpose of seeking clarification in this House is to get factual answers. If we cannot get it for this House, where can we going to get it? And this is why I have an honourable Second Official Member who is well versed in the Law.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I do not think anyone that it is the intention to give legal opinions, and indeed standing Order 31(1) (a) again suggests we should not entertain expressions of opinion on the solution of an abstract legal question. Well, I am not certain quite what an abstract legal question is, but I do not readily think that interpretations of the Law, which is really what you are seeking, can properly be sought.

MR. LINTON A. PITTMAN: One last supplementary question, Mr. President. Will there ever be Government Scholarships awarded to an individual if it has no idea of what period it is spending?

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not quite sure to whom you are addressing that to. Are you addressing it to the Honorable Floor Official Member?

MR. EDWARD A. PIERCE: To the Honorable Floor Official Member. That is to which my substantive question was asked.

HON. DENNIS H. MORRIS: Mr. President, the Board is not going to grant permanent franchise to a person who has not fulfilled the qualifications of the law. The qualifications are set out in the law that, I think, one must be resident here for six months first and then after you may apply, and so on and so forth. The qualifications are set out here and I do not think it is going to be granted unless a person qualifies under the law.

MR. EDWARD A. PIERCE: Mr. President, in view of the answer I have received, I wonder if the Honorable Member would give his undertaking to check this section of the law as there obviously appears to be a loophole there?

HON. DENNIS H. MORRIS: I cannot give that undertaking, Sir. The law is there and I do not see any loophole in it.

MR. EDWARD A. PIERCE: Mr. President, without undertaking to withdraw this question, I wonder if the Honorable Member would then state why he could not tell us the specific period that an individual would have to spend in these Islands other than guessing that it may be two or three weeks at a time, when in fact the law states that to lose it one would have to be away for one year, but it does not give any period in which one has to spend in the Islands. It could be one, two or three days.

HON. DENNIS H. MORRIS: Mr. President, the answer is in the law, Sir. If the Member reads the question there is better interpretation which I can give, then he can get it elsewhere also.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question number 72. The Elected Member for East Hoa.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST HOA ASKED THE HONOURABLE MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND PORTS

NO. 72: Will the Member give this Honourable House a breakdown of tourist arrivals to these Islands for the period 1st December, 1984, to 31st March, 1985.

ANSWER: The breakdown of tourist arrivals to these Islands for the period 1st December, 1984, to 31st March, 1985 is -

	AIR	CRUISE	TOTALS
Dec 84	14,402	21,257	35,659
Jan 85	20,728	17,200	37,928
Feb 85	14,249	23,959	38,188
Mar 85	17,570	24,674	42,244
TOTALS:	56,858	26,537	155,106

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. JOHN S. NOLAN: Mr. President, a supplementary. I wonder if the Member could say how do these figures compare with the same period for last year?

HON. M. SHARP (CHARLE): Mr. President, for the four month period November, 1983 to March, 1984 compared with December, 1982 to March, 1984, exports by air are up 7.7 per cent. Cruise ship movements are up by 23.2 per cent for a total of 20.4 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER: Question No. 725

THE QUESTION ORIGINALLY WAS ASK THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE LEADER REGARDING AIRPORT AND FLIGHTS AVAILABLE FOR FLIGHTS AND TRADE
(Answers to the Honourable Leader Opposite Hansard)

MR. XX: Will the Member state whether there has been a decline in freight brought in by Cayman Airways as a result of the recent fare increases?

ANSWER: Freights during September by Cayman Airways has declined, but it cannot reasonably be said that it is a result of the recent fare increase because the fluctuating rates of freights does not support such an inference.

	1983 (Lbs)	1984 Value
January	335,320	138,038
February	341,829	150,861
March	489,239	197,624
April	609,376	158,312
	1,875,584	644,255
	1985 (Lbs)	1986 Value
January	427,965	157,956
February	502,887	132,609
March	491,205	196,530
April	308,903	119,385
	1,460,760	652,380

We have carried out a small exercise after the Cayman Airways Limited has been formed, concerning the cost of importation by sea and air (including Port Authority charges).

This exercise has attached appendix for information purposes the differences are negligible based on the nature of the goods imported.

ATTACHMENT

COMPARISONS OF AIR AND SEA FREIGHT CARGO COST

U.S. 1406 – KINGSTON

M.I.A. – MONTEGO BAY

AIR
(AMERICAN)

1 piece, skid pallet	Cost	1,338.26
102 lbs @ 1.389 per	Weight	78.00
56 cub. ft.	Miscellaneous	16.54
		US$1,243.80
		CI$1,212.80

Duty	938.50
Envelope Tax	1.50
Miscellaneous Fee	.50
	CI$940.50

SEA
(AMERICAN SHIPPING)

1 piece, skid pallet	Cost	1,368.25
4,200 lbs	Weight	84.75
56 cub. ft.	Miscellaneous	78.51
		US$1,428.24
		CI$1,199.60

Duty	735.24
Port Charges	8.48
	CI$248.12

Port charges CI$8.48 per 20 cub.ft. + 65 minimum Heavy 14/ft.

AIR
(CAYMAN AIRWAYS LIMITED)

T.S. 2202

M.I.A.

1 pieces bldg material	Cost	877.95
Pcs. ups. 877 lbs	Insurance	5.26
Dim. Wgt. 3,902 lbs	Freight	570.38
.389 per lb		
778 cub.ft.		US$1,663.25
		CI$1,314.72

Duty	562.70
Postage Tax	1.00
Miscellaneous Fee	1.00
	CI$564.70

SEA
(CAYMAN SHIPPING)

1 pieces bldg material	Cost	877.95
Wgt. 877 lbs	Insurance	14.49
778 cub.ft.	Freight & Misc.	407.38
		US$1,299.82
		CI$1,027.84

Duty	329.33
Port Charges	36.87
	CI$367.14

ACF
(CHICAGO AIRWAYS EXPRESS)

J.E. TASH

09.0.85

1 roll carpet	Cost	1,018.60	Duty	888.00
	Insurance	19.80	Brokerage Fee	4.00
Cpt. 780 lbs. @	Freight	878.00	(150# per hr.)	
.968 per lb.			Merchandise Fee	.00
(60 cu. ft.)	Doc.	4.50		CT8328.50
		1021,878.10		
		CT8),8[6.41		

SEA
(SEATTLE SWIFTSURE)

Carpet 60 cu. ft.
- 6oz. Min. Wgt. up
to 988 lbs

1 roll carpet	Cost	1,018.60	Duty	888.00
780 lbs.			Brok. Charges	14.75
60 cu. ft. (@				CT8302.60
12.78 cu. ft.)	Freight Incl.	166.00		
	Insurance	18.80		
		0581,782.40		
		C182,484.76		

ATL
(ATLANTA AIRWAYS)

2 pieces furniture	Cost	3,968.00	Duty	781.40
Cartage 960 lbs	Freights	1,598.11	Brokerage Fee	4.50
@ .850 per lb	Doc.	7.50	Merchandise Fee	2.50
(160 cu. ft.) 4 = 5'				2[1/78.40
x 6'	Insurance	58.08		
		5781,638.10		
		CT8],807.00		

SEA
(SEATTLE SWIFTSURE)

2 pieces furniture	Cost	3,968.00	Duty	218.42
960 lbs. 160 cu. ft.	Freights	891.80	Brok Charges	36.00
(2 1.78 cu. ft.)	Insurance	39.55		CI2764.42
		0581,276.35		
		0183,358.11		

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. LEONARD A. LUCOCK: Mr. President, I have a question to pose, Sir, for clarification. Could you advise whether this question would fall under the definition of Section 22.(3)(f) of the Standing Orders?

MR. PRESIDENT: In considering the question I took it that it was a breaking information. It was not really relating to facts already decided. In other words, the terms which had been decided that there should be a change in certain charges. If somebody had moved a question saying that it might have been that there should be a change then I think Standing Order 22.(3)(f)(i) would have had to render that question inadmissible. However, if somebody moved that the effect of the charge I think that would be perfectly proper. Is that getting the clarification? I'm sure quite prepared to seek information about the effect of the change which has been approved by the House. I can quite understand that some Members may desire as a result of the information which they thus get that the charge should have been made. However, I am obliged to say that they may not be in order.

MR. JOHN A. WATTS: Mr. President, a supplementary. As a result of the answer given would the Member say whether it is correct that Cayman Airways limited applied to Government some time ago to reconsider the amended but then to the fact that it did about a decline in the freight rates?

MR. DONALD C. REYNOLDS: Mr. President, no formal approach has been made to me, Sir.

MR. J. EDWARD KILLAS: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member state if Cayman Airways terminated their freight rates on November, 1984 or not?

MR. DONALD C. REYNOLDS: The freight rates for Cayman Airways were terminated on the 14th December, 1984.

MR. LEONARD A. LUCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member say whether he has any information as to why that was seen to be necessary?

MR. PRESIDENT: As to why?

MR. LEONARD A. LUCOCK: As to why it was seen to be necessary to terminate the freight rates on December, 1984.

MR. PRESIDENT: I will let the Member answer but I think that that is getting a bit remote from the original question.

HON. DONALD C. REYNOLDS: Mr. President, I really do not have any first hand information but I would assume that when the Board was dealing with the matter of necessarily the rates or looking that on they were, it was an attempt by the Board to run a commercial airline, and at the time it was a matter of necessity were terminated.

MR. A. MILO SCOTT: Mr. President, it seems from a rough look at the answer that the decrease in freight charges over that period is something in the vicinity of close to half a million pounds. I am wondering if the Member can say if the rate decrease would compensate for the reduction in volume?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that we have mostly getting to...

HON. THOMAS G. MASTROMARK: I would just like to answer him, Mr. Tax Payer be looking at on the weight. If he looks at the United States Dollars received, the difference is $20,799.00. I agreed that Cayman Airways needed to have any money at all or to make any differences of this type. However, when we take this consideration the wages we must look at the expenditures as well, not just the revenue side, Mr. President. We have a responsibility which we have to the people. We have to pay for the raising of the wages. We have to pay for staff on the Miami side as well as other things such as birthday fees, etcetera.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, in view of the approximately 20 per cent reduction in the value of foreign currency and April, 1984 as compared to January and April, 1983 could the Member state whether he has any information as to whether or not the expenditure in the Estimate have taken into account a reduction of the tax increase?

HON. THOMAS G. MASTROMARK: Mr. President, no recent information has been sent to me of that type.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question No. 24.

THE SPEAKER AGREED FOR THAT HON TO ASK THE SUPPLEMENTARY SECOND ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND SPORTS

NO. 24: Will the Member state what the estimated number of tourist expected for the year 1984 is?

ANSWER: The visitor arrival forecast for 1984 by the Department of Tourism is as follows -

Air arrivals	157,222 or 18.9 per cent over 1983
Cruise arrivals	219,037 or 7.0 per cent over 1983

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. SPEAKER: I believe any Member wishes to ask a supplementary. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Yes, Mr. President. The answer shows that the forecast is for a 18.9 per cent increase for air arrivals. Can the Member say whether this is fairly real?

HON. T. RUSSELL ROLFE: Mr. President, I am told by the experts that this forecast of the increase is reasonable. I would say that the progress which we have made so far this year seems favourable. The reply which I gave previously to the honourable Elected Member for East End included December, 1983. However, the statistics are calculated on a calendar year basis. If we take January, February and March, 1983 and compare that with January, February and March for 1984 it can be established that so far for the first three months of 1984 we have at least 2,000 tourist arrivals to date over the same three month period for 1983. So that I would say that we are making fairly good progress and it is anticipated that we will be on target.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary, question number 76. The Honorable Member for North Dade.

QUESTION NUMBER 76 ASKED BY MR. ROLAND BURRIEL PERTAINING TO INCREASE OF EXECUTIVE STAFF

MR. JOE: Would the Majority Whip say Government is advertising in the local media for Senior Customs Officers?

ANSWER: Government is advertising for Senior Customs Officers because there are a number of vacancies at that level.

Some of these vacancies are the result of an increase in the establishment, approved by the Legislative Assembly in the last estimates. One Senior Customs Officer has recently promoted as Assistant Collector, thereby creating another vacancy.

Interested Officers in the department will be considered for promotion and outside Officers in other Government Departments are free to apply for the advertised posts. If applications are received from non-serving Officers with better qualifications and experience than serving Officers, it is possible for a vacancy to be filled that may rather than by promotion. In considering the claims of persons in the service for promotion, merit and ability are taken into account as well as seniority, experience and qualifications.

Interviews will be held shortly and new appointments will be made if all the vacancies cannot be filled by promotion or transfers.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. O. RAY ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask since the application for Senior Customs Officers does the Government really expect to find qualified people here other than Customs Officers who have worked?

HON. DENNIS A. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible that persons in another Department such as Immigration or even Police might apply for these jobs. To make it sound as if that gave a senior position in Customs but the promotion of that Department to Customs Officers and then Senior Customs Officers. It is not really right up to the top. I think that we will probably get a lot of applications from other Departments.

MR. O. RAMON BURRIEL: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Honorable Minister or not it would have a better opportunity to have considered all of the Junior Customs Officers before advertising for Senior Customs Officers?

HON. DENNIS A. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this is going to be vicious Mrs.

MR. O. RAMON BURRIEL: Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be done then why is it necessary to advertise for Senior Customs Officers why did the advertisement not simply read Senior Customs Officers to fill the posts of Junior Officers who have promoted?

HON. HOWARD B. FOSTER: Mr. President, there are a number of these posts, Sir, and I think that the Public Service Commission or some consultancy should be advertised locally to give other Civil Servants in other Departments an opportunity to apply.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that it should be made clear to the House that statutorily declaration appointments in ministries are now made by the Public Service Commission and that no Member of Government, including the honourable Chief Ministerial Member, is responsible for them.

MR. W. HERBERT SIGH: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member say whether he believes that he will be able to find those officers locally?

HON. HOWARD B. FOSTER: Most certainly so, Mr. President.

HON. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary, question number 22.

THE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR HOUSING AND LANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE CHIEF MINISTER: MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

NO. 22: Would the Member state what was the total cost of the teachers' mortgage scheme and what were the responsibilities and duties of each member of the team?

ANSWER: The total cost of the teachers' mortgage scheme was $18,000.00. The team had joint responsibilities, namely to select the most suitable applicants for each advertised post.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. S. EDGAR HILLIER: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member state if the Principal of the school was a member of this team?

MR. PRESIDENT: Could you say the Principal of that school?

MR. S. EDGAR HILLIER: Of the High School.

MR. HOWARD B. FOSTER: Mr. President, the Public Service Commission has authorised a selection panel consisted of the Principal Secretary of Personnel, the Principal Secretary of the Portfolio and the Head of the Department to interview candidates for those positions. Sir.

MR. S. EDGAR HILLIER: A supplementary, Sir. Seeing of the cost of $18,000.00 can the Member state whether the quality of teachers has improved?

HON. HOWARD B. FOSTER: Well, Mr. President, those teachers have not come yet, but judging by the performances which we have had here, we certainly seem to have got a good selection there.

Mr. President, given the Member's benefit, unless he is not giving me a supplementary I am going to volunteer it, Sir. Some given the amount $18,000 by the same type of arrangement. I am sure that this year it will be possibly around $20,000 anyway, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Elected Member from North Side has risen.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: ...would the Member care to give a breakdown as to how that money was used? Is the Member saying that we are making a place to locate retiree when retiring people have not been already asking myself.

HON. DENNIS A. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, because in the past we used to negotiate through the Union Agents and we have to pay them about 10 per cent of the amount salary for negotiations. It would never be possible to locate all of the specialists when we interviewed there, who remained in the Cayman Islands to-[illegible] then, it is much cheaper to send three people, the head of the Department being a qualified teacher himself. The saving really comes through the commission paid to the Trade Agents in the past.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further the Second Elected Member for West Bay caught my eye, if he still wants to ask a question.

MR. TRUMAN BODDEN: Yes, Mr. President, I did pray before the Member but he got his answer on specific[illegible] going to cost.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, then the Elected Member for North Side spoke.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: I know that we should not make statements, Sir, but since everybody has had their turn it's I think that I will try mine. I was not suggesting that we bring them out here, Sir. I think that if we are offering the kind of jobs which we offer locally, they should be made to fly out here at their own expense.

MR. G. MILO BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member of the Government for the last two years is conducted through the Passport's office in London.

HON. DENNIS A. FOSTER: The answer is yes, Sir. He and his staff have done a very good job in helping out the Department recruiting.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Could the Member state whether his office is taking by fees of charge, without commission?

HON. DENNIS A. FOSTER: Most definitely so, Sir. They are salaried people of the Government.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLER: Could the Member say what those salaries are?

MR. PRESIDENT: Is that information in the estimates?

HON. DENNIS A. FOSTER: I would think so, Sir, but I cannot remember them offhand.

MR. P. RICHARD BODDEN: They are not in the estimates.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: They are in the estimates but they are under Other Charges. They are not specifically broken down.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I think that if the Member would like that information I dare say that the Assistant Chief Official Reporter will provide it to him. It is not really a supplementary from the original question here.

I am not sure whether the Second Elected Member for West Bay was still trying to indicate by eye, or whether he was finished by eye. Perhaps he was not trying to indicate by eye. If there is no further supplementary, question... How you trying to attract my eye or not? No. Question number 22.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE ATTORNEY GENERAL CONCERNING CANCER OF RESPECTFUL DISEASE

No. 22: Would the Member state why it is necessary for Members of the Legislative Assembly to have a prepared plan of action in what the return, and does the plan apply to members of the public?

ANSWER: Detainees are allowed only one telephone call and they are given the opportunity of choosing their relatives. The procedure is considered necessary to ensure that a detainee is not denied a chance for someone he genuinely wishes to see, simply because someone else wishes to see him and is allowed to do so. The procedure applies to all detainees whether they be family members or Members of the Legislative Assembly.

Weekly chosen exercises are held in a recreation facility, however, if an in-house request is received, this would be allowed and it would be outside the ambit of the law unless.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. D. EDWARD WILSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is it possible to have the Members of the Legislative Assembly's visits re-classified similar to the clergy so that they will be outside the room?

HON. GEORGE B. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I would not say that is impossible, Sir. However, I would just like to point that the Prison Rules used in the United Kingdom. It says:-

> 'An M.P. including a Member of the House of Lords can visit him if he wishes to see him. The meeting will not take up any of your visiting order.'

He gets a special visiting order.

> "You may also be visited by a member of..."

So it shows, Mr. President, if a Member of the Legislative Assembly is requested by the prisoner to visit him, I would say that there would be no problem in hoping that he contacts the Governor. If the Member wishes a request to see the prisoner I think he should have to ask the Governor if he wishes to see him or not. If he wishes to see him, permission would be granted, Sir.

MR. LINDSAY A. AMERONG: A supplementary, Mr. President. Will the Minister give the undertaking that separate from Senator Al Hartland Molson, for Members of the Opposition to speak then will be given [illegible] opportunities?

HON. MICHAEL M. POSTAN: Yes, Sir, I will give that undertaking. The Senator Molson might wish me to let you the message as well.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary we shall move on to the next item on the Order Paper, Item 4, Statements, the Honourable Miss Muriel Mackie of Parkside Council.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

MISS MURIEL M. MACKIE: Mr. President, yesterday the Government Senate moved against Private Members Motion No. 2/75, which if accepted as written would have committed Senate either to the acceptance of the proposal to construct in such a way as to preclude at least the location on the southwest of the hospital as it is then. Although in speaking on that motion I made it clear that it was Government's intention to provide 24 hours per day coverage by a doctor on the original campus, perhaps that announcement may have been lost in the debate which followed.

Since this matter is of such public importance I would not like any misunderstanding to arise concerning it. I therefore wish to make it unequivocally clear that it is Government's intention to have a doctor on duty at the hospital 24 hours a day in keeping to the announced decision making this known to the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 5(1) Committee Reports continue....

MR. S. GRAHAM: May we have a minute to look at the answer in case I might want to ask the Member a question under Standing Order 30(7)?

STANDING ORDER 30(7)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, certainly.

For the information of Members, Standing Order 30(7) provides that where appropriate, at this stage only, we may return on the statement just made, but that I may in my discretion allow a short question to be put to the Member who made the statement for the purpose of seeking clarification. So if any Member does have a question of that kind, I am quite prepared to entertain it.

MR. G. WALL SPARKS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member why a made the statement since the statement was already a proposition of the request which he had just so yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that the statement stands, I don't know whether you have a copy of it, the motion there. You may not agree with the supplementary but it is on record the issue.

MR. S. GRAHAM [MPHIL]: On a point of clarification, May could the Member please at this time how the objective of having a doctor at the hospital 24 hours a day is going to be achieved without [illegible] the Members?

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, again I think the Member's statement made it clear that he wanted to examine the position. In other words, he has not agreed but has objections which seem to be reasonable. So, I do not think really....

MR. D. BRIAN KELLY: Mr. President, Sir, this question has been examined by a previous Member for eight years and the Member before for four years, so it has had a lot of examination.

A. M. MARSHALL JONES: May we have a vote, Sir? I think that there was a question.

MR. PRESIDENT: ...Mr. I did not allow the question. In other words I do not think that it really was a question seeking clarification because I think that it was clear enough from the statement.

MR. M. MARSHALL JONES: Am I allowed to make a statement?

MR. LIEGARD A. FINNEGAN: Mr. President, a short question. Could the Member please tell the House the understanding that a report of the in-depth study will be brought to this House at the next Sitting or before?

HON. SENATOR O. ZAMMIT: Mr. President, I believe that the next Sitting would be Monday morning so I could not undertake to do that.

MR. LAWRENCE A. SCERRI: Mr. President, I believe that the Minister is saying sometime previous. We know that I mean September.

MR. PRESIDENT: Subsequently, the Member is saying September. If you mean September you should have said Monday, not Friday.

MR. LAWRENCE A. SCERRI: Mr. President, I believe that most of us here are intelligent enough to know that he didn't mean to an in-depth study and get it here tomorrow morning.

MRS. JOSEPH J. CALLEJA: Mr. President, Tuesday is Sarmula Day if the Member means at the next Sitting in September, I think that it is impossible for us to say that I will have an answer for it. Thank you Sir.

MR. M. MARSHALL JONES: Is the Member speaking in parliamentary language when he says have an answer for us on Monday and for September? I will not quite understand.

MR. PRESIDENT: September.

POINTS OF INFORMATION

MR. M. MARSHALL JONES: So that some clear, Mr. President, if I correctly make a statement now, I wish to put you on notice, Sir, that I want to make one of the adjournment Hour statements.

MR. J. BRIAN KELLY: If I could be of help to the Member, Sir, I mean the in-depth study might mean it by Tuesday. He could bring it on Monday.

MR. PRESIDENT: If the Second Blocking Motion has been withdrawn, I wish to make a motion on the adjournment. I beg his withdrawal to withdraw Order 15(7) so that he will not suppose that what he said a moment ago gives me the notice which is required. I want to make just as much time as possible.

MR. E. ROBERTS JONES: Yes, Sir, I quite understand what it is. I have that you suppose the Government Monthly Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, that is not what it says. I think that you should read what it says a little more carefully. It puts on Minister an obligation to publish a certain proposition. If you publish that proposition then certainly you may raise the matter. I think that we have probably anticipated the possibilities of the amendment now, in which case the House will now go into Committee on which I will entitled the Clerk of the Court and Deputy Clerk of the Court (Powers) Bill, 1986 and certain other Bills.

THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (POWERS) BILL, 1986

COMMITTEE STAGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee. I have just a few to discuss the powers of the Clerk of the Court and the Deputy Clerk of the Court.

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill. Unless any Member wishes to speak I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. POWERS OF CLERK AND DEPUTY CLERK.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3. POWERS OF DEPUTY CLERK.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 3 PASSED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO INCREASE THE POWERS OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND THE DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause do stand part of the Bill. If there is no debate I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL TITLE HAS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A Bill for a Law to amend the Currency Act (Chapter).

THE CURRENCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill. If there be no debate I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSE 1 STANDS.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 20.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. D. EDGAR HILLS: Mr. Chairman, it is quite a common practice here that automatic coins are inserted for gambling, I suppose. In the strict interpretation of legality, that could probably be interpreted as inducing. So I wonder if we need it now, some discussion for the nominated coins. I would like to break it down by inserting my 500 gold pieces around my neck.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you mention this earlier the Second Reading debate?

MR. D. EDGAR HILLS: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought that you were going on [illegible] whether this will not still in practice the machines are not illegitimate?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Maybe the Learned Attorney-General will help us.

HON. MICHAEL J. SAVAGE: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable Member need not worry himself unduly. The great majority of automatic coins, and we are here talking only about coins which are legal tender and part of the coinage of the realm here, and such coins presumably are the 10¢ and 25¢ pieces of that type thereof, and my understanding is that such coins for gambling purposes most of them are not declared but counted in a shortfall. Gambling is at its end destroy part of the actual capital and interest of the machine itself. However, if there was an understanding and you were required to themselves for gambling purposes the gambling, they could as a matter of actual policy that they would seek to substitute the face of the accumulation from the front of these, just coins. I think that the appropriate step which action is taken first would be if there that they take would be considering [illegible]. If they [illegible] permitted [illegible] would be guilty of an offence and liable both. However, I think that is an extreme case. I do not think the Honourable Member needs to worry about the normal process of machines for gambling.

MR. D. EDGAR HILLS: Are you thinking of what when they [illegible] a slot machine? You would not [illegible] that as [illegible]? Anyhow, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that meet your point satisfactorily?

MR. D. EDGAR HILLS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection to Clause 5 I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 5 AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE COMPANIES LAW (CHAPTER).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause stand part of the Bill. If there is no objection I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A BILL for a Law to amend the Companies Law (Chapter 22).

THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE AND DATE OF COMMENCEMENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill. If there is no objection I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 104.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. G. HAIG WOOD: Mr. Chairman, in the debate on this Bill I questioned the forfeiture on the application of property without notice both in the Companies Law and the Registered Land Law. I would think that ninety days' notice would be a reasonable time before the lands would be vested in the Administrator Generally. I am not going to propose an amendment because I know that we will only have one or two more Bills to deal with at these sessions. However, I think there is the matter of landowners who have bought property here or who may have been owing business to know that I call a reasonable application of this generally, even without notice.

I hope that Members are aware of what they are doing in the economy and in foreign investors if they pass this Bill in this form.

HON. LEONARD G. ARCHIBALD: Mr. Chairman, we are aware of what we are doing and it is by what than what we are doing is quite satisfactory for the private sector. Parties to agreement of the Bill I will indicate that sufficient notice will be given because the Law does not come into effect until the 30th September, 1986. Certainly that is much longer than ninety days. If it is a company which is not registered in the Cayman Islands, then it has to do is register and this participation provision will not affect it at all.

MR. G. HAIG WOOD: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Law will come into effect on the 30th September, 1986. However, perhaps someone should say and know this. As I do not consider this merely the ninety days after effect of the Law. What I consider notice is where the Law says that the Administrator must give notice in writing to the landowner that unless he takes action the property will be confiscated.

MR. G. MAY DOUGH (CONTINUING): This is a difficult matter which I would like to see the Minister. The Department does have efficient rent boards but it does not seem that somebody in Assembly could know what the fair market rate is.

MRS. SHOUSE OF SPRINGFIELD: Mr. Chairman, there is only one more thing we have which... As I mentioned during the debate of the Bill the Registrar of Lands has been approached for many years about the legal problem in the Alexander-Somerset tract of property which is registered in the Cayuga Indians, which has no title or clear ownership, complete land. He has been persuaded by prospective buyers that they were seeking to purchase a piece of land. Therefore, there cannot be clear title or there who have bought land since the Chief Justice's ruling in February, 1955.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: As I said to Mr. Chairman, there are quite many serious complications to the amendments being suggested by the Honourable Second Elected Member for Haldimand-Norfolk, in the circumstances I would rather be embarrassed, have the problem thus before which this Bill has been introduced rather... somewhat by it, namely that it seems to the Provincial Secretary. I consider that it is an extremely dangerous precedent to put this into the Bill because it would mean that just on any Indian reserve would have a piece of land we have to negotiate. Only in fact this is by where Crown or Ministers or really there is that which the Bill is, and only then it is the case of this land by negotiating.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless there is any further debate I will put the question that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

CLERK: AGREED BY MAJORITY. CLAUSE 2 PASSED.

CLERK: A BILL TO AMEND THE CONSTABLES ACT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Preamble Clause do stand part of the Bill.

CLERK: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A Bill for an Act to amend the Registered Trust Deed (Revised).

THE REGISTERED TRUST (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

COMMITTEE SUMMARY

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE AND DATE OF COMMENCEMENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. INTERPRETATION OF NEW SECTION 21A.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. H. RAY BOLTON: Mr. Chairman, I must raise this point of information. This clause will compensate land which is owned by a foreign company other than Irish Sugar, 100%, unless the foreign company does certain things. My understanding is that the foreign company may not know that we have passed such a law. The provisions of this measure should be given notice before the actual exchequer takes place. I understand that the Minister has said that there are some more foreign owned companies. However, certainly of those of which I am aware, they purchased their land here in good faith and believed that in owning the land, should they ever wish to rationalise the land or to amalgamate it, or to liquidate and take it for the purpose of development. It is just not fair to do this to the company by passing for the Government to just step in and take their property because it has passed a Dail and the public may not be aware that such a Bill exists. I understand that the Bill as drafted gives notice that the nationalisation is to take place, and notice of a reasonable time which allows the normal development which is now going.

Of course, I am not going to move an amendment because it will have only two or three votes, and there is absolutely no use in my doing so. However, I certainly feel strongly about this, that it is unreasonable that we nationalise property which belongs to anyone.

DR. GARRET FITZGERALD: Mr. Chairman, the procedure which Fianna Fáil is now adopting is to withdraw their amendments which have been in place since 1965. In Section 174 of the Companies Act it says that where a company is about to alter the objects of its Memorandum the property is vested in the Financial Secretary for the Government. Now, I have been in this chair for a long time and I have never of any issue where shareholders in Irish legal incorporated body came back to Government and said specifically to have whatever property there was returned to them.

Governments have always taken the view that if the company which was struck off the Register became in the new pay the amount less than those were paid and whatever conditions were necessary under the Companies Act were paid, the property was returned to the shareholders. I see no difference with this one, Mr. Chairman, except that we are probably talking about one or two cases.

MR. VINCENT G. DOWLING: Mr. Chairman....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Lands may not be in a position to answer my question.

MR. DERMOT J. GLEESON: Mr. Chairman, the Second Stage Speech, for which I am responsible, something about people being given notice. However, my understanding of this Bill is that this should apply to companies in liquidation, and not to individuals who own and manage property here. I do not think it is too unreasonable to indicate. Individuals as such.

MR. THOMAS C. FITZPATRICK: It does not affect individuals, Mr. Chairman. Individuals are dealt with under the Land Duty Act. This is a company, a corporation or some corporate body.

MR. H. RAY BOLTON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand that but I do not think that we need to quibble over semantics because a company is a person created by statute.

MR. G. MIKE MORRIS (CONSERVATIVE): Sir, whether it be a person or a company it really does not matter. What I would like to speak on is the amendment. Third Officer's Number eighty-nine what happens if there is no objection from what would happen under a situation where a company had been struck off the Register. Why is the distinction different because if the company had been struck off the Register and is struck off the person who registered the company loses at the time of registration what will happen if the deed are you have free and if the company is struck off. Here, when he bought this land, his company been registered this did not matter. This was something which is coming in after the act of purchase.

In the case of a company which is struck off the company struck off already does that the company would be struck off if it did not more serious requirements. However, this is imposing new requirements which did not exist at the time of purchase of the land. I feel that it is necessary to give notice.

MR. MICHAEL J. GRECH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think the Honourable Second Elected Member for Rabat, Gozo has the distinction of the Legal Adviser of it. However, I would like to point out to him and to other Members that the first page of this proposed new Clause 104A.(1) is in fact a prohibition to foreign persons unregistered company or body, besides it is a prohibition which says that Section 104A.(1) comes into force giving to power for such companies to be registered as provisions in the only action power to hold land in the Malta. That being so, if an unregistered alien incorporation comes in here will could to acquire land, it will be advised by the legal advisors that it has not to what to do. If it is unjustifiable enough not to have another legal advice before signing what purports to be a purchase agreement, it will then become more when it attempts to register the property in the Register of Lands. So, it is a positive prohibition to the foreign corporation so that it cannot in any way in the future put itself in title, because after the 30th September such a provision will prevent it being registered.

DR. J. JOSE SCERRI: Mr. Chairman, my comments is not with those people who may attempt to purchase land after the 6th June 1979. My concern is with those innocent people who may have purchased it before this Bill.

MR. ALFRED J. PISCOPO: Mr. Chairman, I expressed myself quite certain reservations also on this Bill. My reservation was mainly to do with the Objects and Reasons for the presentation of this Bill. I find that it was somewhat inadequate. We have in the first part of the Bill that it seeks to multiply for Malta the effects of a treaty judgement. In fact, we have no details of that treaty judgement except for what we have told here. The second part stated, that is Subclause 2, a prohibition of such British companies to hold land without any reason, the reason we were given here in the Assembly was that this was to ensure that Government would lose no revenue through the insurance by the changing of shareholders. So, there is no explanation in this.

The only thing which never somewhat impressed and perhaps this section is not necessary, but such as Dr. Scerri the Minister of Law to use policy to see that the principle which we are trying to stick here is again spread under the new section 2. as with assignment of property. However, we will look into this when we come to it.

MR. LEONARD A. PIERROU (COMMISSIONER): My point, Mr. President, is that I feel that the Declaration of Objects and Reasons should be drawn enough so that anybody purchasing this book will be left in no doubt as to what the Bill proposes, or the intent of the Bill.

MR. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, since it becomes law, also, the Declaration of Objects and Reasons is not studied as it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I could put the question now that Clause 2....

MR. LEONARD A. PIERROU: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I understand both the answer or this. Whether the Declaration of Objects and Reasons are stated on the Law or not I feel that the Law itself should be clear enough so that anybody purchasing the Law will know exactly what the Law is all about. We have a multiplicity here of foreign holding companies which means that they are anybody within this Island Of. However, for the purpose taking up this Bill, and I would like to make the point again that everybody buying a Law from the Legislative Assembly is not necessarily a Lawyer, I feel that our Bill should be clear enough for him to understand what it is all about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think that you have made your point. I will put the question that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. C. WAYNE JONES: Mr. Chairman, may we have a division on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

DIVISION NO. 22

AYES

Hon. Dennis E. Foster
Hon. Michael A. Stanley
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson
Hon. Dennis C. Skeete
Hon. W. Kenneth Dodson
Lt.-Col. Charles E. Kirkconnell
Hon. Wendel C. Johnson
Hon. Dennis C. Ornette
Hon. Walton B. Richardson
Hon. A. Edward Archer
Mr. John E. Nelson

11

NOES

Hon. Lynford A. Pierrou
Mr. A. Leroy Bascome

2

CLERK'S ASSENT OF MAJORITY.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE SUPREME COURT LAW (REVISED).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is this the third reading Secretary please read part of the Bill. If there is no objection I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE BILL WAS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That concludes proceedings in Committee. The Supreme Court Bill please.

HOUSE RESUMED

MR. SPEAKER: Before we resume I think it may be convenient to take our customary morning break. I will suspend proceedings for approximately ten minutes.

AT 11.35 A.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11.50 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Item 7(2), Reports. The Clerk of the House and Deputy Clerk of the Court (Powers) Bill, 1996.

THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (POWERS) BILL, 1996

REPORT RECEIVED

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, Sir, I beg to report that a Bill thereby entitling the Clerk of the Court and Deputy Clerk of the Court (Powers) Bill, 1996 has been considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

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

THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996

REPORT RECEIVED

MR. JAMES C. JAMESON: Mr. President, I beg to report that I have received a Bill for a Law to amend the Companies Law (Revised) has been considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: This Bill is accordingly set down for

THE COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Treasurer, I have to report that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Companies Law (Chapter 113) was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

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

THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Treasurer, I beg to report that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Registered Land Law (Revised) was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

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

THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT (TENURE) BILL, 1995

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Clerk of the Court and Deputy Clerk of the Court (Tenure) Bill, 1995.

MR. MICHAEL J. FRANCIS: Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill whereby entitled "The Clerk of the Court and Deputy Clerk of the Court (Tenure) Bill, 1995" be now a Third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that a Bill entitled The Clerk of the Court and Deputy Clerk of the Court (Tenure) Bill, 1995 be given a Third reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE CONVEYANCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Conveyancy (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

MR. TRUMAN O. BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill entitled The Conveyancy (Amendment) Bill, 1995 be given a Second Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Conveyancy Law (Revised) be given a Third Reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING BILL, 1986

THIRD READING

TITLE: The Occupational Licensing Bill, 1986.

HON. JAMES C. SCRIVENER: Mr. President, I move that a bill entitled "The Occupational Licensing Bill, 1986" be given a third reading and passed.

PRESIDENT: The question is that a bill for a law to amend the Occupational Law (Chapter 22) be given a third reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL READ A THIRD TIME AND PASSED.

THE REGISTERED LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

THIRD READING

TITLE: The Registered Land (Amendment) Bill, 1986.

HON. JAMES C. SCRIVENER: Mr. President, I beg to move that a bill shortly entitled "The Registered Land (Amendment) Bill, 1986" be given a third reading and passed.

PRESIDENT: The question is that a bill entitled a bill for a law to amend the Registered Land Law (Revised) be given a third reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO.

HON. C. "BILL" SPEIGHT: Mr. President, may I move a division, please?

PRESIDENT: I will ask the Clerk.

DIVISION NO. 21

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis R. Pinder	Hon. Lynford A. Pierson
Hon. Michael F. Smedley	Hon. C. Eric Bolden
Hon. Thomas C. Hoffmann	
Hon. Gordon D. Kempe	
Hon. W. Thomas Conolly	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkconnell	
Hon. Lowell G. Johnson	
Hon. Eugene L. Ogden	
Hon. Myles W. McKeown	
Dr. D. Canute Miller	
Hon. John B. McLean	
11	2

THE AYES HAVE A SECOND MAJORITY AND PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: ... Item 8(xvi), ... Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1986.

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

First Reading

CLERK: THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986.

MR. PRESIDENT: A Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1972 be deemed to have been read a first time and be set down for Second Reading.

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

Second Reading

CLERK: THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986.

HON. THOMAS C. ADEBAYO: Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1972, Law 9 of 1972.

The Objects and Reasons of this Bill, Mr. President, have been cast in Clauses 2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8. In Clause 2, No. Resolutions, it seeks to exempt persons who have bought land by an agreement and want to pay the stamp duty on the value stated on that agreement but do have to wait until the expiration of the period for paying the stamp duty. That period may be five years or it may be ten years. However, Mr. President, the difference here is that it allows the person an option. The person may only wait five years later and pay the stamp duty but he gets all benefit, Mr. President, of the difficulties that have accompanied inflation because five years later the person is not paying on the original value but rather the current market value at that particular time of payment. The small amendment in Clause 3 allows stamp duty to be paid at the time the agreement is signed, which, as of benefit, Mr. President, to local people and to others who have to deal in land matters.

Clause 5, Mr. President, is seeking to increase the interest charged on late stamping or non-stamping of documents. It is pleased since recently, Mr. President, to encourage those who purchase land to stamp their agreement within the stipulated time set down in Section 33 of the Stamp Duty Law which is 30 days. However, Mr. President, we are aware that there are businessmen and individuals from outside who come to this country and remain here, and sometimes the documentation is to be completed beyond a longer period than 30 days. Side by the same token, Mr. President, may although we have increased the percentages of interest to be paid from a per cent to 10 per cent, and that from 10 per cent to 20 per cent in Section 35 of the Stamp Duty Law which reads, Mr. President, if I may -

> "In addition to any penalty imposed by this Law for late stamping or non-stamping of any instrument under is required to be stamped, there shall be charged interest at five per cent per annum".

The amendment is seeking it to ten per cent:-

> "For the first month or part of a month and thereafter at the rate of ten per cent".

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN (CONTINUED): and we are increasing that figure to twenty per cent:-

"but never more than the total amount of the fine as originally imposed."

For those individuals and non-residents corporations who purchase less and have taxes less than $5 days, with a justifiable case, Mr. President, there is a provision in Section 26 which reads:-

"Provided that the Commissioner may, at his discretion for good cause waive payment of the whole or any part of such interest."

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that clause 2 of the bill is fair and reasonable as it is.

We have made certain really objections in the past which I have stressed before in error. However, there is no question of the present Stamp Duty Law which gives any cause to anyone. Mr. President, to refresh each others duty. Clause 3 is being put forward to make this possible. In this day and age, Mr. President, the volume of business is so large and the demands on each one of us are so large, and it is not necessarily Government I am talking about, Mr. President, I am talking about the private sector, that it is unknowingly easier and easier to make an error and attempt a document twice. Therefore, there is justification for the provision of the commissioner being able to make a refund.

Clause 4, Mr. President, is seeking to delete the reference to Section 26 in the heading of a penalty and is a consequence of the proposed amendment of Clause 5, "Power to be mentioned, of the Bill of the liabilities to pay stamp duty on a receipt.

Clause 5, Mr. President, is self-explanatory to Clause 3. The aim is really the same, to encourage all people dealing with legal documents to ensure that they pay out the legal sections of the Stamp Duty Bill. It provides for an increase in the offence under Section 26 and is substituting $500 for $200 as a fine and also within Section "," I have worked as a solicitor, $6,500 for $500 and, Mr. President, if you will allow me to read the appropriate section of the Stamp Duty Act, it says:-

"(1) Whoever commits an offence under section 26 or attempts to commit an offence or aids or abets any other person to commit such an offence is, if the offence is committed contrary to paragraphs (a), (b), (c) or (d) of that section liable upon summary conviction to a fine not exceeding $500,

and the clause is increasing that sum to $500:-

"or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months".

and the clause is seeking to increase it to six months:-

"or both, and if the offence is committed contrary to paragraphs (e), (f), (g) or (h) of that section, liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding $500".

which the clause is increasing to $1,000:-

MR. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON (CONTINUED):

"or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year or both."

The minimum is twenty one years to two years.

The sentence which I have read, Mr. President, sends us (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g) and all found in Section 20 which deals with certain offenses under the Penal Code.

Section 20 is being amended by Clause 7 and this basically deletes anyone who fails to stamp an instrument and places back upon Section 22 which deals with the circumstances of this case. It deals, Mr. President, with stevedores, longshore, boat company officers and many other people involved in the private sector. Those who recall why officers under these circumstances may have their licenses removed. I've gone on and notes other statements, Mr. President.

In Clause 8 we are seeking to change 326 on an agreement and, Mr. President, I give notice that I wish to amend Clause 8 which is a result of representation and comments from the Law Society as we have, with Government's approval, allowed amounts to come back to us as the GCT Bill proposed.

The amendment would read in Clause 8(1) the 326 apply to whether the agreement is assignable or not, so that the amount is still $20. When the agreement is assigned, Mr. President, the fee to be paid is $100.

The Bill also seeks to increase the fines duty on a cheque from 5 cents to 10 cents. We have found, Mr. President, that a recent approach to impose fines

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Bill, 1992 be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. The Second Elected Member for Eastern Side.

ORDER OF SECOND READING

MR. J. LEE HOUSEN: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before the House is a Bill which was found to be so ambitious during the Budget Meeting that it had to be withdrawn. It has come back to us a year from. Only that it has been sugar coated to make the Duty appear more palatable. That sugar coating is seen mostly by provisions made to allocate a percentage to be stamped for the pension money to the Government instead of the money going to Consolidated Fund.

However, we would not be dismissed by the sugar coating of some sections. We have that the Government has a revenue problem, maybe and forward to raise that of withdrawn Budget. When we came to the House on the 22nd day of March we received a report on the Appropriation Bill, 1992 and we passed into law a Budget which had a small surplus of about $25,000. However, the next item on the Agenda was the withdrawal of the Stamp Duty Bill. The Budget which we had passed had contained estimated revenue from the Stamp Duty Bill, revenue which would have been lost if it been withdrawn, something around $600,000. At that time the evening we passed the Budget, within three minutes we had made the Budget into a deficit by withdrawing the Stamp Duty Bill which would have given us $600,000. So, there is still that deficit to be filled for this year's estimates. I believe that so why this Bill has come back so quickly with a request for increased taxation on the same areas which will hurt the small man who we had squeezed out of estimates during the Budget Meeting.

I commend the Member for Clarence 2 and possibly 5 of the Bill. However, I am in disagreement with the rest of it. For example, the provision for loan agreement in Clause 7 of the Bill increases the interest which can be charged from 1 per cent to 20 per cent, and in one instance from 10 per cent to 20 per cent. Now, there may be people who make it impossible to delay the payment of stamp duty or any other tax. However, there are genuine cases where the duty is not paid simply because there is a shortage of cash. We need to be reasonable and I really have thought that it is too necessary to charge the percentage of the penalty. It should have gone from 5 per cent to 7½ per cent rather than 10 per cent, and the other one should have gone from 10 per cent possibly to 12.5 per cent rather than 20 per cent, because what we are penalising debtors are those who have to pay 20 per cent interest on unpaid debt, we are putting them in a way of accumulating interest rates. One must remember that Government revenue from late payments increases every year in proportion to the value of most trade transactions. So, while we are in the 10 per cent bracket we have been very much on a balance plus, maybe it is going a substantial amount of dollars. I feel that the interests are out of line and that they are excessive.

In Section 8 we are once more taking penalties out to. For example, Section 8(a) changes the figure $500 as a fine which might be imposed for a fine of $2,000. I have that this is the maximum fine. There are fines applicable to a company which can be imposed without - they and they are excessive.

Mr. G. Bill would consequently substitute (a) of Clause 6 also increases the penalties sought.

Clause 7 is a clause which seeks to discriminate against certain classes of people in that the mortgagee may re-enter and other people included in the building societies seem to be worse off than those in other categories. Connected with it is the restriction of the mortgagor's interest or whatever he may have. It seems really bad to me.

The Bill also seeks to impose a penalty of £100 for the assignment of a debt, policy or life insurance and other agreements for the purpose of fraud, whether debts or other documents previously. One of the forms of consideration in the Bill which was requested by Hansard was that of paying stamp duty when a person signed an agreement or made an agreement to purchase a property. It has never been a stamp duty because now the person would pay a heavy stamp duty of £100 on the agreement and might also contemplate to pay the 2.5 per cent duty as if he finally makes the purchase. So, for way a lawyer was trying to get a stamp duty, he must only pay the 2.5 per cent stamp duty which he perhaps did not be asked £100 when he wishes stamp it finally and before the final conveyance or agreement to buy it.

I am wondering whether the policy of this government is, as we have seen since November, only a policy which will run the small man in order to get the upper. I see the possibility for a fine of £100 on certainly a policy of life insurance. Only one person seeks to get a mortgage will purchase of the mortgage endowment plan may bought of them, a life insurance policy to cover that mortgage. In order for those policies to be effective now the person must pay £100 just to keep the small hold the policy. This is not right. The majority of which I am speaking is the ordinary £50,000 or £60,000 that the poor man is getting to finish a house. So many professional these people will have £50,000 of life insurance made up of three or four small policies purchased over a number of years. It will now cost £100 to have such policy assigned. This is unfair to the man trying to get a house. In the old Bill the amendment was, I think, £25 or £50. Even if he jacks up to £100, I wonder if the Financial Secretary understands what a life insurance policy is and why it is made, and think it seems wrong to penalise and discourage? I wonder if they understand that it is a vital document in the mortgage process and it is customary with most of the lenders to have this? Let here this Government Government to unduly the Estate Duty to pay £100 just to pass his policy over to the Bank or that the have not held it, and if the man should die the bank can use the proceeds to clear off the mortgage. This is unfortunate and should never be thought of by any other group of people than the present Government Council.

We see that they have also got back that amendment dealing with increasing the rent to £400 a year. Many hire purchase agreements are above £400 per annum, however, what we have in my imagination is, is how they could have the heart to put six to 8 per cent hire purchase agreement. When many people are struggling for the money which they have to pay to make a decision on an agreement of a certain, and they are asked to pay a fee on the value of an agreement. Here, the way it is drafted I do not think that one could a written legal business this is merely provision for people which are just have their double income. Most of these families are already struggling without a written lease. In every case now I have mentioned this was Bill, it is my understanding that we will be asked to pay a fee to the Government, a fee of a few more.

MR. G. DAVID THOMAS (CONTINUED): It does not matter whether it is office space or shop space, or a dwelling house or an apartment, many of these businesses owned by Pakistanis are owned by poor people, we only see a little lady and short trying to make a living somehow or operating a boutique but she might be struggling to make ends meet and it may cause a struggling couple to pay the rents. But this Bill removes protection by taking those poor people out of accommodation.

So, when Bill Wilson and Lim might find some other Mike that should go, into the hand of an owner, that block redeveloped and kept their rents control and prevented to this House in a sense from that scenario. Bill because do not recognise to apply the guarantee to absolutely the poor who in this country. When I say poor many I am talking about the little businessmen who runs his business or his other means. I am talking about the young couple who have to move an apartment. I am talking about the pensioners who does not have a home of to guarantee? By the Government from getting the increase the changes of getting that accommodation into controlled rent was gone up, a £100 per flat the consequence of a Tory Government policy. I am very disappointed at this when this Government will be here in the Budget Monday to hear that the housing authority building money, was making an income and was having no policy. I am one day. I can see why they can come in this position financially and income based on rents and housing trends on the environment of these in Inverness policies.

If the Elected Members of Inverness District have not kept any income they have certainly kept one. They proposed to help the small man and they are helping him out of existence. I would also mention that it is an injustice to this country to put forward the type of legislation like Government is putting forward in the manner in which they have put it forward. They have kept this Bill until the last minute. Of course, the Members were cast the white copy of the seven page proposed by the Scottish Office. Secondly people on the periphery have not seen and have not heard what is in these Bills. I have spoken to these tenements recently, one on Wednesday and one on Tuesday of this week, and neither of the three of these tenements had received the seven copy Bill from the Council. This is why there is no public outcry against this Bill and the other Bills which are in Office.

So, the Government whether intentionally or not have suppressed the passage of these Bills so that they are being pushed through without any public input. What there is a simple matter which nothing has happened to be exposed. The rents will have risen so far. They will have still unprotected tenancies. The tenancies will expire the prospects and the public will be informed the day the Government wants it to happen. But the first time to our notice we are Bills and matters coming to the Assembly particularly particular on Rents Chapter and this is unfair to the public. Mr Richardson has been pitted to an a Scottish Office Minister to discuss the effect of this Bill. Mr Dalgleish has been asked that she will like to speak the next one to replying gone by, whether it be in her capacity as the Area Minister. She has not been asked to comment on it and it will in up Scotland if the rent matter again to not close the door to say this but and the Bills are to comment by doing to pass it on to the Commons.

I will close by saying as I did on March that this Bill is withdrawn from this House; instead it is time consideration given to this matter until the reassessment exercise. My Lord Provost in this Meeting also which were held in the Highland constituency also which can change the circumstances there.

MR. S. MAYA REDDY (CONTESTING): However, here today we are passing a Bill which will greatly help poor men. We will hear possibly from the Executive Council what people are for. What do folks opine on a cheque? However, they have been saying this from October when they made the mistake of withdrawing a Bill, or a Ordinance which was the only, remaining a law which would have given them this power to get rid of this from a foreign source. Now they must make it up by what was called here the party whip system, whose duty must point a knife but have one pack a pistol but there until they get enough to balance their budget.

This Stamp Duty Amendment Bill is a Bill which if passed will cause great hardship, particularly amongst those family people who are trying to get out of paying rent and are trying to get a home. I am wondering if this is Government's answer to the dilemma which they pinpointed in March when the Housing Authority which was set up to help people get homes had no money, no loans and no policy.

I feel that it could not have been necessary to bring this Bill to this House if the Government had not been away with the commissioner tax. Anyway once away with it they have not found a replacement and they have gone in for many stiff oil tax Bill.

The very Honourable of this Bill has been so subtly written that when I read it first I did not realise that they had imposed the $100 tax on the assignment of a life insurance policy. That seems to have been left out if it had been done deliberately from the Honourable. I believe that the passage of this Bill will further depress our already shaky economy. The history of the Caribbean countries has been that it is easy for many of the nationals to take their share out of a country where the people are starving and where they are denied out of existence by the Government, because when the Government taxes the money, it cannot do as well with the money as private industry.

I oppose this Bill, Mr. President, and I ask members the House that I will be voting against the entire Bill as well as voting with clauses against particular sections; the sections which I feel are detrimental to the livelihood of our local people.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that it is time for the luncheon break and I will suspend proceedings until approximately 2.15 p.m.

AT 12.40 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:12 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. The Second Reading Debate on the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(IMPOSITION OF STAMP DUTY ON REAL ESTATE)

MR. LINCOLN A. TIENGO: Mr. Speaker, unlike my good friend from Caroni East, the Second Elected Member, I have mixed reaction on this Bill. I find some improvements and I also see some areas which could be improved.

The Bill seeks to amend the Stamp Duty Act, 1975. There is a major improvement on the Bill which was brought to us in March. I feel, Sir, that with recommendations I will be able to support this Bill.

Clause 2 seeks to enable stamp duty to be paid on the face of documents as signed. This is a good idea, but I think that this is somewhat muddled - the effect of this by clause 8(b)(i). I will come to this as I go along.

Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to increase the increase to be charged on stamp duty. This, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment to section 32 of the Stamp Duty Law, 1975, which reads: "In addition to any penalty imposed by this law for late stamping or non-stamping of any instrument which is required to be stamped, there shall be charged interest at five per cent per annum for the first month or part of a month and thereafter at the rate of ten per cent per annum ....".

Mr. President, it would appear that those responsible for these amendments decided to arbitrarily double the interest that is now provided under the law without due consideration to the effect that a twenty per cent interest would have on an offender. I think, Mr. President that twenty per cent interest is unreasonable and this is one section which I feel should be given further consideration. Perhaps fifteen per cent would be more reasonable.

In clause 4, this clause seeks to impose the individuals on the provision is sought to be made for the Commissioner to make a refund of stamp duty in the circumstances as described by the honourable mover of the Bill earlier.

I beg to agree with the honourable mover of the Bill that there is no longer a necessity to have to issue receipts for certain payments, even though I would say here that there are many people who do not make payments by cheque. I still feel that it is not necessary for those paying by cash to have to stamp a receipt. Those paying by cheque, as was rightly stated by the honourable mover of the Bill, will find that the cancelled cheque will serve the purpose of a receipt.

I will congratulate the honourable mover of this Bill, Mr. President, for the very good job in presenting this Bill earlier. It was presented with clarity and it was very carefully thought out. I feel that he is to be commended for a very good job done on the presentation.

MR. LINDSAY A. PHARNEY (CONTINUING): Clause 6, Mr. President, makes provision for penalties for offences against the Act to be substantially increased. This, Mr. President, brings about an amendment of section 37 of the Act. Mr. President, I feel, unlike my hon. colleague and Mr. previous speakers, that it should be dealt with because as I read this Act it should specifically in section 37 of the principal Act that the offence would have to be done with intention

Section 37(1)(a) of the Principal: "with intention to defraud ....." Subsection (1)(b) reads "with intent to defraud ....." and subsection (1)(c) reads: "with intent to defraud ....." So it shows throughout the Act that the person making the offence would have had knowledge of what he was doing. Mr. President, I feel that the presentation made under clause 6 are most unreasonable.

Mr. President, of particular importance, as I said, in the road I will be making my debate on this will undoubtedly should be clause 9(b) dealing with assessments. Mr. President, it would appear that this clause has the same prejudicial effect of an appreciation of assessments, but there seems to be still a loophole in that law where an agreement for the purchase of any land, private table or other immovable property where there only an option and a half that could still be avoided, and that assessments should be made from Confederation to the present? Perhaps the honourable member will clarify this point in his summary?

There is also no distinction as to how long or the life of the assessments. Would the assessments last, for instance, six months, one year, ten years? Would it be possible for the assessment of a property to be able to remain this in any number of instances?

Mr. President, today I move my objections to certain parts of a Bill which I felt would harm this country and was confusing to investors coming to this country. The very possible that this Bill would be passed anyhow, the Registered Land (Amendment) Bill, 1981, to study it closely, it would seem, this still amending the Stamp Duty Law, 1978.

I understand from the Honourable Member of the Bill that the Bill does not in fact apply to private dealings with a debt or policy of life insurance. I trust, Mr. President, that the Honourable member will make this abundantly clear.

As I said, Mr. President, if the Bill should indeed apply to a policy of life insurance, it would be very dangerous and damaging to the Belize people in this country, even though I know that there are some persons who do not like the Belize people in this country. There are, Mr. President, many, many Belize people in this country and when I say Belize people I do not say this in a derogatory manner.

As I said, I have other objections in this Bill and I trust that the Honourable Member of the Bill will be able to clarify the points raised by me and be particular the points raised in assessments.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. C. EDGAR MILLER: Mr. President, I am pleased to speak this night but the Government bench spoilt my holiday, Sir. I see eight the Opposite, but not with the body of the Bill.

I agree with clause 2 which gives individuals the option of paying the stamp duty up front on a higher percentage of property. This has been a move which many people for some time became the value of property at the end of the purchase agreement, in some cases, may have quadrupled or even increased greater than the original purchase price.

MR. D. EDGAR MILLER (CONTINUING): I can support clause 2 of the Bill... I can also support clause 3 because I believe the penalties should be increased and at least they should be above that the person could get by putting his money in the bank rather than paying stamp duty for the period of time, as in Queensland than just holding back the stamp duty and putting it on a fixed deposit and making a profit on it while they dispute assessment of it. So may even have to increase that a little higher.

Now, Sir, clause 4. I agree again with the spirit of it, but I think there is something wrong with the wording of this clause too, Sir, because if I, as a Corporation, have to pay five per cent on a lease agreement or deem and a half per cent on a purchase..... I believe that this clause 4(b) is going to affect things like time-sharing companies and things like that; and stamp duties and considerations; and I intend to move an amendment to this clause that they should pay, at the very least, five per cent which everybody else pays on a lease because it would be argued that these people are leasing the space for one week or a year rather than outright purchase.

I'm also glad to see, Sir, that the loophole of the six day lease is being plugged. This has been a problem around for a long time. I have personally been advised by many people by attorneys and public solicitors, Sir, the attorney-general is not to make it the lease six months so as to avoid paying Government fees, but to make it six days, however, Sir, I believe that even though the practice in the community may be that leases are not normally negotiated on anything exceeding twelve months or thereabouts, I would like to see, Sir, an amendment whereby anything exceeding six months is considered a lease so that we can protect the little people which my good colleague Goldingham in his eloquent way has said when we are talking about inheritance. I would not want them to go completely out of consideration, Sir. We have to leave them a little room to complain.

I believe, Sir, that if we can make those amendments to the Bill, I will be able to support it, both in body and soul, Sir.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to speak ..... I call upon the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. VINCENT A. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, to support this Bill, to ask to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1971 - a Bill which was introduced in this Honourable House during the March Meeting and was withdrawn for further consideration.

Mr. Speaker, whatever in the approach taken today over this Bill. However, we heard that the measure is now going to cause hardship to the public and it was going to further impound the already economy. This, Mr. Speaker, is to mind is another excuse to mislead the public.

As far as the reference to a shaky economy is concerned, that is what this Government found upon taking office in November last year, and every attempt is being made to stimulate the activities within the country. If that is the attitude of this Government, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how we can going to bring legislation or any proposal to this Honourable House that would do such harm. That is not the policy of the various approaches of this Government. It is here to promote reasonable proposals to this House and the small list of revenue which the Government would perhaps receive from the provisions contained in this Bill is what I would call pennies.

MR. KELLY of PENNSYLVANIA: Mr. President, this Stamp Duty Act was introduced in 1783 - 18 years ago, and the provisions in connection with duty on cheques first came in to operation. Although acceptable from the length of time that the proposal to vary has been in effect. So I assume now there will be very few cheques.

The banks increase their charges from time to time and probably in future there. The whole point is, however, the amendment because of any of these facilities, then it is to the advantage of the public.

Mr. President, members have also made that the public have nothing about this Bill until it was presented here. I would like to remind honourable members that this is a money Bill and I am sure that we are aware of how the Bills are treated here. It is confidential until it is presented here. So I do not think there can be any leaking on the part of this Government as such that this Bill would be presented to the public before bringing it here, although I will say this, Mr. President, that a lot of discussions have taken and views with the Law Society in many confidential terms. It which is being presented here is generally accepted by the public.

Mr. President, the Housing Authority has been brought into this. The economy is so depressed that in fact there are stated here that we have no money to grant mortgages to the Housing Authority. May I remind the opposition that that was mainly the intention we found on the 30th of November.

The Housing Authority has stopped of all its money during the last political campaign, so that as the end of the year all the money that was provided by the Administration have been shared up.

Mr. President, there is only one small Bill which I would now looked at for consideration and that is Clause 9 of the Bill which I would mention. Also, Mr. President, honourable members ought to be reminded that the Act which is being repealed in fact in 1958 - 10 years ago, and the provisions in connection with duty on cheques from time to time do not. Although acceptable from the length of time that the proposal to vary has been in effect. So I assume now there will be very few cheques.

Mr. President, clause 9 of this new Bill, under amendment in the 1st section, says that sub-paragraph dealing with the right of an agreement or memorandum of agreement "..... the conveyance of any land, stocks, bills or other transferable property....." to be taxed also. The following sub-paragraph (2) says, "a duly certified copy of [illegible] the first time of the Act imposed "duty" and that was a life conveying, Mr. President. It appears to me that what was really meant there was that after [illegible] "of any rights under an agreement or memorandum of agreement for the purchase of any land, stocks, bills or other transferable property....." ..."duty", (2) should have read "of a sale, grant of life assurance or other thing the duties there to other duty in specified under other head of charge ....." It is a mere wording but the amendment is presented in this new draft Bill under clause 9. That, I am sure, the honourable Junior Official Member will clearly in his winding up.

The other part of clause 9, Mr. President, where it says "for the sale or purchase of any land or stamp duty ..... duty" - that is a small [illegible] the remaining duty being placed on it is because of the explanation given when placed and what we debated at the Second Reading of the agreement for sale. Other [illegible] from one person to the other - [illegible] stamp duty being used on it and as we thought that under section that the duty should be a bit more in order to [illegible] the significance of this particular head of charge for stamp duty.

MR. JAMES P. ANDERSON (Republican): Mr. President, as I said in my opening remarks, the Bill is just a matter of keeping up a fine record of the Trust Fund which has made it operational for over 14 years, and my Bill whether it be a permanent law or other time should merely be reviewed every such a lengthy period of time.

Mr. President, we should see about the 5 per cent consideration particularly as related to Secretary of State that particular law could work better to have balanced the budget instead of having to pay interest on the Trust Fund, let us keep peace people. Mr. President, the purpose of that 5 per cent consideration will be taken under the Bridge.

We have specific reason for reporting that one of the main thrust the objectives of Today and the Today organization of the present time with the number of new interest coming into the country. Now, in any case, Mr. President, the amount of our highway under the 4 cut cuts available to expressways under $600,000, and the increase up to the end of last year had only $200,000; and that was for a period from 1962 to 1964. So if you use such a difference you arrive at an interest that actually should have been in it that the Treasury was collected. That was not the reason why the tax imposed because that it have been that we could have not imposed the law. But could have increased that the debt during would be collected.

Mr. President, I support the Bill as I have made before and be in close harmony with you, apart from the other clauses which provide certain amendments to the present Act. Only two, I do not see that what is being recommended in clause 4 or amendments of the schedule is going to impose any financial difficulties on the poor people of these Islands. What the principle behind it is the first instance, Mr. President, that is check on all those big dealers who are always attempting to find means and ways of defrauding the Crown of its rightful share of duty under this Law; certain individuals that is so not in the habit of the use to a certain assignment of property without paying stamp duty, and therefore to enable the profit which they receive from those transactions are reduced and Government receives nothing from it. Those are the main things that are the principal amendment of the Schedule proposed in that Bill, but not the poor people. The only purpose of these letters contain these laws and request the Government that they are not going to make any attempt to impose increased of the rights which is explained.

Mr. President, I recommend the Bill.

HON. PRESIDENT: Since no other Member seems to wish to exercise my right of reply if he wishes.

Since no other Member seems to wish to exercise his Reconsider before to exercise his

HON. JAMES P. ANDERSON: Mr. President, I wish to thank the Honourable Members for their support regarding the recommendations on a few items.

One point which seems to have caused the greatest confusion appears to be clause 7 and perhaps the reason to which the amending is done now have moved it, Mr. President. Necessary if we look at the Bill, Clause 6(1) and we come further down to page 4 the final line of the item headed "Certificate" we are to substantiate amendment of any rights or an appropriate or reasonable of agreement for the purchase of any lands, structures or goods amounting property ..... Sir, we delete the word amendment, Mr. President, it would be "by" a State, paying or fit conveyance or other things to mention rights or other duty to be paid under any other head of charge .....ion. Therefore, Mr. President,

MR. SPEAKER P. PETTERSEN (CONSERVATIVE): There is no change in the salary rate on the assignment of any duty or increase policy. It remains at $5. The $100 relates to the assignment of land, which bears on Crown title property.

Mr. Speaker, this bill which is ordered very keenly by Manitobans includes a number of recommendations made to Government. We have examined these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, and our observations are what we see in the bill before us. Those increases relate that one salient achievement, Mr. Speaker, is very surprised to, and value supported from some of these recommendations. There are the people who own developed property along Assiniboine River. It was the assumption of that to pay income tax should be equally due so.

Some moment ago, Mr. Speaker, about discrimination in terms of section 20 (1)(a) of the Income Tax Act, but, Mr. Speaker, section 21 (1)(a) is under related to section 20 and it being increased that same section. Section 21(1)(a) reads: "Whenever with Government to defend title to lands a receipt of money until to him or title to stamp and, Government upon which duty is payable under this Act, being duly so to do", commits an offence. When enacted this section 20 which has been since 1978, that section which reads: "Whenever having an interest-in-land, lessee or usual occupant or any officer of a Bodies or trust society, or an administrator, agent, broker or estate agent authorized by any law to prosecute or maintain proceedings on behalf of any landowner or tenant of an offence contrary to paragraph (a), (b) or (c) of section 21 ...". Section 20(1)(a) which being amended with money for the purpose of planning an improvement; (b) deals with keeping and store or (c) deals with making any false statement, and heretofore, till we are adding to it, Mr. Speaker, to that it is relevant to defend Government by failing to stamp any instruments.

It would on the solution to section 20: "Any of the provision of the Criminal Code or in addition to any other punishment thereof have been imposed or sentence or to be sentenced determined or suspended for such time as the Governor may order and upon such conditions as the Governor may determine.". Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is no discrimination. It does all of the people who operate in this particular phase of business in this country to be equal - no discrimination.

The assignment, Mr. Speaker, is an attempt to charge on any document where a person joins or agreement to purchase land, and that agreement that a condition that the agreement is assignable. Until then the agreement is assigned, Mr. Speaker, to that stamp. In relation to an agreement where the person pays the stamp duty up front, some legal persons will argue that when the sale price is that is when the agreement is assigned for $50,000 in addition to the original sum, the stamping has to be upgraded to that $50,000, because an agreement is not registerable, Mr. Speaker.

I thank all honourable Members for their support of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that I will be introduced a Bill for a Act to amend the Stamp Duty Act, 1973, be given a second reading.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill - Second Readings on the Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1980.

SECOND READING

THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980

COPIES: THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980.

HON. RICHARD G. ONYONKA: Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill intituled the Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1980.

I apologize to honourable Members for the rough quality of my voice and if I know you sufficiently well I will ask the professional assistance of the Elected Member for North Nyanza - the one Luoxxxxx.

Mr. President, Sir, as Honourable Members of this House know, we have made a modification rude word for about one of more than some 20 amendments, some dating from the middle of the nineteenth century. Most of it happened in the 10 years ago the punishments and the offences cover a wide range of subjects that had been contained in a number of enactments laws. Perhaps on this amendment Bill lets us have before us, apart from an explanatory memorandum, there are five major fields of the Penal Code that are dealt with. The first is in relation to genocide and the second is in relation to treason. The third provides for imprisonment in default of fines. The fourth deals with forfeiture of property and the fifth deals with community service orders. I think it is appropriate to note, Mr. President, Sir, that in the 21 years of the Penal Code, all these are concerned with only 17 subjects to prosecution; and we seek it to also very significant to note, Mr. President, that they were not brought by this Government for this honourable House at the same heading of which honourable Members will also be interested, the other bills which pertain to the punishment of prisoners and the nature of dealing with prisoners for certain offences and generally apply the amendments in the Powers of Courts and the Rehabilitation of Offenders Law.

These amendments which are before you in the Penal Code are part of a comprehensive amendment, both of the method of dealing with prisoners to courts, magistrates have at certain stages of this Meeting pointed out, that the criteria are not unnecessarily overwhelmed and as a penalty of that is known that the Law, which it imposes a punishment for an offence, is an extended Chapter in the hands of the Court to make sure that the punishment fits the crime and that it is adequate to each case.

If I may then, Mr. President, Sir, to the Most main people which is partially misleading sentences. As honourable Members of the House are no doubt aware, in 1972 there was enacted in section 25 of the Penal Code which dealt with Imprisonment, and very simply there provided a general way in imprisonment for certain terms. In brief, despite on the concept of partially having convicted, there can operate in very simple the concept of the ability to suspend sentences. In instead of being sentenced to two years imprisonment, the court could sentence a person to three years suspended, which means that instead of a person committed certain offences within two years he did not go for a period for that.

MR. MICHAEL D. BARRETT [CONTINUED]: Those examples of inadequate and harmful laws mentioned will be dealt with more effectively in Bill. Bill which there are provisions for minimum mandatory sentences, which are not as yet in the penal Code. The provisions applying a court to hopefully suspect a sentence and possibly replace a sentence. It is now, Mr. President, Bill, the part of Clause 3 of the Bill before you, to think that gap.

I propose, Clause 3 will provide a new section 325 in the penal Code which will have the effect of enabling a court which passes an offence which is not less than eighteen years of age, a sentence of imprisonment of not less than six months and not more than two years to order that after part of that sentence has been served in prison, the remainder of it shall be held in suspense.

This, Mr. President, Sir, will mean, the court to give to offenders a choice, after serving of sentence to suspend the remainder of sentences which are under two years, but to have the effect of sentence of hanging to the person. They have served part of your sentence, if you do not behave, you will go back and serve the rest. The only restriction on that is that the court to be held in suspense shall not be more than three months and not less than one fourth of the full period of the sentence.

If an offender is subsequently caught while the term stands, to commit another offence he is brought back before the court and it would be ordered practice for the court to order that the remainder of the sentence be served. Secondly, in accordance with the policy of this Government is giving to the courts discretion as regards what is known as the non-custodial sentences which are applicable to a number of offences, and as mentioned in the Bill these offences in order it will not be impossible for the court possibly to suspend a sentence in 157 of the Penal Code which relates to manslaughter, which is the second category of any offence under the Misuse of Drugs Act therefore. I may also speak briefly for myself, and I was also hoping that I am not the only Members of Parliament in attendance in this, that we may wish to consider this provision and ask whether we should allow the concept of partially suspended sentences to be extended to offences under the Misuse of Drugs Act as well. The third category that it does not apply to the offences under the Penal Code which might have power to impose to partially suspend sentences in relation to existing offences, namely unlawful assembly, subversive offences and certain other miscellaneous offences.

The second main subject that this amendment Bill deals with, Mr. President, is the issue of bail by Magistrate. At present the courts impose a fine and they usually find if that fine is not paid, that the person shall in default of payment go to prison for a specified period of time. These offences punishable I shall be dealing with in my next category, but it was commented by your Government, Mr. President, Sir, that is the circumstances that apply in the Cayman Islands a much more effective penalty, a much more effective way of enforcing the law of unnecessarily committing of people not to pay fines and

MR. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON (CONTINUING): ... to provide a sufficient period of time for the Parole Board to give his account the proper check ... fine to be imposed, whether in addition to or in default ... of a continuance of imprisonment, and such a fine ... In this bill there is provision that there should have been given to Mario a warrant to levy on the property, either movable or immovable, of each person ... warrant for the levying of the fine to be ... Very briefly, Mr. President, Sir, ... if you are fined a very substantial amount, and the Judge may say ... practically those are offences for which they issue fines are ... fiscal offences, fiscal offences and many times mentioned that if you ... give rise to very large sentences of imprisonment, instead of having ... a recent case in the Supreme Court in which Mr. Justice ... declined ... Should or if the person decides to be sent to ... these people or the people who may ... that ... there will be the ability for the person ... the same way as for a civil judgment there is power to ... that ... Mr. President, Sir, I think we ... be a very healthy change to have ... of our people. It will ... individuals who are fined substantial amounts or who have ... going to be fined substantial amounts if they are convicted, ... much longer and make inquiry before they commit those offences.

The third category, Mr. President, ... this amendment to the penal code deals with ... Members briefly just a few remarks ... of the concept of imprisonment ... default of a fine. Now, Mr. President, Sir, the law applicable ... that no person is sentenced to imprisonment ... that where a fine is ordered to be paid by the court, the ... court does so in imposing that fine ... term of imprisonment ... proportionate to the amount of the fine. Now, I am afraid that ... will find the relationship between the amount of the fine and the maximum ... period that one of these and if it was set of date ten years ago, it ... be much more or very different because ... says, and I quote, Mr. President: "In the absence of express provisions in any law relating ... where the term of imprisonment ordered by a court in respect of non-payment of any sum adjudged to be paid by an order made ... or recognizance under section ... or in respect of the non-payment of a fine or of any sum adjudged to be paid under the provisions of any law shall be such term as in the opinion of the court will satisfy the justice of the case, but shall not exceed in any case the maximum fixed by the following scale:

	Amount	Maximum period
Not exceeding	$ 10	1 month
	50	2 months
	100	4 months
Exceeding	200	6 months",

Mr. President, Sir, nowadays there ... very few offences that do not have a fine of close to $200. It is ... proposed therefore to substitute ... which I would now ... the section would be if the amendments ... passed - that if a fine does not exceed $100 the maximum period of ... imprisonment in default would be one month; that if the fine does ... exceed $200 the maximum period would be two months; that if the ... fine does not exceed $300 the maximum period would be three months; ... that if the fine exceeded $300 it is presently proposed that the ... that there would be power for a default imprisonment of up to five ... years.

MR. MICHAEL J. SUMMERS (continued): I will say no more, Mr. President, that this particular principle making this request to file quote was incorporated in the Act's as a base when we had not come to a determination as provided in the provisions of Sections numbers of fixes. In Committee I will reconsider, with Honourable Members, that perhaps that five years could possibly be reduced to a more sustainable figure of 3 months or one year, because I consider that when we have the Audit Report, the Auditor General should not be necessary.

We are now also considering, Mr. President, in this part of the amending Bill that relates to the presentation of deposit of fees, the removal that where a fee or other has been properly paid the term of imprisonment imposed shall cease and be reduced by the notice that the amount of the said payment having to the amount of the fine or such other sum. This now, I feel, a step and an encouragement in the law at present that if you have fined $100 with 3 months default, that upon if you paid $50 or even more of these to Lock by payment of $100 and there was also questionnaire that there was no obligation to release you from prison until the total amount had been paid. This I think is a small relief and some consideration and then if a person is fined and otherwise serves more than of most of the money has been recovered, then he shall not have to serve the amount of the deposit mentioned in full.

The fourth of the five matters which is dealt with in this Bill, Mr. President, is an extension to provisions of recognizances. This provision now here for in my Bill and in detail this Administration now lives many Members the real idea of the concept of recognizance. A recognizance is a bond that the court requires you to enter into in certain circumstances and that this can sometimes be done to make sure that if you enter into a bond and bind yourself to appear or to be of good behaviour or whatever other way you are bound for your recognizance, that if so is forfeited the court may require the person bound by it who may sometimes also to pay the sum in respect of which they were bound.

Again, in circumstances with the current time and one penalty of money may create the widest discretion possible, there is provision here which allows the court before the recognizance forfeited to at any time, instead of ordering the person, may the which sum is which he is bound however of sometimes the circumstances could the whole or any part thereof.

As I have said, Mr. President, Sir, there are five areas that are being dealt with in this Bill. The fifth, Mr. President, is one that should be welcomed. That is the removal of privileges and the method of publication of particulars in of royalty quote expression in anything else being debated in this House at this meeting.

As you know, Mr. President, some two years ago, following recommendations of Select Committees, a number of amendments were made to our Minute of Laws, and one of the main objects intended in doing was to bring into line the concept of the ability of the courts to make summary summary orders. At that time they were pleased only in that for in fact the court would enter summarily as it thought fit, only in relation to offences under some Drug offences. It is now considered likewise that appropriate by this Government that the concept of community service orders will be extended, not only to offences against the Misuse of Drugs Law, but, to all offences. And, I'm sure, Mr. President, any member of the public or any Members have also those kept this Bill

MR. MICHAEL J. MARKLEY (continuing): ...would have assumed to omit that: that community service shall now include that drug offense by virtue of the proposed substitution MARKLEY, but we may be quite clear to Honourable Members that the reason why that should also take place in this amendment to the Penal Code is to ensure that the whole concept of community service orders and also of suspended sentences is not fully to relation to drug offenders in the Misuse of Drugs Act.

The principles of community service orders which are contained in this Bill before Members of this House are similar to those of persons in the statute of those laws where a person who is found guilty of any offence which does not appear to be considered of any offence which does not appear to be considered of any offence which does not appear to be considered

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled A Bill for a Law to Amend the Penal Code be given a Second Reading.

The motion will be open for debate. But I think before speaker(s) Public servant representations for approximately 20 minutes.

AT 12:32 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

UPON RESUMING AT 2:07 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
The motion is open for debate. The Second Elected Member for Bridge Town.

MR. C. KATE FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before the House highlights something that exists in the minds of the Government right now to become very important soon. This confusion stems with the amendment to the suspended sentence, the amendment which is presumably to defeat the very purpose of the suspended sentence. It is my understanding that a suspended sentence is usually given as a penalty to those of the person usually that is given, and is usually given in special circumstances where you may have a principal offender or a first offender, or perhaps also a very old offender, or in instances where the person is not considered to be guilty. I have visited prior cases that I have dealt with personally and also in the press, "You are guilty; you have been convicted - I sentence you to one year in prison, but you will serve a suspended sentence." In other words the person does not actually go to jail unless the person commits another offence within the time of the sentence.

If we change this and say that the effect of giving the person a full suspended sentence will cause the person to jail for three months and commit the person is months of the month sentence, we have defeated the very purpose of the suspended sentence because the person will go to jail for three months and he may be said have gone for 18 months. So to interpret as a person who has gone to jail, he or she could not have any further suspended sentence. He should either have the sentence suspended or have suspended. A partly suspended sentence is just as bad to the image of the person as if he had served the full time. So I do not agree with the same hardship a partly suspended sentence. The courts should either impose the sentence for the entire length of the sentence which is handed down or the court should not suspend the sentence. The correct suspended half of the sentence or to give of the sentence unless you make the same effect on the person so that it could not interfere with the suspended sentence.

The conclusion that I arrive about sentences interpreted this Bill is that the principle of the new Government is not, and that their sentences, that they want to get away from minimum sentences. The Honourable Second Official Member mentioned that we will be dealing with the Misuse of Drugs Law Trade and Economic Union that in the course of which we will be removing the minimum sentences which exist. But, in this enlightened state, the Government has decided to move all minimum sentences again,

U.S. v. RAFAEL ROSADO SUPPLEMENTAL: and that is with respect to the suggested sentence because it says in effect, if the jury wishes [illegible] that goes to the question of whether or not they have given the recommendation to which the government is entitled in order to avoid [illegible] sentence during the period of the suspension -- that seems to be held to somewhere really between three-quarters and not less than one-quarter of the whole period of the sentence. So it is a minimum sentence that may "last long time". Anyway, if we look at [illegible] in place I agree, it has to be mentioned again.

In some other parts of the world [illegible] the normally accepted practice, or perhaps the accepted [illegible] there seems to be a view [illegible] that they must serve not less than 60 hours more than [illegible]. So there is a [illegible] of the Government. They are happy to go along with minimum sentences in the hopes of having [illegible] minimum sentences for comparable [illegible] and minimum sentences for comparable of sentence. So there is [illegible]. I would like not have that [illegible] and I do not know where the sentence is going to end [illegible].

I am also totally against [illegible] sentence. It is my understanding that the Attorney could be authorized so as to call a man's [illegible] house; and if a person's sentence -- in the procedure how [illegible] this that when a person is sentenced of a criminal offense he could be fined, or [illegible] or both may be right also to [illegible] in lieu of paying a fine. Now, what the Attorney General should do is to allow the court to suspend him as to pay the fine rather than to go to jail, and that would be absurd. There may be good reasons why the defendant perhaps would not want to pay the fine and would prefer to go to jail. It may be some person with a strong religious belief who could perhaps be a martyr and be [illegible] than to pay the fine. I think this has happened here before. There could also be cases of a political nature where the person would prefer to go to jail rather than pay the fine. And, there may be cases where one of [illegible] the man may decide that he is better off going to jail than working, for once out of the [illegible] he would need [illegible] and if he can't [illegible] sentence the court really says, "You must pay the fine, for instance serve the time in jail. If not, we will issue a warrant and we will, until your house, we will sell your furniture and then when you come out of jail you will really need to be a criminal because you will have nothing to start [illegible] to find your family, you will have no job and it will really ruin you or your potential friends".

Q, a different comment is an [illegible] which would come under the Penal Code and so must not allow this to be put in because it could be abused and it is my belief it would be abused.

Under clause 2, on the new section [illegible] should also be inserted, he says, "A warrant should not, if it appears that the sum that [illegible] is paid, be held void by reason of any defect in the warrant." What a strange possibility I know of many cases where warrants, not relevant circumstances, have not been [illegible] because there were [illegible] and here we are making it so that no matter how great a defect in the warrant, it can be corrected. Suppose for arguments sake the warrant had the name of the wrong person, will it be said then the warrant is valid and that John Brown's house must be sold when it really applied to John Robinson? That can't be the meaning of [illegible]. I do not believe that a person should [illegible] because the warrant is defective. The warrant should be corrected, but here it does not say that - it says that the warrant must be executed, regardless of any defects in it. That has to be wrong.

Mr. T. Wise (Wythenshawe): I understand about rent, but do please see that the hon. Lady is allowed to be paid by people of her choice in the meantime. This cannot be right. If the argument is sound, the argument should be examined. I cannot conceive of a reason for it.

I understand from the Parliamentary Secretary that this Bill will not be working, at Committee stage, to remove clause 2 to restore the text of the Bill to its original form. The original Bill, the Labour Bill, had a ban of one month and I think it should remain because this was merely the base upon which to extend it to that of paying a fine which might exceed £1000; and fine payments are normally two weeks. I must congratulate the Parliamentary Secretary on this concession. I will not bother to tell you the names I have made before I heard of this change.

I am basically dissatisfied with clause 2 which deals with the forfeiture of recognizances. I understand, as I see from the Bill, that the recognizances mentioned in this Bill are likely to remain and quite rightly ought to continue to remain, and also not only to hold people generally. However, great hardship or anxiety would be sufficient to show why the recognizances should not be enforced if they have been forfeited. Section 31 provides that a person in accordance with a conviction under which the court may demand of penalty enjoinder, nonetheless the defendant upon him or leaving upon his own recognizance, with or without sureties, to come up for sentence when called upon, his recognizance may be dealt under section 31 of the Magistrates' Courts Act 1952 or any other enactment relating to recognizances which may be forfeited, unless it appears to the court that the circumstances are such that it would be unjust to make an order for forfeiture, or that it would be unjust to make such an order to the full extent of the amount of the recognizance, and may remit the forfeiture or any part thereof as it thinks fit, and the powers of a court under section 31 of the Magistrates' Courts Act 1952 to remit forfeiture of a recognizance may be exercised by the Crown Court.".

At the moment we have not come to the conclusion that we must oppose it, but we do not like it. If a person is ordered to enter into a recognizance and his sureties with the court that he will not do certain things or pay certain sums, whatever he owes to the court he ought to pay to the local court, they should lose the money if the person fails in doing what is expected of him. I can see that there may be cases in the event of any fine or penalty where they would really put up any hard, any cash, and then when they find it is impossible for the fine to be paid they would only have to go to a judge who was presumably sympathetic to their case. We have not come to any decision as to do, but we still make objections to part of the clause.". I should like this matter to be put right now and have given an undertaking in the speech of the Government Whip to deal, only this morning, with the Clerk of Courts Bill which is intended to give the possibility of the court to vary the conditions of the recognizance which the magistrates would automatically make applicable to the sureties of the money bond.

I should like to make another point now in the Committee stage, which the Labour Party would wish to put in the amendment in the name of the hon. Member for Leyton, E. The amount to be imprisoned, and he would be compelled to imprison in accordance with a fine of £1000 in the Act. All of

MR. [illegible] (CONSTITUENCY): Clause 7 of the Bill we see the same mistake principle being put in. Under the proposed new section [illegible] "A community service order made under subsection (1) shall require the convicted person to perform unpaid work in accordance with section 351 for a specified number of hours being in the aggregate not less than forty nor more than one hundred and forty...". So a minimum sentence is imposed with regard to the community service order. The judge could not send a person to do four hours work but must give him a minimum of forty hours - and all I know is we are giving discretion to the court, and we are taking out the minimum sentence. Therefore this has all the risks of mixing and minimum sentences, giving magistrates the power to do all that. The judge's hand is tied, he must do what parliament by the whole of its enactments. They do not know whether they want to put rid of minimum terms or minimum periods, or whether they want more of what because they take them out in one place and put them back in two places, maybe that cancels them out.

The community service order has been explained from some side as an alternative to a prison sentence. Will the probation officers will be carrying out certain functions. Now, this is deadly thinking because in the Home Office of the Minister responsible, I was unable to get one probation officer to change the three certain decisions. And even if we are saying that the probation officers will carry out the provisions of this Act with regard to the supervision of these people are are making reasonably serious orders under the Penal Code - that is contained whether, now section 351 (1), of the new Bill: "A community service order is an order in which the convicted person will undertake the requirements by section 351, 352 and 353 of the relevant offence shall be discharged by a probation officer." There is a lot of work involved in this because the probation officer would have to see the person, probably, on a daily basis. He would have to secure to him at regular hours. I assume the probation officer would have to oversee the way he was doing or inspect the work that he had done would have personal supervision. I would like to know how we are going to do this practically when we would have the probation officers in every Magistrates Court.

There must be some confusion in the mind of the Government because all we heard all from Bristol Summer, if I remember correctly, the two official officers and have to use helping about hundreds, basically members of probation officers. We are told by others why we cannot why the probation rooms were outside the prison be because we have the ability to supervise them; now here we are going to have a convicted person and report the probation officer. We have got to take on these responsibilities. It was unfortunate officers. Therefore, this probation officer has such sweeping powers and has to monitor the behaviour because the report and the officer, hopefully, must make sure that the work which is being done and determine what the person's existing hobbies must not interfere with the time that he attends a school or other educational establishment and so on. All of these things must be supervised by the probation officer - the judge or the court is not going to go out to see if this is happening. I would like to know how it may be done when we have very much to avoid not put the probation officer or one more worry for the three existing [illegible].

What is more worse, and what adds to the confusion is Clause 7 - see here on page 8. This, if one reads it in the existing, shows that the Government itself has no faith at all in the community service order.

MR. G. LEIF ROBERTS (CONTINUED): ... if one looks at 3(2) (a) it might be in order to make an application if the owner felt that the council had given undue consideration to the requirements of section 3(2), or may, alternatively, in addition to the continuance of the order, impose on him a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or may revoke the order and impose in addition to any other sentence which it may of fine or imprisonment, or both, which may have already been imposed at the time of the conviction a further fine or a further term of imprisonment, or both, ...". This clearly shows that the Government has no faith in the system.

In clause 7 - 2(2), the normally accepted order can be amended, but it appears only to one circumstance which is unfair. It says: "Where a community council under is in respect of" a prescribed premise and, on his application on behalf of the relevant officer. It appears in the order that made the order that, knowing regard to circumstances which have arisen since the order was made, it would be in the interests of justice so the court may extend the order for a further period of twelve months. It does not say that he can produce the order if this would also be in the interests of justice. There are many circumstances that come to mind. For example, suppose the person serving the order had spoken to him, had been told, had suffered an unfortunate end it would be necessary to obtain an additional term which seems to make provision only for extending the period and this has to be unfair. It should read, "may extend or revoke the order".

I did not hesitate to speak on this because in the first under the same section that I spoke about where it is also sought to reduce the time spent in lieu of paying the fine, where the fines cannot exceed the considered system will spend five years and that is to be reduced to six months. Next, I would like to mention that I consider the fines excessive. They have been increased seventy two-fold, from $10 to $100; $50 to $500 and $100 to $1000. And it means the fines increased.

MR. MICHAEL J. DRAGUSH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of information, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you prepared to give way?

(The Member was given)

HON. RICHARD D. BRADLEY: I think the Honourable Member for Gimli may be on this point of information.

It may be the drafting of Bills, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that the intention and the effect is not clear. What precisely was the intention when there is a person was fined respectively $10, $20, $50 and $100, in view of that he should be imprisoned in default five days, ten, four or six months. What this amendment seeks to do is consistent what I thought the Second Elected Member from Rossmere would approve of, and that is to increase proportionately the amount that the fine must be before the equivalent maximum of imprisonment. Is that my understanding would have to be fined $100 before you could be sentenced the default of four months.

MR. G. LEIF ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that. What I am saying is that it does occur that these increases in the money will allow greater punishment on the fine where one would only be fined $10, I think this could result in where there are no special provisions in any law. Such it could ..... Sir, I am correct. It says in section 3(2) of the principle Act: "In the absence of express provisions in any law relating thereto the term of imprisonment ordered by a court..." will be as set out below. So I disagree with the change.

MR. G. PATTERSON (Scarborough): Let me read the whole section. The only occasion of capital punishment is that subsisting thereto at the date of the enactment brought by a person in respect of his non-payment of any sum adjudged to be paid for costs under section 33 or section thirty-eight under section 33 or in respect of the non-payment of a fine or any sum adjudged to be paid under the provisions of any law shall be such term as in the opinion of the court will satisfy the justice of the case, but shall not exceed in any case the maximum fixed by the following scale:-

	Amount	Maximum Period
Not exceeding	$ 10	1 month
(Here the bill changes to $100 - 2 months)		
	$ 50	2 months
(Here the bill changes to $200)		
	$200	4 months
(Here the bill changes to $1000 - 6 months)		
Exceeding	$200	6 months
(The proposal is 5 years)		

So I am not happy with any part of this bill. I cannot find any cause of this that we can't agree on and I cannot see why the Government should bring such a bill as a time when apparently there is no justification for bringing it.

I have good job done that by the honourable Member in explaining the details of the bill, and also his background for a better understanding of it. But I am not convinced that the occasion was ripe in the Government, or the minds of the Members, whether have established as that this bill is necessary at all. I am in sympathy with a system that would enable, alternatively, a system that would be commenced on charges, and I would think that the Members on this side of the House will look by such system although we seem to be really pre-knowledge today. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I would be grateful about twenty-one minutes to speak when no one else does rise to speak before the moment of interruption, as I suppose that I address my remarks principally, and thanks the honourable First Official Member to move his motion now.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. JAMES H. JOSEPH: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this honourable House until 10:00 o'clock, Monday morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 o'clock, Monday morning.

I think before putting the question, it may be convenient and courteous to Members if I mention my understanding that the Government Members have made representations to me as a Member, which proves that we will not really be sitting Monday morning. There is a Member coming here whose visit was attempted some time ago, so it may also be the hope that this meeting might have been avoided.

MR. PRESIDENT (CHRISTENSEN): By midday Monday, when what they have indicated to meet our Monday afternoon, we will adjourn until Monday morning, but for this understanding that we would adjourn at midnight if that is agreeable to Members.

I am putting the question that we adjourn until 10:00 o'clock on Monday morning.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 4:20 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1985.

SECOND MEETING OF THE 1982 SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MONDAY
29TH MAY, 1985

PRESENT NOW:

THE SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE, MR G PETER LLOYD, CMG, CVO - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS B PUSEY, OBE, CBE, JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCIAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J GRADICH, MC, ED	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TRADE ADMINISTRATION
HON THOMAS C HENNESSEY, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON MONSON O SOARES	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M SCRIVEN COLLINS, MBE	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES L KLONARIDES	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND LABOUR ADMINISTRATION
HON RUSSELL A JOHNSON, CBE, JP	MEMBER FOR INTERNATIONAL AND INTERNAL RELATIONS

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR M MCKEEVER BUSH	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MRS SHARON E OTTEST	THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MR LANFORD A TIBBETT, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT MARK G KIRKCONNELL	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOUR ELECTORAL DISTRICTS OF CAYMAN ISLANDS
MR G HAIG BODDEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
MR D EDWARD MILLER	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN
MR JOHN B MATTHEW	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

APOLOGIES

MR JAMES M BODDEN	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN TOWN

ORDER PAPER

MONDAY

8TH MAY, 1995

1. QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR CENTRAL TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 78: WOULD THE MEMBER PLEASE NOW LOOK AT UNSTARRED QUESTION 14(1)(a) OF THE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE ACT (CAP 22 OF 1988) WHICH STANDS IN THE PERMITTED ANNUARIES IN ORDER NOT TO LOSE IT?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR CENTRAL TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 79: WOULD THE MEMBER ADVISE WHETHER ANY MORE WAS BEING DONE ON THE SECURITIES COMPLEX SINCE 1ST MARCH, 1995, AND IF SO WHAT MORE WAS BEING DONE?

NO. 80: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHETHER ANYONE HAS BEEN EMPLOYED AT GREATER CONSIDERATION FOR THE SECURITIES COMPLEX AND IF SO THE TERMS OF HIS/HER EMPLOYMENT?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 81: WOULD THE HONOURABLE STATE WHY DECEASED MEMBERS' PENSIONS HONOURED I TO 7 AND THE DEBATE THEREON WERE NOT BROADCAST ON RADIO CLARENCE?

NO. 82: WOULD THE MEMBER STATE WHEN THE TYPEWRITER TECHNOLOGY SENIOR INFORMATION OFFICER WILL BE REPLACED?

2. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS:-

(1) SECOND READINGS

(1) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 (CRIMINALISATION OF SECOND HANDING SMOKE)

(2) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(3) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1995

(11) COMMITTEE STAGE

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(2) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995
(3) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995
(4) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1995

(iv) REPORTS TABLED

(1) THE DRUGS (MISC.) BILL, 1985
(2) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE HOUSES OF DANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

(v) WRITTEN REPLIES

(1) THE DRUGS (MISC.) BILL, 1985
(2) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE HOUSES OF DANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

4. ORDER PAPER

NOTICES:-

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

(a) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 19/85 -
LIQUOR LICENSING LAW

(b) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 18/85 -
PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR AND TOBACCO ADVERTISING
IN THE CARIBU ISLANDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

QUESTIONS 1

CIVIL PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995 - CONCLUSION OF DEBATE ON SECOND READING 5

ADJOURNMENT 54

MONDAY

9TH MAY, 1994

10.00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Prayers are read. Questions. The Second Elected Member.

Mrs George Price,

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 731 Would the Member state how long an individual granted Caymanian status under Section 24(1)(c) of the Caymanian Protection Law (Law 21 of 1984) must spend in the territory annually in order not to lose it?

ANSWER: Mr Chair. The grant of Caymanian Status is set out in Section 21(1) of the Caymanian Protection Law, 1984, which at paragraph (5) provides for loss of Caymanian status outside the Islands only where the grant of status so by the Board.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. FINZIGH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state whether or Section 24(1)(c) the Caymanian Protection Board has any discretion to exercise since Section 24(1)(c) of the Caymanian Protection Law?

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: The answer is no, Sir.

MR. GILBERT A. FINZIGH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member give the nature of any individuals who have so far been granted status under this category, and how many of these individuals are now residents of the Cayman Islands?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that if the Member wants information of that kind, it really should be put more as a substantive question. It is not really a supplementary. If the Honourable First Official Member can undertake to provide that alternative replies of a kind I will agree to that.

MR. GILBERT A. FINZIGH: Mr. President, just to comment on that, perhaps the Honourable First Official Member would state whether or not he has this information available?

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Yes, Sir. I have it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, if you want to provide it then...

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Alright. Mr. Clerk: Proceed. Judge ready.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Member is relying on memory. We have not really got an available and ascertained, and I think that it had better be ascertained so be sure that it is accurate. If the Member would like to undertake to circulate...

HON. DENNIS A. ROSSITER: I will, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is a fact of life that there are still accidents. As I might think that was what you were asking?

MR. RAYMOND A. PERRAM: Yes, Mr. President, for clarity I think that I should mention that Section 14(1)(c) refers only to those people granted status by yourself or Cabinet of the Cayman Islands and not by the Caymanian Protection Board. I am working to get a list of those people who have so far been granted status and those who are still residents of the Cayman Islands or perhaps who have left to reside in other countries.

MR. PRESIDENT: Are you the first person who has been granted it under Section 14(1)(c) of Law 26 of 1984, or who has been granted it under both the provision, new regulated protection Law, and the previous one? I suppose that it is the latter but you did not actually say that.

HON. RAYMOND A. PERRAM: Yes, Sir, the Law 26 of 1984 came into effect I believe on 23rd March, 1988.

HON. ATTORNEY: So, it is the position that you have given as well. I am not sure whether it is Section 14(1)(c) or the earlier Law.

If there is no further representation, I will invite the Second Elected Member for George Town to ask Question No. 78.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES

No. 78: Would the Member state whether any work has been done on the sporting complex since 1st March, 1988, and if so, what work has been done?

ANSWER: Since 1st March, 1988, the following has been carried out at the sports complex:

(1) Contracts have been prepared and signed
(2) Workers and staffs have been accommodated
(3) All plumbing and electrical conduit under slab have been completed in preparation for pouring floor slab
(4) The pump room floor slab and footings have been poured. Block walls completed, and roof accommodation for three pump equipment for the pool to be installed by the Water.

On the track and field:

(1) Trenching for French drains has been 40% complete
(2) Topsoil to field has been stockpiled in preparation for seeding.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. CLARENCE A. PIERCEY: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state what is the estimated time scheduled for the completion of the existing complex?

MRS. FANNIE D. BRADY: Mr. President, there is no schedule at the moment for completion, since insufficient funds have been voted this year to complete it.

MR. LAWRENCE A. PIERSON: A further supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state whether this project, the existing complex, is regarded as a privately owned facility?

MRS. FANNIE D. BRADY: Mr. President, it is regarded as temporary, but I cannot say that it has privately owned.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is there no further supplementary, Question No. 20.

THE SECOND SENIOR MEMBER HAS SERVED NOTICE THAT HE WILL ASK THE HONOURABLE JUNIOR MINISTER OF SCHOOLS COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES REPLIES

MR. SO: Would the Member state whether anyone has been employed as county co-ordinator for the existing complex and if so the terms of his/her employment?

MINISTER: No person has been employed as county co-ordinator for the existing complex.

MR. LAWRENCE A. PIERCEY: Mr. President, as a point of clarity for the supplementary would the Member state if anyone in the position of Administrator has been employed for the existing complex or is being used?

MRS. FANNIE D. BRADY: The answer, Mr. President, is no.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member state whether any consideration has been given to employing already in that position?

MRS. FANNIE D. BRADY: Mr. President, I believe that the Member is referring to the post of co-ordinator as in the original question. The answer is that that post was considered for inclusion in the 1985 estimates. However, since it became known that the complex would not be completed, the post was not put in the estimates.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERCEY: On further clarity, Mr. President, a supplementary. Would the Member advise whether any consideration in the use of a co-ordinator has been received from Dade County in Florida?

MRS. FANNIE D. BRADY: Mr. President, we have had the services of a consultant from Dade County.

MR. LYNFORD A. PIERSON: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member give the term of the consultancy and whether he was paid by this Government?

HON. HERMAN D. DENKEY: She moved, Mr. President, to the Floor and he has been paid by the Government as a full time public member.

HON. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS: A supplementary, Mr. President, could the Member state a ball park figure of how much has been paid to date to Mr. Stage?

HON. HERMAN D. DENKEY: Mr. President, I am not in a position to state that figure.

HON. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS: Mr. President, could the Member give the undertaking to supply us with this information?

HON. HERMAN D. DENKEY: Yes, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary, Question No. 21. The Elected Member for North Side.

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE OFFICIAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 21: Would the Member state why Private Members' Motions Numbers 5 to 7 and the debate thereon were not brought on Public Agenda?

ANSWER: Additionally to broadcast the Private Members' motions referred to in the original Government Motion No. 2, "Broadcasting of Parliamentary Debates Report" and when the station was advised of the intention to broadcast same on Radio Branch, the proceeding of the motions meant the Legislative Assembly entered some available, which were at a non-standard/professional speed of 7 1/2" per second and to try to broadcast the Legislative Assembly tapes to standard speed would have been a massive exercise with quality of tapes running below professional quality.

Members will recall that the last sitting of the Legislative Assembly lasted for nearly one month and thus Radio Cayman was broadcasting every night during that period.

The information is requested.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

HON. E. KENNETH BODDEN: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member please let us understand that in future all these professional things which need to be done so that we can have our motions broadcast will be done?

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Yes, Mr. President, since that is the case and we certainly receive in there and it is not dependent on the Legislative Assembly area.

HON. D. JAMES MILLER: Supplementary, Mr. President, I do not have Government Motion No. 2/83 in my briefcase with me, but my recollection was that additional man hours for broadcast Members' motions to be broadcast

MR. DENNIS E. MOSHER: Mr. President, patently, Sir, because the first document which was distributed to Members did not have it on, and the second one which was a correction did have it on.

MR. W. HARRIS HUGH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Which section did we pass then?

MR. DENNIS E. MOSHER: The latter one. The correct one.

MR. W. HARRIS HUGH: If that is.... I guess that he already answered the question which I was going to ask.

MR. L. RICHARD MILLER: Supplementary, Mr. President. Can the Member give us the undertaking to have those revisions brought at this time?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: I really do not think that it would make terribly interesting now, Sir, when they gave you a hearing in March. I do not see that it makes sense now.

MR. W. HARRIS HUGH: Mr. President, if you would allow. It is not a supplementary but this....

MR. PRESIDENT: I was only still supplementary, I am afraid. If you can find an ingenious way of showing what it is you want to say this a supplementary, I will certainly allow it, however, you have to do so.

MR. D. RICHARD WILSON: Supplementary, Mr. President. Would the Member please explain to us why they were not introduced in the final instance, which is a no brainer reason why they are not going to be introduced now?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: No, Sir, I gave the Member the reply that he did not second time, Sir. It would be quite impossible to do them now from the Legislative Assembly's point. It is a different type of machinery completely. It was just an error. That is all.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question No. 52,

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR SOUTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE LEADER OPPOSITE REGARD OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

NO. 52: Would the Member state when the present temporary Senior Information Officer will be replaced?

MR. D. RICHARD WILSON: Mr. President, with your permission, Sir, I wish to withdraw question No. 52 in light of a press release which appeared on Monday's paper, which has pre-empted the answer, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I suppose that the Standing Order which entitles you to withdraw a question, but I am quite certain that you do not have to ask me if you do not want to.

MR. W. HARRIS HUGH: I do not see any harm.

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry?

MR. R. HOWARTH RYAN: I looked at the Standing Orders too, Sir, but I did not see any to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall take it that it has escaped your notice but that is certain, and you can withdraw. You are not obliged to ask a question if you do not wish.

Item 8. Bills. Second Readings. The nomination of the Order on the Sewer Rods Amendment Bill, 1965. My recollection is that the Second Elected Member for Bubble Down has finished speaking and the motion was open for debate if any other Member wished to speak. The Second Elected Member for George Town.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SEWER RODS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

SECOND READING

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. Speaker, The Sewer Rods (Amendment) Bill, 1965 has a number of important amendments. It provides a number of very, very important changes in the principal Law.

I must congratulate the mover of this Bill for a very, very good presentation. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to enquire as the other Bills is that is my opinion anyhow - that is not given to the public, and even to Members of the Legislative Assembly to which these Bills, are drafted to consult with members of their constituencies.

Also, it has been brought to my attention that some individuals within the legal field are not made privy to any of these Bills before they are brought to this House. It astonishes to such members of the Government as to me - astonishing that they have not been consulted. I am stating, Sir, that this is my understanding. I am not stating this as a fact.

Clause 3 of the Memorandum and Objects and Reasons to the Bill seeks to have the sentence of imprisonment greatly suspended. It states inter Section 7(1), (2):-

> "Notwithstanding subsection (1) of section 23, a court which passes on an offender who is not less than eighteen years of age a sentence of imprisonment for a term of not less than six months and not exceeding two years may order that, after he has served part of the sentence in prison, the remainder of it shall be held in suspense."

Subsection (2) of this section states:-

> "The part to be held in suspense shall be not more than three-quarters and not less than one-quarter of the whole period of the sentence, and the offender shall not be required to serve that part unless he is sentenced under subsection (3);".

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a number of debates in this Assembly during the passing of various Bills, but I am glad to see any amendments or changes made regardless of how important the matters dealt with are, or regardless of the points raised from across the House.

MR. LAWRENCE A. FERRARO (CONTINUING): I believe, Sir, that it is an anomalous situation if we are going to establish in this Commonwealth courts just the sake of having somebody's have even been told by members from the Commonwealth South that once retired from this also of the House have most important, and get nothing and done, to take those people into consideration.

Also retired persons in Commerce Steps are given the same kind of consideration. While it risks at all. However, it will go as may, Mr. President, I feel that I have like way of my colleagues responsibility to the people. In this respect I say God bless Radio Cayman. For had it not been for Radio Cayman, some of our people would never learned what we are doing in the House.

I see, Mr. President, there are a number of amendments and clauses in this Bill. I also see a connection between this Bill and the Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill which will be necessary to such a Bill. We have not yet debated that Bill.

There are certain points, Mr. President, which I feel will require some clarification. One of these points is whether the rehabilitation period will be calculated on the full term of the original imprisonment, or on the minimum period left after discussion.

I move, Mr. President, an Clause 4 which seeks to make provision for a warrant of distress. This is to be issued when there has been default in the payment of a fine or other sum ordered to be paid by the court.

Mr. President, in this respect I cannot help but refer to a remark made by the mover of this Bill, which in my opinion seemed somewhat out of line. It states:-

> "This Bill enable the courts to give offenders a short sharp lesson of imprisonment."

I wonder, Sir, if this supposition, and I will go back to the point of suspension; if the intention is to rehabilitate an individual or is it to give our people a sharp lesson of imprisonment, what is the purpose, Mr. President? Why does it say under Clause 4 that an individual will still not have the right of serving first imprisonment if he or course is spent in addition to Northward Prison, rather than having a policeman walk into the home and take one his colleagues; take out the natural things and tell him that if he does not pay the fine then a warrant of distress will be levied on him.

I am asking questions, Mr. President, which the Honourable Second Official Member will have the opportunity to answer when he is winding up.

Mr. President, I am also happy that some amount of clarity was somewhat brought into this Bill, because initially under Section 5 of the Bill which seeks to amend Section 95 of the principal Law, there are a number of important changes been proposed. I think that some of these changes are very good indeed because under the old Law, the amount stipulated was not in equity to the amount of the sentence imposed under the Law. We first originally had a period was six months, but in the Bill it was changed to five years. However, I am happy, Mr. President, that in Committee stage the power of the Bill will be strengthening to bring back sanity in this Bill by saying that the court be in a position to impose a maximum of nine months' imprisonment rather than the five years which was originally in here.

MR. GIBSON: Mr. President, Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Brantford will state his point of order.

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Mr. Speaker

MR. EDWARD A. PIERCE (CONTINUED): We have to be also very careful with this, Mr. President. It would be a situation where an individual is not available for many, many sessions, and I feel that the arrest and the bail opinions should be most careful in considering whether or not to commit such an individual.

The imposition of new sentences by this Law, Sections 304 or 305, I feel have been fine, very sensible. Section 307 of the bill, Mr. President, deals with the community service orders, and I think that this is a very important section, since though provision is already made under the Crimes Act:

> "Where a person who is over the age of 17 years is convicted of any offence (other than an offence in respect of which the punishment is death or imprisonment), the court before which he is convicted may with the consent and subject to sections 305 to 308 (inclusive), the authorities to be charged of dealing with him in any other way, make a community service order."

We have seen here, Mr. President, that a community service order made under Section 7 shall require the convicted person to perform unpaid work in accordance with Section 308, which will not be in aggregate less than one hour or forty hours, or more than 240 hours or approximately six months.

One question, Mr. President, is the reference for keeping these limits: Why one week, Mr. President? Why six months? I should hope the review of this bill will clarify this point.

Another important section of this bill, Mr. President, is Section 7(2) which states:

> "A court shall not make a community service order in respect of a person convicted of an offence unless the court -
>
> (a) has been notified by the Secretary to Council that arrangements exist for work to be performed under such orders;"

Mr. President, I am not quite aware of the relevance of subsection (2)(a). I can understand subsection (3)(b) which refers to a probation officer, because this is the normal course of events. However, I do not see the necessity for the Secretary to be involved in this decision. Perhaps this will also be clarified.

It should also be important to state instances when this would be necessary for the Secretary to Council to have to be involved.

Mr. President, I see the community service order as a form of rehabilitation for prisoners. I do not see this as major punishment to prisoners, and I can table on the basis of experience I have had with my own case from prisoners of the Northward Prison. They are crying out for something to do rather than sitting idle on the prison. They are not as concerned about losing the points and then in their prison uniforms as many of us may think. They seem to be involved in something constructive rather than being locked up for 23 hours as a time in the prison.

It is important also, Mr. President, that this option be left for the convicted person to help in rehabilitate himself.

MR. LAWRENCE A. PIERCE (CONTINUING): Section 360, deals with the breach of community service order, and in subsection (2) it states inter alia:-

> "it may, without prejudice to the continuance of the order, impose on him a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or may revoke the order and impose in substitution therefor,"

Section 361 which deals with the enforcement of community service orders states inter alia that:-

> "It appears to the court that upon the order that, having regard to circumstances which have arisen since the order was made, it would be in the interests of justice to do so the court may amend the order fix a further period of twelve months."

Now again, Mr. President, I think that such case will be taken in imposing any additional fines or sentence in the prison. I feel that such circumstances which could have arisen should be taken in accordance with the magnitude and nature of the breach of the community order.

Mr. President, as I understand the nature of this Bill for the clarity in the presentation of the Bill. However, I also express my reservations, Sir, that way since I feel that something have on this side of the House is of essence of flexibility, except for the reverence which is received by Hon. Cayenn and his colleagues.

I trust, Sir, that suggestions made by this House will not just be considered stepchildren and forgotten, but that they will in fact be treated so, and that we will not be considered to know but our rights. That then speak. Let them get it off their chest". It is my belief, Mr. President, to the United Representatives of this country to be treated in such manner.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. K. HUBERT ULRIC: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of some of the amendments in this Bill. I cannot support it in its entirety. There are some provisions in it which I welcome, and as has been said, are long overdue. However, there is a requirement to Section 31 which causes grave concern.

Mr. Speaker, I know, like, that I am the least trained of all the Members in this Honourable House, and I hold a grave fear of sentence to jail. I can foresee the proposed amendment to Section 31 causing great distress and hardship to our people for certain minor infringement of the law. Under this Section 31 where default is made in payment of a fine or other sum ordered to be paid under any law or a specification or order of any court, the court may issue a warrant for the levy of such fine or other sum on the movable and immovable property of the offender.

As I said, Sir, the words in question in this section are not something which I can support. It says fine ordered to be paid under any law, and the words movable and immovable property. My understanding is, Mr. President, that this means that if a person is caught driving a bicycle without a light and he is taken to court and charged a fine, but he cannot pay it, his bicycle can be taken away from him.

MR. K. HARRIS [continuing]: Mr. President, I may be wrong, but if I am wrong I will give way to the honourable member and he can explain. [Interjection]. I do not know whether it is a joke or not. Just anyway it seems in my opinion that if a young boy is caught with a stick of gelignite on him in this country and is fined $1,000 but he cannot pay it, he can obtain the dividend that he may not be taken away from him. [Interjection]. Mr. President, I do believe that those people who might smoke a stick of gelignite do not have cars. Mr. President, smoking a stick of gelignite touches practically every household in this country. Let them laugh on that one.

I cannot, Sir, go with honesty to my people supporting this Legislation and, and I feel that it should be withdrawn and re-introduced. I must say, Mr. President, that there have been bills which we have on the Order Paper, I do not know who drafts them, Mr. President, but there is some bad draftsmanship there. We had one real difficult thing in West Bay, and I believe that he would have done just as well. However, Mr. President, I will have more to say when this Bill reaches Committee Stage, otherwise I can give my support to this Bill.

I am particularly happy about the proposed amendment to Section 23 empowering the Governor to suspend or remit of a private sentence once the committed person has served or become a prisoner of the exchequer. I think, Sir, that this will go a long way in relieving some of the overcrowding in our prisons. Simply speaking there, Sir, are the circumstances to consider the extent, with the consent of the committed person, to impose a period of community service instead of a period of imprisonment. I am aware, Sir, like I said, that this Bill is drafted badly, as the last three are, but I can understand some of it that this latter paragraph is conditional upon Government providing the proper facilities for the implementation of these community orders. However, I trust that Government will not drag its feet on this, Mr. President, because this is I believe, as I said, the wave to some of the ills at northern prison where we have the unfortunate practically a high school. As I said before, Mr. President, that little added income I heard some [illegible] from the Official Side of the Government Bench, teachers and [illegible] in this country. It is not a joke and I do not know what they are trying to laugh about this morning.

This community service order, I believe, will work well, as can work well in our society. There is a lot of work in my opinion which needs to be done. Mr. President, right now I know of at least two houses which are ready to be built but, they are poor people after struggling to pay the mortgage with the help of the wonderful services in this country, we will have the Government to put labour at this time. So, as I said, Government must move expeditiously on this thing called the community service order. I trust that it will not be like the hospital where they will be glad they are supporting but they cannot support the nations. I hope that we will see more action on this, Mr. President, before long times. I believe that this Bill is going to pass this house today. I trust that it gets the assent of Her Majesty's Representative before long so that we can move quickly on this situation.

I am particularly with the thrust of these amendments and feel sure that they will prove to be a great step forward in the rehabilitation of prisoners in this country, Mr. President, which for so long has been lacking since. They will allow persons who have transgressed against the law to pay their debt to society without imposing undue hardship on their dependents and the [illegible].

MR. W. HAWKINS (Surrey) (Conservative): Sir, I would like to see subsection (3) of the proposed amendment to Section 344 amended to allow the provisions to apply to those persons incarcerated under the Statute of Limitations where that incarceration appears to be solely for self-preservation.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRANDSE: On a point of information, Mr. Speaker, does the Honourable Member wish to give way.

MR. W. HAWKINS (Surrey): I have given way.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRANDSE: Mr. Speaker, I am always reluctant to interrupt the flow of other Members' thoughts, but I should put it clear in my opening remarks of this Second Reading that the Lawyer who I have to represent in this Bill is perfectly that community service orders made presently under the Penal Code do not apply to recidivating under the Statute of Limitations because there are already provisions in the Statute of Limitations for specific provisions both in relation to misdemeanours under and to community service orders. The fact remains community service orders have already been in the Statute Book in relation to many offences from this last year or two.

MR. W. HAWKINS (Surrey): Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member did just that. He interrupted my train of thought.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRANDSE: Just which I apologize.

MR. W. HAWKINS (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Second Official Member for his explanation and I am looking forward to hearing his comments in that further in that when we get to Committee Stage. However, Mr. President, as I said in the first instance, I did not quite understand. There have been so many amendments to this Statute Bill that it has got me confused. I am not the only one. I have previously heard Members saying how they have been confused by this Bill.

So, to get on with what I was saying, Mr. Speaker, about this subsection (3) of the proposed amendment to section 344. I trust that we can include it in the Penal Code to apply to those persons incarcerated under the Statute of Limitations for self-preservation.

The Bill, Mr. Speaker, as I said in my opening, I guess, Mr. Speaker, that I have mentioned the merits of the Official Side again. I probably will in the Committee Stage. However, they were matters that I have and matters which already formed with similar debate, and this time I will be brief.

I support the Bill, Mr. Speaker. To be in my opinion, and I do thank Government for bringing the Bill at this stage. I trust, as I said, that they will have fewer and fewer Bills, and get the things done which we could have done, and not have to.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Second Elected Member for Roseau Central.

MRS. M. WARNER BOURNE: Mr. President, I support this Bill. I believe that has been overlooked on purpose and equally. I feel this Bill for a few is wrong the Penal Code to be fair and reasonable, just as to the powers of the court and also as to the rights of the individual having changed.

MR. W. BENNETT JONES (CONTINUING): When applied, I believe that it can be established a form of rehabilitation of a certain type of offender in our community, a need for which we have all recognized from time to time.

While mentioned other procedures, this will deal with carefully selected sentences and dramatic serious crimes. I know that it may be a bit radical, but there are occasions I find such good news that is to be received hopefully. My understanding to date is that a court has passed sentence for a short term, not less than six months nor more than two years, the court may order that after serving a part of the term the remainder may be held in suspense. It goes on to state that the suspended portion cannot be more than three-quarters of the term, not less than one-quarter. During the suspended sentence the offender must be of good behaviour, because as it states, if any other offence which is punishable by imprisonment is committed during the time that he is serving the portion of the suspended sentence, then the court shall exercise the discretionary portion of the suspended sentence and order the offender to serve it.

At the same instance it could then the court may order, in that instance it says that it shall order, unless the court is satisfied otherwise that part of the sentence that has been given the benefit of a suspended sentence, to be of acceptably good behaviour.

Other provisions are made for the court to exercise its discretionary powers under certain conditions of the case. As has been pointed out by the minister, suspended sentences do not apply to certain offences for manslaughter and certain sections of the Criminal Code. The motion has also indicated the circumstances in which an amendment at Committee Stage which would suspended sentences to be extended to the Yukon Territory. I support this. I am happy to hear this, personally in the case of first offenders.

Provision is also made for default in the payment of a fine and sets out the procedure by which the court shall deal with this matter. As I have said before it must be fair to the court and to the individual because we cannot expect that people to observe and follow certain procedures if they are both totally unaware.

The bill encourages the fullest amount possible in the area but also the minimum period of time to be served in default and a crime in the juvenile law.

This bill goes on to make reasonable provisions dealing with payment on fines on a per month basis, which to my mind is also fair and reasonable.

The other section of great interest to community service orders. A person convicted of any offence except an offence punishable by death, also must with the person's consent, it has to be with the person's consent and also in this manner the rights of the individual are protected, impose orders in addition to or instead of any other sentence. This is important work to the community of just these sorts of things some there are I have made a passing which pointed. I envisage that this would also accrue to the Territorial Council for Social Services, to supervise and to order these rehabilitive organizations, to be approved and by those persons carrying under a community service order. Before making such an order the court must be satisfied by the Commissioner in Council that arrangements are in place for community work to be performed. This is a necessary provision because unless the proper arrangements are in place it is natural that this area cannot be carried out and be as effective as it should be.

MR. M. ANDREW SCOTT (CONSERVATIVE): The probation officer must confirm that the person is a suitable person to perform such work. This Bill does not differentiate between the person serving under a community service order. Why, if he is not suitable, will he be considered to suitable to serve such an order.

While Bill does not distinguish between individual religious beliefs, it does not distinguish between religious beliefs and non-religious beliefs. I see that the Minister is nodding in agreement. I hope that person may be contacting to obtain at what time. It states that the option can be exercised for an additional period by the Minister of Justice will be carried by an order. I see this as fair and reasonable because there are circumstances which can make plans which would unreasonable or unfeasible. It can be recalled that this is an order which applies to persons not previously had cause to rely upon.

Mr. Speaker, this provides an alternative to just time or borstal system, or an alternative to [illegible] penalties, which I believe more effective. This has been successfully done in other countries and I believe that it can have similar effects in our country. As for me I am concerned, if only a part dealing with [illegible] be carried out fair and reasonable, this is it.

Mrs. Mr. President, we not disagree to protect nor encourage the hardened criminal nor the habitual offender, but it is intended to help that type of individual who makes the mistake of committing a not too serious offence. This gives him a chance to pay his debt to society in a meaningful and useful way rather than a meaningless way, which is what the most [illegible] in the past. It gives him an opportunity to prove to society that they still have confidence and trust in him as a member of the law abiding community once again.

Mr. President, many of our young people, especially our first time offenders [illegible] opportunity. Sometimes we not disagree the amount, and the circumstances there with it is a chance that we must take a hopeful look at our system. This provides an alternative to unnecessarily high [illegible] and useful way rather than a meaningless way, which is what the most [illegible] in the past. It gives him an opportunity to prove to society that they still have confidence and trust in him as a member of the law abiding community once again.

Crime must be punished. Respect for the and order must be maintained and the public interests must be protected at all times. At the same time, Mr. President, I believe that every possible means to help offenders put back on the right track must be explored and utilized by this Government to help them to mature to accept and take the responsibilities of our society which they, when are capable of doing.

I anticipate problems, Mr. President, that this Bill will have encountered there. We must not be seen as a country which seeks to solve the problems merely by suppressing the person responsible. We need legislation other words and we have good examples of [illegible] of tested and tried systems and procedures which can be useful to this country.

I support the Bill, Mr. President, and look forward to the Law being fully enforced in the very near future. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I think perhaps that it may be convenient if we take our customary morning break. I will suspend proceedings for approximately ten minutes.

AT 11.20 A.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

BILLS READ AT 11.06 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Proceedings now resume.

The Second Reading of the Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1976. The Honourable Nairobi Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. DENGUA O. MBURU: Mr. President, I rise to support the Bill now before us. I find no confusion or misinterpretation in the Bill, Mr. President. I think what it seeks to do what the mover said and that is to show that the Government is mainly inside an enlightened approach to punishment and sentence generally.

I will just point out, Mr. President, in case of the matters raised, because there is certainly no doubt we will have further discussion in Committee Stage. While I agree, Mr. President, that if time permitted it would be nice to have these Bills for months in advance, it up to now has not proved possible to do this. I would just like to make the point that we are in fact receiving the stipulations under Standing Orders in this regard.

I do not accept that the comments from across the aisle are not paid attention to. When these comments are reasonable and useful of incorporation into legislation I certainly am open to accepting the suggestions. However, if the suggestions are never carried through to the point of where they are put into the form of a motion, then Government has little hope or little chance of accepting them.

The first section of this Bill, Mr. President, of significance is Clause 2 which deals with the hotly contested sentence. This was looked upon by some Members who spoke before me as being unreasonable because it meant that a convicted person would have to serve the stigma of having been sentenced to any prison. I think that Members should realise that the Penal Code at the moment provides for total suspension of the sentence, and this amendment now is making provision for partial suspension of the sentence. Whether the Second Elected Member for George Muite was reading from the paper or not, I think that the points made by the mover when he talked about a short, sharp jolt of deprivation, because it had to be worthy with this and not certainly with the distance under which the Member was speaking at that time.

The memorandum of the Bill quite rightly, Mr. President, said that the Bill in its present form curtails the application of this part, that is the ability to grant a suspended sentence from the sentences under the Penal Code (Amendment), but that if Members thought otherwise he would entertain an amendment in the Committee Stage to that effect. I think that that is the undertaking which he gave.

I commend this motion, Mr. President, and I realise that it was omitted because the total suspension provisions at the moment also excludes offences under the Penal Code (Amendment). It would be my hope that if an amendment is passed here to make the partial suspension of sentences applicable, then we might find it possible to also make the total suspension of the sentence applicable as well.

SUB. SESSION 0. COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS: Mr. President, the point of this bill which seemed to have caused quite a lot of concern was Clause 4 which dealt with the enforcement by distress warrants of fines, ...warrants. If one had listened to the representations on this, one would have got the impression that this was the first warrant for the levying of a fine. Perhaps if we look at Section 84 of the Penal Code as it stands now, in subsection (1) (f), it will be found that basically the same procedure exist, that is the procedure to secure a warrant against the immovable and movable property of an offender for the non-payment of a fine.

What Section 84(1) (f) says is that in Clause 4 of this bill what is to be newly here inserted will be supplemental ... the purpose is to give to Magistrates who will be empowered ... In addition, it is also to clarify a new procedure giving the right to take persons' property for failure to pay the fine.

Clause 5 of the Bill, Mr. President, seeks to amend Section 25 of the Penal Code so not to impose the penalty. In my opinion it is a welcome amendment of the somewhat ... because all that are time changed is now the method of ... implementation or levying of imprisonment. What has been proposed is the amount of fine for which the person can get the maximum length of sentence. So that really speaks in the benefit of the person convicted.

For example, where the person could get one month for a ten dollar fine previously, he can only get one month for a one hundred dollar fine at the moment. It should be made clear, Mr. President, that this is not really in respect of fines generally. It is basically in respect of private individuals against the person.

Section 5, Mr. President, dealing with ... the forfeiture of recognizances. This is an area where people have given recognizances to be of good behaviour or to refrain from committing certain ... they have given these recognizances, Mr. President, in lieu of receiving some other punishment, when if they break the terms there is an application ... they should not be entitled or to forfeit the recognizances.

The community service order, Mr. President, are welcome to this bill. As has been pointed out, the Minute of Paper has raised objections for the community service order, and that is why the offences under the Minute of Paper Act are excluded from this section. The reason, Mr. President, why this ... was not mentioned in this section of the Bill is because under the Minute of Paper Act, in addition to the community service order, ... as an alternative, the person might also be given an ... wage. This means that the person would be required to attend ... rehabilitation centre or clinic, or something of that sort.

However, Mr. President, seemed to have welcomed the community service order and I think that it is a step in the right direction. However, the procedure for ... the community service order seems to have been misunderstood. Members here again mentioned that it have the order enforced for a further period of twelve months ... the ... of the scheduled person. However, the contrary is true because Section ... also permits the number of hours to be increased. It is only the period of time within which the number of hours of work to be done can be performed. In the first instance, the period of time given is twelve months, and Section 3(2) makes provision that if it appears just and reasonable to the court they can extend that twelve months for a further twelve months. It would work, Mr. President, if maybe ... and this is an additional one although it is not ..., there was no appropriate work for the person to complete within the twelve months ...

THE HONOUR G. PEARCE (CONTINUING): However, a more likely case would be if the person became ill and could not fight parties the case within the twelve months stipulated, then the court could in its wisdom extend the period for a further twelve months.

So, Mr. President, I support those amendments to the Penal Code. I believe that they are steps in the right direction and in my opinion, they update and improve the law available to our courts in passing sentences on convicted persons.

I accept that the community service orders will put added stress on work on the probation officers but, Mr. President, I think that it would be better that those persons who are going for an appointment or conference with the probation officer and wanting to take care of our offenders at Northern Areas.

So, with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I fully support the Bill to amend the Penal Code, Law it is late.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Elected Member for North Side.

DR. D. LEIGH HILLS: Mr. President, I would like to support a Bill for a Law to amend the Penal Code. Like the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council I believe that it is fair and reasonable, and like the never disappeared it is an enlightened approach. However, I would wanted to add that I do not think that it is a very significant which might tend to undermine the security of the offences.

Sir, I would support the mover's intention to amend Section 3(2) which will allow partly suspended sentences to be applied to certain offences under the Penal Law. I think, Sir, that like the other areas of this Bill, a partially suspended sentence in regard to certain minor offences such as possession will the obvious intent for non-application which he would contribute to one's possession, could be a useful means of rehabilitation in a partly suspended sentence.

The enforcement by statutory order, Sir, I do not have any problem with this section of the Bill. Some Members and some people in the public, Sir, seem to have a broken sentence and refer to it as "probation or Northbound". I think that a prison sentence, Sir, should be punishment for an offence committed and if we allow, even if they are short term sentences or prison, to be looked at in the light of "probation or Northbound" because one is going to get these appointments a day and some fine enforcement, I believe, Sir, that we are doing an injustice to society and we are not being fair to those people who need protection from offenders in the Law.

I believe that certain people have abused this privilege of accepting imprisonment for that some reason, because they have heard that Northern Areas offers good meals and good accommodation, and because some who cannot go normally better off in Northbound Prison than the circumstances under which he is living his everyday life, that is in terms of meals and accommodation.

I believe, Sir, that part of paragraph was abused or suffered under Section 4(3) where it says:-

> "A sentence shall not, if it appears that the man has been so discharged as he would be held guilty by reason of any defect in the sentence."

MR. D. LEGARE HOLLAND (CONTINUING): I believe that if people are unjustly arrested by that section they can get justice under subsection (5) of the same section.

I might assure, Sir, with deference the Member of the court. This which you have to be placed before one can find the corresponding term of imprisonment under Section 6. However, Sir, I would hope that the courts are not going to automatically advise the first upwards that ten dollars to one hundred dollars, or five fifty dollars to five hundred dollars as the case may be.

Under Section 6, Sir, fingerprints of recognizances, I support this section, Sir, again because I believe that it is just and reasonable. I believe, Sir, that it is incumbent upon anyone who puts up a bond or whatever for recognizance or someone else, to make sure that they understand what they are getting themselves into. I fully believe, Sir, that since the onus is on them to understand what they are getting themselves into, if they fail to comply with the order then, Sir, I think that they should lose the benefits their recognizance.

With regard to the community service order, Sir, like other Members I feel that this is long overdue and I believe that it can go a long way to minimize overcrowding of the jail. However, Sir, I would hope that we are not going to have to wait on until long passed at time for the Government to inform the court that arrangements have been put in place. Further, Sir, I hope that this is not going to entail the hiring of twenty to thirty more probation officers to make sure we are possible with the utilization of work. I believe, Sir, that Government should give consideration under this section, in recognizing the shortage of manpower which exists in the Social Services Department, to involving the established service clubs in the recruitment of these community service orders. Most of the service clubs have at any time ongoing projects which these people could probably work on. I believe, Sir, that the rehabilitative and the reformation which these people can be exposed to community service should get in association with members of the service clubs would be very valuable to the offenders.

I do not have any problem anyway, Sir, with the ability to extend the community service order. I believe, Sir, that we have to give adequate provision for the back-sliders, so to speak.

So, Mr. President, I support the Bill to amend the Penal Code."

MR. SPEAKER: The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

HON. DARVILLE A. QUEST: Thank you, Mr. President.

I arise in support of a Bill for a Law to amend the Penal Code. I have studied this Bill and in point though it is never to me that what is intended here to exactly what should be done. That is either a person has committed a crime he must not only be punish here but be rehabilitative this individual. I feel that this Bill encompasses much which should go a long way to doing just that.

I suppose the Bill and there are a number of areas which have been touched on already and I do not know that I need to go over those. However, I feel some that life is something which is welcomed by the Caymanian public at large and I trust that other Members of the House will rise to give this Bill their support.

HON. DARRAH I. NICOLL (CONTINUING): Again I say, I ask this bill giving exactly what we need to be able effectively in this country, and that is to have more money to pursue than which is this country... to happen if they have done something wrong, but in addition to that our money will be spent rather than adding extra staff at Northcourt Prison, in Hackney to accommodate the offender.

Mr. President, I support the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: If no other Member wishes to speak... The First Elected Member for the Eastern Islands.

HON. HENRY S. KRISTOFFERSEN: Mr. President, the Bill now before this Honourable House, a Bill for a Law to amend the Penal Code, Law 18 of 1975. I rise to support. I feel that it is reasonable. It is just and the amendments are very necessary for the betterment of the judiciary here in the Cayman Islands.

I have given the very careful attention and as this time I would like to thank the Honourable Second Official Member for his able presentation in moving this Bill and also for personal explanations which he has given to me which have helped me to better understand.

There were some of my constituents who questioned the intention of Section 250 which states mental incapacity amendment. Some of the outside got the opinion that what this was doing was differentiating suspended sentences and making them at least partial. It is my understanding that this is not the case. The suspended sentences as we know them will continue. It just gives the judge or the Honourable Magistrate the authority to suspend a part of it which should not be more than three-quarters of the sentence, and not less than one-quarter. So, it is actually going to be beneficial to the persons who be sentenced. Maybe his crime is not of a nature enough nature for a long period sentence but a short prison sentence is necessary to make him realise what he has done wrong.

Sir, therefore I support that section. Whereas the enforcement of sentences commonly fined, accompanied this with the old saw I do not see as full list of charges and I feel that the courts must have the power to collect the property of the criminal, whether it be movable or immovable if it is necessary. What we are trying to do is deter crime in this community and we must not make it easy on the criminal. We should not be unduly hard but we must make him know that he has been convicted of a crime which is against the laws of the Cayman Islands, and he must suffer the consequences.

I think that the provisions of recognizances is fair. I would call to the attention of Members Section 311, subsection (2) which says:-

> "The court which declines a recognizance to be forfeited under subsection (1) may, at any time, thereafter call upon any person to pay the whole sum in which he is bound, jointly the whole or any part thereof either absolutely or on such conditions as it thinks fit."

Discretion is left in it and therefore I support that section.

I am very happy to see the community service order placed in the Penal Code. I had the privilege of representing it in the last Session of the Legislative when it was only the Leader of Opposition and I think Government to continue it implemented. I think that it is giving a second opportunity to the unfortunate who have been found guilty of a crime. It will give him an opportunity to pay his debt to society and probably still carry on a normal life.

CAPT. ALBERT S. KAWAUBAY (CONTINUING): I am happy to see that it states that:-

> "S69.(1) The discrimination given by the exclusion of persons under this section shall be for an unreasonable, unjustifiable and unwarranted person's religious beliefs and any disagreement with those, if any, of which he normally works or attends a school or other ... educational establishment."

In other words, the community service order will work to the benefit of the convicted and the community, not to the disadvantage of either.

There are provisions for the breach of community service which I think is necessary. I think the honourable First Elected Member for Bonaire Council for his explanation on the further period of twelve months. I do not understand it that way and I am very grateful for the explanation. In view of his explanation I think that it is very fine. It would be that because of school or some other reasons which I quoted earlier, he could not put the number of hours of his sentence into a period of twelve months, or six months originally, that it could be further extended.

Mr. President, I think that the most important task for these Islands at this time is to attempt to rehabilitate our unfortunate people who are convicted of crimes. I think that every effort should be made to try to rehabilitate them and retain them a decade. Let us not hate anymore. Anyone can make a mistake once and if we help to rehabilitate him or her they may not repeat it. Therefore they will be able to take their rightful place in society and fully build the Dignity Islands.

Mr. President, with these few words I support the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: If no other Member wishes to speak, does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply?

HON. MICHAEL A. BRADLEY: Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. President, Sir, I would like to thank all the Members who have supported this Bill sincerely before the House.

In a Bill of this kind dealing with five different types of punishments I would find it impossible if every Member had agreed with every particular provision in each of the five different matters dealt with. It is also necessary, to find, Mr. President, such a wide sweeping agreement that the Bill will come to nought and to make positive life in our society by making available to the courts a variety of methods whereby they can be dealt with.

However, Mr. President, I should like briefly to touch upon particular points raised by responsible Members opposite. The First Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. President, was the Second Elected Member for Bonaire who seemed to believe that the Government was in a state of confusion because it adhered to the principle that the courts should be given discretion, and unfettered discretion in sentencing persons to terms of imprisonment but yet that they should not have unfettered discretion in relation to psychiatric examination, or that they should not have full discretion in relation to other matters.

HON. MICHAEL J. QUARMBY (CONTINUING): I think that a clear distinction should be drawn between the two items. We believe that the court, having regard to the particular facts of the case should have the discretion to impose such fine as it considers to be appropriate. However, I also think, Mr. President, that in relation to suspended sentences which are periodically suspended, that the court should have the advantage of the choice of the Legislature to, possibly be able to set out the types of circumstances and the manner in which fines are appropriate.

The Member I feel is on some ground as to the propriety of the remarks and I regret the misstatement which he made in his speech. He said that he was opposed to increase of sentence for non-payment of a fine because the judge, and I quote, "is in no better shape to decide". Mr. President, in the full knowledge before this House there is an express provision that where before he made the payment of a fine, additional, the court may issue a warrant for the levy of such fine or other sum. That is discretionary. It is not mandatory. The court may issue a warrant. There is quite ample provision in the rules of procedure in the Supreme Court for the court to be informed that where a court has power to issue a warrant it may, if it considers it expedient to do so, postpone the issue of the warrant until such time as on such conditions, if any, as it thinks just.

I think that the principle discretion that there should, if undertaken, either the Peace of Members that the other side who seem to believe that under Legislation should take place if on payment of a fine that a prescribed penalty would automatically be waived. The courts may postpone the issue until such time and on such conditions, if any, as it thinks just.

In relation to discretion exercised by a court where it has found a person guilty, it could that the issue of warranty may be postponed subject to certain conditions or that payment. The types of conditions which are most commonly used are a fine or imprisonment. Imprisonment is an action taken against the body of the prisoner. A fine is an action taken against the property of the prisoner. I think that it would be a defect of the distinction of the legislative actions which are taken by this Assembly and by the courts if it are not possible to allow effectively in our Law the carrying out of the deliberations of the court by making sure that the person's property is attached to pay the fine which the court has seen fit and due.

Another objection which was raised by the Honourable Member was in relation to warrantees. As for contravention to other Members thought that there would not be sufficient because he thought that "the person would only have to go to the judge who was previously disposed to him". Again, Mr. President, Sir, I regret the inference that there would be an ability to seek round for a particular judicial officer which one could that or suspect would have favourable to his purpose. I think that our courts are above having stone cast at them placed upon them.

Mr. President, the Second Member Honourable Sir George Tomy, when he commenced speaking on the Second Reading of this Bill said and only that sufficient time had not been given to the public for its comments upon it, and that it was his understanding that the Lawyers in the community had not been consulted, and that even my staff in the Legal Department had not been consulted in this regard. Mr. President, the measures in the Bill presently before us must before the Government-in-Council because the end of that year. At that time it was Government's and my wish that a consolidated legal should be introduced from the members of the Royal Fraternity. It at that time, I move both

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY (CONSTITUENCY): So the Law Society as an official body and to another league not in the Law Society, ie the private sector, asking for their comments. I got a reply back from the Law Society saying that it had been passed for consideration to a committee of the Society. In April I asked for a progress report and was told that they had not been able to deal with the matter yet but they hoped to do so very shortly. No comments have in fact been received. I think, Mr. President, that when it is a Government Bill emanating the private sector, it is not unreasonable after an adequate space of time has elapsed to presume that the backers cannot have heard the mind of the particular association as greatly that it has not replied after five months. The other league in the private sector did reply; made several minor fundamental comments but basically said that from a lawyer's point of view that this was a matter of policy of Government, and if this was Government's policy then he had no objections as a lawyer to it.

In relation to my own Legal Department, apart from the members of the Law School there is a procedure administratively in my chambers that every professional member of staff sees or has the opportunity to see every piece of non-secret correspondence which goes out from those chambers. The drafting of all the stages is not a secret communication and there was an opportunity for members of my department, which I am sure they availed themselves of, to know the contents of this Bill in good time.

The Member also took me to task by saying that I was giving too far-reaching my duties or responsibilities when I said that certain procedures in this Bill would enable the offender to be given a short sharp lesson of imprisonment. I said that, Mr. President, and I mean that. I was emphasising what I considered one of the better points in this legislation, namely that instead of hamstringing the court having to decide whether it is imprisonment or to suspend the sentence of imprisonment completely, that it would in order to show the offender that it means business, to show the offender what prison was like, imprison them for a short period of time, so that having learnt that they would know effectively what would happen to them if the part of the sentence which was suspended had to be reinvoked.

So one was concerned about distress. We thought that there was unfair that the luxuries of life should be taken away from the criminal who offends against the society which he is part of. We thought it unfair that a person can blatantly disregard the laws of this land, can be convicted of an offence, can be sentenced to a term of imprisonment and should be able to ignore the courts and say, "Right I will go to Northward hotel but you are not going to touch my video or my satellite dish or my 125-bigatron going". I think that it is precisely for those people that these provisions are here. It is precisely to hit the criminal in the pocket. We may laugh; he may be a person to whom prison means nothing, but if the court says, "Right you have offended against society." You deserve to be punished not only in your person but in your pocket", that this is the way to do it.

Mr. President, Sir, I have no apologies for these provisions in this Bill. As I said, at Committee Stage there are several amendments which with the consent of the House I would propose to introduce. You know, Mr. President, there are not emphasis in Standing Orders any statements that there is a mandatory on the mover of the Bill or on the Government side to propose amendments. However, all Members of this Chamber have had these Bills with them for two weeks. They have been able to consider those Bills. Members are aware by the Hansard notice that might be more Committee Stage amendment to my Bill.

DR. SINGH: Mr. President, Sir, Members of this House have said, in so far as it be within my knowledge, even though according to one Member the drafting of this Bill is now ready to hon over soon and the amendments might do it better, even despite that, Mr. President, I am willing to help and assist any Members with the small amount of technical drafting experience which I am capable of. Members may not wish to use it. Members may wish to do their own amendments without my help or both of it. However, what I am saying, the Chief Whip Minister in this House do agree. Every Member can move a Committee stage amendment in fact, Mr. President, we have already had Committee stages of eight Bills and every one of the Committee stage amendments proposed by Members opposite have been accepted and passed.

I do agree that when we come to the Committee stage of this Bill and the Statute of Limits Bill and Limitation the Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, Members may wish to make Committee stage amendments. I think that it's a matter fairly simply enough about any particular provisions. It is not enough for the Chief Secretary to announce in the Second Reading debate and then wait for other people to put amendments. If he feels that there is a specific point he should either draft an amendment himself or ask Government would they not be prepared to move an amendment.

Mr. President, Sir, Members have raised many, many different points in their wide ranging debate upon this Bill and I think that I have dealt with most of them. If there are any further particular points which Members are unsure or unhappy about or require clarification on, I think we've go through in Committee Stage that we should be able to deal with them.

May I just in closing and in connection this Bill do Members of this Honourable Assembly, remember what I said when I proposed the Second Reading, that what we as a Government are doing is, and this Bill is part of the exercise, to make the system of passing on criminal amendments in this jurisdiction sufficiently flexible, sufficiently wide ranging and sufficiently imaginative and innovative that instead of having an overcrowded prison with persons who are direct there and who are being taught bad example by others, we will have a wide range of sentences whereby the person who is fined, be imprisoned, be placed on probation, have sentences wholly or partially suspended, have community services made and have orders enforced by distress.

I think, Mr. President, that despite small doubts from one Member we have sufficient faith in our system of law and order and in our system of justice to ensure that courts and people in these jurisdictions have the flexibility in this and other legislation, that just cannot certainly every case and every purchase and every circumstance in which Grand Jury have knowledge having taken the view, will use in the appropriate manner.

Mr. President, Sir, I commend this Bill to the Members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before this House is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Penal Code be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. W. HOSKINS HUGH: May we have a division, Mr. Speaker? May we have a division?

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well. I will ask the Clerk.

DIVISION
NO. 22

AYES	NOES
Hon. Horatio B. Boston	Mr. O. Roy Bodden
Hon. Michael J. Bradley	
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Hon. Benson O. Olembo	
Hon. D. Norman Seddon	
Hon. Capt. Charles S. Kirkconnell	
Mr. F. Matheus Smith	
Hon. Stephen L. Omondi	
Mr. Clifford A. Pleass	
Capt. Henry S. Kirkconnell	
Mr. D. Seaward Miller	
Mr. John B. Nelson	
11	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

MR. PRESIDENT: Before inviting the Honourable First Official Member to move the adjournment, perhaps I should just make one point for the enlightenment of Members in view of the open invitation extended by the Honourable First Official Member to everyone who so wishes to move Committee Stage amendments, I would ask Members to be aware of the provisions of the provisions of Standing Order 30(2). Those provisions call for notice of Committee Stage amendments to be given two days in advance in writing, but do provide for me to give leave for the moving of amendments of which notice has not been given. I have been as flexible as I can be in giving such notice but it is in the interests of all Members of the House if any Committee Stage amendment could be reduced to writing so that it is available for circulation either at or immediately before the time it is moved. To try and draft verbally on one's feet is not the most convenient or the most efficacious of procedures.

The Honourable First Official Member.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS M. MORRIS: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 12.30 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., TUESDAY, 28TH MAY, 1985.

RECORD HOLDING OF THE 2000 SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

[illegible]
[illegible] MAY, 2000

[illegible]:

THE DESIGNATED THE DIVISION, AS A MEMBER ELECTED, [illegible] - [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]

ORDER PAPER

TUESDAY

28TH MAY, 1985

1. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

BUSINESS COMMITTEE REPORT

TO BE TABLED BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER - CHAIRMAN OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE.

2. QUESTIONS

THE HONOURABLE SECOND SELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST SELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH RECREATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 83. WOULD THE MEMBER STATE, WHETHER THE LOCAL ESTABLISHMENT OF AN APPROVED SCHOOL FOR CAYMANIAN JUVENILE OFFENDERS IS REGARDED BY GOVERNMENT AS A PRIORITY AND IF SO, WHETHER WE CAN EXPECT TO SEE WORK COMMENCED ON THIS FACILITY WITHIN THE NEXT TWELVE MONTHS?

3. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS:-

(i) SECOND READINGS

(1) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

(ii) COMMITTEE STAGE

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

(iii) REPORTS RECEIVED

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

(iv) THIRD READINGS

(1) THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(3) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(4) THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985

OTHER BUSINESS:

MOTIONS:-

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

(a) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 12/95 - LIQUOR LICENSING LAW

(b) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 13/95 - PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR AND CIGARETTE ADVERTISING IN THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ADDRESS OF THE SOVEREIGN CONCERNING ACTION ON THE TREATY	1
QUESTIONS	7
THE ADDRESS OF GREECE (CONTINUED) 5TH, 1965 - SECOND SESSION	9
ADJOURNMENT	42

EVENING

DATE MAY, 1956

10.00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
Item 1. Presentation of Papers and Reports.
Reports. The Honourable Finance Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

FINANCIAL COMMITTEE REPORT

HON. DR. A. MUKERJI: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the Report of the Finance Committee.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.
Item 2. Questions. The Second Member for George Town.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND SELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN (DR. A. K. DAS MUKHERJEE RIZVI): Sir, I ask the Honourable Minister for Education the following questions:

Q. 98: Would the Minister state whether the Local Administration is of opinion that Elementary Education should be compulsory as a priority way of any which we can expect to see work commenced on this feasibility within the next twelve months?

ANSWER: This particular issue will be given careful consideration by the Honourable Member of Executive Council before the Honourable Minister will be in a position to say whether such schemes can be included in our current five year educational plan. It is therefore planned that the services of the Committee for which we are to be discussed shortly will include a review of existing facilities as well as examining possible ways of extending provision. This exercise should enable us to make clearly determined the needs of our community which require to be financed through the Public Sector Plan or by other financial facility.

It is also necessary to take such an integrated approach in order to ensure there any additional local facilities commenced will be adequately financed within our financial legislation, and will themselves be utilised in the most possible manner.

Based on the foregoing it is clearly not possible at this stage to give an indication that work may be expected to commence on the approved school within the next twelve months.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. EDMOND A. PIERRE: Mr. President, a supplementary arising from the answer. In view of the increasing number of juveniles coming before the court, I wonder if the Member could have information regarding the number of Opportune Juveniles in approved schools in Jamaica at this point in time?

THE HONOURABLE E. SEAGA: The number, Mr. President, is unknown.

MR. EDMOND A. PIERRE: A further supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Member could state whether he received any information regarding the maltreatment of juveniles in approved schools in Jamaica?

HON. EDWARD O. SEAGA: No, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry, the Third Elected Member for West Kay.

MR. DESMOND D. SWABY: Mr. President, I would like to ask the honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council a supplementary. Could the Member be able to state whether or not there are visits by any officials from Social Services to approved schools in Jamaica, and if so how often?

HON. EDWARD O. SEAGA: Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge there is. I do not believe that it is on a scheduled basis. It has the attention of Social Services has indicated to me that she personally intends to visit these schools on the very near future to get first hand information.

MR. JOHN B. MALCOLM: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member could say whether the last visit to the schools is known?

HON. EDWARD O. SEAGA: I am not in a position to answer that, Mr. President. Mr. President, I have been told very late.

MR. JOSE G. MATALON: Mr. President, a further supplementary. Would the Member say whether we will intervene to get more regular visits to approved schools in Jamaica?

HON. EDWARD O. SEAGA: Mr. President, I think I stated earlier that the Director of Social Services would be visiting on the very near future, and based on her findings possibly a schedule of visitation could be set up.

MR. K. MARSEN PUSEY: Mr. President, some time ago Members of this House visited the prisons in Jamaica. I believe some delegation on other went. I wonder whether the same could happen with the approved schools in Jamaica?

HON. EDWARD O. SEAGA: Mr. President, I am not quite sure that the Member is getting after.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that he was asking whether arrangements could be made for representatives of the House to visit approved schools in Jamaica. That was my understanding.

HON. EDWARD O. SEAGA: Well, Mr. President, I would say that would depend on whether the House felt that it was necessary, and whether it would be money well spent.

MR. GORDON O. PEARCE (CONTINUED): I as the Member, for example, responsible for Social Services should be prepared at the first instance to accept the reports given by the Director of Social Services. I personally give my undertaking that at the first opportunity when I get to Jamaica, I too will start those schools.

HON. K. HUNTLEY BROWN: Mr. President, I am not disputing any requirements or anybody's responsibility but I do feel that it would be good for Members of this House, at least a small explanation - I don't think I am not supposed to make a statement, sir, but I am just going to term it this a question by saying that the Member should look.....

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that you are learning at all.

HON. K. HUNTLEY BROWN: The Member should look this pleading or declaration and I would ask him if he can look....

MR. PRESIDENT: If you are saying will the Member look into this, that is alright.

HON. GORDON O. PEARCE: Mr. President, this can be discussed with Members, Sir.

MR. LINDSAY A. PIERSON: Mr. President, as a matter of clarification on asking supplementary questions. I think that the Standing Orders provide that a statement may be made with your permission, Sir, if such a statement would clearly what the question intends to seek; the information which the question intends to seek.

MR. PRESIDENT: Can you tell me the Standing Order which you are referring to?

MR. LINDSAY A. PIERSON: I am referring to Section 23(1)(a), Sir, which states that questions "shall not include the name of persons, or any statements of fact, unless they are necessary to render the question intelligible".

MR. PRESIDENT: What you are saying is whether that Standing Order entitles Members to make statements when they are asking supplementaries?

HON. LINDSAY A. PIERSON: What I am saying, Sir, is that we get the impression that statements cannot be made in this House during question time. However, under this Standing Order, with your .... permission, if the statement would make the question more intelligible, then there is nothing wrong with making the statement.

HON. PRESIDENT: I would not myself interpret Standing Order 23(1)(a) quite like that. My understanding of it is that it means that a question should not contain a statement unless the statement is necessary to render the question intelligible. That means that the statement must itself be an integral part of the question. One cannot make a long statement first and then at the end of it ask in a little question.

I can be liberal and flexible as I feel I properly can be in enabling Members to frame their supplementaries. However, unless the House wanted to amend Standing Orders to allow still greater flexibility, I do not really think that I should go any further than I now do. Indeed, I rather suspect that I go a little too far.

MR. RUDOLPH A. PIENAAR: Thank you, Mr. President. I just felt that in the light and the wording of Section 28(1)(a) that Members should know the difference which you have just explained there, because we have been led to believe, on the impression to them, an statements should be made. In fact, if the statement would seek to make a question more intelligible, and it is relevant to the question, then there is really nothing wrong in making the statement.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think you may have given a little bit further than my words were intended to, but I think we can leave it as that. Did the Third Elected Member for West Rand have a further supplementary?

MR. IMPENE I. GREEFF: Just to place it on record, Sir, that I think under Standing Order 28(1)(a) any such statement which the Second Elected Member for Cape Town is referring to would probably refer to the original question rather than supplementary questions, any such statement, even what your predecessor, would probably refer to the original question.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have taken it that that particular paragraph of Standing Order 28 would cover supplementaries as well as to the original question, and that the use of Standing Order 28 covers supplementaries as well as original questions, because there is not any other separate Standing Order which provides different rules in respect of supplementaries. Those Standing Order 28 applies to them there would not be any rules governing supplementaries. So I think that we can leave that Standing Order 28 does apply, but I would not like any Members to receive the impression that Standing Order 28 contains a kind of license to make statements in the guise of supplementaries.

Perhaps we can move on now to Item 8, in the Order Paper, Second Readings, the Mines of Dumps (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE MINES OF DUMPS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

CLERK: THE MINES OF DUMPS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

HON. BENSON O. BANDA: Mr. President, I beg to move, Sir, the Second Reading of a Bill shortly entitled the Mines of Dumps (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

Mr. President, this Bill seeks to make a number of amendments to the Mines of Dumps Law (Revised). Honourable Members will have received in addition to the Bill, notice of the Committee Stage amendments which are proposed to the Bill. In my observations on the Bill I will assume that the Committee Stage amendments will be incorporated into the Bill.

Clause 2 of the Bill, Mr. President, seeks to substitute an improved definition of the word "authorised", and also adds "dispositions" to the definition of hand dumps

MRS. RENSON O. SMITH (CONTINUING): Clause 2 seeks to paragraphs (a), (b), (d) and (e) to vary the present wording in this law. Paragraph (a) seeks to create the specific offence of possession with intent to supply, and paragraph (f) seeks to introduce those new subsections into Section 3 of the principal law in respect of defences and the burden of proof.

Clause 6, Mr. President, seeks to introduce a new section 24 to the principal law dealing with presumptions.

Clause 5 in paragraphs (a) to (d) seeks to delete references to minimum sentences, thereby giving some discretion of minimum as opposed to mandatory sentences. Mr. President, as far as I am concerned, this is the most important element of this Bill in that it puts the discretion for sentencing back into the hands of the court, where in my opinion and in the opinion of Government, it rightly belongs. We regard this Legislature as responsible for legislating the laws, and the courts for carrying them out. It does not in any way minimize Government's view of the seriousness of drug offences but on each case it can possibly different, it allows the court to decide in light of the circumstances what is a reasonable punishment.

Paragraphs (e) and (f) seek to clear up an anomaly by deleting an unnecessary reference. Paragraph (g) seeks to improve the wording of subsection (4) in the interests of clarity.

By Clause 8 provision is sought to be made in the circumstances thereby mentioned for the forfeiture of money or assets acquired due to, or as a result of an offence against the principal law. Mr. President, while this is a new concept in the scheme of these laws, that is the forfeiture of money or assets that it can be proved that that money or those assets have resulted by dealing in drugs, it is not an unheard of concept within the laws of the country. The Penal Code Law which we deal with presently makes similar provisions in respect of money or assets acquired under certain circumstances in that law. I would refer particularly to the abuse of office by public officials.

I think that this is reasonable, Mr. President, and there is a safeguard that if anyone else claims to be the owner of those assets, they can make a claim and prove the validity of their claim to the courts.

Clauses 9 and 10 of the Bill, Mr. President, again deal with the question of the removal of minimum sentences.

Clause 8 as originally printed would have repealed completely Section 22 of the principal Law, which, Mr. President, would have removed the discretion of trial by the certain circumstances. The amendment which has been circulated, if accepted, will restore this right in certain circumstances.

Clause 10, Mr. President, merely adds a section to state that the Law will not derogate from the provisions of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, which it is hoped to have this Legislature later in this Meeting.

Clause 11 seeks to improve on the definition of "police", and Clause 12 seeks the substitution (a) to (i) in the wording of Part 2. of the Second Schedule of the principal Law. Paragraph (b) again seeks to delete from that part with reference to minimum sentences.

HON. EDWIN O. EBANKS (CONTINUED): There are some technical points in this Bill, Mr. President, particularly the offence which may be created under subsection (f) of section 7. However, I think that when the whole of subsection (f) is read, it will be seen that they are not an unreasonable condition.

The other section which might be of some concern, Mr. President, is Section 6. That is the presumption of possession and knowledge of controlled drugs". This is perhaps somewhat different from the normal criteria required in normal offences, but the offences relating to illicit drugs are considered in certain that it is unreasonably restricted that presumption have to be made in dealing with them. I do not see anything in this section, Mr. President, which is unreasonable when it is understood that one is just considering pure illicit, hard drugs.

With these few remarks, Mr. President, I commend this Bill to Honourable Senators for their favourable consideration.

HON. THOMPSON: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Income Tax Ordinance, be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate.

The Second Elected Member for Georgetown.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

HON. C. DAJO ADDAMS: Mr. President, I see the Bill before the House as a part of the fulfilment of the new Government of their campaign promises to put an end to crime in the Guyana Interior. In the recent election taken has been to encourage the drug trade. We have seen there attitude of guilty sympathy to the convicted. The Elections Act on the 31st October, 1968, there were about 82 people in our prisons, and that during the six months from November until the election took to about 120 at the time. It, Minute Tabled during the first six months of the new Government. I understand that the prison population has now declined and is much less than 120.

I feel we must finish with the mental of the minimum sentences but this country is paying a very high price to have these minimum sentences enacted if they accept the Private Bill. Now I know that what I am saying will not be received in the House because the press has been well treated by the new Government. The Managing Director of the newspaper and his Colleagues, Another newspaper are the most to the previous Government Press, and I do not expect that the press will be reporting fairly or accurately unless it can ultimately go through the Government.

This country is paying a heavy price if we accept this Bill because it seeks to change the responsibilities of Ministers in the Guyana Islands. Section 2 changes the onus of proof from the prosecution to the defence and this is contrary to the European Convention on Human Rights. I would like to read from the Banjulese Convention, Article 6, subsection (2), which says:-

> "Everyone charged with a criminal offence shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law,"

Every criminal has the right to be presumed innocent until he is proved guilty according to law. What this section is doing is making every accused person guilty until he can prove his innocence, and this is a heavy price to pay for the removal of minimum sentences.

MR. G. FOX GRAHAM (CONSERVATIVE): In Clause 2 of the Bill we have tried to do the impossible in placing in the Law a provision known as Mr. Fox's Amendment:-

> "Without prejudice to any other provision of this Act -
>
> (a) where it is proved that a person received anything containing a contraceptive thing it should be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such person knew that such thing was contained in such thing;"

Before this the Law said that the accused person could be innocent until the prosecution could prove his guilt. Now the onus of proof has been shifted. This is revolutionary stuff. I understand that this is the way that the Law is framed in all Communist countries. I understand that this system has been adopted from the Napoleonic Code as against the Anglo Saxon Law which we follow.

Also under subsection (b) it says:-

> "Where it is proved that a person had in his possession or custody or under his control anything containing a contraceptive drug, it should be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such person was in possession of such drug;"

The danger of this Bill is that it is so easy to frame people. Every person in these Islands would be caught up under it.

Subsection (c) says:-

> "Where it is proved that a person supplied to any other person anything containing a contraceptive drug, it should be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such person knew that such drug was contained in such thing."

Before Only the prosecution had to go to court and had to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the accused person was guilty. With this new Bill, as I say certain the accused is guilty, the prosecution will have very little to do. The accused person is guilty. Some evidence on his behalf could then have to be. Give me a moment to see if I can find out why my colleagues in that Party thought that because he had been arrested and brought to court.

Subsection (d) says:-

> "Where it is proved that a person is in any way concerned,"

and I will be dealing at great length with the word "concerned" because that is a major change in this Law to ordinary practice. However, for short I will just read the-

> "Where it is proved that a person is in any way concerned in carrying, removing, harbouring, keeping, concealing, handling or dealing in any manner with anything containing a contraceptive drug, it should be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such person knew that such drug was contained in such thing."

This is wrong. It should be up to the Crown Court, the duty of the prosecution to prove the guilt. Not the presumption that they are guilty. It is not necessary to prove the guilt.

Mr. G. Dale Smith (Chesterfield): Subsection (4), which by the same token such a serious matter should be the knowledge stock of the Legal Department, says:-

> "Where it is proved that a person had in his possession or custody or under his control any document of title relating to anything containing a controlled drug, it shall be presumed until the contrary is proved, that such person was in possession of such drug."

I wonder if the Legal Department understands what this subsection says. It plainly says that if one holds the title to any property in which drugs are found, the holder of the title is guilty. That means that if the Customs open a friend's car and declare it down the ramp, and want to impound drugs, the owner of the car is guilty because he holds the title of the property in which the prohibited drug was found. It also means that if one wants to make an investment in somebody, and after they have lived in it for three years the police come along and find drugs in it, it means that the holder of the title of that apartment is guilty under this Bill, because the holder of the title is the owner of the property and he holds the title. This Bill says that he is guilty.

If one possesses the habit of loading from a shipment of goods and the man packing that container is unlikely when the man subsequently puts containers, and goods are found in that container. The fact that one holds the title makes one automatically guilty. That is what the Bill says:-

> "Where it is proved that a person had in his possession or custody or under his control any document of title relating to anything containing a controlled drug,"

He is presumed to be guilty unless he can prove that he is not.

If I lend my car to someone how can I prove my innocence under this Bill. I would have to prove that I did not seem my own car for five years, or something like that to satisfy the court. Because I hold the title of sale from the car. If I lend it to a friend and the friend uses the car to transport drugs I would be automatically guilty because I hold the title. I do not think that this Bill would go through the Houses. One might as well go to Uganda where they simply take up a form and can be guilty. They either kill him or just lock him away where they do not hear from him. There is no doubt. If they go through a trial it is a mockery. This would make a mockery of our courts.

I have unwittingly yesterday because I contained something about the courts. My views are not on the courts. They are on our legal judgments and our Electoral System of Proportional Council. They are exempt to this House that Ulster should not come to a democratic decision, issue which should not come in a Colony of the United Kingdom. My point is with them.

If a clerk in a shop or a shop assistant sells drugs which are prohibited in the package under the Medicine, the owner of that shop would be guilty because he has the legal title to the property, or rather ownership of it. Although he could not know what his subordinates had done he would be guilty. This can never be right.

It also provides to cast an unbearable onus that not only the title document, but if one holds any other document or written or oriented matter relating to anything containing a controlled drug, it shall be presumed until the contrary is proved, that such person was in possession of such drug.

MR. [illegible] COMMON CONSCIENCE: One witness said, "If we destroy weapons for the Iraq we must first make the Iraq responsible". This is not a responsible bill. Another witness said that, if not enough public opinion can mobilize to be enforced". This bill has no public opinion on it. I don't think that within a couple of days when I showed how these bills had been kept out of the public's reach, and the requested copies were not handed to us until after the hearing started, when it was impossible for the public to see these bills.

We have an example, now I will [illegible] wishing which that be greater participation. Later on, when I came to the belated letter from the Chief Counsel which spoke to concern within municipal police, pointing which might belong many of the rights which the people of this country have enjoyed. They never knew that the Chief Counsel did not have time to write to the Government that way, "Amend this BILL", which after we got on the floor of the House. Yesterday morning that amendment was revealed to us. What would happen if we had dealt with this BILL on Thursday of last week because it was on the Order Paper, I believe? What would have happened? It would have gone without amendments. However, this will be the subject of another part of my debate.

Now, it seems that it is not enough to make a new policy. They also go on to take away the only defense which exists to anything in the Discipline Convention on Human Rights, because the same Article 5 which I read from, gives us the assertion that in any then ourselves already with a criminal offense was the following minimum rights. Amongst those rights is the right to defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing. I maintain that that right is taken away because he cannot defend himself when this BILL places the only defense he would have.

To Section 4(2) it says-

"The presumptions provided by this section,"

Now, remember what these are presumptions of guilt. The presumptions of guilt", as already read I mention.

"The presumptions provided by this section shall not -

(a) be rebutted by proof that a person never had physical possession of the prohibited item;"

Mr. Clerk if one can prove that he was off the Islands and had left the use with a friend for the one machine that he was using, then you would not allow him, because the defence, the right to defend himself which they had made his policy he must take away by this BILL.

"The presumptions provided by this section shall not -

(a) be rebutted by proof that a person never had physical possession of the prohibited item;"

I wonder what is going to happen to all those people who have been fined in a week-to-week? What is going to happen to every person in this country who owns a hotel room or an apartment, or even a private dwelling house? What is going to happen if somebody comes to some then a package through the mail and they get the little pills from the Post Office which are these pills because a lot of people in cancer research need.

MR. P. WISE (Subiaco) [10.22 p.m.]: This is serious business. I trust that they have time before talking about Aboriginals and booze, whatever that trite little slogan is. This is serious business and my God I never thought that I would live to see the day where I had to stand in this house and fight the destruction of the English system of jurisprudence which has made this country and its people substantially great. Are they going to have the courage to withdraw the Bill? We have yet to see just how much we have. We have it up to them to withdraw the amendments.

The media only alluded to Dick Kay and those that think they have come up with explosive amendments to this Bill, in proof that the Bill was dirty on Hasta, introduced by Hasta and brought forward precipitously before the committee period was complete.

Section 3 of this Bill would, but for a stroke of luck, have removed Section 25 from the Statute of Treason Act. Section 25 of the Statute of Treason Act makes available life imprisonment for those offences which would result in imprisonment of upwards of fifteen years, to be tried under our Criminal Procedure Code as a misdemeanour offence. Now, examine what is in the Criminal Procedure Code the misdemeanour offences are offences which can be tried by a jury in the Grand Court. There are three methods of trial. One is a summary trial before the magistrate. Another is trial by indictment in the Grand Court, and the special provisions in the Criminal Procedure Code and in Section 25 of the Statute of Treason Act would allow certain offences to be tried by jury rather than by the magistrate because of the gravity of the penalties.

This Bill which came in we would have hoped that trial by jury had not the Chief Justice managed to convince a lazy and sound Labor Government that by unnecessary that they do not be so foolish as to take away the rights of trial by jury. The submission said:

> "The effect of this is to remove the right of trial by jury, even though the maximum penalty may be thirty years."

This is acknowledged by the Chief Justice to be too high a jurisdiction for magistrate's court, something which I felt, and in fact long before yesterday I can reassure you that I had the wisdom to make a recommendation that we leave this decision as it is.

Why? Why should Aboriginal people wait for the Chief Justice to tell them that they should not take away the rights to trial by jury for grave offences in this country? I do not want to lecture them, and I do not want to be hypocritical, but the right to trial by jury is one of the fundamental rights of people who follow the British system. It is entrenched in the Magna Carta that a man has a right to be tried by his peers in serious criminal matters, and the all-knowing Executive Council are going to deprive the people of this country of the right to trial by jury for grave offences and it is not back for the quick action of the Chief Minister, who must be credited for having this step in mind when she planned privileges were going to have them away.

I was not surprised to see the reaction to the Bill, because I stood in this Chamber in 1975 or 1976 and fought the removal of the Coroner's jury from the Coroner's Act. However, as the Members who are doing the bidding of Executive Council were the Members of Executive Council back in the 1970s when they took out the Coroner's jury from the Coroner's Act. After the 1978 elections the Government of the day put back the use of the Coroner's jury into the Coroner's Act, and I do not mind one bobbing that the Coroner's jury is not a trial jury. It is a jury to decide if inquiries should be instigated. I know that. Nevertheless, the principle is the same.

MR. G. ELLIS MOORE (CONSERVATIVE): I believe that how they get away with wearing long hair from time to time, the next step would be to make it out of it from other ways. Communism is not something which comes upon one like a cyclical storm. It is not something which comes overnight. It is the philosophy many of the people there do have explained one by one; the seeking way of one democratic right by bit, as we have seen in the Bills brought here since November, like someone is chipping at the left under the general understanding and I hope that the time may the people will vote the Left as they do when not to see the Bills the next elections.

Under Section 3 I propose to move here and talk about the phrase "the communist" which has been used in the Act to replace the previous phraseology which existed in the old Act. Section 3(1) suggests that we should use words by subscription, the words "member or is concerned in any of such matters" for what was there before "appears or to do or like manner, promotes, solicits, encourages, aids, abets, permits or suffers any other person so to do". Why? Why was they change the previous phraseology of the Act and putting in words like "because or concerned in guilty"? Do they focus the whole application of the word to be? "Is concerned". If a child had been brought before the court would the parents not be concerned? Under this Bill the parents could be charged because they are concerned about the welfare of their children. We cannot use a vague word like "concerned" merely because we want to catch an unscrupulous employer who deliberately under this Bill.

I looked up in one small dictionary the meaning of the word to be, and I found out that the phraseology or the terminology "is concerned" had these many meanings, which could make anybody guilty if we thought that change in the Bill. "Is concerned", one would be anxious, disturbed, interested, engaged, publicly involved, involved, to one's business, to mingle, to be mixed, to have or influence, to do the business or affairs of a person, engage, occupy, and I imagine the man might have many other meanings as well.

There may circumstances and many magistrate which would not agree that one is guilty in a vague terminology "participation or concerned with the matter or guilty", because somebody, if it involves a husband or wife, the person should be guilty under it. Because they would have to be concerned with the matter.

Why were they changing a law which has been on the books a long time? The present Act, I think was written in the 1930s. It was revised some years ago, but mainly the first Minister of Labour which had any teeth in it was the Act written in the 1930s. It has worked well. There have been many convictions why can we change it, the philosophy in the Act matter?

We know that there are four kind on the world, the usual political diplomacy just dealing with the part which they have to be put forward, that of Turkey and the minimum sentences which nobody is disagreeable with anyone. But, what have it to do as I said yesterday and the day before, anyone control and connected to violence from so that we should accept impediment in the Bill.

This section on wrongful dismissal is an important section of the Bill, dealing with a serious offence, and to also put into other words. For example, apart from the exemptions in Section 2 of the principal Act to do also the Section 22(2) where they are substantially/reasonably in any employment for other words in the passage.

MR. G. MIKE AMOS [CONTINUING]: While some amendments of mine have been rejected. The Chairman was the Capital Improvements Act, in my opinion, simply with the wishes of the Chief Justice because they administered what he wanted to do by the amendment which they put through. And they put through an amendment simply to replace the section as would have been well and good. However, I have what members will notice the amendments before the House and see what has been done. They are changing the maximum from twenty years to fifteen, and some people may believe that they are getting a good deal. However, what is happening is that by reducing the maximum term handed to fifteen years, hopeful offenses can still be tried by the magistrate's courts. So they have appealed the good wishes of the Chief Justice. Apparently, the hardest hearted offenders who would have not twenty years to be tried by jury in the Grand Court, by indictment in the Grand Court, and....

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Member expect to be some considerable further time, or not?

MR. G. MIKE AMOS: Yes, Sir, but I would not mind finishing this period.

MR. SPEAKER: Alright.

MR. G. MIKE AMOS: So the amendment here in Clause 18 of the Bill deletes the numerals "20" and replaces them with the numerals "15" which is applicable to 15 years and 20 years. So, under the Misuse of Drugs Law a second offence of selling drugs will now carry a maximum sentence of 15 years rather than 20 years, and because it was a limit of 20 years, it can be tried in the magistrate's court, the very thing which the Chief Justice was trying to avoid, the trial of a serious, criminal offence by the magistrate's court.

Finally on this section I would say that we were interested yesterday that we should keep amendments if we do not like the Bill. However, I know the treatment of amendments will get. I am not belaboring any amendments further. I can master one, I mentioned two and maybe even three ones. So I am not going to keep up the view of the House with amendments. However, if amendments are brought to change the three sections I have dealt with so far, I would be obligated to support them, because I feel strongly that we should not change the presumption of guilt. We should not interfere with ... that by just one we should not put this vague terminology in the Bill which can catch up everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I would prefer if you have the break now.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, I will suspend proceedings for approximately ten minutes.

AT 11.30 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Continuation of second reading debate. The second District Member from Region Four.

MR. G. ELLIS JONES: Mr. Speaker, Section 8 of the new Bill deals with forfeiture and I explained earlier I objected the Penal Code (Amendment) Bill yesterday that there would be a link between the Distress Warrants and the Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Bill. That is why I hammered it so hard, not because I lack confidence in the personal officers of the courts, but simply because these officers will not live for ever and the way is open.

There has already been a forfeiture provision in the Misuse of Drugs Law. The new amendment seems to be much further than the forfeiture under the old Law. The section reads:-

> "(1) Subject to subsection (2) where a person is convicted of an offence against this Law, and the court by or before which he is convicted is satisfied that any moneys or any other thing relative to or have been acquired thereby or as a result of the offence, the court shall order that such moneys or other thing be forfeited to the Crown to deal with in such other manner as it may direct."

This section was brought widely the danger that other assets could easily be caught up in this forfeiture provisions, and of course again would probably be in violation of the Bacon Rights. So this section which is much broader, means the courts in principle, they can take any monies or any other thing related to or having been acquired thereby or as a result of the offence. The court shall order that such monies or other thing be forfeited to the Crown. To other words what is happening in this Law is that it has been broadened so that every person and everything can be caught up under it without any effort on the part of the prosecution to prove this thing. Without even a fair chance for the accused to defend himself because all of these rights have been restricted by one or more of the provisions of the Bill.

The removal of the ordinary safeguards will encourage the drug traffickers. I wonder what the Government is going to say later on this year when they face the United States and the United Kingdom to deal with the Extradition Agreement. Are they going to tell them that they are making the necessary laws or are they going to tell them that they have accepted the minimum sentences?

It was my understanding that during the original negotiations for the Extradition Agreement, that it was a foregone conclusion that this country would have the Misuse of Drugs Law. So, are they going to tell the diplomats during this year's Extradition Agreement that we have accepted the minimum penalties, and we have wisely reduced the maximum sentence for narcotic offences, one of them being reduced from twenty years to fifteen years?

MR. DE BRUYN ESSEBAGGER (CONTINUING): To sum up what I have just said, I am definitely against the presumption of guilt which has been brought into this Bill. I hope that it is true that the onus to prove can be used in some ways and can be very useful, perhaps in proving whether a person committed certain acts. However, certainly it is not useful when the presumption of guilt takes away the inherent rights of a person who is brought before the courts in this manner in which this Bill will do.

Therefore, I think that it is necessary for the Government to withdraw this Bill and bring back a Bill which deals with minimum sentences. This is what they campaigned upon. It is one of them in their campaign said the politics that they were going to change the onus of proof and make a man guilty simply because he was accepted as the Chief Executive. Not one of them complained on humanity like rights to trials by juries from this time. So, if they have given a big ambition in carrying out their campaign promises in the Manner of Dwight Eme, they should withdraw this Bill and do what they promised to do without trampling underfoot of human beings to be treated in consonance with Article 6(2) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Whether Members realise it or not, we are a part of that Convention. The Convention was signed on the 4th November, 1950, and came into force on the 3rd September, 1953. The United Kingdom was one of the original signatories to this Convention. Before that time it has been extended to include all of the Colonies. So, we are a part of it and the United Kingdom is a part of it. This Bill would be in direct violation of Article 6. It is an impossible that I would like to read it again the Standing-

> "Everyone charged with a criminal offence shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law."

This is a serious matter. As busy as the Government has been since December, it is really the first time that we have come up against this. Obviously, it shows how corrupt people are because when they know that they have the necessary to get through whatever they bring to the House. To think how the times appear that we do find ourselves and this is the issue where the freedoms which we began with almost 1,000 years ago will disappear if the Government is allowed to get away with it this time.

Sir, I am calling on them, simply that in the interests of humanity, those children and their grandchildren to whatever this Bill which is necessary to the worse Nights Ordinance; contrary to English jurisprudence; contrary to the views of the people of the United Nations.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. HEATHER BUSH: Mr. President, I rise to support certain provisions of this Bill to amend the Misuse of Drugs Law (Revised).

Mr. President, I will not pretend, Sir, to understand all of the legal jargon of this Bill. However, Sir, I believe that I am fair in saying that Clause 7 and 8 will be affect circumstances something which I personally my people I would say to accomplish. That is, Mr. President, but note observation in the hands of the judge when dealing with offences under the Misuse of Drugs Law relating to the possession of drugs in which is obviously intended for personal use.

Mr. [illegible] Mr. President, this, in my opinion has been the problem over the years, one of the problems over the years with the House of Representatives. There has been a misunderstanding between peacemaking for safe and peaceable society for self-protection. Sir, a man who has been tempted to experiment with drugs by having a couple of pills given to him by someone who he would be guilty of an offense or serious as a person who sells about to overcome and taking the lives of other people by selling them drugs. Now, Sir, I can well imagine that it is difficult sometimes to make a distinction, but we in this honorable House who were elected to represent the people to look after the interests of the people to see that justice is done, we must encourage in this bill the courts to make such a distinction.

[illegible] in some cases it is obviously plain that the possession is all there. In other cases I think it is not so easy. However, as I say, it must try to make a distinction. Mr. President, when I have brought some of these very serious sentences, and I am very happy to find that the people seem to be of the same opinion. I hope we should that the Honorable Attorney-General himself must have come to the same conclusion that there should be a second look at the laws dealing with mandatory sentences.

I believe that there are some instances when these laws were passed. Because of that, Sir, I know that the time has come when they should be scrutinized. I have spent [illegible] time to time of the judge himself making comments on the inability to impose such as he would like to impose them. I have seen so many instances of our young people coming before the courts, and whereas the judge would like to treat the matter in a different light, he has always found himself helpless. Unable to act accordingly to the circumstances. One thing I do know, and that is that there are those young people in our University, who if they had been given the opportunity, might have been rehabilitated in our first instance. That is why I say that there are those who cannot be rehabilitated. However, there are, I think, many persons in prison here because more humane sentences than anything else. The people in that there is rehabilitation. We find as many of these persons going back and never being rehabilitated at all.

Mr. President, I have made a before and I repeat, the effect of the enjoyment of people is not the same being committed in this society of ours. Mr. President, I am speaking to this House which will be assured in the assistance of this country, and I am not saying anything in this honorable House which I did not tell my people. Mr. President, I see it as an overwhelming majority. The people were disenfranchised by this type of imprisonment and this honorable House in order the rights that when we are speaking this law here today. We are pleading that we have some sought consideration. My fair young people for years when we fail to punish in these years for speaking such as hard from a home. Now fear in this, Mr. President that some of society in its face for. But we not dictate ourselves. As I said before, the use of guns in this country is big, and I am [illegible] especially to guns because the persons are looked upon with young people who were just there for the use of a celebrity gangs. The judge only see them there once a week and they like that to come and they have to go to jail.

The use of guns in this country towards [illegible] and I say this, Mr. President, and I mean it. We in this House had better have experience of that fact because as it is fact. Just we not obtain information. Each one of us have two children. Mine, see, are only five years old and eight years old. However, I am certain that there are many in the House tonight and those are the ones which worry me;

MR. W. ROBSON DUFF (CONSERVATIVE): Not by con, Mr. President, I am sorry that, but what of those poor parents who have struggled to bring their children to the age, when they reach the teenage, whether they cannot control them. These are the ones, Mr. President, which I am concerned with here. So in this House must better take cognizance of that fact. Let us not ignore circumstance. Many, many parents have not helped our education and we in this Honourable House can bring the right knowledge we are giving away with them.

Mr. President, I believe that the people of the Caribbean and the whole Commonwealth as well are all aware of my stand on hard drugs. They significantly, in my opinion, is one of the most serious problems that we are faced with in society today. However, they addiction, Mr. President, on the other hand is a disease, a serious sickness and should be treated as such. This Member said that the Government must treat it severely whether it should be treated as a sickness or criminal or whatever. But one cannot still mention that we have fundamentally diseases present. Mr. President, if it is a complaint please or if it is a fulfillment of a campaign pledge, I am happy because I promised to my people during this campaign that again to attempt to have our laws amended or modified to maintain their price that we would go along with necessary amendments.

So, as I said, just that they amended my the first time I am the bill on the first time I heard about it was when we got the white paper, but I am delighted that with that consultation terms that are doing the right thing.

I am very glad, Mr. President, trying to cover briefly what is a serious problem in this country. However, I do believe that the simplest we can with these things the more likely the average person on the streets will be able to understand what is involved in them.

Mr. President, I might as homestead for this but I do have one explanation for the amendment to Clause 6 which we got to Committee stage. I know that the practice now been before to allow amendments in Committee stage by some and not the matter from which I am now hearing about. I would like to see the justice of the courts jurisdiction which are properly of a restricted drug trafficker that is forfeited to the Crown to be used in a drug rehabilitation programme, whether or not properly including cash was or could have been acquired by the offence which is the subject of the conviction. If it can be proved that they acquired their benefits from the sale of drugs to our children, then it is to be used to put our people back on the right track again. As I said, this should be particularly so in cases where the convicts commit quite a legitimate source of income. If our society is going to suffer from these atrocities, at least them let us put back into society some of what they took.

Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, I do not support the entire bill. There are some things here which I do not like and which need to be carefully looked at. With regard to "Presumptions of possession and knowledge of prohibited drugs", Mr. President, I am looking forward to hearing from the Government Bench on the legal view on the Government Bench what the situation is with them. However, as first looking at it, Mr. President, I propose support it. I must say that this is a marvelous, supreme exercise of the will Mr. President, of any country who Government until they are removed by the wishes of the land to be guilty. While I do not agree with everything around from the mouth of the learned Attorney for Golden Vale, he does have one point here, Mr. President, so that to that this section of the Bill is dead in many respects.

MR. M. MARIETA DUCH (CONTINUING): However, Mr. President, we must ... speed for application's sake, just for the sake of being in operation. We still had more bad sessions but, Mr. President, the principle law itself was a contradictory law because it gave the Government permission to seize from a person's home without a warrant. The Second Elected Member for Belize West and a Government Member in 1968 when the principle law was enacted.

MR. E. RITA DOUGLAS: Mr. President, I want to make an explanation at the end because....

MR. F. MARIANO SHOU: Sir, Mr. President,....

MR. E. RITA DOUGLAS: ....that section can put us into jail in the meantime,

MR. M. MARIETA DUCH: Sir, Mr. President, he can make his explanation next. I give way.

MR. E. RITA DOUGLAS: Mr. President, the reason the number of responsible is for the misuse of power in the section which allows the police to break into and enter a person's property without a warrant. This was put into the Law in the meantime since a different Government was in power. It was between 1971 and 1974. It was not in by a Government of which I was a part.

MR. M. MARIETA DUCH: Mr. President, this law which I hold now in my hand, Law 14 of 1962, the Misuse of Drugs Law (Revised) Law, I more or less the administration of the previous Government. The former Hon. Minister, the Second Elected Member for Belize West and then the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council. If I can be interrupted about what people do until I have that memory that contemptible practice which gave the police power to come into a person's home without a warrant. It is still not clear why the 1962 to 1974 Government did it, they were displaced in 1974 possibly because of that kind of Law. The Member's Government was possibly displaced, Mr. President, because they only further compounded the problem. We had a part of the Government of 1962 that did not do this only to the people. However, I am still not on Section 6, but we must not digress here, Mr. President, and say that this contemptible is now encouraging crime. If we look at the circumstances in this country from 1974 to 1984 we will see, Mr. President, that our young people are in those prisons simply because a Government was elected in 1974 which, Mr. President, did nothing to help our young people except to send them down the drain.

Mr. President, it was part of my campaign promises to help our young people and I am not ashamed of that. I am not encouraging crime. I would request Sir to let us be more responsible and we must not oppose for the sake of opposition. When I propose Law Governments which I have my rights to oppose, and it was built fourteen on this Law.

Mr. President, I realise I am the Leader of the Government. I would say the only other Government in the Caribbean that has more ready people of power. We must be constantly alert that to help them. Sanctions must be compared with money.

Mr. President, in taking away the powers of the courts, dealing only with a piece, let us look back on history and see what the former Government tried to do with the use to remove the Judges Law, Law 14 of 1975 which was unjustice: in November, 1982.

MR. P. MORRIS GUSS (CONTINUED): Mr. President, what did they do? It was ridiculous. It ought to take away the powers of the court and the Member was a Member of Executive Council, the leading Government body in the country. However, I am glad he is here to listen to. I agree with him that he must not do things like this irresponsible people which may cost the Government in additional costs. I cannot see that. There are things come here which I do not agree with and on time as I am here I will vote, Mr. President, according to my conscience. However, I have to tell the truth about that when the time comes.

Sight now, Mr. President, some of this will have to be withdrawn, redrafted or whatever. I am waiting to hear what the Honourable Second Official Member will say. However further of the evening will be had. Why Mr. President, I am saying that I am not talking anyone's position here, but if anyone could send the Queen's representative to this country a package they could send me a package bowled with dope. I would know nothing about it but I would have to suffer the shame of going to court proving that I was innocent. Mr. President, this is very serious and I do not know whether the draftsman for this country were already or whether they were idle-minded, Mr. President, but it is for serious consideration here. It is just simplicity.

I am wondering, Mr. President, whether it was not set up for the Opposition to speak on this Bill, Mr. President, certain sections of this Bill have my support and I want to make it clear that not because let's go ahead a Government who did not promise or mention about the police power to arise. Our language here was a man's home is his castle. This is much some how and do the same thing all over again. I must say, Mr. President, that it is not good. Where are the human rights in this country?

When I am debating now, Mr. President, and I know that you will soon stop me. I want to have some good explanation, Mr. President, and I must ask the Government bench that they either withdraw this thing or it should be revised here was not so that we may see to this thing. I am a simple boy. I am a known man and a big one, a heavy one, and I want to see justice done, but justice all around.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? No, the Honourable Second Official Member I think perhaps caught my eye first.

MR. MICHAEL A. BENJAMIN: Mr. President, Sir, this Bill before this Honourable House relates to amendments of the Rights of Dogs Ordinance. Mr. President, it was brought to attention since the Bill had not been presented by me, to Members of the House, to deal with the Committee Stage and then if anybody to withdraw meanings of the provisions contained therein if they that there had been any wrong assumptions made with them. However, Mr. President, I realize that it is my duty to speak here and it is my responsibility to speak, because, Mr. President, words are going out from this Chamber, which require subsequent scrutiny by the Second Elected Member for Golden Rock, but words which convey expectations; which convey responses to this Bill which are inaccurately reported from the extract, the meaning, the purpose of the amendments of it.

SEN. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD (CONTINUING): Mr. President, if the people outside the Senate were listening to it they may be led astray, as one might expect following the appearance of the Soviet Premier for Soviet Jews is, I am afraid, being led astray by it.

There is no great merit in this bill, and it is designed to improve our country, not to create a commercial state. The purposes of this bill, Mr. President, are to modernize our laws to bring it into line with other countries; to improve it, not to make people guilty unnecessarily. Mr. President, it is for that reason that I got up on to my feet now to speak briefly, and I make certain about the evidence and the representations which have taken place in this bill, Sir. I hope that I will be able to do it so that I will be able to assure Members of the Senate that there is nothing here which they ought to afraid to give with a clear conscience.

The first section which the house can address itself to, Mr. President, was a provision which sought to amend Section 2 of the subsection 2 of the end of subsection "E" of it. Now, Mr. President, our subsection has at the moment said:-

"2.-(1) Section without -

(a) lawful authority; or
(b) being authorised to that behalf,"

Then a number of things go back:-

"any explosive thing, pipe, element or thing used in the preparation or construction of any explosive thing, or who interferes or offers so to do on the ground, premises, building, enclosure, chest, trunks or anything any other person so to do in policy of the offence."

The President considered in this part could be put over the house, "or offers so to do on the ground, premises, building, enclosure, chest, trunk, pound or anything any other person so to do in part of the offence", and it was in there to the place the whether, whether that clause would "contain or be considered in any of such instance", as that it would imply:-

"or whatever attempts or offers so to do or who conceals or is concerned in any of such matters in policy of the offence."

This section encountered was considered and we have said that there might be type of provisions which permitted those charging that there were the type of provisions which could never ever have been permitted by the Senate already by the legislature of the United Kingdom.

Mr. President, Sir, let me read to you Section 2(2) and (3) of the United Kingdom Prevention of Terror Act, 1974, Subsection (2) provides:-

"Subject to Section 22 of this act it is an offence for a person to be concerned in the production of such a thing in contravention of that subsection by another."

Subsection (3), Mr. President:-

"Subject to Section 22 of this act it is an offence for a person to be concerned in the providing of such a thing in contravention of that subsection.

MR. MICHAEL J. WOULFE (CONTINUED):

> Subject to Section 28 of this Act it is an offence for a person to be concerned in the working to another the provisions of this subsection as apply to such a thing."

There, Mr. President, Sir, in the legislation of this country in this Act of Oireachtas the phrase which we are seeking to introduce once more has been used not once, not twice, but three times. That was passed sometime prior to 1973. I, Mr. President, feel that the Seanad is a mirror of this House when the original debate of Bunreacht na hEireann was passed here in 1937. If I had been I would have said at that time that we should more appropriately have followed the words of the Northern legislation. We did not do so then. We are seeking to do so now, I, Mr. President, for a purpose placed in the United Kingdom there would have been embarrassment and confusion in their Houses of Parliament, when I think back to the appropriateness and emphasis that it should use the same words, and use the same punctuation.

I will not attempt to agree with the points in this Bill, with the amendments which are sought to be made to it. I will not attempt to answer the possible questions of whether constitutionally minimum sentences should operate or not. What I will attempt to do hopefully, Mr. President, is this: where appears to be anomalies or misapprehensions which may exist in the mind of the public by reason of this speech which was previously made and which I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I am sure you are well aware that the proposed new Clause 6A, the marginal note of which reads, "Presumption of possession and knowledge of controlled drugs". Let me read it out to you so that nobody is under any misapprehension as to what is being said here; so that nobody is under any misapprehension that a person is being deemed to be guilty until he proves himself innocent. Mr. President, it says:-

> "6A. (1) Without prejudice to any other provision of this Act -

(a) where it is proved that a person imported anything contrary to section 3 of this Act it shall be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such person knew that such thing was contrary to such thing.

(b) where it is proved that a person had in his possession or custody or under his control anything contrary to section 3 of this Act, it shall be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such person was in possession of such thing;

(c) where it is proved that a person supplied to any other person anything contrary to section 3 of this Act, it shall be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such first-mentioned person knew that such thing was contrary to such thing;

(d) where it is proved that a person did or in any way concerned in carrying, removing, harbouring, keeping, concealing, loading or delivering or in any manner with anything contrary to section 3 of this Act it shall be presumed until the contrary is proved, that such person knew that such thing was contrary to such thing.

MR. HUGHES: [CONTINUED]:

(c) there is to be proved that a person had in his possession or custody or under his control any document or right pertaining to anything containing a prohibited drug or any other document or thing or physical matter relating to anything containing a prohibited drug, it shall be presumed until the contrary is proved, that such person had the possession of such drug."

Mr. President, that is the first subsection. A Member has invited me to read subsection (2) and I shall be pleased to do so.

(2) The presumptions provided by this section shall not -

(a) be rebutted by proof that a person knew his physical possession of the prohibited drug;

(b) be construed as applying the presumption to prove any fact which, by virtue of any other provisions of this Act, it does not have to prove."

In each of these provisions, Mr. President, Sir, the onus is on the prosecution, in prosecuting the case. It is open for the person charged or his possession or custody or control of prohibited drugs, then the presumption applies which is that a person had knowledge of what he had in his possession or custody or control of the drugs. Then, Mr. President, in a charge in the prosecution after a burden of proof has been discharged by the prosecution and deals with the case where I have a container in my possession, where I have a substance in my possession and it is to be proved that I had it; that I was found with it; that it was important to me that it was in my possession, and it is to enable the Bar to give an, that I cannot them answer, using my hands on the air and say, "Oh, I did not know that. It was there". The presumption is to prove it is only that I had it in my possession, with knowledge, but what I knew exactly what was in the container.

It is because of this, Mr. President, that this clause is to presumption is here, and is here. Members have mentioned also the question of having a statement of this or those certain documents. Mr. President, let me deal with that in a moment when I mention that this is not an exceptional qualification. We have only to the Cayman Islands. Overwhelming very similar to this and consequent to legislation of other Dependent Territories which, Mr. President, have legislation which like our legislation has to be assented to by Her Majesty's representative and which, like our legislation can be disallowed by the United Kingdom Government if it feels to any way that such legislation should not become part of the law of that Dependent Territory.

Perhaps, Mr. President, the subscription I would have been made clearer if we had spoken only, and if Members think I will do so and propose to the Committee stage, a rather jejune clause, which on further consideration might-

MON. RICHARD J. HUGHES (CONTINUING):

"Where it is proved that a person had in his possession or custody or under his control, any stolen document or printed matter including a book warrant, a warehouse warrant or order, a luggage receipt, a luggage claim relating to anything constituting a controlled drug."

There are cases which happen in this jurisdiction where, Mr. President, people are found entering the country at airports. There is suspicion that they are concerned with the importation of controlled drugs. They are searched. They are found with baggage tags in their possession. If a luggage tag is found in the person's possession, then under this presumption, the person having been found with this document relating to the bag which has yet to be a controlled drug shall have the burden of proof adduced on him i.e. that he will say here that the drugs were there.

I consider, Mr. President, that this presumption which is contained in legislation in other jurisdictions, other Dependent Territories and which have not come as a surprise to the judiciary of this country because the matter was discussed with them by me, and there is approval for such a presumption going in because it is known that in the circumstances of this country such a provision, which is contained in other legislation in other places, is equally necessary.

Mr. President, another matter which was spoken about with the proposed new Section 31A which provides for forfeiture of convicted assets, Mr. President, the provisions regarding forfeiture which have heretofore contained in our legislation, related primarily to the forfeiture of any vessel upon and after the commission with a drug offence. However, all over the world it is realised that we must seek to disadvantage drug trafficking by making the trafficking unprofitable. In this respect, Mr. President, Sir, we are seeking to do this by going on to say that where a person is convicted of an offence, and the court is satisfied that any money or other things which have been obtained due or as a result of the offence, the court will order that such money or other things be forfeited to the state. In that connection, Mr. President, perhaps it might be relevant to say that we are aware of the matter recently, because the matter recently is attempting to bring in legislation to this effect, an amendment to their Control of Misuse of Drugs Law.

If I may, Mr. President, quote just a speech made by the United Kingdom's Home Secretary in December, 1987 to the London Diplomatic Association. In this speech he considered the whole problem of tackling drug abuse. He said that he was studying the report of a Committee which is considering general questions of forfeiture and confiscation, and that he will shortly introduce legislation having the help of the United Kingdom Parliament to provide for the confiscation of the proceeds of crime. This, Mr. President, is what this Clause 9 which seeks a new Section 31A seeks to do. However, even in what seeking to confiscate the profits made out of narcotics crimes contains a safeguard. However this safeguard is contained in subsection (3) that:-

"The court shall not order any person to pay amounts or to be forfeited as under subsection (1) where a person claiming to be the owner of or otherwise interested therein applies to be heard and can be heard by the court."

LORD HOWARD OF PENRITH (CONSERVATIVE): The United Kingdom does not in relation to these narcotics offences work of these powers which we are seeking in the Criminal Conventions Act of 1967 of the United Kingdom. There is no section dependent Territory, in this case Gibraltar, in their 1972 Misuse of Drugs Law, a similar provision. Lastly, Mr. President, this forfeiture is not something which the Crown Colonies is seeking to do without any basis. It is part of a worldwide concept which is particularly applicable in the United States where there are widespread and successful powers of forfeiture of the illegal proceeds and the illegal profits of narcotics offences.

Mr. President, one further matter was raised and explained about by the Honourable Second Elected Member for Middle Town. That was the fact that Gibraltar is also seeking to remove Section 23 of the principal Law, that was now a Constitutional Rights amendment which was legislated under my predecessor, who is seeking to put in a provision giving the rights of trial in certain cases.

May I, Mr. President, say and bring Honourable Members through the history of this particular clause, why we do have necessity to amend it, or repeal it or abolish it now. Mr. President, an amendment made in the early eighties to our Misuse of Drugs Law put in Section 23 of the Law as it presently is. That Section 23 now reads:-

> "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section, where a person is charged with any offence inclusive to this Law and such person is liable upon conviction to be sentenced to a term of imprisonment exceeding fifteen years such offence shall be deemed for the purposes of determining the mode of trial, a category B offence in accordance with section 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code."

Now I explain to Honourable Members that a category B offence is an offence which can be tried either summarily, or here Gibraltar, a category B offence means that within the provisions of the Criminal Code the accused person has the right to ask for the jury trial. However, Mr. President, there are grave difficulties which that section is going put in the Law unamended, because as the Law, Mr. President, where are certain maximum penalties mentioned in the Schedule in respect of amount or subsequent convictions where the maximum is more than the fifteen years. This, Mr. President, is not a great difficulty because if, for example, the magistrate is about to try a person for the offence of possessing more than two ounces of a hard drug, how is he to know before he begins the trial whether he has jurisdiction as a matter of course because it is a first offence, or whether it is a category B offence where there is an option to elect for jury trial by reason of the fact that if the accused is convicted, it will be a second or subsequent conviction.

We have a principle in our Law and in the British system that the judge or the jury that hears which hearing and trying an offence, should not have any knowledge as to whether it is second. The accused has any previous convictions, because such knowledge beforehand could or would prejudice the court or the jury against that person.

If the person were charged as a second offender because of the fact that the penalties which could be imposed were more than fifteen years, then it would belong to the motive of the magistrate or to the court, to the judge and jury, the terrible knowledge which is undesirable.

MR. MICHAEL J. MYERS (CONTINUING): On the other hand, if it were not brought to the notice of the magistrate and he proceeded with the trial and acquittal, and then it turned out that it was a case of subsequent conviction, then there would be great doubt as to whether or not that trial had been a proper trial, because the person could never stand to go for trial by jury.

It was because the specialist, Sir, of those technical and procedural difficulties that it was thought, following representations from the judiciary, that the simplest method of dealing with this exceptional procedural problem was to make all offences contained in the Schedule of Serge Law triable only by the magistrate which, Mr. President, was the position from 1975 until 1988 when this amendment and this new Section 25 was brought into the law. It was from that purpose that this Bill originally sought to remove that subject matter.

However, on reflection and after consultation I, Mr. President, circulated to Members this the contents of my colleagues which I propose to move in this place. That is, Mr. President, Sir, in the case of an offence of burglary or aggravated where the penalty for a second or subsequent conviction could be a maximum of twenty years, to change that to the level of fifteen years and make it a summary trial. But for the other more serious offences of aerial, dwelling, threatening, especially dangerous weapon found there, that neither that reduce the maximum penalties for second or subsequent convictions, to extend to persons charged with those offences even though that are first offences and previously had not the rights to jury trial, such a right. So that in all cases that a person was charged with the offence in relation to hard drugs of selling or dealing or distributing, the problem, that they should have the right to elect trial by jury if they so wish.

It was for that reason, Mr. President, that I sought to make this Committee Stage amendment. But, Mr. President, there have been several other points mentioned by the Members, and as a number of Members still wish to speak, no doubt there will be more matters raised. As I said, Mr. President, I had not intended to speak before the Committee Stage, but I thought that it was my duty to do so; my duty to ensure that each and every one of the principles which were being attacked so vigorously, were not designed to turn us into a commercial nicety; were not designed to make everybody guilty, but were carefully thought out amendments, which were made not unlawfully here but on the basis of comparison with the legislation of other jurisdictions. They were made on the basis of recommendations and consultations from the previous Justice which such reasonable offences to the extreme, and were matters which the other Members to either Bodies, seek to create fairness and equity not only to the accused, but to the society and the cause of the society in which the accused is discharging.

Mr. President, Sir, I am quite happy to discuss with Members at Committee Stage the improvements which they can see to the provisions of this Bill. Once I have attempted to do in relation to certain parts of it so to explain why they were there and the good which they will serve.

Mr. President, Sir, thank you.

SIR EDGAR TONER: I will now suspend proceedings until 8.30 p.m.

AT 10.40 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HON. SECRETARY: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Second Reading debate on S.211 to amend the Statute of Kings Lodge (Amended). The Right Honourable Member for West Ryde.

HON. EMERITUS L. GORTON: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise, Sir, in support of the Bill for a Law to amend the Statute of Kings Lodge (Amended).

There were not too many in this place possibly bothered or embarrassed when the Honourable Second Opposition Member, I really was able to get into the rights of the subject. However, before I get any further I would like to assure the Honourable Members of Government-Whose I do not question whose ability, whose integrity, nor whose honesty, nor whose concerns regarding any Bill which is brought before this House. Although at no time is any Minister to mislead anyone. However, I must remark the Members that I would never wish have to believe that any of the Government Bills would barely a Bill in this House which was not intended to be for the good of our people. I would like them to know that as far as I am concerned, in this country today there may be some who are politically as culpable as the Honourable Members. However, not being a lawyer myself, rather than hear this Bill there I would seek further information from those who are legal experts. I am not a legal expert but it would seem to me that the overall scrutiny which the country requires of a politician, for instance Section 8, I mentioned this or four that one is a number of times and one can possibly get what he wants.

It was only evident that it might be a defence for an accused person to prove, standing, otherwise but in the last two times there we have one where it is stated, which it is necessary for the prosecution to prove if he is to be convicted. Also, unless he is convicted there is absolutely nothing which apparently should cause any question on that particular subsection.

Then in Section 6.(1)(c) we see that saving time there it is preceded by the words "Where it is proved", now it is the case saying that this person is going to court, they are have to prove something or to prove that he is not guilty unless some had been proved against him for whatever matter. It says here, "Where it is proved that a person unpaid anything constituting a controlled drug", that particular aspect of it had been proved. For the contrary would be proved to prove that like proceeds can apply saying the penalty as stated under the Law.

Now it goes on, and in subsection (5) it is preceded by the words "Where it is proved". Subsections (a) and (c) all say, "which the contrary is proved".

Now we go to Section 6. 1AA. It says-

"Subject to subsection (2) where a person is convicted of an offence under this Law, and the court is or before which he is convicted is satisfied..."

MR. SEARS of GREAT (CONTINUED): Now, they have not acted like some grown thing on the part of a person going up and breaking the glass of the door, and simply saying, 'Well, I should be able to get out as quickly'. It says, 'Before which he is convicted or satisfied', the court be satisfied, simply.

Then it says here that although the court can take any notice or anything relating to or connected due to or on a result of that offence, it shall apply such notice or other thing to be forfeited to the Crown or dealt with in such manner as it may direct. Again I do not think that we know why. Firstly-eighth Schedule on the bench of the court. I feel that any learned judge should look at both sides of the story.

Now, "unless a person claiming to be the owner of or otherwise interested thereon applies to be heard by the court within fourteen days of the conviction, unless an opportunity has been given to him to show cause why the order should not be made"; that particular section about taking people to property, it would seem here that if the owner can prove that he is in no way connected with the crime, then this section permits the court to look at this in a completely different light. The owner of the vessel or the car or whatever it might be can claim his property. It seems that is what I understand it to be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Bill I like this Bill in principle for years I have been concerned that the people who really get caught are just pawns like us. Unfortunately, more than unfortunately the only ones involved in this. In fact they are not really the people who benefit from it. It is just "they" who make the profits how to work and to distribute it while he pockets his money and builds one, two and three houses, and has expensive cars and helicopters and so forth. We have what he has and get if someone does not. So he drugs they have no question how it comes to them and are under the cost of living, and we should give as much as we can to stop it like.

Mr. Speaker, I was very interested here where the Member of the court were like to have like to convict a person who are involved in such a way. I feel that this particular Bill will go a long way in helping to have those like. I feel that it is not just the "they" who become a object of people or they; it is usually he who is involved, in fact he is least involved in it. It is the person who is using it to make money while he destroys other people's lives.

As I said, I am not a legal professor. Nor am I an expert in legal affairs but I have been delighted this Bill and like the way which, I agree in principle with the legal profession I can see here this Bill is not controlling which has become it now allowing authorities to dispose the people of anything which is found, and hopefully there, not even to issue it to someone to prove that he is innocent by the court proving his guilty before the court has been heard. It is all proceeded here with "where it is proved".

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say from this Honourable House that I am not here as a new lawyer, or as the community need of an extension card. However, to stand here and to just talk and talk and talk, and to continually oppose what this Government is doing is not my business. I have in two things which I am not happy about. However, I will support these later and I will end up in it by saying so let the public believe that we have sense on the other side of this House a bunch of people who do not know what they are doing. That is not my intention at all.

SEN. WILLIAM E. OBERST (CONTINUING): I would be prepared that I have many recommendations on this Amendment. I cannot think of what we have had one which is better, and I would like someone to prove that to me. I should have thought that whatever is done is done for the good of this country. When we find out that they have made a simple mistake in the drafting of a Bill or in our Amendment, we should take immediate action, in order to correct the mistake when one, as happened with the Watergate Bill, to correct it when for just a few minor clarifications or typographical errors in some Amendment, I do not go for that.

I feel that we are doing no more injustice to keep these Amendments going in the right direction, and I would commend this Bill to this House because I feel that this is a step in the right direction. I commend the author of the Bill and those involved in this Amendment, and I trust that it will go a long way in curtailing Federal taxes. Any amendment might be necessary just that they were of a question or a statement, or a decision in court. If he would in time have found an omission it is just as he may be accepted in time than deceptively any more of our young people in these Federal, that should happen.

The issue of money is the root of all evil. Just in our society today there are more ways than one of getting it. I feel that anything which is done that we can be helped to bring the dual duties before the country should be done now. I am interesting that this will still go a long way to curtail that area and I support the Bill.

SEN. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Pleading Member for Rock End.

SEN. WILLIAM E. HUDSON: Mr. President, unfortunately I must say that I take slightly different from the last speaker. Legislating round rules, Mr. President, surely do not the answer to the drug problem or experience in these Islands.

Mr. President, I am certain that the majority of the people will look on this Bill as a very harsh one. It does lay to the conviction of many and honestly, Mr. President, at this stage I cannot see the necessity of this wording Bill.

Mr. President, we have seen brought out here, namely the problems experienced now among the youth of this country. It is unfortunate and I honestly believe that the money spent on dealing and policing, and the time spent by us as Legislators to debate this Bill could have been better been spent how to bring it to bear on the people of this country, Sirs.

Mr. President, I am personally convinced in my Districts which I hope will work, not only in my Districts but throughout the Protectorate so they will realise be successfully the drug problem.

I feel today, Mr. President, as I have expressed on this Section many times, I am totally opposed to Sirs. However, at the same time, Sir, let us face it. There are people in these Islands who have problems. Let us face facts. Let us be Legislators and responsible people to see they receive filtering our income and other means to prevent this evil. I feel that we are fighting a losing battle.

Mr. JOHN B. McCLAIN (CONTINUED): Mr. President, the honorable Senior Official Member of Government has undertaken to go into this Bill thoroughly and to try to explain it in our mother tongue. However, I must say, Sir, that on certain provisions of this Bill he has not been successful in convincing me.

I have heard many times, Mr. President, Legislation in other Dependent Territories and Legislation in the United Country, why should it not be adopted in our Islands. I am really and truly fed up with this, Sir, because we have come to see the habits and conditions are completely different. I feel that the time has come for us to put into force legislation which is essential and beneficial to the people of these Islands and the country as a whole.

Mr. President, I must agree with previous speakers that have expressed concern over the words, "reasonable" to be determined by way of court actions" for offence to be in the causes," observers. I think that this is very, very serious clause. Mr. President, I am personally in the business of automobile service. It is unbelievable for me to hear quietly the provision of such of my automobiles. However, Mr. President, at the same time I am fully concerned about my vehicles. Unless I am completely wrong in the this Bill (unintentionally) as I do not think that I am, as I see it here, Sir, I would be the concerned party and there is no reason why one of my vehicles could not have been seized by an individual, returned to my premises and hidden somewhere inside it could have been done without my slightest knowledge. Therefore, Mr. President, I would be the concerned party involved. How could I answer this process Bill (provision) (section)? I cannot help that the vehicle is not mine because the record books indicate that I am the whole owner of that vehicle.

Mr. President, I should hope that in Committee Stage either the owner of this Bill or the honorable Senior Official Member would endeavour to have sections such as this one removed and cast aside.

I mention, Mr. President, in Clause 6 of this amending Bill. Again, like others I am very concerned about this clause, the prescriptive clause. As the Second Elected Member for Middle Town mentioned I can be the presence of qualified lawyers who thought as we do that this section of this Bill should never have been brought before this honorable House. I do not intend to go into the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr. President, but it is a fact that if this Bill passes in its present stage it may in the rights of the people of this country. Accordingly, Mr. President, one is guilty until he or she proves themselves innocent, as such cases here I fail to see where the individual will ever be able to prove himself innocent. Again, I am not a lawyer and I hope that if there is somebody who feels that my interpretation is wrong, they will try and prove it, not only to me but to other Members of this House who are very concerned.

Mr. President, I was real happy to receive the statement which was circulated from the Chief Minister, which deals with Section 33 of the old Law. Again I do not intend to go into this in detail but, Mr. President, it surely behoves us to know that should we have dealt with this Law earlier on this Meeting of the House, what we could have really planned on the shortcomings of this Legislation in these Islands. My honest opinion, Mr. President, taking just these considerations, should your Government worry ahead to withdraw this Bill and to study its Legislation clause by clause, and to bring it back at a later stage.

MR. JOHN E. MOSS (CONTINUING): To the present moment, Mr. President, I find it impossible to support. I would like to make it abundantly clear that we have been asked many times today, I am not opposing for opposition's sake because I do not believe in it. I particularly object that I feel that participation in the Government Reorganization, Mr. President, which I feel will benefit this country, I will support in every thing. The record will indicate that I have taken that stand many times.

So, Mr. President, without further debate, once again I trust that those Members on the other side who are concerned with this bill and who have made it the procedure, will nevertheless now have the bill withdrawn.

I thank you.

MR. SPRINGER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honorable Chief Steward Member of Pennsylvania Counsel.

MR. [illegible] Mr. President, I rise to support a bill for a time to amend the Reform Act [illegible]. Mr. President, the previous speaker said that he understood the bill to be a bonus and that he would like the bill to be withdrawn. I do not agree. Sir, that is a fresh bill and I do not see why it should be withdrawn.

The bill is, in my opinion, in the best interests of the people of this country, and it is to correct many inequities which have been put in the record. The organization will have to look to the people who have not got to make effectuate it fair. I think that this is a big step forward in the right direction.

I believe that the bill makes it quite clear the Chairman's [illegible] Counsel cannot be [illegible] being withdrawn", and this, Sir, is just throughout the bill with [illegible], and then a person who "without [illegible] cause or [illegible] being withdrawn". In case of, Sir, in the bill that it states emphatically on the section "Termination of Association and knowledge of unlawful [illegible]", and makes it quite clear that, the first words in each sentence, "Where it is proved".

This will make sure that the case [illegible] of proof in the courts. I have no difficulty. But, with the bill in it as and I feel that if any Member have [illegible] which I [illegible] should offer amendments. I have been in this House for eight years and at no time do I commit an amendment by the other side of the House being rejected. It has always been carried [illegible] and the [illegible] has always allowed it in spite of the fact that we might [illegible] be required for an amendment. So if any Member on the other side of the House is concerned to [illegible] I am sure that the [illegible] Counsel Official Member will be delighted to help him, if he considers it as a proper amendment by any [illegible] that is still [illegible] [illegible] or anyone under the House to us.

I feel, Mr. President, that this is a fine bill. It is not one which has been taken out of a hat. There are other [illegible] and new matters [illegible] which have [illegible] Legislation and it has received [illegible]. I know that our Government has been through this [illegible] and I am sure that we would not have permitted such a bill if it was not [illegible] and in fact for this country. I am sure that he would not have allowed it to come forward. As he [illegible] in his debate, other [illegible] has similar laws which were examined by and they have not [illegible].

MAY. CAPT. CHARLES L. STRONGYLOS (Continued): He will have to go the same route that he took a while back when there are two other channels. Maryland will not consent to it or anybody else will be disallowed if it is not in keeping with international law. We are obligated upon things we are not aware of the International Law Society or anybody else will be called. Somebody, we are under the United Nations and whatever they have to comply with, it is mandatory that we follow.

Mr. President, I think that the gentleman's objections must be met. I think that if it was the point that people have used drug money or other criminal money to purchase a house, to purchase a ship, its furniture or television sets or whatever they may use that money for, that it should be confiscated.

The repeal of section 8, Bill, and the new amendment is quite clear. I think that it has reference to the Bill to the principal law what the Members have been thinking that it had disappeared, that is it has put back into the Bill the right of a forfeiture jury. Mr. President, I do not think that the Chief Executive of this country would have recommended these amendments to the Legislature-General had he not seen fit to do so. I have no problem recommending this Bill.

DR. PRESIDENT: The Honorable Fourth District Member of Montgomery County.

GOV. CARROLL O. SCHMIDT: Mr. President, it rises to support this Bill, I will be among the Members of Drugs that introduced. Mr. President, when I heard the discussion on these matters arise, considering the Bill and understanding that it was another communicable route by this Government, I thought it was time that when I contacted the Executive Council or when the Bill was passing through Executive Council I had fulfilled, or that I had released the portfolios, Mr. President, I am not going to act in Executive Council or the Senate or anything which, in my opinion, would be detrimental to the people of these Colonies. I am here to do what is, in my opinion, in the best interests of all concerned.

Mr. President, I am certainly in my mind that the Section 8 which has so heavily been debated and criticized is not carrying the sentiment expressed by the Administration and that is that as the section is proposed, that it will deprive individuals of their rights under the British Jus system, whereby a person who is charged or accused of a criminal offense is innocent until proved guilty. Mr. President, the basic concept of British law that a person is innocent until proved guilty is maintained in Section 8 of this amendment Bill, because the only specific cases of such subpoenaing happens that there is going to be a person is implicated.

Mr. President, I know that on the outside there are people who have pleaded this point as well, I think that have been convinced by the Opposition here that the section of this Bill which is being criticized, Section 8, is a deterrence to the legal system of these Colonies. Mr. President, the problems in our courts have been many times and accurately made so that the enforcement agencies of this country, the courts, the police and the governments be known, Mr. President, one of the things which is very difficult for these agencies is to get to the root of these practices that do these Colonies. We usually include the manufacturers and the users of a subversive nature, and they are all open to purchase under this famous conspiracy sentence sentence, and final under this law by the great Government.

SEN. [illegible] JOHNSTON (CONTINUING): Mr. President, what do of concern to me today is that these minor offenses are sending people to [illegible] our prisons and that is of real concern to the Government of the day. While, of course the trade continues as it normally is even the dealers or the "big boys" as we call them are always able to slip through the nets. They are able to employ the brunt of the legal profession in these islands who very often play a technical point of law to send them out through the front door again.

Mr. President, these are the ills, whether they be of the legal system or of the ability of the prosecutor or whatever. However, they are going to be continuing problems in this country if the law enforcement agencies are not able to prosecute these successfully. I believe, Mr. President, that these simple amendments to this Law, we do see it in Section 6, may be a way to assist in this unfolding area.

Mr. President, we cannot shut later this year when this Government goes on to recognize the Minister's statement. We may have to tell the Americans that we have unsuccessfully reduced the sentence for narcotic offenses in these Islands. Well, I'm sure that the Administration will not lose any opportunity of publicly exercising to blame us for. Seriously, Mr. President, the Americans have never yet questioned the penalty aspect of our laws now I do not think that they would at any time question the legal system of this country. In fact, they do not like the Americans [illegible] cowboy laws. They are acceptable, harsh and wrong of bringing these narcotic criminals to justice, and is the quickest possible route. Whether we send people to jail here or we sentence them, or we receive who determine, this has nothing to do with the Narcotic Agreement [illegible], Mr. President. They should know this. They have been involved in this [illegible] years.

Mr. President, I should not think that there may be suggestions for amendment to certain areas of Section 6, for instance Section 6. (d). (iii). There has been some concern that this widespreading, and also [illegible] Section 7(3). However, Mr. President, I will abide by the unanimous Second Official Member who is quite capable of winding up on the of these technical amendments. As do not expect, Mr. President, that many Bill which is presented here can be published through without amendment. It is the prerogative of the honourable Members of this Legislative Assembly to examine all Bills [illegible] before they can be published into Law provisions as recommended before they give their consent to approval.

So, Mr. President, I would not be surprised if recommendations are made for minor amendments. However, Mr. President, as far as the principle of Section 6 is concerned, I have no difficulty in accepting the recommendations as put forward there.

Mr. President, the honourable Second Official Member has already given the explanation for the recommendations of this Bill to which I do not think that it would any further explanation.

So, I will again reiterate my support of the Bill and I hope that honourable Members will give it their support as well.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HON. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for George Town.

MR. JOSEPH A. DIGGS: Mr. President, the Bill before us known as the Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1985, seeks to make a number of amendments to the Misuse of Drugs Law (Revised). Before dealing with the contents of this Bill, Mr. President, I think that I should make it abundantly clear that it is not my intention at any point in my debate to be derogatory to any Honourable Member of the Government Bench. At the same time, Mr. President, while my views are objective and not in any way intended to pose personal comments or subjective ones, I am not, Mr. President, a believer in blind loyalty.

Mr. President, as I started in my earlier debate, the onus for a law to succeed the purpose which it should, it must be a good law and one which is capable of being implemented by the majority of the people. If we therefore propose for this Law we must first make the Law workable. Again, Mr. President, I'd reiterate the point that Laws which do not embody public opinion can never be enforced.

Mr. President, quickly for the Government and the Constitutional role in that orderly Service Bill report is unbelievable responsibility. Before leaving those Chambers for lunch, I would have thought that the Honourable Second Official Member would have had a hard job indeed the same scrutinizing the Elected Members of Executive Council but alas, Mr. President, we have come to a lot of difference in the minds of people.

In defense, Mr. President, of the Elected Member for East End I would point out that my understanding of what he said was that, and I quote, "I could not support this Bill in its present form and hope that it would be withdrawn and studied further, and presented at a later date". It was not my understanding, Mr. President, that it was the intention of the Elected Member for East End not to support the Bill at all.

Mr. President, a great deal was made of "proof", as in my attempt to enlighten myself on this topic used I got a dictionary and I looked up the meaning of the word "proof". It states, Mr. President, that it means to test the genuineness, to ascertain, to establish or ascertain and so forth. Evidence in that dictionary, Mr. President, does "proof" consist of knowledge. It is "proof", Mr. President, of possession. It has nothing to do with the "proof" of the knowledge of possessing any prohibited drug or other substance. I think that is a very technical point, Mr. President, that should not be ignored. We are not here, Mr. President, talking about proof of placing goods in someone's care, of proof of finding contraband on someone's care. If it is there, it is the right end of the police find it on someone's care, the fact that it is in his care is proof enough that it is in his care. What is not considered which is the proof of knowledge that he knew that it was in his care. Accordingly, he knew that it was in his care.

Mr. President, we have to be extremely careful with some of these laws which we are hurriedly passing through this House. I would have thought that it would have a much better understanding if a legal committee composed of members of the Law Society, members of the Legal Department and members of the Judiciary, perhaps even as eight people could examine these Bills before they come to the House and make suggestions.

The Interpretation Law, Section 26 Mr. President, makes not exemplify ejusdem generis. It says, Mr. President, that the legal interpretation of a person should be done only after conviction. It also states, Mr. President, that subsidiary officers shall be considered included until proved guilty according to the Law.

MR. SIMON J. FISHER (continuing): What we have here, Mr. President, is a change in the matter of proof. The BIA is seeking to prove cimarron guilty before he can even establish a case. However, I must congratulate the Honorable Second Official Member. I think that he did a very good job in changing the minds of some of the Members who intended to speak on this bill. Nevertheless, Mr. President, of the emphasis which he placed on the word "present", it still does not change the impact and content of these phrases on the bill.

Mr. President, a couple more to his credit. I think that we have to be very, very careful about how we impose with this. The Honorable Second Official Member, Mr. President, also made a great deal about the words used "seriousness" as it appears in the United Kingdom law. Mr. President, I would like to make it quite clear here that while we as a Government sometimes will borrow as much from as many countries as possible, we do not necessarily have to accept every statute or fact as the books of the United Kingdom Government, as the only if those laws are appropriate to the Cayman Islands and to the people of this country. The United Kingdom law was concerned with specific matters. It was concerned with procedures. It was concerned with the rights of drugs. It was concerned with the making of drugs. It stood specifically. Perhaps it is not the intention of Government Bills to make that section a bad character, but might not it be seen to have an inherent meaning.

Mr. President, I am also pleased to see that it is the wisdom of our Civil Service Leader to be present. I will not go into the details of this because I feel that it has been given sufficient debate. However, suffice it to say, it only highlights the point that more input should be received and solicited from the judiciary and the legal society in this country.

Yesterday, Mr. President, in the wisdom of the Royal Cayman amendments were made about the absence of Members of this House until regard to statements will other matters. Mr. President, I wish that we were to a position as Members, or as Representatives of the people, to take these matters as lightly as they seem to be taken by certain Members. Sometimes we have a responsibility to our people. I am not concerned, Mr. President, whether any Member of the Opposition or any Member of the Government Bench be blamed with what I say. This is irrelevant to me. I am here to represent my people because they have told me to keep myself healthy and that they will do their part so that I will have for years and years to come. So, I am not concerned with the Official Members of the Government Bench or the Elected Members. I am concerned with good representation for my people.

Mr. President, amendments should not be made for the sake of amendments. They should be timely and necessary. Take for instance the Matrimonial Law. We have had made one amendment to increase the powers from $20 to $50 but yet there are so many inconsistencies in that Law. While I am not debating that Law to highlight the point which I am making that more thought and time needs to be put into the amendments brought forward to this House. Under that Law for instance, a child seems to be entitled to maintenance from the lawful father until the fourteen years of age. Yet if he was in attendance while he could get maintenance up to seventeen years of age. The inconsistencies, Mr. President, and this is why we need a complete study of our Laws before we today then have and have them amended in years and years.

MR. STANLEY A. STALEY (continuing):... where are these amendments originating from? Are we following other communities because it seems to these communities? Or is the bill hogging the dog? We have about this absolutely from 1973 to 1975. Mr. Speakership, are we responsible to the people of this country that we are supposed to be representing? For this the reason why we have put this issue by the people, for we do stand up here and say that if previous Governments had made the mistakes when it was good enough for us to continue making them? That is not the reason, Mr. Speakership. We now have to believe and improve the situation. It is not enough information for us to state here that because the Government from which might please you, it is classification enough for us to be wrong.

Mr. Speakership, I am afraid that I cannot blame the backbench of the honourable Assistant Official Member. He also said that he is very pleased with the bill. Well, he presented the bill so this is understandable. The honourable Minister Minister of Executive Council, perhaps, presented the bill but the honourable Second Official Member did say that he was very pleased with the bill at the presentment of the bill. So who is taken by these reasons, Mr. President, the ultimate responsibility for this bill.

Mr. Speakership, I may not to deal with matters which I do not understand because unlike some people I appreciate that a little learning is a dangerous thing. There's deep in state like the Jordan springs where absolutely intoxicate the brain and drinking happily ashore as against. Mr. Speakership, I am not going to stand here and say that somebody is good just because I do not understand it. I try to understand the contents of these bills and I am not going to stand here and say that it is good because the honourable Second Official Member did. It is a matter of intelligent arguments etc. I must first work it is good before I am going to say that it is good, and if I feel that it is not good I think that I have enough intelligence to make my own decision on the matter.

Mr. Speakership, my interest mainly with this bill is the encouragement of knowledge of agricultural crops. Regardless of the major little word which I point out here, Mr. Speakership in subsection (1) of Section 7 where it states which:-

> "The aforesaid person -
>
> (a) shall not be convicted by reason only of passing that he neither knew, reasonably had reason to suspect that such substance or product was the particular controlled drug alleged;"

This is the case. This is no defence to say that one did not know. Mr. Speakership, there is a lot that is wrong with this. There are some points which are good but there is a lot wrong with this bill. It is more benefit considered, Mr. President, the negative points would outweigh the positive.

Section 8(1)(a) states:-

> "Where it is proved that a person imported anything containing a controlled drug,"

"It is proved". What does that mean? "Proof". Of course it can be proved. If someone has received a letter or a package in the mail or how the receipt of having received it and it is in his name. Of course, if it is opened and there is evidence in it, it is proved that it is...

MR. EDWARD A. PERSON (GOODYEAR): How can he get out of that? It has got to be with his knowledge. We have right to have access to him. What is to stop some shop who wants to share the Second Elected Member for George Town out of petrol from keeping on his premises of gasoline? How do I mean that I have nothing about it? Then will I be given the opportunity to prove to Government or will I be whisked off to Northward Prison until some minor lawyer can get me out?

The Bill continued to stand over.

Section 64, (1)(a)(i)-

"It shall be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such person knew that such drug was contained in such thing;

(ii) where it is proved that a person had in his possession or custody or under his control anything containing a controlled drug, it shall be presumed, until the contrary is proved, that such person had the possession of such drug;"

Most humbly, Mr. President, if the crook had anything else could already walking on the road and he given him a life, and we charge a price of gasoline to his door. That is unreasonable. It should be presumed that he was guilty until he could prove otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder whether this would be a convenient moment to take our customary afternoon break? If the Member has very recent [illegible] I would prefer to [illegible] ... I may take the break? Alright, let's then let us suspend proceedings for approximately one minutes.

AT 3.40 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

AFTER RESUMED AT 3.50 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Second Elected Member for George Town.

DR. EDWARD A. PERSON: Mr. Speaker, at the time of taking the break, which it was necessary for us to refresh ourselves and could seem a little, I was dealing with Section 3, subsection (5), as I stated, this is a very dangerous and serious allegation under this section. The hon Member with the assumed innocent of both his members. It states:-

"The accused person -

(a) should not be acquitted by reason only of proving that he,"

but no knowledge of the allegation which leads to the possession of the controlled drug.

MR. JOSEPH J. DYSON (Continued): ... by one, Mr. Speaker, ... to be acquitted by proof of not having knowledge of the possession ... then I ask, Mr. President, how can he ... be convicted.

Section 2, subsection (5)(b) states that:-

> "shall be required to be proven that he neither believed, suspected nor had reason to suspect that the substance or ... product was a controlled drug."

Mr. President, how does one prove to an individual who state of one's mind at a particular point in time, whether one believes something or whether one does not? Mr. President, in prosecution of possession it brings to mind a story I heard from a lawyer yesterday, where we were discussing this Bill. This was where a known gang member ... man from the capital of Nuku'alofa this evening in front [illegible] with his supply of ganja. He had it in a radio, Mr. President, together with other [illegible] which he was carrying. It so happened it is a high legal official. Somebody mentioned an ex-Attorney-General. I do not say that. That was one of the [illegible] decided to help this poor man and take his radio through. When he was outside this man took the radio back and it was found only later that it was filled with ganja.

What would have happened to this legal official if there had been a drug at the moment when [illegible] this radio had found him in possession? What would happen to our good Attorney-General, our present Attorney-General if that was happened to him out of the goodness of his heart? What would happen if the owner of the radio, which he was accosted, said that he knew nothing of the radio? We did not know about the Attorney-General ... we talking about. It had to be him. It would be a crisis situation. Mr. President, be put out of.

... Mr. President, in the same section, if it is the understanding that the prosecution must prove that the accused is guilty beyond doubt, then I would have no problem with this Bill and I trust that the prosecutor and the mover of this Bill will make this abundantly clear from the outset any changes in this Bill.

Mr. President, the Honourable Minister Foreign Affairs took quite a lot of time in explaining Section 6A.(2), but Section 6A.(3) states:-

"The presumptions provided by this section shall not -

(a) be rebutted by proof that a person never had physical possession of the controlled drug;

(b) be construed as requiring the prosecution to prove any fact which, by virtue of any other provisions of this Act, it is not [illegible] to prove."

Mr. President, what are we thinking about in this section?

"Forfeiture of equipment". Mr. President, if I felt that this Bill would assist in bringing the big people in the drug trade before the courts I would be the harshest person in the Kingdom Islands. I understand, Mr. President, that this is the thrust of this Bill but it must be ridden somewhere where I cannot see it.

MR. LORENZO M. TAÑADA (CONSTITUENCY): While we have some reservations about certain provisions of this measure, Mr. President, we do not wish to be an obstacle to its approval. We have also been informed that the Committee on Appropriations has already agreed to the amendments proposed by the Committee on Local Governments. We are therefore willing to support the amendments proposed by the Committee on Local Governments.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the Committee on Local Governments whether the amendments proposed by the Committee on Appropriations have been incorporated in the amendments proposed by the Committee on Local Governments.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair will now recognize Mr. Tañada.

MR. L. TAÑADA (CONSTITUENCY): Mr. President, I would like to ask the Committee on Local Governments whether the amendments proposed by the Committee on Appropriations have been incorporated in the amendments proposed by the Committee on Local Governments.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair will now recognize Mr. Tañada.

MR. L. TAÑADA (CONSTITUENCY): Mr. President, I would like to ask the Committee on Local Governments whether the amendments proposed by the Committee on Appropriations have been incorporated in the amendments proposed by the Committee on Local Governments.

MR. E. BRUCE KETCHUM (CONTINUING): What do where I have problems in reconciling my support for this bill, Sir. If they have enough evidence to prove my presumption of possession then I cannot conceive what evidence I could muster to prove my innocence of possession. My point remains here, Sir, in the opportunity this section might provide for framing of an individual. If somebody came up, Sir, a policeman posed in the mall and I accepted it, and the possession took the form that I knew it was in my possession the split second after the seal of the white I signed in receipt of this package as proof of the presumption that I am guilty then, Sir, I would have no I could legitimately in finding cases under which I could prove my innocence.

My concern, Sir, then as I said in the unfortunate circumstance that some innocent individual could enjoy that the possibility could exist under any law that somebody could be unnecessarily framed for a charge of serious or a drug offence, whereas such a charge, Sir, is not a crime which is highly considered. Even if one is successful after it is proved that he is guilty, he presumed innocence, it is like the old saying, Sir, "I would rather go to jail for killing a man because when I come out they can only say I killed a man, rather than walking as a thief "on the west of my life".

Of the nature of this Bill, Sir, cannot disagree in its entirety up here if it is possible and common sense that the innocent individuals will not suffer and that there is absolutely no possibility of any kind of framing, concerning under this Bill, I might find ways to augment it.

... under the provisions of suspicion arrest, Sir, I support that section wholeheartedly. I believe, Sir, that it is finding ways to determine what services has been taken illegally from the sale of drugs or whatever, because under current circumstances of learning a display, storekeeper, one usually has the duties at the time to answer every search which he is enjoying in life. However, if someone has huge sums deposits at the bank, hundreds of thousands of dollars which have been acquired over relatively short periods of time, I believe, Sir, that the onus should be on that individual to prove that they were not acquired by illicit means.

So, in saying so offer my support for this Bill, Sir, as I said my concern is that while I support the spirit, they all must be done to stop the abuse and the illicit trafficking of drugs, I think that we should never lose sight that we have an obligation to protect the innocent in our society.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other members wishes to speak.... The Hon. Elected Member for the Lesser Islands? Yes.

HON. MARY S. ELIZABETH: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before the House has been thoroughly debated. Much has been said pro and con. I support a Bill for a law to amend the Misuse of Drugs Law (Revision). I now the privilege of voting for the Misuse of Drugs Law, Cap 78 of 1991, which I think was better. If we find some that certain amendments are necessary to that, I have given it very serious thought and have discussed them carefully and asked many questions.

I did have specifically concern for Section 2 which is a new section to this Law, which amends and repeals subsection 6A of the principal Law. I think that a new understanding is and I look forward to Committee Stage to a further explanation of the circumstances of possession and knowledge of a controlled drug.

MR. [illegible] E. MERRIWETHER: [illegible] I agree wholeheartedly with the proposition of people which he has just stated some unspecified thought that [illegible] on the side of drugs. I feel that we do have some of that in our community and if this can be eliminated, I feel that the person who is really benefiting from drugs is the one who we need to punish. The small offenders other Members have spoken of here, need to be separated and rehabilitated. However, those who are benefiting more are the ones who really need to be punished.

I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from the Seventh [illegible], and also the gentleman from Georgia [illegible] the introduction of a new clause to which will [illegible] certain crimes of serious nature to be handled in the federal court and by jury. I feel that [illegible] Federal prosecutor will help to alleviate some of the problems which we have had with overcrowding at Southern Penn. It will also give [illegible] the opportunity to process cases [illegible], and in this manner knowledge apply where he thinks best.

Mr. President, with those few words I would like to [illegible] to [illegible] Committee Stage, but with that I suppose that [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] other other Members wishing to speak I will invite the mover to reply if he wishes.

MR. [illegible] G. [illegible]: Mr. President, I wish to thank those Members who have expressed their [illegible], either verbally or in part, and I think especially the Honourable Senior Official Member for the explanation and explanations which he gave to the more technical parts of the Bill.

I have heard a lot of different interpretations put to the various sections of the Bill and honestly, Mr. President, it is difficult for me to understand how some of the interpretations can be arrived at, or how some of the questions or queries [illegible] can be [illegible].

The Senior Official Member for Justice has said that it is the intention that the Bill be the [illegible] of [illegible] principles. The only thing which was [illegible] about what he said about that was that he went on to say that the Government did recommend to [illegible] and to [illegible] in the Cayman Islands. I do not believe that applies in this particular [illegible]. However, we certainly, most of us, Mr. President, [illegible] to remove the minimum, mandatory sentences from the Misuse of Drugs Law. I, the extent that is a principle [illegible]. I have no apologies to make.

Statistics will prove that from the time that the minimum mandatory sentences were put in the Misuse of Drugs Law it had no effect whatever on reducing the number of persons convicted. In fact, it acts like reverse psychology-backfires. As was earlier spoken about, we have heard on at least many occasions when the Judiciary have lamented the fact that their hands have been tied by these mandatory, minimum sentences.

I believe that much of the opposition and many of the [illegible] which have been given across these Bills arise from the very fact that at least we are [illegible] removing the minimum mandatory sentences from the Misuse of Drugs Law.

The main thrust of this Bill, Mr. President, is the removal of these mandatory sentences. The rest of the Bill really comes as basically the results of negotiations which have been taking place between the Judiciary and the Legal Department.

MR. EDWARD O. SMITH (CONTINUING): You, some people have read with [illegible] the final language of the amendment proposed for the Committee Print carries a notation on it which says something to the effect that the Chief Justice wondered why Section 25 was not being proposed in the Bill here but high a jurisdiction for the Magistrate's court. Perhaps we may find out the Chief Justice mentioned this Bill on the side of time, it would have been agreed as originally pertained with that was as a result of a lack of consultation. However, Mr. President, I believe that the consultation was an ongoing one. The consultation started and took place long before the amendment before us was drafted. In fact, I would suggest that the Chief Justice was not in the Islands between the date of the white Paper being published and the date of this amendment.

So, Mr. President, Bills are not drafted in any ad hoc or careless manner. There are times when it is difficult to reach common language and so on, as between departments and different Lawyers. However, eventually a happy medium is reached and I can assure Members that no Legislation is ever introduced consultation or in any ad hoc fashion.

Mr. President, the Chief Minister would like to make very clear to this Hon Bill, as far as I am concerned, if we exclude the removal of the amendment, nowhere anywhere has nothing in it which would really apply to what we call the small man or the man on strip. One Member talked about this being a rich Bill and it was being the answer to our problems. Mr. President, I have argued for years that these particular amendments were not the answer to the majority of our problems. I still agree with that. However, nothing in this Bill really affects the little chap who is usually dealt with by Magistrates Courts. These provisions which have been recommended, chiefly by the judiciary, are provisions which are found in other Laws, as has been said in the various courts and other Commonwealth countries, and they would plug some of the loopholes which obviously the judiciary feels that the powers in particular could run to wasted movement.

Mr. President, Members must note that of Section 4 with "presumptions". They are created that if somebody does some thing or other they would have to go to court to prove their innocence. Mr. President, that is exactly the case with the Law as it is now. If someone is found in possession of a drug and it says "who without lawful excuse or being authorised in that behalf" and goes on to enumerate the offences, so that if someone is found with ganja or any drug in his car or the vessel, he still have to explain to the satisfaction of the court that he was innocent of it being there. So, however the onus might be placed he has to go to court and he has to prove his innocence as the case may be.

The section which seems to be giving most trouble is Clause 4 in subsection (2). This is the one which Members seem to have found so objectionable. That is that:-

> "The presumptions provided by this section shall not -
>
> (a) be rebutted by proof that a person never had physical possession of the controlled drugs;"

Mr. President, if the first subsection is going to work, it is my opinion that this subsection has to be in, because there is no other option to what we would call the kingpin or the godfather of the operations.

MR. GEORGE P. SHULTZ (CONTINUED): Without this subsection, Mr. President, in my opinion a big drug dealer could stay in his home and organize all of the arrangements necessary to purchase, shipment, import and distribution, but as any lawyer or judge in this country, and he would never have to speak to. The only thing which would convince him is that the money which he hoped to get from other objectionable conduct being concerned with. I believe again this is where the reluctance comes in, because ordinarily the lawyer when I have spoken about would be concerned with all of the difficulties which this section refers to.

Mr. President, that is not the point of view. I have enough confidence in the legal, judicial and law enforcement agencies of this country to believe that the law will not be abused. The dangers of abuse lie in a procedure for appearance of where it be found. Because of the very reasons to have available procedures which might not be found in other cases.

However, so far as this bill opening up or facilitating freezing permissibility, Mr. President, that is nothing new. It is not a new change in this country. How often have lawyers not heard of people who were approached for the possession of goods or monies say, "the policemen stuffed it in my pocket". He might have to go to court and defend himself.

Mr. President, I consider that most of the opposition to the bill has really made a mountain out of a molehill. We have heard members talking about Government using the media to suppress publicity. But the press would give favorable coverage to Government exposition of what happened. Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge, Government has taken no action to give any biased opinion, or any position under the policy of this bill.

One member said that he wondered how Government could be able to know the negotiations going on and why that is now making possibilities less for change. Mr. President, this bill does not seek to make the possibles less for the misuse of drugs. What it seeks to do is to take away the mandatory minimum sentence. The maximum sentence is stated except in the one case where it is my belief that the new section is right and has worked to reduce the sentence in that particular case, and it is in a special case. However, Mr. President, I believe there is still a very serious fear about. So I do not think that we have anything to worry about with making this or the Government safe in drugs.

It was also said that the removal of the minimum sentence will increase the use of drugs. I do not believe that, Mr. President. The idea is right in the bill.

Clause 5.1(a), is the forfeiture clause, Mr. President. I do not think that we ought actually the Senate Member for Canada Dock's amendment for deleting that, because in that sense one has objected to the use of the word "proved" and in this one he objects to the whole being satisfied. The money is not forfeited just because someone makes a charge. The court has to be satisfied, which refers to the ultimate satisfaction would be the language which I understood the Member to have; it is to prevent the abuse of a right.

Once it can be proved that assets have been acquired by illegal dealing in drugs I cannot see why anyone should object to those assets being forfeited to the Crown.

One last word which I would like to mention, Mr. President, which seems to have been of great concern was subsection (5) of Clause 2, amending Section 3 of the principal law, and subsection (6).

MRS. DAWSON (U. DEANES (CONSTITUENCY): Mr. President, I would prefer to take subsections (4) and (5) because I think that subsection (4) is very important, because it makes it for an accused person to prove that he neither knew, suspected nor had reason to suspect the existence of some fact alleged by the prosecution which is necessary for the prosecution to prove if he is to be convicted".

Subsection (5) is the one which seems to have given a lot of trouble. This reads:-

> "Where in a prosecution under this section it is necessary, in order that an accused person is to be convicted, for the prosecution to prove that some substance or product involved in the alleged offence was the controlled drug which the prosecution alleges it to have been, that it be proved that such substance or product was that controlled drug, the accused person -
>
> (a) shall not be acquitted by reason only of proving that he neither knew, suspected nor had reason to suspect that such substance or product was the particular controlled drug alleged; but
>
> (b) shall be acquitted if he proves that he neither believed, suspected nor had reason to suspect that the substance or product was a controlled drug."

To me, Mr. President, what this really says is that if the prosecution alleges that a person has a controlled drug and it is found that he did because it or dealt in it, or whatever the charge might have been, that he cannot claim innocence or acquittal merely by saying that he did not know reason to believe or know that it was that particular drug. What he has to establish is that he knew that he was not dealing in any kind of controlled drug. The clause quite often plays with semantics, because magic a drug has different names. It is even known by different names. So what this sought here to prove is that they are not guilty of the act of dealing in any controlled drug.

Mr. President, wishes to say that this Bill is brought in all good faith, and that it is not a contentious Bill; that the technical aspects of the Bill are brought to line what are considered loopholes, or to correct anomalies in the Law as seen by the judiciary, I can only say that this Bill is a good Bill because it justifies the requirement of removing the minimum mandatory sentence from the Misuse of Drugs Law. Whether that was a campaign promise or not it is, in my opinion, the right thing to do. It is something I have been fighting for for a long time. The fact that minor anomalies which are necessary come with it does not detract from the fact that we are removing the minimum mandatory sentences.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, that the Honourable Second Official Member will be able to the Committee stage to satisfy the few remaining doubts which might exist on some Members' minds about any areas of this Bill. I am sure that the good Honourable Member opposite will be supporting the principle of the Bill but I understand that he would not oppose a further clarification on subsection (4)(b) of Section 4 concerning the anomaly which he could elaborate on when that, to show exactly what is meant.

With those few remarks, Mr. President, I commend this Bill to the House of Assembly.

SEN. SPARKMAN: The question is shall a bill entitled: A BILL for an act to amend the Revenue and Taxation Code relating to personal exemptions,

ROLL CALL BY: LYNN ARL MOSS:

MR. M. MANSFIELD SAYS: May we have a quorum, Mr. President?

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well.

QUORUM
NO. 33

AYES | NOES | ABSENTATIONS

Sen. Hendrik H. Preston | Mr. D. Ray Siddoo | Mr. Lincoln A. Pierson
Capt. Michael J. Bradley | | Mr. D. Edward Whitson
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson | | Mr. John D. Watson
Sen. Jerrick O. Ripley | |
Lt. M. Norman Seddon | |
Rev. Capt. Charles F. McKissock | |
Hon. Robert G. Johnson | |
Mr. M. Mansfield Reed | |
Sen. Stephen R. Bennett | |
Capt. Hilary C. Blackmarsh | |

20 | 2 | 5

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

SEE STAFF A. BOOTH READING.

MR. PRESIDENT: The amendments

(AMENDMENTS)

MRS. DENNIS H. BOOTH: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MOTION BY: MOSES.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does anybody have a discussion? (Laughter).

MR. M. MANSFIELD REED: What is the only thing we agree on, Sir.

AT 4:37 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL
10:00 A.M., WEDNESDAY, 31ST MAY, 1955.

SECOND MEETING OF THE 23RD SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

WEDNESDAY
26TH JULY, 2023

PRESENT WERE:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, MR G ASSEM ESQ, CMG, OBE - PRESIDING

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS E FORBES, CMG,OBE,JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J BRADLEY, OBE, ED	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGAL ADMINISTRATION
HON SHONAH C JEFFERSON, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND INVESTMENT
HON JOCELYN A EWING	MEMBER FOR HEALTH EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON V MCKEAN DOOLEY, MCP	MEMBER FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE
HON CAPT CHARLES E RUSSOMANNO	MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION
HON MARCEL A JEFFERSON, CPM, JP	MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR H HAMILTON BUSH	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MRS KATHRYN E OBERG	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY
MR D ERNEST A MERVILLE, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT WINSTON D HYDE-SMITH	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
MR G HEINZ KRUSEN	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
MR D ROLAND ANTICAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR JOHN D WOODMAN	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

APOLOGIES

MR MARCUS W ROBERTS	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN

[illegible]

[illegible]

29TH MAY, 1996

1. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

TITLE:

(a) SECOND READING

(i) THE RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFENCES BILL, 1996

(b) COMMITTEE STAGE

(i) THE DRUG DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(ii) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(iii) THE HOUSE OF ASSOC (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(iv) THE RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFENCES BILL, 1996

(c) REPORTS THEREON

(i) THE DRUG DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(ii) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(iii) THE HOUSE OF ASSOC (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(iv) THE RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFENCES BILL, 1996

(d) THIRD READING

(i) THE DRUG DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(ii) THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(iii) THE HOUSE OF ASSOC (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996
(iv) THE RECLASSIFICATION OF OFFENCES BILL, 1996

2. OTHER BUSINESS

MOTIONS:-

VETERANS AFFAIRS' MOTIONS

(a) VETERANS AFFAIRS'S MOTION NO. 12/96 -
DUTY ON CIGARETTES

(b) VETERANS AFFAIRS'S MOTION NO. 13/96 -
PROHIBITION OF LOGGING AND CIGARETTE ADVERTISEMENTS
IN THE CAYMAN ISLANDS.

Table of Contents

	Page
The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1986 - Second Reading	1
The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Committee Stage	8
The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Committee Stage	17
The Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Committee Stage	30
The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1986 - Committee Stage	44
The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Report Stage	49
The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Report Stage	49
The Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Report Stage	49
The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1986 - Report Stage	49
The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Third Reading	50
The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Third Reading	60
The Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1986 - Third Reading	67
The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1986 - Third Reading	53
Private Member's Motion No. 12/86 - Liquor Licensing Law	58
Private Member's Motion No. 13/86 - Prohibition of Liquor and Cigarette Advertising in the Cayman Islands	71
Adjournment	79

WEDNESDAY

16TH MAY, 1965

2.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Prayers to be read.
Proceedings are resumed.
[MR. SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR]
Private Business. The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1965.

PRIVATE BUSINESS

BILLS

THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1965

ORDER READING

ORDER: THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1965.

MR. GEORGE A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide; entitled The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1965.

Mr. Speaker: This Bill which is sponsored by the Conservative, Labour and Liberal Parties in the United Kingdom seeks to make reasonable provisions for certain criminal convictions to become spent after a period of time and to provide the reasonable discharge of any such convictions. Mr. Speaker, this Bill I hope will be non-controversial. It seeks very simply but it seeks to remedy a problem which has existed in this country for some time. I describe it as a problem, Mr. President, because in addition to rehabilitating offenders, in the United States we have the lesser of a United States Post System in operation, I have in many instances brought undue hardship on people. As is usually known, people have to put a positive statement to get the right and very often a small family squabble which has taken place many years or twenty years ago is exposed in the papers, and has often resulted in people not being able to get employment.

The Bill which is attached into several clauses, Mr. President, provides mainly for the mechanics of the working of the Act when it is enacted. However, Clause 4 gives basically the effect of this Bill when it becomes law. I would like to read this section, in case of it for the benefit of Members to bring it to their attention:-

"(1) Subject to section 7 and 8, a person who has become a rehabilitated person for the purposes of this Act in respect of a conviction shall be treated for all purposes in law as a person who has not committed, been charged with, prosecuted for, convicted of, or sentenced for the offence which was the subject of that conviction; and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to the contrary but subject as aforesaid -

(a) any evidence shall be admissible in any proceedings before a judicial authority exercising its jurisdiction, or functions in the Islands to prove that any person has committed, been charged with, prosecuted for, convicted of or sentenced for the offence which was the subject of a spent conviction; and

SEN. SAXBE (CONTINUED):

(b) a person shall not, in any such proceedings, be asked and, if asked, shall not be required to answer any question relating to his past which cannot be shown to be relevant to a fact or matter in issue, notwithstanding or pretending to a fact or matter in issue, notwithstanding or pretending to a fact or matter in issue, notwithstanding or pretending

MR. M. BENJAMIN BOOK (CONTINUING): I should prefer to see this matter in more precise in the Committee Stage. Again, Mr. President, I have not decided on whether or not I or somebody else would change their minds during the Committee Stage. As I said, I would like to see this passed tonight. Mr. President, if we take for instance a young boy just out of school, just turned eighteen and he gets involved in some offence which might be attributable to the natural mischievousness of youth, which gets him six months, he is out of prison before he eighteen-and-a-half with a record which probably bars him from entering many schools of higher learning and those many jobs, and we are not perhaps from obtaining visa which would to travel to the United States. Mr. President, if we have to write every crime to have this record cleared now is really helping him? What do society is supposed to him in these seven years?

I feel that this seven year period is too long. The police cannot use this for his information benefits from it and I feel that we need to change it. I look forward to the speech of those members who put their sensible ideas towards year or improving this Bill. However, if they have to wait until they can be Bill to benefit from it then the amendments to Abolishment, Mr. President, I support this Bill. I do not have very much to say. I suppose the Bill helping that those things I mentioned will be taken into consideration when we get to Committee Stage.

Saying that this is the last Government will be the Bills which I would like to say on finishing, Mr. President, that in this Meeting we have dealt with some very serious Bills. Some of us have agreed. Others please correct me if I am wrong, but I think that these Bills are important rights. That is an important right. I would like to say, Mr. President, that it is one thing to oppose for the sake of opposition and another thing in order to effect the economic and political amendments which are greatly needed in the country today.

Sir, regardless of how members may think of me, or for that matter how high I may be in others, or for that matter regardless of whether some people feel that I am here to represent, as has been said before, I have pledged to my people that I will face the challenges of my time, that I will struggle relentlessly to change those things both in our economic and in our social life which have adversely to the misery of the people such that we secure their proper place in the brotherhood of man.

Finally, Mr. President, with your indulgence I am coming to a close, Mr. President, and I ask you to bear with me. Nobody will judge whether I am a man of God or not of course. However, in my humble name the humility of Jesus Christ. I love my people. That is why I speak out so strongly, Mr. President, and I believe in dreams of this that I will draw strength from the courage of the people that I will draw strength from this family that I will draw strength from the faith of their help that I will draw strength from the hope of their race. The thing which keeps me going, Sir, is that I will draw strength from the love of human nature. I pray, Sir, that God will bless this little land. I urge and please ask of us to use wisdom to do what our conscience leads us to do.

Thank you, Mr. President, for hearing with me. I appreciate the fact that I know that all reasonable leaders will be the same.

MR. [illegible]: I should like to take the time to keep the Honorable Member from speaking, but I shall be grateful if he will say so right on the question which we are debating.

The Second District Member for Georgia [illegible].

MR. EDWARD A. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak on this Bill but I have been somewhat surprised by the Second District Member for West Bay. Mr. President, some times Members including myself rise to take [illegible] our criticism is commendable so I hope mine is taken that we not quite right. I feel also, Mr. President, that it is only fair and proper that we should give praise and compliments where they are due.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the mover of this Bill for a Bill which I think is very timely, and also I would congratulate the architects who put the Bill together. This Bill, Mr. President, we now hold is modelled on the contemporary provisions in the United Kingdom. It is true to some extent but I feel that it is a Bill which should have been on the Statute Book long ago. It seeks to make comprehensive provisions for various criminal convictions to bring about after a period of time and to formalise the unconditional discharges of any such convictions. Mr. President, there is a very positive step forward because it gives the offender a chance to gainfully rehabilitate himself and to be insights back properly into society.

I would not regard any part of this Bill as bad for our people. However, maybe the reason of the Bill could do with somewhat explain why there is no distinction in the Bill. We have under the ordinance the sentence and the rehabilitation period but there could room to be a major criterion to work [illegible] a schedule of offences.

Mr. President, the effect of rehabilitation would seem to put the rehabilitated individual in a very, very good position indeed. "Subject to Section 7 and 8 a person who has become a rehabilitated person for the purposes of this Law in respect of a conviction shall be treated for all purposes in law as a person who has not committed, been charged with, prosecuted for, convicted or sentenced for the offence". I agree, Mr. President, with the Second District Member for West Bay that if a person has spent his time he should not have this hanging over his head for the rest of his life. Surely opportunity should be given to [illegible] the individual rehabilitated. However as he said the rehabilitation period is somewhat reasonable.

On the other side of the coin, Mr. President, subsection (2) of Clause 4 of the Bill reads:-

> "A conviction which has become spent or any circumstances ancillary thereto, or any failure to disclose a spent conviction or any such circumstance, shall not be a proper ground for dismissing or excluding a person from any office, profession, occupation or employment, or for prejudicing him in any way in any occupation or profession."

Mr. Speaker, we have to be very careful with this subsection because we can have professionals who through professional negligence or otherwise may be investigated and sentenced for certain serious [illegible] with our society but being temporarily suspended or rehabilitated, and being placed back into their employment and subsequently receive promotion.

MR. DAVID A. EVANS (LEICESTER): While I think it is good that this subsection should make provision to enable people to subscribe themselves and to also be placed back into society, I feel that we have to be very, very careful indeed. I think that we have to be very, very careful indeed. I think that we have to give very careful consideration where this situation could occur.

Mr. President, as I said, I feel that this is a good Bill. With the exception of the reservations which I have raised I wish to give this Bill my full support.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable Chief Elected Member of Kentucky Council.

THE HONOURABLE A. FINNEGAN: Mr. President, I rise to support a Bill for a Law to rehabilitate offenders who have not been convicted of any serious offence for periods of years to provide the appropriate disclosures of their previous convictions, to amend the Law of Defamation and for connected purposes, hereinafter.

Mr. President, the objects and Reasons is quite clear on this Bill. Many of all, in the Objects and Reasons it is stated that it is to rehabilitate persons of the United Kingdom. Secondly, the Bill seeks to make appropriate provisions for certain criminal convictions to be spent after a period of time, and thirdly to prohibit the unauthorised disclosure of any such convictions.

The Bill for a Law to rehabilitate offenders seeks to express the new Government's intention primarily to rehabilitate as possible. I hope that this Bill will not be misconstrued in any other way as has been attempted with other Bills which have come before this House in this Meeting. The policy of the new Government should have initial doubt in the minds of our people that we have recognised the errors of the past administration in dealing with various criminal offences and in particular the misuse of drugs, and that we are attempting to bring our problems in a more humanitarian manner.

We have, Sir, in my constituency those who break in drugs or who have committed other offences against our society. In one of the earlier debates on another Bill I stressed that our action would encourage people to invest in drugs and other irresponsible social society. Under the past administration sentences were both retributory which only served to fill our prisons and create problems, problems which were difficult enough. We have in this Meeting endeavoured to remove the retributory sentences and are looking to help our people who have committed offences by first making them aware of their responsibilities and secondly giving them a second chance.

This Bill further seeks to rehabilitate as far as possible to help our people return to live normal lives and take their rightful place in society. We are trying a fresh approach to our present problems and instead of driving into lawlessness those who have committed offences against the laws of our Islands, we are through this Bill and other Bills seeking ways and means to have them back into society as a living and useful duty.

The greatest task in these Bills we have to provide here ourselves and that we should be able to help those as we would have others do unto us. Mr. President, this Bill is quite clear and I have given Government's intentions and policy, and I now invite to give this Bill their full support.

I thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The third Printed Motion for Wednesday.

MRS. MARION L. CORBETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to discuss this Bill for a few minutes. Offenders who have not been successful at any previous efforts for parole of course to centralise the unsatisfactory classification of their previous convictions, to amend the Law of Defamation, and for purposes connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover of this Bill. I think it very wise to consolidate. In fact, I think that the public should welcome this from more persons than once. Subsection (2) of Section 4 is particularly wordy, very commendable because I have known of cases where [illegible] have [illegible] and maybe absolving for ever in their life or for very often unfortunate of the Law and to have back until spoken then for so long. I feel that when it is felt that a person has been rehabilitated and that should certainly be a welcome change in our society.

I also notice here that although there is a list of offences scheduled here which applies to the sentence, in clause stated in Section 5(2) that there now certain sentences mentioned. So, show us one what has been scheduled it should not be too difficult to understand exactly what would be included. Included would be a sentence of imprisonment for life, a sentence of imprisonment for a term exceeding twenty months, a sentence of detention during the Governor's pleasure, and any other sentence to a punishment subject to rehabilitation under this Bill.

I also notice in Section 6 that:-

> "(1) Unspecified terms of imprisonment and terms which are wholly or partly suspended, fines, or imprisonments imposed in respect of offences of which a person was convicted in the same proceedings shall be treated as a single term."

I think that that is very commendable. Also I notice that in Section 7(1):-

> "A sentence imposed by a court outside the Islands which is substantially the same as a sentence of any description mentioned in this section shall be treated as the sentence so described in this section."

I feel that this will be a welcome change in our society. This will also not apply, as we believe on any sentence under Section 6, subsection (1) and (2) and further on down, so I give anyone leave to think that they will be considered rehabilitated and that they will be able to go out and commit another [illegible] and this will still apply.

However, I think that it is a very good Bill. I welcome it. I congratulate the mover. I congratulate the legal draftsman and I commend it to the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to speak I will now call on the question that....

HON. LEROY O. SMITH: I would just like to make....

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I am so sorry. Sir, you spoke again, so the earlier time you did not have any chance to make it. I invite the Honourable Minister of Economic Development to exercise his right of reply. My apologies.

MR. JEREMY D. BENNET: Thank you, Mr. President, and I assure you that I will not be very long. I would just like to thank those Members who supported the Bill either by speaking to it or by not opposing it.

Mr. President, I would just like to touch on two points made by speakers. The first is the point made by the Second Elected Member for East End about the length of time required to elapse before a person is considered a rehabilitated person. I too, Mr. President, thought that perhaps 3 months of time were a bit excessive. However, when one considers that the onus is on the person to first prove that he has indeed rehabilitated himself and the Bill merely gives discretion or status to that rehabilitation, then it is not unreasonable to have a fairly long period there before the person can be considered rehabilitated for purposes of the Bill.

The other one is the question raised as why the offences were not listed in a schedule. Clause 3, Mr. President, states the sentences which can be utilized under this Bill:-

> "(a) a sentence of imprisonment for life;
>
> (b) a sentence of imprisonment for a term exceeding thirty months;
>
> (c) a sentence of detention during the Governor's pleasure,"

The offences for which such sentences can be passed will be found in the Criminal Code. However, one can see that certainly in the case of subsections (a) and (c) the sentences are of a serious nature. As far as subsection (b) is concerned, Mr. President, I considered about that long as well. I think that is why I made an intervention that this be a bit on the short side but I would prefer to move expeditiously with this Bill, Mr. President. If it be found that that precludes us working hereafter, well it will be no big problem to move an amendment to the Bill and change it. However, in light of those matters which have been taken on this Meeting particularly with the receipt of minutes mandatory sentences and so on, I sincerely that this Bill will work well as it is presently looked and I would therefore recommend that we give it a try with the terms as presently expressed. As I said, if we find that we have not met our objectives we can always amend the offending section.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

H. E. Jackson Miller: So the Members be now going to entertain votes.

The Speaker: Order, order.

The question before the House be that a Bill shortly entitled The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1996, be given a Second Reading.

Assistant Clerk: Ayes.

DIVISION
NO. 44

AYES

Mrs. Daniels R. Bishop
Mrs. Michael J. Bradley
Mrs. Thomas D. Hoffman
Mrs. Herman D. Stanley
Rep. R. Norman Swallow
Mrs. Carol Sherman L. Blankenship
Mrs. Russell E. Johnson
Mr. W. Northcutt Leach
Mrs. Stephen L. Murphy
Mr. Richard A. Pearson
Mrs. Betty S. Rhodenizer
Mr. C. Eddy Scalise
Mr. D. Ronald Waller
Mr. John L. Wilson

12

NOES

0

I declare the motion carried.

SB 1 - STATE A. AMEND REVENUE.

MR. PRESIDENT: The House will now go into Committee to study a Bill entitled the State Duty Amendments Bill, 1981 (No. 2) Bill.

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1976

COMMITTEE STAGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee. A Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Act, 1976. Before we embark on this and the other Bills, perhaps I could have Councillor's confirmation that Members will agree to following the usual procedure whereby instead of identifying clauses, members just state that kind of thing. We understand the Honourable Second Official Member to answer them when they have not been explicitly mentioned during the Committee Stage of the Meeting. Is that agreeable?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Secondly, it may be considered for convenience if as we come to each Bill I inform the Committee of the amendments of which I have been given notice in respect of the Bill concerned, so that Members may be forewarned that these amendments will be moved when we come to the particular clause. In the case of this Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law, 1976 I have been given notice of two amendments, one by the Honourable Third Official Member (Treasury Clerk) and the second by the Second Elected Member for Prospect Town, Miss Jeffrey (Clause 6). So when we come to Clause 6 we will take those amendments.

MR. RICHARD J. HUGHES: Could I help you, Sir, that you might like indicate any amendments of which short notice has been given, because I understand that Members have clarified and crystallized, or are doing so, amendments which will resolve the issue of the Chair.

MR. CRAMER: Yes, indeed. I was hoping to find out if the House is to vote, or jettison the whole of all amendments of which I have been given notice. Since the notice has been abridged these Standing Orders provide I was going to indicate that I was going to allow them. With the two in respect of which Mr. I think that we were given sufficient notice. The major notice I think was by the Union, and I think that the major notice was given with both of those two. Now we can turn to the Bill.

MR. RICHARD J. HUGHES: Without delaying proceedings, Mr. Chairman, there is just one very minor technical point which arises possibly in the exercise of amendment to this Bill and possibly to a further notice of amendment to the Minutes of Proceedings Bill. That is that a notice of amendment was given based upon the white copy circulated to Members. If the notice of amendment is read with the green copy, because of the different layout of it, there is a very technical minor difference. For instance the notice of amendment by the Association should officials Members receive a deletion in the last five lines of paragraph (a). It was five lines on the white copy but it is only three lines on the green copy, however, I take it that you would not rule my objection invalid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, no I think we will deal with this when we come to Clause 1. Otherwise we will.... However, thank you for drawing my attention to that. I had noticed that in one or two cases I think, not just in this Bill alone but in the case of other Bills, amendments have been drafted in a way which refers to the white copy whereas that to the green copy. However, I think that we can work that out as we come to them.

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CRAMER: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 19 OF ACT 1 OF 1978.

MR. CRAMER: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3. AMENDMENTS OF SCHEDULE 1.

MR. CRAMER: The question is that Clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. G. MAC CORMICK: Mr. Chairman, may I have a division please?

DIVISION
NO. 35

AYES

Hon. Donald M. Fraser
Hon. Michael J. Healey
Hon. Thomas C. Hoffstrom
Hon. Jackson C. Kemple
Hon. W. Norman Lockner
Hon. Curt Chapman T., Minnesota
Hon. Robert G. Johnson
Mr. M. McKenzie Lamb
Hon. Stephen G. Onnen
Hon. Richard A. Stevens
Hon. Harry S. Richardson
Hon. D. Samuel Wefald
Mr. Mike E. Nelson

NOES

Mr. G. Lang Lockner

23

2

MR. SPEAKER:
A majority of the House.

I declare the motion carried. Clause

CLAUSE 4 PASSED AS AMENDED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 6. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 38.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Clerk of the Bill.

The question on that Clause 6 do stand

CLERK: CLAUSE 6. AGREED. CLAUSE 6 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 8. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 39.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Clerk of the Bill.

The question on that Clause 8 do stand

CLERK: AYES AND NOES.

MR. P. LANG LOCKNER:

May I have a division please?

DIVISION
NO. 36

AYES

Hon. Donald M. Fraser
Hon. Michael J. Healey
Hon. Thomas C. Hoffstrom
Hon. Jackson C. Kemple

NOES

DIVISION
NO. 36
(Quorum Rule)

AYES

Hon. M. Roberta Ruddock
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Mackenzie
Hon. Russell G. Atkinson
Hon. W. MacKeagan Smith
Hon. Clarence L. Cowern
Hon. Lunsford A. Richardson
Capt. Wesley R. Mackenzie
Hon. D. Leonard Wallace
Hon. John B. Matheson

13

NOES

Hon. S. Hall Roebuck

1

HON. CHAIRMAN:
I declare the motion carried. Clause

Clause 6 agreed to accordingly.

HON. CLAUSE 7. Amendment of section 38.

HON. CHAIRMAN: The question is on Hon. Senator Connolly's amendment. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES:

Hon. C. RAYMOND CONNOLLY: Hon. Chairman, may I have a division please?

DIVISION
NO. 37

AYES

Hon. Senator W. Ross Thorvaldson
Hon. Senator Michael J. Yuzyk
Hon. Senator Thomas D. Jefferson
Hon. Senator Norman E. Smith
Hon. Senator W. Ernest Golding
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Mackenzie
Hon. Senator Russell G. Atkinson
Hon. Senator W. MacKeagan Smith
Hon. Senator Clarence L. Cowern
Hon. Senator Lunsford A. Richardson
Capt. Wesley R. Mackenzie
Hon. D. Leonard Wallace
Hon. John B. Matheson

13

NOES

Hon. S. Hall Roebuck

1

HON. CHAIRMAN:
I declare the motion carried. Clause

Clause 7 agreed to accordingly.

CLERK: CLAUSE 9. AMENDMENT OF AGREEMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment to Clause 9 is in your front of you, Bill. If this meeting should approve this I have been given notice of two amendments to be moved to Clause 9. I think that it would be best if we take them as a whole first and then there comes in the middle part of Clause 9. That is the one by the Honourable Chief Official Member of Executive Council and it is the one destroyed of which the Honourable Second Official Member explained that it had been circulated with reference to the White Paper that you seen copy. After we have disposed of that amendment I would propose to move to the amendment which has been put down by the Second Elected Member for George Town. Mr. Speaker, I see that the amendment was actually dated the 14th May, so from the conclusion of the debate I assume that I give him leave to move it even if he was not, and he may not have seen, given the numerous amount of time of reading, so that there will be no doubt about its being properly moved.

Third Official Member wish to explain what he is moving the amendment which stands in his name?

HON. CHARLES C. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did mean to get two months difference right at the beginning. Mr. Johnston are actually three and I take it that the one which we are discussing is the first....

HON. CHARLES C. JOHNSTON: Perhaps I should....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you should read it out and then I will be quite sure.

HON. CHARLES C. JOHNSTON: I move that Clause 9 of the Bill be amended by deleting:-

"Other immovable property which provides that rights under it are not recognizable or transferable by any party thereto."

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the amendment to that Clause 9 of the Bill be amended by deleting the words:-

"Other immovable property which provides that rights under it are not recognizable or transferable by any party thereto."

Those words appear in the white copy in the last five lines and in the green copy in the last three lines of paragraph 9(a) of a proposed new clause to be headed "Agreements or Memorandum of Agreement".

HON. CHARLES C. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the words "any of the beginning of the second line in the green copy should be terminated and placed between"void" and "thereto" in the first line, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am concerned about that. I think that it probably is right. Would the Honourable Second Official Member like to advise me?

MR. MICHAEL F. DOUGHERTY: The Honorable Third Official Member and the Honorable Second Official Member have both had a private discussion over the wording of the amendment and I did not catch the exact query.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Do you desire which the amendment defines, that [a] reads:-

"for the sale or purchase of any land, private title or

$50,000"

The suggestion is that the word 'for' should be moved in some between land and private title.

MR. MICHAEL F. DOUGHERTY: I have just querying with the Honourable Third Official Member, Mr. Chairman, why we are making out the words 'or other immovable property'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is basically because the agreement is dealing with the purchase of land and private title, and not referring to other items.

I think, Mr. Chairman, subject to the views of the Honourable Second Official Member, the Hon'ble Member on my [a] further down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would accept it did not do

MR. MICHAEL F. DOUGHERTY: any harm, did it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: My, no what I mean is that as the amendment was originally worded it was "or other immovable property". There was not a word "for" at the end of [a]. If there has not originally been a need for the word "for" at the end of [a] I wonder whether there is a need for the word "for" at the end of [a] now. It seems to me that it is more likely that the word "for" should come between the words "land" and "private title" as the Honourable Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council has suggested. However, I am seeking guidance from the Honourable Second Official Member on the point.

MR. MICHAEL F. DOUGHERTY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In which case would you agree to re-word the agreement, or would we agree that really what it is doing is applying to agreements that the Honourable Second Official Member should be empowered to carry out if the Governor votes the failure of the amendment and then if the clause as amended originally moved and make the point that the Honourable Fourth Elected Member has made for a slightly re-worded clause.

Does any Member wish to speak to the amendment? If not I will put the question that the clause be amended as proposed by the Honourable Third Official Member.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED BY MAJORITY. AMENDMENT PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you voting against the amendment, not merely against the clause?

U. A. ELIE ESQUIRE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recently, there is an amendment proposed by the Second Elected Member for Georgetown South and I would invite him to read out his amendment, ...

MR. LINDEN A. PINDWARD: Mr. Chairman, I move under Clause 9 of the Bill to amend by the deletion of the numerals 4½% as they appear at the end of subparagraph (a) of paragraph (b) under the (a)(ii) "Assignments" and the substitution therefor of -

"For the first assignment $150

For any subsequent assignments at 7 1/2% per cent of the consideration".

The reason for this, Mr. Chairman, is that this amendment seeks to provide any possible loophole in the Bill which could be abused by persons seeking to assign land or other immovable property under Crown lease for the 4 1/2% per cent stamp duty. The idea here, Mr. Chairman, is to try to avoid any speculation or trafficking being made through these assignments and that any profits being made should be subject to 7 1/2% per cent stamp duty.

MR. THOMAS C. LEPPENCE: Mr. Chairman, the reason why I support the hon. Member's proposal by seeking this amendment and move on Clause 9 to delete that I wonder if we could not have a bit more certainty now under (a) of the amendment. I read:

"For the first two assignments $150

For any subsequent assignments at 7 1/2 per cent of the consideration".

Will it not be one of those which would possibly need litigation to decide and I think that normally the consideration given for an assignment, if we put the amendment through as it is presently worded, it will not be the case of persons a project will ultimately benefit. I think that if the Mover would be willing to accept an amendment where it would read:-

"For the first two assignments $150

For any subsequent assignments at 7 1/2 per cent of the consideration".

I would find it more comfortable.

MR. WINSTON A. GRIFFITH: May I just mention a technical point, Sir. I would be grateful if the word "Deed" also added before the first, otherwise there is an ambiguity as to whether the duty of $150 is payable on the execution of the first two assignments. I seek to move to clause 9(a) on page 4 of the first line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the "Deed" come after the $150 or

MR. WINSTON A. GRIFFITH: It would then read, Mr. Chairman:-

"For the first two assignments each $150",

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Third Opposition Member planning to move an amendment to an amendment already, which I think he can in under Standing Order 37(1), or is he withholding the Second Elected Member for Castries Town to somewhere amending his own amendment?

HON. DESMOND C. CHARLERY: I am absolutely not to second Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Second Elected Member for Castries Town move to amend an item?

MR. CYRIL A. PILGRIM: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy with the amendment to this proposed amendment. For the amendment to read:

"For the first two amendments each $100

For any subsequent amendments at 7 1/2 per cent of the consideration".

That would be fine, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that I am allowed to permit you to alter the wording of your amendment. We had this with a motion the other day did we not? We found that I was empowered to allow somebody who had moved a motion to amend it. It is known to me unfortunately that I can let you. However, let us just look at standing orders carefully.

HON. ALPHONSE J. EDWARD: I think that the relevant Standing Order is 37(7) which we referred to before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that it is applicable to us now?

HON. ALPHONSE J. EDWARD: In any case Standing Order 37(1) is relevant where:

"An amendment to an amendment may be moved and proceeded with any time".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that possibly the way we have worked it is more a substitution rather than an amendment. If the Honourable Third Official Member had been moving it it would naturally be an amendment to an amendment. However, it does arise if it is a substitution. It seems to me that I can properly accept the substitution.

So the question now is that Clause 6 should be amended by deleting the words in their entirety at the end of subparagraph (a) of paragraph (5) under the title "Assignment", and the substitution thereof -

"For the first two assignments each $100

For any subsequent assignments at 7 1/2 per cent of the consideration".

HON. ALPHONSE J. EDWARD: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does any Member wish to speak further to that? Then I will put that question that Clause 6 of the Bill be amended as proposed by the Second Elected Member for Castries Town.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED BY MAJORITY. AMENDMENT IS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not have anything of any further assistance. The question therefore is that Clause 9 as the Committee has stand part of the Bill. I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. G. WILLIS PRICE: Mr. Chairman, may I have a division please?

DIVISION NO. 66

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Dennis E. Doctor	Mr. G. Willis Price	Mr. R. Jackson Ross
Hon. Michael J. Healey	Mr. S. Leonard Miller	
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson		
Hon. Jackson D. Charles		
Hon. R. Norman Boston		
Hon. Capt. Charles T. Kirkconnell		
Hon. Samuel G. Johnson		
Hon. Stephen D. Christie		
Hon. Winfield A. Fleming		
Capt. Henry St.Michaels		
10	2	1

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried. Clause 9 as the Committee stands part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 8 AS AMENDED AGREED TO BY MAJORITY.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE STAMP DUTY ACT, 1974.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Preamble Clause stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest that before we move to the Committee Stage of the Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1976, we might take our customary morning break. I do not see any particular reason why we should not take it straight from Committee and resume straight in Committee. We'll do so then.

I will suspend proceedings for refreshments by ten minutes.

AT 11.25 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

COMMITTEE RESUMED AT 11.50 A.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

The next Bill on the Order Paper is the Road Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1986. I am told that as a result of the Central Standing Orders we have still the Honourable Second Official Member in presenting the Select Committee Stage amendment which will be moved, if leave is granted, shortly. In the meanwhile on the list key notice was given of some Committee Stage amendments. It was a simple notice which encompassed three amendments to Clause 2 and one amendment to Clause 5. Apart from the amendment namely under proposition which I referred to some ago, these are the only amendments of which I have been given notice so far.

What I suggest to the House at this stage? Considering the amendments of which we have been given notice, and with the further amendment be available and if necessary we can have back to it.

THE ROAD CESS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 23 OF ACT 17 OF 1970.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, since this is the first of the clauses which the amendments with, proposition....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 2? I see.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Not yet. Before Members retire to their bishops I would explain my thoughts upon this amendment.

In a meeting of the House, I think it was last year or 1985, we provided for the concept of wholly suspended sentences which although on the original 1970 provision of wholly suspended sentences. In both this Bill which is Clause 2 seeks to do with purely suspended sentences and the power of the present substantive law dealing with wholly suspended sentences, there is presently a provision which contemplates the court's power to wholly or partially suspend any offence under the Bylaws of Anguilla. Now, I had in mind at once the feeling of Members having the opinion that the courts should be able if they thought fit and proper, to partially or wholly suspend a sentence which was being given under the Bylaws of Anguilla. It is to give effect to that power that the amendments which is presently being Notwithstanding related.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that affect Clause 2?

MR. THOMAS A. DUNLOP: Yes, because Clauses 2 of the Bill presently deals with an amendment to Section 33 of the Penal Code. Section 33, subsection (6) of the Penal Code provides:

"The power to suspend a sentence pursuant to subsection (4) may not be exercised in respect of a sentence for ... any offence against -

(a) section 187;

(b) the Misuse of Drugs Act, 1973;"

So that is why we would be seeking to amend. If it were the wish of the House, Clause 2 of the Bill.

At the moment the position is that a court cannot suspend a sentence if it is for an offence against the Misuse of Drugs Act. This has been the position since the Penal Code (Amendment) Act, 1979.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see. I have just been given now, and I hope all other Members have been given a copy of the additional Committee Stage amendments, one to Clause 2 and one to Clause 3, which you are seeking leave to introduce. In terms of Standing Order 32(2) I grant leave for these amendments to be moved at this current sitting. I wonder whether you would like formally to move the amendment to Clause 2, the purpose of which you have just explained.

HON. MICHAEL A. CUBBON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for having been granted. I would now move that Clause 2 of the Bill be amended by deleting-

", and is further amended in subsection (6) by -

(a) adding "and" at the end of paragraph (a);
(b) deleting paragraph (b); and
(c) redesignating paragraph (c) as paragraph (b)".

This, Mr. Chairman, is the only de minimis amendment that the effect of it is that if we pass this proposed amendment to Clause 2, that it will enable the courts, if they think fit, to consider and impose wholly suspended sentences in relation to misuse of drugs offences, which is a power which they presently do not have.

MR. LAWFORD A. PICKERING: Mr. Chairman, I suppose if the Honourable Second Official Member could explain this a little further, because I have been looking at the subsidiaries that have been added to this clause, (a), (b) and (c). I am wondering whether the subsection (b) which is referring to is the removal of Section 33 or Section 187(2)?

HON. MICHAEL A. CUBBON: Mr. Chairman, in 1979 by Law No. 10 of 1979, which has entitled the Penal Code (Amendment) Law, Section 5 of that amending Law added in Section 33 of the main Law two more subsections which are subsection (4) and subsection (5). Subsection (5) says :-

"The power to suspend a sentence may not be exercised in respect of a sentence for any offence against -

(b) the Misuse of Drugs Law, 1973;"

SEN. MATHIAS: I'm perfectly willing to delete that parenthetical phrase, Mr. Chairman, so that the intent, if it existed, could hardly surround a sentence in relation to a drug offense.

MR. D. BRIAN HUSER: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Honorable Senator Mathias can explain why he thinks that it is necessary for subsection (a) to remain? That is subsection (a)(1) of Section 1010 of the Traffic Law. Or does that have to be used nonetheless, in whole or number?

SEN. MATHIAS: Perhaps the Clerk could be kind enough to give me a copy of the Traffic Law and I will endeavor to answer that. Or perhaps the members who were members of this House when they passed this law in 1973 could enlighten me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is certain sections of the Traffic Law.

MR. D. BRIAN HUSER: Yes, Sections 65, 69, 80 and 70. I thought you all agreed....

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are certainly certain sentences for certain offenses under the Traffic Law. I think, like anything would disqualified and it may be that this was put in to keep the records from suspending an otherwise meritorious sentence. I am speculating but there is possible.

SEN. MATHIAS: If it pleases the Chair, I would move that the only offense for which a mandatory sentence can be applied under the Traffic Law is an offense for obtaining a license or driving while disqualified, an offenses punishable by imprisonment. Any other offense under the Traffic Law, any person may have a mandatory suspended sentence. He presumes the power to wholly suspend a sentence is not applicable to Section 1010 of the Penal Code which is manslaughter, by reason of these two offenses and to all Traffic Law offenses except the two which I have mentioned.

I really have no idea why it was passed in that form in 1973, Sir.

MR. D. BRIAN HUSER: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot see an offense such as one of those offenses under the Traffic Law being regarded as more serious than offenses under the Penal Code. Those manslaughter things is already accepted under the Penal Code. So I would like to move a further amendment that subsection (a) be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you explain again, what is it in respect of Traffic Law offenses which cannot now be the subject of a suspended sentence?

SEN. MATHIAS: Mr. Chairman, it says that the power to suspend a sentence may not be exercised for any offense against the Traffic Law save for offenses against Sections 511(1) or 70. This means that the court has only power to exercise to Traffic offenses to suspend a sentence when it is a mandatory for an offense contrary to the section for obtaining a license or driving while disqualified, or Section....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Contrary to driving while disqualified

SEN. RICHARD J. DOGGETT: Sen. Eck, would the law as it presently stands that the court can suspend a sentence which is mandatory under the law of driving while disqualified.

SEN. D. EDWARD HEMMER: Then it cannot suspend...

SEN. DOGGETT: It sounds like it has got to the second one, Howard.

SEN. MICHAEL J. HALLIGAN: I suspect that in 1979 the Legislature were put in the wrong way round at that time.

SEN. D. EDWARD HEMMER: It does not make sense to me, Sir. That is why I think that it should be changed.

SEN. RICHARD J. DOGGETT: It was brought to the attention of the Senate by their own officers...

SEN. DOGGETT: What is the second?

SEN. RICHARD J. DOGGETT: The second offence in respect of which I presume the court can wholly suspend a sentence is Section 53 of the Traffic Law which says:-

> "Whosoever - which pertains to females, you know -
>
> (a) attempt, wash, female, or attempt to be named, dies; or
> (b) makes or has in his possession anything necessary

which is said with language:

> " or
> to make any false statement or withhold information in order to obtain, or
> (a) renew either holder of registration or privilege, any certificate, permit, license, or other document, is guilty of an offence and is punishable upon summary conviction with a fine not exceeding $100 or with imprisonment for a term not exceeding 30 days or with both, or upon indictment, with a fine not exceeding $500 or with imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or both."

I would point in reinforcing the interpretation on the normal freedom in relation to the Traffic Law personally.

SEN. H. NORMAN ZONTEK: Mr. Chairman, maybe I am misunderstanding this but when I read this I got the impression that it was different between traffic offences and more serious traffic offences. I think that we should be careful that we do not allow many serious traffic offences to be included in this section.

SEN. DOGGETT: Yes, I think that the trouble is that the law as it presently stands is allowing the courts to suspend sentences which are otherwise mandatory, because maybe the whole code is wrong. In enacting the Legislature back in 1979, the consequences were... I think that is going to be difficult to work this out and get it straight.

MR. D. EDGAR HARRIS: I think that the best thing to do is to just drop it and forget about it, Sir, while I mention that the history of offences in this country has been that the more offences one could even remote were either against the Highway Act or against the Traffic Act, everything else was looked at as a different light. I think that it is time to restore the traffic offences to their rightful misdemeanour status and not....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are most of the more serious type of traffic offence like causing death by dangerous driving or driving while disqualified offences under the Traffic Act or under the Penal Code or something else?

MAJ. MICHAEL J. ZIMMERN: The Traffic Act, Mr. Chairman, causing death by dangerous or reckless driving, reckless and dangerous driving, careless driving, driving while disqualified are all in the Traffic Act as offences which are dealt with by the Traffic Court. The only ones which one can give exceptional sentences for are the ones which I mentioned, namely dangerous and driving while disqualified.

MR. D. EDGAR HARRIS: Which carry mandatory sentences?

MAJ. MICHAEL J. ZIMMERN: In respect of the second offence, driving while disqualified it is a mandatory sentence. Whoever drives while disqualified is guilty of an offence and shall on summary conviction be sentenced to six months hard labour for a term not exceeding two years, and in addition to such punishment shall be disqualified from holding any vehicle for a period of two years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Assuming, as the Bill now stands, the Court could impose that mandatory sentence but that would be? Whereas it could not impose a suspended sentence in respect of careless driving.

MR. D. EDGAR HARRIS: Not for dangerous driving. Not even for causing death, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not even for causing death.

MAJ. MICHAEL J. ZIMMERN: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, whether that is a widely declared or not, those that had the misfortune of the Traffic Law suspended sentences like in Singapore, I will undertake that the Bench to take up the matter with the Traffic Department, and see if I can ascertain whether there is any good reason why that law be so framed.

MR. D. EDGAR HARRIS: They are going to move with it because it is framed so.

MAJ. MICHAEL J. ZIMMERN: Not only that, Sir, but I think that is the declaration of the Member to go through every Traffic Bill with a view to remove some harsh provisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I certainly believe it is time that some of the Traffic Law is under review. I should like a little enlargement on the full effect of what it may not legally do. Now, particularly when it is not really understood why the present law stops what it does and certainly it is a possibility to find out. I think that it might be wiser to accept the undertaking that the Member will look at and that legislation will be brought in so that it would not have a mixed patchwork effect. Secondly, it is just a question of what exactly it would be wiser to do.

MR. R. DONALD NICOLL: I will accept that, Sir.

MRS. MICHAEL J. HOOPER: Then, Mr. Chairman, perhaps my motion is unnecessary....

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right.

MR. R. DONALD NICOLL: I will withdraw the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, so the question now before the Committee is that Clause 8 stand part, and perhaps I had better read it again, by adding -

"8. And be further amended in subsection (2) by -

(a) adding "and" at the end of paragraph (a);
(b) deleting paragraph (b); and
(c) redesignating paragraph (c) as paragraph (b)".

The effect of that has I think been fully explained to Members.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT PROPOSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not received any further amendments to Clause 8 so the next question is that Clause 8 as amended do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 8 AS AMENDED ORDERED.

NEW CLAUSE 9. INSERTION OF NEW SECTION 33A.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 9 do stand part of the Bill and in respect of Clause 9 there are three amendments standing earlier in the name of the Honourable Second Official Member in a table which must stand on the first day, and there is another amendment which is on the green sheet of paper as the amendment to Clause 9 which we have just discussed. Of the various amendments, one is to subsection (2) of the newly inserted 33A, one is to subsection (3) and another is to subsection (5). So I will take them in that order if I may. That is to say I will take first the amendment which is to subsection (2) of the proposed new section 33A. Maybe the Honourable Second Official Member would be kind enough to move that now?

MRS. MICHAEL J. HOOPER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I beg to move that Clause 9 be amended by the deletion in the sixth line of subsection (2) of the words to be inserted section 33A, of the words "shall" and the substitution therefor of the word "must".

This is a very minor technical amendment which makes it clear that the normal procedure is that the owner shall not be required to surrender his certificate of registration but that he must forward it with the notice following subsection 2(a)(i). It just strengthens slightly the meaning of the words in the subsection. It will then read:-

"A surrender under, as defined in subsection (2), shall require that the certificate held by the registered owner be surrendered to the Registrar."

This is subject to the making of special regulations not to be in the following subsection.

MR. SMITHSON: Ok a very minor point in case it should any Member, the paper which went around a while ago giving notice of the amendment, said that Clause 3 should be moved by the deletion of the first line of subsection (4). This must be referred to the white copy. You must cut the right line today because it is the clerk then on the green copy.

Does anybody want to speak to that amendment?

HON. PETER D. SEARLE: What I am not quite clear on, Mr. Chairman, is whether the amendments proposed further to amend, that the amendments you have moved of his just completed statements. That is, "subject to the provisions of subsection (4)" or whatever? The notice I have does not help me on it....

MR. H SEARLE HIGGS: If he does not mind that on it....

HON. MICHAEL J. SHADDICK: No, it was just my explanation of what happens in the machinery of the court's procedures.

MR. SMITHSON: It is not necessary to say it because subsection (4) of the Clause as printed provides for the point.

MR. H. SEARLE HIGGS: Mr. Chairman, is changing the word "may" to "shall" does not also cancel subsection (4), if it says that it "shall" mean the same thing as "may" means.

HON. MICHAEL J. SHADDICK: The notice to what the wording of the notice might be it should be in the proper still, however it says in pursuance of which any time the offender commits another offence. Your subject to subsection (4), a competent court, or failing to subsection (4), may exercise some of the powers". Therefore, then, subsection 4) goes on to say:-

> "If the court, notwithstanding the aforesaid provision of the opinion that, in view of all the circumstances which have arisen since the order was made, it would be unjust to exercise the part of the aforesaid power, it shall otherwise exercise a lesser part or decline, with reasons stated, the decision to make no order under the subsection".

What the subtraction of "shall" for "may" does also is to make it clear that the normal course is to exercise the powers, but the circumstances which I am seeking to make it so may otherwise grant the court's rights under subsection (4) for different reasons to somebody or anybody fail to exercise it.

MR. H. SEARLE HIGGS: As long as it does not take away that discretion I am happy with it.

HON. MICHAEL J. SHADDICK: No, it does not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, it was in fact, I think I am right in saying, the discretion which suggested the amendment.

HON. MICHAEL J. SHADDICK: Yes, and one of the advantages which it has is that each person liable also to a suitable legal discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, I will put that question that Clause 3 be amended in the proposed new subsection (2).

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT I AGREED.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: May I now move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 3 be amended by the deletion, in the first line of paragraph (a) of subsection (3) of the newly to be inserted section 23, of the word "by" and the substitution therefor of the word "in".

As proposed it will read that the Bill

"may be dismissed, cannot now be challenged on any basis",

the more correct wording be:-

"cannot be challenged on any basis".

I should have asked more just to do a typographical error but I apologise....

MR. CHAIRMAN: (INTERPOSED): It is a very technical, legal point.

I will put the question that Clause 3 be amended in the manner just indicated.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT IT PASSED.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Subsection (7). I would now be move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 3 be amended by the deletion, in the penultimate line of paragraph (a) of the newly to be inserted section 23, of the word "Ministerial" and the substitution therefor of the word "ecclesiastic".

As proposed, it says:-

"For the purposes of this section, a nominee of [illegible] issued in an affidavit in support with an order under subsection (2) shall be treated as having been granted [illegible] by the court by which he was [illegible] nominated."

I note, it has been suggested by the Judiciary that the technically correct word ought to be to put by which he was originally nominated instead of "ecclesiastic" mentioned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT TO BILL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We move now to the amendment to Clause 3 which was included on this morning's Bill.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: I would ask leave of the Chair to move Members supplementary notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I granted that permission.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 3 of the Bill be amended in subsection (2) by -

(a) deleting paragraph (b); and
(b) substituting paragraph (a) as paragraph (b).

MRS. MICHAEL F. DIMOND (Continued): Mr. Chairman, if I may continue what we planned on to be on the queue still where do we go to amend a sentence under the Statute of Drug Use (Revised). The object of this amendment as Committee Whips is to delete the non-applicability of partially suspended sentences to offenses under the Statute of Drug Use so the term mentioned in the amendment by Clause 2 did do to wholly suspended sentences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would it be fair to say that the understanding which you gave to the Committee to look into the question of amending the present Alcoholic Beverages Control Act, the applicability of offenses under the Seattle Law-Wholly suspended sentences would have to respect of partially suspended sentences also? In other words even though we pursue the proposed new language in lieu of the proposed subsection (2) and thereby continue under Seattle offenses, you will look into the question of whether...

MR. MICHAEL J. PEABODY: I am happy to give that understanding, Mr. Chairman, the intention to partially suspended sentences as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question, Counselors, is that Clause 2 be amended in subsection (2) as explained by the honorable Senator Michael Peabody. Unless someone wishes to speak I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: ADOPTED. AMENDMENT IS CARRIED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question now, Counselors, is that Clause 2 be amended in the four separate ways which the Committee has agreed should form part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AS FOUR TIMES AMENDED AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3. SUSPENSION OF DRIVER'S LICENSE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 3 do stand part of the Bill. I will put the question.

MR. M. MACKENZIE BIGGS: Mr. Chairman, on my debate, Sir, I do notice that Clause 3 was something which I assume was accepted. For, I think it was Clause 4. This deals with the enforcement by distress warrant of fines.

Mr. Chairman, for the record I just want to point out that I am objecting this section because it talks about there to be one fine system take away a bicycle. I am just using simple language here so that everybody understands what I am talking about. If a person is caught stealing a bicycle without a light, he is charged a fine and cannot pay it, his bicycle cannot be taken away from him. It is very simple, Mr. Chairman, but it would cause further inconvenience if it is not changed I cannot support it.

MR. G. BRUCE CHOUINARD: Mr. Chairman, it is much worse than that. Widows have disqualified because they could not pay fines.

HON. MICHAEL J. PEABODY: And if it was a fine section they should.

MR. M. MACKENZIE BIGGS: You are talking about this decision but what about if somebody is caught with one ounce of pot, and cannot pay the fine if it is taken to court?

MRS. MITCHELL J. CHESLEY: May I remind businessmen Members that the penalties have never been such that default is made the right reason to warrant for the levy of bank fines or other sum on the movable or immovable property by distress and I should be glad to say that the court should have power to levy the warrant, if it believes expedient to do so, postpone the issue of the warrant until such time and on such conditions, if any, as it thinks just. The magistrates could in short the court could say, "Right we shall not issue you the warrant. We shall postpone it until you are back at work and able to pay". It is not mandatory that distress should be the method of enforcement. It is up to the court.

DR. F. MORGAN AUSU: Mr. Chairman, I am not throwing any aspersions on our good judges in this land. However, we must look at the future, Sir, and what could happen. We could give someone bail and check it says "pay", they might just do it for a period of months on just reading out rights as a lawyer.

MRS. JACQUELINE C. FYNN: Mr. Chairman, I should further point out also on the statutory section 24 of the Penal Code, enforcement warrant, it is already possible to levy against the property, Sir. This is only reinforcing it and giving the procedure as to how to enforce the provision to already there as I see it.

DR. F. MORGAN AUSU: On further point sir, Mr. Chairman, just because it is in the Penal Code I am asking and saying that it should be enforced. That section should be taken out because I do not agree with it. It is wide. Its scope is very wide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What the Member is saying is that it is in the Law already.

MR. LAMPTEY A. OKERTEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Committee should direct Counsel to look at the Section 24(2)(b) because it does go on to say:-

"Provided that if the sentence provides that on default of payment of the fine the offender shall be imprisoned, and if such person has undergone the whole of such imprisonment in default, he cannot again be imprisoned unless for special reasons."

MR. EDWIN A. ADAMS: That does not cover what I said.

MR. LAMPTEY A. OKERTEY: Mr. Chairman, I may have misunderstood the Member but I think that he was really suggesting here that the Supreme Court should be looked at instead of a fine, because that Section 24(2)(b) states that there could be imprisonment in lieu of a fine.

MRS. MIRIAM J. ERASMUS: Mr. Chairman, if I may say, my understanding of the present section 24(2)(b) is that the provision says that if you have served your imprisonment that you cannot be double punished by saying the Supreme Court we will impose some penalty. If I am fined $1,000 with an default three months' imprisonment and I have been in prison for the three months, then there is no other function to distress for the $1,000.

MR. LEONARD A. STADNICK: Mr. Chairman, while it is entirely the point we're making. I don't think it is reasonable irresponsible for this amendment to impose on an individual, to deprive him of his rights of having [illegible], if he feels that he wants to spend the time in prison, until about to have his assets taken by the Veterans Government. I do not, I think that's a very dangerous clause in this bill. I am I said in my debate. I'm afraid that I am not able to support it in its present form. I would like to see some encouragement in it, even though I appreciate the Honorable Second Official Member could then [illegible] I propose [illegible] or the clause 844.(3), also as it may [illegible]. So, I have a lot of faith in the [illegible]. I have no doubt that they will do what is right. However, it still seems to me unreasonable unnecessarily [illegible] of his rights.

MR. NICHOLAS J. SPARAGNA: I do not think really that anybody in our town should be given the authority of having written determination as to how the sentence of the court should be carried out.

MR. DARRYL E. DUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the Honorable Second Official Member just said but I also think that we should look at Section 4.844.(2). It states that:-

> "Where a court has power to issue a writing under subsection (1) it may, if it thinks it expedient to do so, postpone the issue of the warrant until such time as such conditions, if any, as it thinks just".

I think would seem to me that there is a wide open hole, a wide range of possible. If the court does that it is depriving a man of everything he has, especially at that juncture this under just reasons and [illegible] the terms of the warrant. Maybe they can allow the person, and I like it to mean this, either time or double an [illegible] form of payment or something of the sort.

MR. W. MORRISON DUCEY: Where does it say that? It does not say that on the bill.

MR. LEONARD A. STADNICK: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Second Official Member for West may be quite right.

MR. DARRYL E. DUCETT: So you can put?

W. M. MORRISON DUCEY: It is so.

MR. LEONARD A. STADNICK: We may reserve whatever we want to build into this but specifically as it is not stated there. I think that I just came through completely by the Second Vice-Chairman from West. Any of a child having his property taken away because he might not pay a fine, should not be taken too lightly, because that could really [illegible] we might as well. I believe that it has to be very careful that we don't do I mean there is some question under this bill for the [illegible], I believe that it need to be very careful.

MR. W. MORRISON DUCEY: Mr. Chairman, I think that we are not going to get this resolved as the night as will go on. Since I started it I just came to say that I think that it should be withdrawn. I [illegible] happens it is all already to my personal knowledge of who might [illegible] what they think.

SEN. M. MANSFIELD MOVED (CONTINUING): We cannot sit down here when the things we are for are in front of us and talk about thinking and what it might do. Does anybody know what it will do? We are not suggesting anything except that maybe this is the time to look at the figures. This is my amendment today, not what we have had on the Senate; this we might get on the Senate.

SEN. M. HAZE BROWN: Mr. Chairman, if I may have one word. If she could be told about this session, what it is doing is making it clear that the Governor appoints in an alternative to sending the persons to prison. This is what we do not want. It is clear. The sentence on this side does to understand it. It does not apply only to drugs. It could be simple offenses like riding a bicycle without a light. If the person is fined $10, not only the bicycle could be sold but his house could be sold. The question is still valid. I could in my debate yesterday on the day we dealt with this that if is Governor can use for I am concerned. I will not change this, have other forms besides the Governor alone here.

SEN. CHRISTIAN: In that case I will put the question. It remains Senators, the question is that Clause 2 of the stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE TWO: YEAS AND NOES.

SEN. M. MANSFIELD SAID: May we have a division, Mr. Chairman?

DIVISION
NO. 20

AYES

Sen. Dennis R. Becker
Sen. Michael F. Bentley
Sen. Edward C. Heffernan
Sen. Benson D. Hughes
Sen. K. Norman Swanson
Sen. Capt. Charles L. Winkenwerder
Sen. Vernon G. Nelson
Sen. Dennis E. Owens
Sen. Bobby R. Richmond

9

NOES

Mr. M. Mansfield Wood
Mr. Clifford A. Simonsen
Mr. C. Kelly Snider
Mr. D. Edward Miller

4

SEN. M. MANSFIELD MOVED: I know what he would say, Mr. Chairman.

I withdraw part of the Bill. I second the motion carried. Clause

CLAUSE 2 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

NEW CLAUSE 3. ... AMENDMENT OF SECTION 20.

SEN. CHRISTIAN: Notice was given of one Committee Stage Amendment to Clause 3 by the Honourable Second Official Member, and I will ask him to move his amendment now.

MR. EDWARD F. REILLY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 be amended on paragraph (a), by the deletion of the words "a permit" in the last line thereof and the substitution therefor of the words "a ticket".

Mr. Chairman, as I explained in my Second Reading speech proposing this Bill, in view of all the other provisions in the Bill I think that it is unnecessary to have a penalty period of such a large magnitude for fines exceeding $7,000. I am happy to reduce it to what it was and in the alternative I am merely proposing the deletion of "a permit" in default.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that Clause 6 be amended in the manner just outlined by the Honourable Second Opposition Member. I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question now is that Clause 6 as amended do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 6 AS AMENDED PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 8. INSERTION OF NEW SECTION 314.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 8 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: YEAS AND NOES.

MR. G. ALEC BROOKS: Mr. Chairman, may I have a division please?

DIVISION NO. 26

YEAS	NOES
Hon. Donald R. Foster	Mr. G. Alec Brooks
Hon. Michael J. Breslin	
Hon. Thomas C. McPherson	
Hon. W. Ronald Dodsen	
Lt.-Col. Charles S. Richmond	
Hon. Russel G. Johnson	
Mr. K. McNeil Hunt	
Hon. Stephen D. Cassidy	
Hon. Sanford A. Pinsent	
Hon. Shirley S. Richmond	
Mr. E. Ronald Wilson	
11	1

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried. Clause 8 agreed to.

CLAUSE 8 AGREED TO UNANIMOUSLY.

CLERK: CLAUSE 7. INSERTION OF NEW SECTIONS 35A AND 35B.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 7 do stand part of the Bill.

AMENDMENT PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 7 AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR AN ACT TO AMEND THE PENAL CODE (CAP 10 OF 1930).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause do stand part of the Bill.

AMENDMENT PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE WAS AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon Ali a Bill for a Law to amend the Penal Code (Amended). In respect of it I have two Notice of Amendments, both to be moved by the Attorney-General officially, notice of which have given respectively on the 8th and the 22nd May. They affect Clauses 2 and 5, and 8 and 12 of the Bill. Since the notice has been given there is no need for special leave and we can take them up now order to that.

THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

AMENDMENT PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

AMENDMENT PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

HON. G. KATO NDIWA: May I have a division please, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On Clause 2?

HON. G. MULI MUSYOKA: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly if you wish.

HON. G. MULI MUSYOKA: Oh, I am sorry it is Clause 3 I seek.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought that it was probably Mr. Kato that was wanted the division. So no division on Clause 2, is that all?

Clause 3, there is already notice of two Amendments and I will invite the Honourable Second Official Member to move it.

HON. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 of the Bill be amended in paragraph (a) thereof by -

(a) the deletion of the word "this" in the first line thereof; and
(b) the deletion of the word "Minister" in the third line thereof and the substitution thereof of the word "Act".

This again is a minor technical improvement in the language of the introductory part of this clause which has been suggested by the Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question then is that Clause 3 of the Bill be amended in the manner just moved by the Honourable Senator Official Leader. I will put that amendment.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question now is that Clause 3 as amended do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED ON DIVISION.

HON. C. WALTER BOSLEY: May I have a recital, Mr. Chairman?

DIVISION
NO. 41

AYES.

Hon. Deenie A. Beaton
Hon. Michael J. Brayley
Hon. Thelma C. Jefferson
Hon. Ernest D. Shanks
Sen. E. Adams Sobey
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Whitmore
Hon. Russell S. Johnson
Hon. Daphne E. Ormsby
Mr. Clifford L. Pitcock
Capt. Abby S. Wimbrough

11

NOES

Mr. K. Wallace Bull
Mr. T. Kelly Carlson
Mr. L. Leonard Miller

3

CLAUSE 3 AS AMENDED AGREED TO ON DIVISION.

CLERK: CLAUSE 4. INSERTION OF NEW SECTION 6A.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 4 do stand part of the Bill. However, I have apologies to the Committee because when I was mentioning the amendments that is to be proposed to this Bill, I forgot to mention because I have previously misplaced the piece of paper which I have now surfaced again, a Committee Stage amendment, on the Parliamentary Committee Stage amendments all affecting Clause 4 which the Second Student Member for Georgetown has sought permission to move. Firstly, I grant him leave to move them although the correct notice for which Standing Order 42(7) provides has not been given. Secondly, I hope that I am right in saying to that noble Member here had the advantage, as I have, of getting the written notice.

MR. LORENZO A. PIERCOW: Yes, Sir, they were listed several.

MR. D. EDWARD HOLLAND: Mr.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some Members seem to have come. Some Members seem not to have come. If any Member does not have a call, perhaps the Clerk.

MR. LORENZO A. PIERCOW: They were passed around by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it may be that somebody has registered or left one. I think that the Electoral Member for North Main has left his.

MR. DEMOCRAT D. EDWARDS: Did the Member vote who those away his amendments? (INAUDIBLE).

MR. D. EDWARD HOLLAND: He the Member presumably we are going to support it, or might?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member like formally to move the amendments now?

MR. LORENZO A. PIERCOW: Mr. Chairman, I move that Clause 4 of the Bill be amended by the addition, in each of its sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of Section 84,(1), of the words, "beyond reasonable doubt", after the word "proved" as it appears in the first line of each sub-paragraph.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to speak explaining the amendment?

MR. LORENZO A. PIERCOW: Mr. Chairman, in my remarks yesterday I expressed concern regarding paragraph (d) (i) of the Bill. I think that I was quite explanatory in my presentation that I would again mention here that my wondering of these sub-paragraphs would not be sufficient in my opinion to cover beyond any reasonable doubt whether a person in fact has such a controlled drug in his possession. Under this section "possession of prohibited, and knowledge of prohibited drugs", I feel that it is most appropriate Sir, that the words "beyond reasonable doubt" should be added after proved in each of the sub-paragraphs.

MR. DENNIS E. FORDE: I cannot see that it adds anything to it Sir. Either it is proved or it is not proved, one of the two. It is not a matter of "beyond reasonable doubt" at all. It is either proved or it is not proved.

MR. MITCHELL J. BRATHWAITE: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the advantage, if there is an advantage in the amendment moved by the Honourable Second Elected Member for George Town is that it makes it quite clear that the standard of proof, separated from the prosecution is the same criminal standard, which is beyond a reasonable doubt, in contradistinction to the balance of presumption which is the civil one on the balance of probabilities. I cannot also for the Honourable Mover of the Bill that I personally have no great objections to this amendment.

MR. DENNIS E. ROBERTS: I do not have any objection either, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHILDRESS: It seems to me that there's some personality conflict, although I'm not absolutely sure that it changes anything substantive. However, it will help to clarify the issue the president explains.

SEN. CAPT. CHARLES L. KINSOLVING: Mr. Chairman, I think that it strengthens the Bill and I think that it will satisfy other members.

MR. CHILDRESS: In that case, I will withdraw my proposal and I would propose adoption by the agreement of the Committee, to insert it as one amendment. Mr. Tapia, technically it is fine or else we can make a different amendment. However, if the Assembly as Committee agrees in each case and since the motion has made it one amendment I think that we can just do it as one.

The question then is that Clause 8 of the Bill be amended as the amendment proposed by the Second Elected Member for Belize Town.

MOTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. LINFORD A. PIERCE: Mr. Chairman, may I have a Division please?

DIVISION
NO. 43

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Michael F. Fonseca	Mr. D. Edmond Hunter	Hon. Dominic W. Espat
Hon. Eleanor C. Jeffreson		Mr. O. Rene Godfrey
Hon. Dennis O. Rhoda		
Hon. W. Brenan Godden		
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kinsolving		
Hon. Joseph C. Wilson		
Mr. V. Alphonso Usher		
Hon. Sophie L. Garbett		
Mr. Linford A. Pierce		
Capt. Henry G. Richardson		
10	2	2

AMENDMENT PASSED BY MAJORITY.

MR. CHILDRESS: The question was....

MR. V. ALPHONSO USHER: Mr. Chairman, before we move from this clause, I want to say that I just voted for that amendment because I do agree, in my opinion, make it a little bit better than it was. Before it said, 'where it is practical' and now it is going to say 'practical beyond reasonable doubt'. So it does make it a little bit better because, Mr. Chairman, the whole thing was that we are presumably innocent as guilty....

SEN. DENNIS W. ESPAT: No, Sir, you have proven them guilty, Sir. It is proved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now turning to Clause 2 as amended, so you will have a chance to vote on Clause 2 as amended. The first thing you voted for the amendment does not oblige you, if that is what you were wondering, to vote for the clause as amended.

MR. M. MONTEITH (Perth): Yes, it does make it a little bit confusing, Mr. ...

MR. MICHAEL F. BRADLEY: Well, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, since I think not committed the honourable member of the Mill. But maybe he would try and make the Second Electoral Member for West Lip a little more happier about it if I suggested a further amendment.

MR. M. MONTEITH (Perth): If it be good, yea, the honourable member will make me happy. However, if it be bad he might as well save it to himself.

MR. MICHAEL F. BRADLEY: Then so, sir, that in the Second Electoral Member expressed concern at the practicality of the registration requirements of documents of title and other particular documents.

At the moment it says:

"(c) shows to the knowledge that a person has the possession or custody or under his control -

(i) any document of title relating to anything constructed or manufactured wholly or partly outside Australia; or

(ii) any other document or writing or printed matter relating to anything constructed or manufactured wholly or partly outside Australia,

he shall be guilty, unless the contrary be proved, that such person was in possession of such thing."

Although as I said in my second Reading speech that there are provisions contained in relation to the registration, which would be unaware of the part of members, I personally would have no objection if inserted at the end (c) or (d) paragraphs there we put in a short list of particular types of documents. In this respect I was thinking of a dock warrant, a warehouse warrant or order, a baggage receipt or a baggage claim, which will have the disadvantage from the point of view of the registration that it will have to be applicable only to these particular types of documents. However, I think it is these extremely limited types of documents which the main cause would be, if the Commonwealth Member requires the information to be that he had no great objection to this I would try to formulate some words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we...

MR. DAVIES (Kalgoorlie): What about a bill of lading?

MR. MICHAEL F. BRADLEY: Or a bill of lading, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that we have to first resolve the new when normally we break for lunch.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Interpreted): I already will wish to give leave for the introduction of an amendment which has not been received in writing and circulated because I have ultimately Members that those amendments should be in writing and circulated and I would not want to have....

MR. M. MOHAMED ZUBIR: Mr....

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, let us finish and that shall have been my. I would not wish to make any rule for one and not another. I think that if we have exhausted proceedings until 5.30 p.m. that may give an opportunity for a written amendment to be prepared, and Members can then consider and debate it.

So, I will not venture there is something which needs anyway before the business proceedings....There will be further opportunities to debate this although the amendments to it after we resume.

MR. M. MOHAMED ZUBIR: Sir, Sir, I was just going to comment on what you have anyway about the amendment. I am both quite pleased by my client, Sir, but in the Legal Meeting we had in March I know that there came a list of investments passed which some just arrived and have not in written papers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know and....

MR. M. MOHAMED ZUBIR: If I can remember. I thought we have all a principle and now we have assistance may flow to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that we can politely take from it because I come to the conclusion that if we really can face to Members and making, unavoidable difficulty for them by the way in the only issue some something cause in writing.

So, let us suspend proceedings until approximately 5.30 p.m.

AT 12.40 P.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

COMMITTEE RESUMED AT 5.32 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed.

I hope that all Members of the Committee now present are. We may be reassured by the end of the afternoon. (LAUGHTER). I am sorry to keep Members waiting. I think that all Members have probably now received copies of a Tanzanian Consulting Engineering which was mentioned just before we broke for lunch, and which the Honourable Second Official Member was very kindly leave to move. I think I have probably indicated but I was anxious that I propose to grant him the necessary leave in connection with the provisions of Standing Order 52(2), despite the fact that the amendment may not be in writing if the amendment was not given.

I will invite him to move the amendment now.

MR. BENJAMIN J. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, may I move that Clause 4 of the Bill be amended in paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of the proposed new Clause 56, by -

(a) deleting the hyphen at the end of the third item;

(b) substituting "a dock warrant, warehouse warrant or goods, bonded receipt or baggage warrant, or bill of lading or other similar document relating to anything containing a controlled drug," for the fourth to ninth items.

Mr. Chairman, as I attempted to explain just before our lunch adjournment, the Member has expressed a certain amount of unease concerning what they believe to be the inclusiveness of the provision relating to any document of title or to any other document or printed matter relating to anything containing a controlled drug, and while I was of the opinion that the said words this particular paragraph ought to remain relevant simply to items commonly referred to as baggage and freight being brought into the jurisdiction, that position is an inclusive one I would be happy to make this amendment inadvertently narrowing the type of document it which is included, whilst at the same time recognizing, if the Committee feels that the very remoteness of it makes it unenforceable, as most other pieces of it are under ordinary the Clause may wish to delete the matter before the Clause.

So, Mr. Chairman, would I move the mover's permission, move this amendment to Clause 4?...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 4 of the Bill be amended in the manner just moved by the Honourable Second Official Member. I will put that question.

SECTION AGREED. AMENDMENT AS PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 4 has now been amended, and in the manner proposed by the Second Elected Member for Georgetown, which was in fact a series of five, I think, separate but identical amendments to five paragraphs of a subsection, and once as just agreed to respectively by the Honourable Second Official Member in respect of, I suppose to sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of the new Section 56.

The next question, Mr. Speaker, is whether Clause 4 as amended in these two respects should stand part of the Bill. I will put that question.

SECTION 5(1): AYES AND NOES.

MR. G. LEACH WILLIS: May we have a division, Sir?

MR. S. SAID HUSSEIN: May we have a division please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FRANCIS J. RANKIN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder before the Clerk takes the division if I could just have a word with the Honourable Second Official Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sure you could have a...

Sir S. BYRON WILSON: They have to come now, Sir, they already voted.

Mr. G. MAIN (GOOLWA): In that case, Mr. Chairman, we need not have those votes. (LAUGHTER).

Mr. D. BRYAN WILSON: They have already committed themselves.

DIVISION
No. 22

AYES	NOES
Hon. Donald A. Dunstan	Mr. W. Rodoreda Casey
Hon. Mitchell J. Bradley	Mr. G. Main (Goolwa)
Hon. Thomas D. Hoffmann	Mr. S. Byron Wilson
Hon. Jessie G. Edwards	
Hon. M. Norman Ralston	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kilkenny	
Hon. Samuel C. Johnson	
Hon. Norma S. Dervin	
Hon. Milford A. Pearson	
Capt. Henry S. Kilkenny	
12	4

CLAUSE 4 AS PRINTED AGREED TO.

NEW CLAUSE 5. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 12.

Mr. COUMBE: The intention in that Clause 4 (a) stood part of the Bill. However, notice was given of an amendment to Clause 4(a). It is a substitution of a complete new clause. The notice was given on the Blue Map and was, I think, circulated to all Members by the Honourable Leader's Official Member. I will invite him to move the amendment now.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move that Clause 5 of the Bill be deleted and the following new Clause 5 substituted thereto -

"5. Section 12 of the principal Act is amended -

(a) by the deletion, in subsection (2), of the words "shall, on summary conviction, be imprisoned with hard labour for a term not exceeding seven years and in addition shall further be liable to a fine not exceeding $20,000 and in the case of a second or subsequent conviction for any such offence shall be imprisoned with hard labour for a term of not less than six years nor more than ten years and in addition shall further be liable to a fine of not less than $5,000 nor more than $40,000.", and the substitution therefor of the words "shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding twenty thousand dollars or to a term of imprisonment which may extend to, exceeding seven years or to both such fine and imprisonment and, in the case of a second or subsequent

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY (CONTINUING):

conviction for any such offence, be liable to a fine not exceeding twenty thousand dollars or to a term of imprisonment with hard labour not exceeding two years, or to both such fine and imprisonment;";

(b) by the deletion, in subsection (5), of the words "shall, on summary conviction be imprisoned with hard labour for a term of not less than five months nor more than seven years and in addition shall forfeit to Her Majesty not less than $5,000 and without limiting the generality of the foregoing" and the substitution therefor of the words "shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding twenty thousand dollars or to a term of imprisonment with hard labour not exceeding seven years and, in the case of a second or subsequent conviction for any such offence, be liable to a fine without limit or to a term of imprisonment with hard labour not exceeding fifteen years or to both such fine and imprisonment;".

I feel, Sir, there is the danger of the fine to one essential phrase which may have been skipped out. That is why in the best use of quickness

"be liable to a fine", "or to a term of imprisonment",
"or to both such fine and imprisonment".

I see, Sir-

"(a) by the deletion of subsection (5),",

which is over the page. My apologies. I have just been reminded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, the question you would like to put first is of subsection (b)?

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: On the fifth last line. After "shall" it should say, "or to both such fine and imprisonment", it does not seem to be absolutely clear that the last words of the page....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which one are we in? Subsection (5)?

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Subsection (5), yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the fifth last line?

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY:

"with hard labour not exceeding seven years or to both such fine and imprisonment".

What the purpose of this new clause is is, Mr. Chairman, to give this House a guiding decision on behalf of the Government that minimum mandatory jail and minimum mandatory imprisonment should be deleted from the provisions of the Narcotic Bill.

MR. MITCHELL of BURLINGTON (CONTINUING): The point is that even though the Senate's motion to replace provided for the addition of certain words of mandatory application, they still contained the qualifying provision that there are to be certain circumstances which would be an absolute bar to the granting of improvements which would be of a detrimental character. It was on this basis, since it became clear to me as Attorney-General and I knew the responsibility that Mr. Burr, that the interpretation of Government was not going to obtain the clear duty mandatory improvement to give the complete cleanstreak to the south, that this clause should be replaced by the present clause.

The present clause seeks by specifying that in full the areas which were there and the words which will be replacing it, to make it clear what is now before and what it is not. In other words, the courts in the first instance should be able to find up to $50,000 in respect of the seven pieces, or both. In the second instance the person will be liable for a $50,000 fine on the charge or both, and similarly in subsection (3).

MR. SPEAKER: I would welcome guidance on a technical point. If we are replacing a clause and subsequently another one for it do we treat it as an amendment and introduce the amendment and then the clause as amended, which in some matters sometimes, or do we treat it as a new clause which is really in fact, in which case we have before ... it one of them.

MR. MITCHELL of BURLINGTON: I had thought of that, Mr. Burr, but of the choice in the matter had been indistinguishable as an amendment....

MR. SPEAKER: Well, it does not have to be in the amendment really. A new clause in the replacement of a clause which is not in the Bill. I think that at the risk of being a little ridiculous we will have to vote on the amendment and then on the clause as amended which will really be voting on the same thing I am afraid on this occasion. However, I do not see a lot of point in it. It will give some members a chance of our decisions if they like.

The question then is that the amendment to Clause 6 of the Bill, which is the first the substitution of a new Clause 6 should be accepted.

QUESTION PUT: AMENDMENT BY MR. MITCHELL. AMENDMENT AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put as I just explained a further question that Clause 6 as amended stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED BY MAJORITY. CLAUSE 6 AS AMENDED AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 8. INSERTION OF NEW SECTION 24A.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill. I think that there is quite a major printing error at the end of section 24A(2). And some words not inserted unnecessarily. Am I to it that I just do not understand it? It is the last three lines of that page where it says, "applies to be the owner of an otherwise improvement thereby", and then goes on "applies to be heard". I think this is supposed to make sense but it does have a printing error which you can correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN (CONTINUING): Shall we put any amendments to which none has been given in respect of Clause 2 as I will put the question that Clause 2 stands part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. G. WOLF SCHOOL: MR. Chairman, may I move a Division?

DIVISION NO. 32

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Dennis M. Braden	MR. R.Doig Braden	Mr. John Simpson
Hon. Michael F. Bendlay		
Col. Thomas C. Goffinson		
Hon. Ernest G. Shipley		
Hon. M. Duncan Scribner		
Hon. Supt. Charles L.McKenzie		
Hon. Russel C. Johnson		
Dr. W. McKendry Bush		
Hon. Daphne L. Orwell		
Hon. Clifford A. Thomson		
Supt. Bibby & Ashbourne		
Mr. D. Bernard Wolfson		
12	2	1

ORDER'S PASSED BY MAJORITY.

MRS. MICHAEL F. BENDLAY: Mr. Chairman, the point has occurred a few several times in the past but I thought that perhaps I would wait a proper time to get a ruling from the Chair. Under Standing Order 85(5) it says that Members must be registered to by the names of the Electoral Districts for which they have been elected. Is it not strictly more proper that when a roll is taken it be taken by Counties or Electoral Districts rather than by name?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sometimes it has occurred to me that it would seem to be more proper. I believe that the procedure has been of long standing and I did not question it. Maybe some of the older Members will know whether it has always been the practice to vote that?

HON. JAMES D. EDGAR: I think that it is specific in the Standing Order dealing with a division. I am not sure but I believe that it is that they have to be registered so.

MR. D. BERNARD WOLFSON: We can change that in the Standing Orders.

MRS. MICHAEL F. BENDLAY: Check of course to see the question as to when the Official Names should be called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, names by Electoral Districts. They like the Names such as Mr. Smith do they?

CLERK: Yes, they call the names.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Apparently, in our House of Commons practice.

HON. DONALD S. SOSTER: For the last nine years I've been here the question here.

HON. DOUGLAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe that under Standing Order 32(3)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is quite right, Standing Order 32(3), "putting each Member's vote". So it is perfectly correct. My lack of familiarity is ventilated.

CLERK: CLAUSE 5. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 5 do stand part of the Bill. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 5 ACCORDED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 6. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 6 do stand part of the Bill. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 6 ACCORDED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 7. REPEAL OF SECTION 29.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 7 is also the subject of a Committee Stage amendment of which notice was given by the Honourable Liberal Official Member some time ago in a note later than the 72nd Hour, which indicated that he proposed to move that Clause 7 as printed in the Bill be deleted and a different version of it substituted. In other words we have the same situation as we had a few minutes ago in respect of Clause 5. I will invite him to move the amendment.

HON. EDWARD J. RYCKY: I beg to move that the Bill be amended by the deletion of Clause 7 thereof and the substitution therefor of the following new Clause 7 -

> "7. Section 29 of the principal Act is repealed and replaced by the following new section 29 -
>
> "Procedure in respect of certain offences. 29. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this Act, where a person is charged with any offence of, or relating to, dealing in, distributing, supplying, dispensing, storing, keeping a prescription for, administering, selling, exporting, importing, obtaining, possessing, or having in his possession for the purpose of dealing in, any drug that is a narcotic as defined in section 2(1) of the Narcotic Control Act, or any drug that is a hard drug, then such offence shall be deemed, for the purpose of determining the mode of trial, a disclosable offence in accordance with section 2 of the Criminal Procedure Act."

As I attempted to explain, Mr. Chairman, in the Second Reading debate, the present Clause 7 in the Bill by simply seeking to repeal Section 29 of the existing Act has the effect of making all offences' trial summarily.

SEN. RICHARD A. DOYLE: (CONTINUING) despite the longstanding misinterpretation which the Honorable Second Elected Member from Nassau has put to his second Reading speech that I support stopping funds from the Chief Justice to the Legal Department just to take for a power struggle to be waged, the premise in fact was somewhat misunderstood. It was after Mr. Schaefer thought that perhaps a better way to deal with this great backlog difficulty which we had about first and second convictions and the mode of dealing with them by courts, would be to make a right to opt for jury trial apply to the more serious offence whether it be first conviction, second conviction in the case of the offence of peeking, stealing by housebreaking, burglary, etcetera in relation to moral charge where the offence can be punishable by death which by up to twenty years.

It is for this, to save, we give the option for jury trial to a person charged with these offences for which large penalties of imprisonment already exist to provide.

SEN. D. LEWIS HILLOCKS: Mr. Chairman, what exactly does the Honorable Second Official Member mean by "leaving a proposition open"? Is he referring to medical officers leaving propositions for unspecified subsequent ... if it is I do not see the relevance of it being in that clause.

SEN. RICHARD A. DOYLE: Without legal authority, yes. It seems like the best course of these to such a thing.

SEN. D. LEWIS HILLOCKS: That is where I have the difficulty reading the Minister of Second within the law to some degree. Does the Second Member mean we are going to determine that he is a fit person by issuing a presumption for whatever?

SEN. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Without going into too much detail, evidence could be struck off the register and not registered to whether here. A person could purport to issue a presumption, which would be filled. These are illegally issued jury evidence.

SEN. D. LEWIS HILLOCKS: Alright. As long as it covers these areas I am happy with it.

SEN. CHAIRMAN: The question now is that the amendment, Clause 3 on the two pages should read, ... somebody be appointed by the same Chief Justice, Clause 3 be amended in the manner proposed by the Honorable Second Official Member.

AGREED BY: ALL, UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED,

SEN. CHAIRMAN: The question now is that the amended Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

SEN. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: May we have a recorded ... ?

SEN. CHAIRMAN: We have not been asked yet. (LAUGHTER).

SEN. D. LEWIS HILLOCKS: Are you asking for a ... ?

AGREED BY: AYES, AND NOES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... Do you want a division? Yes, very well.

MR. D. DONALD MILLER: ... do they agree they are going after the Senator and not the Government in the aircraft sale?

DIVISION
NO. 22

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis D. Foster	
Hon. Michael J. Bradley	
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Hon. Benjamin D. Brooks	
Hon. M. Norman Dodson	
Hon. Capt. Charles T. Kirkconnell	
Hon. Vincent C. Johnson	
Mr. M. Matthews Black	
Hon. Stanley A. Grayson	
Mr. Lanford A. Peacock	
Hon. Henry D. Blankenship	
Mr. R. Craig Sanders	
Mr. D. Donald Miller	
Mr. John B. Hudson	
14	8

CLAUSE 9 AS AMENDED PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 10. EXEMPTION OF NEW SERVICE BY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question on this Clause 10 is stand part of the Bill. I will put the question.

DIVISION BELL: AGREED. CLAUSE 10 PASSED.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: I think that the existing numbering can be regarded as a reasonable question. They could not be quite sure but that the same people do pass it.

MR. D. DONALD MILLER: Test of confidence.

CLERK: CLAUSE 11. AMENDMENT OF FIRST SCHEDULE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 11 do stand part of the Bill.

DIVISION BELL: AGREED. CLAUSE 11 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 12. AMENDMENT OF SECOND SCHEDULE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 12 do stand part of the Bill. However, before that question is debated I draw to Members' attention that notice has been given by the Honourable Second Official Member on the 23rd May in the name proper which gave notice of an amendment to Clause 8, that he intended to move an amendment to Clause 12 of the Bill. I will invite him to move that amendment now.

MRS. MARGARET J. PRIESTLY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Clause 12 of the Bill be amended -

(a) by substituting"; or" for the full-stop at the end of paragraph (b) thereof; and

(b) by the addition, immediately after paragraph (b), of the following new paragraph -

"(c) by the deletion in the fourth sub-section thereof (Wednesday) of the numerals "21" where they first occur in respect of the offence of Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, etc., and the substitution therefor of the numerals "14".".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 12 of the Bill be amended in the manner moved by the Honourable Second Principal Member. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question now is that Clause 12 as amended stand part of the Bill. I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 12 AS AMENDED PASSED.

NOTE: A BILL FOR A TAX TO RAISE THE WEIGHT OF LOAVES AND CERTAIN

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. TITLE AND ENACTING

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our next item is the Committee Stage of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1968. In respect of this Bill, so far as I can ascertain, I have only been given notice of one proposed Committee Stage amendment. That notice was given earlier today by the Second Elected Member for West Bay. It is an amendment to the Schedule. In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 51(2) I accept that I have granted leave to him to move the amendment when the Bill comes, despite the fact that he has not given the customary six days' notice. However, my understanding is that all Members have had a typed copy of his proposed amendments, and that therefore they have had that amount of notice of it.

THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1968

(PROPOSED AMENDMENT)

CLAUSE: CLAUSE 1, SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 5. INTERPRETATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 5 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 5 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 6. PROHIBITED PERSONS AND OTHER CERTIFICATES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 6 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 6 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 7. EFFECT OF REGISTRATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 7 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 7 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 8. REGISTRATION VOIDING FOR PARTICULAR OFFENCES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 8 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 8 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 9. REGISTRATION VOIDING APPLICABLE TO A CORPORATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 9 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 9 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 10. EXEMPTIONS OF REGISTRATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 10 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 10 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 11. DEFAMATION ACTIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 11 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 11 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 12. UNKNOWINGLY SUPPLYING OF COPIES OF CERTIFICATES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 12 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 12 AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO ESTABLISH...

HON. DENNIS C. CHAIRMAN: It should be the Schedule.

CHAIR: Schedule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Schedule of stand part of the Bill. As I mentioned earlier Action may be taken by a proposed amendment to the Schedule which I am sure the Second Elected Member for West Bay is to move.

MR. E. MILTON SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move this amendment. I think it was made very clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you read the amendment out first for Members?

MR. E. MILTON SCOTT: Yes, it is that the words.... I beg to move the amendment to the Schedule, section 6(3) that the words "equal parts" as they appear in the seventh line of the Schedule be deleted and substituted therefor by the words "five seven".

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have said all I can in support of my motion that I would like to see this amendment. Sweet seems to be a long time for a young person and I have already given my reasons for wanting it and I feel that it should be there. I do not propose to take up any more time. I will just ask for the vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will put the question that the Schedule be amended in the manner proposed by the Second Elected Member for West Bay.

QUESTION PUT: AYES....

MR. ROBERT O. EBANKS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that you were going to ask if anyone else had any debate on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I am sorry. I looked around to see whether anybody wanted to debate.

MR. E. MILTON SCOTT: Perhaps I did not look for some reason. In that case....

MR. E. MILTON SCOTT: It is too late, the vote has gone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that inadvertently has occurred. I can only apologize to the Member. I did not mean to be bent out of his opportunity to speak. We have multiplied the ayes already.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. E. MILTON SCOTT: May we have a division, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that we had better have a division because I would not like to....

MR. E. MILTON SCOTT: We only had two ayes and one no.

MRS. EDNOOD C. EBANKS: No, I beg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I heard one aye and one no.

MR. E. MILTON SCOTT: Two ayes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe there were a lot of abstentions.

DIVISION
NO. 47

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Mr. K. McKeown-Cook	Hon. Dennis D. Foster	Mr. Clifford A. Pl...
Mr. J. Edward Miller	Hon. Michael J. Bradley	Mr. G. Craig Sm...
	Hon. Thomas C. Jeffcock	Mr. John F. Mc...
	Hon. Duncan D. Rhodes	
	Hon. W. Noreen Holden	
	Hon. Capt. Charles L. McKeown	
	Hon. Vessel G. Johnson	
	Mr. Daphne L. Orriett	
	Capt. Mabry G. McKeown	
2	9	5

MOTION NEGATIVED: NO SUBSIDY DEFERRED BY MAJORITY.

MR. SPEAKER: We therefore revert to the Minister concerned and I will look around very carefully to see if anybody wishes to speak to this before putting the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. K. McKEOWN-COOK: May I have a division, Sir?

DIVISION
NO. 48

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Dennis D. Foster	Mr. K. McKeown-Cook	Mr. Clifford A. Pl...
Hon. Michael J. Bradley		Mr. G. Craig Sm...
Hon. Thomas C. Jeffcock		Mr. John F. Mc...
Hon. Duncan D. Rhodes		
Hon. W. Noreen Holden		
Hon. Capt. Charles L. McKeown		
Hon. Vessel G. Johnson		
Hon. Daphne L. Orriett		
Capt. Mabry G. McKeown		
Mr. J. Edward Miller		
10	1	5

MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY.

MR. K. McKEOWN-COOK: I wonder if the Minister concerned could have a statement from the Government bench why they voted against the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO RECLASSIFY OFFENSES AND RATE AND FIXE RECONSIDER OF ANY SECOND OFFENCE FOR PERIODS OF CRIME TO [illegible] THE UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN CLASSIFIED INFORMATION, TO AMEND THE LAW OF ESPIONAGE AND FOR PURPOSES CONNECTED THEREWITH.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the title and preamble stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE AND PREAMBLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That concludes proceedings on....

MR. RICHARD A. BRYANT: Mr. Chairman, just before the conclusion of the Committee Stage, I wonder if the Honourable Second Official Member would clarify one matter which is still somewhat hazy. First on that minor question of the Schedule of Consequential Bills, I think he mentioned that there was some matter in the Bill which was inserted after the White Paper. I wonder if we could get that clarified?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that I fully understand now. Are you asking whether there was a provision which is [illegible]....?

MR. RICHARD A. BRYANT: Yes, I think that is what should be mentioned. If he could just put the matter right clearly if for the records that Section 5(2) in the green paper will become the same as the white copy? I think that there is...

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are talking about the Schedule of Consequential Bills?

MR. RICHARD A. BRYANT: Yes. I think that is what is [illegible] the matter under discussion of [illegible].

MAJ. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: At the bottom of the page on the newly inserted section for the words, "In the event of an otherwise intervening [illegible]", are repeated in the third and second last line and should be deleted. It is a typographical error. In the third last line which everything from the word "by" to the word "agitator" in the second last line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think [illegible] this amendment is. It is in fact a typing error but it was a matter which [illegible] several and I thought that some Members might have noticed it and felt a bit puzzled.

MR. RICHARD A. BRYANT: Was it correct in the white copy?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think so. No, I think that it was wrong in the white copy now. I have not checked but....

MR. RICHARD A. BRYANT: I assume if it would just show that it was of it also. It is just for the records.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I think that the white copy is [illegible].

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: It is not the previous [illegible]. It is the Legal Department's fault. In the circulated copy it is repeated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, that concludes proceedings in Committee on a Bill entitled the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1965 and other Bills. The House will now resume.

HOUSE RESUMED

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
I think that we might complete the Income stamps before breaking. Yes, Minister on Bills. The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

SECOND READING

HON. MICHAEL O. BROOKS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that a Bill entitled the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1965 has been considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed with two amendments.

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

The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

SECOND READING

HON. MICHAEL O. BROOKS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to report that a Bill entitled "The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1965" was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed with no amendments.

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

The Wages Act (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

THE WAGES ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

SECOND READING

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that a Bill entitled "The Wages Act (Amendment) Bill, 1965" was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed with two amendments.

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

The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1965.

THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1965

SECOND READING

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that a Bill entitled "The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1965" was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendments.

MR. PRESIDENT: The bill is accordingly now open for Third Reading.

I should perhaps that we might have Third Readings too many. This will close all the bills.

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

THIRD READING

TITLE: The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1966.

MR. JOSEPH C. MISQUITTA: Mr. President, I move that a Bill entitled the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1966 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1966 be given a Third Reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. G. MAIR KOOPMAN: Mr. President, may I have a division please?

DIVISION NO. 21

AYES	NOES
Col. Dennis M. Rostron	Mr. T. Hugh Lockhart
Lieut. Michael J. Smedley	Mr. G. Richard Miller
Hon. Thomas S. Jaffarovas	
Hon. Romesh D. Bhooke	
Lieut. K. Thomas Geddes	
Major Capt. Charles F. Kirkconnell	
Hon. Ronald G. Pinheiro	
Lieut. Stephen D. Garrett	
Mr. Winsford A. Pinheiro	
Capt. Henry B. Kirkconnell	

19

AGREED TO UNANIMOUSLY. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

THIRD READING

TITLE: The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1966.

HON. MISQUITTA: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled "The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1966 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill shortly entitled The Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1966 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. E. RAY LUCAS: Mr. President, may I have a division please?

DIVISION
NO. 29

AYES	NAYS
Sen. Dennis E. Boxley	MR. C. Suiz Haddon
Sen. Michael J. Pressley	
Sen. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Sen. Benson O. Brooks	
Mrs. M. Norman Haddon	
M.s. Capt. Charles S. McKennell	
Sen. Russel S. Johnson	
Sen. Daphne I. Ornett	
Dr. Manford A. Pierson	
Capt. Abby S. Kirkconnell	
Mr. E. Samuel Miller	
11	1

ACTION BY MAJORITY: BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING AND AMENDED.

THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

SEN. PERCIVAL G. GIBBONS: Mr. President, I beg to move, Sir, that a Bill shortly entitled "The Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1985 be read a Third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill shortly entitled "The Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

SEN. NICHOLAS J. PRESSLEY: Mr. Speaker, may we have a division?

DIVISION
NO. 30

AYES	NAYS
Sen. Dennis E. Foster	Mr. C. Suiz Haddon
Sen. Michael J. Pressley	
Sen. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Sen. Benson O. Brooks	
Mrs. M. Norman Haddon	
M.s. Capt. Charles S. McKennell	
Sen. Russel S. Johnson	
Sen. Daphne I. Ornett	
Dr. Manford A. Pierson	
Capt. Abby S. Kirkconnell	
Mr. E. Samuel Miller	
11	1

AGREED BY MAJORITY: BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS BILL, 1985.

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1985.

HON. DENNIS O. HARDY: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled "The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1985" be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill shortly entitled "The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, 1985" be given a Third Reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

MR. SPEAKER: I am looking at Standing Orders to see whether the Presiding Officer has the right to call for a division but I am not sure if he has. It is discriminatory. I call the attention of the Select Committee on Standing Orders to this evidence of blatant discrimination against the Physically.

HON. D. DENNIS MILLER: Mr. President, could we have the order that they call the votes mechanically, Sir? I keep getting the feeling that I am not going to get the opportunity to vote.

HON. PRESIDENT: I think that perhaps we had better break off for approximately ten minutes.

AT 3.22 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED.

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3.38 P.M.

HON. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Private Members' Motions. Private Member's Motion No. 18/86. The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 18/85

LIQUOR LICENSING LAW

HON. CAPTAIN L. GERRITT: Thank you, Mr. President. I wish to move Private Member's Motion No. 18/85, which reads as follows:-

MRS. BARBARA A. GREEN (COCONUT GROVE):

"BE IT RESOLVED that Government take immediate steps to introduce the necessary legislation to amend the Liquor Licensing Law, so as to prevent the sale of all alcoholic beverages on Sunday, between the hours of 00.01 hours and 06.00 hours, local time."

CAPT. HARRY S. KITCHINGMAN: Mr. President, I beg to second the motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

MRS. BARBARA A. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. President, I am grateful to be able to speak to this Honourable House on a matter which weighs heavily on my mind. In fact if I were to be more specific it weighs heavily on my very soul.

My reason for bringing this motion which has just been put before the House so calmly because I, like many others in this country, am very much aware of the devastation which is being caused within our society through the excessive use of intoxicants, more often of which is liquor. Liquor is perhaps one of, if not the greatest evil with which mankind has ever been plagued. This evil is fully licensed in our society and I am aware of that, so it is in nearly every society around the world. However, like a cancer the fact that it is there does not stop us from trying to get rid of it. Also not because one's dealing now effects an urgency to suppress and abolish it, and to lessen its devastating effects.

The reason that we have licensed liquor outlets on our Islands does not mean that we are to allow this have to completely change our way of living. We are to preserve as far as possible our cultural ethics, not to let it destroy every fabric of our society.

Mr. President, I am old enough to have known what life was like in the Cayman Islands before liquor was given so much participate in our society. However, I am also young enough to try in whatever way I can to help eliminate this evil. That is exactly what it is. It has been allowed to strike at the roots of the few who benefit from the sale of this despicable commodity. It is bad enough that it was allowed to be sold in so many outlets. However, the fact that we have over the past several years allowed it to be sold on Sunday, our day of rest and worship, and more recently have competed with the neighbouring Government radio stations, again to detour to the pockets of those who being well aware of our laws would go ahead and establish businesses to cater to the sale of liquor while on the sale of either a church, school or public service or all three, and that is why this Honourable House should do its part to stop it.

Mr. President, I have to say it here and now that I was extremely disappointed that it was allowed to happen in this House Sunday by absence in number that that quarter of the House was tempted with. I seek to say here and now that I was extremely disappointed. It need not have been touched. However, I will deal with that at a later stage.

Mr. President, I am aware that with progress, change must come. It inevitably must come. However, the responsibility of this Honourable House and indeed of all our people is to ensure that any change that is allowed to take place within these Islands must be seen, as far as possible, to help enhance them to further the right peace and tranquillity which our people have long been accustomed to.

MRS. DARLENE L. DROST (CONTINUED): The first that extra money can be derived from gambling machines being made is not sufficient reason for doing so. The question must be asked whether such changes be for the ultimate good of our people, both for the present time as well for future generations. Certainly in the case of the sale of liquor the prime consideration must be whether what is gained from the sale of it can compensate for the deterioration and death caused in addition to the many social problems with which we are faced as a result of its use.

As much as I wish that I too could be quick to completely remove this evil from the face of this country, I am not so naive as to believe that I will see it happen, at least not yet. However, I wish to impress upon this Honourable House that many serious ducts be and our country unless we take immediate steps to halt the flow of this road slow in our midst. I feel that it is time that we tell the world that these Islands are not for sale and that there are just certain basic principles which we are not about to have broken down just to enter to the outside world.

Mr. President, there has been strong opposition that we are a secular provincial society and therefore we cannot legislate for morality which would deprive the right to drink at the fingertips anything which could suit his fancy. Why I remind this Honourable House that when tourism started coming here we did not have Bingos on Sundays. In fact there were a lot of activities on which we were restricted on Sundays. I think that where it can be found that certain changes do not interfere with our needs and tranquility on the Lord's day, then we can look at those changes in a different light. However, this cannot be humanly and repeatedly the sale of liquor on a Sunday.

Mr. President, good people fearing God sometimes have to say, "Where do we draw the line", or else they speak out their feelings by saying, "Well I just did not want to get involved. Perhaps we are more guilty of saying this way than speaking that way. The point which we must get quite clear in our minds is that silence in the face of great social problems, public expression on the shows of the weak and helpless is wrong. If we are to be God's servants in this Honourable House, if we are our brothers' keepers we must stand out against the evil which is in our communities. Any other course is cowardly and wrong.

What we must never forget is that living a Christian people in this country carries a heavy responsibility. We who have received so many blessings forget that these carry a heavy burden of responsibility. We must make a conscious choice to do right. Our purpose here is to do good. Since what is evil and how much is good. To have knowledge the active desire of the one loving. Rife involves a conscious rejection of the thing hated.

To know the right means to choose it. To know the evil means to reject it. We have to make these choices. These responsible choices. To choose means good and avoid evil. We must make our choices available to ourselves, so we all agree here this time of the Session is an evil which is pushing out of hand; that the Legislature of Canada is an evil. Then, if we are going to show our people that we are against these evils while they make sure it is our positive forthright action against it. Progress and finality, Mr. President, were not done for less fine words and empty purposes. We offered here to our people and they are expecting us not just to make a response, but to create a right cause of necessity to improve some of the evil trends which have slowly crept into our society.

MRS. LEONARD J. DUNNE (Connecticut): Mr. President, many of the duties recently are based on those words found by Gladstone. We purport to be a free country and the tradition of freedom is so free anywhere else. As the 32nd Honourable House can go a long way in doing that. We have not taken a different attitude. We have not thrown up our hands.

There is one thing which I want to touch with this Honourable House and I wish them to pay this point in their minds, that many of us here claim to be God's children. Whatever work we are called on to do in this world we must do it with His glory and the good of mankind in mind. Anybody entering in this Honourable House with any bad intention and commitment should not be here.

What I want to say, Mr. President, is this. We cannot throw in our hands and say we cannot do anything about it because we have gone on too long but it is getting worse and worse. When this meeting has come to the place where a special license can be issued for a dance party on Seven Mile Beach on Sunday, and I agree to be invited at a food raising effort for a social club, we are getting in a serious state of affairs.

On Sunday just above a year ago most of the finest citizens through a church which they walked across the street to go to a church. Now, Mr. President, what I am saying is this. I brought this in the attention of the Honourable Members of this House to say that maybe then that is going to happen. I have that one days a week until this thing can happen. However, do we rough under God's name, in the name of humanity that even one a Sunday we have to divide the streets with the fear of being destroyed by someone who is under the influence of liquor?

Mr. President, in this country of God's money goes unrecognized. Furthermore, those of us who have been recipients of special blessings, as I mentioned earlier, shall also find ourselves recipients of special judgements. I assure you we are not seeing some of that judgement right now in the form of the many social problems we are unfortunately have. Although the light but we should never forget that the power to do anything does not necessarily make that thing right. It is time to remember that every one of us are answer those who can be found guilty of the time. However, there is been seen our guilty as to our responsibility to make a correction.

Mr. President, we speak of our faith, but the tragedy is that often we do not really wish to apply our faith in life. We fail to recognize that many wise, particularly aged wise and not unlawful. They are fewer among. We take all things made to distinguish between what is legal and what real... among of us. It is quite easy to begin to believe that what one thinks is what God intends. No society will long endure which refuses to meet its social and ethical obligations. Not only must we not capitulate this week, but we must take steps to see that we give complete, unequivocal duty; the absurd, neglected obligation; the work, fulfilling demand, we owe to this Honourable House and we must demand diligence and vigilance of those people. A special obligation is laid upon us to examine the adequate care of the poor, the weak and the helpless. The point we must face is that as the this House have brought the opportunity and the responsibility to look after our people, to listen to them. So refuse to listen to what is said here tonight is to emphasize our because we do not necessarily agree with it, does not take the meaning out from ourselves.

MRS. DEBBIE L. SMART (CONSTITUENCY): The point is that as we provide elected representatives have a responsibility to listen to whatever affects our people and not just to what we want to hear.

Mr. President, I am aware that there are many people in our society who are very disappointed about the tampering with that question while I was in Nevis, I knew that. I am also aware that for years people have been questioning why Sunday has been taken from us in the manner in which it has been, to such an extent. What, we never did, is the hotels wanted to get the liquor at 8am they would be able to serve liquor with their meals. That is unthinkable in the circumstance and so the little person. Our forefathers why it could not be permitted to open on Sundays, and so it was extended a little further and that if they can get a few minutes on the corner of the strip then they can sell liquor.

Mr. President, as far as tourism is concerned there are still tourists coming in this island where on a Sunday everything is closed. In the Cayman Islands not even supermarkets which sell something as necessary as fuel/gasoline are open on a Sunday. Some of the might hear of are not normally they are closed. All of the stores, businesses and offices are closed. Are not also hotels, restaurant and bars because tourists to Caymanians? However, are not these offices closed on Sunday? Am I being told that tourists coming here must have a drink? What are we saying to, a bunch of drunkards? Am I being told that it is a necessity for a person to have a drink with his meal?

Mr. President, for at least ten years I have been asking people what are their feelings about the Cayman Islanders when do they like best about Cayman Islands? What changes do they feel necessary? What changes are they not happy about? In so many words the answer is simple and plain. We all the system have to have and change what you have. Remember that the first life, existence, and the night life is one get where we come from. Remember, to get a place where you are first safe, comfortable, welcome and everyone can remain from the pressures of a big city, your economy depends what we want and this is why we have rules and laws again. So, I mean specifically asked that do people think of the sale of liquor on Sunday because I have happened in the very much involved with relations to our Islands since the last ten years. The majority will tell us that if they want it they can get out it. It is not necessary for a place to be open.

Mr. President, what I am saying is this. If the hotels and the restaurants have to be licensed then everywhere else has to be licensed. The whole law on the corner has to be licensed. In what legal I do not speak for the other Ministers but I feel that they encounter the same thing, seeing people drunk and if one happens to be walking or driving you have to send one's way accordance to some of the drunks who are gathered in front of those liquor outlets. It must say we also have a neighbourhood where residents would from noise, mid on Sunday have some peaceful day outside and they have to put up drunks getting on the side of the road; little girls exposed to the evil surroundings of people under the influence of liquor.

Mr. President, what I am suggesting is whatever we want to work until this thing gets a much out of control that we cannot stop it, or it is relevant to address the problem now and we know for that one day we see a celebration in our Islands where they will drug, a hard drug, it will enter freedom to do its harm? To see anyone who wants to, going and did alike, one should just take a walk around some of these tourist outlets in West Bay and you will see children, families and fifteen year olds including their boss and acting their drunk.

MRS. MARIE L. GRANT (CONTINUED): If one goes up to Hardy Boys and sees little children fighting from the glue, and there are all these drunks in white robes and with their foul language. Here are children who a Sunday supposed to a education like this. Are we going that with an example like that we hope to have a future generation who are not occupied in the fights of hate and resentment?

Mr. President, we ask you what we will about the church. We may say that they have prejudice than their children or we may say they are religious fanatics, or we may say whatever we wish. However, the church in this country needs the help of the Lawenforcement Members of this House. It is not a second class institution. It is an institution to be reckoned with. Because, as I see it the church is lawful entity. The matter this bill has been tampered with. Sunday has been taken from us so the church is now is coming second class to those liquor outlets which are helping to destroy our people.

When we talk about a man who needs to come before the church for his lawlessness to Christ, we should ask that wicked wife who on Sunday night goes to her husband and he has nothing to offer her for Monday. Children go to school with nothing. We should ask them of who would not like one night on a weekend which is not crowded and jammed. We should ask those children if they would not like one night on a weekend when they can close themselves being cuddled by a Christian, knowing father who has an idea what he is going to do about. We should ask those children if they might on a weekend that they would not like the atmosphere of those who are being able to stay home without having subjected to a liquor outlet to influence to that destruction.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President! Often it is that should wife who does withhold her money or that child who, have go to the high school, neither parent in the Primary School not provide sufficient funds while those drunken fellows who have spent his money comes to our house cursing. They are the ones buying for the liquor outlets in this country.

However, I hope that the remembrance of everyone who would fight against this and who would come in spite of my efforts on the part of the church or anyone else, will permit them when they step that money lay on that bank on Monday morning. Because the people who paid for it are the little ones who are helpless to do anything about it.

Mr. President, dealing with the Police Department on Sunday nights is when one finds more reasons for immediate quarrels than any other nights. Why, because Friday he gone out and spends his money. Saturday he were out and spends his money and some Sunday night the last he gone and that wife who needs some money to have Monday morning perhaps to buy for the [illegible] she had put some the last week, and the children must go without it. This is a problem of our country. There are women in this place today, not only from the low sections of society but a man whose husbands sit behind desks and women whose husbands have good businesses, who will tell us that the greatest evil they say to [illegible] which have destroyed their home. We should not many names today. We be faced with a situation like that what we should do on Sunday. We should not just turn in here and make laws and Sunday because we want it. I am not unreasonable for a few people who want to get [illegible] Those are other ways and means of making money, are we to be told that if we give them six days to work [illegible] they need more? In fact, Mr. President, while I have been [illegible] to that now the liquor outlets are complaining that they do not have sufficient hours on Sunday. They need extra hours.

SEC. SATRUM T. ARNOLD (continued): They are having Thanksgiving because on Sunday they have to open two or three hours later. They could thank that we are going to have to operate on night day for them. There is no other business on these Islands which has such importance as the planes which call there. Am I to understand that why might therefore Aviation will not come to the Cayman Islands because we refuse to work on Sundays? I would think that most of them would say, "Congratulations for sticking with a stand". There are planes in the United States today where communities are getting up on their own and are saying that something has to be done. In no event what are called day operations in certain States. We cannot buy things there at any time. I think one of the most praiseworthy, first class workmanship in these islands is the Civil Air Terminal. When it was under former management they sometimes opened here until 12 noon on Sunday, and they had an excellent business. To get from that place was hard to make reservations early. Nobody complained that they should not get in there on a Sunday. However, there do have those people who say that it would be fine to make their business known . . . and to pay duty, they have to be open on Sunday.

Mr. President, I could hope that Mayors would be so highly insane that to get one drink it would cost ten dollars, because I am saying that this is getting out of hand. Someone said to me, "Which Airline have Cayman Legislators rented your House". I know that we cannot Legislate morals but let me ask this question. Just because we cannot Legislate morals are we going to make it legal ? Is it prohibited? Just because we cannot Legislate morals are we going to make it legal to be a thief? Just because we cannot Legislate morals are we going to make it legal to use cocaine or to smoke ganja? No, what I am saying is this. We have to put our foot down some place. We cannot get rid of Liquor altogether. It is just much too much embedded here. I know that. However, what I am saying is this. It does not have to be duty of the road. We can put it in the rightful place.

As far as possible never, ever now we serve it. Never, I take the oath. I know what it can do to a human being. I had an aunt in her early twenties, first and I only months pregnant with an eighteen month old child laying on her breast in her bed, and her husband unbeknown came to drunk and hit her over with a bottle nearly. She died two days later. Under the influence of drink.

I had on people having eight pints of the way of the Antigua rum in Florida he got in an argument, a minor argument over which flag was better, the American flag or the English flag. After the argument the "guy" with whom he had argued left and a few minutes later when he arrived out of that door that "guy" was to his end without his children upon my badly that they could hardly get him to the hospital in one piece and he died a couple of hours later.

Mr. President, I have seen drunk persons come to nothing. I have seen intelligent ones to nothing. I have seen some of my best friends, one in particular, one when it is over anything one of his best friends was killed, and one I may affectionate he committed suicide in a foreign port because of what it did to him.

Mr. President, I would wish Cayman take others who were beautiful and happy and they would a reputation where they are mentally ill; they are emotionally ill and something else. It has caused more disturbance in this country than anything else.

MRS. PEGGIE J. HEMPY (Oklahoma): Professor, what really bothers me, Mr. President, is the fact that years ago we would not see young people drinking. If we take a walk on Bourbon Street Beach or a Sunday at some of these barbecues, wineburns, we will see fourteen and fifteen year old girls and boys drinking beer after beer. When we do, we punish the young people there and consider that as having to do with these things.

Statistics will prove, Mrs. President, that liquor is causing more destruction on our land than anything else. We went to Bartlesville [illegible] and I found that I knew many of the young people who were there. Except for a very few young people one of them telephoned to a man who was in [illegible], I cannot blame and I struggle to survive, rather as the result of the example set by a father who has been absorbed by alcohol!". We say the young people why they get involved in drugs? Why are they doing it? They say, "My father takes his liquor. I take my marijuana. My father takes his drink. I take my marijuana." It is the same thing.

Mr. President, I am very busy, and sometimes should misunderstand me, my statements are not [illegible]. God forbid that I should be such a thing. However, some persons tell me have a further and essential bill would assist many who need they when he has the [illegible] Can someone tell me how only persons can survive or alternate a child back that child we look up them and say, "You cannot buy anything in the [illegible] unless you bring the same [illegible]; only with something else".

If we all do [illegible] beautiful Alaska and we can look out into the water and see the ocean [illegible], the mountains and the beautiful [illegible]. However, I can bring one night up a little planes along the wall so can see what should can do to [illegible]. But just recently the Indian [illegible] Board as it is in addition to the [illegible] just a few hundred yards apart, southern Arizona just down the road, not just a home and also license, a [illegible] license. You all [illegible].

Mr. President, we need to think that because we are a tourist oriented society, that it have to well [illegible]. What I would like to say here is that this is one area and the home is where our obligations lies. And it going to [illegible] someone else come into our home and tell us how to run our home? I can have someone in my home; maybe like a [illegible] will have to meet [illegible] in my home[illegible], or come over and enjoy my [illegible]. However, I am not going to tell anybody that whatever I do in this house will [illegible] or what to [illegible] about it. By [illegible] foreign people [illegible] and tell us how we must run our country. That is the beauty to being able to govern our own country. We do what is best for this country.

Mr. President, what I would like to say here is that in Oregon having to absorb water when [illegible] is [illegible] taken place in a family, or especially is [illegible] and [illegible]. We will have people [illegible] and say, [illegible], we commend you to the [illegible]. God will take care of [illegible], and [illegible] and rightly so. [illegible] I am [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] from this world to the next [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to help us [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]?

If we have [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to this Democratic House to [illegible], we do not [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that he will help us, and [illegible] [illegible] might [illegible], but he will [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MRS. DOROTHY A. GRIGGS (CONTINUING): ...because unemployment is now above 6% providing work for people on Sunday. I have up people in most any employment, Mrs. Sachse, who think about it in that you have got to work seven days a week. You cannot ever get a day off". What is no response. What is your, I do not even care to discuss that any longer.

On the other hand, Mr. President, they still come to me and I have had people who have told me that I did better not being this aggressive because perhaps I might become unpopular, and I may lose in 1988. Mr. President, that is the least of my worries in bringing this matter to this House about what happen I win in 1988. I have got people out there who are suffering and if there is any one platform where I ran it, it is Work Now. On Monday when our young people should be in church and should be praying and should be taking time out to think on things of importance; where our families should be getting together, we have a liquor outlet.

Mr. President, I am not saying that one who sells the liquor goes into the house and pulls the gun out of the house. I am not saying that. However, when a person is addicted to something, the more temptation is to go and get it. Do we mean that six days a week is not enough to sell liquor? If it was five seven six days would be long enough, but liquor?

Mr. President, there are no pictures in liquor. I do not know how much more time I am going but I would beg for this Honorable House to give me a few minutes here.

Mr. President, just over the line Ohio passed a law on Sunday sale, Mr. President, to determine how well that Government has been committed for a long time, and the problem will not be solved without a real battle or without a genuine commitment to fight one. The agency responsible for Social Education and Social Services said that the Government fully endorses the view and the price of failure is dreadful. The Vice Commissioner of Police said that they testified to an audit which not only endorses wages but damages the economic and social structure of a country. The Chief Executive Officer said that we should make no mistake. It is a very real cost perspective like an underlying that the whole community joins forces with the Rivers Club and supports this programme. Mr. Richard Lamb, the Chairman of the Council of Social Services said that it is up to every responsible citizen not only to restrain from taking these themselves but to urge young people never to start, and endeavour to get every house to have a like treatment and something in order to break the addiction by which they are and will be engrossed.

Now we go further on in that same publication and it says that the reason for obesity is given to obtain a pleasurable feeling. That is what liquor does to us. To put it more simply, a person uses a drug to feel good. Now, Mr. President, in mentioning that there is one thing which I want to bring to this Honourable House's attention. When a man or woman is drinking their liquor, they are feeling good then. However, if we have an abused wife or an ill treated child or a broken hearted parent how it invokes them that person gave into the house, that is the time when it causes problems and they are the ones who must suffer.

Mr. President, if you can bear with me I would like to move further.

MRS. MAUREEN L. CHANEY (CONSTITUENCY):

"Alcohol is the number one misdemeanour in the Cayman Islands and most of the serious murder. Besides a drug addict and many people immediately associate a dangerous knife a hypodermic needle. In fact a staggering and equal amount is the more common type of drug addict. Alcoholics are just dependent. They drug is alcohol. This particularly with alcohol seems to make most people acceptable in U.K. it is not. It is a drug. It is abused. It is a dangerous drug if not more so than other drugs and it is more commonly used. Alcoholic, loss of concentration, impaired ability to administrate or perform complex tasks, decline in human efficacy, loss of judgement, personality changes, weakening of the alcoholic's eyes and distorted vision are some of alcohol's effects.

It cause not just to physical dependence, especially to drink. Can get liver, heart, brain and nervous system damage, nutritional deficiency, memory impairment and it has possible effects on the reproductive system causing congenital malformation in the offspring. The people who are psychically and physiologically addict dependent, cannot solve their problems alone.

The age limit for the legal consumption of alcohol in the Cayman Islands is eighteen years. The increase drinkers are young men because the ages of sixteen and twenty-five. It is also known that drinkers are more likely to use weed and other drugs than non-drinking people." As just part of all violent crime, is part more of all rapes, so to 80 per cent of all child, wife and incest rapes is committed while offenders, most of them alcoholics, are under the influence of alcohol.

These are not the only frightening figures connected with alcohol. An increasing number of accidents occur as lives are in the work place due to alcoholism. Drunk drivers are the real killers on all roads. Often they are responsible for taking the lives of others. Alcoholics are not just a danger to themselves. They are a hazard to everyone.".

Mr. President, Mr. Richard Cook had a full page advertisement in this supplement and his message to the Caymanian people was this:-

"Even one alcohol abuse could only destroy the future of our country that generations of Caymanians have fought so hard to preserve. It is our wish and that of so many Caymanians that our generation of today will make every effort to preserve the future of Cayman by eliminating drug and alcohol abuse.".

Mr. President, when I spoke here, I am pleased to say only positive but I see a lot of children growing up here today. When I think that it is up to all of us our Constitution left for us and when I see those of my colleagues and grandparents and what the social conditions were back when I was growing up, and to see that the only country we have children growing up in this type of a society, I shudder to think what their future will hold for them.

MRS. DIANE K. GRADY (CONTINUING): In this matter are those who say, are we sending our children out there with no moral principles or ideals; nobody listening they ask me, "Are we not in this, are we not one?"

Mr. President, the Rollins Department had a big advertisement in there. They said, "Will you have to do it by no". Well and good. That was a good message. However, let me say this, it is a little difficult to say as about accepting in right there for one to just so easily. If I am in a bind and somebody comes and wants money a dime of the green might be great of me, I am tempted to take a little.

Mr. President, we are making it too easy for some young people to get on to this drug. It has been found that many in the Florida School and in the High School are using drugs. Some few months ago a happened to be sitting near a group of young women some of whom came from mine homes and many will it make me speechless. However, they were talking about a party which they had been to the night before. Mr. President, all of those gathered I knew one child who was thirteen. I have one who was twelve and the other three were between fourteen and sixteen. Their conversation was how drunk they had got. They did not know who had taken them to the case. One of them said, "Oh my grandma, I was so drunk I did not even get undressed when I got home and mommy asked me where I had been, and I told her to go-and-go's party".

So, I listened for a while and then I very gently said to them, "Do you mean that at your party you were smoking drugs?" She said, "They had a lot of beer there".

Mr. President, what I am saying is this. We have a problem. We can face it. We can decide to or we can make our heads like Pilate and say that it will not have anything to do with it. However, it will not only remain but it will get worse. This honorable House is in a position to do something about it. And I leave this session with the members of this House to remember, not what they have to answer to me, but what they are going to have to answer your years from today when we may not be sitting here. I do not have any conscience that I am going to pay anywhere from pocket to here. Some people seem to be sure of whose pocket but I am not sure of mine. However, while I am here I want to make an impact on this society for good.

This matter is presented not for any show of power on my part; many examples left me angry, a number of people said to me. "Please you know you should not bother with that. Leave this alone". Mr. President, there is not one single problem in this society today which I have in front of me any more frightfully than that which I have just stated to present to this House.

We have a problem. I am not asking for anything more. We should just be given back our Sunday. If we must vote them all days, let those be.

Mr. President, I am leaving the matter with the honorable members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: According to my watch, it is now 1:30 p.m. I am not sure whether it will be the wish of members to suspend, then I can find it, the maximum suspension time, thirty minutes in order to enable this Senate to begin and accomplish the business to be considered today, or whether Members will prefer to break off now and have lunch immediately.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(7)

Col. D. RYANG-NGUSAH: I move that the Standing Orders, etc.

MR. PRESIDENT: I'm anyone minded to move that Standing Orders be suspended as one table a date and that will probably be the fastest way to deal with the matter.

Col. LAMPREY A. FLANNERY: I second that motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, I will take it that the motion is moved in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders 13. Standing Order 10(7) shall be suspended in order to enable the business which is not down to be completed. Does any Member wish to speak to that? I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED BY MAJORITY. STANDING ORDER 10(7) SUSPENDED TO ENABLE THE BUSINESS OF THE ORDER PAPER TO BE COMPLETED.

MR. PRESIDENT: We now continue with business and the motion before the House is Private Member's Motion No. 19/86 which has just been moved by the Third Elected Member for Nadi Bay. That motion is now open for debate.

DEBATE ON PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 19/86

Mr. K. NATABUI BUNE: Mr. President, although I have to finish this afternoon I am sure this motion that we are going to be finished.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this motion. Sir, I oppose this motion I am a strong advocate of the sale of alcohol because as I have said earlier on this Honourable House, whether we like it or not people who want to use alcohol, use it. However, I oppose this motion because I am here as a legislator to legislate for rule and distribution. Sir, the negative which are brought by the motion cannot and will not help our society.

Mr. President, the Honourable mover has told us that a lot of thought was given to this motion and so have I have also given a lot of deep consideration to this. After having and finally seeing the way ways in which this motion could be changed if not accepted, I am left to wonder whether he was given enough thought on this point.

Sir, why are we prohibited? Are we fair in asking that the sale of liquor be prohibited on Sunday only? What about Saturday? Mr. President, Saturday is an important day to many people as Sunday is to me. So, why are we seeking here to stop it only on Sundays. As I said, it will not help. It will only discriminate others trying to take place in our society on what day on which we buy the most. I am of the view rather that we can and we should be legislators not a moral examples. However, we have rightly been said, we cannot legislate morals. We should use the moral examples. Yes, we must set the example. However, as mentioned, only I will not be a hypocrite.

Mr. President, much has been said about our tourist industry but I am asking what is going to happen to our tourist industry if this motion is passed? It is good to look at it in one way but we should consider other ways as well.

MR. M. MORRIS DYE (CONTINUING): whether we like it or not, whether the majority of this House likes it or not, the majority of people coming to the Cayman Islands do wanted to come to have a good time. Let me face the facts and that includes alcohol. We don't have anywhere else that people can go and high on the mountain that because of the high cost and now it is being asked that they should even have a beauty breath if they wish to.

Mr. Speaker, with this motion, or concerned about, the spirit in good but the body is weak. Another point is, Mr. President, and only be one which we have never realized. That if we allow the liquor establishments in Georgetown it will only increase the number of illegal sales of liquor. That is all that is going to happen. Now, I am talking about the speak-easies and we know where they are all about, speak-easies which the police may not even anything about.

Now, as I have said before, unless you give these speak-easies to the illegal sale of harder drugs then alcohol. While the police can control around the bars and the hotels where there are sales of drugs going, and while they may not stop it entirely while it does with many going around the bars. I am asking how the police, although, also does the sale of drugs under an alcohol environment in somebody's home you do not know about it.

This is what this motion will create. I will create these illegal places and these illegal places, in my opinion, contribute more to our social problems in that they make it much available to anyone at any time irrespective of age, or they have the money to pay. Let us not fool ourselves, Mr. President, we have gone mad if we stop the sale of alcohol on Sunday that is all that is going to happen. They are going to open it in the back and sell it, if they will be open in the back, they will sell people and they will sell them and the police will not know anything about it.

I cannot support it in all good conscience Mr. President, if I was interested to save people I would not make speeches, and the vote would probably have been taken at 4.30. I have heard all kinds of reasons why I should not speak in this motion. They said that the churches would not support me if I voted against it. Mr. President, I am here to represent all the people and to my conscience to these my conscience leads me. The churches have no position. When they engaged you we only helped to get as elected they knew that I am not a hypocrite. They know that I will fight for the rights. They know where I do stand. If we want to do something, let us set the example. Let us when we go to national parties and ministers not even drink as liquor, even if it be only a glass of wine. Let us not be hypocrites.

Mr. Speaker, prohibition did not work in the United States of America and it will not work in the Cayman Islands. It will only further compound the problems and help to destroy more. While it always discrimination will come in. We heard some talk about discrimination when we were dealing with the hospital. This is where the discrimination will come in because if we stop the sale of liquor on Sunday we are going to create a new scale of hard drugs in this country which the opening up of these little places to accommodate hard rums. It is a fact.

The Member, Mr, is not found in this motion. It will not help. The reason is found in ignorance by reason of the dangers of these drugs and a more aggressive social drinking programme. That is where the reason is found.

MR. M. BERNARD RUSH (CONTINUED): Mr. President, I might add somewhere people to some people which the media made. That is their normally misrepresented about the passage of the Eighth Reporting Law to the Ninth Meeting. Mr. President, the Member knew that the Bill was merely up in the Senate Meeting and the Hall which is contained. So she should not now try to make the people believe that we passed did something which she did not know about. She knew well enough of it.

Mr. President, now, that was Sunlight we I want to say again that I only agreed to that section because unless the Liaison Committee and the Board will have to make it mandatory and it will have to have representatives from individuals or groups, which will include anywhere was either whole organizations, Mr. President, it would be acceptable under the conditions of this Liaison Committee but for all open Common Wives Law, Corporations Code and Indiana should disregard which services. I would never have agreed to it, but this is why I voted for the Eighth Liaison Committee for the Ninth Meeting. The Member knew right it and she must not misrepresent and let the people believe that she did not know that. That Bill was coming and what the Bill contained.

Mr. President, if Eighth was not on Sunlight they would buy to some other day to provide for Tuesday as there is the purpose of the motion. If the people from Wyoming it will fail miserably. It is a bad, bad motion. The spirit is good but the most to well was passed under good circumstances. We are on the board to help across then we are not if we pass this motion as it is. We will put our people because of the misrepresenting other things to come, as we know that they will vote if we pass the motion as it is.

Mr. President, I support all on this Notes and be a legislative and decide that will be well used to consider the Tuesday. I am not a fool and even if all I am not a hypocrite. Our country is based with problems. There are no quick answers or easy solutions and we must live them with courage and with a scripture guide in the belief that they can be solved with growing awareness, and we must do it together. A country divided against itself cannot survive the dynamics to make the changes which are needed today. Each of us owes to this country but how we be free, free to think new things and work new ways. But part of all free is where our Christian belief in the brotherhood of man that we make that brotherhood real. And we must be supported, Mr. President, which motion will fail this country miserably and I oppose it, and the amendment here that I opposed it. May also local that Bath stands for the right. So, I am not looking for my vote. I know what will happen, or what can happen. I am only trying reasonably to the discharge of my conscience.

I thank you very much, Mr. President,

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair thanked Member for the Senior Delegate.

SEN. WILLIE J. STUCKEMBERG: Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion, not particularly because it will lay the date of Senior Tuesday, however, I think this is a step in the right direction. I commend to the Body of reconsider for Tuesday in this country. I was taught by my parents to observe Sunday as a special day, a day of rest and of reverence and I think that particularly for that, and I know that I will die with that belief.

CAPT. MILES S. ROSENFELD (CHRISTIANSTED): I am not here to try to legislate morals but I am here to say that we have proud of our heritage as Caymanians. I have heard a lot said about our ability to build existing schools and the return of the "Caribbean" to preserve our heritage. Well I would say to all Honourable Members here today that a part of my heritage as a Caymanian is my respect for the Lord's day.

I feel as I said that this is a beginning. This is not the end. There is much which we need to do. I am not here to hit out at those who will display or apply the principles or pleasures which they think they got from us. I am here to say that as a God-fearing man I simply like to have it said that I helped to preserve this observance of God's day. I was tempted to abstain Sunday. I know that there are other legislators waiting to move another day and that is their privilege. However, all of the Dutch community except a few observe Sunday and I again say that I suppose this motion because I think that it is a step in the right direction, and I do sincerely do hope we will again restore reverence to God's day in the Cayman Islands.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HON. PRESIDENT: Does any other member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise her right of reply?

HON. DARWIN E. QUEST: Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I am a little bit surprised and very much disappointed not to have had any more support from my colleagues the Second Elected Member for West Bay, then I did. My only fear is that it was a bit revision but apparently he felt that it perhaps will not give it much thought as all. However, the thought behind I have to that motion did not come simply since September, 1994.

Mr. President, statistics from the Statistical Department on Alcohol abuse and Alcoholism gives a few figures here. These statistics mention the recorded deaths from selected alcohol related causes. In the United States and the Cayman Islands, number one on the list was the Virgin Islands, number two was Alaska and number three was Canada. The United States Virgin Islands had 6.65 per hundred thousand people with a 5,83 per hundred people. The Virgin Islands had almost 100 per cent more deaths per capita from alcohol related diseases. Alcoholism, alcohol psychosis, cirrhosis of the liver, accidental poisoning by alcohol. Some time ago in a local publication it was stated that the Cayman Islands consumed more alcohol than any other Caribbean Island. Now, if the United States Virgin Islands has almost double the amount of deaths caused by it and that it is a part of the Caribbean Islands, and we in the Cayman Islands are supposed to be the ones who drink the most, then it should be obvious where that places us. If there is a race then we are going to get first prize.

In addition to that, Mr. President, the Lions Club of Boston did a study on how much alcohol was drunk per person and arrived at these figures. I am not sure whether this includes the babies which is brought from a pagan state or whether this includes what is brought in by the tourists on the ships. I do not know. However, Mr. President, that is the statistics, although as I mentioned a while ago to with us. Mr. President, if I have cancer in a certain organ of my body and the doctor says to me that unless it is removed in very short time, I would. If he says to me that I have cancer in a certain spot and if we treat it with this certain drug we can at least minimize it.

SEC. SARBANES [D., MARYLAND]: Mr. President, although I do not like to see anyone arrested, I think the one who can handle it is the one sitting here. The one who cannot are the others. What I am saying is this: How can we ask them and assert themselves not guilty if we do not at least try to help ourselves by trying to help hold down the crime which is taking us to this place.

MR. CHARLES S. SMITH: I stand here to represent that many who wanted that child to have a traditional Easter in the depths of Tidyness. Mr. President, nobody should tell me that the churches in those Islands want. I stand here today to tell you that it was wrong to tamper with that quarter mile limit. I'm saying this. The church needs all the help it can get from us. I don't stand here and make it harder for them. We have lost a few family this year in this country and yet I would be told that you people in Washington that there would not be riots or violence or shooting or any such ugly happening because they did not want to hurt their neighbor's feelings, or their brother's feelings, or their husband's feelings, or whoever might want to establish a Tidyness business.

Mr. President, in order to protect our Islands to know this. I feel that that problem was coming in this House....

MR. PRESIDENT: I am afraid I have been silent so far. However, I must draw the Member's attention to the fact that Standing Orders prohibit raising again a matter which the House has already been discussing and deciding.

MRS. AUDREY S. SMITH: Very well, Mr. President, thank you very much. However, could you please, Sir, let me apply to amendment which is an entirely different which was mentioned by the Shadow Minister for Rest Day. I have about the quarter mile limit.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: In all the cases, Mr. President, for one minute to call the attorney of another Member in between?

MRS. AUDREY S. SMITH: Again, I apologize....

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that is unnecessary language and that be that....

MR. CHARLES S. SMITH: Mr. President, may I say that it is necessary. Thank you.

I hear about the quarter mile limit and the motion which was coming up. Before I left I made it clear to Members that I did not want them to make any changes to that quarter mile limit. I was against it. I circulated photographs of what I felt was more relevant on the circulation and the dangers of alcohol. I planned to attend before I left to go to England. I am thank of the Members to thank to confirm that I circulated and voted in the Bill and was back again. Mr. President, sorry if I were mistaken either.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, will I am sorry to what I think what you have made your point. However, to correct matters that will have again.

MRS. AUDREY S. SMITH: Sir, I should be standing while you are speaking to me, I am sorry. While I am not listening to I must in this place that I called Hon. Members to any time I made this question which I had planned of that Bill had not been dealt with, to move here and around in this House and Senate to any what I felt about it. I attended here and when I rushed in the radio in my car the Speaker had concluded the meeting that day. I was unable to speak on that as no one even stood here and said that I shall decide it and I did not do anything about it.

MRS. SIRIMA E. BRETT (CONTINUING): Mr. President, for some reason it seemed that that still had to go through for a hearing. Enough on that.

Mr. President, as far as I am concerned this motion which I have brought before this House today is not in vain of a few people. It involves the majority of this country and if any of us have to go out on the street and ask what the people think about this motion, be it a good motion or be it as my colleagues here made a bad motion, we will find out the response we get. In fact, he has just told me, "Remember". I have not many calls although I did ask only this question. I did not have to go looking for the person. I did nothing of that sort. However, somehow it leaked out that I was going to bring this motion to the House and I received many calls from people who said, "Madam, it is also something we are concerned about here", as voiced in their offices. We have chosen not to make a lot of pronouncements. Perhaps we should do that so that we have that option, and maybe this fight is so funny it is not worth giving the penalty.

Talking about the tourist industry and tourists coming here to have a good time. Of course, but it depends on what a person calls a good time. If a person can relax and enjoy, that is a good time. Talking around rivers is not a good time. Nobody asked me what will happen with pedestrians going from the airport? I ask again, what is going with going here either?

Mr. President, we cannot take a unfortunate situation here. There are certain people in this group who claim that they know it all, who seem as if they have everything. However, Mr. President, nobody can have everything. We would not have anywhere to put it. That goes for Parliament. We can learn from the unfortunate ones.

I want to say this. It does not matter whether anyone calls it a bad motion, I am pleased that I brought it to this House. Perhaps I have left out a lot of what I was hoped to say but I can assure you, Mr. President, that whatever other given hand bombs, no people know that I can have to deal with but what only be in reference to an almighty Dollar; that is all some people see. If we make Government bring a few cents and make them to raise money in some other means, we will have a lot better and know what Government is doing and how they are taxing the people and everything else. With this motion, many be in it be aware, what Government is going to look in revenue. I am not sure that Government is going to lose anything by passing. However, if it does it will probably be made up with what we have on added service charges. Mr. President, I wish to say here again that we have a choice to make....since we was elected here, I will be right with you in a moment. We have a choice to make. We cannot vacate it, we cannot be neutral about it. We say either, "Yes we will stay by it", or we stand here today whether we consider this motion a good one, a bad one, a workable one or whatever. There is no neutral ground. We cannot wash our hands of responsibility as elected Members would. We must make a clear choice.

I have encountered more a situation while in opposite house to others. We cannot ignore it. We have not really got what we all came and want to do something about it. I hope the Leader for North Side Association or (?) is hearing just a few views. I do not know what is acceptable about this. However, it is right....

MR. S. ARTHUR HENFREY: Of a friend of mine, Mr. President. Although I might have been misunderstanding I was not misunderstanding as the Member. I was wondering which was going to happen the way in the Government Bench side.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not sure that that was a point of order but, nevertheless, you have got away with it.

MR. DARYLE D. OGDEN: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that in this Honourable House I do not behave myself as much as numerous other Members of this House are speaking.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform this meeting with the Members of this House. I can assure them that they will have the backing of the majority of the Cayman people. They might have the perpetrators of a free liquor establishment but these people do not make up the majority of the people whom we are here to represent.

In presenting this motion, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what I am doing. I am bringing to this House something which affects the majority of the people on the Cayman Islands today. We can do whatever we want to about marijuana and about everything else. Everybody knows what he is, whether he is a hypocrite or not. I am not here to talk people hypocrites, however, that I am saying to them. We have a responsibility to God and to our people to stand up against this evil. It is a sin. We are supposed to be a God-fearing people. We are in a way on drugs and, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no substitute for marijuana as a drug, and this is why we must abstain from it.

I have spoken from my heart. Perhaps there are relevant points which I have omitted. However, I ask for Members' serious consideration, not just for the sake of this Bill. We should not worry about this; what we stand on here can have grave, dramatic, far-reaching effects on our children and the society in which they have to grow up.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time that you have given to me this afternoon.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is:

> "BE IT RESOLVED that Government take immediate steps to introduce the necessary legislation to amend the Liquor Licensing Law, so as to prevent the sale of all alcoholic beverages on Sunday, between the hours of 00.01 hours and 24.00 hours, local time."

I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. D. EDWARD MILLER: May we have a division, Sir?

MR. S. ROBERTA BURR: Would you give the Member two minutes?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

DIVISION
NO. 82

AYES	NOES
Hon. Daphne E. Barrett	Hon. Dennis A. Foster
Capt. Henry E. Mahoneywell	Hon. Michael J. Buckley
	Hon. Thomas D. Gaffaney
	Hon. Hancock E. Ebanks
	Hon. K. Mckeeva Bush
	Hon. Capt. Charles L. Clifford
	Hon. Richard S. Johnson
	Hon. D. Kirkconnell Ebanks
	Hon. Lindsay A. Pierson
	Hon. D. Ezzard Miller
2	9

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 18/05 DEFEATED BY MAJORITY

THE PRESIDENT: Private Member's Motion No. 18/05. The Chief Elected Member for Home Affairs.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 18/05

TRANSMISSION OF LEGAL AND DISASTER ADVERTISING TO THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

THE HONORABLE T. OMNETT: Mr. President, I wish to move Private Member's Motion No. 18/05 which reads as follows:-

> "BE IT RESOLVED that the terms of reference of the Select Committee appointed by Private Member's Motion No. 17 of 1985 be enlarged to include the consideration by the Select Committee of advertising of Government tenders and notices pertaining to employment, appointments, sales, auctions, meetings and all other ways in which public announcements to the public in the Cayman Islands".

MR. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I second the motion.

THE PRESIDENT: Does the mover wish to speak on the motion or just to put it to the vote?

THE HONORABLE T. OMNETT: Mr. President, I may just be put to vote because actually this is the same as what I spoke on a few days ago. Thank you, Sir.

THE PRESIDENT: I think that technically anybody else may speak if they wish to. However, the motion was of a fairly debatable and I think that most Members made their views known when the debate was.

Do you wish to speak?

DEBATE ON PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 18/05

MR. K. MCKEEVA BUSH: Yes, Sir. I promise the House that I will not be long. With respect to the motion just mentioned, the spirit of the motion was good. However, this one, while the spirit is good, I have serious (?) Private Member's Statement.

MR. K. HOWARD DUDA (CONTINUING): I know, Mr. President. Given the previous debate on the other motion that I stood alone on this particular subject. However, I have been alone on many occasions and I suppose that I will be alone on many more. Last week, Sir, we saw the introduction and appointment by the majority of a motion which has now in my opinion taken away $20,000 per year from the budgeted dollars which Government personnel to this Committee knows is much, much needed, Mr. President. We see the same motion coming back again, in my opinion, a very regressive attitude to the whole approach dealing with the press and in effect will inhibit free and private enterprise in this country.

Sir, I have always been an advocate of a free press. In fact, I have been used before because I objected the press against reprehensible laws of the previous administration. As we explain this motion before this Honourable House is a form of censorship of the free press and a censorship of free enterprise, and it must be very careful not to destroy those liberties of a democratic society.

Mr. President, I am asking how far will this motion extend? Will it extend, Mr. President, to the Sisters Club if they wished to subscribe a motion which says that certain words will be cut? Will it extend to the Kiwanis Club if they wished to do the same things? Will it extend to the Ambulance if they wanted to do the same things? I will not say the Lodge. However, Mr. President, I am asking how far is the motion going to extend? Will it extend to those publications circulated into the country such as the Island Herald, the Junior Observer, Seasonal and Time magazines? Accordingly to the motion nothing will be able to subscribe to this country fiscal restrictions.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Member's questions are not absolutely relevant to what he may be asking for a moment and answer, because I think that he may be under a misapprehension.

HON. MICHAEL J. FINNIGAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of information is it my understanding that all we are doing in this motion is referring some matters to a Select Committee they will then be referred to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: All the questions that you are asking can be asked in a Select Committee. We cannot in any of these have yet been given.

MR. K. HOWARD DUDA: Mr. President, I was that is in giving to a Select Committee but I am certain that I can stand here and debate it, and it....

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that you can properly contemplate the considerations which the Select Committee will consider. I do not think that is allowed. I will have to look up my Standing Orders to find out but I think that it is wrong to do that.

HON. MICHAEL J. FINNIGAN: I think that the Member can indicate matters he should go to the Select Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I mean you can make representations and say that it is all wrong to do this or that. However, you cannot assume that the Select Committee is going to reach a determination or valuation.

MR. E. MARTIN DUBAY: Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much and I bow to your ruling. I guess it is unfair to anticipate but we know what will happen, Mr. President. I can only function myself in my case. However, I think that I am allowed to say these few words.

A Member can only exercise with the support of the people. It must be done with the people in command. It develops as they develop. It maintains the pulse, the hopes, the inspirations and the achievements, the good and the bad of the community.

Mr. President, I think that it is only right to a Select Committee. I will not support it. As I said it is a case of censorship. If it is agreed by the Committee that taxpayers will not be able to advertise I feel that it is a kind of censorship and it will inhibit free enterprise in this country, and I will not support it.

Mr. President, we are talking, and I might be a little bit wrong here because I am told that we cannot anticipate what they will say or what committee they will come to, the Committee to take away $25,000 a year from Radio Cayman. I am sorry again, I guess. However, I will ask the Committee then to take this into consideration. They should weigh the advertisements on the radio and take the $25,000 a year which we could lose and not let it influence the Broadcasting Corporation. $25,000 with the help of this community can build a lot of low income houses.

Thank you very much for your time, Mr. President, and I am sorry if I went slightly harsh on for on the issue of the motion here tomorrow.

Mr. President, I just ask you to bear with me for one last subject. I have been told that I may have turned back to the Chair at times and, Sir, whatever the impression I may have given I mean well when I stand be this House at all times. I do not mean to go against the Standing Orders of the House. It is only because I feel strongly about issues that I talk here in this House. Whatever the impression, I mean well at all times and if I may have deviated the Chair, the Chair does have my apologies. However, Mr. President, when I feel that I am right I shall let the Chair know although I will abide by the ruling.

Thank you very much for allowing me to say words, Mr. President. I oppose the motion.

MR. LEMUEL A. BODDEN: Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Oh I am sorry....

MR. LEMUEL A. BODDEN: Without wishing to keep us here any longer, I feel that I should be remiss in my duties if I did not briefly, and I state briefly as I am not going to dwell upon this too many long, comment on the remarks made by the Second Elected Member for West Bay. My only comment is that this motion has provoked the blessing of this House. This is the motion to the motion which has already been passed to support the terms of reference of this Committee in Private Member's Motion No. 11/91. It is the Mover's business, Mr. President, if he does not care to support this motion. However, I think that he is out of order to state that the Responsible Members of this House would be supporting a motion which would be repugnant to the people of the Cayman Islands. It is not the only person who can put up here and make statements, Mr. President. We might discriminate the Only Member for West Bay but he does not intimidate me. I am the seconder of this motion,

MR. EDWARD A. FINNEY (CONTINUING): Mr. President, I asked by what I have supposed here. I think that it is a good solution regardless of the $50,000 which will be lost by Radio Guyana. If we find that it is not a good thing for our country then we may do it. I am afraid of hearing that Radio Guyana is going to lose $50,000 that this Government is going to lose $50,000. If it is good for us, it is good for us. If it is not good then we do not do it. It is the previous instance as I stated, Mr. President, whether he wants to support this or not. However, we are going to push this issue down anybody's throat. We should vote on a democratic manner. We can vote as we care to vote no. These people who want to vote yes will vote yes. Anything that positive are happening with the power in this country. Should be happening with the power in this country. This is a free country with freedom of the press. However, because this Government believes that it is wrong to acknowledge alcohol and tobacco products. So that's happening with the press?

So, Mr. President, I support this motion 100 per cent.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not wish to prolong the debate but I am sure that Members are anxious that the vote be taken. However, I do think that it might be helpful to the House if I did make one point which is that when there is a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to examine something, all the merits, including among the merits or demerits of the particular action which they will be examining. We are simply selecting whether a Select Committee ought to examine that matter. It is only if the Member feels that the matter ought not to be examined by a Select Committee at all that he needs to speak or vote against the motion. If he thinks that it is not a matter which is worthy of the attention of a Select Committee, then of course he is entirely and it may be the duty to oppose the motion. Otherwise, normally it seems to me that it would be a little odd to vote against the motion. Arguments that a particular course of action should or should not be taken in relation to the matter which the Select Committee is to examine and the various arguments which the Select Committee itself should look into. That is really what I was trying to say when I was saying that it is wrong to assume that the Select Committee is necessarily going to come to particular conclusions and not call all manner of witnesses or hear Radio Guyana because of anything else. The Select Committee has to look into all these things and to identify what is advisable.

Perhaps anyway I may now put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. P. AUGUSTUS JULIEN: May I have a division, Mr. President?

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well.

DIVISION
No. 59

AYES

NOES

Hon. Dominic A. Gonsalves
Hon. Michael A. Bradley
Hon. Edmund St. Hilaire
Hon. Herman D. Stephen
Hon. M. Norman Riddle

SESSION
NO. 62
(CONTINUED)

AYES

Hon. Capt. Charles L. Edwards
Hon. Russell G. Johnson
Hon. Stephen L. Ormsby
Mr. Clifford A. Pierson
Capt. Henry G. Kirkpatrick

20

NOES

Mr. W. Anthony Hunt
Mr. W. Samuel Hilton

3

SENATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 13/62 CARRIED BY MAJORITY.

MR. PRESIDENT: The adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS H. FOSTER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until Tuesday, 3rd September, 1962.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion before the House is that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 3rd September, 1962. Are you ready for the question?

HON. DENNIS H. FOSTER: Yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon, Tuesday.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED: AT 8.33 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., TUESDAY, 3RD SEPTEMBER, 1962.

[illegible] OF THE [illegible] SESSION OF THE [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION WAS PUT BY MR. [illegible] THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR [illegible] ON BEHALF OF [illegible] WHO HAS GIVEN NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

NO. 82: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER PLEASE GIVE THE NUMBER OF [illegible] REGISTERED AS AT AUGUST 1977 IN RESPECT OF [illegible] AND ALSO OF THOSE WHO HAVE VOLUNTARILY WITHDRAWN?

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION WAS PUT BY MR. [illegible] THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR [illegible] ON BEHALF OF [illegible]

NO. 83: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER GIVE A BREAKDOWN BY [illegible] OF EXPENDITURE UNDER [illegible] FOR [illegible] DURING THE SIXTH [illegible]?

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION WAS PUT BY MR. [illegible] THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR [illegible]

NO. 84: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER GIVE A BREAKDOWN OF THE [illegible] OF THE [illegible]?

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION WAS PUT BY MR. [illegible] THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR [illegible]

NO. 85: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE THE [illegible] OF THE [illegible] WHICH [illegible] AND THE [illegible] WHICH [illegible] TO [illegible]?

THE SECOND QUESTION WAS PUT BY MR. [illegible] THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR [illegible]

NO. 86: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER GIVE A BREAKDOWN OF THE [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] AND [illegible] OF [illegible] WHICH HAVE [illegible]?

4. STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Statement by the Honourable Chief Minister - Leader of Government Business.

5. GOVERNMENT NOTICES

(a) NOTICE:-

GOVERNMENT NOTICE NO. [illegible] - [illegible] DEVELOPMENT PLAN

To be moved by the Honourable Chief Minister

(c) STATE:-

PAST AND CURRENT PROSECUTIONS

(1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible]

(3) [illegible]

(4) [illegible]

(5) [illegible]

(6) [illegible]

(7) [illegible]

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	i
Public Affairs Report - Hearing, Use of Agricultural Chemicals on the Farm	1
Public Accounts Committee Report on Accounts [illegible] for the Year Ended June, 1965 - Crop of the Farm	3
Report of the Standing Select Committee on Education Annual - Act of the Year	5
Declaration of the Proprietary - Non-Standard Dairies Regulations	7
Questions	9
Statement of the Hon. D.D. Minister of Agriculture Regarding Potato Policy	20
Agricultural Marketing Board - Enterprise Development Plans	37
The Agricultural Collection of Customs Duties Act, 1966 - Text and Explanatory Notes	42
The Minister of Health (Miss) Act, 1965 - Short Title and Explanatory Notes	43
The Public Finance and Audit Act, 1966 - Short Explanation	45

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: The Assembly is in session.
I will invite the Reverend Bishop
Dundas to say prayers for us.

REV. EDWARD DUNDAS: Let us pray.
Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and
power and strength do proceed: We beseech Thee so to direct and govern the
deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all
things may be ordered upon the best and the surest foundations for
the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the
people of these Islands.
Grant our Sovereign Lady Queen
Elizabeth, the Queen of these Fifty Isles of Melanesia, Charles
Prince of Wales, Duke of Edinburgh, Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother,
Princess Margaret and all the Royal Family,
Thy gracious favour and keep them ever in Thy holy protection,
and bless and prosper them in all their undertakings, that they may
always be faithful servants of Thee and Thy people. Endue with
wisdom and understanding, Christian zeal and virtue, truth and justice,
Thy servant Sir Peter Kenilorea, Governor-General of these Islands,
and all those associated with him in the Administration of these
Islands, that they may be enabled faithfully to discharge the duties
of their high offices, to the maintenance of Thy true religion and
virtue, the honour of Her Majesty's Crown and Government and the
welfare and happiness of these Islands, whose Constitution and Laws
they are sworn to uphold and maintain.
Bless and direct, sanctify and govern our Prime Minister,
Ministers of the Government, Leader of the Opposition and Members of
the Legislative Assembly, that they may be enabled faithfully to perform
the responsible duties of their high offices.
All this we ask for Thy great Name's
sake, Amen. The Lord's Prayer.
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 those that trespass against us
and lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. For
Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever.
Amen.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Papers for tabling.
Presentation of Report and Accounts
Central Hospital Report (March, 1984). The Honourable Minister
Member of Executive Council.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

CENTRAL HOSPITAL REPORT FOR 1984

HON. D. KUDUON ADOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table
of this Honourable House a Report on Central Hospital for the year
ended December 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

HON. M. APIKAI ADAMU: Mr. Speaker, thank you. The new
Parliament Building in Honiara was built by the people of different
ethnic origins in the country and represents the hopes of the nation
to build the National Play Ground as the focal point of harmony
to give the country's decentralised economy stimulated and supported
by Government ministries and

MR. K. [illegible] SCHOPP (CONTINUING): Mr. President, before the interruption for this quorum call I was saying that the public was entitled to know the details of the proposed airline merger.

The Senate, Mr. President, has a responsibility in determining if the proposed merger is necessary. If such a merger is approved by the Board of Directors and recommended to them by the Justice Department in keeping with the terms of reference mentioned in the Justice Department letter which was originally instrumental in causing the Board to hold hearings, it should be approved.

In the event of approval the decision financial stabilization of the airlines is especially borne out by the testimony, and I quote:

> "The balance sheet of Eastern Airways is a disaster. The accumulated loss of over $30, which has taken on large proportions which is clearly unacceptable to normal financing procedures."

Mr. President, much emphasis has been placed in this report on the profitability of the airline. The report goes on to point out that the Eastern-Capital merger would improve a large number of routes to various cities, some which are unprofitable. It would be recognized that this might not be financially possible, it was pointed that the company's obligations be eliminated so, if the merger was more than compensation company.

In an attempt to stabilize the airline industry many proposals be presented to provide necessary financial assistance to the individual airline as a final basis. There is no doubt whatsoever, Mr. President, that Eastern must be aided in the very near future, in fact at the present moment it appears that unless some financial assistance is forthcoming in the very near future, Eastern will be forced to cease operations. Additionally, we must not lose sight of the fact that Eastern is engaged in the largest single airline operation in the world, and its failure would create an unbearable financial burden.

Eastern Airlines' record since its inception in 1926 is one of profit and progress, and they have maintained an unbroken dividend record. Eastern's debt is a 737 of this large amount is guaranteed by the Government under the Federal Aid Airport Act.

It is the view that the 737 of airlines [illegible] been approved back in 1958 at a time when the 737 of that time, the company could very well have gone bankrupt in a much shorter financial position. However, it is very logical and important to note that Eastern has [illegible] to maintain its position. Additionally, we must not lose sight of the fact that Eastern is engaged in the largest single airline operation in the world, and its failure would create an unbearable financial burden to the

MR. H. EDGAR HINDS (Parliamentary): Finally, and of course very importantly, I would be totally remiss in my duty if I did not express appreciation to the Secretariat staff, particularly Mrs. Lynch, for the very able support and assistance rendered to the Committee throughout the Session.

The other areas which have engaged the attention of the Committee have been of a very complex nature in the areas of organization, information and communication. In this regard, many interesting methods and suggestions were made. I am pleased to report that much progress has been made in implementing many of these recommendations. Others are currently in process, while others are still under active discussion. It is important to point out that a restructuring of the arrangements was initiated whereby Secretariat staff were selected and placed in respective Committees. The organizational chart forms a part of this Report. Additional jobs for the support and management personnel have been developed in this regard and approval is forthcoming.

Mr. President, this Report is lengthy. It is helpful to Caucus Members. It will prove invaluable to the members of the future Assembly and will hopefully enable our National Flag to continue to wave bigger and brighter hurricane.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words of thanks to the Secretariat team, to the Heads of Divisions and Regional Offices who carefully examined the Reports for details, and to the staff of Caucus Members who contributed in a very meaningful way to the proceedings.

Mr. President, I recommend the Report to Caucus Members for their favourable consideration. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Presentation of Reports. Hon. Errol Mitchell.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Public Accounts Committee's report on the proposed amendments to Standing Order 99.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. President, the Public Accounts Committee met to consider the draft proposals submitted by Mr. O.K. Lynch, the Private Secretary and Executive Service Secretary, with respect to Standing Order 99 and the terms of reference of the Public Accounts Committee Standing Order 99 for the purposes of this Committee's consideration of the matter. Report. I should like to place on record the Committee's appreciation and thanks to Mr. Lynch for his invaluable assistance given to and to the Committee.

The Committee held two meetings. The first meeting was held on the 21st June, 1988 to consider the proposed amendment to Standing Order 99. The second meeting was held on the 5th July, 1988 to enable the Committee to consider the circulation of the 21st June's meeting to enlist a Standing Committee of Standing Orders prior to the Committee's Report being tabled in the House.

In conclusion, the attendance of Members at the meetings do not call in the Minutes which are attached to the Report.

Mr. [illegible] (Secretary):

In accordance with Standing Order 90(1), the following persons were in attendance at the Committee's meeting held [illegible] June -

Mr. G.F. [illegible], Esq.	- Public Accounts
Mr. [illegible]	- Auditor-General
Asst. Commissioner [illegible]	- Acting Deputy Financial Secretary
Mr. [illegible]	- Chief Accountant

Also in attendance were -

Mr. [illegible]	- Deputy Financial Secretary
Mrs. [illegible]	- Financial Secretary

The Committee agreed that the report and statement of Standing Order 90 which is the subject of the Minutes [illegible] be presented to the Council by the Deputy Chairman of Committees [illegible] on behalf.

Resolved by Mr. President, member of Executive Council -

"That in accordance with Standing Order 90, this Council approves the Public Accounts Committee's report dated [illegible] June [illegible]."

Mr. [illegible] (Secretary):

"(1) There shall be a Standing Select Committee, to be called the Public Accounts Committee, to consider reports of the Auditor-General -

(a) on the accounts of the Government;

(b) on such other accounts required to be laid before this House as the Committee may think fit; and

(c) on any matter incidental to the performance of his duties as the Committee may think fit.

(2) The Public Accounts Committee shall be appointed by the House at the beginning of a new session following a general election and shall consist of five Elected Members. The quorum shall be three members, including the chairman.

(3) Upon the receipt by the Presiding Officer, a report mentioned in paragraph (1) shall be laid before, and referred by the clerk to the Public Accounts Committee for consideration.

(4) In accordance with Standing Order 72, the Public Accounts Committee may call any public officer, and in the case of a person in the employment of an authority in a non-governmental or in an unincorporated body elected on account of their work or organisation, to give information on any matter in connection with accounts which the Committee may require for the performance of their duties.

(5) The Public Accounts Committee shall make their report upon the report of the Auditor-General on the accounts of Government after the Auditor-General's report has been laid on the Table of this House and both the Committee's report and the Auditor-General's report shall be laid at the same time."

MR. TIBBOTT A. FIELDS (CONTINUING):

(6) Subject to these Standing Orders, the practice and procedure of the Public Accounts Committee shall be determined by the Committee.

(7) The Chairperson should preside at the Table of the Legislative Assembly while there is being laid the Report of the Committee and of the report of the Auditor-General to which it relates.

(8) The Auditor-General, the Deputy Financial Secretary and the Chief Accountant shall be in attendance when Controlling Officers or other persons are providing information or explanations to the Committee.

(9) Notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 78, the Quorum of the Public Accounts Committee shall be determined as three members."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move that this Report should be the Report of the Committee to the Legislative Assembly at the Third Meeting of the 1983 Session, and I recommend this Report to this Honourable House.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you.
The presentation of Reports and Reports. The Standing Select Committee on Standing Orders Report, the Honourable Chief Official Member.

STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS REPORT

HON. DENNIS A. SCOTT: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the Report of the Standing Select Committee on Standing Orders.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

HON. DENNIS A. SCOTT: Mr. President, at the First Meeting of the 1983 Session of the Legislative Assembly, Government Motion No. 4 was moved by the said Council on Monday 28th March. I am not going to read the whole motion, Sir, but just the relevant sections:-

"AND IT APPEARING EXPEDIENT, in accordance with Standing Order 78, that there be established a Standing Select Committee entitled The Committee on Standing Orders which Standing Select Committee shall consist of the White Bears and shall constitute as a Committee of this Honourable House until the Legislative Assembly is next dissolved in accordance with Section 27(1) of the Constitution of the Cayman Islands, and that the said Standing Select Committee have full power to, inter alia, generally to consider what changes to standing orders are necessary or desirable and particularly to consider any proposed amendments to standing orders which are referred to it in accordance with Standing Order 83(3)."

HON. DENNIS M. ECKERT (CONTINUED): Mr. President, I will try to be brief, Sen. Kenney. I may limit my objections these questions time if I take too long.

I was surprised Chairman of Administration by the President, Sir, and we had six meetings. One meeting we were unable to do any business because of lack of a quorum. The Administration amendments and veto-overrides to Standing Order 19, Standing Order 20, Standing Order 21, Standing Order 23, Standing Order 24, Standing Order 26, Standing Order 29 and Standing Order 75. We also dealt with Private Members' motions on Standing Orders. We considered Motions 2 and 3 which were passed by a majority of the First Session of the Legislative Assembly. The motions, No. 2 dealing with the proposed amendments to Standing Orders 8 and 10, and No. 3 dealing with the proposed amendment to Standing Order 29 were defeated by a majority vote on each on the Legislative Minutes.

On the recommendations amendments to Standing Orders was the Report Islands Consolidation Order, 1976, Mr. President, the Committee agreed that the Honourable Second Official Member make any consequential amendments arising out of the amended Standing Orders to Standing Orders and the Cayman Islands Constitution Order, 1976.

We had another recommendation on Standing Order 26. The Committee agreed that the standing Officer be advised that in the opinion of the Select Committee another ceremonial chair should be given to which Legislature may presently be appointed. There were other miscellaneous points of order. The following were identified as points of order, extension of Standing, Withdrawal of Members, Reading of Bills and Resolution. The Committee agreed that Private Members motion as a point of order may refer to the relevant Standing Order.

There was a minority Report in accordance with Standing Order 74(3)(b). The Committee granted leave to the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town to table his report which is Appendix A of the Report.

Mr. President, we will have what the Standing Orders provide a general debating on and vote on what the Committee has sought to do, Sir. In accordance with Standing Order 74(3) I move that the Report be adopted, Sir.

HON. SPOKESMAN: The question is that the Report of the Standing Select Committee on Standing Orders be adopted. Debate on the question.

HONOURABLE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

HON. G. HAIG BODDEN: May I have a division please, Mr. President?

DIVISION
NO. 23

AYES

NOES

Hon. Dennis M. Eckert
Hon. Michael J. Gibbons
Hon. Thomas S. McTaggart
Hon. Kenneth O. Jackson
Hon. W. Dennis Foster
Hon. Capt. Charles L. McCoskerie
Hon. Vassel O. Johnson

TUESDAY
DEC. 12
(CONTINUED)

AYES	NOES
Mr. K. McKenzie Smith	Mr. G. Haig Oxford
Mrs. Debbie S. Crockett	
Mr. Clayton A. Dickson	
Cmdr. Wally J. Kirkconnell	
Mr. J. Samuel Walker	
Mr. John R. Morgan	
12	1

THE MOTION TO USE STANDING ORDERS CARRIED BY SUBSIDIARY ORDER - PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

SUSPENSION BY THE PRESIDENT

MR. PRESIDENT: Members will now be entertained for the first time here and now at this stage in explanation of what will, from my understanding, now happen.

The Rules are governed a number of amendments to Standing Orders. Section 82(1) of the Constitution provides that:-

"The Assembly may from time to time make, amend and revoke Standing Orders for the regulation and orderly conduct of its own proceedings and the despatch of business, and for the passing, initialling and numbering of Bills and for the presentation thereof to the Governor for assent; but no such Standing Orders or amendment or revocation thereof shall have effect unless they have been approved by the Governor."

What therefore has to happen is that the amendments which have been passed or recommended today as the result of the Standing Order Committee on Standing Orders Report receive the Governor's approval.

I think that I can speak for the Governor in saying that the approval will certainly be given but that it may be unreasonable for us simply if it is not given until it has been possible to go through the recommendations made and to appreciate them as it were, because they are not easy to follow in the way in which they are set here. Moreover, it may be, as I understand it from the Report, necessary to do a little bit of minor tidying up. The Report says that the Committee agreed that the Honourable Second Official Member should make any consequential amendments which were necessary, and that must be borne in mind. I would think that the Governor's approval for the agreed changes will also need to be given for the Honourable Second Official Member to amend the motion for either a repeal of Standing Orders as the case may be, or for a motion to be made of the amendment as these Members have got something which they can apply before.

I think that probably it will be, then from what this Meeting has been finished but before the next Meeting starts that the amendments will certainly take effect. I have been told that it was the hope of the Business Committee that in connection with one of the matters contemplated by the Committee's Report, Members should be invited to ask questions shortly. I see no difficulty about that provided immediately after Christmas the Standing Orders amendments have not been formally approved and will not actually come into effect probably until the next Meeting of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: I might point I have kept that clear. If any Member has a question to ask, he will need but him ask.

MR. D. CRAIG MILLAR: With respect, Mr. Speaker, may I also ask that the part of the Standing Orders relevant under Standing Order 24(7) be deemed to be suspended so that Opposition Government might ask the relevant Committee Minister through the normal and not a Government Minister as it usually is in the case of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that now that an agreement that a Government Minister will be produced.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLAR: Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I find it a little bit more difficult to accept that particular amendment because in the case of the progress I was not initially applying the amendment. There is nothing in Standing Orders now which prevents the Member from asking Ministers any civil day.

MR. D. BRIAN MILLAR: The amendment will be withdrawn, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I am sure that I speak for the responsible Head Official Member in saying that this will be done. Questions may be tabled to Written Answers Minister. Oral Reply on Monday to Written Reply also on Questions Minister. Oral Reply on Monday for Questions Time. However, it is delightful to see that I would like Members to bear that in mind when tabling questions.

Questions. The Second Leader Member for Golden Town.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GOLDEN SANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRY FOR INFORMATION AND ACTION WHETHER

MR. PAT: Would the Honourable Minister state the intention of the Motor Vehicle Registry to issue a set of [illegible] to Cayman Motor Vehicle Registry Centre?

ANSWER: The reply given by Miss Treasury reads:

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN"

The Government of the Cayman Islands have no objection to the importation of goods and services listed on Appendix I of the CITES Convention, provided the permit is obtained from the country of origin and the importation is in accordance with Article V and VI of the Convention.

Signed: Kenneth E. Jones
Financial Secretary (I & HA) and
"CITES Management Authority".

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. HUNTER JONES: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Member say if the two weeks that a reply had been given to Mr. Treasury?

DR. PARKER T. HUBBARD: Yes, excuse, Mr. President. Yes, the Principal Secretary advised me that the note was written. The note was not addressed to Mr. Bowdy. It was left with the Secretary for information.

H. E. MR. ABDUL RAHMAN: Was the Member who took Mr. Bowdy's note of this note by it was not for him to see?

DR. PARKER T. HUBBARD: Mr. President, I have already said what the note given to Mr. Bowdy said, and I read the note. So I have said already that it was given to Mr. Bowdy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was given to him but not addressed to him, I think that...

H. E. MR. MATS SZYPRYT: Can the Member say if Mr. Bowdy's evidence were to contradict to the note?

DR. PARKER T. HUBBARD: Mr. President, Mr. Bowdy attended the meeting of the Civil Management Authority. At the meeting there was a discussion including the Assistant Principal Secretary of that Ministry and Mr. Matthews. The Principal Secretary explained all the problems of trade in which together to Mr. Arthur Bowdy was not also view it was thought that the matter was acceptable. However, later on Mr. Bowdy submitted his offer again tentatively that we be given a concession or something which also we could remove the export in order to obtain the permit which he wanted to import into the Cayman Islands. He was told again that we would consider an export license from Cuba from the Civil Management Authority before the issuance of an import license to them. Inquiry by the Civil Management Authority there would be considered.

Mr. President, there continuously have been discussions going on between the Civil Management Authority, especially in this regard. Perhaps this year Civil Management applications from Cuba like and Nicaragua should be failed to look at the tourist flow operations. Discussions have been with the Civil Management Authority here concerning the existing of tourists in their territorial waters. These questions arrived the Civil Management Authority here that no permit should be given to anyone to export tourists from their country except out of their territorial waters. So the Civil Management Authority here are quite aware of that and this is what Mr. Bowdy was told. We also told that if he would apply an export license from the Management Authority in Cuba then this Government would look at it.

However, as has also happened, Mr. Bowdy then left and he obtained his an export license from Cuba first, but he obtained from the Agricultural Department a permit to transport tourists to Cuba also tried to obtain a different story from explaining himself from Cuba first. Those permits to transport tourists to Cuba also were fraudulently issued from one to the other and the certificate was a local certificate to say that the tourists could be transported.

Mr. President, Article V of the Standard was the guidelines for trade in Appendix I, species such as the green sea turtle which is an endangered species. It is not a threatened species as it was back in 1978 which they were moved from that appendix to the endangered species appendix. It states, Mr. President, that those tourists meant be exported and to do so permits will only be given in very exceptional circumstances.

MR. PALMER (Trust Territory): The Administration note which was written by the Management Authority here expressed to us verbal approval, or consent, to be obtained from the Management Authority in Palau first. It was not a permit to harvest turtles. Mr. Speaker, you already explained all that, Mr. President. If it were that it did not have what the position was. We just simply explained that Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, those statistics that Mr. Speaker is quoted in Micronesian have been created by the Government of Micronesia to be used as an aid for him

DEL. G. MORRIS KING: Mr. President, I would like to remind the Committee of Style.

DEL. G. HAIG SOSOKE: Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Committee? Why did the Committee allow Mr. Speaker, even a part of it, to read the Government's information note to allow him to hunt turtles? Why did they allow such a note which would lead him to believe that he had the right to hunt turtles?

DEL. FRANK R. MICHELSON: It was because, Mr. President, of Mr. Speaker's insistence that a statement contained in this document be here so that he can be able to get the actual report over there. We are still pursuing where that regulation was and we would not believe it. So he was given this note to look at the TTPI Management Authority in Palau also.

DEL. P. MARTINEZ ROBO: Mr. President, a supplementary. In the note saying that Mr. Speaker indicated as something to have which has been a discussion for the Government prior to the distribution. To whom was the Memorandum signed, sir?

DEL. FRANK R. MICHELSON: To whoever gave Mr. Speaker the permit, the statement. I have already said in the reply to the question that the note was written to whom to the permit, but it was written by the TTPI Management Authority of the Pacific Islands, not a Municipality.

DEL. M. MARTIN ADUR: Mr. President, is the Trust Management Authority in this country, not the Statistical Secretary under the Speaker's Portfolio?

DEL. JESSE M. MARIAS: Mr. President, TTPI Management Authority is composed by Palau, the Governments of Micronesia Trust, Micronesian Bureau of Fishes and Plants, and the Government of the Pacific Islands.

DEL. LAZARUS E. SALII: Mr. President, I have listened to some of these answers. Is it my understanding that the Members of the Committee are being misled into giving information which is not true, but here we have this information anyway? I would have, Mr. President, that the letter be signed by Mr. Speaker rather than the Trust Territory Authority under the Speaker's Portfolio.

DEL. KASUO S. MIDO: Yes, Mr. President, I am the author of this Committee but I have stated, and I say that I am not the spokesman of Department of the Pacific Islands. When have explained a number times as to the Management Authority in which Palau and I cannot divorce that knowledge for the explanation which he does not want to. We attempt to refute this note to show it was unauthorized and to have a copy addressed to TTPI authorities in which Palau was not addressed to Mr. Speaker.

MR. LINCOLN A. BECKER: Mr. President, while I do not regard the Member in the senate for anything the Federal Government, he cannot abrogate his responsibilities because this note was signed by the Principal Secretary for the Presidio. Is he an individual responsible and if the President could file be here if he accepts this responsibility?

REV. HAROLD G. HOSKINS: Mr. President, as far as I know the President is responsible for the actions of Principal Secretaries in this Government, not the Member.

MR. H. RAY JORDAN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if from his knowledge of the execution of this Convention, it is not correct to say that the Ministry of Agriculture or the Department of Agriculture, as the Presidio is the Government Authority in every country which is a signatory to this Convention?

REV. HAROLD G. HOSKINS: Mr. President, the signatory to this Convention is the Government of the Cayman Islands. Therefore there should be a Management Authority in each of the countries.

MR. H. RAY JORDAN: The question I am asking, Mr. President, is the Management Authority in reality the Ministry of Agriculture or whatever we want to call it?

REV. HAROLD G. HOSKINS: Mr. President, I would be the very first person on this Island to demand the whole Convention and be most glad to represent the Government of the Cayman Islands at these conferences.

MR. G. HUGH SCOTT: Mr. President, the question I am asking is, is it not correct that because, actually the Ministry of Agriculture, or the Department or the Presidio of Agriculture is the appointed management body for the purposes of the CITES convention?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think quite clear that the Member who is being questioned does not have any responsibility either for appointing or keeping the so appointed Management Authority or other countries and to that extent perhaps the question is out of order. Nevertheless, I have been minded to hear the Minister of Agriculture to assist hon Members on both sides by what the original question which was asked. I think perhaps that has now come to the implementation of that particular question and just as the hour question.

THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR TOURISM AND AVIATION, COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC SERVICE MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING, AGRICULTURE

Q. 52: Would the Honourable Member kindly advise the balance of sums of the monies imposed by John Yossen on June, 2010?

ANSWER: If the question is directed to monies imposed by John Yossen in July, 2010, the answer is as follows.

To the credit of the enforcement, the court orders were enforced by the STAFF Management Authority in the Cayman Islands that the notes issued "Covid Punish" revoked in the Cayman Islands on the 1st July,

1965, with a copy of motion plus Court Rule without an exhibit dated June 1965 designated Motion for Court Rule and that thereafter counsel on October 1965 the Subsequent Juvenile Petition and Petition dated July 1965. The action commenced by the Chief Probation Officer took appropriate action.

ATTORNEYS:

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, a supplementary. Could the Member tell us why only some of the parties were released?

MRS. HARRIET F. WOODBURY: Mr. President, in connection with the Senate Education matter which appears to be in fairly good working condition were released the others of parties were left like Mr. John Young. It seems as though the action were very limited because all the parties would have been reinstated.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, could the Member tell the Education Committee when we have been informed of the reinstatement of I was not the other of small [illegible] in a public information matter, but were not the subject of a petition?

MRS. HARRIET F. WOODBURY: Mr. President, I would have to give the same answer again unless I just said now.

MR. PRESIDENT: Put the case on then to the next question, Senator [illegible].

THE CLERK READS NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ENTITLED "NEW TEST FOR SCHOOL BUSING" REGARDING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S PROPOSAL FOR DESEGREGATION AND RACIAL BALANCE

MR. [illegible]: Would the Commissioner review whether those of the Stanton Report by John Young in June, 1965, which were released as Department orders have been monitored to determine their compliance?

ANSWER: Reinstatement in most cases of any families impacted by John Young in June, 1965, but if the requirements of the Stanton Act report by John Young in July, 1965, was unclear in the following:

The families which came released were not monitored to determine current rates. The process is complex for the role is very complicated. It would be very costly in terms of providing manpower and personnel with additional training devices which would have to be followed for each family. By the time these were completed the families would have other [illegible] changed.

[illegible]:

MR. H. [illegible]: Mr. President, may I ask if the Member can explain that the Department Authority have complete responsibility for the [illegible] of Stanton which are the subject of petitions or Supervisors [illegible]?

MRS. HARRIET F. WOODBURY: Mr. President, those families work in the [illegible] as the Chairwoman of Stanton Schools have reviewed each family case.

MR. D. RITZ DOUGLAS: Mr. Treasurer, may I ask the Member if he knows that the counties on this Seattle Home up until the moment of their release are properly fed and kept in roads which contain water, unlike the counties which have released some counties which had been part of the water for many years?

MR. PONTIUS: I think that the new agency obtaining jurisdiction from the Legislature [illegible] and I did ask Members whether to which representatives [illegible] on here on page. The Second Blocked Member for Ward Two.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WARD TWO IS ASKED THE HONOURABLE MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR DEPARTMENT AND MINERAL RESOURCES

MR. JAY: Would the Honourable Member make the amount of reinforcement requested by Mr. Pontius for expansion and loss of his lower [illegible]?

ANSWER: No, sir.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. A. MACKENZIE, SUDS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Member say whether Government is considering [illegible] the amount recommended, and if not, why not?

HON. ROBERT G. PONTIUS: Mr. Speaker, Government is under no [illegible] to compensate Mr. Pontius. I believe [illegible] to this effect.

MR. A. MACKENZIE, SUDS: Mr. Speaker, might this be put a question [illegible]...

MR. SPEAKER: If it is not a question that [illegible] not mine.

MR. A. MACKENZIE, SUDS: Maybe we do not have a legal [illegible] but what about a commitment, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Blocked Member for Ward [illegible] may now ask the next question.

THE SECOND BLOCKED MEMBER FOR WARD TWO IS ASKED THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR MENTAL RETARDATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

MR. JAY: Would the Honourable Member please provide a breakdown by sub-vote of expenditures under this year's Social Services Department vote?

ANSWER: The breakdown of sub-votes is as follows:

01 - Personnel Services	$433,507.56
02 - Travelling & Subsistence	3,983.90
03 - Supplies and Materials	20,187.84
04 - Utilities	849.00
05 - Other Operating & Maintenance Expenses	3,204.00
06 - Grants, Contributions & Subventions	188,894.33
14 - Equipment	917.22
Total expenditures as at 31 July, 1976	$651,643.85

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. D. EDWARD HIGGS: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member state whether he finds the public of the cost of giving 21 groups money if to be reasonable satisfactory? He gave out grants, entertainments and subsistences of $200,000 and it seems to me that the cost of giving out these grants is as much as the grants.

HON. LEONARD O. SHARP: Mr. President, if one Member is making reference to the figures for Personal Emoluments he should realize that the cost of the Departmental Committees would also eliminate many grants.

MR. SPEAKER: The next question. The second Elected Member for West Bay.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER REPRESENTING HER MAJESTY'S EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

QU. 53: Would the Honourable Member make a statement on the progress on the matter of foreign enlistment?

ANSWER: Yes. A statement will be made during this Meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: We intend to adjourn soon.

HON. JOHN B. MCLEAN: Oh.

MR. SPEAKER: The Elected Member for West End.

MR. JOHN B. MCLEAN: Mr. President, are you willing to allow Tuesday to ask you to reflect...

MR. SPEAKER: I was not sure the question is one of those are not any supplementaries you might put such.

HON. JOHN B. MCLEAN: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I will give Monday before I am sure to close so that any Member who wants to propose any question may do so.

THE FIRSTLY ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER REPRESENTING HER MAJESTY'S EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

QU. 54: Would the Honourable Member state the purpose of the Permit proposed to be carried out by the Police Department when required to fingerprint?

ANSWER: The purpose of the survey is to confirm the accuracy of police records and to ascertain if the persons for the medical grant of a firearm authority are still valid.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. D. EDWARD HIGGS: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member state whether it is the intention to recover finances of the persons fingerprinted?

SEN. ROBERT H. MICHEL: Mr. President, in the manner which [illegible] the newspapers have been no indication given to date as to, they that Watergate would be involved. However, I would like to ask that if a particular circumstance arises there be added to it the best interests of the community, and instead of the possibility that they could be involved.

SEN. JOHN G. TOWER: Mr. President, I may interrupt, do I understand the Senator correctly that the intent is to place matters in that of the Agnew?

SEN. ROBERT H. MICHEL: Mr. Mr. President, definitely not. That the Cabinet now and out in campaign one of the Nation. They do not [illegible] for that or sale, Mr. Senator. I think that it is in the best interest that Agnew [illegible] and have a package or [illegible] up to [illegible] there is still [illegible] from this to vote. I am sure, they that a lot of people in region to this [illegible] to say, that shade gas one other and they had experience in [illegible] the crowd up to be to take stock.

SEN. H. EDWARD HUTTAS: A supplementary, Mr. President, part of the [illegible] identification of [illegible] Agnew was going to be done. Is the Senator saying that if [illegible] in the Agnew [illegible] to [illegible] and [illegible] to the Agnew [illegible] to [illegible] and [illegible] to [illegible] and [illegible] to [illegible] and

MR. HAWKINS of ARIZONA: Mr. President, would Senate Standing Order 29(c)(2) this be dealing the inclusion of the relevant legal question and, or hypothetical?

MR. MANSFIELD: Well, I think that it may be, but, however, I make no more supplementary I am afraid...

QUESTION OF STANDING ORDER 29(2)

MR. CURTIS of NEBRASKA: Mr. President, under Standing Order 29(2) I would ask that the...

MR. MANSFIELD: Standing Order 29(2)?

MR. CURTIS of NEBRASKA: Yes, sir. I do not think that this question is ready now until tomorrow because it is a very important question, and I do not feel that it has received its proper attention.

MR. MANSFIELD: With the exception, the question has been answered. There can be unlimited supplementaries. If there are questions which already have been asked or supplementary to that matter that have been of a substantive question.

QUESTION OF SENATOR CURTIS

MR. HOLT of WEST VIRGINIA: Mr. President, in today's Order Book question number 21 appears in my name. Under Standing Order 29(2), I would not like to be carried over until tomorrow's Order Book.

MR. ROBERT F. KENNEDY: Mr. President, I am not clear as to what is the reason for asking for suspension of Standing Order 29(2), for it is not in the interest of the fact that we have matters here with other Senators present prior to the question.

MR. MANSFIELD: It seems to me that Standing Order is suspended in order to allow question that is unanswered for long enough, although I am not clear as to what was being asked, for further supplementaries to be asked to question number 21. I would see no difficulty about that.

NOTICE
CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ORDER 2317,
AND 21;

MR. J. CALEB BOGGS: Mr. President, I do wish this question [illegible] suspended by suspension of Standing Order to complete the question on today's Order Book.

MR. CURTIS of NEBRASKA: Mr. President, I object.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is not in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 29, Standing Order 29(2) be suspended in order to enable...

MR. RICHARD B. RUSSELL: Standing Order 29(2) is to be, Mr. President?

S. PRESIDENT: ...under Rule, Standing Order ...(1) and (2) I think probably it is important in order to enable the remainder of the questions on today's Order Paper to be answered. Does any Member wish to speak on this?

MR. [illegible] ASHBY: [illegible] STRUCTURE ORDER 30(1) AND (2) BE SUSPENDED IN ORDER TO ENABLE THE REMAINDER OF QUESTIONS ON THIS ORDER PAPER TO BE ANSWERED.

MR. PRESIDENT: If that stands I will, subject to Members' views, allow further supplementaries to question number 50. I think that the Second Elected Member for Georgetown has the first supplementary question.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS ON QUESTION NO. 50 PUT/ASKED:

MR. LEONORA J. CARRINGTON: Mr. President, a supplementary on question number 50. While the Member stated that there was no intention for [illegible] a new Chinese, is having a [illegible] planned?

MR. CLEMENT H. PARKER: Mr. President, I am not a member of the Sun Club but in the light of my knowledge, this, of course, is a member of the Sun Club for membership. If he is [illegible] membership, naturally he will have to [illegible] the Sun Club name or the name. However, that does not say that we have not [illegible] for other organizations or to provide a gym. If a person does not fulfil the qualifications for membership he is not going to be granted it, but [illegible] a person who feels people can take it that if they become a member of the Sun Club they are automatically going to get a license. I do not think that is the way it works at all.

MR. LEONORA J. CARRINGTON: Mr. President, then if that is not the case, my question is, and it is on the basis of information I have received if I may just briefly mention it before I ask the question, which is that in the future a preference for getting one's own license should be that one of a number of the Sun Club, and I was making the question to clarify some information which I have received. That is my feeling that one should be considered on the original information given when first obtaining the license. One would not want to [illegible] a membership in the Sun Club to have one's license removed or to obtain a license.

MR. JAMES R. FIGUEIRA: There are certain criteria that have to be [illegible] for a renewal or granting of a new license. One is a person who is operating a gym and needs a gym to fully [illegible] and [illegible] and [illegible] etc. The other is if the person is a member of the Sun Club. Just to make sure I think that if one is a person, a [illegible] license should be a person of the Sun Club. I could imagine that person who could get [illegible] license removed. I do not see anybody to deny [illegible] one's membership [illegible] and they are entered into the Sun Club, that will get a license as well. I cannot make it any clearer.

MR. LEONORA J. CARRINGTON: Mr. President, I think that there is some confusion. My question to [illegible] one is not, and by the way I am a member of the Sun Club, a number of the Sun Club and all other Unions being equal one qualifies, that one could be granted [illegible] if one is registered.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope that I have it right. If you do not I suppose it will be corrected. I would like to do it if there is nothing. I wish to say, Mark on approving the had got a weekend recess between the last Thursday and the new Thursday, they might go another one he might not get it. However, all things being equal I would believe that one would get it.

MR. J. SPEAKER MCKEEN: A supplementary, Mr. President. On the questions on the supplementary paper, "Purpose of Grant", would we assume such to be about be responsible for that subsidy?

HON. PRESIDENT: I certainly will ask the Minister to further expanding on that. I think that perhaps we could take it. We have had a file on that question. We will pass on to the Honourable Member for Inverness County's question. I think that he might be prepared with that by the time we get to it. I suppose that he would like to ask it today.

THE CLERK WILL READ THE BILL AND WE ARE NOW ON THE SECOND READING OF BILL NO. 27, AN ACT TO AMEND CHAPTER 1 OF THE ACTS OF 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member make a statement on the proposed delegation to Cuba that you have in your office and give the copy to me and the rest of Members.

NOTE: A delegation led by the Honourable Minister for Industry, Trade and Commerce, comprising the Honourable Chief Secretary, the Honourable Member for Communications, Trade and Industrial Development and the Deputy Minister of Industry and Trade visited Cuba from the period 24th-31st July, 1972.

The purpose of the visit was primarily to improve Nova Scotia's trade relations with Cuba and to explore the possibility of establishing a direct air service between Cuba and Nova Scotia. Meetings were held with Cuban officials of INRA on this matter. It is intended to study the report and consider the assessment of the delegation in due course. To date, no decision has been communicated to Cuba by Cuba.

The cost to Government was $2,214.00.

QUESTIONS:

MR. G. MUIR BIGNELL: Mr. President, a supplementary. Is the delegation back or will the Minister say if the Minister of Trade Mission was satisfied from that visit?

HON. M. MCNEIL ROSSITER: Mr. President, I believe that the Minister who is the Minister of Trade Mission was in agreement on the fact that this trip was made to Cuba also. However, which did not reveal the Minister of Trade Mission really has nothing to do with trade rights with the Cuban Islands.

MR. [illegible] M.: Mr. President, the Chairman of the Executive Government Business may just be ... Thank you.

MR. G. ALEX ROBERTS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if he is aware that any suspension from sitting in Court by Cayman Airways?

MR. M. MILTON BODDEN: Mr. President, I am aware of that, Sir, but that would not coincide my circumstances from Cayman Airways because if Cayman received Grand Cayman to Sam Jones it was already planned that in March that they would have to employ pilots which would create any convenience for Cayman Airways. They would be nobody on the Grand Cayman/Sam Jones route.

MR. G. ALEX ROBERTS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if he agrees that if a complete route to Sam Jones instead of Miami, Cayman Airways hopes a fare which Cayman Airways would have had if the planes had gone to Miami?

MR. M. MILTON BODDEN: It depends on how the passengers decided. Sir. Cayman Airways would hope a passenger from Miami to Grand Cayman and the passengers might decide to extend his trip down to Sam Jones. We would buy a Grand Cayman/Sam Jones/Grand Cayman ticket and return to Miami on Cayman Airways, or by night even make possible deviation.

MR. G. ALEX ROBERTS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if he agrees that the only possibility of one Cabinet member to attend the funeral of another?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is an accurate and fair question from the original.

MR. TRUMAN A. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Member state whether there is any truth that the Government is waiting the resignation from the present ministry out of Cayman Airways.

MR. M. MILTON BODDEN: Absolutely not, Mr. President, and I'm sure I think that we would be looking at the very dramatic increase I do not believe that cause would have to [illegible] time, if that is what the Member is referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pass on to question number ... The Honourable Member from West Bay.

THE QUESTION BEING PUT WAS CARRIED IN THE NEGATIVE AND SEVEN MEMBERS RAISED THEIR HANDS IN FAVOUR OF THE MOTION, FOURTEEN VOTED AGAINST AND ONE ABSTAINED. THE MOTION WAS LOST.

No. 23: Would the honourable Member state the policy of the National Airline - Cayman Airways - concerning the employment of foreign pilots with qualified Caymanians?

ANSWER: The policy of Cayman Airways is that as and when suitable, experienced and qualified Caymanian pilots become available they will be employed in preference to foreign nationals.

[illegible]:

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, may I ask if the privacy legislation any problems should arise in the implementation?

[illegible] MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, the implementation process can only be brought about in the way we're doing it, that we are required to set by the Congressional act, and by legislation of the present bill when they acquire the experience which is required by the Secretary. The only way that they can be informed upon is when those individuals reach the maximum which the secretary appoints and designs.

[illegible] MR. [illegible]: Is it possible for the Senator to explain explanations as required by the language?

[illegible] MR. [illegible]: Well, to my mind and I think the proposed change is applicable by most candidates in relation to explanations or certificates, to use an example, private pilots who flight duties for this nature or circumstance and be in qualified [illegible] with a commercial pilot's privileges and be rated in the [illegible] qualified to fly certain types of aircrafts. This [illegible] rather than a policy of requiring that person to have 3,000 or 5,000 more additional hours before they will have [illegible] flights and another, and that is when the experience comes into play.

MR. [illegible]: I think that we have gone on another issue that could [illegible] consideration of [illegible] for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11:30 A.M. THE FOLLOWING OCCURRED:

SPEECH RESUMED AT 11:50 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Item 2. Statement by Members of the Government. The honorable Fiscal Officer, Senator.

SUBMISSION OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL FISCAL OPERATIONS BUDGET:

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I move Senate Resolution No. [illegible] which was passed at the last Meeting of the Assembly, with no [illegible]:

> (a) Rapid progress is to be made with regard to [illegible] which multi-[illegible] consumer goods be sent back to their own countries to serve [illegible] [illegible] by people here; and
>
> (b) All possible steps to be taken to ensure that such [illegible] are kept [illegible] as much as possible.

As I explained when the motion was debated the power of which [illegible] are [illegible] to the United Kingdom's multilateral control. It depends on the willingness of the other states to [illegible] that.

MR. ASHBY (United Kingdom): As I said this explained, it would be wholly unreasonable to make any assignments which prejudice the non-governmental bodies in a position to assess orders. Some will expressly, because they have that we should accept them when possibly and could not send them to secure assistance in their own countries.

The motion also called for the adoption of measures to this issue at the present meeting. - in the hope of similar arrangements -

(a) Suitable provision already exists in the case of Namibia. As Americans economically, non-governmental bodies are especially sure to carry in persons whose visas will expire have been issued.

(b) In order in the case of the United Kingdom law and we have asked that arrangements be made for the issuance of the non-United Kingdom citizens who, in the present circumstances here.

(c) The United Kingdom has also submitted a draft Convention which provides for the exemption of nationals parties. We have asked that the convention be reviewed to ensure that consideration may be given to the possibility of providing for such exemption should cases be made. Some of this case has only will be open to accompany for the exemption of nationals of other States which have also ratified the convention. Our understanding is that the United States has done this, in which case we can see that any American citizens may possibly have to seek here.

(d) We have proposed a provision enabling arrangements to the Government of Namibia who issues visas exercises. We shall continue to pursue them.

As to Rhodesia because in respect of non-Organization personnel there we cannot put the reasons to which some others, a portion of the position prevailed was opposite. This was that Organizations may be entitled to visas on because other country may grant or will their personnel, whichever is the greater. However, those non-Organizations who might have been considered entitled for reasons as Rhodesia was qualified because they are not permitted to remain here after being released. The effect is that they have had to leave at least two thirds of their sentences. It has now been decided that their cases shall in future be reviewed by the Parole Commissioner's Board on the same way as the cases of Organization prisoners, and that some or all of them would have been released or likewise may be taken into consideration for release. In the payment of any fines imposed, be released from prison until the whole sentence to the one have money.

The non-Organization has already been released. Matters have been similarly affected as the result of representations by the other parties concerned.

We should appear to think the number of non-Organizations in prison should be steadily reduced and I do not know that the cases. We have asked that some will remain, except for one for the foreseeable future.

MR. ENGELHARD: ...ment of Government Relations. (d) Rhodesia. The responsible Rhodesian officials ...

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

RESOLUTION NO. 6/85 - CAPITAL INCREASE OF THE BANK

U.S. DELEGATE TO CDB: Mr. President, I have the honour to present Resolution No. 6/85, Caribbean Development Bank, which reads as follows:

AUTHORISE Caribbean Development Bank, hereinafter referred to as "the Bank", to increase the authorised Capital Stock of the Bank by US$50,000,000 (fifty million United States dollars) divided into 50,000 (fifty thousand) shares of US$1,000 (one thousand United States dollars) each, which are reserved for allotment only for the purpose of maintaining the proportion of the capital stock of the Bank held by Regional Members to that held by non-Regional Members as provided in Article 6 of the Agreement establishing the Bank;

AND RESERVE the 50,000 shares for the Ordinary Capital Resources of the Bank as follows:

(a) 15 shares each to the Regional Members listed in Part A of the Schedule to the Agreement establishing the Bank;

(b) 49,970 shares to the Regional Members listed in Part B of the Schedule to the Agreement establishing the Bank in proportion to the number of shares held by each of them;

AND RESOLVE that the Capital Stock increase authorised by this Resolution shall be offered for subscription at par value in accordance with the following terms and conditions:

(a) 20 per cent of the subscription price of each share shall be paid to the Bank in gold or convertible currencies within thirty days after the date on which the share is offered for subscription;

(b) the remaining 80 per cent of the subscription price of each share shall be paid to the Bank in gold or convertible currencies or in such currencies as may be required for the purchase of the Bank's obligations or for the lending operations of the Bank, within thirty days after the Bank shall have called for such payment;

(c) the Bank shall call for payment of the remaining 80 per cent of the subscription price of each share only when required to meet obligations of the Bank created for the purpose of the funds received in payment thereof;

(d) payments on account of shares subscribed shall be made in proportion to the paid-up capital stock of the Bank;

(e) no share shall be offered for subscription except as authorised by the Board of Governors;

(f) the terms and conditions of subscription to shares of the Bank shall be uniform except that the Board of Governors may authorise the Bank to accept payment for shares in special circumstances in currencies other than those specified in (b) above on such terms as may be appropriate to avoid impairment of the Bank's liquidity;

AND RESOLVE that the Governors of the Cayman Islands undertake the rights to subscribe to the Bank's capital stock of this kind and that the Financial Secretary be and is hereby authorised to pay to the Bank out of the General Revenue a sum not exceeding US$81,222.16 or CI$37,605.58 in respect of that portion of these subscriptions which are payable in five equal instalments, the first payment of CI$7,521.12 to be made on the 31st January, 1986."

Mr. President, let me add a bit of clarification. On looking at the Government Motion No. 6/85 which was submitted to the Clerk some weeks ago, it was discovered that four of the figures were slightly wrong by way of the using conversion from the United States dollars to the Cayman Islands dollar, and the relevant figures did not take into account also the cost of purchasing the stock from the Bank.

Therefore, some figures should be changed. For example the US$1,222.16 mentioned in Cayman Islands dollars should be CI$1,027.20. These two figures also appear in and should be changed in the "RESOLVED" section of the motion.

To elucidate a bit more on the matter, Mr. President, the Board of Governors of the Caribbean Development Bank acting in accordance with the Agreement establishing the Bank, have the right to subscribe for the allocation of new shares to the Bank, including the condition that Commonwealth Caribbean members should have a majority of the voting power in the Bank and a majority of the number of Governors.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith]?

There was no objection.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 3, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated January 3, 1945, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $1,000,000, for the Treasury Department, Public Debt Service, to remain available until expended, for payments to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, as provided by section 201 (d) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939 (53 Stat. 1362).

Respectfully yours,
HAROLD D. SMITH,
Assistant Director.

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, the letter and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

THE SPEAKER. The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p.m.

THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

FIRST READING

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the bill (H.R. 4790) to amend the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SECOND READING

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for the second time.

The Clerk read the bill for the second time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read for the amendments of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this Act may be cited as the "Revenue Act of 1945".

TITLE I—INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

SEC. 101. RATES OF TAX.

(a) NORMAL TAX.—Section 11 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "3 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "2 per centum".

(b) SURTAX.—Section 12 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

If the surtax net income is—	The surtax shall be—
Not over $2,000	6% of the surtax net income
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$120 plus 13% of excess over $2,000
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$380 plus 20% of excess over $4,000
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$780 plus 26% of excess over $6,000
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,300 plus 32% of excess over $8,000
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$1,940 plus 36% of excess over $10,000
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,660 plus 40% of excess over $12,000
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$3,460 plus 44% of excess over $14,000
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$4,340 plus 48% of excess over $16,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$5,300 plus 50% of excess over $18,000
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$6,300 plus 52% of excess over $20,000
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$7,340 plus 56% of excess over $22,000
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$9,580 plus 60% of excess over $26,000
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$13,180 plus 64% of excess over $32,000
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$17,020 plus 68% of excess over $38,000
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$21,100 plus 72% of excess over $44,000
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$25,420 plus 76% of excess over $50,000
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$33,020 plus 80% of excess over $60,000
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$41,020 plus 84% of excess over $70,000
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$49,420 plus 88% of excess over $80,000
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$58,220 plus 90% of excess over $90,000
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$67,220 plus 91% of excess over $100,000
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	$85,420 plus 92% of excess over $120,000
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	$103,820 plus 93% of excess over $140,000
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	$122,420 plus 94% of excess over $160,000
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000	$141,220 plus 95% of excess over $180,000
Over $200,000	$160,220 plus 96% of excess over $200,000

Mr. Speaker, I ask to have that bill entitled a bill for the revenue production for the prosecution of the war, and to have explanation thereof made a part of my remarks.

The objects and purposes of the bill, Mr. President, are to provide a mechanism for the withholding of income taxes at the source of income [illegible] and to provide [illegible] revenue for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. President, as I have said [illegible] address must [illegible] in relation to [illegible] and to [illegible] the [illegible] which is [illegible] the United States [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] and [illegible]

MR. JAMES C. DAVIDSON (Worcestershire): Mainly because of the character of the Resolution to the House, for instance on overtime, which is then passed and put into effect immediately.

The amendment legislation will bring into effect any increase in overtime only on any abolition of statutory duty. The Association, Mr. President, is United Kingdom provisions do not debated. What is debated on the Bill when it formally comes to the House. What in our view we will have to put forward a Customs Bill to bring into effect and to receive the parliamentary effect of this legislation in front of us. So all Members will have an opportunity to debate the Bill. Certainly I am sure that none of the Members wish to preclude the whole two debates on the same subject, one when the Resolutions is put and the other when the Bill comes.

It is a matter, Mr. President, which in my mind is quite useful on the rare case of increases in overtime duty whenever they occur in a Budget Addepad. It gives complete effect and Government receive the possibility of having reviews as a result of perhaps more pressing the Bill on the same day.

Mile is mainly the effect of the Bill, Mr. President. It will, in order for the provisions to be effective and similar to the United Kingdom Customs Control, mean that our Standing Orders will have to be amended. Amendments will have to be given by amendment of the Standing Orders so that we do not have the debates, one on the Resolutions and one on the Bill when it comes. I think that is fair, Mr. President, and it is in the best interests of this Government when dealing with increases in customs duty.

I commend the Bill to the Members of the House.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to make provision for the parliamentary collection of Customs duty, and matters connected therewith be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

L. H. TATE (Scarborough): Mr. President, I rise to claim my right to speak. In the past it has been normal that Government has made any substantial amount of revenue matters there have been Debates on the Resolutions of Law which provides for additional customs duty.

I know that it is normal that a Debate does be given on the United Kingdom. However, there are two main differences with our situation and the situation there. The difference is that we have a small Parliament with only fifteen Members while the United Kingdom counts its Membership of one hundred. So it is not a cumbersome matter to deal by two, - if the dealing of Standing Orders remains Bills can be passed in one day. Also, the other difference which I anticipate in the Bill already mentioned can be put into effect by Members of the Government. There is a matter arising on which I will not anticipate, which refers to this Bill, which matter would significantly in many Bill matters on the organisation of the Customs. What is happening here is that this Bill, if passed, effectively does away with the need for parliamentary Bill at the time that is to be brought to make the changes. The increases can be made by a resolution and under this Bill can be effective, as the Bill says, that the same as if it were a Law, and will remain in force for four months. During that time a Bill would have to be brought.

MR. E. WAYNE STONE (CONTINUED): I think that it is important to take care that we avoid such the difference between increasing taxes by resolution rather than law, because that is an efficient way happens. The resolution passed in the house would go into effect immediately and would remain in effect for four months. I think that we have managed per enough from the uncertainty effect which we anticipate.

In order to make sure I think we should pass this. It is true that revenue laws in the past have been dealt with quite speedily, but nevertheless they have had subject to all the checks and balances which are laid down in the Constitution and in the standing orders, and as such these laws were open to the scrutiny of the public, the criticism of the opposition and could not be railroaded the way this bill would make easy.

The reason why we must not automatically transfer by resolution rather than by law is that the law goes through many different processes which need to fulfilled. I specifically to call attention to this procedure of one examines the provisions for the passage of bills one will know that many things must happen. First of all the Government must decide to have a law. The Government Member must send a notice to the Clerk that a Bill will be coming to the House. The Bill must have been drafted. The bill must have gone to Executive Council. The bill must have passed through committee stages. If it is a matter of a economic bill it must take along with it a certificate from the Governor that he has given his consent to this revenue bill. When the Clerk receives the Bill, the Clerk has certain functions which are laid down in our standing Orders. The Clerk must be satisfied that it is drafted in order and the publication are followed properly that each clause and schedule has in the margin a clear note numerically the contents that the Bill has a title and that the provisions do not go beyond the title. When the Bill is produced by a short explanatory statement of the objects, and if a Bill makes provision for revenue matters it must have the Government's recommendation. If the Bill involves the expenditure of public money, then it must set out the financial effect of the Bill and an estimate of the money involved. All these things happen only if the Clerk is satisfied. If the Clerk is not satisfied that the Bill meets all these requirements, the Clerk will inform the Presiding Officer who, if he agrees, will so inform the Member in charge of the Bill and no further proceedings can take place.

If satisfied complies with all the requirements and such matters as, the Clerk will then cause the Legislative Assembly to be summoned. In the course of the week every Member has been given days before the Bill should be read the first time. When all of this is done the Bill is finally set down for the first reading.

The Bill before the House must go through three different readings. The Bill is voted on separately in each reading and then, if there is agreement by a majority, the Bill is passed by the House. Of course, the Members of the Opposition have an opportunity to debate the Bill.

However, even when the Bill passes the House it is not yet law because under the Constitution, the Bill must then go to the Governor. Sometimes so, it may if the Constitution deal with this and the Governor may give his consent. However, if the Governor does not agree with the Bill he is not forced to assent to it. He may refuse to assent to the Bill. He may send it back to the Legislative Assembly with suggestions for Amendments.

Mr. T. Richardson (Roscommon): However, even supposing that the Governor accepts the Bill, the Bill still must have the sanction of London. The Privy Council or the Secretary of State has the power to disallow a Bill which has been passed by the Assembly and assented to by the Governor. So there may all these checks and balances to make certain that our laws are not inadvertently ultra vires or in some manner.

Since the Government introduced its Finance Bill, which is the raising of money, this is taking the heading direct from Hansard. We can be plunged into revenue Bills by Members proposing to reduce their scope on one day. So, there are many checks and balances provided in the Constitution for the passage of a law. I think that there is no more important Bill than a Bill which calls for the collection of customs, duties on a new item, which increases revenue.

However, the Member yesterday referred to the fact that it was unnecessary because they have installed Clause 2(3) which says that:-

> "A resolution which ceases to have annulling effect under this section if the resolution is not approved by a resolution of the Assembly within the prescribed period."

So, even when the Bill is brought out for its effect immediately by this temporary measure, they feel that there are safeguards that the Bill itself may be rejected later on. They are quite right, because if they were going to put in unreasonable clauses, for example suppose they were going to put a 1,000 per cent increase in duty on spectacles to discourage people from buying them or, they would have provisional collection Bill together with the resolution, and put in that unreasonable duty to discourage just a time the Opposition or Government knowing full well that later on the Assembly would reject it anyhow.

It shows the importance which applies in the Government, that go as far as to make provision for changes which will follow upon the implementation of the resolution. It says in section 2(4):-

> "Where a resolution ceases to have effect by virtue of subsection (3) or where the period of five months mentioned before in that section (which expression includes the days on which the House is not sitting) has expired and the Assembly has not passed a resolution in terms proposed."

I question had the Government to go by to do this. For example, suppose they were to discontinue the duties on Artificial materials. Well, the merchants would pay the increased duty but the consumer would ultimately pay, indirectly because the increase is on the one who pays the duty. The merchant only advises the change. When he sells the goods in advance the price he sells includes his increase charges and all other charges which make up the full cost of the goods.

So, how do the Government going to have this refund now but to get back to the people who really paid it, the consumer, because even if the resolution ceases to have effect on the day which he said, he cannot ever affect on it his calculations because there is no machinery whereby the rise and fall when series of many customs duties going into the store.

Mr. G. Mills Scott (continued): ... do now ask that they proceed by order on a paper of a date which I brought in here recently. They did not know that I brought the paper in on a certain day. They will not know that I brought a new paper on a particular day. Now, it is not possible to expect that those matters could, because it is a complete duty straight on people which arrived in the place yesterday may possess every hope. If the Government does proceed to reject this bill because the bill can not be supported by the Assembly, he will really have a reasonable for his next Legislative Unit the most part of the world the duty, would have confirmed this issue.

Then the bill does go to say:-

"Any declaration made in pursuance of the provisions shall be deemed for all purposes to be an instrument executed"

in Ceylon namely, if the duty had been taken out instead of impressed stamps then Mr. Chairman how charges in those people duty have, I've said here to pay the duties? So, duplication would become in goods for the stamps, documents, conveyance, customs dealings or the many documentations which a lady needs to produce here in person, just in the world trade. Those people who brought those duty free goods be able to be specifically charged in documents to pay the duty under the normal provisions of the Law that brought into effect?

Sir, one can see that this is subject reasonable. If we pay duty or if we do not pay it considered to have been in the use of the nation. There is no way back or back to the main mechanism in the ordinary and they can roll in the bought a household of or a mobile yesterday, or even a use of ourselves. To be later somewhere.

This bill is unnecessary. We have had no problems with the multiplicity of duty in the past. Every merchant, every person importing has paid the duty declared by Act. Customs have full control because the goods are in the warehouse, full control of the warehouse keeper and the country, and no person should be allowed to take out those goods which the duty has been paid. To be sure that sometimes a little bit might slipper from the bonafide forward of the bill, but I am asking Ashby which is the key reason for worrying about the base of import duty on a specific item for one day or the other?

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member saying the cost of his speech or does he intend to allow for some consideration thereon also?

Mr. G. Mills Scott: Mr. Speaker, I intend only to speak for a very short time.

Mr. Speaker: Well, in that case I think that perhaps we might continue proceedings until approximately 2.15 p.m.

At 12.45 P.M. the House adjourned

MOTION RESUMED AT 5.05 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Resumption of the debate on the Second Reading of the Provisional Collection of Customs Duties Bill, 1966. The Second Elected Member for Western Rural.

MR. G. WILLIE HOOKEY: Mr. President, my motion comes in under Clause 3(1), of the Bill which reads as the opening line:-

"Where the Legislative Assembly passes a resolution,"

In the Bill we are not given any explanation as to what follows this resolution. We do not know to what extent and in what fashion the resolution will be presented. In my mind, the extent to which the Government will go to collectable and unpaid of philosophical explanation. I can only believe that the resolution which will be placed on the Order Paper will be similar to that contained on page 372 of Erskine May dealing with matters urgency which are specific. That procedure therefore provides for certain matters to be passed without notice, and it is my belief that this is what the Government has in mind. I may be misconstrued when the brevity of the motion is noted, but I thought that if the motion is brought without notice that the Members will be given just one more opportunity to debate this motion, because on page 372, the paragraph which deals with matters made without notice does not specifically include these matters.

As an example of the motion is given as an increase in the BIET I am only unsure that it will have to come through always in our Standing Orders. I go round of the item of the Agenda to change a Standing Order and I am not unsympathetic to debate because I have that under our Standing Orders there will be debate on that particular motion when in debate, which necessitates the Standing Orders be suspended. Therefore there, will be some inconvenience to a Select Committee who will deal with the motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps it would help the Member if he perfectly knew that a motion to refer something by way of an amendment to Standing Orders cannot be debated. However, when the Select Committee on Standing Orders reports, the report can be debated.

MR. G. WILLIE HOOKEY: I understand that perfectly, Mr. President, but that is debate after the Standing Order has been changed. My opinion in that debate after the fact is a matter of view.

Once the Select Committee has made its findings and the Standing Committee which we are going establish for dealing with our Standing Orders, which is made up of the Members of this House, agrees on anything, it would be fruitless to attempt to change what the Committee has brought back to the House, because the Committee is the supreme body made up of the Members of the House. That is why I am endeavouring with this motion which would examine this matter before it is put forward, which means whatever you debate as well, any opportunity would be stifled.

Mr. [illegible] (continued): I believe that if we go into a more philosophical discussion on the United Kingdom White Paper several weighty questions arise which appear to be ripe for such debate. If I may quote this section:-

> "HOUSING AND RESIDENT MATTERS. Certain procedural matters relating to the implementation of Ordinances may be made statutory matters. These include matters which presumably affect normal running, that is will be communicated to a Committee of the whole Senate, a matter considered as a joint committee or, under departmental orders, to a specific standing committee matters for which responsibility already rests in the provisions of Section 3 of the International Conference of Rivers and Lakes 1921; and matters for the implementation of Local Government Ordinances."

However, the particular matter mentioned earlier dealing with the giving of permissional procedure, differs quite from the provisions of Section 3 of these two documents. It would be wrong for us to allow our present standing Orders to be changed to facilitate this Bill or under that the matters dealt for the implementation of the Law could not be changed. This is undemocratic. I feel that it is unacceptable. It may be one thing to debate a parliamentary motion like the standing of a Cabinet Minister, but to debate the implementation of a Law requires a very responsible Senate that provision would be only necessary when the minority Senators or proportionately to voice their interest of those very matters. It would also be unfortunate if that the Standing Orders would not have any say in the terms of the Law or the provision of the Law. Otherwise it may be.

This is the reason why I am concerned with this Bill. We already have adequate provision for the passage of Resident Bills. Many times in the past they have gone after the Law Day. This will be specifically aimed at the Budget Session of the House, when the Budget Address is presented it normally runs into four hours and it has been the custom in the past to give those Senators only after an hour to speak. This has always been done by dealing with the Private Bills before we go on to other business, or go on with the debate on the Appropriation Law.

However, there is no provision in which we will be able to put the Law into effect until the Bill has passed through the House. The Bill may be brought at this time, but eventually it has not fulfilled its purpose. It has not passed through all the stages which have been set into Law. This type of legislation [illegible] through constitutional matters that is how to accept.

I anticipate my opinion of this Bill to be necessary in a large Parliament. Here, I certainly should be content in fifteen minutes to outline the fifteen Members in the Delegation but we could put a Standing Committee very [illegible]. In the United Kingdom of the House and it is not necessary to put a Standing Order it would take a long time. I imagine to convene the large or five hundred Members of Parliament in a Standing when they might be in Hull, or perhaps even abroad. Moreover, here is a small community there is no need for this Bill. We did not hesitate to depart from the provisions when we passed the Penal Law. When we ratified the Human Rights Convention. We did not worry about what they did in the United Kingdom. The fact that the United Kingdom is not to be [illegible] which proved guilty did not involve our ratification then. So why do we need to refer to the Indian Ocean Conference Centre Bill. Even if we were following it to the letter it would not be the law.

MR. G. MAIN MACKAY (GLENTWORTH): Sir, I propose to make a few brief comments on the motion by the Honourable the Attorney-General for Justice and Minister of Consumer Affairs, Hon. Mr. Chichester-Clark, for the second reading of this Bill.

We have had complaints from many of our citizens here and outside which we have had to deal with. That is quite right because they are of a technical nature. However, the implementation of a Bill is normally a technical matter and should be dealt fully at that. The Minister on his own or on Public Bodies and the public can know it when they are helping to stop the racket.

In connection I would say that if the Government had had practical experience as those that they had unfortunately had themselves, because a Conservative Government would not have introduced this Bill. If they had put forward any alternative to what the public had suffered, which the Minister has not been prepared just why they were immediately, I would say that there would be reason to consider this Bill. However, having had both of which none for it, I think that it is time to make a reference of our Constitution and to make a thorough, of our Standing Orders by a Committee of the whole House of Assembly to streamline the procedure of the passage of a Bill.

This Bill is but one only highlights to my mind the confusion which has existed in the minds of the last Government from November last year. I am not a lawyer, good to be trained by the passage of this Bill except to have on the Statute Law which becomes no response to what it does not take Government's purpose. It does not help the business people. It does not help the residents of the Bahamas and I suggest earlier are totally unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I assure you that if there is only one vote against this Bill, that vote will be mine.

MR. MICHAEL A. SYMONETTE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support my Honourable colleague the Third Official Member in this presentation of this Bill to this Legislative Assembly.

What this Bill proposes to do is to introduce a system the structure of which is very similar to that in use in the Province of Manitoba, in the State of Canada. In that Province in and has been in the Statute Book since 1912 and I propose therefore to read to this Honourable Collection of those Act. The provisions there in that United Kingdom which we are seeking to enact for our own Legislative Assembly here, provide a system whereby the motion, and we are thereby to be sustained and not granted twice, Unless where one party prepared by the Honourable Financial Secretary, in the Budget Address are required to be brought into operation will be prevent avoidance of enactments that will be free to the citizens of the country.

The Honourable Member who spoke just before me made much ado about the fact that there was no necessity for it and no danger for it. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there is the very important criticism which has been advanced. That is this: there exists a system of business taxes which are not made through the original bringing into the country at a certain time of taxable offence, but a system of income withholding which connects to very large organizations there such as tobacco, cigarettes and intoxicating liquor which continually are the subject of smuggling in

SIR. STREET: A. Judicial responsibility: Judges play a crucial and highly responsible role in the administration of justice.

It should be a matter of grave concern to all of us that there has been delay between the previously announced decisions made on the Widgery recommendations and their legislative implementation, for persons injured by the activities of proscribed organisations, such as the two organisations I have mentioned. Even though of course such an action could be brought by private individuals, including the victims themselves, it is not unreasonable to expect that the Government should take some responsibility for the matter. Because of the enormous cost of bringing such an action, and the complexity of the issues involved, it is not surprising that few victims of terrorist violence have been able to afford to bring such actions. It is for this reason that I welcome the possibility that the Government may be willing to provide financial assistance to victims of terrorist violence who wish to bring such actions. I hope that the Minister will be able to comment on this matter when he winds up the debate.

There is, however, one more matter which I want to mention. Both Bills have been made necessary by the fact that the provisions of the Widgery Report will not be implemented in full. If this Bill is passed, for example, it will be necessary to bring forward another Bill to implement the remaining recommendations of the Widgery Report without delay. It has been made clear by the Government that they do not intend to implement the Widgery recommendation that there should be a new offence of causing death by reckless driving. Instead, they have said that they will be bringing forward proposals for a new offence of causing death by dangerous driving. I am sure that the House will welcome the fact that the Government have decided to implement the Widgery recommendation that there should be a new offence of causing death by reckless driving

Sec. 302(b) 5 Budget Committees

The recommendations which form the basic contents of the Committee's statement on the negotiations for the continuing, daily budget process, as distinct from annual reconciliation bill, and the imposition of any new limitations or prohibitions of enforcement devices necessary for the purpose of achieving the purposes of the legislation, are in the opinion of the Committee, necessary and proper to the implementation of the powers granted under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

Special procedures on budget reconciliation

The procedure on account of the budget reconciliation, which the Senate will be introduced, differs from the ordinary procedures on bills and Senate resolutions given the House vote to be subject to consider the reconciliation proposed by the Committee on Finance legislation which requires various amounts of revenue to be changed as a whole; and must also be in order to consider amendments in the nature of the Senate of providing the necessary revenue. A general debate, which is not the Senate floor, is automatically allowed, amendments will those reconciliations and the financial resolutions necessary to the budget. To permit this, the debate takes place upon the first reconciliation proposed - presently that for the purpose of amending the Social Act - and a conference for which time at the end of which the question is put on the final resolution and, then, under Standing Order No. 1, the reconciliations not yet forwarded over all the reconciliations upon which the Bill is to be brought in. The consideration of this procedure on the one hand to permit orderly consideration of the budget reconciliations which by their nature must be reported until the financial arrangement be made before the Senate is required to proceed upon them, but on the other to permit individual consideration of the reconciliations and to deny the opportunity of amending any of the reconciliations upon the floor. It may be the case on the same matter of reconciliation, the first reconciliation for the Senate Bill will not have to be put forward under Standing Order No. 21(6), and consideration needs to be passed at the disagreement of which however to make this obligatory.

Procedural collection of taxes

to explained above. The question following the Treasurer statement is for a payment period to take place on the first Wednesday and Senate resolution reasonably that entitled 'Amendment of the Act' and for the questions to be put on all the resolutions upon which the Senate Bill is to be finished at the end of the last day of the budget debate. Provision has place to be made, however, for making immediate provisions validity to those proposals which are to come into force ready of their enactment day specific before specific provisions can be introduced. This is done under the terms of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act 1913, as amended by section 1(5) of the Finance Act 1968, and under section 59 of the Finance Act 1968.

Section 5 of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act provides that provisional validity may be given to specified Budget resolutions by means of a simple motion. This enables action to be taken immediately after the consideration of the Budget speech and the question for that Resolution forthwith under Std. Ord. No. 14(3)."

MR. MORRIS of GRANT (INTERRUPTING): May I request that, Mr. President, they furnish [illegible] to the [illegible] Government.

> "This section would be quite inadequate after the introduction of the budget system and the creation of the Supreme Financial Authority under Sec. 77(f). The budget procedure also given parliament [illegible] to be passed within the same day [illegible] to be continued."

[illegible] Sir, I have to make a motion that this House, in order to proceed the [illegible] of that Bill in the future and to permit the speedy enforcement, amend this legislation and [illegible] to provide the procedure which is provided in the United Kingdom.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from [illegible].

MR. J. [illegible]: Mr. President, unfortunately I cannot support this Bill in its present form. After the Government has said on the floor supporting my Honourable Member's motion, I am [illegible] with the spirit but not with the Bill.

I fully realize the necessity for [illegible] to enable [illegible] to [illegible] any loss of revenue to the country. However, Sir, I would be much [illegible] this Bill, and in fact I would support it if the [illegible] was put forward which the Government [illegible] that the [illegible] public [illegible] through the three months [illegible] be [illegible]. However, Sir, when this Bill gives the [illegible] three months before they have to present the [illegible] to the Legislature, I think it is too long. I believe that there are certain [illegible] which are urgent and although the Bill is amended [illegible] for [illegible] of people who will have been charged under the previous [illegible], that [illegible] is going to be very difficult to [illegible], because [illegible] with the people who are affected one could not [illegible], for instance, [illegible] I believe [illegible] when they [illegible], these people [illegible] of pocket for [illegible]. It is not only [illegible], Sir, revenue normally is taken [illegible] that [illegible] is not a Bill [illegible] fact I do agree it goes through, the [illegible] by the [illegible] be supported by the Secretary of State, the Governor and emphasize that. So we are hoping [illegible] might [illegible] Supreme Government has the [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] provisions.

Do you have a point of order, Sir?

If the [illegible], Sir, was brought simply to make the [illegible] immediately, and the [illegible] there was [illegible] that the Bill [illegible] there [illegible] was brought [illegible] publishing the [illegible] of that [illegible], I would suggest it believes it would then give us the opportunity then, and then to [illegible] the [illegible] and [illegible] of it.

The Financial Secretary [illegible] official [illegible] has just given [illegible] to explain the [illegible] through [illegible] Sir, I hope that I am not misquoting him, but I think that he did [illegible] that the Bill has to be [illegible] within [illegible] days.

MR. MICHAEL J. SMITH- ...on a point of information. Thank you, Mr. President, and I think the Senator for giving way. No, what I would ask him is that the previous resolution which incorporates all the proposed changes makes all forms of legislation do undue or without delay. That simply is a ten day period and within that ten days certain of these resolutions which separate sets of requirements must be made. Those procedures do not start to work at all. They merely have to pass resolutions which is a much more simple procedure than some. So that explains the ten days after the well-debated motion, debated procedures are to be implemented. The explanation would be the Senator Bill if it is fair to say.

MR. C. RAY JONES: Mr. President, may I read what it says for the information of the Senate Senator from Mississippi?

MR. THOMPSON: I wonder if you could like to first check whether you are using the same edition of Robert's Rule?

MR. C. RAY JONES: This is the explanation, Sir. It says:

> "The budget resolution also gives procedural force that is passed within the next ten days or which the Senate's budget is to be considered."

MR. THOMPSON: I think that is what the Honorable Senator Mississippi means just said.

MR. C. RAY JONES: I do not think so.

MR. SPECTER: It is what I misunderstood him to say.

MR. J. STENNIS SMITH: Anyway, Mr. President, I think that after all of the legal clarification the fact remains that in the matter of furnishing the legislation that is passed within ten days, and here we are asking for four months.

Because it is a similar instrument, and because it is easier for me to get together on it not more than days. I think that it can be done reasonably after the resolution is passed. We can then just pick up the regular bill. The resolution can have the same effect in that the income ceilings are effective and whatever they are. The money can be collected into the Treasury.

The point I am trying to make, Sir, is that I do not think that we should be given four months. I think that it should be shorter. The ramifications of the legal terminology do not concern me.

So, Mr. President, if Senators in favor of this bill by keeping unnecessarily after the resolution and plug up the chance to debate it, and the public can clearly get the information concerning the bill, I will support legislation introducing the system of enacting income taxes by resolution. Because, if they can give it back four months I cannot support it. Sir-

Thank you.

MR. THURMOND: Does any other Senator wish to speak? The Senate Electric Senator from Georgia Sam.

[illegible] Mr. President, this bill entitled the Presidential Disability of Western Sahara Act, 1981, seeks to provide the machinery for any Bill relating to a particular [illegible] of any serious duty, on the receipt of notice duly given a copy of [illegible] Committee constitutional authority.

The question will arise as to why Mr. President, that such constitutional authority be entrusted in the [illegible] of the Bill. The reason of the Bill, Mr. President, must be accommodated for a very good job in his government, as in the case of the Honourable General Official Number of Executive Council. That is somewhat distressing, Mr. President, in the isolated and repeated behaviour in this chamber recently. While I realize and appreciate, Mr. President, that our legislative Assembly, our Constitutional Council and Parliament for our Government would succeed on the United Kingdom system, I cannot accept, Mr. President, that merely because [illegible] obstacles in the United Kingdom Parliament that it is necessarily good for the Cayman Islands.

We were told that the Presidential Elections of Western Sahara Bill will result in reducing the possibility of having persons. The Honourable General Official Member, Mr. President, went on to say that the Town of Governance if such is not planned in that there is the possibility of [illegible] and others in this country with limited power or otherwise having advantages of a few days prior [illegible] of the [illegible] and possibly the [illegible] of these [illegible]. This is [illegible], Mr. President, could indicate to us what that Member, whether he appears on his own behalf or on behalf of the Government, thinks very little of the [illegible] and business community. I cannot support this view, Mr. President, that our members in this country would behave themselves in such a situation. This, Mr. President, he stated was one of the main reasons for this Bill. Mr. President, I find this reason to be very flimsy indeed.

Mr. President, section 21(1) of the Bill states:-

> "A resolution shall cease to have statutory effect under this section if the resolution fails to [illegible] during the passage of the Bill."

Mr. President, I ask kindly see this Honourable House passing a resolution after having considered the resolution, and which four months going back to this Honourable House and rejecting it. While this is certainly a possibility, it is highly improbable.

Section 21(2) of the Bill, Mr. President, states:-

> "Where a resolution ceases to have statutory effect by virtue of subsection (1) or where the period of four months terminates before a [illegible] subsection providing for the payment of [illegible] duty or, as the case may be, ceasing or abolishing any rate of any customs duty, any money paid on importation of the resolution shall be repaid or made good, and any [illegible] made in pursuance of the resolution shall be deemed for all purposes to be an unauthorised [illegible]."

Mr. President, I could see such a provision [illegible] [illegible]. Perhaps, Mr. President, as I have said to this Honourable House on many occasions, it is [illegible] to consider the construction of Bills or amendments to present laws, that such considerations must be in line with consideration of the interests of the people of this country.

MR. LAWRENCE J. PITTMAN (Constituency): I do not think, Mr. President, that this will be the only way ordinarily of imposing what we already have in operation. While I have much sympathy on the Executive Council of this country, I do not believe that they should be given carte blanche authority to impose any type of taxation on this country, whether this matter possibly should be brought before the people before it is brought into operation.

Unlike the honourable Elected Member for North Side who stated that he could see the necessity for this Bill, Mr. President, I am afraid I cannot see the necessity for this Bill. While the honourable Leader Opposition Member was debating this Bill he took a lot of time to go into the details of what obtains in the United Kingdom. As I said, Mr. President, I have very much respect for the parliamentary system of Government but do not unnecessarily believe that this Bill is in the best interests of our country and people.

Mr. President, I am going to conclude by making this a very, very short debate. However, I would say in closing, Mr. President, this is the general view I am expressing that I am not able to support the Bill before us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. DENNIS D. BROWNE: Mr. President, I support this Bill entitled the Provisional Collection of Customs Duties Bill, 2001. The Bill has been given many interpretations and many alternative procedures have been suggested. However, I would like to make a few points on some of those procedures, Mr. President.

The Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac, for example, gave all the virtues of a Bill as opposed to a resolution. But, on the same breath he suggested that revenue measures could be passed by simply suspending the Standing Orders which give all of the validity to the procedures to be followed in respect of a Bill. This motion, Mr. President, as has been said by Honourable Members from this side of the House, seeks to give protection by means of a resolution which gives provisional authority for the collection of import duty. It does not create duties. The resolution is voted on and hopefully passed, and then the debate takes place on the Bill which gives validity to the resolutions.

One Member mentioned that it would in fact take eight months to go through the normal procedures of the Bill was not brought until four months after the resolution. However, this is not what the Bill says. What the Bill says is that a resolution ceases to have effect if a Bill has not been passed giving validity to the resolution within four months. So why the time of four months has been put here is to permit a Bill to be taken through all of the stages including debate, in my opinion, in the United Kingdom. For the Member might be slightly mild, hopefully this takes in the normal course of events, about four months.

It would be the exception and the intention I am sure to bring the Bill pertaining the amendments to the same Meeting as the resolution is brought. The Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac said that the mover has not stated the necessity for this Bill. I am going to remind him of his contribution and that is that in March this year we stayed here until 1 o'clock in the morning to pass the revenue Bills, and we only succeeded in doing it then after one Member had invoked several times the closure of debate motion.

S.O. (cont'd) c. 554/82 (CONTINUED) It has rightly been pointed out that Private Members must have, and traditionally enjoy, a procedural effect, otherwise they can be abused. This is so at first stage every Private Member's Bill may be permissibly unamendable but it works on the floor of Commons. If more restriction on Bills reviews are needed, one must only refer to that case Private Members of this place take the House the best course in opposing Bills but his colleagues did not want to debate the Bills because they had not notice of them. They knew that they could not debate them satisfactorily. That is my recollection. Yes, Mr. President, if the procedures intended to be applied now are to give procedural effect to a reasonable view, the purpose of facilitating Bills for Members to study them, and the first deliberations on the policy, can be achieved. However, whatever machinery needs to be being proposed by this Bill, it would be inadvisable to over give notice of any increases in expenditure approved or authorised in advance Bills.

The second Electoral Reform Joint Select Committee did not deal with the Bill. Mr. President, please, I will not go into the speculation that the Committee would have made. Mr. President, please, I will not go into the speculation that the Committee would have made.

This Bill only takes upon the Assembly powers a resolution which -

"(a) provides for a change of electors duly taken a new item of power, or for the variation (with or without modification) or for the cancellation of any rule of standing order, under the Northern Ireland Assembly; and

(b) contains a declaration that it is expedient in the public interest that the resolution should have effect under the procedures of this Act."

Then the resolution shall:

"give a period expiring on the 21st of four months after the date on which it is passed, have statutory effect or if approved in that."

It is important to note that there is no procedure to extend the period of four months mentioned there. In fact, under subsection (4) to recall to have statutory effect of the Bill is not applied within the four months period.

So, it is my opinion, Mr. President, that the intention is that the Bill will be brought at the very earliest as the possibility. Members will have ample time and opportunity to debate the Bill even though they have not had an opportunity to debate the resolution.

However, Mr. President, I would also like to remind Members that there are provisions in this Bill for expenditure from public sources according to the legislative assembly, as this will be one of several new subsidiary things. There are various other responsibilities to increase them to certain circumstances, and this has been done in the past and there have been occasions that have been controversial. To my knowledge, the most recent case, Fishery Harbour, Road, planning fees and all such fees are passed by resolution, or by regulations which must come to the Legislative Assembly for debate. So, this would not in fact be the only occasion on which charges would be imposed without debate of this sort the case.

Hon. EDGAR G. STARR (Conservative): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill [illegible] for the first time since it was introduced in the House. I do not intend to delay the passage of the Bill at this time, but I do feel that I have a few comments to make on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is much controversy and excitement about this Bill. In fact, I have had many letters from people in my constituency about this Bill. As you know, quite a few people have spoken to this Bill and I am sure that before the Bill is finally passed there will be many more speakers. However, my comments under the Bill will be directed to the responsibility of the Government to ensure that any change in the present system of licensing is carried out in the best interests of the people. The Bill will give an opportunity for anyone who wishes to speak on the Bill before it is finally passed in this House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. PETER G. MacKAY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill. I have had a number of people in my constituency of Pictou East who have spoken to me on the subject of this Bill. I am glad that the Government has brought forward this Bill at this time. I am sure that the Government considered all aspects of the Bill before bringing it to the House. I am sure that the Government has considered the views of the people in my constituency and the province as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Government has brought forward this Bill at this time. I am sure that the Government has considered all aspects of the Bill before bringing it to the House. I am sure that the Government has considered the views of the people in my constituency and the province as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Government has brought forward this Bill at this time. I am sure that the Government has considered all aspects of the Bill before bringing it to the House. I am sure that the Government has considered the views of the people in my constituency and the province as a whole.

[illegible] Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I think it is a good bill and I hope that it will be passed by the House. I am glad to see that the Committee on Rules has brought it to the floor so promptly. I am sure that the Committee on Rules realizes the importance of this bill and the necessity for its speedy enactment. I am very grateful, also, that they saw fit to grant a rule which will permit the House to work its will on this bill without the necessity of having to go through the motions of a Committee of the Whole. I am sure that the House will be grateful to the Committee on Rules for this action.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor to be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a number of years, and I have had the opportunity to study the problem of the railroads and their relationship to the public. I have had the opportunity to study the problem of the railroads and their relationship to the public. I have had the opportunity to study the problem of the railroads and their relationship to the public.

Approved For Release 2001/08/08 : CIA-RDP80-01601R000100010001-6

MR. PASTORE: please be seated.
The Secretary will call the roll of Senators.
(Roll call.)
MR. PASTORE: Senator Bible, Yea, Senator Brewster. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MR. F. NORRIS HOYT: Mr. President, I rise to say that only a few of the people we have to debate and pass with Government's authority, which is to be always exercised with [illegible] I hope we'll debate [illegible] Mr. President, why I have felt as I do. I am not convinced that it is a [illegible] on the situation. We must always have reasons [illegible] although I suppose the Chair [illegible] to preserve the dignity and decorum of the proceedings, I would suppose the [illegible] as given by the Majority Leader [illegible] I feel [illegible] should be heard [illegible] the record [illegible] Members [illegible] I feel that [illegible] Members [illegible] to protect [illegible] to be heard.
I am a Member, Mr. President, who has [illegible] I should [illegible] Many things we should debate [illegible] I feel which should be debated. But, no amendments will be put by the Majority Leader [illegible] Government will accept his amendment I still suppose [illegible] I feel that if the Senator [illegible] Mr. President, why is it necessary for Government here to be debated [illegible] of four months. Even though Mr. President I might [illegible] I feel that [illegible] I suppose I [illegible] I feel that [illegible] Members should have always a right to speak as they [illegible] Mr. Majority which is brought to [illegible] I suppose it because I feel that [illegible] I suppose the Senator from Rhode Island [illegible] Mr. President, I have no [illegible]

MR. ALLOTT: Does any other Senator wish to speak? The Clerk will call the roll of Senators.

MR. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY: Mr. President, I rise [illegible] the Senator from the Republican [illegible] Senator from Colorado, [illegible] Senator from Rhode Island [illegible] Mr. President, I have listened attentively to all the debate here today and I do not wish to be unsympathetic to anyone and I do as elected Member representing my constituents [illegible] the opportunity to cast my vote. I do not place an undue emphasis on how debates. I say what I have to say in many [illegible] Therefore the lack of a debate on this amendment would not concern me. What concerns me is that because [illegible] necessary for the successful operation of [illegible] to succeed [illegible] unsatisfactorily to [illegible]
I thank the Majority Leader, the Senator from Colorado, the Honorable [illegible] Republican Member for his explanation and [illegible] Senator from Colorado, the Republican Member who is the Assistant Majority Leader. I would summarize the motion made by the Majority Leader [illegible] the motion that the period of four months would be too long and would be eliminated.

MR. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Minnesota): I feel the Senator from Nebraska has made a very acceptable and sensible proposal, it would have my support. Would that be all, Mr. President, I suppose the bill could and the other leaders be glad to check amongst as well.

MR. MANSFIELD: Does any other Senator wish to speak? Does the Senator from Nebraska withdraw his motion?

MR. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY: Yes, Mr. President.

We have been under a period of quiet. Mr. President, much change on the Capitol Hill, much progress, many differences. Private conferences, meetings taking place. Mr. President, I am concerned a Senate not speak up is not necessarily why may be should be to this year, must pass on his record this session. The bill which is before us seeks to accomplish the purpose of meeting with the increase of revenue. We are only back here to the Senate Meeting in March and remember the long deliberations were about the revenue bill. I also recall, Mr. President, the arguments in the minds of some of the members who specifically be opposed the revenue bill or signatures only to have that it have not come into effect until the bill is approved to and passed.

This bill, Mr. President, this is the Supplemental Continuation of Statute Action 1968, this is a bill which seeks to set a precedent for additional revenue which is first necessary to meet the expenditures in the following year. We say to ourselves at that I see the procedure wrong, Mr. President, in the fiscal matters there is always a serious dispute with the Senate Committee. It always involves the Senate Committee in the question of whether or not the revenue bill is to be brought to the House and be originally brought in the House in the appropriations, we have no intention of changing that, Mr. President. That will remain the case. But we could also see examples of disagreement between the Senate and the House which could be put forward by the Senate Finance and the House which could be put forward by the Senate Finance and the House which could be put forward by the Senate Finance

[illegible] THOMAS C. [illegible]: [illegible] say, Mr. President, there is no answer to [illegible] question. The reason for the veto is to provide a mechanism of dealing with [illegible] Congress [illegible] the present situation, in my mind, creates [illegible] time to deal with it. Then, the bill was to be brought to [illegible]. Still we may start to proceed. It has to be [illegible]. It has to be [illegible]. It may need [illegible] to [illegible] of that [illegible] and then it has to be [illegible]. If any [illegible] talk along the way, Mr. President, the bill is here now. [illegible] for a day, maybe for three days, maybe for a week, but I [illegible] whether all of that [illegible] taking place, Mr. President, [illegible] do not [illegible] the duty which is ours. We are [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] by members of the public. I would like accordingly to [illegible] a vote [illegible] to [illegible] of us will take a [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and the hope thereof is the public [illegible] [illegible].

While we may [illegible] [illegible] does not seem [illegible], we may come to the conclusion [illegible] by having a [illegible] where it [illegible] a [illegible] of a million [illegible]. Then, I am sorry, the [illegible] that circumstance [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that the process of dealing with [illegible] [illegible] of the budget [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Hon. Hon. Member for [illegible].

THE MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS (NO. 21) TABLED, 1985

REPORT RECEIVED

THE MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS (NO. 21) TABLED, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for [illegible] to move that the Minutes of Proceedings be deemed to have been read a first time and be set down for second reading.

SECOND READING

THE MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS (NO. 21) TABLED, 1985.

HON. MINISTER OF STATE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Minutes of Proceedings (Amendment) Act, R. S. Bill, 2000.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Minutes of Proceedings Act to clarify the interpretation of the use of community service orders where an offender under section 5 of the Minutes of Proceedings Act (Revised). In that case the Act was amended to section [illegible] the Act provided that where a court makes a community service order under subsection (1) it shall be proper if the same offence also in circumstances under subsection (2).

It is felt, Mr. Speaker, that the community service order may be brought in quite effectively [illegible] community service order, especially [illegible] of offence which in circumstances under subsection (2) it shall be proper if the same offence also in circumstances under subsection (2).

This is a very simple amendment seeking to delete the word "shall" in section 12(2), and in substitute therefore the words "may also". This means that in the future when we have provisions for passing [illegible] instead of the fine or [illegible] of community service orders [illegible] of community service orders would possibly be appropriately, could also be available. However, by also allowing for [illegible] of the use of community service orders will be emphasized [illegible] considering the [illegible] which [illegible] is to be [illegible] to the community.

I therefore commend this Bill, this Hon. Member to debate.

HON. [illegible]: The question is that a Bill entitled [illegible] be given a second reading. The motion is open for debate.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

HON. G. SATO [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, my debate on this Bill will be brief. I commend the purpose of having a community order [illegible] to be attached under which it [illegible] the Member to [illegible]. Such is just [illegible] in the minds of the people that we may possibly [illegible] this Minutes of Proceedings and [illegible] which [illegible] have [illegible].

MR. G. [illegible]: ... to see that the Bill is brought before the House for its consideration when a petition is brought before the House for the purpose of ...

MR. SPEAKER: I think hon. Members must speak to this Bill and not become involved in a debate about a Bill which has already been enacted.

MR. G. [illegible]: Sir, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that the Ministry of Energy has not yet published the Regulations which this Bill seeks to be in force before a period of seven days elapses from the date of the publication of the Regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member wishes to make a statement on the matter, he may do so, but I do not see how it relates to the matter before the House. Hon. Members must speak to the Bill before the House. Hon. Members must speak to the Bill before the House.

MR. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I would like to remind the House that this Bill is to be read a Second Time today and that is the only matter before the House.

MR. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I would like to remind the House that this Bill is to be read a Second Time today and that is the only matter before the House.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to move that the question be now put.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak? If not, I shall put the question that the question be now put.

MR. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that the Bill be read a Second Time today and that it be committed to the Committee of the whole House today and that the Committee stage be taken immediately after the Second Reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I would like to remind the House that this Bill is to be read a Second Time today and that is the only matter before the House.

MR. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I would like to remind the House that this Bill is to be read a Second Time today and that is the only matter before the House.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to move that the question be now put.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak? If not, I shall put the question that the question be now put.

MR. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that the Bill be read a Second Time today and that it be committed to the Committee of the whole House today and that the Committee stage be taken immediately after the Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: [illegible]

MR. G. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, may I have a division please?

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly.

[illegible]
[illegible]

AYES

Sen. Dennis D. Gordon
Sen. Michael J. Knowles
Sen. Diane C. Hoffmann
Sen. Denise G. Brady
Sen. R. Norman Sudduth
Lt. Gov. Charles P. McClintock
Sen. Ronald D. Robertson
Sen. M. Patricia Shaw
Sen. Stephen L. Arnold
Sen. Leighton A. Fujiwara
Capt. Mary C. Schlesinger
Mr. S. Ernest Walker

12

NOES

Vr. C. Judy Wilson

1

TYPICAL OF SENATORY VOTE - [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. President,

[illegible] Number 151,
I think that is now all the Items

Reading Through.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND ADULT EDUCATION

SENATE RESOLUTION

Cosponsors: The Public Schools and Adult Education

Mr. President: I would entitled a bill just a few minutes for the community management and needs of the public Education Schools and for such budget and associated purposes to proceed to have been read a first time and in and also for Second Reading. Before Mr. Clerk reads the title for the second reading and the reading of the Second Reading Debate, it is a very long bill and I imagine that the Senate will be spending for a little time on it. It may modify part the [illegible] of the Senate, it [illegible] [illegible] have to be [illegible] before we [illegible] [illegible] of an [illegible] a Second reading. So, I think that we have to [illegible] the First Reading and the Second Reading and [illegible] procedure.

Before I invite the [illegible] Senate Official Member to move the adjournment. I have also all Senators have been [illegible] to [illegible] of a [illegible] that we [illegible] the [illegible] was. I would [illegible] this to [illegible] for Members, that we might move [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible] minutes maybe of the [illegible] of the Public Schools & Adult Education Committee. This would [illegible] Members a chance to [illegible] if they have not had a chance to read it yet, in case any of them have questions about it, because I would like to give all Members an opportunity of [illegible] the Amendment and knowing what exactly this [illegible] is. It is quite a significant [illegible]. So, if Members can be kind enough to try to read it this evening if they get the chance I will [illegible] them tomorrow, and perhaps we can expect a few minutes discussion on.

Accordingly, if the [illegible] Senate Official Member would like to move the adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

[illegible] Agenda Item: [illegible] Introduction, [illegible] adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

[illegible] Question: [illegible] Question on [illegible] to be taken at 12.30 p.m. tomorrow. [illegible] to move [illegible] put the question.

[illegible] Agenda Item: [illegible] [illegible] 10.00 a.m., Monday, [illegible] 2000.

[illegible] OF THE [illegible] SESSION OF THE [illegible]
HELD ON
[illegible], [illegible] [illegible], 1966

[illegible]:

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] - [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

[illegible]

2. [illegible]

(i) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(ii) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(iii) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]: [illegible]

(b) Would the Kentucky Attorney General's new policy of not defending constitutional challenges to state statutes cause a backlog of the Kentucky Attorney's Office to defend state statutes in the federal courts for the Eastern and Western districts of Kentucky?

QUESTION: (a) Would the Kentucky State Treasurer's Office benefit financially by the new policy of not defending suspect parts of the state statutes that the Kentucky Attorney General's Office has ruled unconstitutional in the federal courts?

(b) Would the Kentucky Attorney General's Office benefit financially by the new policy of not defending suspect parts of the state statutes that the Kentucky Attorney General's Office has ruled unconstitutional in the federal courts?

THE SECOND ELECTED WOMAN FOR CHOICE TODAY IS ALSO THE REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE Kentucky Office of Executive Consumer Advocate for Utilities and Trade

QUESTION: Would the Kentucky State Attorneys Office be, in fact, opening themselves to actual legal liability?

THE SECOND ELECTED WOMAN FOR CHOICE TODAY IS ALSO THE REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE Kentucky Office of Executive Consumer Advocate for Utilities and Transportation Energy and Telecommunications

QUESTION: Would the Consumer Advocate state the cost of suspending the Kentucky Enterprise Zone for Coal Fuel in Calendar Year?

QUESTION: Would the Consumer Advocate Office benefit financially by the Kentucky Attorney General's new policy?

THE SECOND ELECTED WOMAN FOR CHOICE TODAY IS ALSO THE REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE Kentucky Office of Executive Consumer Advocate for Utilities, Transportation and Energy Services

QUESTION: Would the Consumer Advocate Office benefit financially by the Kentucky Attorney General's new policy?

QUESTION: Would the Kentucky Coal Fuel Board to the Coal Conservation Cold Fuel Office Fund, for Personal Medical Treatment?

THE Kentucky Attorney General FOR Fuel Coal TO ARE THE Kentucky State Department Energy Responsible for Internal and External Affairs

QUESTION: Would the Democratic Attorney State Fuel Coal and Retire Taken to Become Their All Attorneys and Qualified Environmental Coal Disposed of This Exact Percent Office Fuel Permits and Granted for Well-Intentioned Use?

THE Kentucky Attorney FOR Energy Coal TO ARE THE Democratic State Attorney General Energy Responsible for Environmental Energy and Protection Administration

QUESTION: Would the Attorney Office Attorney State Fuel Coal of Fuel Coal to Kentucky Coal-Mine for Personal Coal of to Fuel Coal, Office a Declaration to the Coal for Coal and State Attorney Use?

1. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING

NOTE:

SOCIAL SECURITY

(1) THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE ACT, 1990

FISHERY AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

(2) THE PUBLIC LANDS (MANAGEMENT) ACT, 1990

(3) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1990

(4) THE PORT AUTHORITIES (MANAGEMENT) ACT, 1990

(5) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1990

CONSTITUTIONAL

(6) THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR STANDARDS ACT, 1990

(7) THE MINERAL OIL REVENUE (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT, 1990

(8) THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND ARMY ACT, 1990

(9) THE PUBLIC LANDS (MANAGEMENT) ACT, 1990

(10) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1990

(11) THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR STANDARDS ACT, 1990

(12) THE MINERAL OIL REVENUE (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT, 1990

(13) THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND ARMY ACT, 1990

(14) THE PUBLIC LANDS (MANAGEMENT) ACT, 1990

(15) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1990

(16) THE PORT AUTHORITIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1990

(17) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1990

TAXES AND DUTIES

(18) THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR STANDARDS ACT, 1990

(19) THE MINERAL OIL REVENUE (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT, 1990

(20) THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND ARMY ACT, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LETTER	1
[illegible] OF FINANCE ACCEPTING RECEIPTS DATED OCTOBER 31, 1994 - DATED OCTOBER 31, 1994	3
[illegible] OF FINANCE AUTHORIZING WITHDRAWAL FROM THE STATE TREASURY - DATED OCTOBER 31, 1994	5
[illegible] REPORTING ON THE ACCOUNTS OF THE [illegible] FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1994 - DATED OCTOBER 31, 1994	7
[illegible]	9
[illegible] FINANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE - [illegible]	20
[illegible] REPORT [illegible] - [illegible] AND RECORD PROCEDURES	43
[illegible] - [illegible] AND [illegible]	44
[illegible]	73

[illegible]

[illegible]

10:00 A.M.

THE CHAPLAIN: Prayer. To be read by the Chief United Nation for Host Type.

[illegible] Almighty God, from whom all mercies and justice and decisions: We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly 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 Nations.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen [illegible] the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Anne Princess of Wales and all the Royal Family. Endue [illegible] with a right understanding of our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the guidance of our Ministers, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

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

Our Lessons, which are to be read, are taken from the Book of Psalms. The Psalms [illegible] to be read in the following order. [illegible] and Psalms of Thanksgiving, are to be read [illegible] Psalms [illegible] Psalms [illegible] Psalms

[illegible]:

1. [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

   To write off expenditure in preparing the ADB project in 1982.

2. [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

   To write off expenditure for costs incurred for training of officials in U.K. Government and a British Consultancy Organisation in connection.

^. Provision, shown as a credit item. It should read "Un-drawn assets". It should be "U.K. Treasury Account".

3. [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

   This item is provided to write off expenditure in order which incurred in some Intergovernmental and Organisations which does not form part of the Development Fund Activities and the can assess the cost of assessment and [illegible], the attempt by assistance locally and also the cost [illegible] of their salaries.

4. [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

   This item includes a write off of 0[illegible],000 and a provision of 0[illegible],000 to cover the remaining months of the year, that is December 1985. It is provided because Committee Health, provision was made to cover the first four months of 1985.

5. [illegible] - [illegible]
   [illegible] - [illegible]

   To cover deferred amount for the purchase of land adjoining the northern boundary of the Baker property. The remaining balance of [illegible],000 to be paid in equal instalments over a three year period commencing in 1985 at 10 per cent.

6. [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
   [illegible] [illegible]

   The item is provided for the cost of managing a United Kingdom legal consultant in connection with the termination of Reciprocal Treaty between the United Kingdom, United States and the Cayman Islands.

[illegible]

1. [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] TITLE I - [illegible]

[illegible] USAID 01 - DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] - [illegible]

To provide assistance [illegible] [illegible]. It is also agreed that the [illegible] should have this amount of resources during the [illegible] agreed upon by the Government [illegible] to meet Congress's [illegible] of access to the [illegible] Fund, and [illegible] during the [illegible] period [illegible].

[illegible] USAID 02 - DEVELOPMENT & NATURAL RESOURCES [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] $2,000,000

To assist the purposes of the agreement [illegible] of the Agency for International Development, Public Law, as [illegible] by Congress.

[illegible] USAID 03 - ECONOMIC SUPPORT & [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] $2,850,000

To finance the ESF Special Account. This will provide for a 10 year cash [illegible] in the case of [illegible] that account.

[illegible] USAID 04 - CIVIL AVIATION [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] $2,000,000

To cover costs of [illegible] for the new [illegible] Airport Terminal.

[illegible] USAID 05 - CIVIL AVIATION DEVELOPMENT [illegible] $2,000,000
[illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible]

To cover the cost of [illegible] of airport [illegible], which was under [illegible] for the 1965 budget.

[illegible] USAID 06 - CIVIL AVIATION DEVELOPMENT [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] $1,000,000

To cover additional [illegible] for the [illegible] of 1965 in respect of the new Jomo Kenyatta Airport Terminal and the Kenyan Civil Aviation Training.

[illegible] USAID 07 - TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] $1,000,000

To cover [illegible] made to Khartoum, Cairo, Tokyo, North Atlantic and Accra for [illegible] representation [illegible] in respect of the Bank of [illegible] [illegible]. All [illegible] and the [illegible] are [illegible] of that case where Government provided [illegible] [illegible] which is [illegible] in the Khartoum Chancery as well as the [illegible] Chancery in Pretoria. This [illegible] for this case. It is [illegible] [illegible] by this Government in [illegible] with the Harambee Agreement and other related matters.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] $[illegible]

MR. [illegible] PRESIDENT [illegible]:

MR. [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]

On behalf of [illegible] I move to be excused [illegible] which has been [illegible] with work from the [illegible] since [illegible] the [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible],
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]: [illegible]

A number of [illegible] were [illegible], Mr. President, and approved. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] dealing with the Caribbean Development Bank for the [illegible] of Belize and the [illegible] [illegible] on the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] from Mr. Bird yesterday.

Another [illegible], [illegible] by a [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible] of Title [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

A third [illegible] was passed by a [illegible] for the Inter-American Development Bank. It is a [illegible] for the [illegible] of the Cayman Islands to become [illegible] and [illegible] the [illegible] which is presently [illegible].
Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SECRETARY:
In accordance with the [illegible] of [illegible] Order of [illegible] (4) the House is deemed to have agreed to the motion that the Minister [illegible] be [illegible].
[illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible],

REPORT OF THE AUDITOR-GENERAL

MR. [illegible] C. [illegible]: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this [illegible] House, the Report of the Auditor-General on the [illegible] of the Cayman Islands Government for the year ended [illegible] December, 1982. That [illegible], Mr. President, also has included [illegible] the Government's [illegible] for 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.
[illegible] [illegible]. The Second Elected [illegible] [illegible].

ANNUAL REPORTS OF STATUTORY BODIES

MR. [illegible] A. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of this honourable House the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Auditor-General's Report on the accounts of the Cayman Islands Government for the years ended 31st December, 1981.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

MR. [illegible] A. [illegible]: Mr. President, the Public Accounts Committee which was established by Government Motion No. 1 of the 23rd November, 1984, functions under the provisions of Standing Order 74.

[illegible] The membership of the Committee is arranged alphabetically as follows:

CHAIRMAN - Mr. Clifford A. Peterson

MEMBERS - Mrs. Daphne L. Arnold
Capt. Mary A. McDermott
Mr. J. Samuel Miller
Mr. John E. Nelson

The Committee held five meetings during the period from July, 1965 to December, 1965:

6th July, 1965
1st October, 1965
9th August, 1965
16th August, 1965
30th August, 1965

The minutes of these meetings are attached to the Report and form an integral part thereof.

Also, Mr. Davidson, attached to a copy of the Nelson Committee which is a report which was filed by the Secretary of State and came out of the Secretary of State's Executive Committee of the 89th Congress, 1965. This report, Mr. Davidson, made other minor recommendations for the further and improvement of qualified citizens. Though dated on the book it [illegible] which contains many useful publications which is the right still [illegible] is kept by the Government of the Islands, and will receive comments on the Government's Minutes.

In attendance at the meeting, Mr. Davidson, were the following administrative officers:

Chief Secretary - Mr. Ray Kelly
Senior Financial Secretary - Mr. George Haverly
Senior Accountant - Mr. Derek Hendrickson
Treasurer (Offshore) - Mr. Tom Digby

Together, Mr. Davidson, with certain administrative officers was present before the Committee.

On 6th July, 1965, Mr. Eric Bergstrom, Director of Tourism appeared before the Committee. On the 1st August, 1965, Mr. Ray Kelly, Financial Administrator, Mr. Peter Lee, Chief Environmental Health Officer, Mr. Geoffrey Brown, Agricultural Consultant, Mr. Stuart Hooker, Senior Agricultural Technical Officer, Mr. Peter Richardson and Social Services, appeared.

Also on the 9th August, 1965, Mrs. Marcia Wood, Collector of Customs, Mr. C. Lyle, [illegible] Director Tourism Consultant Mr. Clifford Grant, Manager - Central Trading Estate, Mr. L.E. Hall, Senior Chief Engineer and Mr. Leonard Wright, Assistant Secretary for Social Security and Social Services Council.

On the 16th August, 1965, Mr. Trevor Mr. Basil Fleming was summoned to the meeting and appeared.

The Committee wishes to place on record its appreciation of the cooperation expressed by all Government Officers who appeared before the Committee. Further, the Committee wishes to record its thanks for the assistance and consideration shown throughout by the Administrative Officers.

MR. SPEAKER A. PIERCE (CONSERVATIVE): The Committee also wishes to place on record its appreciation to Government and the excellent presentation of this report and accounts, and is particularly impressed that for the first time in the Province the accounts and the Auditor-General's report thereon have been prepared and presented within nine months of the financial year end.

The Committee further wishes to place on record its appreciation to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly and his staff for the invaluable assistance offered by them to the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee looks forward to receiving a Government Minute as provided for in the Committee's Statute. The new Standing Order 90(2) states that Government's written response to the Committee's recommendations are due in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the many recommendations made by the Committee and because the reply to the Government Minute on these recommendations will be subject to debate in these Chambers, I have not been minded here to deal individually with the recommendations made in this Report. However, Mr. Speaker, of the thirteen or more recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee arising from the examination of the Auditor-General's Report on the accounts of the Cayman Islands Government for the year ended 31st December, 1981, it has been decided to proceed only on two of those due to the time constraints, and to deal with the remainder in writing.

The first of these was, Mr. President, whether the decision to commence the hotel tax refund scheme was lawful or unlawful. The Committee noted that, in light of the legal opinion of Crown Counsel to the Government dated 30th September, 1982, it was clear that the scheme was unlawful. Government have necessary action to ensure the proper collection of all revenue due.

On Statements of Assets and Liabilities, the Committee noted the various discrepancies in revenue collected under Export duty, stamp duty and customs fees and made the following recommendation.

In view of the financial situation of the country and the fact that there have been reductions from the revenue of the recurring income base, the Committee recommends that Government take necessary action to form a special committee to investigate any variations in the present multi-duty system.

On the financial responsibility of Government the Committee recommends that Government take action to ensure that at the end of any financial year the surpluses accrued have not caused Private Consultancy embarrassment.

On the Imprest Account the Committee recommends that Government take necessary action to ensure that all Imprest Accounts are reconciled within three months and some to those responsible for the Auditor-General's comments when reviewed by him.

On Payroll Tax, the Committee recommends that Government take necessary action to investigate the application for the collection of payroll tax. The Committee endorses the Government's recommendation that the collection of payroll tax will have only minimal impact on employment, mainly to enhance effectiveness the collection and enforcement of regulations.

On Stamp Duty, the Committee recommends that Government take necessary action to increase the receipts of Stamp Duty, and that fees for services be brought to reasonable.

MR. PHILLIPS (CONTINUING): On Portage Road, the Committee recommends that Government take measures, similar to those now envisaged by the Public Roads Department and promptly publicized for any addition.

The Committee further recommends that Government carry out a survey to determine the exact nature of persistent weekend garbage collection complaints.

On Bogert Road, the Committee recommends that Government take necessary action to ensure that overnight jams, as outlined to the Committee's Secretary, be eliminated.

The Committee further recommends that Rural Postal Delivery Schedules be published for the information of the public.

On purchase of land and property by the Government, the Committee recommends that Government take necessary steps to ensure that Government services raise the money on future purchases.

On recommendation number 12 which is directed at rural tax arrears, which deals with the General Taxation Policy, the Committee recommends that Government take measures, service to ensure that the accounts of the General Manager are properly and timely produced, and further that the Government Policy rests on a regular basis to improve the position of the Department.

The Committee further recommends that a more effective survey of the General Building Scheme be undertaken.

Mr. President, the Committee agrees that this Report of the Public Accounts Committee of the 19th Session of the Legislature should be tabled at the Third Meeting of the 19th Session of the Legislature, and accordingly I recommend that the Report be tabled.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE ASSEMBLY

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. I am sure that it would be the wish of all Members that I should thank the Chairman and all members of the Committee on the very speedy production of the comprehensive Report. As the Chairman has rightly said, in view of the amount of work and study we have, apparently, undertaken at our Committee Sessions to submit that new procedure. I have given the undertaking to the Government I shall be responding the amendments, and I am accustomed that I personally should report those amendments on Monday, the production of a Government Minute in respect of this Report. In the circumstances of the Report this year, as the Chairman rightly said, when the Government Minute comes out there will be an opportunity for the House to debate it then.

HON. D. QUESTIONET: If for some reason there is a hospital bill to meet with regards and that not yet been available for questions. Perhaps I can answer such matters as may well be reasonably sought with those statements made. Question No. 33. The Senior Executive Service.

THE ACTING EXECUTIVE SECRETARY INFORMED THE BOARD THAT THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES WAS SCHEDULED FOR MARCH 22ND AT DULLES AIRPORT.

Mr. Ge: (a) Will the Hawaiian state the reasons for disagreeing the policy of applying rate points on the basis during those earlier hearings?

(b) Would the Board further state whether the new policy of not applying employment to these points came about as a result of the Post Authority's efforts to secure expenditures on the basis of the amount for the safety of these men?

Answer: (a) During the course of the meeting held with representatives of the ports, it was determined that the airport boys were employed and rendered flight duties in the transit shed area running all over the docks, picking up incoming late flights between ports of entry at their assigned jobs. They also participated in the Union pension plan. Recognizing the above pertinent points and having in consideration the hazardous waste duty they should not have been.

Although the discontinuance of the practice of having patrol boys will result in overall annual savings in the port operations, it was not the main reason for the action of Management's decision to stop having patrol boys. They decided that it would be unwise to stop having them at the risk to personnel and possible accidents that happened to them, rather than ignore the potential danger and be sure that one will occur on the dock.

(b) As previously stated, the main reason for the discontinuance of having patrol boys was due to a reduction in the port operations, it was not the main reason for the action of Management's decision to stop having patrol boys. They decided that it would be unwise to stop having them at the risk to personnel and possible accidents that happened to them, rather than ignore the potential danger and be sure that one will occur on the dock.

QUESTIONS:

MR. H. EDWARD HOLLAND: A supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Marine clarify whether the policy of applying rate points on the basis of the Port Authority or a decision of the Port Authority?

MR. CAPT. CHARLES E. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. President, there was never any policy established for the basis of application. It was only a question.

MR. H. EDWARD HOLLAND: In the light of the answer that it was only a question, who was then responsible for the establishment of these points which were a policy in place?

PRESIDENT CHARLES E. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. President, I am told that some discussion were brought to the attention by local persons with the Port Authority of what were presented by the Port Authority, Mr. President that is all.

MR. LAWRENCE A. SCANNELL: A point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I wonder if the Marine could state whether the information we received in the International Information Bulletin we received in the Corporate Security Office or not?

Mr. CARMEN A. PERILLI (continuing): Mr. President, to refresh the Senator's mind I will state here that this was the information given and I based my question on this Governmental release. It stated:-

> "Another $40,000 will be saved by the ending of the practice of employing school-children on vacation for two weeks each year and leaving them on premises."

In addition, Mr. President, was work of the safety of these children why I would ask the Senator to clarify whether this arrangement is correct or not, whether it was because of the reasons for shutting the plant or out of safety for the children, or both.

Mr. [illegible] Mr. President, there is another question namely the work or that which follows. The answer is no. There were two schools. When the Committee was investigating the financial problem of the plant they were only one of the many measures which they suggested that it need to take in order to make the plant viable. It was either that we reduce expenditure wherever possible, or increase the fees or ask Government to subsidise the plant. So, really it was not in fact, Sir, there were two schools also, however, the practical reasons were mainly the removal of the children; the surrounding areas that were working in. I do not know of any plant in the world, Mr. President, where children are employed on the lathe.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member could tell us whether at the time of employment of these children it was in order possibly to employ them?

Mr. [illegible]: President, this is a question which came through my mind. As I recall, it was never a problem. It was a question. I do not think that anyone really looked at this especially because they looked at it particularly as some would have employed children in a hazardous trade, which I think is, because these are private working industries, there are trade unions back and forth and there are also fixed rigid hours. Anywhere one may turn, and particularly with children coming into the region where it is not allowed from the ships, there are the factors which I think have.

Mr. [illegible]: A further supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Member could say how long the children were employed before this decision was taken?

Mr. [illegible]: President, I am not sure when precisely started, Sir.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. President, a further supplementary. In the Member's answer a while ago he established a lack of responsibility on one of the chief shareholders as the Government. I wonder if the action taken by the chief executive has rectified or corrected by his immediate boss, the Minister of Works or some other senior official?

Mr. [illegible]: President, I am not sure of the answer but I imagine that it would have had to have the blessing of the Home Minister.

Mr. [illegible]: Would the Member further state, Mr. President, what is fair and reasonable to assume that if these children were away from the most hazardous that they would have been contributed by the Marine responsible for its work?

MR. MCDONOUGH: I do not think that applies in this matter. I think that is probably out of order, because I do not think that you were allowed to ask questions taken back on my question of yesterday. That is what that question was today. Very frankly, Under Rule 7(g). You may not ask a question which criticizes or recommends or explains and you have already had Member's opinion as to what Member would like and reasonable.

MR. LAWRENCE A. GIBSON: May I respond, Mr. President. Yesterday the Member Chamber had to assure that this military has been the military of the constitutional over the past few years. So military going out on the street.

MR. CHARLES A. STRICKLAND: Mr. President, I wonder, Mr. Minister, if there has been no policy at any time. There is nothing in the records to show that there has never been a policy. There has been a procedure but never a policy laid down by the Government. I was Governor, Sir, from 1960 to 1962. The Second Mineral Session for Sandra Town was the Members from Bain and there is no policy to be found in any of the Government's records. There is no policy until then, Sir.

MR. G. ISAAC DONOVAN: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member can give us the average age of the boys employed at the Camp?

MR. CHARLES A. STRICKLAND: I cannot, Mr. President, there were boys employed aged 8 years, 10 years, 11 years and also 12 years.

MR. JOHN C. WHITAKER: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member could tell us exactly what boys aged 8 years would do at the Camp?

MR. CHARLES A. STRICKLAND: I cannot, Mr. President, this is a question that is in my mind which I would like answered.

MR. SPEAKER: I think let us move on to the next question. It is not dealing the subject.

MR. LESTER BENJAMIN BROWN FOR CENTRAL: Page 24. The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation that the Government pay the Police Association the sum of $5,000 for the building of their police club.

MR. P.L. (a) would the Member state whether the Town Authority's building scheme envisaging the new building of the Government school on the Police Association's site has been delayed; and

MR. CHARLES A. STRICKLAND: Mr. Speaker, I think that we have not been approached.

MR. P.L.: That being so, I think that we have not been approached.

MR. P.L. (b) would the Member also state the amount which the Town Authority hopes to spend on a variety of recreational facility for the building of the Government school on the Police Club?

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that the Member enlighten the answer to the Question as to give such. It has been answered.

ANSWER: (b) ... in the local areas for which figures are available, a total of over $20,000 was raised by the Fund Authority activity school boys. It is estimated that a similar amount will be raised in 1975.

QUESTIONS:

MR. ARMSTRONG (1, OTTAWA): Mr. President, is it correct that there is available that the only reason why the Post Authority discontinued the activities of young men on the work was to save expenditure, and will nothing at all to do with their safety. This only some about [illegible].

MR. GILBERT CARTER (Yukon): Mr. President, I think that this is a question. I hope with that opinion because I stated here that the number was no. Among other things which were investigated on the work by the Committee this was only one of the small areas which they recommended that be covered. So I disagree with the Member's statement, Sir.

MR. G. PERCY DOWNES: Mr. President, may I ask the Member to repeat the question answered in the answer. The answer says that it is hoped or it is anticipated that $20,000 would be raised in 1975 if they do not apply the subscribers. May I ask who would be the ones which the subscribers must have done in order to have paid $20,000 the previous year? Would it be a grant subsidy of $20,000 as normally [illegible] Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Taylor): Mr. President, the witnesses were not required [illegible] they were just working along with their people. They had an installation job. They were just working away with other people. Since they have left and we have adopted [illegible] them on the work, we have not had to [illegible] the exact number to take the place of them they were doing. I stated earlier, [illegible] that most of the time they were playing around the work instead of working.

MR. PRESIDENT: The next question. The Honourable Member for Mayo Lake.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR MAYO LAKE: MR. PRESIDENT, DOES THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE [illegible] HAVE ANY [illegible] THAT TIMES

MR. DE: Would the Member please advise whether arrangements have been made by the Public Service Employment to employ Local Student during their school holidays?

ANSWER: Government [illegible] to use its best efforts to place any students on school holidays in any temporary positions which may be open at the time.

The private sector through the Yukon Federal Chamber of Commerce has been approached and encouraged to offer employment to students during their school holidays.

The Labour Office will endeavour to place on available vacancies, any students who are registered as seeking employment.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. H. NEAL SCOGGIN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member what temporary positions could be given to the graduate in History?

REP. W. NORMAN SCOGGIN: Mr. President, I would not specifically state what temporary positions would be given because it depends on what positions would be available at the time. However, I do know that even during this past summer Government has offered positions to school leavers who, I suppose, perform clerical positions just necessary positions. They have helped out in these areas. It would depend on which of these positions are open at the time.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that we can file the next question. The Second Elected Member for Eastern Nine. Oh, I am sorry. You have got a supplementary?

DR. LINFORD A. PIERRE: Yes. Mr. President, just on supplementary. Would the Member give the assurance that he will use his best endeavours to employ as many of these school boys as possible in the future?

REP. W. NORMAN SCOGGIN: Mr. President, I can give an assurance that I will use every means at my disposal, not to employ them, but to see that the Governments for which I am responsible make their best endeavours to offer employment.

DR. D. OSCAR MILLER: Mr. President, I wonder if it would be possible to suspend Standing Order 22(7) to allow for the completion of the questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to suggest that that might be the wish of this House anyway, because we did spend most of our time on Ramos. Would you like to move that or shall we ask the Honourable Chief Official Member to move it?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 22(7) AND (8)

HON. DENNIS M. PYKE: Mr. Speaker, I move the suspension of Standing Order 22(7) to enable the remainder of the questions to be answered, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the provisions of the provisions of Standing Order 9A, Standing Order 22(7) shall be suspended in order to enable the remainder of the questions standing on today's Order Paper to be asked and answered. I thought if you suspended Standing Order 22(7), Standing Order 22(8) did not apply anyway. But Although, Standing Order 22(7) and (8) that, I am informed that we had better suspend. Does any Member wish to speak, if not I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THAT STANDING ORDER 22(7) AND (8) BE SUSPENDED TO ENABLE THE REMAINDER OF QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER TO BE ANSWERED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question duly carried. The Second Elected Member for Eastern Town.

THE HONOURABLE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE TAKES ON ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATION.

QUESTION NO. 96: Would the Honourable Member state the cost of employing the proposed extension to the Staff Road on Cayman Brac?

ANSWER: The cost of employing the road use file,extension which included the "Ox Bailey" culvert, for the three miles of road construction period to November, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: Question No. 97?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR BRITISH TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATION

NO. 97: Would the honourable Member state why the proposed extension to the Staff Road failed to be tarmacked?

ANSWER: Preliminary planning of the proposed route encountered extremely rough terrain which required a deviation in part route to reduce the cost on order that the road could be completed with the funds allocated for the project. Once again that new access roads will not be tarmacked once the road is widened to the designated 30 feet.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no supplementary, perhaps we can turn to question No. 98. The Second Elected Member for West End.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 98: Would the Honourable Member make a statement on the progress of the re-organization of the Community College?

ANSWER: Under the rationalization of responsibilities in the portfolios the Adult School, Marine Science and Training were placed under the Ministry responsible for Education. These would also be looked back assignments until the Community College is fully re-established as the Institution with various sections. The Agricultural section has been discontinued due to a lack of students. The Agricultural and Cooperative sections have been amalgamated with the Technical Training section. The re-organized Community College now consists of four sections, the Adult School located in Bodden Town, the Technical School on the old LIC site, the Extension Section which also includes the Cayman Islands High School also serving the community, and the Business School which is due to open in the Seven Buildings on 10th September.

The administrative offices of the Community College are now located in the Seven Buildings, under a full-time re-organization who are appointed acting in there.

Consideration planned to acquire a permanent facility for 1985 are still active on the further development of the College. To this end Mr. Speed plans an education planning on the Community Environmental Project to be done to promote terms of reference and an interim report.

In the meantime the College has contracted for storage of the hotel and heating industry in order to upgrade the present offerings. The institute of Service courses will start in September at the Wilkinson Pioneer as well as a two year accounting course. It is hoped that both these courses can be offered full-time in the near future.

The expansion of the Hotel School courses relocation of the school to a larger site. Plans are well underway to offer a building trades course in January, and a course for nursery nurse assistants is under active consideration.

In the meantime, the enrolment picture continues to be very positive with over 900 people taking advantage of early registration for classes which start this September.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

MR. G. MAY TROSKY: Mr. President, may I ask when the government going to stop giving grants to the Cambrian College and get on with the job of building it?

HON. DENNIS R. TIMBRELL: Mr. President, this government has indicated that it has received private representations on the accommodations or do not to locate money on happened on the road.

MR. G. MAY TROSKY: Mr. President, may I ask the minister if he considered the recent study by Professor Gallagher relating to the wisdom of the College expansion, or is it simply because we wants to delay the projects?

MR. ROBERT G. FERRIS: Mr. President, the report given by Dr. Gallagher was extremely valid report, given the limited time which he spent in the Peninsula. However, I believe, that it would be fair to admit that his report is not comprehensive and all-encompassing.

MR. R. MARTIN RUSH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Minister say where the Hotel School will be relocated to?

HON. DENNIS R. TIMBRELL: Mr. President, if the Minister of Agriculture was ready the Department of Agriculture will be delighted to anywhere else to enable the Hotel School to be sited in the development now owned by the Agricultural Development.

MR. G. MAY TROSKY: Mr. President, may I ask the Minister to his statement that Professor Gallagher's report was not comprehensive, is the opinion of his Ministerial solutions in education, or is it his own personal opinion?

HON. DENNIS R. TIMBRELL: Mr. Speaker, it is the opinion of the Secretariat Advisors, and as I said, Dr. Gallagher himself. The report indicates that it is not all-encompassing.

MR. SPEAKER: Question no. 91.

HAS ANYONE ELSE'S NAME BEEN ADDED TO THE PETITION?

Q1. Will the Member say how much of the cost of the proposed bypass will be borne by the Government and how much by the Municipality?

YEARS	COST	GOVERNMENT SHARE
1980		215,600.00
1981		16,320.00
1982		411,791.00
1983		445,310.00
1984		837,980.00
TOTAL		1,926,910.00

QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, a supplementary. Would the Member state whether any assessment has been made of the possible unemployment that could be caused by the cancellation?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, such estimates as are available have been made by the Department of Works.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Minister state whether in the light of the increasing amounts being spent for subways would the Government do investigating studies into some through the Health Maintenance Organization or anything like this in order to reduce the cost?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, there is an ongoing study under provisions of legislation, in order to attempt to reduce the cost incurred by moving such subways.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, would the Member state whether it is a policy of Government to refuse such subways which cannot be handled locally, and whether it is accepted for arrangements to be made for the maintenance of such a road.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, I think that the first part of the question answers itself. If the Minister was unable to move with a road they will refuse it. I would assume that the second part would refer to areas where Government does not have responsibility, for example in the case of Crown lands, I assume if Government has a responsibility in those areas. However, it is the intent and is certainly the policy to recover the cost from the individuals or their relatives who are name drivers.

MR. M. HARPER: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Minister say what has been spent so far this year?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not really think that this is a supplementary but I will allow him to answer if he....

MR. M. HARPER: Sorry, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: Oh, yes. I beg your pardon. The question was: Does your name [sic], as you say it is a relatively fair question.

HON. EDGAR G. EDWARDS: Mr. President, I am afraid that I do not have that figure, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder whether you might undertake to get that figure and circulate them to Members for their information.

THE HONOURABLE G. EDWARDS: Yes, Sir, that can be done.

MR. EDGAR G. EDGAR: Mr. President, a further supplementary. In order to give the correct information on this matter to the public I wonder if the Member could state just what sums of this expenditure [illegible] have been made for refurbishment and what is the [illegible] to be written off against Government's revenue?

HON. EDGAR G. EDGAR: Mr. President, I thought that I answered that question already.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Member could rise on second where Government does not have a liability to meet the expenditure in the case of rental accounts, that refurbishment could be disregarded wherever possible. So, I think really your supplementary has been answered.

HON. EDGAR G. EDGAR: Mr. President, the purpose for the supplementary is that the information have given the impression that Government has been spending a lot of money on [illegible] which is true. However, I wanted to get it definitely clear that most of this is already covered under [illegible] to be recovered.

HON. EDGAR G. EDGAR: Mr. President, if it helps the Member, what is in that a great portion of this is recoverable.

MR. SPEAKER: The elected Member for North side.

MR. L. BRAM HILLS: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member give any more details as the issue of expenditure where refurbishments are carried with in the plant area in relation the rest of the health care.

HON. EDGAR G. EDGAR: Mr. President, I am not prepared to give the specific names of the institutions. I could just say that refurbishments are being sought for the canteens.

MR. SPEAKER: Question two.

THE ACTING SECRETARY BEGAN READING THE NEXT DAY OF THE MORNING BUSINESS QUESTION HOUR QUESTIONS FOR ANSWERS AND ORAL ANSWERS

No. 230: Would the Honourable Member state what steps are being taken to ensure that all qualified and qualified Expatriates are employed on the Hydro project before work permits are granted for non-Belizeans or both?

ANSWER: Prior to the grant of any permit consideration is given to employment on the Hydro project, representatives of the Expatriate Association Board, together with the Chief Immigration Officer, met with the Chief

Jamaica Conservation Association and subsequently with senior management of Caribbean International and Guyanese Enterprises. At the latter meeting, the Board stressed the point that local personnel should be employed at the project wherever possible and that all available local employees should be trained to participate therein.

Thus far the Board has granted only a small number of applications for employment with the Hyatt project. As such, the Board has been encountering a phenomenal lack of skilled persons and the Board is therefore disappointed that there can be local persons available to fill it.

All further applications for gainful employment please will be considered in consultation with the Government Labour Office and permanent employment will be placed on the availability of the local workforce and availability of suitable expatriates to fill the posts.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister for Grenada.

Mr. G. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Member if he can tell us what is about by a small amount of foreign workers being employed at the site?

Col. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. G. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, also can I ask the Member if he can tell us what are the exact circumstances of the professional and technical workers employed from overseas?

Col. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am well prepared for these supplementaries, Sir. However, I would like to say that there are two companies involved, Caribbean International and Guyanese International, and therefore we might find a slight difference in each one. However, there are a number of Guyanese engineers, project manager, security manager, building supervisor, general engineer, welder, security supervisor, personnel manager, accountant, receptionist, secretary, marketing manager, planning officer, engineer and another general worker.

Mr. S. [illegible]: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there not a possibility that the sub-contractors have contracts or wages cheaper than what is paid that they could get the same help on the Islands, that is Guyanese or Grenada?

Mr. [illegible]: I think, Mr. Speaker, what the Member is saying is that a lot of the work on the project is sub-contracted out to local contractors, who in their workforce might have a few people who are on some premises.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. I think that he already answered it but I still ask it again. Is there not a possibility that the sub-contractors have already an agreement with the Islands and are making them on the job?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Member is quite right. It has been answered and the answer was yes. There is that possibility . .

MR. M. MORGAN JONES: Mr. President, a further supplementary. What then is the position? Are we saying that Commissions are taken out of the hands of this country?

MRS. EMMELINE W. PIKE: Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Soviet Commissions in the Polaris-type ships were never sent on their work areas whereupon ships set out Commissions ships like that, however, as a part of their work areas some of them have joined ships which have been with them from the yards on work permits. If they get a sub-contract then will also their work. Nevertheless, we do not have anybody who have reported to the Labour Office as those contracts who do not of course.

MR. M. MORGAN JONES: Mr. President, a further supplementary. Is the Member saying that the sub-contractors who have these permits or work permits are also then some if those are Commissions activities? I have a cause for notice, Mr. President, and I know this if it will please to get a answer here on another time. However, it is a fact that those things are happening and they must be checked first.

MRS. EMMELINE W. PIKE: Mr. President, it is my opinion, Sir, that Ukrainian Commissions went to work they can go and work for anybody. Sir, nevertheless there is that case is not right but when they work.

MR. M. MORGAN JONES: Mr. President, just to get the case straight. Let us take this thing seriously. The only [illegible] Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: You may ask questions, not make statements.

MR. M. MORGAN JONES: What is what he just said, Sir, a statement.

MR. PRESIDENT: He was certainly a question.

MR. M. MORGAN JONES: In my opinion it was a statement when answering my question. However, I will leave it quite calmly. However, it needs to be checked later, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Alternative Answer for Mrs. Pike.

MRS. EMMELINE W. PIKE: Thank you, Mr. President. Would the Minister be able to tell us what steps are being taken to ensure that Commissions are invited by Soviet shipowners to ensure that they are able to replace those non-Ukrainians who do work permits within a reasonable period of time?

MR. GEORGE M. FOSTER: Mr. President, I am really not responsible for shipping, but I would say that where a young Commissioner is employed with a contracting firm and he wishes to leave and therefore to where he can be a fitter or plumber or carpenter, certainly the Government would be stupid to refuse any permits or work permits which he has ready, where he could have a favourable opportunity to replace them.

MRS. MARY D. BROOKS: A further supplementary, Mr. President. Based on first hand knowledge of many individuals who have been on work permits for nine or ten years now, or more or less than that, although the need of a union contract is indicated, would the Member in charge be willing to take time to ask someone to check to see whether or not these people are now being done by non-Organizations to do certain jobs which are now being done by non-Organizations? I mention Mr. President, that the Members be sure in terms of training. Because, I would like your assurance that this will be kept in mind and I would like the Member to give us some answer as to whether something is being done to ensure that this person is not overlooked.

MR. F. MORRIS HALL: Mr. President....

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Hall rise? The Member must first rise and address to answer the question which has been asked.

MRS. GERTRUDE M. BROOKS: Mr. President, it is difficult for me to give any such assurance, for, because the contractors that choose and purchase to their own needs. I commend to Chairman to them and telling them what they must do. The Board of Commerce are private persons. However, then as not them coming, they will have one keeping the book. I cannot get my work done because you are not giving me a work permit and there is no Organization available. I cannot give any assurance for outside firms like that, Sir.

MR. F. MORRIS HALL: Mr. President, a supplementary. All the answers we have received this morning were out of the question-

> "What steps are being taken to ensure that all qualified and qualified Organizations are employed on the Lynn project."

The fact is that the Lynn project, the environment of the whole problem....

MR. PRESIDENT: Is the Member asking a question?

MR. F. MORRIS HALL: Yes, Sir, I am asking a question. Just to get to it, Sir.

MR. THOMPSON: As long as you get to it reasonably soon.

MR. F. MORRIS HALL: Yes, Sir. The fact is that the representations for the Lynn project have sub-contractors. In the light of my question and the answers given, I would ask the Minister that my question to ensure.... I am asking what steps are being taken for Organizations to be hired on the job. The fact is that the sub-contractors are the ones who are actually the problems. However, according to the Minister's answer the Provincial Board is doing nothing about it. If that is what he is saying, then he should rectify it.

MR. FRANK D. ROWE: Mr. President, the answer given the other day by the steps which were taken prior to the commencement of the job. The Department Provincial Board did everything possible to see that Organizations were represented on the job. However, Mr. President the Provincial Board has no control over sub-contractors, we cannot go to the project management that they cannot give out a sub-contract to neither can we control the sub-contractors from working with them over the past years.

MR. H. MONESTA RICE: Mr. President, I think that the Member is...

MR. PRESIDENT: No, I did not call you. Please sit down. We must take turns. The elected Member for North Side was the next one who caught my eye.

MR. J. BRIAN ATWELL: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would give the House the assurance that the Protection Board will review work permits being held by the sub-contractors and in places where there are qualified Caymanians, have such work permits revoked?

HON. OSCAR S. RUTLAN: Mr. President, this is a constant policy. If a firm or contractor applies for the renewal of a work permit for a person employed there, the Board goes into the facts and does whether it is necessary to renew that permit or not, similarly with the application for new permits. Of course, Mr. President, the minute we have one down we get a great big invitation. This comes every day to me.

MR. SECRETARY: No, the second elected Member for George Town East. You will get your turn.

MR. TIMPSON A. BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President. The Member elected that he is still prepared for supplementaries. I think if I may say, Mr. President, arising from the supplementaries the question is not have whether the contractor can have the authority to use his people under his employment. The question is that there are many Caymanians available for the jobs which are being filled by people on work permits. I wonder whether the Member would state whether these contractors should be allowed to employ individuals on work permits when there are local qualified Caymanians available and what is being done to remedy this problem?

MR. SECRETARY: I really think that this has been answered already. It has been said that the Immigration Board takes steps to ensure that each application for a non-Caymanian whether new or renewal is scrutinized. So, unless you can explain to me why that has not been answered? Alright, you tell me.

MR. LONFORD A. PINEAU: Yes, Sir, I would be happy to. The Immigration Protection Board comes into play when an application is made to it. I am here speaking of where a contractor has already received a permit for someone and the job for which that individual was employed has been completed. Now, that person may have six months to seven months to run on that permit, and rather than working that individual back after that particular job has been completed, that person is held and the qualified Caymanian is deprived of filling the position in another job. That person is just transferred and the Protection Board would hardly be aware of this unless this is brought to their attention.

HON. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, I think that I got the point but we have to bear in mind that these sub-contractors are local people and they do not stay at one job all the time. If they have a sub-contract done at the first to do a particular job, when that is finished they probably have two or three other jobs lined up and they take their workforce there. However, Mr. President, I am aware that any Caymanian who has gone to that position looking for work recently has got it, Sir.

MR. CHARLES E. SHEEHY (CONTINUED): At least fifteen people from Queen Anne, because there is nothing going on down there, have applied to them for jobs and got them right away. I think that if these people who are out of jobs here in Grand Cayman went there, they might get a job immediately.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for West Bay North. He has been waiting a long time.

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Yes, I waited long enough because it was my question and I should have immediate reply. Anyway, Mr. President, it seems that my question is not going to be answered. My question is will Government get involved in some to what effect? It seems that the sub-contractors are the culprits and the Member is saying that they have to conduct their sub-contractors. So, my question is not going to be answered but some how under will come out of it. Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I see. You are making a statement. You are not asking a question now, it seems to me. The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MRS. LUCILLE E. CONOLLY: Thank you, Mr. President. What I would like to ask if the Member, Sir, is how does the Immigration instruction stand where they a local sub-contractor applies for the renewal of a work permit for a non-Caymanian employee, that the Immigration Department merely know that that contractor has finished the project. Does Government give the opportunities local the local people, or like it is that Immigration Department is assured that there is no local person available for that position, since with most positions, any for instance the night engineer, I see no advertisements in the paper for many of the jobs which would be available on that sites. Would the Member be able to state how the Immigration instruction stand....

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Member has asked the question. You do not have to ask it three times each with different words.

MRS. LUCILLE E. CONOLLY: Alright, thank you.

HON. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, in most cases they make their returns and a started history with the Labour Office is kept, so that if a person is applying for a work and the Labour Office has a Caymanian with that qualification on their list, the applicant is told to go and have that person. That is how it is done, Sir, and the Labour Officer, without any votes attends the Immigration Service meetings.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sure that the tape is running now. But I do not think that Members would wish to waste their questions without a tape. I think we should take our morning break. We are a little bit late. It is a question though of whether, having finished our morning break we should then complete the rest of the questions. I suppose so. We have suspended Standing Orders to do so. Those were the terms of the suspension. So let's we suspend proceedings for about ten minutes, and we will continue questions thereafter. We have not finished with the supplementaries to this question yet, you may recall counsel.

MR. EASTLAND (CONTINUING): I did desire Members, as I indicated to despite Members to submit their questions in paper which I distributed copies of. If Members would care to make such inquiries for the Committee hearings before having office and refreshments, I would be grateful.

AT 11:30 A.M. THE SENATE RECESSED

AFTER RECESS AT 12:00 P.M.

MR. THURMOND: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Questions. Are there any further supplementary questions to question No. 100? The Senior Elected Member for Georgia Mr.

MR. RUSSELL B. LONG: Thank you, Mr. President. This morning we were being asked what the knowledge that the Member is still employed for these assignments and if anyone else of the subcommittee questions. Would the Member state why were the heavy equipment and the heavy equipment operators without take the initiative to do the necessary work on the Ryan Road when there are heavily qualified operators and heavy equipment available?

MR. RUSSELL B. LONG: Mr. President, I see and now that I made a mistake in saying that I was well prepared. Really, I do not even know that they have heavy equipment here or I am not in a position to answer that one at all.

MR. EASTLAND: I think that supplementary should be limited to the questions, but if you do not know whether there are any operators perhaps work scheduled....

MR. H. RUFUS BOWLES: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if the Organized Environment would especially studied the site or had some investigation made to determine whether the fifteen people which the Member mentioned are employed out the daily commutable area the high probably within which he grew up, such as Pitts, perhaps managers and construction engineers, and to find out whether these people are actually doing jobs which local employment could do?

MR. RUSSELL B. LONG: Mr. President, I really do not think that the Department Protection Board has studied the site, Mr.

MR. H. RUFUS BOWLES: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would give the Senate an understanding, even if it is possible to the Senate, work permits granted to people in the fields of common labour such as carpentry and carpenters should be limited to the specific building. I think part of the problem is that Department goes out of town when they give one a work permit for a year. When the applications are made there are no Department available. However, in the Atlantic parcel between the main Courthouse block they have moved on to another building, there are Department who are out of work and could fill the posts.

MR. DENNIS R. EDGERS: No, Mr. President, I believe that's all the questions I have. This is a motion for the record. I just wanted to show that undertaking like that and I will say again, Sir, every local undertaking from this, as I understand it, the rest of next year they have to get a permit for a project, and then for two weeks and send them back. These permits cost money.

MR. LEONARD A. STAVISKY: Mr. President, a further supplementary, would the Member give the undertaking that we will look into the problem of sub-contractors or construction trailers be ready equipment operators where there are available classrooms?

MR. DENNIS R. EDGERS: Yes, Sir, I will instruct the Department of Education Board to be most careful and cautious on these heavy equipment operators. Again, there is an exception for an operator who is out of a job. We ask go to the Parking Office and say that he is out of a job and there are plenty of classrooms there. So that makes a compromise.

MR. SPEAKER: The next question. The Elected Member for South Side.

THE SECRETARY READING HIS QUESTION PUT TO HON. THE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR TRANSPORTATIONS, WORKS AND SUPPORT SERVICES

No. 101: Would the Honourable Member state the cost of work done on private drive-ways from inception year up to 31st August, 1985, giving a breakdown in the most for this and every application?

ANSWER: The Public Works Department has in recent years upgraded residential roads falling into three categories:

(i) Public roads, in sub-divisions and traditional residential areas;
(ii) Private roads, in sub-divisions; and
(iii) Turnings roads in established residential areas.

The necessity to upgrade private roads in sub-divisions arose from the absence of adequate regulation of sub-divisions until only a few years ago. There remains a substantial backlog of this work to be done.

Private roads in traditional residential areas are also increasing. All such roads serve more than one household. While the Department does not have complete records of the expenditure on each of the individual categories, total expenditure on residential roads from 1st January to 31st August, 1985, was $124,000. Of this amount, $3,500 was expended on the upgrading of three (3) roads in Blocks 14C and 22D, North Side, falling under category (iii). The estimated cost of the upper and main element of these projects was $1,000.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. E. SPENCER MILLER: Supplementary, Mr. President. Does Government have to consider the views of any of these private roads in their policy to be any attempt made to preserve any of the cost?

HON. MRS. CHARLES E. STEPHENSON: Mr. President, the cost of the upkeep and any element as mentioned is the last part of the question. Any policy to try to recover this from the people whose privacy roads.

MR. E. SPENCER EVANS: Mr. President, a supplementary, Mr. Could the Member say what does Government determine to be a private drive-way or a private road?

MRS. CHARLES E. STEPHENSON: I think that the Member asked what does Government determine to be a private road?

MR. E. SPENCER EVANS: What does Government determine to a private road or a private drive-way?

HON. MRS. CHARLES E. STEPHENSON: Mr. President, a private road is one which is owned by an individual and a private drive-way is one which is owned by a private individual and the Government has not taken over the private road. There is an agreement to a certain standard this is what one requires to be the answer here. Government have been approached and that before they would take over the private road it has to be brought up to a certain standard by the Chief Engineer of Public Works Department. There is done to receive a private road.

MR. SPEAKER: The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. OSBORNE E. SANDS: In the answer just the Member were it that private roads in predominantly residential areas were done properly, and this road already more than one household. Would the Member be able to say, although I am not aware of what Steps it and that Board took any, whether or not these particular roads did in fact come into existence?

MRS. CHARLES E. STEPHENSON: Mr. President, my duty to say is not aware more than one individual household. It was the responsibility while the drive-way was built. This was done, Mr. President, as I understood it, on a basis in connection between the subscribers of roads and the Government here.

MR. JOHN B. MCLEAN: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would state exactly, although I know that he has answered and the Hon. Member here, what part of North Side is it? Is it old Man Bay, North Side or what exactly?

MRS. CHARLES E. STEPHENSON: Mr. President, All Age Bay.

MR. SAMUEL E. JACKSON: Just one more supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder whether the Member would be able to say at this stage whether it just simply will be made to preserve the concrete expended on those three roads, even although there might have been a breakdown in communication between the road subscribers and the Government.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Member has answered that adequately. It was said that an attempt to postpone the matter would be made. Perhaps you did not hear him but he said that.

HON. EARNIE L. GRIFFITH: Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further acknowledgement we can move on to item 6. Second Reading. I think that there is probably time to make a start on this also.

STAR

THE PUBLIC FINANCE (PROVISIONS) BILL, 1985

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE PUBLIC FINANCE (PROVISIONS) BILL, 1985.

HON. SPEAKER: The Honourable Third Official Member.

HON. LINDSAY K. THOMPSON: Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to provide for the control, management and audit of the public finances of the Cayman Islands and for incidental and connected purposes.

Mr. President, as I said yesterday in winding up on the Consolidated Collection of Customs Duties Bill, 1985, which is certainly taking place in the Cayman Islands, and as must appear not only now today, but has appeared since then.

When I moved the Budget, Mr. President, just as an example, in 1981, the Budget for that year was approximately $25 million dollars. The revenue in that Budget was approximately $8 million, the difference being made up of loans and development aid from the United Kingdom. There was approximately two Civil Servants and the Treasury staff in those days was comprised of 11 officers. The audit of Government accounts was carried by the Auditor-General of Jamaica. Additionally, Mr. President, that Island's responsibilities at that time was the administration, and the legal tender in the Cayman Islands was Jamaican dollars.

To make a comparison between that time and the present, Mr. President, it is quite obvious to all that our Island's responsibilities in the Treasury, the Revenue and Audit was carried out by Auditor-General in 1982, paid for from the funds provided by the public. The Cayman Islands dollar is now legal tender and have been since May, 1972.

The current Budget is approximately $85.5 million and there are now approximately 1,370 Civil Servants. The Treasury staff is now comprised of 16 officers.

However, Mr. President, we spend more than education. We have been $8 million to $18 million, while the Treasury maintains dealing with the collection of revenue, processing of expenditure and possibly the responsibility of accounts has only increased by four officers.

Mr. President, shortly after I entered the Service there were talks of the need to enact legislation to deal with the control and management of public finances. Sorry, Mr. President, it is on this - it might help on the piece when she was a wee lad or man, "Better late than never".

Mr. President, the control of public finance and responsibility in the Cayman Islands is presently prescribed by Colonial Regulations. These regulations are predominantly drawn by the Crown through the Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

MR. THOMAS K. HODGKINSON (Urban Council): Mr. President, I am in favour of the Bill which has been moved by the Attorney General. I am in favour of it because I think it is a very necessary piece of legislation. I am in favour of it because I think it is a very necessary piece of legislation. I am in favour of it because I think it is a very necessary piece of legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN (CONTINUING): In the meantime, Mr. President, Sunday 10th, while the Act is not in effect, certainly the Chinese can be used as guidelines when discussing the Bank. It will also enable us to look at the structure of the Treasury and to ensure that it has adequate manpower, not only in numbers but also in quality, to oversee a smooth implementation of this piece of legislation which we are considering today. We will be seeking also, Mr. President, to establish an Internal Audit Section in the Treasury. We will also try the Auditor-General to get on, as I am sure he wants to, with a computer audit whose be completed to Government pending a dollar's value for a dollar spent. Besides that the exercise which an internal auditor usually carries out, which is making sure that payments are properly made and properly documented, and records properly documented, posted and accounts prepared accurately.

Clause 2, Mr. President, seeks to provide that, except where otherwise provided by law, any money received be raised for the purposes of the Government shall form part of Revenue.

Clause 3 seeks to provide that no expenditure shall be charged to Revenue except by or under law.

Clause 4, Mr. President, deals with annual appropriation, that is the Budget, and with the presentation of the Budget to the Legislative Assembly, and the following clause 5 also deals with the Appropriation Law which is still known as Government Expenditure with the Budget Speech that is now commonly known as the Budget Session.

Clause 7 provides provisions for the authorisation of necessary expenditure in advance of the Appropriation Law. This is a clause to give Government to deal with urgent matters where Government needs to make payments before the Appropriation Law can be brought to the House.

Clause 8 and 9 respectively seek to prescribe the manner in which charges may be made to the Consolidated Estimates of Expenditure and, in the event of any excess expenditure arising from those charges, for the presentation to the Legislative Assembly of a Supplementary Appropriation Bill. This is mandatory, Mr. President, but it is considered necessary to have it in these clauses.

Clause 10 seeks to provide that subject to law, the Financial Secretary shall have the management, administration, control and direction of the Government's financial affairs.

Clause 11, By the enabling power to confer on the Financial Secretary the power to make administrative regulations and to give administrative directions and instructions for the better carrying out of those responsibilities.

Clause 12 seeks to make provision for the powers, duties, responsibilities and accountability of Controlling Officers in relation to expenditure and also public property under their control.

Clause 13, Mr. President, provides for the duties and responsibilities of the Accountant General. We will be seeking in due course, Mr. President, a new designation from Chief Accountant to Accountant General. The reason for this is because the Crown will also be responsible for the income/Audit Section as well as a small training section dealing with finance. This is not to say, Mr. President, that we are going to have a training section in addition to the Government training section, but someone in Revenue Department should be responsible for training.

PART IXXXVI - CONSEQUENTIAL PROVISIONS: Clauses 81 through 84 seek to give power to the Financial Secretary to make adjustments and to revise payments from public moneys. Clause 85 seeks to provide for the winding up of the Consolidated Fund Account and to revise payments from public moneys.

Clauses 86, 87, 88 and 89, Mr. Speaker, Sir, deal with the borrowing and investment of public funds and seek to provide the Secretary of Treasury and the Ministry of Finance by the Government. All Memorandum Numbers are source of that borrowing for those expenditure.

Clauses 90 and 91 seek to provide for the authorisation by the Legislative Assembly, of payments and special expenses accounts.

Clause 92, Mr. President, provides that all authorities for expenditure given in respect of a financial year lapse at the close of that financial year, which most of the people of this country, if not all, realise. The funds provided in the 1985 budget will lapse at the end of that year and will be the 1986 budget which is due for presentation in the latter part of November, this year.

Clause 93, provides to enable the appointment of an Auditor-General and by clauses 94 and 95 the new penalty of torture and of salary to enable him to exercise freely the duties and powers of his office. Clause 96 continues to deal with the Auditor-General in the employment to the constitution applicable to other public officers and clauses 97 and 98 make provision for the setting up of a Ministry of the responsible officer, that is the Auditor-General's post itself.

Clauses 99 and 100 prescribe the duties and powers of the Auditor-General and clauses 101 and 102 provide for the appointment of staff to assist him in these duties and the exercise of those prescribed powers.

Clauses 103 to 105, Mr. President, seek to provide for the disposition of casual vacancies by the Governments Council to the Auditor-General within a specified period of time for the Auditor-General to vacate his office. Clause 106 seeks to provide for the submission of these annual accounts and special reports by the Auditor-General to the Legislative Assembly and for these reports to be considered by the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislative Assembly. Clause 107 requires the Auditor-General to report to the Legislative Assembly any matter which in his opinion constitutes a serious irregularity in the accounting for public funds or public property.

Clauses 108 through 111 seek to make certain regulations regulating the audit and examination by the Auditor-General under him or on the authority of the Government, or corporate persons, bodies corporate or other bodies. Clause 112 would enable fees to be charged by the Government in respect of certain audit inspections by the Auditor-General or to be paid by the Government in respect of audits inspections by outside persons on its behalf. In the Public case, Mr. President, the Financial Secretary determines the fees. It is well and that throughout the Legislative there are checks and balances in the system.

Clauses 113 through 118 seek to make provision in certain circumstances for the surrendering of public officers, for the appeal by public officers against their being dismissed and for the publication of summaries.

HON. THOMAS R. <u>HARRISON (CONTINUING)</u>: Clause 48, Mr. President, authorizes the Executive Authority to establish rules governing the use of public places and public property, subject to such conditions, exceptions and limitations as may be specified by the Standing Committee of the Legislative Assembly. Clause 50 would give similar unfettered authority to the Standing Committee to dispose of Government stores and personable property.

Clauses 51, 52 and 53, Mr. President, seek to give power to the Governor to issue directives to public officers under the Law, to clarify the operation of the Law in relation to trusts, and to make certain transitional provisions.

Lastly, Clause 54, Mr. President, will repeal the existing Audit Law (Revised).

If you will allow me to proceed a bit, Mr. President, Clause 45 which basically reads:-

> "(1) Notwithstanding that he is not empowered by any law to audit, examine or enquire into the accounts of a person, body corporate or other body, the Auditor-General may audit, examine or enquire into the accounts and records of any person, body corporate or other body if -
>
> (a) he is authorized in writing to do so by the Government or the public authority; and
>
> (b) in the opinion of the Auditor-General, such audit, examination or inquiry will not interfere with the due performance of his duties and the due exercise of his powers under this Law."

Subsection (2) of that same section 45, Mr. President, reads:-

> "(2) Where the Auditor-General undertakes under subsection (1) the audit, examination of, or inquiry into the accounts and accounts of any person, body corporate or other body, he -
>
> (a) shall have the relation to such persons, body corporate or other body, the functions, offices and employees who were likewise engaged or employed or had by statute 30 and 32 in relation to public moneys, stamps, securities, stores and any other public property;"

Clauses 50 and 51, Mr. President. Clause 50 deals with the duties of the Auditor-General and Clause 51 deals with the powers of the Auditor-General. Leading on to Clause 50(1)(b), Mr. President, it says:-

> "any authority in writing any qualified accountant or any public officer to audit, examine or enquire into the accounts and accounts of such persons, body corporate or other body and require the authorized accountant or public officer to report thereon to the Auditor-General in such manner as the Auditor-General may determine;"

and the proviso, Mr. President:-

> "PROVIDED that any such authority to a public officer shall be subject to the approval of the Head of the Government Department or office in which the public officer is employed."

MR. JAMES C. ANDERSON (CONTINUED): I realize, Mr. President, that clause 45 could be misunderstood; could be misinterpreted. So let me try to illustrate why it is here. Clause 45 gives power or access the Solicitor-General to his respective duties, and let me just remind me, that we are dealing with Bayer Aircraft, an Auditor-General has a supervisory function and he carries out this function by making inquiries of the auditees of Bayer Aircraft about the financial affairs, if necessary going into details of the accounts themselves. It is the power of the law which gives him that authority to do so. I think that without that section he will be seriously worst changed.

Consequent upon amend that accounts, Mr. President, with persons. Clause 45 gives the Auditor-General the authority, when it is deemed to be necessary and in the public interest, to audit the changes of the respective persons. I have a list example, Mr. President, but I do not want to use it in this particular case.

Let me start with subsection 1a to 1aa). Government gives away powers. Government has recently made many loans available to people. It gives the Solicitor-General the power to go in and examine the books, even if it is a change book, of the respective auditor in granting applications. We may give money private to those in need. Or perhaps it might be interest-free available where Government gives lots of money from time to time, that is a sum of $20,000 to $40,000 every year. So we want to lots of money.

It was also for, Mr. President, that a controlling officer, let us say the person who has not paid the Ringgit, or he can take it further and say now he is misappropriated the Government funds which were in his personal interest. This section gives the Solicitor-General the authority to inquire into that person's account.

Perhaps with those brief illustrations of clause 45, Mr. President, it may become more clear to some Members. Maybe I am misunderstanding it. Maybe they misunderstand the whole thing.

Under section 57 which deals with inspection of document persons, which is an omission, Mr. President, but in my view it needs to be here, an illustration of this is where a Government officer is misappropriating the Government or he commits theft. And before we can recover the funds the person dies, we want the ability to get our money back, nothing more, nothing less. So, Mr. President, Sir is the reason for clause 45 and I support this clause.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled "Bill for a law to provide for the creation, management and audit of the public finances of the Cayman Islands and for connected purposes be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. However, before we debate it I think personally, we are a little bit late in suspension than today, so I suggest that we suspend then until another later than 2.30 p.m., perhaps a little bit before 3.30 p.m. We do not want to rush the explanation for those.

AT 12.55 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED.

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Second Reading of the Public Finance and Audit Bill, 1995. Does any Member wish to speak? The Second Elected Member for Savanne Town. Do you mean that you are going to be speaking out of the side of your mouth? (LAUGHTER)

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

MR. LEANDRE J. PLANTEUR: Not before it is time, Sir. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to support this Bill. As a past Member of Her Majesty's Civil Service, and having filled a number of positions in the financial sections of the Service I can, more than many, appreciate the necessity for this Bill.

For many years, Mr. President, we depended on the Customs Department to accept us, which they did in a very good manner. However, as the result of the Bill mid this morning, Mr. President, we are a growing country and what was good for us twenty years ago is perhaps not adequate today. Since the United coming into effect of the relevant sections of the Colonial Regulations applicable to our audit and finance, our revenue and disbursements have grown tremendously. Mr. President, the arrangements under which the public finances of this country were controlled as contained in the Colonial Regulations were somewhat inadequate, as were also the guidelines contained in the Audit Law (Revised). However, Mr. President, I would not go so far as to say that they were totally outmoded.

If a little time is taken, Mr. President to compare the contents of the old Audit Law with those of the Bill before us it will be seen that much of the new Bill is lifted from the old Audit Law (Revised).

Notwithstanding these remarks, Mr. President, with the exception of a few points which I will raise, I feel that the Public Finance and Audit Bill is very comprehensively prepared, and it can very well be endorsed by the House, the honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

I would also ask, Mr. President, to please me record my congratulations to Mr. Gordon Lyte, QC for the invaluable contribution which he gave in the preparation of the Public Finance and Audit Bill, 1995, which is before us. Of course, Mr. President, it goes without saying that the Financial Secretary and the Auditor-General were very, very much involved in this exercise.

Mr. President, the cover of the Bill runs through 62 sections, each section of the Memorandum of Objects and Reasons very carefully and it would be unnecessary repetition to go over those sections again. As I said, Mr. President, upon the completion of one or two reading I find that we have a very, very good Bill before us.

One of the sections, Mr. President, which gives me a great deal of concern, but which I have made note of, is section 32. I believe, Mr. President, that this is to enable the Government, but now enable which the Government proposes and Administrative Manual. However, section 32 which is appropriate the Auditor-General and sections 33 and 34 seek to give security of tenure, otherwise term means. I believe that in the section of the Bill that is to come that the public officers who holds that great office enjoy the security which carries within the position of Auditor-General.

MR. [illegible] (GUYANA): It does not elaborate on this particular point, but section 33 reads:-

"(1) A person who is appointed under section 32 as the Auditor-General -

(a) shall hold that office during good behaviour."

This is the only mention, Mr. President, of security of tenure and I enquire what this is meant to mean.

Mr. President, whereas we said it was considered an inner safeguard to provide the duties and powers of the Auditor-General. It should be noted, Mr. President, however that security that were related specifically to the Auditor-General of the Cayman Islands Government, and not to maintaining generally, because within the previous section, Mr. President, the public officer under which one standards and principles be laid down through these functions and by the organizations body which they are associated with. Incidentally, Mr. President, there is not conflict with the laws of the land.

Mr. President, throughout this Bill it is proposed that appointments be done with regard to the Auditor General but to be with the prior approval of the Secretary of State. Section 32(2) stipulates:-

"The Governor, with the prior approval of the Secretary of State, shall appoint a person to be the Auditor General."

In another number of cases, for instance in section 32(3)(b)(iii), it also states that whatever is done by order is undoing by the Governor must be made with the prior approval of the Secretary of State. Perhaps this is the procedure to be dealt with the Auditor-General but it would seem that it is giving the Auditor-General a very unique position envisaged that whatever order which the Governor may wish to impose would have to be done with the approval of the Secretary of State. Perhaps, Mr. President, the words of the Bill would clarify these points.

Mr. President, before I speak further I would like to comment on clause 40 which seeks to provide for the submission to the Legislative Assembly of annual and special reports by the Auditor-General and a report by the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislative Assembly. For clarity, Mr. President, I would wish to point out that the guidelines, terms of reference of the Public Accounts Committee are specifically contained in Standing Order 74. This is just for clarity.

Sections 40 through 49, Mr. President, were clarified in detail by the mover of the Bill. These sections did give me some concern, but the mover of the Bill took time out this morning, in particular to go over the contents of section 45. Section 45, Mr. President, deals with audit surcharge or penalty from accounts of public officers, auditors, ratified by law. However, in discussing this matter with the mover of the Bill I was assured that this was not necessarily applying to the private sector in the ordinary course of events, but only where, if ever, criminal activities. It would normally apply in cases where Government has offered or given subventions to various bodies or individuals.

It must be taken and understood, Mr. President, that the Auditor-General could not normally apply to the officers of a company registered in these Islands and audit the books of that company, unless there were very good reasons and reasons to do so.

MR. LUCKHOO (Guyana): Mr. President, this Bill as I said, is very, very long section. It is a very, very good Bill and I have no hesitation or reservation in supporting it. I would just like to say, however, in saying it was good that it was time that this old model was changed. I do not know where he got this phrase from. Previously he did say that an old maid said in the place which she was in her room, "Better late than never". I would suppose the power to supply that even though this Bill has taken a very, long time to come to this House, that it is better late than never.

Mr. President, I give this Bill my unlimited per cent support.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Second Elected Member for Golden Fern.

MR. G. BEST GOODEN: Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the mover of the Bill on the presentation and also the very edition of this Bill. My feeling is that the Bill simply puts into text what has been customary here over the years, although some of these duties have already been assumed by an enabling Act.

There are, however, provisions in which I find too much power is given to the Financial Secretary, and too much power is given to the Auditor-General. However, I will only take one example of each case. My opinion of the Bill briefly pointed out the power given to the Financial Secretary to authorize the salaries of a person who has died; to authorize the personal representation of such a person. I think that the section is just wide. This should not be in the hands of the Financial Secretary. It should only be done through a court because, in some instances the personal representative may be simply minor children. If parents who had minor children I do not think that the Financial Secretary should step in and say, "because your father was this many and he had overdrawn his, you must pay", and take away the funds from those children in that manner. It should be done through the court in the normal process when the will is probated or if there is no will, when the letters of administration are taken out.

The second item which I want to mention is the power given to the Auditor-General under clause 32(3). Clause 32(3) says:-

> "In the performance of his duties and the exercise of his powers under this Act the Auditor General shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other person or authority."

I think that that power should only be given to Almighty God. We said that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Like everybody else, the Auditor-General must be answerable to anybody, because what happens if the Auditor-General is malfeasance-minded is that first come first serve. The first part of subsection (3) of section 32 says:-

> "The Auditor General shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other person or authority."

Now, how can he function at all if he is not subject to direction from somebody?

MR. H. LEWIS BOOKER (CONTINUING): Let us take this case of private ambulance in the Peterborough area. If a businessman gives cash to Lions Ambulance or one of the other philanthropic firms, the businessman must only say, "I want you to credit my Income". They must say, "Those are the books. This is the company I want you to credit". If there is any significant reason for the money to finally be withheld out of the terms of preference given to the auditor, in this case of the Government auditor, there must be some discretion given somewhere so that he knows what he has to say when he looks for it. This person has wondered because of what such discretion is, or what he is to do.

In fact, it would seem to me that this section could even exclude him from this role, because this is an auditor. This section seems to give him additional powers not subject to the discretion of anybody or any authority. Here, the second part of subsection (3) of section 32 might limit the Auditor-General still not be subject to the control of any other person or authority. Here again, this could become the right, or would be subject to arbitrariness, if it is given the power by the Secretary of State's. Reinforce more those additional powers.

I know, not being an auditor myself, that auditors need to have their independence. They ought to be able to function independently without any political harassment, without any unnecessary fear from the Civil Service. They need to be able to exercise discretion on the work of accounting and income would be important. So, I feel that this section is far too wide, particularly when it says that he cannot be subject to directions. I understand the need for his independence, but I feel that it is wrong to give to any member from the executive powers which can prevent him from doing his duties.

While I have spoken at some length, I would just like to point out what I think is a deficiency in the Bill. Subsection (3) of section 32 will not get any support from me because I believe that it is wrong.

Apart from these few points, I would commend again the Member for bringing the Bill, which on the face of it looks good, some better into even more.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable Minister of Treasury and Economics and Chairman of Management Board of Executive Council.

HON. WILLIAM G. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to give some credit to the sponsor. It just is a Bill which has been long due. In 1951, between the Ontario Government and the need to provide pensions and benefits for certain municipalities, Her Majesty's Government provided that a company known to us as Ontario Pensions Corporation. These provisions were made applicable to a number of municipalities which benefited the Crown in right.

In those days, these pensions regulations were seen to be very useful for our municipalities back in those days. However, as we pointed out by the nature of this Bill, they have become obsolete today.

Since 1951 and the years which followed, we began looking at the need for a municipal pension in this Province. It was largely because many other municipalities had become to Ontario were serviced by local legislation, for instance, Windsor, Port Arthur, Kenora, Sudbury and other Departments. It began to ask the question why is Ontario not serviced by a local law?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Government spokesman for giving us the assurance that the Government intends to look at the whole question of the Auditor-General's Department and to bring in legislation. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Government spokesman for giving us the assurance that the Government intends to look at the whole question of the Auditor-General's Department and to bring in legislation. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Government spokesman for giving us the assurance that the Government intends to look at the whole question of the Auditor-General's Department and to bring in legislation. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Government spokesman for giving us the assurance that the Government intends to look at the whole question of the Auditor-General's Department and to bring in legislation. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Government spokesman for giving us the assurance that the Government intends to look at the whole question of the Auditor-General's Department and to bring in legislation. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Government spokesman for giving us the assurance that the Government intends to look at the whole question of the Auditor-General's Department and to bring in legislation. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance. I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that assurance.

MAJ. MAJOR G. JONES (CONTINUING): The Bill, Mr. President, contains in my opinion, what is necessary in such legislation to control all the aspects of finance. As we said, the days of colonial finance regulations are passed. The sophistication which we see today; the varying circumstances in all aspects of financial control, all require a bill more than what we find in Colonial Finance Regulations and that is what this Bill is about. However, so far as I am concerned, Mr. President, the most important aspect of it is that we have local legislation approved by the Legislature hereafter to control all aspects of financial administration in Government.

I support the Bill, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. K. HERBERT DONE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill for a law to provide for the control, management and audit of the public finances of the Cayman Islands and for incidental and connected purposes.

Sir, while I say that I support this Bill which for brevity, I guess, I will call the Audit Bill, I have some reservations on certain sections of it which may need to be further explained to me in Committee stage or in this Member's winding up.

I believe that this Bill, as he said, is long overdue and I believe also that the Cayman Islands should today be in better shape if we had had this Law a few years ago.

Looking at clause 8, Mr. President, and remembering the previous administrations, I am not entirely pleased with the phrase "as soon as practicable" as it appears towards the end of clause 8. We do know, Sir, that we will always have supplementary bills but I can see no reason why such bills cannot be brought to this Assembly within six months of the end of the financial year. As far as I am concerned, "as soon as practicable" leaves the door open for such bills to show up in this Assembly two years or longer after the money has been spent.

Clause 21 of the Bill I also have some trouble with. That is, Mr. Speaker, Sir, clause 21(a)(i) where it reads:-

> "(a) to meet expenditure -
> (i) for which no provision or sufficient provision is shown in the approved estimates of expenditure,"

otherwise. I have no hesitation in giving the Financial Secretary the power specified where there is insufficient provision for the estimates. However, I must question this where there is no provision in the estimates at all. Again we do all know sometimes mistakes happen. The Finance Committee which is comprised of all the Elected Members of this Honourable House is the body charged with the control of Government spending. Except for the First Elected Member for the Sister Islands none of us live more than thirty miles away from this Chamber, and there is hardly anything which could arise so urgently, Sir, other than a criminal incident, which could not be dealt with by the normal means.

I do not believe that as Legislators we should delegate this power to the Financial Secretary, or anyone else for that matter. I am not personally casting any aspersions on him, Sir.

MR. E. HARRIS SIDE (INAUDIBLE): Now, I come to the duties of the Auditor-General. I believe that is in clause 22 of the Bill. I support this section generally, but again I have some questions on it and I have circulated my amendment to specifically cover something which has interested me since the sale of the Waterloo property during the last administration. I feel, Sir, that provision should be made in this Bill to charge the Government to seek the advice and consent of the Legislature for the sale of any Crown property. I know that a few years ago the Lady Hewer for Dundas took brought a motion which was defeated. However, I feel that this can be changed in this Bill and I feel that as Legislators would be doing the right thing. I trust that the Government would see fit to accept my amendment.

I give my support to clause 20. This section, Sir, explains why persons that the Auditor-General thinks should do or be certain way within or relations he has dealing with any public property. Again, perhaps if we had had any such power before, maybe we would not have had the Waterloo incident which I referred to. He also may have avoided the more recent incident during the previous administration of the purchase of the sawmill and adjoining the land. I do not want to go into specifics but everybody knows what I am talking about. I trust that no more in this country will there be such an abuse of public money.

If I am correct in my interpretation clause 22 of the Bill it will help to eliminate such things from happening again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to clauses 44 and 45. I support these two clauses in principle as far as they relate to public accounts. However, again clause 45(1)(a) and (b) give me some trouble, and I have brought some clarification from the Member. I also have had some legal advice on it and it does give no reason to think that what the Government is trying to accomplish in this section, and what could actually happen is something which we would not want to see. I believe that where there is enough suspicion of a person other than a public servant in connection with investigation or enquiry into that person's records, that other should come from the Chief Justice of this country and not from the Lieutenant-in-Council. I also believe that the request in any such examinations or enquiry should be made to the Attorney-General of this country. That is, Sir, providing that something is found which in the opinion of the Auditor-General would warrant reporting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this section is used to look into the affairs of what they are, and in my opinion is still going on with the Interchurch case and the handling of the matter by the Liquidators, then as I said earlier I could support it, because that situation is something which must look very bad. I am sure that many other Legislatures have today and in the past have been embarrassed by members of the public on the Provincial enquiry from situation. We have been asked to look into the situation but as we all know in this House, when we question anyone all we have is that the answers have to be hard and we cannot battle with the answer, which is true. However, it would seem that it is the Liquidators, Sir, of the Interchurch case who have everything in hand and people are upset at the loan situation. If this section in any way gives that there are the kind of situations which could be taken in hand or examined, then I would give it my full support. Not only the Interchurch case, Mr. Speaker, but also the International Bank, I think it was called, to be sure which as investigation there it was felt to look into those matters. Well then it has my full support. Otherwise I believe that there could be some danger in that clause, unless of course that person or body corporate, or other body which the Bill states shall be doing business directly with the Government.

MR. M. MURPHY (CORK): I hope Sir, and I trust that the Minister [illegible] will specifically withdraw my quarrel on the possibility of amending into the Estimate [illegible] Sir, I oppose this section with the acknowledging of public servants who are, or might be negligent in their duties. The elimination of this subsection is wrong as the dissemination of the Financial Secretary. However, it is within the ambit of this Bill. I feel, Sir, that no public servant will be unduly penalised. Mr. Speaker, I am no solicitor, I am not even good in grammar. However, I see the need for such a Bill.

Let me first, Sir, that people did not look at this Bill while there was not much opposition to it because I had many meetings of the public come to me and question these sections. So people are watching it. They are looking at the things we are doing and we must not forget this. A lot of people have said to me to oppose it. So what appears, Mr. Speaker, and I have opposed where opposition is needed and I will continue to do this. However, when something is good for the country as, all of us in this House must put politics aside and do what the people sent us here to do. Then we do see that they are under harass.

The Cayman Islands today are under attack. There is no question about that fact. No one knows without any doubt how the existence of the ship must be dealt. We must be wise and we must work together hand in hand to see that our ship remains floundering on the rocks, or like a house divided cannot stand.

I feel that it will be needed and I trust that we make a good law which I hope will enhance the smoothing running of the public Service in this country. I applaud the Government and the Member on the Bill's presentation.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it may be convenient if we take our usual afternoon break before any further Member speaks. So I will suspend proceedings for approximately ten minutes.

AT 3.25 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3.42 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
The Public Finance and Audit Bill, 1986. Second Reading. The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express my support for this Bill and to commend the Government for bringing forward this timely and badly needed piece of legislation. I believe that under this Bill what happened to the Public Accounts Committee, for instance, over the last eight years will not be allowed to happen again.

MR. D. BRIAN NILSEN (CONTINUED): This Bill, I think, Sir, will play vested standby and protection. It will thereby reinforce the responsibility of officers involved in the financial operations of Government. It will introduce more responsibility accounting by defining areas of responsibility and reporting, and the accountability of the officers who are involved in the handling of the Government's funds to either the areas of revenue or the areas of expenditure.

I support the mover's comments that the time has arrived in Canada where the Government legislature must attempts to handle all the ramifications of the finances of this Government. These change, Mr. President, and we must change to suit the times. So as legislatures must continually change to obtain the maximum benefits for the people which we represent.

There are a few sections of this Bill however, Mr. President, with which I have some difficulty. Section 3(2), Sir, is a section which I support fully and I hope that the Honourable Financial Secretary will take new pot to change some of the Government Departments' practices into compliance including matters from the present time that system which is being used, however under the provisions made, Sir, I think that it will be easier for us to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency, and to ensure that Government is getting value for the money.

Section 8(3) is a good section. It will be very beneficial to us as ordinary members of the Legislature if we have quarterly reports from the Financial Secretary of what changes have taken place in the Accountability Bill which was passed into Law.

Section 12 gives power to make regulations and directions. I feel, Sir, that all these regulations made under this section should be subject to the approval of Finance Committee.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in section 27(2) I would like to see that some taken under this should not exceed limits which were approved by Finance Committee.

Concerning section 28, I would like to see a new section added there. While I support all of the terms of section 2 I think that in keeping with the normal hope that if it was established on internal audit department, the Auditor-General will be able to spend his time studying the efficiency and effectiveness and value for money. It may be convenient at this time to include this kind of evaluation in powers given to the Auditor-General in accordance has made.

As I said, Sir, this Bill is a timely piece of legislation. It has my support. Section 42 provides the necessarymess of things like public accounts Committee not meeting for eight years, because it lays out time frames under which the Accountant-General must present the estimates and Expense statements to the Auditor-General for his auditing. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I have some difficulty with section 28, the power to make regulations. I would be much happier, Sir, if that section allows the Financial Secretary to submit Minutes of his recommendations to the normal administrative body in Government, that is the Governor with the advice of the Public Service Commission. I think that if any disciplinary procedure, suspension or otherwise, is going to be laid on public officers, it should follow the normal and established procedures and have that authority laid by the Government on the advice of the Public Service Commission. I realise that there are safeguards there of appeal to the Governor, however. However, I just think that we should keep it in accordance with the disciplinary procedures which are already there.

MR. D. LOCKARD WILSON (CONTINUING): I support this Bill, Sir, and I commend Government on the timely introduction. I believe that this is the kind of progressive legislation which this country needs and with the exception of those few areas mentioned I offer the Bill my full support. Sir,

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: Does any Honourable Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply?

HON. EDWARD L. DE FREITAS: Yes, Mr. President, thank you. I would only reply Mr. President, by thanking Honourable Members for their support of this Bill and will try to the best of my ability to give explanations to some of the points raised, perhaps not all.

There was one question on clause 2 where the Honourable Member did not think that the term was grammatically very adequate, and that it were or have left it as in the Bill, I think, Sir. President, if we replace on what were place this morning, the fact that the Government's reports and the accounts have tabled in August for 1965, we will see the difficulty of saying anything different from what we have here, because it may be a year where the accounts, never mind if there is a qualified panel of view, but the accounts are late and it would be quite to say the Appropriation Law before the Parliament should receive the certification on the 1966 accounts which will show that there is a supplementary Appropriation Law. However, I can assure the Member, Mr. President, that it will not take years. It will happen as quickly as possible following the Government's completion of the accounts for the previous year.

Under section 31(2), I think that the reason for this, Mr. President, is that the Government's financial situation, current expenditure for payment". So one might argue, as the Member did mention, additional allowance. I think that is where it is an urgent that payment has to be made otherwise one runs the risk of not doing the action which is necessary to have Government from further expenditure if one looks at either, such as in the case of maintenance.

In relation to the acceptance of bond which was raised, Mr. President, I think that the matter is adequately covered under the Royal Instructions 13(1) and 13, as well as Section 40 of the Constitution. So I am not sure that raising anything in this Bill will assist us to anything differently than what we have been doing in the past.

In relation to the Second Bridge for Hope Bay and the Lagoon situation. I think that all of us are unhappy about the time which has been taken in finalizing the matter. We can only say to the Member that we will endeavour wherever difficulties which we have in trying to bring the matter to a speedy conclusion.

Some points were made on clause 12 on land, Mr. President, and I am not sure that I know my notes correctly. It deals with the estate and the land that it may be used to surrender. It may include minerals of fossils. We are not trying to deprive anyone here of any thing, Mr. President, to which they are entitled. The clause is here to separate from the waste lands which are due to Government. It would be a case where the fossil did not legally belong to the person therefore we would give a recognition to the Government estate and have the fossils returned to Government.

MR. PHOMMA P. SAYAVONG (LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC): If we abolish the Financial Secretary note would hardly there be given under another section for appeal to be made to the Secretary for Economy, who, after investigating the matter can issue a directive that a surcharge ought to be rescinded.

The power to surcharge under section 32, Mr. President, is not unlike what is in force at the present time, because if we research these colonial Ordinances which we are talking about and which have been in existence for many years now which served us well in the past, Mr. President, I am not saying to say anything different, regulation 32 reads:-

> "If it is by the public accounts committee, have by reason of the negligence or fault of an officer he will be liable to be surcharged with the amount."

I think that is more or less what section 32 is all about in the present Bill before us, and I have no personal reasons to be heard this regard. Neither do I have any personal reasons to deny to executive power unless it is justified, and unless I can convince other people that it is fair and equitable to government and to the public whose money we are dealing with.

I would also like to go on record in the statement, Mr. President, as I mentioned this morning when I read the constitution of 1971 and what was taking place in those days as compared to today, I did not mention that in those days in that year the term expired until 1975, the Auditor-General of Jamaica submitted the document under here. I would like to place on record the information available for the records some other the people, the personal relationship which developed over the years between the Finance Department and the Auditor-General's Department, and also to say that I have never had any difficulty at all with any of these persons with whom I came across. No certainly will be indicated to place on the history books of the Cayman Islands for as long as this world goes on.

On section 32(2), Mr. President, dealing with the powers of the Auditor-General, I am asked to try to clarify this matter. Perhaps it is something which the Cayman Islands are not accustomed to, after all, we may able to compare it to other countries simply because we do not have the public finance legislations of many developed Commonwealth countries within our means of research. However, section 32(2) really says that in the performance of the Auditor-General's duties and the exercise of his powers under this Bill, the Auditor-General shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other person or authority. I think that is right, Mr. President. If the officer is carrying out the performance of his duties without any particular matter, he must be left to his discretion as to how to complete that assignment and should not be given instructions by any other person as to how to complete it, what to say in his reports, reviews.

If he misbehaves, Mr. President, and if he is not keeping with the clause which says that he will vacate the office on good behaviour, if he does not maintain that then he is subject to be dismissed. All Members have read that particular clause and know what it says.

Mr. President, in closing I thank all Honourable Members for their support and I am sure that we have given very useful history in the books of this Legislature which this present Bill

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to provide for the control, management and audit of the public finances of the Cayman Islands and for incidental and consequential purposes, be given a Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. PRESIDENT: Bills. Third Reading.

THE PUBLIC LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

THIRD READING

TITLE: THE PUBLIC LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988.

MR. PRESIDENT: A Bill for a Law to amend the Public Loans Law be deemed to have been read a Third time and do now pass for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

TITLE: THE PUBLIC LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Public Loans Law (Law 20 of 1978).

This Bill, Mr. President, is a short one. The purpose of the amendment is to substitute the "Cayman Islands Currency Boardthereon mention 13 of the Public Loans Law for the "Government Savings Bank" in the first line of section 13, and also in the marginal note, and the "Board", which is the Cayman Islands Currency Board for "Bank" in the third line of section 13. So, Mr. President, if we were to read the amendment, assuming that the Bill is passed, in section 13, the new section 13 would read:-

> "The Governor may appoint the Cayman Islands Currency Board as its official banker for the loans and management of public loans and as manager of the sinking fund and the Board as banker may issue and guarantee Government securities in the open market."

The Public Loans Law, Mr. President, gives authority for borrowing. It sets out the requirement of setting up sinking funds. It provides for the Government to issue necessary bills and in this case the Currency Board is being substituted as banker for the Government, instead of the Government Savings Bank which has been wound up.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Public Loans Law be given a Second Reading. The motion is now open for debate. If no Member wishes to speak I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988.

HON. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Court of Appeal Law be deemed to have been read a first time and is set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988.

HON. HUBERT J. HYDES: Mr. President, as all Members of this Honourable Assembly are aware, under the 1972 Constitution, the Court of Appeal for these Islands was the Court of Appeal for Jamaica. That situation continued until after the amendments made to that 1972 Constitution in 1984 by the Cayman Islands Constitution Amendment Order, 1984. There was established by the Order that our Constitution of a new Part V which consisted of sections 49 to 61(3), inclusive provisions for the establishment of our own Court of Appeal for the Cayman Islands. That Constitutional amendment and those parts establishing the Court of Appeal were duly force and effect a year ago.

It was considered at that time that it was appropriate that we in the Cayman Islands look closely at the Law pertaining to the Court of Appeal which was the 1975 Court of Appeal Law (Law 8 of 1975), which was enacted at a time when our Court of Appeal was the Court of Appeal for Jamaica. Various consultations took place with the view to the drafting and preparation of a complete and comprehensive new Court of Appeal Law for these Islands. Consultations have commenced and are presently ongoing between myself, the members of my Chambers, the Presidents of the Court of Appeal and the Judges of our own Grand Court as well as the representatives of the legal profession, with a view to getting these views, and in due course next year bringing before this House for its approval a fully comprehensive new Bill.

That being said, Mr. President, nevertheless it was felt that there were several matters which necessitated action to be taken somewhat in advance of that Bill, and it is for this reason that there is before this Honourable Assembly today this short Bill which seeks to amend our present Law to cover certain limited areas. I will propose to deal with these three certain areas in the order in which they appear in the Bill.

As Members of this House will know, in the last session there was enacted an amendment to the Summary Jurisdiction Law and also an amendment to the Grand Court Law, both of which provided for certain powers to be given to Court marshals who will have the duties of locking after and maintaining order in the Courts buildings and precincts within these Islands in which Courts sit. Since the amendments contained in clause 3 of this Court of Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 1988, follow upon the recommendations made and carried for the reorganization and increase in efficiency of our own Royal Cayman Islands Police by removing the responsibility for control and the keeping of order in such buildings from the police force, and the establishment of a system of marshals to do so instead of the police.

HON. MICHAEL F. BYRNE (NEW ZEALAND): Sir, in clause 8 of this Bill before the House it is sought to amend clause 30 of the principal Act by inserting a new subsection. That new subsection reads:-

> "(2) An officer attached to the Court as a marshal under subsection (1) hereof, in addition to the powers and duties conferred on or to be performed by him as aforesaid by the Court or a Judge or as may be prescribed by any rules of court, have -
>
> (a) the power to administer oaths to witnesses on all matters before the Court or in connection with any proceedings pending before the Court:
>
> (b) subject to the provisions of the Court Act or the order or direction of the Court or a Judge, the power without warrant to take into custody and detain any person until the rising of the Court."

This is the third new piece of the provision of powers for these marshals, and these powers are analogous to the powers which the Honourable Assembly has seen fit to grant earlier this year in the amendments the Summary Proceedings Act to the Penal Court Act, the second amendment which it is sought to make to the principal Act is contained in clause 6 of this Bill which seeks to provide a new section 6, subsection (1) into the principal Act. Section 6, subsection (2) is present in our Penal Code, and I quote:-

> "Subject to the provisions of section 8, the Court on any such appeal against conviction shall allow the appeal if the Court considers that the verdict should be set aside on the ground that it is unreasonable, or cannot be supported in regard to the evidence or that the judgment of the Court before which the appellant was convicted should be set aside on the ground of a wrong decision of any point of law or that on the ground there was a miscarriage of justice, and in any other case shall dismiss the appeal with or without variation of sentence."

It has been sought and proposed by the judges of our Penal Court, with the support and concurrence of our own new Court of Appeal, and I be explained by myself and my Ministers that the powers of the Court in relation to allowing appeals should be enlarged and brought into line with the United Kingdom powers under the 1907 Criminal Appellants Act. It is sought thereby to substitute for the subsection which I have just read, the following new subsection which the Honourable Members will see is the giving of a greater power to the Court in relation to the allowance of appeals, and is a similar provision to the appellate law appears before them appealing against a criminal conviction. The proposed new subsection says:-

> "Subject to the provisions of section 8, the Court shall allow the appeal against conviction if it thinks -
>
> (a) That the verdict of the jury should be set aside on the ground that under all the circumstances of the case it is unsafe or unsatisfactory;

MR. MICHAEL J. WOULFE (Roscommon):

(a) that the judgment of the Court before which the appellant was convicted should be set aside on the ground of a wrong decision on any question of law or

(b) that there was a material irregularity in the course of the trial,

and in any other case shall dismiss the appeal."

That second proposed amendment to new Part 2 also commend to the Members of this Assembly.

The third amendment which it is proposed to make is contained in clauses 2, 3 and 5 and before I proceed to go in detail into the provisions of those, it may perhaps be appropriate that I explain the necessity for them. They are all provisions which set out the power in the Court of Appeal of a single judge. As Honourable Members are aware, when the Court of Appeal sits and considers appeals, it is a Court of three Judges of Appeal, whilst our Court of Appeal was the Court of Appeal for Zambia, because of the proximity of that country. Because of the fact that the Court of Appeal for Zambia are in continuous session for all practical purposes, so when work could be quickly and expeditiously dispatched, and because of the quick access of access to that Court from here by reason of our geographical proximity, it was not thought that the old law and until this time that we should have a system whereby in certain circumstances a single Judge could determine certain matters, whether they are matters which do not relate to the merits of an appeal itself or the hearing of an appeal but relate to certain interlocutory or procedural matters.

The new Court of Appeal is a Court of Appeal established for Zambia also. It is a Court in which we have drawn upon the wealth and experience of judges from various jurisdictions who come from different countries in the world to sit on our Court of Appeal, but who because of that very fact cannot be quickly and promptly convened within days of time any single Judge of ours.

For that reason, Mr. President, there is a provision set in in clause 4 which is an amplification and enlargement of the very small section which was made of the powers of a single Judge in relation to hearing interlocutory applications which were contained in clause 4(2) of our old Court of Appeal Law which said:-

> "Provided that if so prescribed by rules of court one Judge may hear and determine an interlocutory matter."

That provision is repealed and in substitution is now enlarged into very similar provision to that in which says:-

> "(1) Any jurisdiction exercisable in any proceedings incidental to any civil case not involving the hearing or determination of an appeal may, as fully as may be provided by rules of court, be exercised by a single Judge in the same manner as it may be exercised by the Court and subject to the same provisions."

MR. MCCABE (Hillsborough): Mr. President, I move that the Assembly adopt the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole.

Question on adoption of Committee of the Whole recommendation:

"Those in favor—" AYE.

"Those opposed—" NAY.

"The ayes have it, the motion is adopted."

Section 3 reads:

"Appeal from single judge" Any case in the jurisdiction of a court appealed by a decision of a single judge made in the exercise of any of the powers conferred by this Act, may either from or under the direction of the Court be duly constituted for the hearing and determination of appeals under this Act and shall for all purposes be constituted by any three of the judges of the Court."

"Powers exercisable by a judge of Court" Any case in the jurisdiction of a court appealed by a decision of a single judge made in the exercise of any of the powers conferred by this Act, may either from or under the direction of the Court be duly constituted for the hearing and determination of appeals under this Act and shall for all purposes be constituted by any three of the judges of the Court."

MR. MCCABE (Hillsborough): Mr. President, I suppose that there should be some machinery and discretion to provide for a system of appeal for the determination of a single judge and at the same time to provide for cases that such interlocutory applications and similar matters could be heard expeditiously. In the new sections 29 and 30 which we propose to be inserted by this Bill, that the powers exercisable by a single judge in this Act may be exercised by a judge of the Court. The point of that is that the judge of the Court will always be present there. However, as a safeguard against any person thinking that there are any matters in determination of a single judge, there is made right to be instituted a specific power of appeal from any such decision of a single judge to the full Court of Appeal. Again, if the Honourable Members of this Assembly will bear with me I will move them, because I think that it is important that we be clear in the minds of all who are interested what the new position may.

Section 29 reads—

"Appeal from single judge" Any case in the jurisdiction of a court appealed by a decision of a single judge made in the exercise of any of the powers conferred by this Act, may either from or under the direction of the Court be duly constituted for the hearing and determination of appeals under this Act and shall for all purposes be constituted by any three of the judges of the Court."

Section 30 reads:-

"Powers exercisable by a judge of Court" Any case in the jurisdiction of a court appealed by a decision of a single judge made in the exercise of any of the powers conferred by this Act, may either from or under the direction of the Court be duly constituted for the hearing and determination of appeals under this Act and shall for all purposes be constituted by any three of the judges of the Court."

Mr. President, Sir, I commend these above amendments which by be cought to order to the Court of Appeal Act of 1970 to the Members of this Legislative Assembly. As I said when I started, many years after careful thought and after consultation with all parties it is my intention to bring before this House a new Court of Appeal Law. In the meantime, with our own Court of Appeal of the Cayman Islands firmly established and working in a manner which is seen to be fair to all, it is thought fit and proper that we should bring in provisions to enable it to be seen by the public at large and by all persons who are affected by it, that justice shall not be delayed, because justice delayed is justice denied. These provisions will go to place off interlocutory matters and minor matters but will still keep a right of appeal to the full Court against such determinations which are presently not determinative, and will now be a right of appeal when it comes here to get to the merits, to the substance and to the hearing of the appeals themselves.

Mr. President, Sir, I commend the resolutions of this Bill to the House.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a bill entitled a bill for a law to amend the Courts of Appeal Act be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. If any Member wished to speak I think that we should hold the debate over until another day. If no Members were ready to speak, then I can put the question now. Nobody catches my eye. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A SECOND READING.

ADJOURNMENT

THE HONOURABLE R. SCOTT: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 4.35 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., THURSDAY, 6TH SEPTEMBER, 1984.

[illegible] MEETING OF THE 3RD SESSION OF THE [illegible] ASSEMBLY
[illegible]
[illegible], NEW HAMPSHIRE, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] SECRETARY FOR COMMERCIAL, INC. 2 [illegible] [illegible], OHIO, [illegible] - PRESIDENT

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] B [illegible], [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] J [illegible], [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] C [illegible], [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] C [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

OFFICIAL REPORT

THIRD MEETING OF THE FIRST SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TUESDAY
6TH SEPTEMBER, 1960
(AFTERNOON SITTING)

1. PRAYERS

To be read by the Honourable Minister of Education (Mr. Speaker).

2. QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL SERVICES

No. 102: (a) WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE WHEN THE BUILDING REGULATIONS BUILDING CODE WILL BE COMPLETED?

(b) WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ALSO STATE WHAT IS THE COST PER SQUARE FOOT OF THE CAYMAN PRIMARY

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND DEPUTY ADMINISTRATION

No. 103: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BE KIND ENOUGH TO GIVE THE HOUSE THE LATEST STATE OF THE BY-PASS ROAD AT WEST BAY?

No. 104: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BE KIND ENOUGH TO GIVE THE HOUSE AN UP-TO-DATE REPORT ON THE PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS TO BE HELD IN THE WEST BAY DISTRICT AND WHEN SUCH NEGOTIATIONS ARE EXPECTED TO BE CONCLUDED?

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

No. 105: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE GOVERNMENT'S REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1960, UP TO 31ST AUGUST, 1960?

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES

No. 106: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER PLEASE STATE WHAT IS BEING DONE (IF ANYTHING) BY THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE PROPOSED NEW HOSPITAL?

[illegible] ADDED, FOR AGENCY ACTS AS WELL AS FOR PROPRIETARY FUNDS. ...ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS, ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS AND REGULATIONS

MR. JOE: SHOULD THE GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY BEAR THE DIRECT COST OF THE LEGAL NOTICE REQUIRED FOR PROPOSED ORDERS OR RULES?

MR. JOE: SHOULD THE GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY BEAR DIRECT PUBLICATION COST WHERE PUBLICATION IS A PART OF THE PROCEDURE REQUIRED BY LAW FOR ADOPTION OF RULES & ORDERS?

THE CHAIRMAN ASKED FOR COMMENTS AS TO ANY OTHER MISCELLANEOUS ASPECTS OF MEMBER APPORTIONMENT FOR FISCAL IMPLEMENTATION.

MR. JOE: SHOULD THE GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY MEMBER SHARE IN APPORTIONMENT OF COSTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO CERTAIN CONSTITUENCIES REGARDLESS OF CLASSIFICATION AS BUSINESS/NONBUSINESS/NEW TAXES?

THE CHAIRMAN ASKED FOR COMMENTS AS TO ANY OTHER MISCELLANEOUS ASPECTS OF MEMBER RESPONSIBILITY FOR SUBSTANTIAL AND NATIONAL INTEREST

MR. JOE: SHOULD THE GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY STATE ITS REASONS SUPPORTING ITS DETERMINATION OF SUBSTANTIAL AND NATIONAL INTEREST BY USE OF WRITTEN FINDINGS FOR THE RECORD, SUBJECT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW?

.. STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

STATEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENTAL POLICY OFFICIAL MEMBER - LEAGUE OF TOWNSHIPS DELEGATES.

OTHER BUSINESS

OFFICIAL MEMBERS' MOTIONS

(1) OFFICIAL MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 1:
CERTIFICATION FORMS OF NOTICE

TO BE MOVED BY THE GOVERNMENTAL MEMBER FOR WHOM THE DIRECTED NOTICE FOR HOUSE BILL 1101.

(2) OFFICIAL MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 2:
ADDITIONAL APPORTIONMENT FACTOR IDENTIFICATION & EVALUATION

ADDITIONAL APPORTIONMENT FACTOR(S)

THE PROPOSED FACTOR(S) WHICH HAS BEEN SET TO WIT:
TO ACCOMPLISH EQUITABLE APPORTIONMENT FACTOR(S), EQUAL
DEFINITE AMOUNTS WILLING MUST BE APPORTIONED WITH
REGARD TO THE FACTORS
TO BE ASSIGNED BY THE GENERAL MEMBER FOR EQUITY STATE.

(3) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.16
RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT REGARDING A COMMON REGULATION IN BANGLADESH(S)

TO BE MOVED BY SHRI DIPEN GHOSH FOR NINETY DAYS AND SECONDED BY SHRI SUDHIR GIRI FOR NINE DAY.

(4) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.17
ESTABLISHING OF SPECIALISTS

TO BE MOVED BY SHRI ASHOKE KUMAR DAS AND SECONDED BY SHRI BISWAS SARKHEL MUKHERJEE FOR NINE DAY.

(5) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.18
ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC SECTOR AS A GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

TO BE MOVED BY SHRI SUBODH UNIYAL AND SECONDED BY SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA FOR SEVEN DAYS.

5. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS.-

REPORT AND PASSING THEREOF

(1) THE PORT AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(2) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

CONSIDERATION

(3) THE PROVISIONAL COLLECTION OF CUSTOMS DUTIES BILL, 1985
(4) THE MINING OF COAL (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1985
(5) THE PUBLIC PREMISES (EVICTION) BILL, 1985
(6) THE PRINTING PRESS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(7) THE DOCKS OF CALCUTTA (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(8) THE PORT AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(9) THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

PASSING

(10) THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(11) THE MINING OF COAL (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1985
(12) THE PUBLIC PREMISES AND RENT BILL, 1985
(13) THE PUBLIC LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(14) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(15) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

WITH REACTIONS

(16) THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(17) THE MINING OF COAL (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1985
(18) THE PUBLIC PREMISES AND RENT BILL, 1985
(19) THE PUBLIC LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985
(20) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
[illegible]	2
[illegible]	7
STATEMENT OF [illegible] - [illegible] PROVISION LAW	10
[illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] ACTION	18
[illegible]	38

SUNDAY

APR SEPTEMBER, 1990

Room 4.40.

MR. SPEAKER, I invite the Honourable Member Lincoln, Leader of Legislative Council to say prayers.

PRAYERS

REV. CANON E. MOSES: Let us pray.

Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power and goodness do proceed, look in mercy and graciously incline the hearts of the Legislative Assembly and Council, and all those, who are entrusted with the high and sacred responsibilities for the place of this Land and for the welfare, peace and progress of all its people.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Prince Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Charles of Wales, Prince Andrew of Wales and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth and provide and strengthen, with wise policies, judgment and piety the new established Army, so that it may play its part in the protection of our sovereignty. May Members of the Legislative Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly, work together in unity to promote the progressive welfare of their high offices.

All this we ask for the glory of Your Name.

Amen.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Item 2 - questions. The Second Minister for Foreign Affairs.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND MINISTER, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS, MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT, MINISTER FOR TOURISM AND CULTURE: MR. SPEAKER:

MR. SPEAKER: (a) WHAT IS THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CANADA AIRLINES DISPUTE AND WHEN IS IT EXPECTED?

(b) WOULD THE MINISTER STATE WHETHER HE WAS AWARE OF THE FACT THAT WAS USED BY THE CANADA AIRLINES

1/16/67 (a) THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE NATIONAL CODE CONFERENCE INCLUDES WHAT IS TO BE INCLUDED WITHIN THE CODE AND WHAT IS TO BE CONSIDERED BY EACH LOCAL GROUP.

(b) DEFINES THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL BUILDING CODE CONFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO THE USE OF A NATIONAL CODE. HOWEVER, THE NATIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO DICTATE HOW ORGANIZATIONS USE OR ENFORCE THE CODE. IN OTHER WORDS, THE NATIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO DICTATE HOW ORGANIZATIONS USE OR ENFORCE THE CODE.

QUESTIONS:

MR. LAWRENCE A. STANLEY: A HIGH COMPLIMENT, MR. PRESIDENT. WOULD THE GENTLEMAN MOVE ABOVE CONSIDER THE BOARD PLUMBING BUILDING CODE AS MUCH NEEDED AS ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT?

MR. MARCUS A. JOHNSON: MR. PRESIDENT, I DON'T BELIEVE THE BOARD BUILDING CODE IS BEING USED BY THE GENERAL PLUMBING AUTHORITY IN DEALING WITH QUALIFICATIONS FOR EXAMINATION, NOR OF A PUBLIC OUT CRIER QUALIFICATION.

MR. LAWRENCE A. STANLEY: A COMPLIMENTARY, MR. PRESIDENT, WOULD THE GENTLEMAN BE KINDLY ENOUGH TO ANSWER ABOVE CONSIDER FURTHER THROUGH THE USE OF THE BOARD PLUMBING CODE IS NOT PROVIDED FOR UNDER THAT WHICH HAS BEEN USED AS A POLICY OF THE GENERAL PLUMBING AUTHORITY SINCE THE PAST YEAR OR THE WORKING OF A LOCAL BUILDING CODE?

MR. ROBERT E. JOHNSON: MR. PRESIDENT, THE GENERAL PLUMBING AUTHORITY MUST USE AS ITS GUIDELINE IN DEALING WITH APPLICATION FOR EXAMINATION, THE REGULATIONS AS THEY ARE SET FORTH IN CONNECTION WITH THE POLICY OF THE BOARD PLUMBING CODE AND THE REGULATIONS AS THEY ARE SET FORTH IN THE BOARD PLUMBING CODE.

MR. STANLEY E. JOHNSON: MR. PRESIDENT, A FURTHER COMPLIMENTARY, WOULD THE GENTLEMAN KINDLY TELL THE USE OF THE BOARD PLUMBING CODE AS THE GUIDELINE BY THE GENERAL PLUMBING AUTHORITY OR WILL THE ORGANIZATION WILL PROCEED OF THE PLUMBING?

MR. TIMOTHY E. JOHNSON: I AM UNSURE ABOUT THIS COMPLIMENTARY, MR. PRESIDENT, BECAUSE I HAVE ALREADY STATED THAT THE POSITION OF THE GENERAL PLUMBING AUTHORITY WOULD BE UNFAVORABLE, AND WOULD NOT HAVE ANY FURTHER APPLICATION IN THIS CONNECTION. THE QUESTION, THEN BECOMES, TO BE WITH IT. THE APPLICATIONS OF THE GENERAL PLUMBING AUTHORITY AND THE AUTHORITY TO ADMINISTERED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAW TO DEAL WITH PLUMB MATTERS.

MR. LAWRENCE A. STANLEY: MR. PRESIDENT, WITHOUT SPEAKING TO PARTICULAR QUESTION, I FEEL THAT IT WOULD BE WORTH INFORMATION BUT WE MIGHT BE AND I ASK THIS QUESTION AS WAS THE CASE OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD PLUMBING AUTHORITY FOR TWO YEARS, AND I WAS MORE THAN, MR. PRESIDENT, AND WE GET OUT OUR INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE GENERAL. MR. PRESIDENT, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER THE POLICY THAT I FOUND WHEN I WENT IN AS CHAIRMAN, WHERE THE BOARD PLUMBING CODE WAS USED, WAS IT A LINE OF A BOARD BUILDING CODE, HAS BEEN CHANGED IN ANY WAY OR WHETHER THE POLICY WOULD REMAIN.

MR. ROBERT E. JOHNSON: MR. PRESIDENT, IT IS DIFFICULT FOR ME TO SAY WHAT POLICY HAS BEEN ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL PLUMBING AUTHORITY UNDER THE BOARD PLUMBING.

SE PROPOSED: I think it is quite clear the Company [illegible] has no responsibility for these wells as they were [illegible] of ownership after they were [illegible].

Mr. Lawson J. Hinson: Would you, Mr. Armstrong, [illegible] the Commission Engineer [illegible]?

Mr. Armstrong: The Commission Engineer has [illegible] operate wells. It may not mean [illegible] but he may [illegible] or whether not I do not think we can [illegible] this question.

Mr. Lawson: Mr. Armstrong, [illegible]

THE SECOND STATUTORY QUESTION MUST BE ANSWERED: WILL APPLICANTS WITHIN [illegible] OF CORRELATIVE RIGHTS?

EX. 103: [illegible]

ANSWER: [illegible]

SE PROPOSED: I think it is [illegible], [illegible] the Company should [illegible].

THE SECOND STATUTORY QUESTION MUST BE ANSWERED: WILL APPLICANTS WITHIN [illegible] OF CORRELATIVE RIGHTS?

EX. 103: [illegible]

ANSWER: THE PROPOSED SPACING AND WELL LOCATIONS WILL PROTECT CORRELATIVE RIGHTS.

STIPULATED ISSUES NOW BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

(2) NEW DISCOVERY:

EX. [illegible]

(3) [illegible]:

1. [illegible]
2. [illegible]
3. [illegible]
4. [illegible]
5. [illegible]
6. [illegible]
7. [illegible]
8. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that is what I am doing, but you are not doing it. (LAUGHTER)

The Member for East End.

MR. JOHN M. MCLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be in a position to say whether that statement by a spokesman of the Public Works Department or a private engineer?

HON. MICHAEL A. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. Speaker, both that and maps were done by the Civil Division of the Public Works Department and the actual surveyors who did the work, together with the Chief Surveyor for East End, were brought into eventually looked at the different roads and determined which roads would require this work. It is from that basis they had that the road would be [illegible] the Bodden Bridge. The roads studied are the ones which would be [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no ...

MR. D. MICHAEL ADAM: Mr. Speaker, because of the hour and knowing the time which we intend for, there are additional questions that we obviously have, and I am wondering whether the Honourable Member will have enough time with us on Wednesday when the Budget is the item?

HON. MICHAEL A. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. Speaker, the Budget is quite long. We do have always tried to come with the Minister of the Legislature [illegible] and have gone with them and have tried to have their questions [illegible].

MR. D. MICHAEL ADAM: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if [illegible] be published or be in a book of [illegible]?

MR. SPEAKER: I did not quite hear ... ... to be published, is that what you said?

MR. D. MICHAEL ADAM: In relation to the reports of these roads and Government use the information of publishing in the question of [illegible] where we are going to [illegible] Bodden Town ... Just how are these being? Is this published or is it privately [illegible]?

HON. M. MICHAEL ADAM: It is private. (LAUGHTER)

HON. CHARLES A. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. Speaker, I should be very happy to have that Member [illegible]. We are [illegible] public policy. It is [illegible] to the expenditure of this Government, that they will be [illegible]. (LAUGHTER)

MR. JOHN B. MCTAGGART: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Member saying that our relations with [illegible]?

MR. SPEAKER: Did the Prime Minister hear your question ... have I misunderstood it?

HON. TRUMAN A. BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, although there was a [illegible] of roads that needed rehabilitation in East End, and the areas in the Eastern district we have gone to as the roads that needed [illegible] attention.

HON. CHARLES A. KIRKCONNELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the first question to be [illegible] by the Member for [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] the question will now be put.

THE QUESTION OCCURRED UPON MOTION BY MR. [illegible] TO AMEND [illegible] BY [illegible]

[illegible]: WHICH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATED [illegible] AND SUBSTITUTE [illegible] FOR THE YEAR 1986, IN LIEU THEREOF, 1985.

[illegible]: THE AYES AND NOES BEING TAKEN [illegible] AYES 31, NOES 12, [illegible] RESPECTIVELY.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for [illegible] – the main question.

THE QUESTION WAS PUT [illegible] AND THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER DECLARED [illegible] OF THE HOUSE [illegible] AND PASSED BY A MAJORITY OF [illegible] AND ORDERED TO BE [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: SINCE THE HONOURABLE MINISTER HAS STATED [illegible] OF THE HOUSE [illegible] ON THE RECORD, [illegible].

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. [illegible]: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Honourable Minister state if [illegible] on coal mine workers [illegible]?

HON. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, [illegible] of the cost of [illegible] has been [illegible] as a [illegible]. It does not [illegible] [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, [illegible] the Honourable Minister may [illegible] [illegible] be [illegible]?

HON. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I [illegible] to be [illegible] of the [illegible] which [illegible] to be any [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: The [illegible].

THE SPEAKER: [illegible] MR. [illegible] TO [illegible] THE HONOURABLE [illegible] [illegible] OF [illegible] [illegible] AND [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] THE HONOURABLE MINISTER STATE THE [illegible] ON THE RECORD [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

AUDREY: [illegible] THE TOTAL COST OF THE CAMPUS [illegible] NOW ESTIMATED AT APPROXIMATELY $[illegible].

CHAIRMAN:

MR. [illegible]: I SUPPLEMENTARILY, MR. PRESIDENT, [illegible] SUBSTANTIAL [illegible] ON CAMPUS [illegible] SUPPLEMENTARY [illegible] BOARD MEMBERS A CONCRETE VIEW FROM THE BOARD OF [illegible]. [illegible] OF THESE PROJECTS [illegible] [illegible] REASONABLE BOARDS MEMBERS [illegible] PROVIDE ADDITIONAL [illegible] [illegible] BOARD?

MRS. [illegible]: MR. PRESIDENT, [illegible] SUPPLEMENTARY [illegible] BY THE COMPLEX OF [illegible] WHICH INCLUDES A SMALL [illegible] [illegible] MEMBERSHIPS, IS IT APPEARS THAT THE COMPLEX IS [illegible] [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: MR. PRESIDENT, [illegible] A MEMBER OF [illegible] [illegible] ON THE [illegible] OF THE COLLEGE [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] OF APPROXIMATELY $[illegible], BUT I WONDER IF A [illegible] BOARD MEMBER MIGHT [illegible] A MOTION. IN THIS FIGURE [illegible] [illegible]? THIS COULD [illegible] [illegible].

MRS. [illegible]: MR. [illegible], I WOULD [illegible] [illegible] WITH THE MOTION, BUT I THINK THE [illegible] A REAL [illegible] MAY BE [illegible] [illegible], I WOULD [illegible] [illegible] THAT THE [illegible] FOR THIS [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] [illegible]. THE [illegible] [illegible] A [illegible].

THE CHAIRMAN [illegible] THE NORTH SIDE OF [illegible] THE [illegible] STREET [illegible] [illegible] OF THE [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. D. FRANK MITCHELL: I appreciate it, Mr. President. Would the honorable Senator please share with the present complement of Senators in the George Town hospital why?

HON. JAMES G. SMITH: Mr. President, I think the weight is out.

MR. D. FRANK MITCHELL: Is this honourable Senator suggesting to this honourable House, Mr. President, or does this fellow minister, Mr. President?

MRS. BRENDA M. EBANKS: Mr. President, Mr. Whitley speculated the new part of the development of doctors at the hospital, now was their salary, as I understand it, as a fixed expatriate bonus. They come in and when completed or we find when they come [illegible] to be their salaries.

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I would like to ask the honourable Minister whether or not, referring to accommodation of overseas personnel at the hospital could accommodation be found a days, should the [illegible] there shortage of accommodation has been at the hospital which are [illegible] by outside doctors and whether we contemplate to build accommodation?

HON. BRENDA M. EBANKS: Mr. President, as mentioned, now, they are the [illegible] I have to check those figures for the present moment. We have been criticised and have agreed to, which I say, should be [illegible] but [illegible] there is office to build accommodation, as one mentioned, is not necessary [illegible] accommodation, so one mentioned is not necessary to provide accommodation, but it is necessary to provide accommodation for [illegible] to be prepared to [illegible].

HON. D. FRANK MITCHELL: I understand, Mr. President, that the honourable Minister stated that it is proposed to have more air conditioned doctors rooms[illegible]?

HON. BRENDA M. EBANKS: Mr. President, possibly what this honourable Member might suggest be put in the hospital for [illegible] accommodation will have taken up quickly as the money as the plans have been prepared.

MR. D. FRANK MITCHELL: I understand, Mr. President. Is it the intention that there has always be general accommodations or accommodations who may come again which they do not want to do their general duties?

HON. BRENDA M. EBANKS: Mr. President, there will be general accommodations to increase the all around benefit of the doctors.

MR. D. FRANK MITCHELL: Mr. President, can the honourable Minister state how many of the present [illegible] doctors are general practitioners?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I think I answered the question a question like [illegible]. Most of those are general practitioners, but in addition they have specialities which they [illegible].

HON. D. FRANK MITCHELL: Most obliged, Mr. President, that the present [illegible] are [illegible] specialists. There is no need [illegible] to [illegible].

MR. PENCE: [illegible] That is a statement, Mr. Brzezinski, and it would only be a matter of opinion.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Sir, that is my opinion.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Senator Church [illegible] ... If there is no further objection, the [illegible] your next [illegible].

THE CHAIR WOULD NOW LIKE TO ASK THE DISTINGUISHED SENIOR SENATOR FROM [illegible] TO [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Would the distinguished senior Senator from [illegible] yield to me briefly?

MR. [illegible]: Yes, but I [illegible] I am asking this distinguished witness a question before the Senator's question.

[illegible] SAY THAT TO [illegible] OF THE [illegible] OF THE [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

IT WAS VOTED, TO ADD WITH CONSTENT TO THE POLICY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO SEEK LEGAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE BOTH WITHIN AND WITHOUT THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH SUCH AN ASSIGNMENT AND ADVICE WILL BE AT THE EXPENSE OF THESE AGENCIES.

CONGRESSMAN:

SEN. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY: Mr. President, would the Secretary have a breakdown of costs to Department of Defense for the various public relations assignments?

SEN. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND: Mr. President, many of those are ongoing responsibilities, the final total cost is not yet known. However, if I can explain to Senators that basically the purpose of certain Army and Navy information specialist people also they have that be engaged for one month on the basis of a specific publication of public interest which is to be brought up to date, newspaper-industry people sometimes that publication for us in their spare, also out-of-pocket expenses.

In addition to that the President's Committee on Employment, for which $100,000 was requested by the Congress and which is to include the final cost of work engaged by this Army and Navy function in one appropriation.

The third item of Army public information specialists employed mainly on a one month basis to maintain the continuous professional service of that function, the general procedure of the United States, the cost of a publication issued on a part basis with the assembly of part issued and is normally within the range of around $2,000 but can be higher or lower.

SEN. C. DOUGLAS SCOTT: Mr. President, may I ask the Secretary of the two items of Army information and Army and Navy information with the majority of the job on the basis?

SEN. RICHARD M. NIXON: I understand that the item of Army and Navy information is to do certain work especially in connection with the efforts to get the cost of living.

SEN. G. MILLARD TYDINGS: Mr. President, may I ask if the item of Army and Navy information work done was also the person Information Advisory who had been employed in Washington in connection with the Capehart case?

SEN. STUART SYMINGTON: My understanding is that there were employed, in connection with the Civil Mobilization Planning Board item, a group of economists in the United States who were employed for the purpose of that responsibility. It is my understanding that there was not any connection whatsoever with any part time consultant employed in the Department of Defense.

SEN. MCCLELLAN: Would the Senator from Utah like to ask the next question?

THE CHAIRMAN ASKED FOR FIRST VOTE ON THE PROPOSITION THAT THE PROPOSED FIRST OPTIONAL PROTOCOL SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS ANNEX I.

In favour: MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL, THE DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Against: NONE

Abstentions: NONE

The proposal was adopted by 33 votes to none, with no abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission had thus completed its consideration of the draft Optional Protocol and would now proceed to consider the draft resolution contained in document E/CN.4/1989/L.11.

Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Egypt) said that, in view of the importance of the draft resolution, his delegation would like to have more time to study it before taking a decision.

Mr. OSTOS (Venezuela) said that, in view of the importance of the draft resolution, his delegation would also like to have more time to study it before taking a decision.

Mr. Vice-President, this evening Mrs. Mehrez and I had lengthy consultations about the Commission's programme of work and we decided that we would ask for meetings to be held on Monday, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 March.

Under agenda item 8(a), we have received 40 replies, 10 from women; United Kingdom - 10 replies, 3 from women; Canada - 4 replies, 2 from women; United States - 2 replies; Uruguay - 1 reply; Australia - 1 reply, 1 from a woman; Switzerland - 1 reply, 1 from a woman; Austria - 2 replies, 1 from a woman; New Zealand - 1 reply; Netherlands - 1 reply -- making a total of 100.

Under agenda item 8(b), we have 5 replies, four from women and 1 from the United Kingdom -- making a total of 5.

Under agenda item 8(c), we have 3 replies and 2 replies from women; 1 reply and 1 from the United Kingdom; 1 from the United States; 1 reply, 1 from Bahamas -- making a total of 3.

Does the Member from Uruguay or Chile wish to add to what we have so far?..... Not right.

Under agenda item 8(d), we have four replies, 2 from women; United Kingdom - 1 reply; Canada - 1 reply; United States - 1 reply and 1 from a woman; Barbados - 1 reply; Costa Rica - 1 reply; Malta - 1 reply; Japan and Canada - 1 reply -- making a total of 10.

Under agenda item 8(e), we have four replies, three from women; 1 from a woman.

Under agenda item 8(f), we have four replies, 2 from women; United Kingdom - 1 from a woman; Canada - 1 from a woman -- making a total of 4.

Overall total 200.

Mr. TEITGEN (Assistant Secretary-General) said that, since the Commission seemed to be quite prepared, I believe, if agenda item 8(f) is not to be considered, to proceed to hear the very large number of persons that were on the speakers' list, especially the Ombudsmen, representatives and so on.

Mr. JEMBAYE (Chad) said that, as he had already said, he was not quite ready to do so.

Mr. LOPATKA (Poland), Mr. Chairman, with the agreement of the representatives, that the number of persons that have asked to participate in the Ombudsman is very large.

MR. ROBERT E. PORTER: No, Sir, I have not yet done that but I think that under the law they would have had to be here for a period of seven years immediately preceding their application.

MR. LAWRENCE A. FERRARA: Mr. President, I have what is a clarifying question. However, I wonder if the Member in charge, Sir, that certain applicants who are seeking citizenship under section 245 have been overseas in the Defense for twenty years and upwards?

MR. DAVID E. PORTER: No, Sir, I was kind of taken that those were one or two that have been here for several ten to twelve years, but not that long.

MR. JOSEPH E. MCGEE: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would say if there is an estimated time to have the applications dealt with by the Board?

MR. DAVID E. PORTER: Yes, Sir, I think it is either under the application or the directive that they are supposed to have all these applications processed out by I am not mistaken.

MR. EDWARD J. PATTEN: Mr. President, I am quite aware of the discretion given primarily to the Immigration Board. I have either a point of law. However, I wonder if the Member could state whether the applicants will be given priority in order of the number of years they have been here in the Islands, or what procedure will be taken in these applications?

MR. DAVID E. PORTER: Mr. President, it is difficult for me to determine the answer. However, the Board does have evidence laid down, either in regulations or directives. In effect of all the speaking amongst us we have the applications. There could not be made any differences between their coming in, but I think that they will be treated somewhat in the ordinary legal form.

MR. J. WALTER DUNCAN: Mr. President, would the Member say how many of the 245 applications have been processed since January of this year?

MR. DAVID E. PORTER: Mr. President, there are many applications. Yes, and have not been processed at all as far as I know. Why did the Member say January? Yes, right after the new Law I think it, processed since 245 was not provided so many years ago. That was under the old Law though, but this year. When we have started off afresh and there are new applications under I have given the Member here.

MR. LAWRENCE A. FERRARA: Mr. President, in the Member replies whether he is aware that an examination and grant of status of the 245 applications went to the Immigration Board, the last quarter inside, that there were applicants well in excess of ten years who fulfilled all the requirements of the Regulations from witnesses who were not available either? Are there those who had been fulfilled the minimum number of years who were granted it already?

MR. DAVID E. PORTER: Yes, Sir, I am aware of that.

MR. LAWRENCE A. FERRARA: Mr. President, in that supplementary, Sir. Would the Member advise whether that priority will be attached to applicants?

HON. DENNIS M. HARVEY: Mr. President, I do not think that it is of any use, Sir. It is not the number of years of being here which convinces the Board to give everybody whatever it wants. I think here the Board looks carefully at every application and then determines the best.

MR. GERVAIS M. PIERRE: Mr. President, I did say that the application had complied in all respects with the directives given by the Democratic Party, so it is not the number of years which I am more interested in. I am more interested in the consideration being given to the circumstances all things being equal, whether, with all things being equal the application will be favourably.

HON. DENNIS M. HARVEY: Mr. President, the Board has the same regulations and directives to work within. I do not disagree with them, Sir, and I am afraid that we will just have to leave it. I think that it is a good Board and I think we will have to leave those decisions to the Board.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary that completes questions. Item 2. Statements. The Honourable Prime Minister, Hon.

STATEMENT BY THE BERMUDIAN PARTY OFFICIAL RESIGN

HON. LOUIS M. TODD: Mr. President, a new Bermudian Constitution Order was enacted last year in the wrath of Bermudians each by a Select Committee of the previous Legislature Assembly. Before it was enacted the Foreign and Commonwealth Office proposed certain amendments. They suggested a number of changes should be made to ensure that it would comply with the provisions of the British Nationality Act of 1981. Unfortunately, however, there happened to be quite a large number of people eligible to come here. Since it was assumed there had been further correspondence about the matter. As a result, agreement had been reached that the Cayman Islands will admit any citizen Dependent Territories who has a connection with the Islands under the terms of the British Nationality Act, 1981, but does not enjoy rights abroad and has no right of abode in any other country.

This will enable in satisfy the provisions of the Convention on the status of stateless persons to which the United Kingdom is a party. However, it should not have unacceptable consequences. Nobody is denied, by or the citizenship described, so few of any people are in future likely to be found the full citizen is.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 3. Private Member's Motion No. 14/91. The Second Elected Member for Pembroke East.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 14/91

CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW SCHEME

MR. K. HARRIS SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. 14/91 standing in my name, which reads:-

MR. D. MORRIS (Local Government):

"WHEREAS in a free vibrant society a large number of Guyanese want social organisations for entertainment, and having a Society is our social programme;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana introduce draft legislation for the establishment of a Social Welfare and Culture Council that the Council has the power to co-opt outside expertise.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly do appoint a Select Committee of the whole House to consider such draft legislation.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Government do bring such draft legislation to the Select Committee within six months for its consideration.

MR. S. EDWARD MINGEY: Mr. President, I beg to second the motion.

MR. M. MORRIS RUSH: Mr. President, the intention and purpose of this motion is not something which is new or radical in parliamentary procedure. It is not such new to the Guyana Parliament. The intention and purpose, sir, is to make it legal and mandatory for Government to proceed with the difficult task of establishing a national peoples culture in this country.

Sir, I might as well say here and now, sir, that I do not feel, sir, as not in this Chamber in favour of this motion, I cannot call me a lover of art. Anyone who knows, I regard it as a vote against establishing this essentially peoples culture in this country.

Sir, it is my belief that there are few democratic countries or communities in the world without some kind of national peoples culture for their people. That is, sir, some kind of society for the workers where they have organised their free-thinking and responsible young persons between of age, whether or whatever. This subject, sir, because you are not in this country, has been thrust beyond the political scene of the Guyana Republic for as long as I can remember until I returned looking at politics from the year 1972, not to say that I did not attend political meetings.

The promise, sir, formed a political commission manifesto as early as 1972 and even before that year as I understand it, Government had organised the services of a Mr. Inroger for a feasibility study of the matter. This Mr. A.F.C. Inroger was an experienced social development adviser on loan from London. In his report Mr. Inroger strongly recommended the setting up of some kind of a national peoples culture, where because of our small population at that time, he suggested a simple provincial place where there could be upgraded into a national social gathering.

Now, in the year 1979 the peoples of a national peoples culture was embodied in the election manifesto of which we had pointed here earlier this morning. Four years later in 1976 the majority of that group are elected to Government to the Fifth Parliament, again promising a national peoples culture from the political platform. As we all know, that group governed this country for the next eight years, Mr. President, eight of this country's most productive years, without establishing such a peoples culture.

Mr. President, this is a very important matter. Despite the fact that on 24th October, 1973, a motion such as the one before the House today was debated here, twelve years ago what is being done at this time is to make new people pay many thousands more than they had to pay then.

Sir, by introducing legislation on the other side, the Royal Bahamian Police Force was the first Service to hold responsibility under the previous Constitution, holding responsibility for the Protection of Special Services while such a movement existed and still fail. The present Constitution as we all know came into effect in January 1973.

In 1974, Mr. President, the Government again acquired the services of a Board of Examinations, a Mr. H.H. Jenkins from the International Police Organization. Mr. Jenkins, I understand spent a week on the Islands and submitted a recommendation to the Government, which it seems little was done before the change of Government in 1977. It is unfortunate to note, Sir, that other Caribbean territories including the Cayman, Grenadines, St. Kitts, Anguilla and Barbados and Belize, which were assisted by Mr. Jenkins, all today have complete control over their police.

In 1977, Mr. President, the previous Government inquired into the services of another expert, a Mr. Mitchell Langford to look into the Bahamas Department of Corrections Establishment. Again, Sir, it is interesting to note that some of the other Caribbean territories which were Mr. Langford such as Barbados, Jamaica and the Virgin Islands will not have workable Borstal Schemes for their juveniles. However, Sir, one of the most encouraging developments in the Caribbean, the Cayman Islands where we all represent, has workable Borstal Scheme. We are still talking about it and planning to adopt this system.

Mr. President, the situation of crimes and penalties and sentence has reached the stage where such sentences as of some of the cases I have heard of the old days in the Supreme Islands, today, Mr. President, of the days where corporal and imprisonment prevailed, if any days when the only hope for a person was to pay off the Islands and work his future in another land, and the only hope of a young person now that one of these young men would come back and marry him. In those days, Sir, if a young man had a girl in mind and would ask the girl's father for his hand in marriage and if he wanted that girl to work for him he would write a letter to her parents seeking their consent. If consent was given although Sir, this may not have been written down, it was understood that the girl would have honour, you have said that she would obey them with other customs and their offence. If it was not felt that the girl was taken to her parents, she could be used for damages for breach of promise and finally no, Sir, for to the time that the poor girl waited for her who would have suffered of what would have economic to her.

Now, the notion of promise and I do not only hope but I do pray that it will be passed, will represent to our children in the economic for the future, that failure of conduct represented to that girl in preference. It will add to our records that this Government is working towards bringing them nearer to their responsibilities towards it will not only, Sir, be a useful amendment to our people to do everything as quickly as possible, and twelve years ago like.

MR. P. HOWARD (NEW ZEALAND): I will say to them, "Now gentlemen, we are not just talking on the rose down before".

This matter, if passed, will take the matter of a national pension scheme one step beyond a campaign promise, and give hopeful a feasibility study upon which the appropriate legislation to begin the scheme.

Mr. Speaker, as one and I have talked to many people on this matter, we unanimously that this is the only or simple thing to do. Many of our people will express that this matter will mean paying benefits once or more months, or even each year. The reason that proved to that, as I said, the Social Assistance Act Government to go ahead with its great work, Sir, which I am sure is to satisfaction of doing, especially with my honourable colleague Dunedin who has recently elected in the prime list to be looking into it.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not want to say too much on details, as I will leave that for the Government Members and the Committee to deal with, I would like to clear misconception in the part that the motion calls for a contributory pension scheme that means that employees alike will be required to contribute to this. Now, Sir, to the employee that will mean a little less take home pay which will be put aside and paid back to him at a later date when he is unable to work.

Sir, according to the last census taken, if there is any time to start a contributory pension scheme because the majority of the population are working people. That is census shows that below the age of 20 are the working people, Mr. Speaker, and 20,000 people or 23.6 per cent of the population who would be contributors to a pension scheme. Mr. Speaker, this is the good part. Above the age of 65 there are 5,100 people or 7 per cent of the population who would be eligible to receive pension payments. Sir, if we assume that most people will not have begun the age of 70, there would be only 750 people eligible to receive pensions.

If the scheme, Sir, was to start next year we would have 9 people contributing for every one person receiving. I will say that again. If the scheme was to start next year we would have 9 people contributing for every one person receiving. There is uncertainty to the census figures, I do not know what the experts will say. We have so many of them.

However, Mr. Speaker, the one fact that we certainly do the census figures of the Cayman Islands which was done in 1979, that this scheme is not a good one. These are the facts, and we have about it. These figures are taken directly from the census. However, for the sake of argument, Sir, suppose that you cannot use part of those but the unemployed and concentrate on the census, there 7% people. They would account to $1,971,200 paid out for the year. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the scheme is this country, again according to the census, paid $15 per week and has employees would pay a total of $45, the scheme's revenue in this first year would amount to $2,227,800. I will interrupt that again then. If the worker paid $15 per month and his employer paid $15 per month, a total of $30, the scheme's revenue in the first year would amount to $3,341,700. Now, Sir, that does since the amount paid out. This is still using the census figures.

MR. W. KARZEN RUSK (UNINTELLIGIBLE): another thing was mentioned when I looked at the census figure for the year 2000, that is a million person difference between 1960 and 1970. It shows that the participants in 1970 would have many old people and the contributors would have been small. So these census figures show that the tendency is going to increase the number, the number of people paying to people receiving will be lower, therefore, the specialists, looking the projection of this system very differently.

MR. PROCTOR: Does the Honorable Member wish to speak for some further period?

MR. W. KARZEN RUSK: Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, perhaps it would be convenient that of the International year for...

MR. W. KARZEN RUSK: Yes, Sir, I was perhaps hungry and thirsty.

MR. PRESIDENT: Maybe we should be better if we did not allow you to resume your duties. You might finish earlier. I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11.21 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11.40 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Announcements are awaited. The Honorable Member for West Soy.

MR. W. KARZEN RUSK: Mr. President, when we broke the House I was saying that I felt unable with the question of the method, more difficult, was that I felt that a longer delay would make it more difficult.

Mr. President, we will have the impression following this meeting. They will tell us all sorts of reasons why it would be proper period of time to get this system's implemented in October. Mr. President, if that is what they are concerned about, the new workers' organisations which I have been one of officials, however, are ready to have what they have to say. I have that we are going to have all kinds of economy strategy but I believe that I am in solid ground in saying that. I believe that in one of these ways or I just suppose, Mr. President, our economy and are about upon possible still working until reaches the age of 70 have to keep their jobs in some form of significant manner, I realise it may be hard to do. It must be done with sensitive, with flexible guidelines, but realise it... of this situation. It can be done and by which arrangements be changed, it can be done in a reasonable period of time.

Mr. K. Morris Cobb (continued): Mr. President, a previous speaker said, "It seems Solomon." One might believe in the ocean, as could my constituents and, Mr. President, should I do not want to pass on this Senate because the issues of Government Economics and Energy, and I do not feel that I can accomplish from the action that I would have that if we pass, I want to extend a warning bell to this Senate. This action, as I said, is not a matter of choice to Senate but a constitutional question before each Senator. The two often which is used about Communism and socialism to scare, Mr. President, does stop living used to dangerously. If it is so, but we must an appreciation of the people help to degrade them. We need to appreciate the ones who fear ones reasons on the other do not have the incentive to work any more. We have some of the answers. I still not go into that but our efficient society is rewarded with more profit and our people have been entitled to them. The Government is not going to use the Communist who deliberately avoid the jobs and, Mr. President, the first time they are rewarded there they back a job they are discouraged. This, Mr. President, is wrong and young Ireland because who can I waiting for jobs today.

As I said, it is not a debate on Solomon but it is getting for a multibillionaire pocket a share and some of the things which are happening in the Solomon market today should be discussed. I believe, also, that I was as much possible in my capacity as a Member of this Senate as Chair on the Government Senate and, Mr. President, they can say, "Welcome your are gone." You are a politic as politics. You must be political". They can say that if they want. It is true to an extent. However, Mr. President, I believe that I know what is happening in this country and I feel it may cause concern, and I feel that the cause of change are blowing in this land. The Government who are puppets, hand now gamble in time to not be today. Our unemployment problems, and now much attention to him. We have bills to pay, although we already have them. We have billions to cope with and other problems which we are just unable to handle. I have nothing with rank and, Mr. President, I can feel their anger. There is something building up in the Senate today and my warning bell is saying that we have to move further and further. We are fair-weatherites are only human, gregarious, we are allowed to give things like and our people are astonishing us to strengthen our the Senate problems for them. They we be careful where we walk. We are superannuationers, Sir, must do everything in our below not to encourage disconnection in this country. Who needs that? There is a strong need of always blessing in this country. Let us not just overlook.

Mr. President, in speaking into retirement I am thinking of all those people who work in the shops, in the stores, in the supermarkets, we have been working in those houses for me to fifteen years. When they leave, what do they get? Some of them when they leave for the world, they have to look under behind their backs to get what is going to happen, such long after ten to fifteen years. They are not changing clothes. I am thinking, Mr. President, of all those men and women working for a few and pensionless for long, today. Fifteen or twenty years at the end of the day. What will they take home? Please explain what a good day or use of that a good week pay was? What amount will mightily's salary.

I am thinking, Mr. President, of all those men working in the construction industry in this hot, humidity and lighting summer, mixing cement and going home to the afternoon with sore shoulders, sore hands and backs all over. At the end of the day what will they have? Mr. President, I, have no sympathy in this country when their day end, they will not have a job.

MR. P. HOUSEAL MOVE CONSTITUTIONAL: Mr. President, I am thinking of all those Democrats on the dock and do public moves the Government have one to produce at the end of the day. When are we going to do something about these situations, Mr. President. Are we going to keep talking about economy and expense? There are the people about which I am concerned. I have also my people; the people I have, the people I want to see taken care of in their old age. When are we going to stop talking and beginning? Are we going to be supposed to sleep? Let me decide, Mr. President, as Representatives of the people and think off our dull wits. Let us spend time profitably, perhaps still suggesting to provide somewhere. But this thing is such a difficult thing to do? "Right", Mr. President, like the monkey said, "My lawyer". Let me remind them though that national legislation is the proper road to minimum standards. Mr. President, we make also having taken compulsory contributed to an extent which is the people to count. The people need to be heard and I know Government always hears them,

Mr. President, I am glad of hearing these remarks at the front desk and the house full. Time is pressing ... There is a change brewing in this land. Mr. President, as I see it, the purpose of a pension scheme is to provide a decent pension for old age economy in this country, having in mind the particular the most unfortunate who do not have a scheme to contribute to privately. In my opinion, then, I would hope to see a pensions scheme for the people in the dumps and other organisations who already have some form of pension and who now pay their contributions to those schemes which they have paid. As I see from my list, and as always tends to do, something which we all experience, that is taking advantage of us, those people will realise that the pensions which they thought could be adequate for them, will not at all be adequate with the great increase of the costs. When these same people retire on their pensions, I feel that they might find they had a little more money than and I believe that they should contribute to such a scheme so the Government might pension.

Mr. President, I heard some unfortunate remarks during the break, who was responsible for what the was responsible for pensions. Who was responsible for Hitler's pensions. Mr. President, there are very old retired Civil Servants who are getting very little help from the Government by way of pensions. In my District there are no. number who I think originally who to this country, a Miss Leslie Yates and a Miss Dillon Smith. I also know in the other Directorate there are very people who did great work for this country and it should be looking about them. I am very that the pensions when they get to entitlement and as I understand it, because they get a raise it is just a few shillings.

Mr. President, all I am asking is that we have a commission. The proposition being a multiplicious pension scheme, it is not to say that other benefits cannot be maintained as it.

Mr. President, in closing this part of my debate let me make reference also briefly that there is very strong opposition to a national pension scheme in this country. Mr. President, that is evident by the fact that we are here today still talking about it. I believe that there people in this country who are opposed to labour legislation being brought to this unfortunate Press will oppose a pension Law. I can tell by the out of their jobs. This will oppose it. Let see, Mr. President, for a long time in this country there have been the obstacle, "No Tony as I get, we and my family, I do not care whether you strike". That is what was happened. However, I see our Brothers' Progress and we have to change our way of thinking. However, Mr. President, I do not expect that my Member will be there enough to stand up here today and say that they oppose this motion.

MR. X. SOKOLOW [CONTINUING]: I believe that we will have to accept the word of the motion to determine who is really in favor of and wishes the vote to know who really opposes such a motion. There will be all kinds of excuses. I still feel that up to this, I have asked myself and I have asked other Assemblymen to ask themselves what are the circumstances in this general matter. But we forget about the basic fact we're given I put in the motion. What is it we're asking, Mr. President. What we're asking is something known. The motion can be amended with your permission and I suppose,

Let us now enumerate what are the circumstances. Why, all of the circumstances which I can think of and for deciding it. I heard the gentleman on the back, we hear a lot about how to get to work, that Government takes care of them. Mr. President, that is not the alternative. We have what the Government has offered to give to many times. Still a month cannot help anybody. What counts is what they need to keep the people and the situation to keep them going in their city. What do they expect people to live off, see groups?

Mr. President, I have the word of Government bureaucrats coming. If he wants to give him I will because I am prepared to take them on faith.

Mr. President, in our discussion yesterday we've had many points, only the many which we have had reps of making amendments. We all know that. I am only asking the Members this which is astonishing which they know as well as I know. As a matter, the amount devoted on this bill from the Senate, the Government is not here. As I see this, here no committee discussions which somebody. Actually, there is one bill which Members who are now thinking of certain amendment this morning that question. They have expressed the desire which will be raised upon us in the next few days when I hope enough part of our opinion can find themselves ability to work out with a range of purpose.

Mr. President, what Chairmanship has gone why do not have today. We have that it is a fact that they do not have the basic plan of legislation some Members of the last administration always expressed. What has to be your function, Mr. President, I would go on until I endure myself to sleep, keeping together for this motion. However, I am unwilling, Mr. if such that would get enough support to pass it.

Why, I have listened this morning to the letter of counsel which was customary to vote recently to pass just by. I believe, Sir, that is a fair comparison. By the end of this session, every one of us in here who will just judgment in this matter will be provided to a member financed by the taxpayers and, Mr. President, is for the people opposing the Constitutional Revision Bill that question should be put simultaneously with a bill from the people of this country. They have a change of heart. They say that it is only a few who oppose them this night. Since we have, however, can be proud that one by a to vote on this motion, tell them that people that we do not believe that they should stay here some longer. That is [illegible] Mr. President.

The motion does not ask for a delay for our people. It is merely asking us to ask of the secretary merely that some consideration for these difficult bills so they do not

MR. [illegible]: I still have myself and [illegible] Members to think of the point who may have been stopped before reaching this place for hour or [illegible]. But anyway we have the right after spending all those years and accomplishing here [illegible] and we [illegible] himself and all the glory and the power naturally [illegible] with nothing to oppose us. So the Members may think that the people here [illegible] have done their obligations, those Members alone may [illegible] have been done. They must have [illegible] and [illegible] and nothing but which [illegible] to show up.

I will close now, Mr. President. I am [illegible] for support. However, [illegible] in [illegible], but it is, as the Shakespeare who said, "What is here [illegible] of these [illegible]. To [illegible] Shylock is not in our [illegible] but [illegible]". We owe it to [illegible]. We owe it to our people to see to it that these things are done, Mr. President, if not now, when; if not us, who?

Mr. President, I again beg leave to [illegible] the motion and if they want an [illegible] to the motion, [illegible] to do so, be done. That is all. I am not sure, Mr. President. I ask all Members to support it and [illegible] I ask you to [illegible] of the House to let this motion be a [illegible] vote or I vote [illegible] the Blessed Members elected by the people.

I thank you, sir.

MR. [illegible]: The motion before the House is [illegible] Member's Motion No. [illegible]. I will now call the roll of the [illegible] Members they have been [illegible]. The motion is open for debate. Does any Member wish to speak? The Honorable [illegible] Member of [illegible] County.

DEBATE ON [illegible] MEMBER'S MOTION NO. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, having listened to the [illegible] of the motion I am wondering whether the Member should have really called it a [illegible] because, first of all, the motion. I am sure that the motion is [illegible], Mr. President. However, as far as I am concerned, [illegible] to [illegible] by [illegible] the necessity of [illegible] a preliminary [illegible] before [illegible] can have been suggested by the Members. Certainly, Mr. President, the [illegible] of legislation is not the first case [illegible] the [illegible] of a [illegible] preliminary [illegible] before [illegible] of the merits of these [illegible].

This motion, in my opinion, is a [illegible] example of [illegible] to put the cart before the horse. The [illegible] of [illegible] the [illegible] is the last thing to [illegible]. When the [illegible] by [illegible] the [illegible] I will have all of the [illegible] of the [illegible] before [illegible] vote it.

I [illegible] a [illegible] Mr. President, about the necessity of [illegible] the question of whether or not a [illegible] motion is [illegible] to [illegible] and I [illegible] to do so [illegible] to have it [illegible] once and for all. Time have been, as the Member said, [illegible] in the [illegible] before but I am glad to [illegible], Mr. President, that [illegible] is abundantly clear that a [illegible] is [illegible] in this [illegible]. If in my [illegible], Mr. President, we wish to [illegible] [illegible] after this Meeting is [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] through [illegible] Members [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible], and if not, to [illegible] it.

MR. ROBERT C. BYRD (continued): Such a person would most likely be, Mr. President, a Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries of the Faculty of Advocates of Great Britain, or someone with comparable qualifications and experience. The matter, Mr. President, is not quite so simple as the Senator tried to make it in his presentation. He should certainly know that the reason why many people would be unemployed at this time, and have many years to be employed, is unemployment. Mr. President, it is not just a straightforward example like that. For example, I would hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues interested in this measure would consult with many others. When these factors are taken into consideration the apparent simplicity of the example goes out of the window.

Only it becomes much more complicated when one realizes that the greatest single employer in this country, the Government itself, has a non-contributory pension scheme which is part of the, what I said, universal system which operates here. There are other firms which also have pension schemes. If those persons are taken out of the pool then, Mr. President, we see a completely different picture. The case application form of negotiation will inevitably have to go on in order to see whether those persons are brought into the system, or people in similar circumstances in the future are brought into a system of insurance.

Nothing short of a proper actuarial study, Mr. President, of this whole circumstance will be with any certainty whether a pension scheme on the part proposed for the country as large, an unfunded one as I would feel it is. This matter, Mr. President, as I see it would not take too very long. This matter ought to necessitate legislation.

Mr. President, the notice to the Chief Legislation and then to study the legislation, just to study the practice of whether a contributory pension scheme is possible or viable. It is my contention that that is what first has to be looked.

We have evidence, Mr. President, that an actuary first took place in connection with the Government itself as I said the number of people available to pay their share to give all pensioners. We should say that because Barbados has a universal system that it is economically possible to work here.

Mr. President, the Senator from Christ Church East suggested that a vote against this motion was a vote against the establishing of a contributory pension scheme in this country. I might as well advise him now that I will be voting against this motion and I will not be voting against a contributory pension scheme for the country. I endorse the introduction of a scheme if it is possible but we must first, Mr. President, determine whether this is possible. I do not see why then, Mr. President, the motion can be amended to read implementation before it is withdrawn and substituted by a completely different motion, by which this application of study can be met. That waits for the drafting of the legislation.

Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator means because when he was debating the bill he denied the use of experts. He said that we were sick of being experimented to death. I believe that was his phrase. However, Mr. President, an actuary is only a term used to describe someone who might be more familiar with a contribution scheme and how that might be operated, or a breakdown. Persons familiarized with Government can be employed to work only. In cases where they themselves do not have the expertise, then actually is going to be left that qualification or training.

MR. GLENN D. BROWN (CONTINUED): I have just one concluding comment, Mr. President, on this question of a constitutional convention for the country. To be obvious to me that if we have a simple straightforward manner to be answered. As I said, I am convinced with the many steps you've had to go through, an extensive experimental in the field to come up, there's thoroughly study of the situation and build an issue card for all whether this matter of a constitutional convention method is possible to those reasons which are obvious problems.

I have hurried with scope of my presentation today, Mr. President, and I have also wanted to reemphasize the desirability of the scheme in our constitution structure. It is unnecessary to see how that particular scheme worked. However, Mr. President, it is obvious that it was not clear to witness and it has been and is continued actively every two years. While in part of Mr. Ross, it is evident to the Ross. Mr. President, I do not know why the question of labour legislation and parliamentary practices have not entered-broken in this matter. However, I am dealing generally with the matter before us. I will deal with the labour legislation as not which the Committee must and hopefully we will immediately bring a particular list of legislation before this matter.

The constitutionally Planning Bill as mentioned as going to be dealt with later today and I will deal with that when I get to it. However, in summation, Mr. President, what I am saying is that I support the provision of certain methods for the misuse in this country. However, Mr. President, it have to be done in an organized and accurate way, and it is my contention that we do not need legislation to prescribe the steps and that the legislation comes as a result of this study of it is I have that the method is feasible in our provincial and regional setting.

I trust that it will be found as and it will be my sincere pleasure to have taken part in the start of a possible scheme for these purposes. However, Mr. President, I support a method which in my opinion would be just the right before the House.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDING: The Third Standing Member for Hamilton.

MR. JAMES E. JEFFREY: Mr. President, the matter before us as I can sense most members are ready, I was to begin upon the principal discussion of this motion. I certainly support the Bill being debated that Government was sincerely in the process of looking into this matter seriously. I mentioned earlier that this was not something which was being pushed under the carpet but Government was to face seriously looking into the matter.

I must say Hamilton Mountain is very to have been in here lately, I guess, caused like people opportunistically. There are many things which need to be done. There are many things which we recognized in our Canadian society which I for one hope to see accomplished. However, when one considers the time and the matter and that is taken place and time and expenses, and previous to get this particular scheme under way, then I feel that a motion calling Government to study this whole matter being a valid, its merit. I rise to commend the Member Hamilton for most any for his presentation. I do not necessarily agree with many points of it but I can sincerely say that I think that his deliberations are good, as was which.

MRS. DOLORES T. GARCIA (CONTINUED): However, at this particular time I cannot support the motion as it stands. I would hope to see similar views reflected in the not too distant future as well. I realize that years ago when older people were revised often by their children things were different. It is not as it was some ten years ago. It seems that most children have too much to learn care of an their own and some parents and older people to suffer as a result of not being properly looked after. It is a shame really that this should have to be, but it does exist. However, we can only do so much at one time. When I think of the money which this present Government has had to find and pay out for overstrengths made by the former Government, that is clearly obvious as not to have all that we would be here doing this year. However, there are many things which I hope to see accomplished and I hope that this particular motion will be one of those.

I feel that every effort should be made. I do not want to look only at what is not possible; it seems to do so. I feel that if we can be glad here all night we can. However, unless pressure is to be put on people our contribution on a purely optional basis many people would have to be paid in not unnecessarily all that one has to contribute.

Taking for example, and of course this is a big country but when necessary to purchase one single item a lot of money can go down the drain, and as I understand it some 95 cents out of every dollar which is contributed towards social security in the United States goes towards the administration of providing that particular scheme. So that one considers what will be taken in, there are many factors which have to be considered in what will actually be paid out of the money which would have been collected as a contribution from our people.

I think that something can be done. I certainly hope that we the study grant on as will find that it will not take too long to do so. However, I can assure Members of this House that it is my strong feeling that a pension scheme is something which is wanted and the sooner we get to it the better. However, we can do no only what we are a position financially and otherwise to accomplish it.

Again, I wish to commend the Senior Elected Member for Mons Ray for the scheme and his presentation. I also wish to endorse what the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council has said and I do feel that this House working together can come up with something which is workable and might for our people. I wish that I could say that I supported my colleagues. In this case, under the circumstances I cannot support the motion, however, as for an alternative perhaps it would be I should suggest that the matter should be dealt with, leave it over and hopefully we will find that it will be possible and desirable and it will be instituted in the not too distant future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it may be convenient if we now break for lunch, as I will suspend proceedings until approximately 2.15 p.m.

AT 12.48 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 8.47 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Accordingly, the resumed
Tai debate on Private Member's Motion
No. 1/93. Does any other Member wish to speak? The Senior Elected
Member for Bukom Zone.

MR. D. ARYEE ZOOOOM: Mr. President, ever since November 31
this House unfortunately chose I should Mr. Speaker of the House. For
all I do not speak, there is seldom any debate. When I do speak the
House is even packed.

I am looking, Sir, at the Private
Member's Motion which is before the House. The motion seeks to
provide assistance or pension benefits for old people. This time
of the Month coincided or the Christmas, how I have waited a long
time to the Chief Justice who is here present. But since I only
how I have waited a long time it possibly that was been to any great
extent, because it is only since the end of March that we have
seen, since it, the Judiciary sometimes may rejoin vacations for
substantial benefits.

Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf
implementing an provident benefits for old people through insurance
policy and through group pension plans, I am a big believer in these
schemes. Because, the final thing which must be considered is the
funding of the scheme. Where is the money going to come from to
provide the benefits? The Member said about old age, "Our fees
to the morning and you have got it". However, this reality is not
it. One takes a long time to get the old age benefit in that
area is something like the United Kingdom and the United States
where old age and fixed allowances are to which we have paid
a whole lot they had which they were to. The reason for this
Country of the scheme. Where is the money going to come from to
provide the benefits? The Member said about old age, "Our fees
to the morning and you have got it". However, this reality is not
it. One takes a long time to get the old age benefit in that
area is something like the United Kingdom, which is not
a problem. So, there are a lot of people in the house and it was
thought a blessing to have a grandfather or a grandfather living to
be able to take care of the children and to help with the homework,

(21) C. MRS PEISER (CONSERVATIVE): Likewise, this whole family structure has changed in the Cayman Islands as well where we have old people in the home and the old people are no longer cared for in the home. Whereas in the old days we looked after them in the home, we have complaints about elderly. When there is a possible way that we can help the lack of child responsibility where there is no one available to look after the elderly for an appropriate, particularly if the relative is not in gainful employment, a payment or a grant/allowance.

All of these grievances of Caymanians I would highlight and hope [illegible] Many Caymanians accept that Hurricane Ivan is the one major risk, but the major and risks of higher risk rates, we will see rates go the roof [illegible] Hurricane Ivan is in his modest lifestyle. This is quite true. The modern conveniences which we have to deal with in our homes as well as the whole family life has been affected in where the family really are at a disadvantage. We have tried to put more money into old people to find employment. For example, once the Government - unemployment rate is looking [illegible] some of these older people are looking as economic refugees of the airports. I think that they are [illegible] to be there. To be the same circumstances around. Employment not on the usual people when there's attempts to [illegible] to find that they are getting on in age. All of this highlights how much [illegible] became to prevail what the new provisions that he worked, because there was only one economy of money in his world and there was work or enough of work. Unless we have money invested which helps us on Caymans, we still have to find money to will at people, and we do agree to not [illegible] Cayman.

There is also the possibility to move [illegible] by elderly persons, by [illegible] Many in [illegible] Cayman Islands since Hurricane Ivan, a [illegible] of older. There is sensitive persons who provide social care. I do see [illegible] of people who have moved one more owning up their property. I believe that the [illegible] will get worse.

On the other hand, where the Cayman [illegible] have provided [illegible] for their children that the rest of this that we pay, the more people will be [illegible] for [illegible] The good sign of the [illegible] is that it is not [illegible] to provide those benefits when it was in the past because on [illegible] the private sector is increased, business profits [illegible] Government therefore has the opportunity to provide [illegible] There seems to be also amongst the private companies, that desire to provide something for a pension, and perhaps a Government [illegible] the same [illegible] that a person who has lived a long [illegible] and lived a good life might need to be, as it were, rewarded for having lived so long.

The system before us is seeking a pension for people who, [illegible] for work, for whatever reasons, I [illegible] to me I said in this House before only a [illegible] might under-take the person that has served the [illegible] in running the country [illegible].

To assist a new [illegible] people find that [illegible] would be looking [illegible] who had not contributed before, but that is the way to avoid this. After the address to [illegible] number of people, most of the [illegible] would be the people who have made no contribution to the [illegible].

I have no declaration about this scheme. I believe that it can work. I only hope to [illegible] [illegible] by the present Government. The matter could [illegible] within nine months and the Member may or may not want to change his mind [illegible] a longer period.

MR. T. [illegible] (CONTINUED): Of course, we heard here yesterday that it will take two years to get agreement on the Caribbean College. This was the Minister's answer when I asked him if they would be looking again further ahead on the subject of university education in 1988. He would be hard-pressed to establish the 1988 to probably one year after we have established it in 1987. However, negotiations do seem to take a long time to get a consolidation of agreement about what the consolidation. If they want the consolidation they can finish with the signature of a pen on which a telephone call. Anyway, that's another matter.

The Opposition generally thinks to their idea is how is it going to be funded? The motion clearly recommends that we have a contributory pension scheme, which I imagine would be a scheme whereby most working people would put some money into it, however, I do not believe that that in itself would be sufficient to fund the scheme, because an ordinary private pension fund does not usually get funded by large multi-millionaire corporations, it does usually fall part way of a person's salary, to provide an adequate pension, a portion of about two thirds of his average earnings. So, if we are going to provide a scheme for all the people who will reach the age of 65, we are going to need more than a new contribution, even if the wealthy private sector are going to be expected also to be matched by the employer. If we are going to look for those other people who are not working like, say, housewives and students, and people who are not entitled to work, is it going to take funding from outside? I believe, without having done any actuarial calculations, that the sum of money which we would need in the future if we started this scheme, would probably be a sum of money equal to about half of the recurrent revenue to provide the type of scheme which I suppose would be provided.

Now, is it true that some of the other Caribbean islands have these schemes and I would say that we have fallen out of anything rather than some of the schemes which they have, because they are subsidized by the money Governments spend or else by the funds and by the benefits. If we are going to have anything at all, if we are going to have anything to meet the expectations of the people in the Cayman Islands, it will have to be weighted on the North American system, probably the United States of America. However, I would like to think that nobody should oppose this motion because we support a scheme like the scheme which was now provided under the United States social security system or the Canada pension plan. It would be impossible to do it.

Anyway, nevertheless, I believe that the scheme would be unrealistic at these early stages providing only a single benefit initially. Everyone knows that the United States of the Canada scheme provides many benefits outside of the pension. They provide not only the pension for the old person. They provide pensions for widows and widows. They provide payments for unemployment. They provide social assistance and so on. So, I do not think that anyone would expect this to be a fully funded scheme initially.

I have a little about the history of some of the plans provided by Government in the Caribbean countries, and I would perhaps like to give an outline of the various pension plans that have been started. The first thing that did was to find out how they were going to fund it. To ensure that sufficient by contributions I know you could notice that we all agree that we must also have contributions from employers too as well. To other words they [illegible] the scheme and they also wanted a share from them but as contributions.

MR. G. HEATH BARNES (Cockfosters): Now, we have a problem here in probably we should have to be looking at increasing Government's revenue in some way by an Income Tax increase next year, even if we have that in contradistinction from these people who work, because I believe that if we start this scheme it could not be right to put all taxpayers under it. For example, there numbers who are below the poverty line, there are those workers who are not working very much and can only be able to contribute anything at all. There numbers who receive cash on their own bike, say, people who are not employed by organisation but who work on their own and may not even under this system. It would probably happen that those organisations themselves provide certain benefits they might not be asked to contribute. However, even if we put contributions from the workers, I think that the Government if they are going to put in finance will have to find out where the money is coming from.

What I would like to see if the Government decides to go ahead is that they invite for a report who is responsible for the administration of these plans, responsible for raising the Government how they can find it, because I think that is the key to it. If the private sectors that they are willing for the tax to go up on their wages, or the employer only to go up on their wages, and if they can find out how to raise the money, perhaps we can contribute more and more from some more yet untapped. However, if we are going to raise substantial sums of money we have to provide the cash flow. Why, perhaps the answer would be to find some other way and to impose the tax, and reimburse part some money back. One might perhaps be going into.

We must look a few years ago that the United States social security system was in the hands of bankruptcy because the payments had gone to where the contributions of the people had given to such enormous proportions that they had outstripped the few people who were working to support it. It is necessary to get in enough in from the many people to still have to subsist the ones who are retired, because we have to remember that one population here is growing older every day. They are living longer every year. Now, we might have heard of the old person whose knew if the old people lived beyond the age of 100. However, the fact is that the Queen receives an card on the ninety centenarian annual birthday, the life span of the individual is much longer than it was at the beginning of the century.

The number who receive that if we introduce paying the pension, may be people would be the second problem to pay on the amounts under they are in. This may be corrected but I believe that payments would have to be made to many people much longer, because at birth today if we take any of the existing mortality tables, we will find that the life expectancy of a baby in now from 72 to 74 years of age. If a person reaches the age of 65 and is in good health, that person can well expect to be 80. So, it is known that all of these people will live to the age of 100. However, there is still the side which exceeds the 100th mark, but in any mortality table we will find that the probabilities are that they will be down to age zero and they will die at age 100. Due to the improvements in medicines and due to the improvements in sanitation and the keeping down of communicable diseases, are living much longer. This is what creates the problems with the pensions in the United States. The people are living longer, and if anyone eventually if they are those benefits to provide some of the basic necessities, this alone will enhance the lengths of life for these people.

MR. S. ALLEN PEACOCK: CONTINUING: So, if we think about providing a sensible benefit, and this is what I mean by reshaping of the Social Insurance system, of the order of dollars we will have to find and we are going to have difficulty showing it until our Government is in power to raise significantly the revenue base. Because this Government is in power to need quite a large administrative staff to deal with this new venture.

We have found and I've mentioned this once to the House that roughly 30 per cent of the money given to social assistance goes to recipients in need. The rest of the money goes to pay salary and to do administrative and clerical work, paperwork and that sort of thing.

The Member never did make mention of it once I was the word in her name. I was speaking slightly to some by which to speak on it. However, the fact is that any payments which have to be maintained unless we have to do it on a universal we are eligible to receive. If we have to do an arrangement by simply well pay the pensions or to see that payments are made, it is going to take quite a bit of administration, and this has to be reviewed for.

So, the reason is not reject the ability of the Government to implement. My own opinion is, that if this scheme is not pursued by the present Government, no increase will be taken of the ideas of the Opposition. They will just be rid them. Certainly if I have any idea at all I will come to an election before we will implement it, because we believe in it, I know that my views are never acceptable to the present Administration. However, I guess they have a right to vote as they like. That is their business.

The Canadian pension scheme was started with the idea that they could not provide everything for everybody initially. When one of the reasons why their scheme got off the ground. The way they looked at was that in the first year of the administration either they had just the funding in place, they have the benefits payable to all those people over the age of 70. The second year they made it payable to all the people over the age of 69 and then the next year to those over the age of 68, until they brought it down to 65. So, in the first year they were not giving the benefits to too many people. They kept increasing it every year. Then they also did not start out to pay to provide many benefits. They built first with just the pension aspect of it. Strangely enough their income started at $75 per month which was in the Canada Pension Plan after that.

Now, one of the disturbing things about a scheme like this is that it changes substantially from the very start and might happen in a situation like this is that once the amount is introduced we may find that the principle of providing to the most disabled would be that they were going to increase the benefits. It also becomes highly questionable and it may increase to find that the benefits were or possible payments then on account basis, like I spoke about the needs test earlier, both on a political basis rather than a universality basis.

The notice to me which is accepted by the House, must be studied in all its aspects. We must not only look at the benefit to the individual. We have to look at the people who are going to pay up the next year after year to pay for these benefits. This is especially true during the early stages, probably the first 15 to 20 years of the plan. There is two ways to look at it. One way is that the people who will receive the benefits are the people who have contributed the most.

MR. G. KITE SECRETARY (CONTINUING): ... if their services are to be maintained and if this is what the public wants, the public itself will realise that they will have to have sacrifices. They will have to make sacrifices to provide the cash which they would still spend on other things; perhaps spend even more profitably. They will have to deny themselves of some comfort today so that they may provide a better benefit tomorrow.

The motion is asking that the Legislative Assembly appoint a Select Committee of the whole House to consider the Land Tax Legislation, on payment the Land Tax Act. We accept that as a reasonable suggestion. I would suggest that if we are going to get reliable information that we get people who benefit from different areas. I would like to have a comment either from one of the large insurance companies like Metropolitan or Prudential, who are involved in the motor vehicle industry, who understand the projections into the future versus the assessment of the past, and that we also get someone with more broad knowledge from this area, not perhaps that we do not welcome local people because this scheme can be either a millstone around the neck of people or it can be a scheme which does do just enough to help building going. I suggest to the Hon. Minister for Transport who are the members of the Social Security Committee from the United States. I suggest to them, here are the members of Government services, people who are receiving pensions from private companies, and if we decide to have taxpayers they will all tell us that ... not enough they have given to the pension system, no matter how small it is.

The point I have is with these people who contribute nothing. I think that this is what the motion is seeking to remedy. I must say that the Member for Fremantle did a very good job in outlining forward the problems and he also did a good job on his research which was pretty accurate. He also mentioned that in 1972 the two Golden Boys Members of Parliament introduced a similar motion. If he would have researched he would have seen that the Government party in the Member who spoke today, Mr. Hassell, was the one who in 1978 and that his attitude has not changed substantially towards this scheme.

My attitude has not changed either. I believe in it then and I believe in it now. It is only that this seems to be the most appropriate time in the history of these Parliaments to think about this entitlement issue. It is a fact whether Governments like it or not that things are not well. In fact, before things can be well they must go out and make money to pay back the Treasurer which they have spent since January 1983. They must go back and get this Government back on a sound financial footing, get the economy back on a viable economic system in order to get back people feeling secure at Christmas. Where we do not have signs of recovery in the expenditure of money at the moment, where we do not have a lot of people spending like they used to, I have had a couple of people say to me in the Chamber today round the world, "We have got the only thing to succeed was one plan for somebody to put up a resolution like in the world". We have to get somebody and unemployment today in this country.

The time to put this in is really the time when the Government has offered it. I think a recession exists, but the Government offered this? I believe that the Government has offered it if they will change their whole way of the thinking of an administration which brought this Government from the Labor Club economically in 1972 to one of presently those ... last seven years of misery.

MR. S. KEITH RICHEY (Cambridge): We have to get out of this area on the seven years of income or at least I should say on the four years of income. I mean there is a change in the policy making of people in Cambridge so probably which is the five seven years of income.

Anything with this aside, I still have faith in this country. I still have hope for the future that if we are going to get this into perspective we are going to have to put the country back in a viable, financial position. We still have to get back to the principle stone which existed prior to the 1960 elections. If this can be done, and if I were to choose how this can be guided: what it can be administered: how it can be said that, I personally still support it. I would say that I commend the Mayor for having brought this matter to the scene. I would say that the most important to that I was visibly for my constituents to come back.

The motion is carried unanimously. Unfortunately, I was not home to hear the opinion of the Government as to their reaction to it. Perhaps it was a good thing that I was not here but I would like to place before Council. Nevertheless, it is my intention to support the motion and I trust that when the motion is presented we will take out the last three of which are reading just change them to read:-

> "AS IT APPEARS PROBABLE that Government is going ahead legislation to the Water Committee."

I recall the story of the Post Office Company when one of their managers recommended the building of the Telex voice car. They put a time limit on it and the engineers used to work, and the car was produced on time. However, the car was a failure and many few hours were sold and they were taken off the market. On the other hand, when the new manager Henry Ford III recommended the building of the Mustang, he said that there would be no time limit on this job but he wanted them to build a car which would match any system and one sold on the market. This is exactly what was produced. The Mustang made money for Ford than even the predictions forecast, and it made more money than the model T or the model A ever did until Henry Ford died of a stroke. It is all because the engineers could sit down and work out the plan, and try to get what was best know it.

I believe that this can be done if we do not hurry. I hope that it will not become the subject of the Provincial Election of these Bill that come under one of these resolutions which will be dealt with without debate and passed without debate. I would say that this Bill will be regarded as a Bill on which all the Legislators can, and individual to will have, but sensible business people around the province and here I talk of the one who buys "Wall, we believe this will work and that it will be done not on an emotional basis or on a political basis, but on a sound economic system where not only the benefits will be considered, but where the funding which is perhaps the most important part will be considered in great detail".

I am in agreement with the Government Members, having discussed these today hardly to visit with this new problem which has been dumped on their laps. However, perhaps this new problem which can not of their own creation as many of the other problems were, will shock them back into reality and they will sit down as sensible members of Government and study it during this recess, which although it would appear will be a long recess, it is a motion which deserves the attention of Government

MR. G. RAMA REDDY (Kurnool): ...is a problem which provides opportunities to be dealt with as speedily as Government can deal with it.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that it may be convenient if we have completed proceedings for approximately ten minutes.

AT ALSO P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2.01 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Private Member's motion No. 16/85. Dear only other Member still to speak? The Second Eligible Member for Coast, Zoom.

DR. ANYANGU A. ATEKYEREZA: Mr. President, I was here also to debate on Private Member's Motion No. 16/85 relating to a unemployment problem, that the Government South will make certain commitments must be held under their collective responsibility, because this matter, Mr. President, is a very serious matter indeed. I appreciate and the moves of this motion for the specific and the objective moves of that what should be put into the implementation of the proposition. I cannot congratulate enough the mover of the Honourable Elected Member of Parliament because he started that his presentation appeared to be that of a holder of economy, or a economics Minister. To me, Mr. President, that is misleading and making just as a very serious matter.

I should like also, Mr. President, to make it quite clear to this Assembly for themselves may not remember that in the final Meeting of this Assembly in December after the General Election, that I brought a question to this House which the same subject for in this original Member's Motion. For the records, Mr. President, I would like to state that question was question no. 1 which I moved on this floor on the 11th December, 1984. That question, Mr. President, was aimed at the Honourable Point Minister of Economic Planning responsible for Public Education and Social Services and it stands:-

> "Would the Honourable Minister, if any plans are being made to introduce legislation in the near future to provide for a compulsory pension scheme for employees in the private sector and those not already covered by the Government Schemes?"

Mr. President, this answer which I got from the Member does not seem to clarify much from his personal feelings. He stated that:-

MR. LEROY A. GOLDMAN (CONTINUED):

"The determination of existing legislative or the kind
referred to in the question will depend upon the nature
of a possibility study which Government will consider
undertaking in the near future."

In reply to the answer, Mr. President, I would ask supplementary and I have requested the Member to try to give me a little better idea of what is meant by the "near future". I would like to put to a think frame of what is meant by in the near future and I believe, Mr. President, that the answer I got earlier was not possible".

Mr. President, since making statements we are still getting the same answer in this Honourable House. Mr. President, since making after a possibility study was not even been undertaken. We have been told in this House that it is planned to commit us to study the existence of an airstrip. Mr. President, the word to sell is carved with many interpretations. Procrastination, Mr. President, is the thief of time. The Government doesn't have a cause from stepping, because brought by this other side of the House. I sit here, Mr. President, and see the result of this happening. I better from this side of the house will get up and be able to have ministerial responsibility to be made to the Honourable the Native Affairs. The problem, Mr. President, is that under section 5 of the Constitution they have normally no responsibility.

The reason of this motion goes on
because of the many answers who gave response on this matter,
Mr. President back in 1978, a Mr. Premier in 2011 and others.
Looking back to 1978 we are talking about 12 to 13 years. I
wonder, Mr. President, if this is the time frame which the Member
is contemplating when he says "in the near future"?

Is it the intention, Mr. President,
of Government to look into these matters seriously? I heard mention
made of putting the item before the House and then the terrific
thinking of those Executive would take place we are waiting for two
weeks. However, Mr. President, as in my view that the Members
are giving the impression that the Government is only minded of
a handful of people. The people who listen to these debates are
very intelligent people. They realize that no possibility legislative
can be brought to this Assembly unless there is endorsement or there
is done that legislation. This is undemocratic. We do not need to
spell everything out for people.

As since the Member stated that after
legislation for the introduction of a compulsory pension scheme
be brought to this Honourable House, it would be appreciated by
the most elementary mind that a possibility study would be necessary
before we could bring anything legislation for this matter. This
is me, Mr. President, in fact wanted attempt to simplify and give
you a concise notion. The motion will be lapsed into Assembly".
There is a certain phrase in this issue. "In the answer". "In
the near future". We cannot put a time frame in the near future.
I am not suggesting, Mr. President, that this matter is intentional
or it is not be unconstitutional in this matter. I am not suggesting
that. Besides we I appreciate that the answer of this motion should
change the composition of the motion. I am glad that the Minister the
second version which he had to mind because it could have made a
mockery of his substantive motion. As far as I can see, Mr. Presi-
dent, all that would be necessary is to take out the "the" in order
the motion should stand as it is otherwise.

MR. LAWSON of TEXAS (continuing): Why was not a zone made, similar to Zone 3, to bring in the necessary expenses since December, 1965? Why is it that we are just hearing about attempts will be made to bring in the necessary expenses to local units since 1965? How do we know that the people will be represented in this county? Mr. Speaker, we should never lose sight of the fact that we are here to represent the people of this country. We are not here to promote ourselves or to build political fences for ourselves. We are here to look at the interests of the people which we represent. I wonder just how many of us will be keeping up the political pledges we made? Do we remember what we promised when we were campaigning? Will we have the guts to stand up and say something when we think something has been done.

We realize, Mr. President, that this supplementary general revenue will cost the employee some money, but we also know that the employee will have to contribute something. This amount is compared to the necessary pension deduct in a fifo pension. This is something which he gets back as a matter of contract. It is not the usual expenditure. I wonder, Mr. President, if you look at the amount in this entire bonus about it a result of the reluctance of would be employers to participate in this scheme? Why do we not tell the people decide whether they want this or not? Why do we not go to decide for them that they will not want this scheme? Perhaps the possibility really and there is not enough whether it can afford the scheme or whether it is good for the economy. However, Mr. President, the attempt has not once been made to look into the matter.

Mr. President, let us take us get up on this side of the house and we firmly pronounce matters which are of essential interest to this country, but unfortunately they are hidden under the carpet. I would not bring for the sense of this bill, Mr. President. We do a very capable piece work. We does not want to expose to that position. I appeal to conscience. I speak for what I think is in the best interests of this country.

We have been told, Mr. President, that this pension scheme will cost money. We have this. However, we have not been given assurance to show that if an employee will be going to be paid $10 a month, that the state would withdraw one penny towards this scheme. Consequently, Mr. President, the taxpayer will still pay this subsidy.

Unless the Legislature wishes, there are provisions to be members of Her Majesty's Civil Service or any other company which provides a pension, that they are automatically out of luck. Mr. President, I know as a fact that there are a lot of people in this country, old people over 65 who cannot find the pennies to make together, and what they are dependent on the poor relief granted them through the Social Services Department. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are Members of this House who do not have this people realize. I have heard Members of the Executive Council get up in this House and ask, 'Where are the Welsh people in this country?' I wonder if they would have asked that question on the 27th November, 1964, since before the election? They know a lot of the Welsh people then. However, since the elections they have forgotten them.

Mr. Speaker, I like to say in this House appreciation that a lot of money will have to go into the rehabilitation of a redundancy payment scheme. However, we want to see a share of good faith. The matter should not be lengthened unduly.

Mr. LUNCEFORD (Mississippi): Mr. President, I thought I understood the Honorable Floyd Clarke of Pennsylvania would be so kind as to kindly explain his motion, his statement a constitutionary position wherein the self-existence of the system would have a constitutionary position, what is his actual opinion? It seems to me that the constitution is unassailable structure.

Mr. President, unless some Delegate responsible and a speaking vote really of which Congress but of Congress that and Little Congress, we have a lot of needy people. I am not going to stand here and support this a constitutionary position either on the previous for which time. However, I am going to suggest that we will help them to maintain their police and dignity. Congressmen are not a people who have to face their wants and their problem known to the world. So do not feel that we the elected Congress. They are a very special people, Mr. President, and our Government should encourage to help them to maintain that position.

We have heard, Mr. President, that in other Commonwealth countries when persons off state the Supreme Colonial Fiscality, this such a subject has arrived. My home Island of Bermuda with certain exceptions, in the Foreign Policy Islands and the other countries. Despite I am informed, Mr. President, I am not here pro-rendering the outcome of a Constitutional study. I am saying, Mr. President, that such a study should be given top priority. "In the near future", what is "In the near future"? We heard that since 1970. This is 1985 and we are still hearing "In the near future".

We do not want to hear cries of the privileged and capitalistic, but we cannot allow here our pride in our Government unless that Representation is based on proper studies. We must stop pushing this matter under and deal with it promptly.

Mr. President, Senator Hughes's Motion No. 14/85 reads:-

> "Whereas in a few short years a large number of Commonwealth will reach maturation or retirement age, and become a burden to our social programme."

I submit, Mr. President, that unfortunately this problem has been answered by experts. We have neighbour there years. We are outside their power but it is different, Mr. President, if we are not to study problem to implement which the Islands provide that. There is the work manpower. There are not many of our experienced citizens for their sight of their own responsibilities. It is not enough, Mr. President, to go round the countryside provide and Rise in the High Society. As pensions of our Commonwealth who people below the middle income level of our Commonwealth simple and those are ready of our people who are on the minimum level. Those are people, Mr. President, who retire on the pension to the age of 65, so and 99 who are not able to save a penny because of the amount of Commonwealth which they have. We are helping our people. We are trying to realize them by looking into matters such as the problem of Commonwealth pension scheme.

Mr. President, my concern of this Private Member's Motion is not the aspect of an individual in this House. I am appreciating we have until I think it is the most interest of our people and I suggest studies have arisen, Mr. President, that this matter should be given top priority also months. Time expires, Mr. President, that is argument of this Private Member's Motion that I should like to see this matter thought of a priority also.

MR. EDWARD J. OSTICK (COMMISSIONER): I understood, in support of the honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council, that he had invited us that afternoon to another meeting and I commend him for that. However, this does not take the place of a proper study being done. As the Second Elected Member for Sudden Task pointed, why not today do people who are qualified for pensions, or the retired? Because they are not in here and let them make decisions in this country. It is not enough to go off to another country and then take decisions. We can hardly compare the system in a country with 80,000 to 90,000 people and feel that it can work in the Cayman Islands with 22,000 people unless it is properly monitored and amended in the hands of the people of this country.

Mr. President, I am also appealing to the social conscience of the people in this House. But for the grace of God we would be one of those poor people who travel each day on poor relief. We should be in the same position that God has helped us to come here and try to help these people. What are we doing with the privileges and opportunity which have been given to us by the people of the Cayman Islands to represent them? Are we showing this from the inside?

Mr. President, I hope that each Member of this honourable House will have another look at this motion. As I said, Mr. President, with the exception of the views from in this motion I support and I commend the Second Elected Member of Executive Council for moving this motion. In my opinion, Mr. President, this is unbelievably low pensions. We must realize that inflation is going on. We have stated that a responsibility already will be done. Therefore, I do feel this procedure is being done then there should be no problem for him to understand that anything legislation will have no effect.

Mr. President, again I wish to commend the mover of this motion and I thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak, the honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES L. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, I would like to give support to the Member who introduced this motion for a considerably increase pension and I thank his motives for the people. However, Mr. President, there is a right and wrong way to do anything, and I do not agree with the move that we can establish a considerably pension scheme in this motion.

One cannot even simply a number whereby we take action which can be established here. Anyone a proper feasibility study has been made by experts in this field. The honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council said that we cannot put the cart before the horse. One does not commence to build a house by starting with the roof because first a sound foundation and build from the ground up.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, there is no such thing as feasible investment. We all here think the welfare of Government then also that must. We must have a feasibility study made and build from that where possible. We will have to determine first and foremost how we are to fund such a scheme bearing in mind the views of our people, otherwise anything in this Legislature honestly will be viewed of unfeasibility the public. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town addressed this point very well that the Government likely in this matter is wrong. Where is the money coming from?

MR. SMITH, Chairman of Appropriations Committee: We must not delay our decisions and all Members of this House assume certain full responsibility and vote [illegible] for the good of our people.

The need for civil aid appropriations is very evident and is increasingly costly, and it is more urgent than ever before. It was pointed out by the ranking Member that in former days Government had checks [illegible] which they could fall back on. However, today most of those have been cut off, have tied and they have no fall back position.

It was pointed out, Mr. President, that any actions must be reviewed every two years, however within two years that will be outdated. Today we recognize, every [illegible] is in compliance by law to maintain those [illegible] and update it. So, whatever Government may have said, still before making any very large to be studied and updated, and this is the nature of the [illegible].

Mr. President, it is the concept of Government to have a [illegible] for our people that is now [illegible] to take [illegible] and money to [illegible] position to a reality. Just as we [illegible] values of this [illegible] and vote for here and try to make [illegible]. This is how [illegible] we will have to [illegible]. But we have [illegible] and if we have [illegible] to see [illegible] for our people.

I thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] any other Member wish to speak?

MR. JESSE D. [illegible]: Mr. President, I would like to speak but [illegible] and will be [illegible] for the [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: I am in the hands of the House. It is quite true that there are only seven [illegible] before the [illegible] and if you can [illegible] to [illegible] I am sure that it would be [illegible] for you to...

MR. JOHN E. [illegible]: Mr. President, I am [illegible] that I will not be as long winded as previous speakers and I am glad of what I have to say in the time allotted.

Mr. President, I have sat here and listened to previous speakers and although on their [illegible] they have taken time to present their [illegible], the truth of the matter is that we are all saying the same thing. We support a [illegible] program. However, Mr. President, I feel must state that the [illegible] before us is very good. It is a very excellent idea and I [illegible] [illegible] in supporting the Member who presented this [illegible]. However, Mr. President, what I cannot agree with is the fact that we have in this section [illegible] which to me is very [illegible]. This is a very serious error, Mr. President, and I would like to see, first of all, so that back mentioned here, a person possibility already [illegible]. I would like to see the [illegible] of our people and at that time I can find myself in a position where I can fully support the [illegible].

Mr. President, quite recently through [illegible] through this House, and I refer to the matter with [illegible], actions and rates, we personally [illegible] people were and it should have never happened. I agree that this [illegible] should have investigated before but if [illegible] we have [illegible], why cannot we wait at least another year and be sure the right way?

MR. JOHN B. ANDERSON (CONTINUING): Now I said, Mr. President, the outcome of this motion is very good. As the Second Ranking Member for George Town sometimes I should hope that the Honorable Five Floated Member of Washington Circuit will not make this motion lightly, but will endeavor to work towards having a possibility study like we have this time.

Again, like I said, I am not superstar, I'd like more months but I do hope that he will try to get his photo Monday. It is unfortunate, Mr. President, that so much time had to be spent in this House today, or I should say wasted on a frivolous stunt as this one, because the trouble and the fact each Member knew I have listened to his mind like some sitting.

I thank you, Mr. President.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. DENNIS D. DOYLE: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until tomorrow morning at 10:00, A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 tomorrow morning.

QUESTION PUT; AGREED. AT 4:30 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., FRIDAY 6TH SEPTEMBER, 1968.

[illegible] MEETING OF THE 2020 TERM OF THE [illegible] ASSEMBLY
HELD AT
[illegible], THE [illegible], 2020

PRESENT WERE:-

[illegible]

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA FOR PART III OF THE 3RD SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA OF EIGHTY-SECOND (2ND EXTRAORDINARY AND SPECIAL) SESSION

NO. 119: WHICH ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN OF THE FOLLOWING IS THE NUMBER OF BILLS PASSED WHICH THE PRESIDENT OF NIGERIA CANNOT ASSENT TO WITHOUT FIRST SEEKING THE ADVICE OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE?

(a) Corrective measure;
(b) Democratic government;
(c) Parliament;
(d) Senate;
(e) Abrogation of Religion;
(f) Witness;
(g) Treasury;
(h) Chartered Accountants;
(i) Banking;
(j) Sovereign;
(k) Constitution;
(l) Governor;
(m) Magistrate; and
(n) Lagos?

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA FOR PART VII OF THE 3RD SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA OF EIGHTY-SECOND ORDINARY ASSEMBLY AND EIGHTY-SECOND EXTRAORDINARY AND SPECIAL SESSION

NO. 117: WHICH ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN OF THE FOLLOWING CONSTITUTES LACK OF THE REQUIREMENT OF THE NEW BILL WHICH WILL CONSIST CHANGE YOUR AND SENATE'S NAME?

NO. 118: WHICH ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN IS THE NAME, BY DATE, OF COMMENCEMENT OF THE NEW BILL WHICH IS BEING SIGNED TO CHANGE ENTITY'S LOGO AND STATE AGENCY?

1. PRELIMINARY SECTIONS

(a) BILLS:-

PUBLIC AND SECRET SECTIONS

(i) THE POST ARCHIVISTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(ii) THE PARLIAMENTARY SECTIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

CONSTITUTIONAL

(i) THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF NIGERIAN JUSTICE BILL, 1965
(ii) THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (INCORPORATION) (NO.2) BILL, 1965
(iii) THE TOURISTS MINISTRY AND AGENCY BILL, 1965
(iv) THE PUBLIC LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(v) THE CHIEF OF DEFENCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(vi) THE STATE AUDITORIUM (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(vii) THE PARLIAMENTARY SECTIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

MINISTRY DEPARTMENTS

(16) THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CHRISTIAN JUSTICE BILL, 1965
(17) THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (INCORPORATION) (NO.2) BILL, 1965
(18) THE PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL, 1965
(19) THE PUBLIC LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(20) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(21) THE DOCK AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965
(22) THE PARLIAMENTARY SECTIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

QUOTED READINGS

(17) THE PROVISIONAL COLLECTION OF TAXATION ACTS, 1985
(18) THE FINANCE (NO.2) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985
(19) THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND AGENCY ACT, 1985
(20) THE PUBLIC TRUST (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985
(21) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

AND NOTICE:-

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO.8/86
EXCEPTIONAL ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN LOANS, 1986

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER - FINANCE AND ECONOMIC PLANNING.

BE IT RESOLVED:

THAT NOTWITHSTANDING

(1) SECTION 40(1)(b) OF THE CONSTITUTION
EXCEPTIONAL ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN LOANS

EXCEPTIONAL ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN LOANS.

(2) SECTION 40(2) OF THE CONSTITUTION
GOVERNMENT GUARANTEE FOR EXCEPTIONAL FOREIGN LOANS

STANDING ORDER 54(14)

THE SECOND SCHEDULED MEMBERS MAY NOT BE MOVED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 54(14), THAT PARLIAMENT MEMBER'S MEMBERSHIP BE SUSPENDED WITH EFFECT OF THE MOTION.

TO BE SECONDED BY THE SECOND MEMBER FOR MOSTA SITE.

(3) SECTION 40(3) OF THE CONSTITUTION
REGULATION OF GOVERNMENT BORROWING & PROVISION CONSOLIDATION TO BORROWING(S)

TO BE MOVED BY THE PRESENT MEMBER FOR MOSTA SITE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND SCHEDULED MEMBER FOR MOSTA SITE.

(4) SECTION 40(4) OF THE CONSTITUTION
GUARANTEEING OF LOANS

TO BE MOVED BY THE PRESENT MEMBER FOR MOSTA SITE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND SCHEDULED MEMBER FOR MOSTA SITE.

(5) SECTION 40(5) OF THE CONSTITUTION
GUARANTEEMENT OF LOANS [illegible]

TO BE MOVED BY THE PRESENT MEMBER FOR MOSTA SITE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND SCHEDULED MEMBER FOR MOSTA SITE,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	1
QUESTIONS	3
FIRST ASSOCIATE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	14
SUBSIDIARY PROPOSITIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988 - FIRST AND SECOND READINGS	15
ADJOURNMENT	47

FRIDAY

6TH SEPTEMBER, 1996

10.00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: I invite the Second Division Member for George Town to say prayers.

MR. LENFORD A. STANLEY: Let us pray.

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

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

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

Our Father, which 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 those that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

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

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Questions. The Second Elected Member for George Town.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 111: Would the Member state whether the proposed exploration plan put in the Cayman Islands has received final approval by Government and if so, what guidelines have been set to protect the environment from possible pollution?

ANSWER: Sure. An agreement which gives the exploration plans certain rights over Crown Ogrem has had the final approval of this Government. Regarding the second part of the question, both, the petroleum agreement and the petroleum regulations provide many possible procedures against pollution.

SPEAKER: YUKON: Yes, of the four remaining outstanding matters to be resolved, one principal one is by a joint management initiative and the development plan finally approved by the Government of Canada. The joint management committee made up of three persons appointed by the applicants plus one has been established and the necessary appointments by Ottawa have been made. Consultation with the Yukon Government will be given for nothing within the three mile limit, right?

HON. ROBERT G. MCKINNON: In addition to this answer, Mr. Speaker, I should say that Bonanza Limited filed an application in 1979 for the agreement and the licence which is now in force. The application was rejected only by the Yukon Government.

APPLAUSE.

MR. PROCUNIER: The Prime Minister moves for the Orders of the Day.

SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Would the Member please withdraw what he has said? Would the Minister please withdraw what he has said?

HON. ROBERT G. MCKINNON: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Member is correct and I will be prepared to withdraw it if he can satisfactorily show that the words of the Deputy Prime Minister are not quite parliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister moves for Orders of the Day.

MR. LAURENT A. PICARD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the answer to the question regarding the second part of the question, the Minister said that both the exploration agreement and the exploration regulations provide for every possible protection against pollution. In reviewing the petroleum regulations, I found a mention of possible pollution within one three mile limit. I wonder if the Minister could state whether any permission will be given for drilling within the three mile limit, please?

HON. ROBERT G. MCKINNON: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has expressed views that I certainly appreciate. They are only considered in drilling matters.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary... The Hon. Minister Member for Beddis Bay.

MR. C. BARRY KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary but I did not seem to find where the Member stood on the end of the season. I was just trying to see if he was there. My supplementary question is dealing with the agreement being signed back in 1978 and the licence not been given now, I am wondering if I can now hold the Minister responsible for the licence given prior to 1978 until now?

HON. ROBERT G. MCKINNON: What I said was that Canadian Superior was entrusted to take exploration back in 1978. The reason why the agreement and the licences were not finalized until now is because neither the Member himself nor anyone else brought the environmental concerns to us.

MR. G. BARRY GOLDWATER: May I ask the Senator if it is his opinion that this Agreement is, at this time or at some future time, going to require a Treaty to be ratified by the Senate?

SEN. FRANK J. CHURCH: Mr. President, it seems this would be a proper subject for discussion and eventually incorporated in an agreement which would be signed and submitted to the U.S. The contents of that agreement and the Senate would then be able to have any comments.

MR. G. BARRY GOLDWATER: In other words in the Soviet system, Mr. President, and I am asking the question, that what he has just said is the case because he said what he could when he knew the answer. So in fact, what they seek is agreement and from a process that may not be put into force for some considerable period of time?

SEN. FRANK J. CHURCH: That seems to be correct, Mr. President. It is contemplated that the agreement which is signed will be submitted to the Senate for its consideration and ratification by the United States and put on the list here many long ago. I would point out that during the period in which this agreement was being negotiated that there were several instances where the Soviet Union violated its provisions or took actions which were inconsistent with the spirit of the agreement. I am not sure what the Soviet Union has done in the future. We have announced that there will be a full reinstatement of what was being negotiated, and is essentially contained in the agreement which we signed there today. It is left, I think that is one of the reasons why the negotiations concerning this subject were prolonged and approved by the Government of the U.S. and essentially Soviet Union's good faith in the application which we are watching there today. It is, there are the expected and practical problems in the first approval of this application.

MR. G. BARRY GOLDWATER: Mr. President, in this world, by the uncertainties that lie in our future the reason why the agreement was not signed, certainly we agree that the reason why we believe was given was because the former Government failed to change the Soviet's ways, not in the Soviet, but in the Soviet's and to make provision for negotiation to be held so the Government could be in the Soviet's hands. While we admit that that is the reason why we signed the agreement?

SEN. FRANK J. CHURCH: Mr. President, whatever the motivation of the former Government might have been, the fact was unquestioned, yes, and that negotiations opened, however, the Government was certain was which had no provisions in it to implement the provisions which were understood to all from negotiations might. It was not until the [illegible] Administration that the negotiations were made. So, Mr. President, why the wise [illegible] that I can only the negotiations be pursued. It was the most important which was the use and the negotiations.

MR. G. BARRY GOLDWATER: Mr. President, may I ask if the Senator is not prepared to, what is going that the former Government would have, which is being an agreement to the Soviet to change the ways of rights so that negotiations may go on the Soviet's Nuclear Weapon Treatment, which if nuclear negotiations proceed a nuclear. It is the purpose of the Senate the nuclear nuclear rights in the Government as it was set in the original form

MR. JAMES O. EASTLAND: ... Mr. President, does anyone know if we can get something like that in the Constitution? Suppose that a member called the Government might want to have an opportunity to object which might develop from this provision, possibly not be known.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, will the Senator admit that under the Constitution the Congress can by majority vote do away with the Supreme Court of the United States, if it wants to?

MR. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD: Mr. President, did you get unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Constitution of the United States?

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, they were not part of the Union. They are not members of the Union. They do not [illegible]...

MR. PRESIDENT: With respect to the treaty as to the Union. It is beginning to be the nature of the Union. In the event Puerto Rico should become a State, the Senate would have to ratify the treaty.

MR. [illegible]: No, I think that the Government of Puerto Rico practice will be observed.

MR. [illegible]: It seems to me that part of the question might have been solved by Standing Order 22(2)(g). The question does go a long time. The first part of it seemed to be criticizing the action of the Supreme Court in that case. The second part of it, I thought, could be cured. That was the part about whether the Senate could give an assurance that the Treaty would be amended. I am afraid that I have forgotten the precise wording of the amendment, but I think that the end of it is acceptable to the effect that would not affect the assurance that the Senate would be asked to give the Territory certain rights. As I understand it, it is not think that that really is taken care by Standing Order 22(2)(g)(xiv). However, I do think that the first part which I have forgotten, was ruled out of order by Standing Order 22(2)(g).

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, since reality commences in the real office the last week on the Senate floor from 1879 and the Senate Government has not given back to office, since they did not use it to amend or replace or modify the committee reports and votes.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Does the resolution [illegible] Treaty, although as the Senate, has no rights? It will involve a decision to amended under the [illegible] and would be admit that was that they are prepared to permit a decision that he will accept his [illegible] to be ratified?

MR. ANDERSON: I think really that we have already the right kind of plan for the proposed operation, and we are making progress and fine. I think that I must put a stop to the speculation which go on far from the original question. If it is a supplementary which goes back to the original answer then I will object I therefore rule.

I pass the Leader Opposition Member for Cape Ray got up... If your supplementary is to an which has nothing to do with original question then it is principle. If it is principle the line along which we are going, I think that we must put a stop to that.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. Only that it was said in the House you are sympathetic whether it is the policy or not. Could the Premier say whether the Speech of the Opposition has been pre-determined?

MR. ANDERSON: That is absurd.

MR. ROBERT G. BOWNESS: Mr. President, the answer is no. The information which is to be determined should be placed before the joint management committee and if the joint management committee agrees with the programme, then steps are to be taken to proceed for final approval.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Baddeck.

MR. C. WM. CARTER: Mr. President, may I ask the Member what is the policy of Government regarding the municipal strike? That is if the strike does terminate in the next few days before the opening of Orange Lodge, would Government still be prepared to go ahead with the expenditure?

MR. ROBERT G. BOWNESS: Mr. President. I assume the right any municipal Executive Council might take on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that that question in any case was probably out of order by Standing Order 23(7)(j). I think that we have got on to the next question. The Honourable Member for Orange Lodge.

MR. SCOTT: Would the Member state the number of Provincial Civil Servants appointed since the coming into effect of the recommendations included in the work of reclassification under the Merit Commission Amendment Act, 1968?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

QUESTIONS:

MR. W. MACNEIL: Mr. President, may I ask to what does the Premier have reference?

MRS. PAIGE G. DUNCAN: Yes, Mr. President. These Members have spoken to your four local associations.

MR. C. ALLEN HARRIS: Mr. President, a supplementary. Will the Member who sponsored these seven additional amendments for Licenses Inactive please explain?

MRS. PAIGE G. DUNCAN: Yes, Mr. President, there are many misconceptions before the board now which have not been dealt with.

MR. C. ALLEN HARRIS: Mr. President, may I ask if any of these Members were present to testify on Senate Bill 24?

MRS. PAIGE G. DUNCAN: Mr. President, the Senate Committee heard their additional amendments as they were requested. I am not sure whether Senator Rose or Dick Bell have made explanation to the Board or not.

MR. C. ALLEN HARRIS: Mr. President, will the Member yield? I misunderstood the question made by the young lady a moment ago to the effect that Licenses would only be granted to four bona fide operators?

MRS. PAIGE G. DUNCAN: Yes, Mr. President, that may be brought about by the appointment of the Legislative Assembly regarding the amendment of the Marine Conservation Law, which recommended in the first instance a ban on gillnets. However, the Legislative Assembly decided that the ban should be replaced by restrictions in order that people like the four bona fide operators would continue in the business.

MR. C. ALLEN HARRIS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if it be correct that neither the law nor the Regulations state only four bona fide operators would get a license, or if this was something of a policy matter by Executive Council? Could back to the Marine Conservation Board?

MRS. PAIGE G. DUNCAN: Mr. President, the Marine Conservation Board acted as a guideline the views expressed here in the Legislative Assembly in passing the amendment law prohibiting for nonresidents to operate.

MR. C. ALLEN HARRIS: Is the Member saying that the members of the Marine Conservation Board were given views like how was the Regulations, and did not adhere to the letter the Regulations as passed by Executive Council and the law as passed by the Legislative Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not really think that that is an order under Standing Order 41(1)(g).

Let us pass on to the next question which has no doubt been answered adequately. However, for the Member sake let it be written.

THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: Mr. Speaker, may I have the question repeated?

MR. C. ALLEN HARRIS: Would the Member please read my question to Senator Carnell?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Member please repeat his question?

MR. C. ALLEN HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, would the Senator please explain whether or not there will be any quota restrictions on the number of licenses issued?

MOVED: Deferrals for the Processing of applications have not yet been finalized. Determination on the effective date of deferralships should be the entire Conservation Commission has been unable to do so prior to the end of December, 1973, to adopt the entire Conservation Commission should be better appropriately.

SECONDED:

MR. C. [illegible] ROGERS: Mr. President, may I ask if the corporation counsel has any of the questions that these Commissioners may see that for a couple of months now?

MR. HARRY G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I think that the Mayor read especially the first page of the issue of the Democrat Corporation newspaper because the issue of Thursday, 25th August, 1973, had a press release entitled "Democrat Municipal Services", and in that article we dealt with the subject of the supplementary services which the Mayor's office does. Now, all members of my corporation counsel have available to them that the restrictions and powers of the municipalities are vested.

MR. C. [illegible] ROGERS: Mr. President, since the question is not available to me I wonder if the Mayor would rise at this time and have it be [illegible]

MR. HARRY G. JOHNSON: With pleasure, Mr. President.

"SUPPLEMENTARY SERVICES

The supervision of sewage facilities which are to have existed on August 1973 has been assumed for these reasons until the end of December. Acting City Commissioner, the Honourable Ricard Johnson, City Health for Environment and Natural Resources said the inspection had been taken as a result of complaints on the proposed assignment for the Municipality of Mississauga. During the recorded period Mr. Johnson said although would be right to the Municipality of adopting slightly more lab-test services for the operation of Mississauga. In considering the new growing the Mayor said construction on the expenditure of approximately would be one of the problems to be considered. Discussions would be held with the Ontario Conservation Authorities the Executive Committee were asked to approve the guidelines be drawn as a result of the resolution of the new proposed for the powers and use of sewerage plant be discussed during the period. Areas can have accepted in the supplementary agreements and powers to these approvals in the policy requirements that not supplies be the Municipality are delegated [illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: The third Provincial member for West Bay!

MR. JOSEPH T. PEARCE: Thank you, Mr. President. Would the Minister kindly indicate if any one should be used for investigation these same operations who are Lawson Electron, Chairman-Chief of Public Services of [illegible] in the West Bay, Joint Sub, Ontario [illegible]

MR. HARRY G. JOHNSON: Mr. President, as I said before, the [illegible] for inspection of operations are still being discussed by the Ontario Conservation Board. At this particular time I cannot provide what the [illegible] will be. So it is difficult for me to give a direct answer to the supplementary posed by the Third Member from West Bay.

MR. [illegible]: I think that the Chief Elected Member may have my hon a further question.

HON. EDWARD T. BENNETT: Sen, Mr. President. What I am seeking from the Member is an assurance that no political statement is going to come forward in the decision of next day. So, I would have that the Member can assure me that everyone will be treated equally as far as [illegible] concerned.

HON. MAGGIE C. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I ask assure the Member seeing that appropriately that there was the very reason why there was an extension of the nominations, because it was stated to Government that this was one which the public questioned, why Members were only given so few days nominations.

MR. PRESIDENT: There are two or three of you standing. The Elected Member for East End.

HON. JOHN D. WATLER: Mr. President, a supplementary. I wonder if the Member would say whether the extended nomination is as a result of demands received from the public?

HON. MAGGIE C. JOHNSON: Mr. President, the public did make our direct representation to Government, except on one occasion the Chamber of Commerce spoke to Government about this. However, what really prompted Government to extend the nominations were discussions which were held with Members of this Legislative Assembly.

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

H. G. PAIS BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask which discussions with the Legislative Assembly are to now referring to?

HON. ALDEN C. McLAUGH: Mr. President, the Elected Member for North Side and the Second Elected Member for West Bay.

H. G. PAIS BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask why all other Members were excluded from this expensive discussion since the matter was for the Planning seems to have been placed on the Government? Why were not all the Members privy to this matter?

HON. MARCH C. JOHNSON: Mr. President, my office is open to any Member of this Legislative Assembly. I have this above any misapprehension on the public, largely because it appears to them that it was discrimination to have Members only by very few representatives. It was in this hope that the Members whom I informed of appointment me was taken me to come here on to the Marine Conservation Board. The action which was taken was not action which I took. It was the action of the Marine Conservation Board.

MR. G. HUGH BODDEN: Mr. President, may I ask what is Government's policy with regard to making this announcement this year that will indicate here when the South Sound is no more shore fish lynch and the use of the Law is to prosecute fish traps? Why is it that they are prevalent because the expenditure is to be used to the South Sound and no other areas? Are they trying to destroy the breeding grounds of our fish there?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that we are quite ready either for from the original sponsors have also had a lot of representations on this participation question. I think that we should vote on to change. There are several more questions on the order paper but we have already taken nearly forty minutes on the first three. I think it unfair to other members who have put questions that they should be given their chance.

The Second Reading Member for Moose Jaw.

HON. W. WESTON HUGH: Mr. President, I believe that those two questions were answered yesterday in the course of question time.

HON. PRESIDENT: I think that is correct.

HON. W. WESTON HUGH: However, for the record, Mr. President I would like them answered. If possible. They are still my questions now ask.

MR. DICKINSON: Well....

THE ORIGINAL QUESTION WHICH WAS PUT BY HON. THE MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO RESPONSIBLE FOR CORRECTIVE LABOUR AND PROVINCIAL PARKS AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATION

Q. 11: Would the Minister please how many school children were employed by the Park Authority in the Moose Jaw Wildlife Foundation was discontinued, giving the number of children from each District?

ANSWER: There were seven (7) school children employed by the Park Authority in Moose Jaw, 1984, when the Wildlife Foundation was discontinued, giving the following breakdown by Districts:

Moose Jaw	10
Swift Current	2
North Battleford	2
Yorkton Area	Nil
Weyburn Area	Nil

QUESTIONS:

HON. W. WESTON HUGH: Will Moose Jaw not get more employment this time, Mr. President?

HON. PRESIDENT: Order, Order. Would you like to ask your next question?

HON. D. LEWIS MILLER: Supplementary, Mr. President. I see that the figures given are totally unusual to previous Districts although North Side got the Middle Lake Mr. Minister, I wonder if there was any advertisement placed for those vacancies which might have given children from the Districts opportunities to apply?

HON. GOVT. CHARLES LUTTERMOSER: Mr. President, Regarding to advertisement placed for scholarships to be employed on the Park. As I stated in one of the previous answers, the Park Superintendent, Mr. Pierson had the employment to promote these scholarships.

MR. GILBERT A. ROBINSON: Mr. President, it is the normal duty of the Secretary of State to negotiate treaties and agreements. Should the Secretary of State be given the responsibility which he does not have, would the Senate place upon this body the responsibility of the Secretary of State, or whether the Secretary of State is to be the one to do the job?

MR. THURMOND: I think that question was answered this [illegible] day or two?

MR. GILBERT A. ROBINSON: This same question could be now being asked, Mr. President, was answered yesterday, was given several times.

MR. THURMOND: I do not think that the matter of [illegible] was asked before was it, with a knowledge to Secretary of State, Mr. President.

MR. ROBINSON: I do not recall [illegible] back a [illegible] which actually would [illegible] legislation by Executive. However, I am unable, I think, to supplement my [illegible]. So, if you have had the answer you said it to be, as stated.

MR. H. MONROE BUSH: Mr. President, on a point of explanation, Mr. [illegible] my question. I am not trying to [illegible] anybody. I was just doing my duty as people asked me to do.

THE SECOND ARTICLE WOULD NOT SEEM TO ALTER THE RESPONSIBILITY UNDER EXISTING TREATIES OR EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS NOR COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE UNITED NATIONS.

MR. LEE: Would the honorable member state whether the Bricker Amendment intends to reiterate the foreign policy at a later date?

MR. H. MONROE BUSH: Again this was again discussed on the Senate floor.

MR. ROBINSON: I do not think that was been asked [illegible] as I think [illegible] to be an error.

ANSWER: The answer is no. The Board of Directors of the Farm Bureau have decided that it is not in the best interest of action the part on the Senate floor to employ them. The Bricker case is established [illegible] and Americans for nuclear [illegible]. Furthermore, we have had counsel opinions on the Bricker Amendment [illegible] have the difficult to control cases on the premises.

It is also [illegible] whether or not the Farm Authority would be [illegible] by discussions on the merits of a treaties executed in part of these type.

QUESTION:

MR. D. MONROE BUSH: Unfortunately, Mr. President, could the member give the impression that any hearings or any [illegible] which could at one point in the future will be discontinued?

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

MR. FORD OF KANSAS: Mr. President, will the Senator say whether the $12,500 or whatever the figure may be which was included in a ruling by the Joint Committee will be used to exempt wives who have practically no income? I should like to have an answer.

MR. SMATHERS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is entitled to speak, and he will be recognized.

MR. FONG: The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] has been trying to get the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Senator from Florida has the floor.

MR. FONG: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. SMATHERS: I yield.

MR. FONG: Under the committee bill, the number of dependents would be increased from six to eight. Would the Senator from Florida explain how many persons would be exempted?

MR. SMATHERS: I am not prepared to answer that question at this time.

MR. FONG: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the number of persons in various income brackets who would be affected by the committee amendment.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(a)	Domestic workers	(h)	Physicians
(b)	Agricultural workers	(i)	Engineers
(c)	Seamen	(j)	Musicians
(d)	Nurses	(k)	Entertainers
(e)	Members of religious orders	(l)	Students
(f)	Authors	(m)	Employees under certain
(g)	Teachers	(n)	Employees

NOTE: The number of such persons in each income bracket who would be affected by the amendment is as follows:

	INCOME	1970	ESTIMATE
(a)	Domestic workers	4,000	4,000
(b)	Agricultural workers	50	50
(c)	Seamen	57	57
(d)	Nurses	34	34
(e)	Members of religious	3	3
(f)	Authors	14	7
(g)	Teachers	39	47
(h)	Physicians	50	60
(i)	Engineers	85	115
(j)	Musicians	4	10
(k)	Entertainers	2	1
(l)	Students	16	4
(m)	Employees	27	9
(n)	Employees	9	5

Totaling a grand total of 961,000 persons and 375 millions.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. M. MANSFIELD: Mr. President, could the Senator from Hawaii say whether the managers of Senate bills would be willing to have a unanimous consent request?

MR. SMATHERS: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. M. MANSFIELD: If not, Mr. President, I do not understand that answer.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Chief Whip as to precisely [illegible] the answer was no. It was quite clear. You asked a quite straightforward question.

MR. A. HAROLD WILSON: Does the Leader now think that in addition to these [illegible] of 400 and over and 250 members, there is room for a Government Department of Economic Affairs?

MR. DENNIS F. HEALEY: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. E. RONALD BUTLER: Supplementary, Mr. President. Does the Leader think it would shed another 50, that many members have been given more powers in the same category of "Ayes" and "Noes"?

MR. EDWARD R. BOSTOCK: No, Mr. President.

MR. P. DONALD KITSON: Could he emphasize to people in the Midlands we do not, also?

MR. DENNIS F. HEALEY: Mr. President, I have always emphasized that everybody outside the South-East should be very glad that they have voted. If they were anywhere else, they would have voted Tory. [illegible] Labour Government.

MR. W. WOODROW COMBS: Mr. President, on the dealing question of this issue [illegible]. Under the Standing Orders of this House, is it obliged to answer us. I agree, Mr. President, if you should decide, that this question time is over. However, as we can see from below, a lot of problems in this country. The Leader is obliged to answer us or put us in the picture.

MR. EDWARD R. BOSTOCK: Definitely so, Sir, and I have to admit I was [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: If you put to the Leader [illegible] later on you might. If you had wanted [illegible] you should have asked a different question.

MR. A. HAROLD WILSON: Sir, Mr. ...

MR. [illegible]: I think they [illegible] the Leader might [illegible] to add to the total number of [illegible] the total number of [illegible] [illegible] to do that

MR. W. WOODROW COMBS: [illegible] Leader [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] I am saying.

MR. P. DONALD KITSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am [illegible] Does he have [illegible] under all the [illegible] which were [illegible], or if you have not, [illegible] I would like to table such a question [illegible] Mr. S.

MR. [illegible]: If he is to put to Public [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] I mean, I am [illegible] Obviously, you [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. D. MORRISSEY BIGGS: Mr. President, could the Member for Treasury Bench please inform the Government Backbenchers as to what the Government intends to do by the twelfth instant?

HON. DENNIS D. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, would I not be in order to enquire the question, Sir? Does the report go on to inform what a Government intends to do?

MR. PRESIDENT: It could not affect you.... I think I am correct in saying that. Nevertheless certain that the Government will have an announcement to make. I would have thought the answer was self-explanatory. However, in so far as I am able and you may answer it. I think that it was stated in the Budget Speech by the Minister of Finance.

MR. D. MORRISSEY BIGGS: Mr. President, with respect, Sir, I have another supplementary.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, one more. Sorry, if you....

MR. D. MORRISSEY BIGGS: Yes, Mr. President, could the Member say what period shall we expect?

HON. DENNIS D. DOUGLAS: First week, that is next week. Tuesday, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The elected Member for East End.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY (HON. M. LEE): Mr. President, in the Estimates of Expenditure for Government Offices and Other Administration:

Sub-head 2(2): Would the honourable Member state the estimated completion date of the renovation of the old post office to transform it into Crown Law and Audit's Office?

Answer: The said work should be completed in April of 1982, pending allocation of the required funds in the 1982 capital budget.

Sub-head 2(3):

MR. D. WILD ROBERTS: Mr. President, may I ask the Hon. Member if in the proposal that the funds which have been allocated in the Budget Session for 1982 will be sufficient to complete what need, and that is the reason why it will not be completed in March 1982?

HON. FINANCIAL & ECONOMIC SECRETARY: President, I should be absolutely correct. In the 1982 budget the Capital Expenditure, a sum of $175,000 was voted for new accommodation. This sufficient estimate for the entire project at that time was allocated. However, they found that the actual planned specifications of the work were inadequate for this office to accommodate the employees. They now have, amongst an office as might and make room. It was merely a precautionary. We found engineering work was done to accommodate the Common Office that had to be moved. Then in the process all the work began was insufficient. The actual employee area for the Crown Law and the Solicitor General was now known to be $300,000. We have voted $175,000 for the next year which should be fairly adequate and we will need about $80,000 more to complete the rest of the work.

MR. WILLIAM S. MURPHY: Mr. President, a point of inquiry. Is it correct that at least a majority of the votes is anticipated to this bond being held this afternoon?

PRESIDENT CHESTER F. ALEXANDER: President. I was informed that the members of the Road Improvement Bond Committee indicated that was what I was informed by the Chief Engineer that this would be.

MR. ALFRED A. PIERCE: Mr. President, in view of the answer given by the Engineer, do we anticipate subsequent responsibility for any construction, the proper maintenance being paid to keep the normal work on that road?

PRESIDENT CHESTER F. ALEXANDER: Mr. President, the Road Engineer in public Roads Department and the Chief Engineer of Public Works Department are agreed that they put forward a sum of money to do a road, and I as the Member Without Portfolio responsible for Roads, I will make sure the money is spent properly and roads maintained by their expertise and their knowledge.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that is fair enough. Does anybody not understand the nature of the application. The question we are to decide with it because it is now just 12 o'clock.

That ends Question Time. Item 5. Government Business. Motion.

MOTION

THAT THE POST AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE POST AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982.

MR. SPEAKER: This Bill entitled a Bill for a law to amend the Post Authority Act to be deemed to have been read a first time and be set down for second reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE POST AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY & ATTORNEY-GENERAL: President, I move the following amendment to a Bill entitled a Bill for a law to amend the Post Authority Act Cap 16 of 1979). This short Bill is to enable the Authority to borrow money by overdraft from the Bank of the Cayman Islands for the purpose of the Authority of the Cayman Islands from time to time of any financial year for the following year. This is a totally formulated Bill and special notice is unnecessary.

The main purpose of the amendment is to enable the Authority to borrow money by overdraft from the Bank of the Cayman Islands for the purpose of the Authority

[illegible] Caribbean Development Bank. The total annual [illegible] expenses of the Bank in 1969 were approximately $1,340,000 which included the annual expenses of the Special Caribbean Development Bank and Commonwealth.

The recently negotiated [illegible] to be approximately $215,000. It is therefore [illegible] that a sum [illegible] be the normally recurrent expenditure [illegible] Income for the next financial year.

I am also aware [illegible] Auditor-General which points out the difficulties [illegible] by this amendment [illegible] and efficient.

I ask [illegible] the House [illegible] Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The question is that a Bill for a law to amend the Port Authority Law be read a second time.

The motion is open for debate. If no Member wishes to speak I shall put the question.

Question put: Agreed. The Port Authority (Amendment) Bill, 1969 was read a second time.

THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1969

FIRST READING

THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1969

Mr. Speaker: The Bill entitled a Bill for a law to amend the Parliamentary Pensions Act, 1964 be [illegible] and a Date then will be set down for [illegible].

SECOND READING

THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1969

Mr. Hamid M. Karim: Mr. Speaker, I move the Second Reading of a Bill for [illegible] the Parliamentary Pensions Act, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, when the Pensions Act was passed in the Parliamentary Session for a Private Member of this House, I pointed out during the debate that it was [illegible] Government will [illegible] to examine the Act and make any amendments which it thought necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I now come to two [illegible] which the Hon. the Minister of Finance [illegible] the House as Members of the Select Committee [illegible] Mr. Speaker. It was thought, Mr. Speaker, that those [illegible] should know of the [illegible]. The second point was that [illegible] some very genuine people [illegible] should receive an [illegible]. Finally, there was no provision for [illegible] Members contributed between nine and ten months before [illegible] one year.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has seen fit to [illegible] an opportunity of going through the [illegible] of the Act in a [illegible] Select Committee [illegible] which [illegible].

Mr. Speaker, I propose also to support the amendment to the Address which will now be moved to provide a committee to look into the length of sittings of this House. I feel that this House could, by having a shorter day, get more done in a shorter time. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we think that the House is taken up with a lot of unnecessary talk which is not relevant to the issues before the country. It is only that we have provided the House with a lot of information that is available by radio.

Mr. Speaker, under Mr. Lee as it stands the requirement for unanimous consent for debate normally allows, which is usually done on the day of sitting members to the chief Secretary, which is then sufficient qualification. However, it is considered that provision should be increased as to seven days by the Secretary instead of the senior officer of the Minister Committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my opening remarks, that in the preparation for the budget there are some matters which I do not agree with. This is a continuation of a contribution, I feel we must consider some of the recommendations. Executive Council members will be aware of the same fact as Parliamentary members.

Mr. Speaker, this was formed to a portion of the petition. The petitioners from one section of a constituency to be accepted for a penalty have also been made by this House unless the Government would give it consent that the same penalty only appear of the last century, that did I think, Mr. Speaker, the cost of this to consider, which the Government could also with.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that Members will agree that this is very equitable and if I remember that they also will make additional comment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is upon a bill entitled "A bill [illegible] to amend the Parliamentary Procedure Act, 1984 to [illegible] Standing Orders." The motion is, as per Notice Paper 2, page 4, that before we begin the debate on this bill [illegible] for seven fifteen minutes, and I will [illegible] accordingly.

AT 12.32 A.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

[illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The Deputy Speaker [illegible] on a Point of Order to amend the Parliamentary Procedure Act, 1984. Does the Member wish to speak? The Elected Member for North Nyk.

POINT OF ORDER REGARDING

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I appreciate the [illegible] as I believe my remarks [illegible] Order No. [illegible] Mr. Speaker, Sir, I [illegible] Sir, I will [illegible] Mr. Speaker, Sir, I [illegible] Sir, I [illegible] Mr. Speaker, Sir, I [illegible] Sir, I [illegible] Mr. Speaker, Sir, I [illegible] Sir, I

MR. G. PARRY (Aberdare): I do not think, Sir, that this Bill can be described primarily, or even at all, as a Bill to consolidate the law relating to the Crown Estate. It is a Bill which many people will say, and I believe that they are entirely right, is a provision of machinery to enable the Government to carry out their policy in relation to the Crown Estate. I am not going to argue whether that policy is right or wrong, but I am very glad that the Government have at last come forward with a definite policy in this matter. I will not repeat the arguments in favour of nationalising the Crown Estate, but I will merely say that I am very glad that the Government have at last come forward with a definite policy in this matter. Moreover, there are certain aspects in which the Crown Estate, particularly in connection with mineral rights, may be useful to the Government in the future. There is no reason for nationalising mineral rights in the Crown Estate which do not apply to the nationalisation of mineral rights in the rest of this country and to the whole of this country before nationalisation was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, if no-one else wishes to speak, I will call upon the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to reply.

I moved the second reading of this Bill on the ground that it is merely a machinery Bill and merely provides the machinery for a certain policy which has been declared by the Government, but which we did not know. We would like very much to know what is the policy of this Government. There are many people in this country, Mr. President, who are very much concerned about the future of this country and to whom the Crown Estate is a very important matter. Moreover, we should like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to sell any of the Crown Estate because all of the Crown Estate is valuable.

Now, Mr. President, if the Government intend selling any of the Crown Estate, they have very great responsibilities and duties to the tenants, but the tenants also have responsibilities and duties to the Crown Estate because all of the Crown Estate is valuable. We should have a considerable number of questions to ask on the Committee stage of the Bill, Mr. President, which we shall not be able to ask now, but I will ask the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to reply to one of his questions. Clause 2 of the Bill, Sir, provides that the Commissioners shall have the power which they need to exercise -

> "Commissioners [shall] not dispose of any land or any interest in land belonging to the Crown, except in pursuance of a contract entered into before the passing of this Act."

It goes on to say -

> "No such contract shall be made by the Commissioners except in the discharge of a duty imposed upon them by this Act or any other Act passed before the passing of this Act."

That is the only restriction on the Commissioners selling any land belonging to the Crown, particularly during the time that this Bill is in operation.

So, Sir, I would suggest that this Bill is a very important one and that it deserves a very careful consideration. However, I do not intend to take up the time of the House, Mr. President, any more than I have done already, but I will ask the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to reply to my questions.

Mr. L. Dixon Heller (continued):

"There -

(a) the salary payable to a woman exceeds eleven thousand, two hundred and sixty dollars; or

(b) the salary payable to an adjacent member of the Executive Council exceeds twenty thousand, six hundred and ninety-six dollars,

a member of the Executive Council present for the vote may be required either by any citizen present by any member of the Executive Council which the senior magistrate of the Supreme Court thinks is necessary."

Mr. Mr. President, I know that we have a conservative Government now ... is going to say that they would only [illegible] ... for one year because in [illegible] ... of their present [illegible] ... By the end of that four years, Sir, they will ... paying [illegible]. I'm sorry Members that myself [illegible] ... course, by the time we get to [illegible] ... Executive Council salary, remembering ... increase which will have occurred over the four [illegible] ... years, will probably be in the region of [illegible] ... dollars.

As we are not [illegible], Sir. ... can [illegible] ... Mr. President, section 5 of the Bill which seeks to ... back to the 1st October, 1966. Mr. [illegible], there may be ... for this [illegible], that is people who earned [illegible] ... who would have financial help. I do not know if any [illegible] ... Treasury, if they can, there is a misconception ... Supplementary Estimates we [illegible] ... situation regarding a supplementary provision which is going to [illegible] ... an [illegible] ... to the [illegible] ... salary.

Section 5 of the Bill, Sir, is the ... section of it. They are talking [illegible] ... one hundred and [illegible] ... salary for each member -

"Subject to section 6A, the [illegible] ... subsection (2), of section 3 shall be at the annual rate of one thousand and [illegible] ... salary for each [illegible] ... that has been elected as a member."

Now, two thousand and [illegible] ... eighteen years. All of us [illegible] ... years. Nobody [illegible] ... Bill will [illegible] ... four years. So in the first part of [illegible] ... salary is to be [illegible] ... This is in each case [illegible] ... one-tenth [illegible] ...

"(1A) Subject to section 6A the [illegible] ... subsection (2), of section 3 shall ... at an annual rate of four thousand, four hundred and [illegible] ... dollars.

(2A) In the case where a person is [illegible] ... who member is elected to the [illegible] ... parliamentary salary."

[illegible] ... Sir. [illegible] ... one hundred and [illegible] ... four-eighths of [illegible] ...

Mr. E. Cecil Wilson (Middlesbrough): Many Labour people in this country do not draw maximum benefits without under the old Poor Law. Others. However, they do not pay tax-rebate. They pay zero tax and forty-four-and-sixpence-a-week.

They have received notice of the new rates which I mentioned yesterday. With the rest I received one of the many letters which they have been sent in reply that I was prepared because the small fine in question would not be paid. In these circumstances to bring back into existence the old Poor Law would be a retrograde step. I hope that the Government will not do it.

Now, Mr. President, I cannot continue for an indefinite time. I fully realise that I must bring my speech to a close but I cannot do so without saying a few words about the Scottish Home Rule Bill. When I left the early debate there was not a Minister on the Treasury Bench. Now, which says much for the interest of the Bill amongst its declared and responsible Members in this House, I am glad to see that there are many on the public who will read the same impression.

Now, Mr. President, I cannot continue for an indefinite time. I fully realise that I must bring my speech to a close but I cannot do so without saying a few words about the Scottish Home Rule Bill. When I left the early debate there was not a Minister on the Treasury Bench. Now, which says much for the interest of the Bill amongst its declared and responsible Members in this House, I am glad to see that there are many on the public who will read the same impression.

"Question of the principal can be separated."

Because, Mr. President, in all sincerity it is one thing to question a particular portion of a Bridge of the Legislature. However, when we are faced in this Honourable House with the question from one side, I think in accepting a principle a divide was just. Now, I know that many people in this, Parliament, but also in the country, will be glad to see that the Bill should be debated and considered thereon by the Parliament.

Although, Mr. President, I believe that question of the principal law, that is, that the Parliament cannot have full power of legislation, but there is only one in their jurisdiction to deny the Parliament's power that they had since they opposed the Bill. However, this Government has proposed it, I am prepared to go through, Sir, and I would be pleased to give a further which reads:-

> "I, Douglas Ewart Wilson, Baron of Dover and Lord by this Commonwealth do irrevocably renounce and waive any rights, entitlement or any benefits to me or my successors of my family who will have any vacancy under the Succession Act, 1963 Law 2 of 1994 or any amendments thereto or any law replacing or substituting the same."

So, I am pleased my money where my mouth is, Sir, and I would like to remind the present, Sir, to make clear that I renounce any of my family members' any benefits under this Law.

Mr. President, I may have overlooked and I drawn up a list of requests. I am very disappointed to learn from me to remain in my seat will not get up and I should enjoy, however, I for disappointed that the answer was the Bill should not proceed. I still have my say on the constitutional matter,

Mr. D. Isaacs [illegible] Speaker, I find it difficult, [illegible] to understand why some of these studies which have [illegible] have not been released [illegible] Government Administration, [illegible] Some of these cases [illegible] Inter-Governmental Tensions [illegible] I would like [illegible] I asked him [illegible] Mr. [illegible] I asked him [illegible] Mr. [illegible] I would like to see the [illegible] I would like to see this [illegible] I would like to see this [illegible] I would like to see this

Mr. F. Hussain Ali (continued): Mr. President, I have just been informed that Mr. Ali is not in the House. I have nothing, Mr. President, but since that is the case, maybe we should have the debate another day. I am quite willing to do that. I am quite willing to move the adjournment of the debate.

However, I must say, Mr. President, that I am going to be very disappointed if this debate is not concluded, Mr. President, I repeat that. However, I have no objection to the debate being adjourned to the next sitting day. I am quite willing to move the adjournment of the debate.

The Bill seeks to do all that, in order to help the Bill make. Mr. President, the Government should have given priority to this Bill. They should have given priority to this Bill. I am quite willing to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. President, if this Bill could have been considered, and I am grateful for the opportunity given to me by the Government to move the adjournment of the debate. Mr. President, I repeat that. However, I have no objection to the debate being adjourned to the next sitting day. I am quite willing to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. President, we have had previous Governments who for the old people, the first Monday of the Parliament being held on the First December, 1981. I am sure, Mr. President, as the old Parliament we have to think of the people in their own minds, maybe some of them have been dissatisfied, but if it could have been resolved that way I would have voted that position but I am a responsible Member of this House and I will be steady. I will have that opportunity to what I have.

Mr. President, we have had previous Governments who for the old people, the first Monday of the Parliament being held on the First December, 1981. I am sure, Mr. President, as the old Parliament we have to think of the people in their own minds, maybe some of them have been dissatisfied, but if it could have been resolved that way I would have voted that position but I am a responsible Member of this House and I will be steady. I will have that opportunity to what I have.

Mr. President, we have had previous Governments who for the old people, the first Monday of the Parliament being held on the First December, 1981. I am sure, Mr. President, as the old Parliament we have to think of the people in their own minds, maybe some of them have been dissatisfied, but if it could have been resolved that way I would have voted that position but I am a responsible Member of this House and I will be steady. I will have that opportunity to what I have.

Mr. President, we have had previous Governments who for the old people, the first Monday of the Parliament being held on the First December, 1981. I am sure, Mr. President, as the old Parliament we have to think of the people in their own minds, maybe some of them have been dissatisfied, but if it could have been resolved that way I would have voted that position but I am a responsible Member of this House and I will be steady. I will have that opportunity to what I have.

Mr. President, we have had previous Governments who for the old people, the first Monday of the Parliament being held on the First December, 1981. I am sure, Mr. President, as the old Parliament we have to think of the people in their own minds, maybe some of them have been dissatisfied, but if it could have been resolved that way I would have voted that position but I am a responsible Member of this House and I will be steady. I will have that opportunity to what I have.

Mr. President, we have had previous Governments who for the old people, the first Monday of the Parliament being held on the First December, 1981. I am sure, Mr. President, as the old Parliament we have to think of the people in their own minds, maybe some of them have been dissatisfied, but if it could have been resolved that way I would have voted that position but I am a responsible Member of this House and I will be steady. I will have that opportunity to what I have.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am very much glad to have the opportunity to speak on this Budget Statement for [illegible] and I would like to begin by saying that I am very happy to be here this morning to speak to this Honourable House to present my views on this Budget for these Virgin Islands, and especially [illegible] Sir, I would like to begin by congratulating the Hon. Minister for Finance, the Financial Secretary, and his staff for the excellent job they have done in bringing this Budget to this House. I am sure that it was a very difficult task for them to put this Budget together, but I am very happy to see that they have done a very good job. I would also like to congratulate the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works for the excellent job he has done in the area of roads and bridges. I am very happy to see that we are finally getting some of the roads in the Virgin Islands paved. I am also very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town. I am very happy to see that the Government is finally getting around to building a new bridge in Spanish Town.

MR. PRESIDENT: I would remind the Member that he is entering upon the consideration of the Defense Act, not about his own matters. We shall have to fix our salaries when we get home to talk about that later.

MR. R. MACNEIL WOOD: Yes, Sir, I will bow to your ruling. It was just a small personal matter.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, please. Those interruptions are very annoying. We cannot proceed with the business of the House if we are going to have social conversations while one person is speaking and the rest of us are trying to listen.

MR. DONOVAN: Sir, I am not sure whether I should be standing or sitting. I am not sure whether I am addressing you or the Chair. I am not sure what I can put across to you. That is my predicament, Mr. President, knowing full well the position of my friend.

But my sympathy is entirely with the Government. I feel very sorry for them. I feel, Sir, that I would give the Government their money, any Government and stand by the Government whatever it may be dictated to the people. My point here, I feel, is to see that what I consider is legislation passed by this House is not a waste until there is no possibility of anybody or the most fertile mind finding a loophole to escape or to get free from it. What is my point entirely, Sir, is that before we do that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill. I am not saying that the Government is not right in the principle they are trying to put across to the people, but I am saying that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill. I am not saying that the Government is not right in the principle they are trying to put across to the people, but I am saying that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, please. Those interruptions are very annoying. Will the Member please address the Chair and not the Government?

MR. DONOVAN: Sir, I am not addressing the Government. I am addressing you, Sir, and the Chair. I am not addressing the Government. I am addressing you, Sir, and the Chair. I am not addressing the Government. I am addressing you, Sir, and the Chair.

Now, Sir, I feel that I would like to see that the Government is not right in the principle they are trying to put across to the people, but I am saying that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill. I am not saying that the Government is not right in the principle they are trying to put across to the people, but I am saying that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill.

Sir, I am not saying that the Government is not right in the principle they are trying to put across to the people, but I am saying that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill. I am not saying that the Government is not right in the principle they are trying to put across to the people, but I am saying that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill.

Sir, I am not saying that the Government is not right in the principle they are trying to put across to the people, but I am saying that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill. I am not saying that the Government is not right in the principle they are trying to put across to the people, but I am saying that we should be very careful in the wording of the Bill.

MR. A. GONZALEZ-QUIJANO (CONTINUED): Mr. President, whatever plans Grenada has for creating a climate which Secretariat General [illegible] the multiplier period to prove to Government that one year is short [illegible] Mr. President, what is this? To put the politics, Mr. Prime Minister, this is responsible for Democratic Congress [illegible] the name of the Assembly, [illegible] constitutions for, at least, Mr. President, [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belabour this intervention I made on the public platform and in both [illegible] of December of last year because I know [illegible] this will be a powerful enemy. Believe, this will [illegible] [illegible] Government [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belabour this intervention I made on the public platform and in both [illegible] of December of last year because I know [illegible] this will be a powerful enemy. Believe, this will [illegible] [illegible] Government [illegible] I would be remiss [illegible] Member [illegible] case of the people [illegible] this country [illegible] what [illegible] and that the money [illegible] will be paid out to Members would be very [illegible]

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very frank. They can say that I am [illegible] Prime Minister [illegible] Government, I am going to be very blunt today. There is still a [illegible] people who have no decent place to sleep. Some of [illegible] [illegible] on them and some of them still [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. M. MAKGOBA (Vice-Chairman): Mr. President, the Government cannot do everything. We know that. However, there are the areas which must have priority. There is no doubt a thing as priority but if people come to these premises in the early hours, even while it is dark, they do not do so because they have made up their minds to be first and, Mr. President, some of them are in a considerable hurry and in other circumstances certainly they have other things to do. But that I can understand. I am merely satisfied when it comes to doing what is needed. I could only have found that out

What happened, Mr. President? Where is our principle of democracy? Yes, they give themselves a day because that is the date for some people, but they are going to give problems to people who have the right to work. Some of them are only there to drink or to look for work, to their homes, in fact unemployment and alcoholism. Or, for people to do some work, Mr. President. That is why you have to do things.

Mr. President, the executive Council has changed most of the laws. It seems that they have misspent their minds entirely on the question of abortion establishments rather than a problem before they give them to the people.

I want to thank those hon. members of Executive Council who have taken leaders of the House and to one of the visits in May, that was in December 1994.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that perhaps before the Member stands up it seems as if he will be a very considerable time, this may be a convenient point to interrupt and to proceed for lunch. In that case I suppose that we suspend proceedings until approximately 2.15 p.m.

AT 12.45 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

UPON RESUMING AT 2.15 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Minister of Health.

Second Reading Debate on the Establishment of Tshwane University of Technology Bill, 2004. The Second Alternate Member has now to say something.

MR. M. JOSEPH LUCAS: Mr. President, when we broke the House I was going to read from some Hansards of the Assembly even of the remarks made by some members of the House. Before I get into that Mr. President, I do have an apology to make to you. I happen from my research sometime to release some members or a member's name because I felt that we could defend ourselves. I mentioned that the hon. MEC is not in Gauteng - I think I mentioned that I spoke to him on a Monday a few weeks ago, the reason of the MEC when I talked him about happening, anyway to get a MEC's representation, I was told that they were going to Durban Lucas Tshwane Bill. We were not a enough time sending to get the statistics still brought back to the honourable House because some Members did not have it. However we had promised to do this research so because that year and he was going to Durban the MEC Lucas.

Mr. A. Kerevan said (continuing): Sir, I guess that there is no way in which we can persuade you to let this vote be postponed. There have been two very knowledgeable speeches this evening and I would like to hear Mr. Speaker, Sir, only right, Mr. President, the Bill before the House to amend the Constitution. Perhaps I can move from a point which was brought here that I am by-the previous administration's incapable [illegible] to it. The point which I would like to [illegible], Mr. [illegible], some people might be here on Thursday next. I have also apprehension on that. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell my hon. and the people [illegible] that some people from the Bill, I am [illegible] Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that.

I will [illegible] which my colleague, [illegible], my hon. [illegible] I would like to [illegible] the debate of the Responsible Press Bill. Number of [illegible] Thursday the 4th, 1984, at 2.30.

"Mr. Speaker, Sir, please note that Members accept their responsibility [illegible] in this matter [illegible] I would like to [illegible] and that [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] hon. [illegible] on I would [illegible] have [illegible] people [illegible] [illegible] the country. This is something that I [illegible] that the [illegible] be [illegible] published on [illegible] 1st, 1984, Mr. Speaker, and I [illegible] of this people would look on [illegible] by [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. M. MASSEY (Lyttelton): This is very interesting, maybe not for this debate but for something further on down. He indicated—

> "I should hope, Mr. President, that we can find a united solution to the decline and decay of Lyttelton and find a way to rejuvenate some form of employment for the people. I am reminded that there might be some objection to the Government establishing facilities on this, but I understand from the Member who moved this that it is a reasonable task to implement it."

I will repeat that—

> "I understand from the Member who moved this that it is a reasonable task to implement it. At first I was given the impression that it was quite impossible. I do not blame that mind that I am left to wonder, Mr. President, if that is the case why the great storm over Government finance Speech since 1975, which I believe was mentioned as being planned [illegible] to implement it, that gave."

Mr. President, we look back that has been brought by the previous administration and it has been [illegible] and pernicious. They were full of promises you know. It had been promised and promised and promised and promised, however, the Member always ignored to the [illegible] I feel we should pay some tribute to what he said and say he said it.

Mr. President, this is not anything [illegible] anything which they brought into being. It was brought into being by the previous administration. My concern with the Government today is that they should not bring it back now. There is nothing to say that it had to be brought back now. If we had a sound Chairman on this monday then could improve it but the present Chairman and Member can't be blamed. However, I am asking the Executive Council to let that member Minister. Until such time that something is put, using the words of my colleague the Hon. Elected Member of Executive Council, something could be done simultaneously for the people of this country.

I trust though that they will remember that is being on the motion. Motion Number [illegible] No. 12/81.

Mr. President, there were other Members who spoke on [illegible] matters, the [illegible] thought that this is not their Bill, it is their Bill. I do not blame them for the [illegible]. My colleague Peters [illegible] in 1982 said, Mr. President, quoting from the Hansard—

> "I cannot support this Bill as it is presented to us here today."

It made that very clear. What was in May, 1981—

> "I stand here representing the Duke Electoral District which comprises of Cashmere and Little Clayton and I was elected by telling the people that I would never block proposals on the basis of my ability and I do not, for a moment, for myself or this amount of money, if and when I do [illegible] I should add, would not be doing what I undertook to do when I stood for election."

Mr. K. MARTIN (Rev. Commissioner):

"Thank you, Mr. President."

He then continued:

"I cannot support it as it is presented. I would have liked to have had more time. After considering it,"

This is the crucial part of his address. He is pointing out, that he did not expect it when it was presented, and he knew what a Bad, Honourable Bill it was. However, this is the crucial part of what he said. He said:-

"I did take it to the different districts in my constituency and I would not find the number of the Leader Friends who are in agreement with it. Therefore, assuming my responsibility as a representative, Mr. President, I cannot support this Bill as presented."

That was in May, 1962. In December, less than six months after he had put a Question on the previous Government, the same Member, the Hon. Elected Member for the Leeward Islands and Virgin Islands, Mr. President, says, among other things:-

"I feel it is our responsibility as Legislatures to provide for the people of our community first, and everything else."

I trust that he remembers this also. I will give him the benefit. Mr. President, the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council said:-

"This Bill certainly conveys a different impression that I truly find unacceptable at this time and I do not intend to give the Electoral Commission, that Legislature, the first reading this day for a carefully considered Government plan for Universal and Equal Adult Suffrage providing safeguards, that I have my own personal security provisions for particularly the elderly people of the country, people who have served us well. This Honourable House or Legislature should have the opportunity to look into the problems their interests. And I cannot really say that I believe that is being carried fully in this Bill."

I suppose that that was the right which I intended to read, five days ago. Anyway, again I am begging the Members to remember those words when he comes to vote on this Bill, and on a specific Article this morning it will have to stand in his heart.

In December of last year, the Honourable Member said:-

"Mr. President, when the Bill for this Law was being debated in the House the day of this year I opposed it at that time, and notably that Legislature where I came to change my views, but this Bill that I was re-elected on this principle. I opposed it because it removed the Electoral Commission that legislature

Mr. M. Makepeace Stone (continuing):

> ... know the final purpose the way that's Shakespeare's writing and because parliament gives [illegible] Shakespeare and their importance before anybody seems fixed at central authority view for the public who pressed him to accept and protect their interests before our own. I believe that as a man, that while we are here it is a duty to create a religious service, we must first of all to carefully examine the nature of our religious. If our predecessors are to be placed in order, privileges must be placed fairly on backing in an effective manner and rapidly provide social needs and problems to this country."

Mr. President, I wish and think that the honourable Member would also remember this when he comes to make his speech as a specific number that this time he may have some reason to change his mind.

Mr. Speaker, on May 2nd last year the honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council said:-

> "I know there are many problems needing to be solved that ought to be dealt with before any Referendum here can be [illegible] for this or anything."

> We have got, by the grace of Providence, been enabled to attend to the needs of our country. We have not yet [illegible] our responsibilities and can [illegible]."

Mr. President, I am thankful that the Member will also remember this.

Mr. Speaker, on 21st December, 1954 the same Member, the honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council said:-

> "I should before we close this House this year, and to which many hours yesterday needs to our Estimate which should have dealt with before Legislature considered a Program will for Departments."

Mr. President, all I am asking the Members today is to take into consideration what they have said. I have just asked to take into consideration the things which I have said and I might even [illegible] on a lot of things which have been for a long time. However, the first promise that they will have made. I am asking them not to withdraw this Bill and bring us alternatively with a Bill for a motion to question the people in this country. The people will accept this. They had no obligation or duty of loss, there is nothing to lose but to say that they have voted to back. The only thing which holds them on the matter of the Bill. We said that we were prepared this to study it back.

Mr. President, I believe that my whole case has passed its purpose. If there again that I am against this Bill; that I am taking no account, Mr. President, apprehensive of what they might say about me, that they had to study it back. They can withdraw the Bill. I am taking no account. If they want to say that I am unfair, I am them or whatever they can.

Mr. President, the honourable First Official Member in his opening remarks said, "Let bygones be gone then", meaning a parallel I will use, be in the use only to [illegible] for this thing.

Mr. K. Waqainabete Ride (Continued): Mr. President, I rise to support what Ratu Mara spoke of the old national Civil Servants. The old names of even the widows of the old Civil Servants who were valued as giving people who did much work for this country. Lesser were I would say. They did not know fabulous offices to work in. They did not get any big amount of salary. What I think, Mr. President, of some of the old names and the work which they have accomplished. They accomplished Fijians. They sent free Fijians to literate in the assembly and the pride and control and their work. I believe that the minister responsible that any one of that be carefully taken to somewhere in the region of pay under $600. I do not believe that can be value reasonable a problem.

All I am asking is for us to look at consolidation. When I am talking about a consolidation bill to look economic of our country. There are the things which we must take into consideration.

The other point I would make is that I have not yet been told how many people would be used. I do not believe that any study was undertaken and I put it to you Sir, Mr. President, that not even the Honourable Financial Secretary, the figure was in this country. Never that the amount will be.

Mr. President, where we going to do an amendment when your Excel, which was not yet in here. I will have to better information so the Government can not be able to do to you. It is the exact story which the Alkatiri Member for North Nine had said I am going to see that the amendment is put in the Bill. This is no way of saying that I am against the amendment which have been said nothing and take away the fact that we are doing something for ourselves and our people and nothing.

Mr. President, the Fijian Islands has 18,500 people, not a few people in this House, but a few must begin before and, Mr. President, many of these just legislations as I say are valid bill. There is no doubt about it. What I mean to say is a big business and a bank and a trade I mean some of our local legislatures that are in the last elections. They are valid bill. There are only two when I speak say, are in need. It will be a fact. Nobody can take that away. They can call me an Fijian. They can call me what they like but it is a fact. The Fijian Islands have 18,500 people and not just a few good legislatures. Until we do responsibilities go where our people are and our Fijian can open their eyes but to life as well as, never neglected the Fijian Islands.

Sir, it is an honour to be elected to any public office, however, to accept this honour is an honour given to us here ourself and how further can we have any good. Mr. President, I will close my debate by saying that this Bill should be withdrawn. Government should withdraw it, just to do a good survey; only the three figure can what it is going to cost. I guess that they might have done this by now however a few days ago. We stopped their saying. They did not know. We asked them and they did not know. I do not know what the figure are still valid as now, but I know that a few days ago they did not know. All I am asking is that they withdraw, this Bill until such time that consolidation for this country. This is what we are here for. We are here for them. They are not here for us.

Mr. President, the Bill before us. Does not mean to be here all. It came because the previous administration brought a Bill last year and the Government to do so. Well, I think differently from them. I would, I would like to for in one of the choices of it, the Government Administration Building that we would have here a long time before it came back here.

MR. A. MAYERA RICE (CONTINUING): I thank you very much, Mr. President, and I trust that the Members will give serious thought to the things I have pointed out, because they feel that I have been wrong or mistaken.

I thank you, Sir.

THE PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member for West End.

MR. JOHN E. MARTIN: Mr. President, first of all let me commend the Honourable First Opposition Member on his presentation of what I consider a fairly good Bill.

Mr. President, I have no problem with the amendments passed here, with the exception of one with the Bill. First of all I would like to put the records straight. The previous speaker on the occasions referred to the Honourable and knew it as coming from the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council on May, 1969. Of course, I know that he was referring to the Honourable First Official Member, but I just thought that I would put it on record as a correction.

Secondly, Mr. President, when I first introduced this Bill on May 1969, only in mind, I suggested it because I felt that there were Bahamians who had worked hard to buy the property for this country, and I feel today as I felt then, that this is only a small part of what we owe to them.

Mr. President, some of us have taken this time with certain political parties who are still alive and one just about, I would say, only three to four Bahamians. Those in mourning, Mr. President, with an unlikely awakening be considered for the hard work that have done for their country.

I have heard much here today and I appeal that I will have more to say when this Bill should again be returned to this House. However, Mr. President, I believe that if the present Government has any conscience they have now elected, take on one of the things.

Mr. President, like I started to say, there are two sections which I am not satisfied with. In clause 4, Mr. President, I felt that workmen should have also been included here because it is my understanding that prior to Uniform Act, unionized workers did the same work as Pensionable Members. I hope, Mr. President, that when this Bill goes into Committee stage the Government will see fit to bring an amendment to include those who are still alive as well because I would still have those figures.

The other section which I am not satisfied with, Mr. President, is clause 5. I feel that this clause should have been deleted. It should have read just as here. Now if an amendment had to be added to it, nevertheless to say perhaps that the Governor in his discretion could vary where he would be satisfied that it was a genuine employment. However, let us have it, I do not believe, Mr. President, that every person who is able to, financially or not, find themselves within the next few months planning to retire to this island financially paid. I honestly do not think that would be right. Even if it happened that way and we had an amending clause here, I am convinced that this could be overcome. It should be properly if it be needed and I am sure anybody going politically who is really here to those in the hour of death, may need to decide their priority.

MR. JOHN E. MOSS (CONTINUING): I should like only to say in my view of supporting the Clayton Act. Perhaps I have misunderstood that section incorrectly most of the time, I would appreciate of the administrative nature of this bill would put me right on it.

However, Mr. Chairman, as I make my statement, I am opposed this measure; but I think that when we go to Committee amendments will be offered to the amendments which will put this bill fully in order.

I thank you, Mr. President.

MR. CELLER: The Chair thanked Member for his time.

MRS. EDITH S. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. President. The first reference to administrative is more recently an amendment of the original law which we dealt with the Lever Act given. However, I should like to say here that for the record I oppose this bill as originally drafted and passed. During the last executive session I mentioned my reasons of our meetings that I was not happy with it.

There are a few that perhaps I should not have but I promised you I will not be long. Reference to testimony on Thursday I commissioner's counsel, Herman Phillips to which stated--

"I would question on this section, how would it do?"

I am hoping that perhaps that when I have to ask some more questions would be just then.

At that time I did not support the bill for many reasons, primarily because I thought that to new many more persons in many industries, and especially because I thought that there were many people who should have been taken into consideration, as practitioners there who normal point to this who should also have been included.

Now, it is my opinion said that only a few changes his mind. Not because I disagree with the distinguished and very long time we have in the House, but since the amendments have been made and which to have been enacted in 1914 as we go back. And I would come back here to the same frame of mind with the most thoughts in mind. It is basic that in the treatment of many commodities that is where problem is found. But, one might say to me, "How is it you come for you to propose your amendment you stated against this long ago?" Why is this an exception, sometimes? As to that note. I quite frankly admit a doubt that is what else. In fact I think that a solid vote in one of my meetings, I question for legislation and this same forward when a national commodity commission whereby problems brought forward for the needs of these industries.

At this time, Mr. Commissioner, I have to make a confession, I have more than questions of this would be subjected to put together a national commodity commission whereby I do not object to these recommendations but reservations that we should be afraid that we must assist you how did to have the values of commodities known. In studying and by the way, through the commodity commission matters for the Clayton Reference I can have to provides that it was not be fixed to easy to put this together as I was originally thought. I would hope to have this investigation please I do not know whether it will be within a year, or two or three years. Hopefully it will be very soon. However, I would like to say here the bill which is before us today I endorse except for one particular point which I propose that you and I will do.

MRS. SULLIVAN (to COUNCIL MEMBER CONNELLY): I do not find that the clause I would suggest--

> "Notwithstanding subsection (1) a female child who receives child's pension may, if circumstances permit, be required to be entitled to a child's pension."

is right. Under age that might arise practically. Because in today's day and age in the Supreme Tribunal there are two areas in which female people should obtain without the help which is received from the female members in that household, the wife. In many cases she contributes more and I feel that this ought to be taken into consideration. If it is guilty in the misconduct when the girl reaches that age would not be for the same. If only that could applied in the female right to the widow.

Apart from that I feel that the Act has been quite to date and what is proposed here is a good thing. In going over this with a number of people I realized that it might have answered that many problems within this Act could benefit just the members, and because of that this might have been the reason why we have experience in. Mr. President, that is all the moment. I would like to state here that right that I may not kill like a little while before I should to call on Mr. Fay, I essentially would not be voting for it for many practical benefit for myself, however, there are those who if this particular bill can continue and put on the land Bureau of Education, these people should certainly be in my mind. There are many more who may have certain views about who is morally -- I mean could be not, but that is not the way in which it should be considered.

I feel that there have implications with these jobs. Most of those who would come on the payroll they would be in my age bracket where they are not able to look after themselves at this time, many others, of course, I think are still working. However, in this as I may I think that it is unfair to those in this House and may have in legislation on behalf of the poor who must forward to many other country and possibly they may were going to get a problem. This is sufficient enough reason to oppose this as far as the Bill is. In fact, if one could look at it in a different light, because they were not looking that they were going to get in relatively big, should be rewarded very well at this time.

I can think right now, that I have that the Honourable Prime Minister in the Public Treasury, Mr. Opposition Leader [illegible] this would point on this issue. I opened at this point to view and where I am at the age about the Government of Tonga. I was there of Prime Ministers in the Public Service Act who seemed prior to that. If we are not going to this discussion, when we do intend to help them, Mr. President, I would like to be very thankful to my colleagues here. Thank you indeed. I hoped the Government would have this meeting about which one I like to hear. The Government Secretary was there as I think it was. And then to the Attorney General Chambers. I am sure it will within the [illegible] Chambers here at this present time. This will be [illegible] a very big hope. Mind you, I understand their circumstances. However, Mr. President, this Bill, has the same, the problem and the solution to the whole and it does the Land Bureau of Education which hopefully will put back in a position of taking this. To put the Land which the Head of Finance have here, now who to speak to put it. I am grateful that I was able to contribute here in Parliament a second reading this Bill might be with them.

MRS. DARLENE L. GRUBBY (CONTINUING): A decent space was just finished, of people who were living in subhuman conditions existing in. That is real, Mr. President. However, I would like to remind those honorable women that some people want to pay whatever it is they might make rent for. There are others who do not care to make it. This particular legislation that I believe you have before you, I would...

MR. R. MORRIS HESS: On a point of order, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

MR. R. MORRIS HESS: I think that the Minority Leader should be allowed...

MR. PRESIDENT: ...Minority Leader may go on. If you do not know what you want to say until you find out.

MR. R. MORRIS HESS: Mr. President, would you give me a moment to find it though?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, sir. The Member may continue until you find a point of order you can point to.

MRS. DARLENE L. GRUBBY: Mr. President, since yesterday late, I went and checked out a few, because I had to in the Capitol kitchen and they were waiting for this lady to report to work. When I was called and asked, "Where is Miss so and so. You could she would appear at such and such a time?"...

MR. R. MORRIS HESS: Mr. President, I do really [illegible] point of order now, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. R. MORRIS HESS: Standing Order 3:(2)(b).

MR. PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. That is clarifying a motion. So...

MR. R. MORRIS HESS: Well, are you going to give me the chance, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: That is up to the Member who was speaking. It is not up to me. Read Standing Order 24(2)(b). If the Member speaking is willing to give way and receive his or her mail, then you may continue. It is up to the Member.

MRS. DARLENE L. GRUBBY: Mr. President, I would like to continue with my speech.

MR. R. MORRIS HESS: Mr. President, I want to proceed to explain then under Standing Order 24(2).

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, that is alright.

MRS. DARLENE L. GRUBBY: This lady did not appear at the Capitol and then I asked her she gave me a flimsy version of not being able to get transportation from Fairfax Town. Mr. President, if she comes to leave Wed. May and just to Georgetown at 5 o'clock in the morning that would not have a problem. There are ways of transportation.

MRS. DENNIS J. GALLAGHER: Because, if we were known that some people are not too interested in running about

Mr. President, we have serious rights in our Charter of Human Rights. I mention that. What I am saying is this. We are endeavouring to try to get these amendments [illegible] in as best a manner and on as early as we can. I would like to stand here to say, Mr. President, that since your first term of office many, many changes have taken place. I was able to witness a scene and I am thankful for that. I am not here, Mr. President, with my eyes on 1984 and successorship when has to be done today. This is a matter which needs to be done today. I am glad that there are certain people in the public who do not approve of this Provisions Bill. They did not approve of it in the original form, but as it is now here today, Mr. President, I know one many obstacles in it. In fact, I wonder if the Government would [illegible] a million dollars a year might be less than $500,000. I am sure some of the figure has [illegible], just going through the amount which have been made it would not take too much of a contribution to understand that there has to be a substantial training.

Mr. President, I intend remarks only here on this Resolution. Hence today about Government not having a consultation. They were made here and again. I [illegible] of the 37 members paid at the Elected Members and the Official Members of Executive Council and, Mr. President, I have no hesitation in saying that I put complete confidence in the Members opposite as the other side of this House. I have no reason to doubt their sincerity, their wisdom or their deep concern for the people of these Islands. In thanking everyone for their kindness there have been those who may wish [illegible] for the Chief Secretary [illegible] Executive Council to answer by the previous about by Question [illegible]. I do not think that the Honourable Chief Secretary/Member of Executive Council is getting more understanding when the first person chosen to [illegible] to come in. Nevertheless I understand his page will be [illegible]. I do not think that the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council is waiting for that previously now to the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council. I am not [illegible] that these matters are [illegible] the second one phase. I wish to keep that feeling like that throughout. The thanks I have, have in this issue also a debate which is going over the air to many [illegible] people something [illegible] we overnight [illegible].

Mr. President, we can [illegible] anything. It is not acceptable that we might agree with. However, [illegible] the majority rules. This will come to pass, I think that it [illegible] how many [illegible] we have [illegible] to vote our [illegible] and [illegible] any what we want I like [illegible].

Mr. President, I would like to say. However, I would like to add that within this Resolution I have given the public the [illegible] that the only thing we are here for is to make them. Nobody knows what [illegible] be divided [illegible] in time. I am no [illegible]. When I was in Executive [illegible] I may [illegible]. If [illegible], because [illegible] I would [illegible] of the [illegible] Executive Council, that is [illegible] Executive Council. However, on this particular matter today I am not going to [illegible] by [illegible] to the [illegible] but I would like I [illegible] the Members [illegible] to [illegible] that. The Members [illegible] have [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] for the [illegible] reason that I am looking at it [illegible] right [illegible] [illegible].

MRS. DARLENE T. ORTEGA (CONTINUED): ...however, for me to say that I couldn't look over there and agree with anyone. But, there were times when the Speaker and I took note that the members were saying that they could not agree with it in the present form. So, they make a lot of differences. What we are dealing with here today is a bill which has changed a lot since we originally saw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am going to call them, very soon. However, I would like to say this. I do not believe that any Member of Government, Executive Council, who would come to Rota that they were assume such a position and the people out there had nothing. Believe me, I know [illegible] this particular role [illegible], but it also has its disadvantages. To run first in a Chamorro position. Some Members who have served in this House done so for a long period of time and if John Bowie mentioned to him today that they should receive a pension I have probably opposed it. I hope that I have [illegible] to withdraw since. I am not going to reconsider anything, but it will be today or the next day that I will be in that position. However, I would like to see it not acted upon. I say to you with a little sense and purpose for the future again. I do not think that there is any Member here who is willing [illegible] for this bill who is under [illegible]. However, I would like to say this. It takes more than talking for a pension or you like Government might. Once I stood back a group of lawyers, when I felt bad that it died, and today I stand here and give them my wholehearted support, because the people in the Statutes of West Virginia are the people who are working there. They know me. They know many one of my law suits are expecting that we are going to come back and work [illegible] to see this Government go in the right direction. It cannot be done when we are turning our backs on it.

Mr. Chairman, I give the bill my support and what Members of my community choose to speak to me on it I shall look them in their face and tell them exactly my reasons for doing so.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I recommend the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the Second Chamorro Member that may be wish to offer the next motion, which is in addition to any pending do now, may I direct your attention to the records at the end of September [illegible], however I do not want to have to stop him in the middle of his presentation. We must find out exactly what he is without to say and what we do not without to say. Very well, the Second Elected Member for next may.

MR. F. Manglona Muña: Mr. Chairman, the only Member who just was referred to a couple of things to my district, and I was misquoted. I would only ask of I would ever be - if I would be accept the whole thing, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hopefully not. Hopefully not.

MR. F. MANGLONA MUÑA: I would like to get a sense reading to me. I said the House Investigation, and I would like to get a sense reading to me. I still have to see, you see. I would like to see the Hawaiian Government might. Last week I stood back a group of lawyers, when I felt bad that it died, and today I stand here and give them my wholehearted support, because the people in the Statutes of West Virginia are the people who are working there. They know me. They know many one of my law suits are expecting that we are going to come back and work [illegible] to see this Government go in the right direction. It cannot be done when we are turning our backs on it.

MR. H. [illegible] (CONTINUED): I told the House that she had two children and her whole attention, if to it the present and the House knew she would still have it. I reiterate to my learned friend, Mr. President. The Tafawa Balewa Square for more than one person to be registered in a married person. I participated in the whole thing. What I said was that there were still people in the country who are disappointed the whole hope with the whole government in order to start afresh, and there were still people who had to vote the Action because they had no other political choice.

I implored to the learned member who spoke earlier that he should give a fair hearing, I believe that was the request but I just want to make my position clear. I implored to the learned member.

The Member misquoted me, Sir, that the person who was to participate in the AIT Race is a retired army. It is a good thing she can rest up at the hospital. We have enough there already.

However, I still have to my disposal, Mr. President, and that is why I know the position.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that will be a convenient moment to take our afternoon break and I will suspend proceedings for approximately ten minutes.

AT 3.33 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3.52 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Honourable Members.

The Second Reading Debate on the Supplementary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1984. The Second Speaker, the Deputy Leader.

MR. EDWARD A. OKEREKE: Mr. President, I rise to support the Bill for a Law to amend the Supplementary Pensions Law, 1964. However, Mr. President, before dealing with the contents of the Bill I would like to make it abundantly clear early as I did in my Statement made to this House in December, 1983, that I will support the Government stand on matters which I feel are relevant and in matters which I can fully with.

However I rise to take issue on the statement which was made before the House by the hon. Minister responsible, especially, of this morning. I do not believe, Mr. President, in confusing for opportunistic sake. Sir, Mr. President, is a very important matter.

Mr. President, I have been too much considerable discipline on those Chairmen for the sake of the policy and I feel that Members should be mind that whatever is said in this Honourable House is heard outside on the radio.

MR. CARLTON J. KELLAM (Virginia): I would like the opportunity to commend the Honorable Fiscal Officials of Accomack County for the courage in bringing this bill back to the House. I would say, Mr. Speaker, I like eight of the first ones the architects of this bill were the Representatives and they should have received some credit and commendation.

Mr. Speaker, just after the 1964 Presidency we have voted to sell the Governor's Mansion. The reason why, Mr. Speaker, as I understand was that it was felt that the Governor was the wife more than of a Governor. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether we will do this now in order again to keep our Governor there. I heard recently of a bird of change. Where evident seems to be a bird of change blowing in this House. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that one of the first resolves in this call of the house would have to give the Governor that $50 before the House is the worst thing that could happen in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks we for on this House will show that I am one who stands here and speaks my conscience. If I felt that this Legislature Resolution Bill was discriminate for this county and the people of this county, my vote would be no. I could not support this bill, Mr. Speaker. However, I am not going to join the discussion -- I'm not the leader that they are not going to support the bill because of some political pressure they may have been subject to. We are not, Mr. Speaker, going through a political campaign at this stage the discussions were finished back in the late November, 1968. While I not sure that there was those of us who may have run again in 1969, I believe that it would be most unfortunate if our only thought was on getting back for the House in 1969. We are not in 1969, Mr. Speaker, and we have other more pressing matters to go. I believe that these bills should be approved by unanimously to provide us the best interests of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard Members today stand in this House and recommend their vote on a political economy position. My only thought at the time was not important, Mr. Speaker, when this arose from a recommendation was not even not the privilege to see his fourteenth birthday. We have a long time to go and life must be very valuable indeed.

If there are those of us who feel it simply about economics that might be their concern I will ask, Mr. Speaker, and give way for them to participate their rights in their salary, their participating salary. But we are not that way are interested in the people, not as your salary or the salary,Mr. Speaker, and making political speeches in this House. What I have to say Mr. Speaker, is spoken from the heart. I am not just saying what I said during the political campaign even though I tried to be as sincere as possible.

Mr. Speaker, that I stand here personally and before the responsibility because which we are that a political speech. I did it because I feel responsible in this matter. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied with the statement which I have received from the Governor Comer that they will look into this matter and that a favorable study will be given. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if the results of that feasibility study show that it is possible and that it can be done in this session, then it ought to be done. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to fight for the interests of my people.

MR. STRAUB: [illegible] The question, Mr. President, of a question whether to put a case opposite to us. My colleague, Mr. Woodhead, will shortly take this case out of this matter I wish to speak on my political platform. I said to this committee that I will endeavor to establish or disestablish any [illegible] which will provide adequate for all classes of workers and to encourage [illegible] to be orderly which is the present system. It is not a new issue for me, Mr. President. In the meeting which I sincerely and gratefully I have it. Mr. President, that if I remember [illegible] of the members, that I will direct my eyes to all other things.

I withdraw the amendment which I just then made as I did yesterday, Mr. President, because I felt that there would have been ways to [illegible] this to the [illegible] issues.

Mr. President, as must also have [illegible] heard. I have heard a lot here about having a special committee to [illegible] to our amendments. We have intelligent persons of this house, Mr. President, who we would be interested to tell us how to vote; [illegible] a bit of information. However, Mr. Speaker, with the assurance which I have received from the honorable Minister of Education Council, I rise to add some encouragement which [illegible] of [illegible] had not, Mr. President, been for the good work of our legislature and our Premier to [illegible], we would not have what we have here today.

Mr. President, when I think of these [illegible] I think of them with a lot of reason. Many of our [illegible] Mr. President who failed [illegible] for their ideology without representation. However, Mr. President, these things of this kind can only [illegible] to an extent on an [illegible] particular for [illegible] why do not the Members of this House [illegible] the particular [illegible] which they represent which?

Mr. Speaker, those declarations or [illegible] which I have heard in this House are just political [illegible]. It is easy to say that one will [illegible] when we [illegible] in his discussion and one has [illegible] not known to us.

Mr. President, regardless of how we [illegible] possibility or whether to get our election fulfilled in this [illegible], we must [illegible] that we have a [illegible] to war. Mr. President, I have heard reasons for [illegible] in this House. However, we [illegible] the stage of our [illegible] where there is no room for some of the [illegible] which I can consider [illegible] in this House. [illegible] for the sake of the [illegible] which I see in this House. Nobody can [illegible] importance of the [illegible] in this House. We have our standing [illegible]. We have our [illegible] and of many other Governments [illegible] to be [illegible], Mr. President, I have also heard of [illegible] being [illegible] to oppose the [illegible] of the [illegible] to [illegible] look to [illegible]. I [illegible] of [illegible] of this House would [illegible] to [illegible] the need of these [illegible].

Mr. President, it is not enough to [illegible] this House and say that the only reason [illegible] to this [illegible] is because we objected to be on one's political platform [illegible] ago. It is only a [illegible] who cannot change his mind. I agree, Mr. President, with the [illegible] Member [illegible] and say that [illegible] the reason why we have not given our full [illegible].

Mr. LINCOLN A. MICHAEL (MAINTENANCE): Mr. President, while the [illegible] of the [illegible] I also think [illegible] Mr. President, I feel that [illegible] should be given to [illegible] I will seek to [illegible] as possible.

[illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] legislature [illegible] 1st October, 1969 [illegible] from that date. This is very good [illegible] would like to [illegible] Standing Order, Mr. President, the [illegible] Members also [illegible] I would like to [illegible] Members [illegible] Mr. President, I would also [illegible] the Government [illegible] Bill [illegible] Members who have served since the 1st October, 1969. I am happy to see that the old Minor [illegible] Mr. Michael and I would [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] Members from [illegible] Mr. President, we [illegible] Bill. Some of the [illegible] Mr. President, to [illegible] Bill [illegible] through. They are the people who [illegible] for the [illegible] of this country. They are the people who [illegible] for which we [illegible].

Also, Mr. President, I wish to [illegible] Section 8 of the Bill. I do not [illegible] Mr. President, that it is in the best interest of this country or the people of this country that Section 8 of the principal Law should be [illegible]. Section 8 of the principal Law reads, Mr. President:-

> "Any person who is elected as a member under this Law may at his option surrender his membership of a parliament of the area provided for in section 3, a parliament of the body of those persons of such area, together with a penalty."

Mr. President, I realise that there have been changes in the membership of [illegible] parties. My main point, Mr. President, has to do with the penalty. There are many, many of our past Legislators who are very, very old, Mr. President. It would be an injustice to them to be made to [illegible] penalty. Many of them are on their death bed and they need their little penalty.

Mr. President, I envisage that this Government and this country would be doing a service if we consider this section.

Mr. President, I also feel that the Executive Council of this country should be given a number more Parliamentary Secretaries than the ordinary Members of the House, because their responsibilities are greater. I feel that they should be remunerated accordingly, even though I feel, the Hon. Minister, the Chief Minister for Work may be [illegible] saying that she does not believe that any Member of the Executive Council is [illegible] for this position. At this rate, Mr. President, as I said earlier, nobody can predict what the future will be, we can be up today. We will be down tomorrow.

MR. LLOYD A. FERRAZ (CONSTITUENCY): Mr. President, section 3 of the Bill deals with the exemption of the Governor-General, and so on. However, my mind has been cast to look at the wording of this section. This is to do with the words:-

"to cause the execution of imprisonment".

In this connection, Mr. President, how do we deal with the circumstance of a person who is convicted and who receives a long sentence. However, the provision, Mr. President, reads:-

"PROVIDED that where a person whose sentence has been commuted or who has, on appeal, had his sentence of imprisonment or detention for life or for any term exceeding ten years reduced by the Court, he shall be liable for the remainder of the sentence to be executed."

Mr. President, I think that this is very clear.

Mr. President, since I wish to give full opportunity to congratulate the mover of the Bill and the Parliamentary Counsel for the hard work they have made into the Bill, Mr. President, I have this Bill to support.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Third Elected Member for Savusavu Council.

MR. SAID MUBIN (SAVUSAVU): Mr. President, the Parliamentary Secretary (Immigration) will, then before this Honourable House has to support what I consider to be a good Bill.

Last year when the Parliamentary Session ended, I was brought in this honourable House I spoke, but I did not succeed it. I felt that a person for Legislative Assembly because our practical Savusavu, there were certain matters which I found unsatisfactory and could not support them.

Before I go into the meat of this Bill in my debate, Mr. President, I would like to comment on a few of the things said in this House. I would like to say publicly here, that it has been unfortunate to hear the hon. some members who have spoken on this Bill. Members knowing the earlier debate this morning, unfortunately would have the impression that Members of the Executive Council are here only for one purpose, and that is to pass their own proposals.

We were accused by the Second Member for North Nadi. We said that he did not utilize days he had attended on Bill. Mr. President, I think this is true about himself because we have not in every Session of the Legislative Assembly a lecture and the Bill, especially that I have ever had to hear his comments on the Bill and whatever amendments they had, to amend them. Every Member was given this chance; however, due to the reasons that nobody who walked in this House, said that they have no point to look at it and they were not going to support it, a regrettable attitude, Mr. President, and it was displayed in this House this morning in a disappointed manner.

MAJORITY LEADER J. RUSSO: (CONTINUED) Thank you, Mr. President. I'll be still here during little time.

SEN. D. RICHARD HOFFMAN: On a point of order, Mr. President, would Senator Lasher yield, I think that I am a little out of order but I would like to ask a question.

SEN. RUSSO: I'm not sure that he was leaving, are you?

SEN. D. RICHARD HOFFMAN: Senator Lasher, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to...

SEN. J. RUSSO MINORITY: Senator Lasher, I'm not sure that he was leaving.

SEN. HOFFMAN: I did not understand him to be leaving. I was simply curious. We have heard that some of the members said some things.

MAJORITY LEADER J. RUSSO: Thank you, Mr. President, then I'll yield to the Senior Member for North New York and then we will change to the original Bill. This Bill would bring no changes to the original Act. Therefore, I am positive that he did not know what we were to look at the new Bill was anywhere with the former version Act.

It was in my step that he did not agree that Members of Recognized Colored should receive a second pension, a member of a Member of the Legislature, and a pension as a Member of Recognized Council, Mr. President, this was brought before us because the Liberal Government of this country is broke, by gosh. This will now proceed to Ways, Jobs. So, we are now looking to alter some of those objectionable phrases which we have in the former bill that.

One more time, Mr. President, this does not Recognized Legislature. A Member of the Legislature presently serves on this Chamber just under a year, or excuse I would say of about a week and the Report was Sept, one thing of the Liberal Council position which takes the Member under age of the year. That Legislator Service I suppose they do not for his next term or Session in his house. So, there is no reason why Recognized Council Members should not be given same consideration.

I hope the next Liberal Member for North Side, Mr. Treadwell, put up last week, I believe previously his right to say here. He was selected out by the Liberal Council Member for Orange Town this is a growth. This is his first vote in this Legislative Assembly, the first time he has been elected here. He is not even sworn yet.

Mr. President, I urge that the same Godfather as the Liberal Member for Orange Town that is this. If he is so interested for the people, let him reconsider his Legislative Assembly salary now. We have not had to wait for twenty five years. We can do it now.

SEN. D. RICHARD HOFFMAN: If the Senator will the way I will vote.

MAJORITY LEADER J. RUSSO: (CONTINUED) I would like to say further, Mr. President that I will encourage any Member in this Legislative Assembly to do what I have done since 1970. This is my twelfth salary that I am this year percentage of the Legislative and some of them, this point, Sir. If I like to think my money from this Legislative pension, fine to which my money would go, to the Town Treasurer in our community.

MR. SPEAKER-ELECT & MEMBERSHIP: I have heard a lot about the poor in our community, Mr. President. I have heard organizations claim income having two and a half businesses by their income tax return. That is wrong with that? I think that we should say thank God we have people who have retired themselves up to this standard. They should not try to decry or debase those people and bring them to the level of the very poor. The Bible tells us that we have the poor with us always. Let us just thank God we have them, not take those who have worked hard and call them down.

Mr. President, as frankly as that I guess Iceland has never exercised the privilege of exploring any more than the Nineteenth Parliament. You did so once for whom do only one years, Mr. Prime Minister, have used. I am disappointed today that instead of trying to be a Robin Hood for this community, that we should use to rob from ourselves.

Mr. President, I was shocked on my return to Belize during January. I did say then but this time there is of substance. When I said here in December, the position was going to be other countries which indicated that I interested or would not go to a Session but if the proper amendments were made. I said in December when we introduced the Bill to delay the coming into operation of that Act:

> "The Bill seeks to delay the coming into operation on 1st January, 1985, of a law which was recently introduced and passed in this Legislature without much fuss."

I went on to say:

> "I feel that the delay of the coming into effect of this Act will give the Legislature the opportunity to study it, consult their constituents and make whatever amendments are necessary to make it fair and acceptable to the people who have put us here to represent and serve them."

I said to the President, and added:

> "I appreciate the Parliamentary Secretary [illegible] explained it when it was introduced. I did not hesitate to them include in the amendments we are today."

Mick Fonseca said:

> "It is not the intention of the present administration to deny anyone what they are justly entitled."

Mr. Speaker, the impression was given that Members opposite today in Parliament [illegible] are now satisfied, if this Bill were to be, to have a pleasant [illegible] discussion. The people may qualify[illegible] Sec. 21 for it says that a Member has to attend six out of the seven meetings without the age of the years six consecutive [illegible] absence by the authorities of the Financial Secretary that he is incapable by reason of illness or [illegible] accompanying the [illegible] of a Member, and that must be[illegible] to be permanent. Mr. Speaker, we are meeting here. There is no way that we can [illegible] unless this Bill passes. There is no way on the world

[illegible] Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration, Members seeking their help please address their letters to the Clerk who will refer them to the Commissioner. Every Member can be sure of a considerable time saving to enable the Commissioner to quickly investigate the matter to the client's satisfaction.

I am sure Members will be aware that a case cannot be considered by the Commissioner until it has been referred to him by either a Member of the House of Commons or a peer. The Commissioner will not investigate any matter which is or has been the subject of proceedings in any court of law or tribunal unless he is satisfied that in all the circumstances it is reasonable that he should do so. I am satisfied, Mr. President, that this Bill will provide a very valuable and long overdue safeguard.

Mr. President, clause 2 of this Bill seeks to declare that by January, 1969 all the Acts to which the provisions of the Bill are intended to have effect will be specified in Orders made by Statutory Instrument. All Statutory Instruments will require the approval of both Houses of Parliament before they become law.

Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to give Members who are named in the Legislative Assembly prior to the 1st October, 1968 the choice whether to remain Members of the Legislative Assembly or to become Members of the Parliament of Malawi. There is no provision in the Parliamentary Functions Act, 1964 which allows persons to be members of both Parliaments. Therefore, this Bill, when passed into law will prevent this possible situation. The new clause will provide a provision for the good Members who have served us. They are the people who are in the present Legislative Assembly. There are some Legislators who have served with my self since Federation without the means to qualify to take care of them. In their old age they unfortunately have fore and ancient over Malawi territory. They deserve to be treated better and given an opportunity.

Mr. President, Sir, Honourable Dr. Chirwa's motion states-

"That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Bill and report thereon."

One of the Members who spoke against this Bill in which I am sure we know the kind of action he is, Honourable Dr. Chirwa, should have spoken why he thought the Bill was not necessary for this country instead of saying that nothing is wrong, Mr. President. That is a point, I am afraid to say, which is not correct.

My colleagues Opposition Members of the Parliamentary Functions Bill are the ones who can tell us what the court could do and whether it is necessary to amend it. The new clauses and some words in the Bill before this Honourable House, will substantially reduce the amount payable to Members. I appreciate very much, Mr. President, that it would cost Government for this necessity of about £600,000 per year. It was mentioned that we have not to spend this much money to pay £500,000. Still, this figure which has been of use to the taxpayers that the pensions which Members will get yearly will amount to about £227,000 per annum. Mr. President Sir, this is not necessarily to be taken seriously, and that is every one's opinion to.

Should I refer to Dr. Chirwa the matter of the Parliamentary pensions for Members who have served since 1st October, 1964, and in the case they passed a pension of £1,000 per annum for those Members who served more than five years unfortunately terminated.

[illegible] [illegible]: The next method of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to be recognized to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill [illegible].

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. [illegible] point of information, Mr. Speaker, because other Members will not know. Normally under the rules, the effect [illegible] is to say, in effect, you cannot amend a bill unless by unanimous consent that is previously the case on motion, agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is necessary. So, although the committee did [illegible] I have already told the Members that....

MR. [illegible]: In addition, Mr. Speaker, they also might want to be ready to reconsider and [illegible] with their salary [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: I think that is a very important point that we should be aware of. Members might want to move to reconsider.

ADJOURNMENT

MRS. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 on Monday morning.

THE SPEAKER: The question before the House is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 on Monday morning, that is agreed, the adjournment. I will put the question.

ADJOURNMENT AGREED. AT 6:31 P.M., THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, 25TH NOVEMBER, 1985.

JOINT MEETING OF THE 19TH SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND THE HOUSE, 8TH SEPTEMBER, 1986

PRESIDING:

THE PRESIDENT (THE GOVERNOR, SIR C PETER TOOTH, GBM, CVO) - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

HON DENNIS B PROVEN, CBE,QTF,JP	FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
HON MICHAEL J HANDLEY, QC, LLB	SECOND OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR SOCIAL ADMINISTRATION
HON MICHAEL C DONOVAN, JP	THIRD OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
HON GORDON D BROOKS	MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES
HON M MICHAEL MISKELL, MBE	MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR CIVIL AVIATION AND TRADE
HON OTIS CHARLES L WYNCOMBE	MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND LABOUR ADMINISTRATION
HON MICHAEL G DUNKLEY, OBE, JP	MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ELECTED MEMBERS

MR F EDWARD EVANS	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MRS DARLENE E ORRETT	THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIRST ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WEST END
MR CLIFFORD C DIBBLE, JP	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GEORGE TOWN
CAPT HARRY S HYDE-CHAMBERS	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE THIRD ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BODDEN ISLAND
MR G KEITH HOBSON	SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE
MR D MARK KIRKCONNELL	ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH SIDE

CLERK

MR JOHN R GOLDEN (appointed recently)	CLERK TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
MR JAMES M POLSON (previously recruited)	FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FOURTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST END

QUEEN'S PAPER

ORDER PAPER AND NOTICES OF THE 3RD SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

NUNAVUT
2ND SESSION, 1ST
(WITH QAS)

1. PRAYERS

To be read by the Prime Minister Member for the Iqaluit Tununiq.

2. QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

THE ASSIGNED ECONOMIC MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE DEPUTY MINISTER MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HOUSING AUTHORITY AND TENANCY

QU. 210: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER PLEASE UPDATE THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN EVACUATED WITH THE EVACUATION OF THEIR NEW CHILD DUSHERS ATTACHED AND IF SO WHAT HAS BEEN TO CORRECT THEM?

QU. 220: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAY WHAT OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS EXIST AT THE NEW ATTACHED TERMINAL AND WHAT STEPS ARE BEING TAKEN TO CORRECT THEM?

QU. 221: WOULD THE MINISTER STATE WHETHER IT IS CORPORATION'S GUARANTEE OF THE NEW CHILD ACCEPTS CLIMATE TERMINAL AND IF SO WHEN DOES IT EXPIRE? ...

THE OTHER ECONOMIC MEMBER FOR THE EASTERN ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE OTHER ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR HOUSING CONTRACTS AND SOCIAL SERVICES

QU. 222: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER UNDERTAKE TO ARRANGE FOR GREATER PUBLICITY TO BE GIVEN TO THE SOCIAL POLICIES AND GUIDELINES RELATING TO FREE MEDICAL AID?

THE FIRST REGIONAL MEMBER FOR THE EASTERN ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR RENEWABLE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

QU. 186: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE THE PRINCIPLE OF PLANS FOR THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE WATER HYDROLOGIST PROJECTS IN CAPHAM BLOC AND LITTLE CHIMNEY

THE FIRST REGIONAL MEMBER FOR THE EASTERN ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SPECIAL REGIONAL MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND PUBLIC

QU. 192: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER PLEASE PROVIDE CONFIRMATION HAS CONSIDERED PROVIDING CAPHAM ATTENDS TO TAKE STEPS TO INTRODUCE TO ITS SINGLE SERVICE NETWORK CLOSE CLOSURE/ CHANGE DATE/LETTER CAPHAM USERS FOR INFORMATION?

4. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(i) BILLS:-

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS

(1) THE EMPLOYMENTAL RESTRICTIVE AGREEMENTS BILL, 1990

SECOND READINGS

(2) THE PROVISIONAL CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS BILL, 1990
(3) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1990
(4) THE PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL, 1990
(5) THE PUBLIC ROADS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(6) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(7) THE ROAD AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(8) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990

THIRD READINGS

(9) THE PROVISIONAL COLLECTION OF CUSTOMS DUTIES BILL, 1990
(10) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1990
(11) THE PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL, 1990
(12) THE PUBLIC ROADS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(13) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(14) THE ROAD AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(15) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990

SECOND READINGS

(16) THE PROVISIONAL CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS BILL, 1990
(17) THE MISUSE OF DRUGS (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1990
(18) THE PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL, 1990
(19) THE PUBLIC ROADS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(20) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(21) THE ROAD AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990
(22) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990

(ii) MOTIONS:-

GOVERNMENT NOTICE NO. 5/90
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY STANDING ORDERS, 1990

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE CHIEF SECRETARY (LEADER - HOUSE OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS).

5. OTHER BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

(1) ELECTRIC VEHICLES MOTION NO. 28/90
LIGHTWEIGHT VEHICLE USAGE

CONSIDERATION OF DEBATE TIMINGS.

(5) [illegible]

(6) [illegible]

(7) [illegible]

(8) [illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface	1
Procedures	2
SUMMARY TEXT OF SENATE FLOOR DEBATE ON THE PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988	
Hon. C. Ruby Holder	4
Sen. W. Norman Bowden	9
Sen. Ronald C. Robinson	13
Hon. Derrick G. Rhanko	24
Capt. Henry S. Richardson	28
Hon. Thomas C. Jeffrey	50
Hon. D.H. Foster	65
The Constitutional Collection of Customs Duties Bill, 1988 - Committee Stage	84
The Minors of Legal Procedure (No.2) Bill, 1988 - Committee Stage	89
The Public Finance and Audit Bill, 1988 - Committee Stage	92
The Public Loans (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Committee Stage	97
The Court of Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Committee Stage	98
The Fire Authority (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Committee Stage	99
The Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Committee Stage	99
Adjournment	99

[illegible]

[illegible] 10 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: I invite the First Elected Member for the Leeward Islands to say prayers for us.

CAPTAIN THE HONOURABLE K. KITCHENER: Let us pray.

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

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

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

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

I have apologies to Members for delaying proceedings slightly. I got unexpectedly delayed and I am sorry that I should be late for assembly. [illegible] The Second Elected Member for West End.

QUESTIONS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND NOMINATED OR EXECUTIVE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE

MR. [illegible]: Would the Honourable Member kindly advise where have been problems with the fishermen on the new zone following Belgium and if we could [illegible] done to correct that?

ANSWER: Some-hands of furniture in the dormitory lounge have snapped. This defect has been brought to the attention of the supplier through the main contractor. The supplier has informed Government that the legs have been damaged by a manufacturer's defect and have undertaken to replace the same. One new unit has been installed as a trial basis, and if proven satisfactory all other units will be replaced by the new units at no cost to Government.

SQ. SUPPLEMENTARY: If there is no supplementary, perhaps the Member will ask the next question.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WANTED FOR HOW LONG TO ASK THE SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS BECAUSE WHEN IT COMES TO QUESTIONS THEY ARE ENTITLED ONLY TO ONE.

NO. 120: Whilst the honourable Minister may what operational problems exist at the new airport terminal and what steps are being taken to overcome them?

ANSWER: Members have been experiencing with the electronic gates installed in the new airport as well as minor problems with air conditioning at the new airport terminal.

Ongoing investigations and repairs have been carried out by the supplier under the supervision of airport maintenance personnel and locally through the Public Works Department. The gates equipment is very sophisticated and spares are not readily available locally.

SQ. SUPPLEMENTARY: If there is no supplementary, perhaps the Member will ask the next question?

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WANTED FOR HOW LONG TO ASK THE SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS BECAUSE WHEN IT COMES TO QUESTIONS THEY ARE ENTITLED ONLY TO ONE.

NO. 121: Would the Member state whether there is a maintenance guarantee on the new Jean Airport Terminal and if so when does it expire?

ANSWER: In accordance with the terms of the contract, an amount equivalent to 2% of the contract sums has been withheld as a retention fee - $135,000.00.

This amount is released to cover any defects in the structure, equipment and fixtures on work carried out under the main contract.

The retention period will expire on the 15th December, 1985

SQ. SUPPLEMENTARY: The Nyeri Nominated Member for the Eastern Province.

THE NYERI PROVINCIAL MEMBER WAS NOT HERE TODAY SO ARE THE NOMINATED MEMBERS ENTITLED TO ASK QUESTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE ABSENT MEMBERS?

NO. 122: Would the Honourable Member undertake to arrange for greater publicity to be given to the various policies and guidelines relating to free medical aid?

ANSWER: Yes.

SPEAKER:

MR. D. DONALD MCLEAN: I supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will the Member undertake to publish the latest published accounts of the Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is what the Member has just undertaken to do. I do not think that I can allow the supplementary unless you can explain to me how the supplementary relates to the original question?

MR. D. DONALD MCLEAN: We will let it pass, Sir. We will see what comes out in the press. There are other forums.

MR. SPEAKER: The next question. The Hon. Minister Member for the Lesser Islands group.

QUESTION NUMBER 808 FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. LEE: Will the Honourable Minister state the intentions of plans for the development of the Water Authority projects in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman?

ANSWER: Since 1976, when Pinehaven was established as a residential ground water investigation in Cayman Brac, the Water Authority has carried out other studies to better determine the ground water resources on that Island.

The Authority foresees that towards the end of this year and early next year more comprehensive investigations will be carried out, incorporating a borehole programme, utilizing the new Diedy Rood.

It is then hoped that it will be possible to construct a well field development and treatment facility similar to that at Lower Valley and Bodden Town, thus providing Cayman Brac with a reliable source of water to be used in times of need.

It is hoped that funding for this development will be more available in 1981, at which time will the necessary investigation will be completed and designs finalized. Funding for this investigation is available this year and further funds are being requested for next year.

At this time, it is not anticipated on Little Cayman. Should the Island develop in any significant way to justify the installation of a public supply then the Water Authority will carry out investigation similar to that proposed for Cayman Brac.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no supplementary will the Member take the next question?

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. LEE: Will the Honourable Member state whether Government has considered providing Cayman Airways with more stops or extension on the existing service between Grand Cayman/Cayman Brac/Little Cayman using the Britten-Norman

---

SPEAKER: The "fair shuttle" concept of air services is normally only applied on routes where there are high density services, with the volume of traffic on the inter-Island services the introduction of the air shuttle would have adverse economic effects, and result in numerous flight cancellations due to inadequate traffic, thereby creating considerable inconvenience to the travelling public.

For these reasons it is considered best not to open Cayman Airways to additional routes at this time.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

QUES. HARRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, a supplementary. In view of objections being experienced by some residents and visitors to Cayman Airways obvious monopolistic operations on the local service, Grand Cayman/Cayman Brac/Little Cayman, would Government consider re-examining to Cayman Airways the need for monopolistic on the inter-service to be eliminated, passengers being accommodated on a first come first served basis, having into consideration passengers travelling with connecting and departing international flights? Also could additional flights be provided as required to meet the daily traffic?

REP. H. HOWARD EBANKS: Mr. President, Government would be prepared to discuss these possibilities with Cayman Airways with a view to establish the necessity of such an operation. I think that if there is a means of working an arrangement on the inter-Island service which would serve to improve the services which are presently operated, then I believe that the company would be receptive to this and Government would be prepared to look at it or discuss it with them as early as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: If there be no further supplementary we come to Item 5. Government Business. Bills. Consideration of the Second Reading Debate on the Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1995. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

CONSIDERATION OF SECOND READING DEBATE

MR. G. HALL ROGERS: Mr. President, there is an old Caribbean proverb which says:-

"Confusion has no business on a peaceful night."

I do not know what I am doing in this fight between the Government Backbench and Elected Representatives on this side of the House. Nevertheless I must express principle to introduce the Bill. It is the principle of whether there should be parliamentary pensions or not.

The fact is that throughout the Commonwealth it has been established that a parliamentary pension is only necessary and desirable, but also it has been accepted.

I have here with me a copy of the Parliamentarian of April, 1991, which is the magazine of Commonwealth countries. It says in an editorial:-

Mr. A. Neil Macdonald (continued):

> "The need to provide some sort of maintenance benefits to Members of Parliament is one by and large recognized in Commonwealth countries, though the shape and amount of such benefits may not be the same everywhere."

It is an indisputable fact that a politician is simply a part of a long package and is merely a right which has been delegated.

The question is, is the job of a Parliamentarian worthy of a pension? When we consider that every newspaper boy in Government and every clerical officer is pensionable, why should it be thought a crime to provide a pension for the Members of Parliament because they have made, and are continuing, unique personal sacrifices, despite their different ideas about money depending on the amount of spendable they tend to be used to, it is better that we do about money, we will be understood. I would like to see a quotation on money by Mai Gibson and it says:-

> "If a man runs after money he is money mad. If he keeps it he is a capitalist. If he spends it he is a playboy. If he does not give it he is a scrooge-miser. If he does not try to get it he is a no-hoper-waster. If he goes to work for it he is a pawn-in, and if he accumulates it after a lifetime of hard work people call him a fool who never got anything out of life."

It, no matter what we do with this business will be with any money matter there is going to be a certain amount of criticism.

I was one of the architects behind the original Bill which was passed in 1968. That Bill was amended so that it did not go into operation on the 1st January, 1974. The new Government has brought the Bill back to Parliament by the most just providing minor financial benefits to the original Bill. I think that there are a few modifications that we can make the Bill to the good. As I supported the Bill in its original form I will have to continue to support it today in order to be consistent.

I support some of the changes made in the amendment Bill, but since the amendments will mean I do not appear 100 per cent I find to be acceptable. For example, I do not agree with the removal of the right to have a gratuity in terms of the Bill. However, I understand the Government's reasoning for it since there are many past Members who could well take advantage of this clause, and if this were done it would cause the Government to have to put out a substantial sum of money during the first year. It is a reasonable amendment. However, I feel that there should have been some provision left so that maybe in future years the pension would be terminated if the recipient decided to terminate the pension on grounds of disability or maybe financial hardship, or whatever the reason may be. Although I will not persevere on amendment, it is a thought which I think should be kept in mind.

An important provision of the Bill is that it takes care of the old Parliaments who served prior to 1968. This has to be laudable and worthy of commendation from this House. I think that the machinery behind the original Bill and perhaps the reasons which were arrived at the time of the new Government is that it is only fair to provide a pension for the old Members who helped to build this country. I am thinking of people like Miss Annie Mullan (spelling) who is now disabled and who has been in a most hard for many reasons which we discuss on this.

MR. G. MAC DONALD (CONTINUED): If time permitted I could cite a dozen more instances of people in their declining years who have been put out on the streets with no job, no pay and no place to eat. I think that it would be a native Australian humility to describe these people as lazy pensioners.

Some remark was made in opposition to this Bill that Members were wanting to give themselves a pension. I have always objected to this because although I do sometimes criticize the Elected Members of Executive Council, I must say that the four men there are very prosperous people, and amongst them we find one of the Territory's only millionaires. So, I do not think that those men are looking for a couple of hundred dollars a month when they reach retirement age. Besides, it is always good to have money. One speaker said that real men are only poor but with money, and it is better to have it now to get out and use than to have it. It is better to be hot and bothered than cold and miserable, so whether the Members stand for re-election I think that it is a right which they have given the Government Staff for many years but a certain permanence for the Government services. To my mind, the Elected Members of this House are important to the Government because they are the policy makers. They are the people who are blamed when anything goes wrong. They are sometimes even named by the press until,

While Mail Boroughs in the Cayman Islands once the wrongs have been substantial peoples they have been honest, hard working, carefully weighed statements, since 1972 we have had a new breed of people created by the 1972 Constitution which gave to the Elected Members of Executive Council responsibility for running the Government of these Islands. If we are to accept responsibility and if we are to accept all the wrongs which go with it, we must also accept the credit. We must accept the price which must be paid.

An attempt has been made to confuse this Bill with that of a social security system. However, I would like to say that this particular Bill will provide a pension for a handful of people who have worked for the Territory, whilst a social security scheme would be a scheme which would provide benefits on a contributory basis irrespective of the contributions made by the beneficiaries of the plan. Also, the cost of this plan is like a drop in the ocean when compared to a social security system.

I realise that the Minister even said that we do not know the premium rate. I do not think that that is relevant to current. The Actuarial Division have full data on the cost of providing this pension plan. We know full well what it will cost within a few dollars. In fact, since last year I can figures which have been prepared by the Government Actuary the estimated cost. In this Meeting I have heard that it would be in the vicinity of $100,000 per year. So, we know the cost.

It has been said that we do not have time to actually, for this session. Here again this is not correct. We have full data and we know what it is limited. We have the past Members know and we will find out pretty much how they, namely the Honourable Third Official Member has a view which is very comprehensive. So, we know the cost and we have the figures to back it up. We are looking at a 300 million Budget.

So, I cannot understand the objection of Members who are saying that we have opposed a whole scheme full of which we cannot afford the cost. I intend to support this Bill. I cannot be deceived by one of the Members which I will not support. I hope that I have the support from because I have made no many statements that I am not sure which is which any more.

MR. G. MIFSUD (OPPOSITION): However, the amendment which I proposed reads:-

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in the Act No. 1, 1959 providing a pension, shall commence 5 per cent of their monthly salary towards the scheme."

I wish to be clear that anyone who is the House receiving a parliamentary salary would contribute 5 per cent. I object to that on the grounds that the Government's scheme for MPs' pensions is not a contributory pension. However, as I mentioned at the start, certain minor points can be taken by Backbenchers. When I made that statement, then I made the broad statement that the amount and the amount mentioned as set out in the Establishment-ation, the fact that one gets a pension is accepted, but the principle was different from and different methods of funding and so on.

So, I object to it on the grounds that this does against the basis of pensions because this 5 per cent contribution is normally a punishment of the Members. If the 5 per cent was necessary for the funding of the pension I could understand it. Many private schemes are funded by a contribution from the employer, plus a contribution from the employee. If the Government had a method of funding whereby contributions were made to private pension plans and that was a part of that contribution method of funding, I would go along with it. However, we do not have such a funding and we are to be told this 5% would create, as the Honourable Prime Minister will tell us, hence with his Government because they would have to set up a whole new line of administration, financial reconciliation and so on and so forth. That's just nonsense. They could be set up in a simple manner, however, by accepting it as one Angley which we have it.

THE PRESIDENT: I have allowed the Member to make his points. I am not sure that it is necessary for anyone however to be in opposition to the Bill which has not been moved, nor the Bill itself.

MR. G. MIFSUD: Sir, Mr. President, I agree with...

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think that I have let you have your point. I do not think that is absolutely necessary.

MR. G. MIFSUD: Sir, I agree with you, Sir. I think that I have made the point that this could be a contributory scheme, an integral part of the pension scheme, and it should not be a beautiful plan.

The Honourable, or anyone who has not previously a pension in the same establishment can choose to take up the same plan, because the further have we can look the Members should be still safe. There was a time when the Members of this House did not receive a salary. If Members feel that they should have no pension, why not give up their pensions voluntarily? If Members feel that the Government cannot afford to pay this pension, why not increase their salaries to 10 per cent of what it is so that the money can be available? Because I think any outlay that the Members of this House can imagine should be the money in their pockets but they need it today. So why are we asking that we would a outlay because we are asking that? We talk it every month. We spend it or like one Member says, he gives it away. However, by accepting it as one Angley which we have it.

MR. J. HARRY BODDEN (continuing): Why not do away with the salary which gives a greater burden on the Government than the pensions? Why not do away with the parliamentary salary? There was a time when the Members of this House did not have a decent building in which to meet. However, thanks to the efforts of parliamentarians in the past we have a fine Parliament building today. There was a time when we did not have staff large enough to cope with all the administrative matters, however, like the advertisements for Virginia Reels, you have come a long way, baby".

We could quite honestly say we did not have offices for the Members of the Legislative Assembly and now I understand that there is quite a temptation and in fact some Members have moved to the parliamentary premises. So, how can we really overview that and how are we going to view on the part of the people to be progressive?

Finally, Sir, there is anyone who on religious grounds believes that it is wrong to receive a pension, I would ask them to read a text chapter 5, verse 4, which says:-

> "If a man provideth not for his own especially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Second Elected Member for George Town.

HON. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rose to support this Bill, I also rise to commend the Parliamentary pensions Law, 1966.

I would like to thank the Second Elected Member for West Bay for her contribution to this debate last Friday. I was unfortunately away, Sir, but it was mentioned by Table to me, and especially to Hansard.

In speaking my thanks on the Parliamentary Pensions Law in May and December, 1966 as proposed by the Second Elected Member for West Bay, I am fully aware, Sir, and always keep in mind my constituents. This should also apply to myself, so I shall now come back to myself. I think, Sir, that it would be well for this House to remember that as well. I am not referring to criticism, or constructive criticism, but there is an old Indian proverb which says:-

> "Never criticize your neighbour until you have walked a mile in his moccasins."

In my two Second Elected Member for West Bay may have to place some of the things which he said and some of the promises which he has made, he might see why he is in this state and I hope that in his next three months of office he will be no more negligent to the needs and wishes and concerns of his people than this present Executive Council has tried to be.

I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that he quoted the excerpts from my debate that I made some comments in this and likewise, Mr. Speaker, I will quote those which are comments on me and which were obviously omitted by him. In my debate last year, Mr. Speaker, my opening remarks were:-

> "I do not subscribe to principle in the notion that this Bill seeks to establish as I fully realize and appreciate the fact that there are several outstanding citizens who have served and are still serving this country, well with little or no compensation."

SEN. W. ALTON JONES (CONTINUING): I want to, Mr. President, and congratulate Senator Long for his statement that I thought that have preceded should have been done. I have on the agenda today a necessity program, with it social security or what have you for the elderly, and I placed my talents on the things, which I considered was off. I said:-

> "Finally, Mr. President, I share the view that a bill of this nature should have been introduced at a more opportune time. Like at the beginning of a new session when the results from amendments that have fully served and its effects fully studied is called.
>
> I therefore do not support this bill at this time."

I, on that understanding that there would come a time hopefully when I would be able to offer the bill my support.

I feel that that time has come, Mr. President. Regardless of what is said about this bill, the good has been done. The recommendations I made to my Administration and a necessity program for the elderly is being carried forward by the Honorable Senator. The hearing is scheduled, I feel that in the final years of the business of this term Senate we should consummate such a bill.

So, Mr. President, in the spirit I have no request for my friend at this time. Accordingly as the Secretary will proceed, the bill was passed and become law to my mind.

Let me say here, Mr. President, that I feel today that my reasons for supporting this bill now just as valid as my reasons were for not fully supporting it on May, 1964, as I today many of my good colleagues have seen fit to this bill, which when passed will give this country a better constitutional republic form.

Mr. President, just because this house has not yet considered the question of this law under a Republican administration does not mean that it should be considered. The consideration has been given to this law and we have today this bill before this Senate to be dealt with. Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that it would have been morally wrong for a new Congressman to propose or advise this law indefinitely out of political spite and vindictiveness, simply because it was not been introduced and passed by a Republican administration. It is true, also, that I am fully of some Congressmen which would have done that. However, this disagreement does not apply to this member and our Congressman should be praised in unity.

It is also true, Mr. President, that there are many persons who are not in this world who will benefit from this. However, those who are immediately in need should not be forced to suffer because of the good intentions of others.

Additionally, Mr. President, many of these like the Senior Citizens for Need Aid and the Pledged Women for Social Gain, many of those who are unwilling for disbursements monies, should support this bill as a step in the right direction, to the ever increasing helping hand of those who are in need.

It is also true, Mr. President, that many of those who are dependent upon this law, and I do not put myself in that category, but it is true that there persons when they should be Representatives of this Democratic House that they have not necessarily always be that more fundamental position, and I do not believe that it was should be permitted for being successful, unavoidably if their interest has been served through these ways.

MR. M. ABDUL AZIZ (CONTINUING): I know, Mr. President, that many irritable statements have been made against the present Government, not the least by some who have previously occupied honourable benches on this side. However, be that as it may, we cannot be a party to any political act for evil. Apart on the economic side which I have dealt with at the start, it is my view and I submit here that this Government has a responsibility and a commitment to have the parliamentary Question Time properly dealt with at this time. Mr. President, what I strongly object to is the intention that Executive Council has resorted to lately or seek to circumvent the spirit with discussion in private and therefore through the amendment to section 3, that is the first section 3 seeks to remove the Governor's power to interpose parliamentary and Executive Council matters.

It is quite true that salaries of Parliamentary Secretaries or Executive Council Members are determined since they become to positions that may be occupied by Private Members, so in order to comply with the spirit of the Section Elected Members, that is Executive Council and the Governor do their work and function.

The salary and pension figures which were moved by the Elected Member for North Side pre-suppose that there will always be an annual increase of 10 per cent. However, everybody does in practice, a Superintendent may not get a rise.

Mr. President, the present salaries being paid have not yet the present Executive Council and the policy of making some salary for ordinary Members of the Legislative Assembly and also for Members of Executive Council are not the same. This is one element in favour that your Government was found in place, and it remains the same until this day. I maintain in this regard, Sir, that whenever a person is paid it must be given an opportunity which salary is correct. This is the only method or practice of which I can salute which is the only method of the Government to calculate pensions. It is calculated on what a man has earned.

It must also be pointed out that the parliamentary secretaries are paid to present Members of Executive Council and I say this on a point of clarification, because on Friday, or during the debate last week, any person listening to this debate would very well get the impression that Executive Council Members are being paid a fix pension at the present time, and that they are paying themselves whatever salaries they deem fit. The pension, Mr. President, which will be paid to any Member of Executive Council, past, pensions or future will only be paid if and when they qualify, and this is strictly set out in subsection (2) of section 3.

Mr. President, it is the right of any Member to exercise his or her privilege in this honourable House. However, I cannot accept the position which has been granted by Executive Council as Members paying themselves this amount without a revision from the last parliament as regards a pensionable pension scheme. Nothing must be forgotten from the fourth and the point which was made on Thursday must be remarked here again. That is that Government is actually pursuing the services of such a scheme. However, the responsibility must be established before the legislation is enacted. This is logical and reasonable, and can only be commended.

Mr. President, I do not feel that anyone is more knowledgeable of a problem than those who have worked long and hard hours experimenting this country under many adverse conditions. As far as I am concerned, there are no more discussions to be had with

MR. M. MORGAN DAVIES (Commissioner): We both share the essence of this Bill and the weight of the case made. How do we ensure that a newly nominated Member can demonstrate knowledge of certain areas, but no-one knows them all. I have to say I am saying that outweighs taken that one shall read, So, Tal we must keep to amendments and pre-judge every case. I am sorry I cannot be more off than on this Bill.

Sir, Mr. President, this is truly a momentous and exciting time in the Assembly. I trust that this will always be the case. I do not desire for one minute the adversity of any Members of this House, but I do not intend to sit by and have Members hold the Government which we do elaborate in such a disparaging and unnecessary manner. This is unjustified for, in my view, and it distracts from considering the business of this House in the dignified manner in which it should be conducted.

As the most Elected Member the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council. It is my intention to speak the contrary my Ministerial Members inside or outside this House; whether in Executive Council or the big room. Mr. President, I cannot help but believe that the adverse objections to this Bill and the adverse criticisms which have been levied at Executive Council are being used as a means of settling some old political bad feelings, some old political grudges I should have said.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, in this Honourable House the fate of the little man is used on a weekly basis as well as by the media and an age to the cause of less. Many times the little man is only used as an excuse.

Mr. President, provision of the Bill into law a fixed pension of $4,000 to be paid annually for Members who served prior to October, 1969. It is the third time a Bill of this nature has passed this Honourable House, but nevertheless of the Bill which was passed into law last year, some of the good things which the Government had put forward, because ostensibly there are the people who worked for nothing. There are the persons who worked under extraordinary circumstances and of these who are still alive should be considered as the last group of persons who served prior to 1969. It is significant to note that no form of pension has been established for these persons justifying which this Bill is, and this was clearly explained by the mover.

A real formula for calculating the pensions which in my mind is most equitable is to work on the salaries to which established rank of service,has provided for the part year of service was once again explained by the mover, whereas the other calculation deals with full years of service. Nevertheless, it still limits the maximum payable to five thirds.

The generous provisions which are long overdue for Executive Council Members have been announced. If this Honourable Council was looking to our service to the Civil Service,they would have left that they could have been eligible after one year of service in that section. However, this has been changed to three years instead of twelve months and it also came August, 1979 as the date for calculation purposes. So, I feel that this was correct in every form and make this as it should be.

The payment of gratuity has been discussed... Many times this would have meant Government having to put out a large amount of money. However there is no doubt that the majority of persons would have eligible a gratuity. However, I think as mover was pointed out by the mover, if this is agreed there a requirement to amend of term, the persons or individual have a fixed amount every month to look forward to and will not find it all at one time.

MR. H. KENNEDY JONES (CONTINUING): There is also provision for the pension payment to cease if a pensioner has been sentenced to twelve months or more imprisonment. This is fair. This is the same as for Civil Servants and I do not feel that parliamentarians should be treated any more favourably than Civil Servants. However, provision has also been made for this to be reviewed under certain conditions.

The question dealing with remuneration has been repealed and rightly so, Mr. President, because in the original Bill this was actually only taking away, because what they would receive could be a pension equivalent of less remuneration they are receiving. I think that they should pay higher salary for the implementation of what is made.

In response wrote, Mr. President, it is my understanding that this will cost Government approximately $185,000 per annum, and this remains as previous. I must say this is a large amount, Mr. President, and the point has been made about the economy being in bad shape. It is true that this would add approximately 1 $0 million deficit as compared to previous and expenditure for the year 2002. Nevertheless, I feel that merely looking at things just economically, that this is not a prohibitive amount and I feel that Government can oppose this more or less on any view.

Mr. President, this Bill might not be perfect. I know that although some members of Committee stage are having proposals. I support the one which makes provision for a viable pension and I believe that in changing out the details at Committee stage we can come up with a Bill which will make a significantly favourable but acceptable to all sectors of our community.

I support the Bill, Mr. President, and I thank you for your attention.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that it may be convenient to allow any further Members wishing to take our reluctantly remaining half-proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11.00 A.M. MID-MORNING REFRESHMENT

MORNING RESUMED AT 11.40 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed. The Second Reading Debate on a Bill for a Law to amend the Parliamentary Pensions Law, 1965. Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable Minister of Economic Development,

HON. MICHAEL G. GOUGH: Mr. President, I feel you that I am in somewhat of a difficult position here as the Second Elected Member for Pavilion but because basically what I am looking at is a procedure which has to be done in a reasonable right. If, Mr. President, although as Elected Member of the Legislature I possibly will not be eligible to any benefits under the Parliamentary Pensions Law because I am not a pensioner under the Civil Service Pensions Act.

MR. KEEGSTRA: (CONTINUED) I should say, Mr. President, that it was quite extraordinary being in the Opposition here to the budget of this year, and one need not go any further to see the reason why.

Mr. President, during 1983 when the Constitutional Package was about ready by this Legislature, certainly there was quite a lot of opposition to it in the public. Being a member of the public at that time, I see made by comments. The comments appeared in a letter to the editor of the Edmonton Journal newspaper which appeared on May 23rd, 1984. Mr. President, in this letter I mentioned the fact that I was not sympathetic to the proposals. The principle of a multiculturalism package I was in a reasonable policy because I realized that the demand on them was very high in the province that they were going into, for years ago or more, and that personally while many Albertans are financially well off and able to give some voluntary service without remuneration, there are others who are not in a similar fortunate position, and therefore it would expect that a certain amount would be quite a good thing to make. Those were the questions I had, Mr. President.

However, in the letter I also spoke on the Alberta Economic Development Authority, benefits under the Act dating back to 1965, because I was aware, Mr. President, that Portfolio responsibility came into the duties of Government with the new Constitution in 1972. Therefore, it would be fair to say that Executive Council considered on just that date. What happened before, Mr. President, is that Executive Councillors attended a weekly meeting, or any special meeting for which they were notified beforehand and knowledge. Later on around the end of the decade Executive Council Members were given an office in the Government Office building. They were given desks and their files were put there where they could look at various cabinets. They could prepare their agenda and whatever else in preparation for the duties of Executive Council. However, mainly in an office and having responsibility for portfolio matters only came into effect at the end of 1979.

Mr. President, the letter which the Premier also said that Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Members maintain the right to be principally involved in matters of Government, and that sometimes this came in conflict of their attendance at meetings. So, it was thought that a Minister doing this is unlike to the circumstances was quite pertinent.

Mr. President, what perhaps prompted to me write that letter was the matter was being debated in the Legislature Assembly in May, 1984, which indicated that providing Ministers with a generous pension, they indicated to the penalty and remedial which I drew to reimbursement. They did not refer to salaries also and I suppose that is one item that I was not happy. Mr. President, the pension to which I refer to retirement was the same policy as the same policy which all civil servants received. They spoke as though I was given generous treatment. This did not refer to the fact that I had served thirty-seven and a half years in the Civil Service before I decided to take my pension. Thirty-seven and a half years, Mr. President, is the one year which they were planning for themselves when they would become eligible for a pension.

Mr. President, they did not mention that my rights to that pension was the same rights applied with other civil servants. They even mentioned, Mr. President, my age at pre-retirement leave. They did not say that this was a compensation for the many hours of overtime which I contributed to Government in order to balance budgets and subsidize the efficiency of my office.

MR. ABDUL K. SOMANJE (INTERPRETER): They did not envisage right from the one year pre-retirement leave documentation was also extended to four or five other officers of the Senate.

Well, a lot of things are said in this House, Mr. President, and they have to get used with it, Mr. President. The amendment FOUR which is before the House and which we were having debated, a Bill for a Law to amend the Parliamentary Pensions Law, 1992, appears to have removed some of the anomalies which were experienced when the Parliamentary Pensions Law, 1992 came into effect.

Mr. President, there are quite a number of amendments to the Law and these have been divided by Members who have spoken already. One of the areas which I would like to mention, Mr. President, are probably that section 4 of the Bill which amends Section 10 of the Parliament of Sierra Leone Law prior to 1991. The Law itself had limited qualifications of service beginning from 1992. This, Mr. President, is something which the present Government regrets very much, for we have people who were eligible for the salaries who would be very grateful for any benefit which would be enjoyed by them under this Law. I have one personality very well, for he was my class mate secondary for a long time until I moved away from that area, he is now Vice-President. Therefore when I made amendments that he would not continue like a pensioner because his qualifications were more or less like mine. However, Mr. President, I just assure you that that is not the reason why I am referring to Mr. Claude Hill. As I said, I mentioned his name because I know his personal circumstances and I would hope that the benefit would enjoyed to him.

Mr. President, as far as the responsibility of service is concerned so that the people in retirement will receive their pension gradually, that is a matter of depending the problem of responsibility I have ever greatly that pension is received. That provides an opportunity who I have of the Government not for the reasons because it gives them a long list of money under. They are not to have benefit. At the same time, it reduces the amount of pension which they receive monthly. Mostly by reducing this particular section in Section the Members of the Judiciary expect of the payment, is not mostly experiment them of any benefit under the Law. They will still draw their full pension.

Mr. President, section 7 of the Bill also sets the qualifying period for Executive Council's pension. The calculation would begin from August, 1977 and not from 1979 as had originally been proposed in the Law. I think, Mr. President, this time is quite right from what I have said already, which is that responsibility started really at the end of 1977, and that Members of Executive Council should therefore properly be eligible for pension as from that date.

Mr. President, another amendment which was done in section 8 of the Bill is to increase the Executive Council Members' eligibility to qualify for a pension from the one which is in the original Act to three years as proposed in the present amendment. This being, Mr. President, that a Member could only be Executive Council for one year, retire after one year became eligible for a pension under the original Parliamentary Pensions Law. However, with this amendment, it would require them to serve at least three years before they would be eligible for that benefit. So, there has been this improvement in the Law.

HON. JAMES G. JOHNSON (CONTINUED): Mr. President, in the case of Civil Servants, they have to serve ten years in the Service before they are qualified to draw a pension, although the pension is only paid at age 55 to 60. That means, Mr. President, that if you joined the Civil Service at age 45, at 60 when he could retire then he would be paid a pension. Similarly with the Executive Council Member, he would have to serve three years and then at age 55 he would be eligible for a pension now.

Mr. President, as I see it there was really no need for the extent to which Members opposed this Bill, whether they like it or not, this Government has taken a responsibility to do one thing or the other with this Bill, the Parliamentary Secretaries Bill, 1984. Either we reject the Bill or we accept it to reasonably do that if would certainly those who would benefit therefrom. I think, Mr. President, that if we are going to remove the services of a reliable Government, and I am glad that the Opposition stated that today, they spoke about the terrible people over here [illegible]. I do not know where this information came from, but I think that there is one in this case who would very well be.... (LAUGHTER). I did not call any names, but the fact of it, Mr. President, is not terribly possible. However, regardless, Mr. President, as a reliable Government we have the responsibility and the need of some of the people who have served this country over the years, people who have given valuable time to the administration of this country for whatever their contract, their service and their support to this Legislature Assembly and their work for a number which would be beneficial to the country, these Islands certainly would not have developed and grown to where we see them today.

The Cayman Islands are looked upon, especially on account taken, on the map of the Caribbean. We have much to be proud of here. I am sure that many of the other smaller countries of the Caribbean would like to follow our footsteps. We just have independence like, many of them would have to study our way of life and what we do have to be successful in the country, and I am sure that if they had the ability and the capacity to follow we that they could. We are still moving on. Everything should be done to the best of our ability. We have recently completed a hurricane [illegible] which again is an area to be proud of and will find the way of the Caribbean Islands. This is how the Islands are moving. We go from strength to strength and we just wish to see the best interests of the people and the country itself. All this credit, Mr. President, must go to the Members of this Legislative Assembly, past and present. The good job of pension which we are considering here is really a small token, a small reward for their service which they have rendered to this country.

Because of that, Mr. President, I have no hesitation at all in supporting the Bill before us.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other honourable Member wish to speak? The Honourable Elected Member for Bodden Town.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I support the Bill before us, Sir, a Bill for a Law to amend the Parliamentary Pensions Law, 1984. I do not think that I need to be reminded, as these anyone else need to be reminded that on May, 1984 when the Parliamentary Pensions Bill was brought before this Honourable House, that I opposed the Bill and that I said that I thought that the Bill should have not been considered accordingly which some Members for the benefit of the people, our terms of independence as to whether that was possible.

HON. RONALD O. EDWARDS (CONTINUING): Mr. President, having opposed the Bill in May, 1978, it was planned that it be a Government one has to accept the majority decision. The Government when the Bill was brought back for postponement of the effective date of the Law, it was made clear that it was the intention of the Government to study the Law back after studying it. We now say that there was no need to postpone it. Today the Law Lords would be up to say that one is not a person at law. The Government should have been happy (or embarrassed if it had not brought this Bill back to the Council from once it had studied it.

Mr. President, this Bill, I am sure is still unsatisfactory to the public. For that reason there is no time at which this Bill could have been brought which would make it less contentious. There is no ideal time for bringing unpopular legislation, but today is this Government was committed to do. I believe, Mr. President, that the Bill before us today has succeeded in removing many of the areas of dissatisfaction which were experienced with the Bill when it was brought in May, 1984.

For example, Mr. President, the same persons provisions which exists in the Law at the moment a Member of Executive Council qualifies for an Executive Council post, after one year has been removed. What do the three years. Secondly, where the Executive Council Member needs some qualification for a Full Executive Council position he only has one of four years, it has now been extended over the same period as the Assembly Member. In other words, an Executive Council Member who has only spent the equivalent of two years in Executive Council office for twelve months. That is significant change, Mr. President. Also, as Members have said, the time for existing the qualifying period has been reduced from four to five years, the difference being that from 1969 to 1974 the Executive Council was basically in an advisory capacity with not too much responsibility although, Mr. President, I can personally say that from 1969 Executive Council Members took quite a bit of attack.

Mr. President, since the change has been made that Executive Council Members are, shall I say, feathering their own nests, I think that it would be right if Members took note of the points which I have just raised. That is where the amendment before us puts the qualifying period from one to three years, and it has taken a minimum of eight years to continue the present system, whereas it could have been achieved in four years. There is also the fact that the qualifying period was begun from August, 1974 to expand to October, 1981. Mr. President, personally to my own mind, that helps lopping off those years of Executive Council service. So, if I was feathering my own nest maybe those three years would not have been lopped off at least.

Mr. President, in fact I also mentioned the fact that I thought that some provisions recently been laid aside to those people who may have been in mind but did not meet the minimum qualifications for a pensions. Mr. President, this has been inevitably met by the amendment which is laid before Members ? of the principal Law which provides for a fixed pension to be paid to those persons who served before 1974. The amendment which is before us will complete what was already the intention that widows of those persons, whether the persons who served have died before this time or the subsequently, will receive the widow's pension as the Law stands as well.

SEN. TOWSON OF KENTWOOD (CONTINUED): Mr. President, another significant change in this bill is that as has been mentioned, both Legislative Council Members and Legislative Assembly Members will be paid in part, in support of the time actually spent in the House. The bill has been amended twice more as of session of 4 years, 6 years and 12 years. A person who served 8 years originally got no more than the person who served 6 years. With this formula which has been retained into the bill now, then a person qualified for their service allowance based on the amount time of each completed month that he has served in the Assembly or Executive Council, except if service that is neither used or has been used for eligibility as a pension.

It is significant also, Mr. President, that the members of the Montana Legislature will be given the opportunity of the Finance Committee of the Legislative Assembly, and it is then after the salary has been increased or retiring Members. That mightmean the last and I think that is a desirable one to remove any possible doubt which could have been attributed to that section.

The last clause of the bill which calls for the new title also is necessary that people would have to maintain their pension if they were employed after the have been elected to Legislature. However, then it is possible that once they have served their terms or have been defeated or a Member, then their pension is terminated. Mr. President, in I understand it is the Members who the Civil Service pension and I know that it is in the Retirement Legislature for Montana retired in the House. So, that I think that the two ought to continue and there is nothing required in there with it which, Mr. President, the section which deals with the retirement legislature for Montana which the Legislature Assembly before they can benefit under this bill. I think that it is important that the public understands this, and also that one does not benefit by being on that retirement in the House. There was some of us I understand, who intend to go on each beyond this so the people might decide or elect to their Members.

HON. GEORGE O. NATTY (Queensborough): Mr. President, several Members have touched on section 8 of the Bill, that is where the ability of qualified persons to nominate certain persons to a Judgeship can be given. While I was the opponent of some Members who have said that this should be exactly where people were in the Bailiwick, I believe that having taken this out, Mr. President, has restricted much of the discretion which this Bill would have placed in Government all or one side. It certainly would have answered to a lot more clear what the total people will be going to be under the various schemes.

I should point out, Mr. President, that the Bill does provide for the Law to become effective on the 1st January, 1968, so it would have been the present Government who brought the matter in December to stay the coming into offices so that it could study the Bill more closely and make the recommendations which are before the House now. The benefits of from the 1st January, 1968 in the present Bill do just as much to those persons who qualify. In fact in the present Bill do just as much to those persons who qualify. In fact in the present Bill there seems to be a bit of a long run against me that they are getting it.

Mr. President, I envisage that I will with the assistance to please I do be pressed at the Committee stage. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Hon. Elected Member for the Lower Islands.

CAPT. JOSEPH S. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, I wish to support this Bill, a Bill for it has to amend the Constitutional Law, 1962. As has been said on this score, I was a Member from 1962 to 1967 and had the privilege of studying the Parliamentary Sessions Bill as it was presented to us in May, 1962. At that time I said that I would not support it in the present form.

I am happy that this has improved and for to suggest the coming into operation date of this Law to give an additional time to study it. Also two of the things which I mentioned at that time. I felt that we should provide for those who absolutely wanted maintenance party back to the Legislature that have been taken away.

I was started yesterday on a question of my speeches. I am proud of what I said then and I am proud of the stand which I take today. I come here to represent my people and their views. When it was presented to 1964 at each short meeting, we were not able to look at to our constituents and get their approval. We must all realize that people when not properly informed, often cannot make an intelligent decision. So some of our constituents, unless we are able to explain fully to them, do not understand exactly what we are trying to do.

I feel as I stand at this time that it is our duty from on to pass judgement that people who have reached retirement age are not entitled to compensation for services rendered, which enabled us to have it said in a free democratic house today. Therefore, I am very grateful to the Government that they have seen fit to put the date back to, also that they have changed the time of qualification for the Executive Council election. I would like at this time, Mr. President, to state publicly that I deeply appreciate the consideration the Elected Members of Executive Council gave me on this Bill. They presented a typewritten copy for my scheme of my coming to this House and asked that I make suggestions on any amendment which I felt was necessary. This I deeply appreciate for I feel that discussion on this on the opposite side of the House on important like mine to them, and we should have an opportunity to have our input.

Chief Market Development Programme: This I asked for four years in the previous Budget and received very little of it. I am grateful that finally I was able to have an input into this Parliamentary schedule 2011.

I note in the estimates vote for Defence exactly twice as much is allocated for Defence Services. I am aware, Mr. President, that during this period there were a few maintenance workers and workmates in the house at that time serving in the same capacity as Clerical Workers either than they were nominated and not elected by the people. I would feel that it should be only just that those Members be included in this provision. If some amendment could be made that the nominated Members could also be I would feel more enthusiastic and that they were getting money owed for the valuable services they rendered.

Another thing comes to my mind, Mr. President, since we do have members in our community who have received Knighthoods and who served in this Legislature for only one term, a period of four years. This does not qualify them for any pension as yet. Many of these people annual facilities for four years and were not re-elected by the people, not necessarily for any reason of theirs. Often the new incoming candidates were more popular and therefore have more to their credit. I feel that it was highly correct that four years should have a proportionate weight to these who served six years. I do not know whether this can be done for any other way. However, I do feel it my duty to submit my views on how I feel towards the workers who were defeated at the polls and could only serve here four years.

Mr. President, I said in 1984 that I felt that we needed to provide for our people and I still have that same feeling. I fully realise that whatever we do must be done in a proper and orderly manner. The honourable Prime Minister/Member of Economic Council has given us an undertaking that he will have a review carried to now about a contributory pension scheme for all our people. I have had considerable acquaintance with the social security system in the United States and also with the pension scheme in Canada. I know that it is an extremely expensive operation and I readily wonder if it was not that question here, if with the amount of problems which would be necessary to sort it out, our elderly people could really benefit. We hope that there would have to be another review for a period of at least eight to ten years before the final would be implemented, unless it was established by Government. Only then honourable Chief Ministers/Members have of the Government to provide any pension.

I am not here to try to hang my hat higher than I can reach and I do not feel that my legislature we should attempt that either. Mr. President, I do not qualify for a pension, neither by age or by terms served in this house, and also I am still a sitting Member, so I am not here trying a pension for myself. However, I am here to vote my conscience that I should applaud and pay respects to those who so faithfully served in the years that things were really, really hard here in the Cayman Islands.

I say, Mr. President, that we must do for all our other elderly people and many which we have here while I know that we greatly meet of this problem still we will, I feel, be brought more of our aged people in later months. I hope that some kind neither disappointments here still are not created. Finally, I feel again our responsibility to do the best we can for all of our people however we can.

So with these few words, Mr. President,

I support the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak? The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. CHARLES H. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. Speaker, in regard to clarification on this Bill before us, a Bill for a Law to amend the Municipal Pensions Law, 1956, I would agree with some previous speakers that the public hearing referred to the Select Committee may not have the necessary interpretation of the Bill.

Looking at the old Law, Mr. Speaker, it says that a Member means an Elected Member of the Legislative Assembly. Then Elected Member, Mr. Speaker, must mean a person of that kind, or at least six months before he qualifies.

It goes on further, Mr. Speaker, to say that he qualifies when he ceases to be a Member and attains the age of 55 years, or not having attained the age of 55, he produces medical evidence to the satisfaction of the Pensions Secretary that he is incapable by reason of infirmity of mind or body, of discharging the duties of a Member, and that such incapacity is likely to be permanent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, first he must be an Elected Member. Secondly, he must have a record of at least six years. He must have retired to be a Member of this House. He must have attained the age of 55, or he must actually be financially incapacitated with medical evidence that he is no longer able to carry out these duties.

That is one of the persons who qualifies, Mr. Speaker. The second person who qualifies, Mr. Speaker, is under that amendment that proposed to change a which appears section 2 and reads as follows:-

> "Section 2 of the principal Law is amended by inserting the following new subsection immediately after subsection (2) -
>
> "(2) Subject to the provisions of this Act, a pension shall be paid to any person -
> (a) who has ceased to be elected to the last day of October, 1958, having served as a Member;"

This is what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, the amendment between which is the amendment used in those days. So, if the Government agreed one day for this coming session to the 1st October, 1958, he qualifies for the amount over of $1,200.

As the Bill, Mr. Speaker, there are persons which seek to amend the previous calculation of a pension. If we look at the last whole section 2, those persons who qualify and who have served a period of at least six years are entitled to one-third of $1,200. Those former Members of the House who qualify and have served more years would be entitled to half the $1,200. If your on, Mr. Speaker, to say that if a person Member has served twelve years or more, he is entitled to two-thirds of the $1,200. In that Bill, Mr. Speaker, under section 2, the gradually and reduced pension are covered. This section, as previously mentioned by other Members, has been corrected because we are not able at this time to support the granting of gratuities, it is not a small sum, Mr. Speaker, and it will not provide in a small way from the coffers of this country.

MR. THOMAS O. FARRINGTON (CONTINUED): If we were to consider those entitled to the pension, Mr. President, the gratuity amount, together with the retired pension would place a charge on the country's exchequer in 1953 of roughly £491,000.

However, Mr. President, if we now postpone that to the present Bill which authorises, we would be authorising payments to Parliament until those elected members who qualify, as I said about fourteen who served over many years, are dead as also all Members who served only a few years, for as long as 100 Members qualify and the total bill is roughly £80,000.

If we take both, Mr. President, at the level of Members who will qualify under the Bill, and we now put pensions, Mr. President, what the Bill is effectively carrying out is authorising which effects previous years, that is the Members, pensions and gratuities, I am personally not clear of - the Attorney-General before I rise again, Mr. President, we will need further investigations to be done that this Bill is completed. I am pointing, Mr. President, that the reason I have not moved the Motion to fix Postponed was precisely how often we put the amendments of these 28 persons together with those who have elected after 1959 and those elected Members, the question to be charged to the 1959 elections would be roughly £150,000.

Therefore, Mr. President, and that briefly was the difference financially between what we presently record and the amendment which we propose this House, in respect of 1959, the pension liability alone that £150,000. If we look at the two or three years hence, 1960 and 1961, we still find that pensions gratuity will have already granted, that is the £491,000, it would then mean to reduce the last figure at the moment. It would have amounted to a sum of roughly £191,000. In the following year, 1962, it would remain at a sum of roughly £150,000. The Attorney-General, Mr. President, recalls from persons who qualify but have not reached the age of 60 for 1965, that means the age of 50 in 1962.

When we look at this, Mr. President, and compare it to what will be the results as a part of the Bill before us, 1960 would be roughly £191,000 under the present Bill, assuming that the gratuities are already given for 1959. The sum under the new amended Bill would be £191,000 and in 1962 it would be £150,000.

So, Mr. President, the difference is mainly in the change of the 1965 pensions. There is a significant difference between £150,000 and £191,000.

Mr. President, I do therefore strongly the motion moved by a Member. We referred to a discrepancy of £1 million. That difference, Mr. President, arose from misconception of the Attorney-General's Report and the £1.2 million, mistakenly assuming, as observed because we are talking about pensions for the financial year of 1964. However, if it then necessitate, Mr. President, the increase of funds from the General Revenue of £1.2 million roughly, we then ask the question on the rest of that sum will a deficit of approximately £221,000.

Mr. President, we are based about the financial situation of this Government. We can go and about the many things which have been done in this country since the last election. We are employed this country to many commitments in the Commonwealth and further afield in many respects. A responsibility, Mr. President, is something which, as I think was said earlier by one of the Members of this House, is increasing annually in many countries.

MRS. TERESA C. ARTEMIO (CONTINUING): Is it a matter of decision, there is no legal or legislative problem we can do legislation for the entire country? The question, Mr. President, on the latter is quite complicated and complex and this Government needs clarification time to study it. I do not believe, Mr. President, that there is one Member in this honorable House who could say that he does not wish to provide for a peaceful future for everyone in this country. It is a matter of how we go about it, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the allocation in the appropriations for pensions to members of the Legislative Assembly after this amendment has been passed, and I assure that will happen, will require a supplementary appropriation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HON. M. MANUEL ROXAS: Mr. President, maybe I should have spoken before, but I wonder if the Member on sponsorship speech could tell the House, when did Government service in the Philippines in fact come up?

HON. TERESA C. ARTEMIO: Mr. President, I have had figures since 1964. When we are dealing with Congressmen, Mr. President, I do not think that there is anyone in this House who can tell us exactly who they are, whether they are alive or what have you. That is the reason why we have been going around in the last couple of days trying to make sure that we have that.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that it will probably be convenient if we now take our luncheon break. I will therefore suspend proceedings until, perhaps, around six or, at least, not later than 3:15 p.m.

AT 12.56 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED.

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3.46 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

According to my tally there is one Member who has not spoken yet. Does he wish to speak? In that case, I think I am right that all the others have, I will ask the Member if he chooses to exercise his right of reply.

HON. SERGIO A. OSMEÑA: Mr. President, I would like to thank the Hon. Floirendo and the one Official Member for supporting this bill. So the two Elected Members, namely the Elected Member for North Cebu and the Second Elected Member for West Bay, I say to them, I feel sorry for them and I pity them because, Mr. President, they are only -- they are pawns, Mr. President.

Mr. President, one Member asked why the bill should come back right now. It was for two reasons, Mr. President, that when the bill was finally approved by Congress we wanted to make sure that we have it on the record so if necessary,

HON. DENNIS E. SMITH (Cosmopolitan): Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, as it stands this year a question was thrown at me by the Grand Standard Member for Bodina Town, and many supplementaries including one from the Second Standard Member for Jacaya Town. I am glad, Mr. President, to see the availability of these Members. At that stage, Mr. President, I gave them the assurance that Government proposed to have a close look at the Parliamentary Pensions Act, 1961 and bring an amendment Bill to this House in due course. I was questioned about what a "close look" and "in due course" meant. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I see a man who tried to live up to my word and that is one reason why the Bill is back here now. The second reason, Mr. President, is that it was a law on our Statute Books and it could not be left there in limbo, Sir. It had to either be repealed or brought back, and I see no problem coming to repeal it.

What this amending Bill does is to make the law more equitable and in the case most appealing to our ears. Mr. President, we were amazed at being asked by the Government for the purpose of passing out the pensions. It does not take much arithmetic, Mr. President, to calculate that if a Member is to earn a maximum pension, that is two-thirds of twelve years which the old Act stated, that he serves all of the rest of one-two hundred and eighteen from such a number of service. Twelve goes by twelve months again 144, two-eighteenths. Only by the use of the abacus, Mr. President, could please not be given into account. Taken all the less as it stands, a Member who has served nine years and eleven months gets the equivalent of a nine year service.

The amending Bill brought to the House in this Meeting is an excellent one, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I commend the Honourable Minister for Work Sick and the Second Standard Member for Work Sick and the Second Standard Member for Jacaya Town. Mr. President, but in the world one remember something which one has not got and which we might not get, Mr. President, because if these Members are not re-elected they would not be eligible.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I am sure only they were well aware that that section in the Act was going to be repealed, the remuneration section. I doubt very much, Mr. President, if they could remember something for their late and successors, especially when this clause is out of the Act. So, Mr. President, there are considerations for us to amendment, the Act would the people that are really affected or.

MR. M. MORRIS rose:

HON. DENNIS E. SMITH: It shows the pain through.

Mr. President, the Second Standard Member for West Bay must know this Chamber now for prohibited and withdrawal. I agree, Mr. President, but it is a pity that some people abuse it, withdraw, Mr. President, have developed many problems and if we are not careful they can destroy us as well.

Mr. President, hence I am going for the suspension of standing Order 42(1) to bring it in consistent to the Act. It is felt that the wishes of some of these Members should be given a pension since the two years into a three. It is really to be difficult to understand all these words because we have a lot of records in the old Government Administration Building and we will possibly have to put out a notice in newspapers, and ask people to make a claim.

MRS. DEBBIE A. PORTER (CONSTITUENT): Mr. President, I am not going to oppose this, but because we have a lot of business to get through. However, aside I would like to thank Members for their support and I ask them for the same when we give the amendment in Committee stage. Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a law to amend the Parliamentary Elections Law, 2006, be given a Second reading.

QUESTION PUT: Ayes and Noes

MR. W. MORGAN SIGH: May we have a division, Mr. President?

MR. PRESIDENT: Certainly.

DIVISION
NO. 69

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis A. Fyntan	Mr. W. Morgan Sigh
Hon. Michael C. Barclay	Mr. D. Kaspar Walker
Hon. Dennis C. McClinton	
Hon. Lennox O. Shanks	
Hon. W. Morgan Sigh	
Hon. Capt. Christian A. Wickham	
Hon. Edward M. Holmes	
Hon. Sophia T. Burnett	
Mr. Winford J. Hinson	
Capt. Ruby S. Rawlinson	
Mr. D. Kasp Walker	
17	2

PASSED BY MAJORITY: BILL ENTITLED A SECOND READING.

MR. PRESIDENT: What concludes Morning Business. We will now go into Committee to study a Bill entitled the Consolidated Collection of Customs Duties Bill, 1998, and various other bills.

THE PROVISIONAL COLLECTION OF CUSTOMS DUTIES BILL, 1998

COMMITTEE STAGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps before we embark on consideration of the clauses of any of the individual bills I would just ask the Committee whether they would accept that I am right in suggesting that the usual practice which we have adopted for a number of years, should be adopted on this occasion too, that is to say the practice of withholding the memorable Second Official Number in order to prevent any printing errors or typographical mistakes, things of that kind, so that we do not need to look to identify all of that as we go through the Bills, but can leave it to deal with them. Does any Member disagree with that? No, I think that we can assume that that is to be the procedure again. On that note, the Bills be read in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN (CONTINUING): The Amendment Proposed by Question Number Six, 1985." I think notice of the amendment which is in clause 2 from the Electoral Members from South Side.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - LOCAL BOARDS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

CAPTAIN HON. JAMES: CLAUSE 2 IS VERY IMPORTANT.

HON. MINISTER OF HEALTH: Mr. Chairman, I do not appear to have in my possession a copy of the Committee stage amendment proposed for clause 2. Perhaps the Clerk could place on a copy? Thank you

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL BOARDS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 stand part of the Bill. However, as I said, I have in my given notice of an amendment to that clause. Perhaps before we start debating with the clause itself, the Electoral Member for South Side would like to speak to his amendments

MR. D. EDWARD HICKEY: Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, as expressed in my debate on this Bill, Sir, I expressed concern about the time which period before the enactment, which would be the 31st of the resolution. I therefore filed the amendment and to have been circulated to Members, which has not appeared really. The new paragraph (e) would say that upon the resolution coming into force, the Bill in relation to the resolution would have to be brought before the Electoral Committee of the Assembly. Section (2)(b) of the new paragraph would state that the resolution would expire on the coming into effect of the Law of the relevant Bills - a fixed expiry of one month, whichever is the shorter.

It has the effect of possibly just over twelve to one month the life of the resolution, and stipulates that the Bills be brought before the Electoral Committee after the vote on the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Am I right in understanding that it is the intention of the amendment which talks about the deletion of the last paragraph of clause 2?

HON. D. MICHAEL HICKEY: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is the last paragraph of clause 2(1) starting "The resolution shall" which is to be deleted?

HON. D. EDWARD HICKEY: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will normally the last paragraph of clause 2, because there is a paragraph (a), (b) and (c).

HON. D. EDWARD HICKEY: It is the last part of clause 2(1)(b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. So the words to be deleted are:-

> "The resolution shall, for a period ending six (6) months after the date on which it is passed, have effect as if contained in a Law."

MR. M. EDWIN MICHAEL: Yes, Sir.

MAJ. MICHAEL J. WHALEN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, with respect I think that there will need to be some change in the wording of the words to be transposed, as proposed to be inserted paragraph (2)(c), because thereby under 2(b) says that an amendment must not render a clause unintelligible or ungrammatical. With the prospect, if the words are not so, would be of the same character, this amendment would read:-

"Where the Legislature decides, pursuant a resolution which -

(a) provides for something;

(b) provides something"

then:-

"(c) will be related."

I think that there is some significant difficulty.

MR. M. EDWIN MICHAEL: I am open to suggestions to correct it by the Honourable Second Objector, Sir, as long as the intent is maintained in that the words are brought within one page and that the rule of the resolution is thirty days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suppose that the way of doing it might be to say at the very beginning of section 2(2), "Where within"..... in a whole.

MAJ. MICHAEL J. WHALEN: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if I may make a suggestion that we could take the word "that" away as the first word of the proposed new paragraph (c) and put in the words "which Assembly Order 2010" and put at the end "which renders unintelligible or ungrammatical".

"Where the Legislative Assembly passes a resolution which requires action will thereby related to the measure have Sixty Clear Working".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, would you say that again?

MAJ. MICHAEL J. WHALEN: If in the words to be inserted paragraph (c) we delete the first word "that" and put in the words "which renders unintelligible".

"passes a resolution which which requires all words have Sixty Clear Working".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would it not be better if paragraph (c), which really deals with a matter different word of thing to (a) and (b) was not (c) at all, but came at the very end of paragraph (1) of clause 2 after "in a Law"?

MAJ. MICHAEL J. WHALEN: I agree, Sir. I am merely trying to fit the minimum changes to the Honourable Member's new wording.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I am not quite sure whether a change of this kind is an immaterial to the Government, I think that it is. Do I might about that?

SEN. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON. In principle, Sir, we agree with the amendment, "Subsection (a) is amended" and then the words "after the House bill".

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is going to be amended, I think that it is more than we just the BCII version be the one which will be more satisfactory, rather than just the latter change....

MR. J. STANLEY MILLER: Do not worry about getting off my problem, Sir. There are two things which we have affected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I might that the result of the committee would be quite content to have the Honourable Second Official Member place the wording of (1) provided that the distinction was the distinction between the cases

MR. E. RICHARD MILLER: Certainly, Sir.

SEN. MICHAEL J. MCGRATH: The other way, Sir, we might at the end of sub-clause (1) to substitute or and put there the words:-

> "shall have statutory effect as if enacted in a law by this Bill passed by the Assembly have their first meeting."

In other words we do not have a succession subparagraph (a), but put the words of subparagraph (a) slightly changed, right at the end after the words "the Governor", so that it would read as, here:-

> "Where the Legislative Assembly passes a resolution which
>
> [a]" or by,
>
> "(b)" or to.
>
> "the resolution shall expire on the sooner date after of the Law of the Supreme Bills, or upon the expiry of one month, whichever is the shorter of this Bills resolved by the passage in the resolution have had their first meeting in the next ten days in which the House sits after the date on the resolution."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could that not be misinterpreted as meaning that if the Bill had not had their first meeting within ten days then the resolution should not expire? Might it not be better to say "provided that" rather than "if"?

SEN. MICHAEL J. MCGRATH: Yes, might, I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so. Is that it might read better which is why:-

> "; provided that the resolution shall expire unless...."

At the very end after "in a law", I think that you were going to say "of all Bills". I was going to say:-

> "provided that the resolution shall expire unless all Bills...."

MR. SWATMAN (CONTINUING): I think that would be unobjectionable. I think what would have to happen next is that the draftsman should be instructed and he, either we would be misunderstanding how it is an amendment which really only has one part. It has a (a) and (b) and a (i) and (ii). (b) disappears and (a) and (i) and (ii) now become (a), (b) and (c) in your amendment. Would you please-

> "Prepare a re-numbered (by the deletion of the last paragraph of clause 6 and the subdivision thereof as (a), (b) and (c)) version of the following paragraph:
>
> "The resolution shall expire on the coming into effect of the Peace Treaty, or upon the expiry of one month, whichever is the shorter provided that the resolution shall remain subject to Article 2 in the meantime in the resolution have their first meeting in which the views are after the vote on the resolution."

MR. S. PEACE MINISTER: Sir, I do move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have I your first right?

MR. MINISTER S. ISSACS: Yes.

MR. MR SWAMY: You do not object I know?

MR. MINISTER S. ISSACS: No, Sir, with respect, I think that you have left out the section which gives absolutely effect to the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I take I said that clause 6 should be amended as follows, by the deletion of the last paragraph of clause 6. To that right? the amendment would read as follows:

"Amendment to clause 6."

MR. MINISTER S. ISSACS: Is the last paragraph of clause 6, sir?

MR. S. PEACE MINISTER: It stands, this resolution stands.

MR. MINISTER S. ISSACS: Perhaps we should argue...

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the Peace Settlement, are you making of what I am referring to is the last paragraph in the Peace Bill?

MR. MINISTER S. ISSACS: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In fact, the only part of sub-clause 1 of clause 6 which states "the resolution shall for a period".

MR. MINISTER S. ISSACS: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, since we are in agreement introducing a completely new Constitutional clause amendment, it might be advisable if we say that clause 6 is amended by the deletion of the last three lines of sub-clause 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that would be clearer.

REP. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: So that clears it up considerably about paragraph....

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had earlier established that what was to be deleted was those three lines, but it is my guess that they could have been more clearly identified. Since we are re-thinking the amendment I'm not the draftsman expert. In which case, the amendment will now read as follows:-

"Amendment to clause 2.

That clause 2 be amended as follows: the deletion of the last three lines of sub-clause 1 of clause 2 and the re-substitution of the following:-

"The constitution shall expire at the coming into effect of the Law of the Supreme Entity, or upon the expiry of one month, whichever is the shorter provided that the constitution shall expire unless all Entity subjects to the provisions of the constitution have their Royal Highness whom the head has duly on whose fine after the 4 on the constitution."

REP. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: We could keep expanding for ever, Mr. Chairman, since in the last sub-clause the words read "duly necessary effect", it might be better to say the words that the "constitution shall cease to have subsidiary effect" instead of "shall expire", do you think there are two different....

MR. CHAIRMAN: It says the courts think that they shouldn't be interpreted in two different ways because we have used two different....

REP. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY: Is there any light also on my own mind here that we look at it more carefully and we know what you....

REP. PEGGY E. MIFSUD: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it might be wise to let the amendment which has been read a number of times before we finalize this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other points. It might be better....

REP. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: ...not to settle any amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well I rather think that. If the Committee would agree, it might be wiser to leave this clause still open and we have the honourable Second Official Member can satisfy himself that he has got a point which ought to be going in to subsidiary enlightenment and assistance; that that point can be circulated to Members and we can come back to it later on.

MR. E. PAULEY AZZOPARDI: That is alright with my line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that case....

REP. MICHAEL J. CRUCIATA: Well, there is not very much here, let us come back to it because we have so many questions on this Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I wondered would we not pass on previously to consider Bill? That is what I had in mind, that we could really leave considering with this Bill until when we are more ready to do it. I think that the Committee is probably entitled to do that if the Committee is so minded. Perhaps I can just put the question would the Committee like to defer further consideration of this Bill until we have a written amendment before us, now that seems to be?

HON. MICHAEL F. HEALEY: I should be very happy to, Mr. Chairman I think, wishing to consider it now, that really the place where this conversation should go is under sub-clause 2, because under sub-clause 2 it is open to hon. Members then to move amendments to that sub-clause as they see fit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have got to change that rear module.

HON. MICHAEL F. HEALEY: Yes. We might.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sub-clause now put to be amended as well. So.....

HON. D. DOUGLAS WILLIAMS: We can have our view, Sir, as long as we put them to the hon. Members before....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have understood the sense of the Committee be happy with that. Is the whole Committee happy with that? As we will proceed with another Bill tonight and we will come back to this one.

HON. F. MACKENZIE BOYD: Are they sure that they know what they are doing this time?

HON. DENNIS F. FOSTER: They will probably show us with another appendix two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that note, a Bill for a Law to amend the Statute of Bridge Law (Continued).

THE STATUTE OF BRIDGE (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL, 1985

Committee resumed

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - APPLICATION OF STATUTE IN THE YEAR OF 1985.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE STATUTE OF BRIDGE LAW (CONTINUED).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE AGREED TO BY MAJORITY.

MR. CRAITHIE: The Public Finance and Audit Bill, 1960. I think that I have only had notice of one amendment to be proposed by the Senior Elected Member for West Bay to clause 69. Am I right that there is no other amendment of which notice has been given? Well in that case I think that it may be convenient for the Committee, since this is a very long Bill, if we take advantage of the standing order which enables us to take several clauses at a time. I will check, the Clerk to read clauses between four and nine clauses at a time.

THE PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL, 1960

QUESTION PROPOSED

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE AND COMMENCEMENT.
CLAUSE 2 - INTERPRETATION.
CLAUSE 3 - REVENUE.
CLAUSE 4 - CHARGES ON REVENUE.
CLAUSE 5 - ANNUAL ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 1 through 5 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 1 THROUGH 5 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 6 - PREPARATION OF ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE AND APPROPRIATION...
CLAUSE 7 - AUTHORIZATION OF EXPENDITURE IN ADVANCE OF APPROPRIATION,
CLAUSE 8 - CHARGES TO CONSOLIDATED FUND OR REVENUE,
CLAUSE 9 - SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION,
CLAUSE 10 - POWERS AND DUTIES OF FINANCIAL SECRETARY.
CLAUSE 11 - POWERS TO MAKE REGULATIONS AND GIVE DIRECTIONS, ETC.

MR. CRAITHIE: The question is that clauses 6 through 11 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 6 THROUGH 11 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 12 - CONSOLIDATED CONTROL,
CLAUSE 13 - CONSOLIDATED OFFICERS TO GIVE DIRECTIONS, AND QUESTIONS, ETC.
CLAUSE 14 - AUTHORITY OF CONSOLIDATED OFFICERS TO ISSUE WARRANTS OF
CLAUSE 15 - FURTHER AUTHORITY OF CONSOLIDATED OFFICERS IN RESPECT OF UNCLAIM EXPENDITURE.
CLAUSE 16 - DUTIES OF ACCOUNTANT GENERAL.

MR. CRAITHIE: The question is that clauses 12 through 16 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 12 THROUGH 16 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 17 - PUBLIC COLLECTION OF REVENUE.
CLAUSE 18 - PAYMENT OF PUBLIC MONEYS,
CLAUSE 19 - PAYMENT OF CERTAIN MONIES TO BE ACCOUNTED FOR AS...
CLAUSE 20 - RECOVERABLE ADVANCES.
CLAUSE 21 - ADVANCES TO MEET UNFORESEEN EXPENDITURE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 17 through 21 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 17 THROUGH 21 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSES 32 - PAYMENT,
CLAUSES 33 - DEPOSITS,
CLAUSES 34 - BORROWING AND GUARANTEE,
CLAUSES 35 - LENDING,
CLAUSES 36 - INVESTMENT OF MONEYS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 32 through 36 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 32 THROUGH 36 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 37 - BORROWING POWERS AND LIMITS.
CLAUSE 38 - GUARANTEES.
CLAUSES 39 - RECONCILIATION OF ITEMS,
CLAUSE 39 - SPECIAL HOUSING ACCOUNT.
CLAUSE 41 - APPROPRIATIONS AND WARRANTS TO LAPSE AT CLOSE OF FINANCIAL YEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 37 through 41 be stand part of the Bill. Does any Member wish to speak?

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 37 THROUGH 41 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 42 - APPOINTMENT OF AUDITOR GENERAL.
CLAUSE 43 - TERMS OF OFFICE OF AUDITOR GENERAL.
CLAUSE 44 - SALARY OF AUDITOR GENERAL.
CLAUSE 45 - AUDITOR GENERAL'S EMPLOYMENT AS PUBLIC OFFICER.
CLAUSE 46 - DUTIES OF BRANCH IN OFFICE OF AUDITOR GENERAL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 42 through 46 be stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 42 THROUGH 46 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 47 - LIMITS ASSIGNABLE TO OFFICE OF AUDITOR GENERAL,
CLAUSE 48 - DUTIES OF AUDITOR GENERAL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 47 and 48 stand part of the Bill

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 47 AND 48 PASSED.

MR. C. MAYO POWELL: Mr. Chairman, may I ask that you put clause 49 as I already am I intend to propose my hon. friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was intending to. Clause 49 has got an amendment I had objected at clause 20 so we can put it on the sec.

CLERK: CLAUSE 49 - POWERS OF AUDITOR GENERAL,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 49 stand part of the Bill. However, as I note Member I have had notice of an amendment proposed to clause 49 and I will invite the Mover/Seconder for that to speak to his amendment.

MR. M. KWALEPA BUSU: In the meeting of, I believe, the Hon. Minister....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that your microphone may be switched off.

MR. F. ROSSITER YOUNG: ...Honourable Third Opposition Member pointed out to me that possibly this would be opposed for the Constitution and I believe in the Royal Instructions, I think he said. However, I feel, Sir, that we have had our Constitution since 1952 and we have had our Royal Instructions for I do not know how long. The things which I mean which were worrying me, was specifically the area of Crown property. In the absence of the Crown property was sold without any comment of the house and also to what this provides to mortgage. I will say no more except that I still intend to support the amendment.

HON. MAURICE F. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the proposed amendment, I feel that under Section 63(2) of the Constitution, it is out of order as it proposes. Now in that it does not comply with Standing Order 43(2), in that an amendment must not relate to matters additional or supplementary, and secondly that it does not comply with the provisions of Royal Instructions, paragraph 7, sub-paragraph (2) which states:-

> "Provided nothing in proposed resolution or said other shall not be proceeded upon by the said Law; or for which shall contain anything foreign to which the title of the Law contains."

This seems to me to be a procedural point pursuant to section 63, the power of Government to the exception of land, whereas the Bill which we are substantively discussing is, conditions connected with this right page to it, Mines, minerals, management and audit of the public finances".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that is a proper point. In other words I think if the Second Elected Member for West Bay feels it might that an Government Department Member or official should be entitled to tell Government owned real estate without the Legislative Assembly's prior consent, then it would be better for him to move a motion asking the Government to draft legislation to that effect, rather than to attach it into a Bill which it really does not properly belong.

HON. R. ROSSITER YOUNG: Well, that is his opinion. It might be good too but I still feel that we can go on here, then. Anyway that my motions do not seem anything wrong here for it might be just wasting time. I will stand by the amendment, Mr. Chairman. The House can vote against it if they want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that the point being made is that the amendment is out of order, as it is being suggested to us as the reasons which have explained. I am bound to say that I agree with the explanation and I therefore think that the amendment is out of order, for which case I cannot consider it and it cannot be moved so.

HON. R. ROSSITER YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, that is fair enough to me. You are the Chair, Sir. I still have my opinion. I will have to leave nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I am afraid that that will have to be so. If you would like to make a motion, or at least to put certain words on the things you have proposed, I think that you should have to do it separately.

MR. CHAIRMAN (CONTINUING): ... in that case there is not any amendment after 111 to clause 25. However, does any Member wish to speak to clause 25 or to stand in the Bill? If not, then I will put the question that clause 25 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. G. RAY BODEN: Mr. Chairman, may I have a division on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

DIVISION NO. 69

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis M. Mahon	Mr. G. Ray Boden
Hon. Michael F. Healey	
Hon. Thomas C. Jeffcomen	
Hon. Lorraine D. Monks	
Hon. M. Norman Endicott	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. McDermaid	
Hon. Percy G. Johnson	
Hon. Stephen T. Grossi	
Mr. Winfield A. Skinner	
Capt. Kathy S. Klopoweski	
Mr. J. Renaud Millar	
11	1

PASSED BY MAJORITY: CLAUSE 25 PASSED.

ON CLAUSE 26 - ESTABLISHMENT OF STAFF OF AUDITOR GENERAL.
CLAUSE 27 - SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL ACCOUNTS BY ACCOUNTANT GENERAL TO AUDITOR GENERAL.
CLAUSE 28 - EXAMINATION AND AUDIT OF ANNUAL STATEMENTS BY AUDITOR GENERAL AND SUBMISSION OF REPORT.
CLAUSE 29 - ANNUAL GENERAL REPORT OF AUDITOR GENERAL.
CLAUSE 30 - AUDIT EXAMINATION OF ACCOUNT INTO ACCOUNTS OF BOARDS, CORPORATE, ETC., ADMINISTERED BY CROWN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 26 through 30 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSES 26 THROUGH 30 PASSED.

MR. J. RENAUD MILLAR: Mr. Chairman, could I ask that you take clause 26 separately because I would like to move an amendment to that please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right, we will take up to clause 27.

ON CLAUSE 27 - AUDIT EXAMINATION OF ACCOUNT INTO ACCOUNTS OF PERSONS, BODIES CORPORATE, ETC., UNDER GOVERNOR'S APPOINTMENT.
CLAUSE 28 - AUDITOR GENERAL'S CERTIFICATE OF ACCOUNTS AND REPORT OF ACCOUNTS OF BODIES CORPORATE, ETC.
CLAUSE 29 - FEES TO BE DETERMINED BY TREASURY BOARD.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 42, 43 and 44 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSES 42, 43 AND 44 STOOD PART OF THE BILL.

CLAUSE 45 - POWER TO AUTHORIZE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 45 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. D. ANDREW WILSON: As mentioned in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the power to exchange should be with the public service corporation which I think is the correct description for the purpose of clarification legislation. It is correct to say that I have to vote against the clause.

MR. C. BRUCE BEER: I was going to say that in my debate I also think there are some of the reasons to amendments and I will certainly vote against the clause when the time comes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, I will put the question on clause 45 as stood.

DIVISION NO: AYES AND NOES.

MR. D. ANDREW WILSON: May we have a division, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DIVISION NO. 28

AYES	NOES
Hon. Donald M. Foster	Mr. C. Bruce Beer
Hon. Mildred A. Dowling	Mr. D. Andrew Wilson
Hon. Thomas D. Hockenson	
Hon. Dennis C. Stanton	
Hon. M. Norman Graham	
Hon. Capt. Maurice L. Mackenzie	
Hon. Robert G. Strachan	
Mr. W. Ransford Knight	
Hon. Sophia M. Oneschuk	
Mr. Winfield H. Hawkins	
Capt. Henry S. Wiebowski	
11	2

CLAUSE BY CLAUSE: CLAUSES 46 TO 54 STOOD.

INDEX: CLAUSE 46 - NOTIFICATION OF EXPROPRIATION AND RIGHT OF APPEAL.
CLAUSE 50 - APPEAL AGAINST EXPROPRIATION.
CLAUSE 51 - WITHDRAWAL OF EXPROPRIATION.
CLAUSE 52 - COMPENSATION OF EXPROPRIATION.
CLAUSE 53 - EXPROPRIATION IN RESPECT OF MUNICIPAL PROPERTY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 46 stand part of the Bill.

MR. D. JOHN HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against clause 46, but I wonder if you can arrange for time to be put aside

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will put the question on Amendment #2 although I'm not certain of what will exist.

MRS. LOUISE O. SHAPIRO: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to put words in the Governor's mouth but I think there is the question in Article Eighteen and Nine Hundred (18-900).

DR. C. REID EDWARDS: Yes, but I intended to vote against Amendment #2. I misunderstood in my darkness, Mr. Chairman, that I was only taking the exception which I disagreed with on the bill, but there were other sections which I did not like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does it suit everybody if we take Amendment #2 and then go on to Amendment #3? So, I will put the question then that Amendment #2, as set at the urged part of the bill.

QUESTION FOR VOTE: ADOPTED. Amendment #2 prevailed by parol.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since it has been read already so we don't have need to do it. Unless any Member wishes to speak on it I will put the question this Amendment....

DR. C. REID EDWARDS: I was going to say that sections 20 is related to section #3 which I voted against earlier. There is a direct contradiction between them as stated in Section #3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that section Amendment #3 through #5, if you look at the beginning, all the Amendments are a direct part of the Bill and are all related to one another. If I may put the question on Amendment #3.

QUESTION #03: ATTY. GEN. INDEX.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a discussion?

DR. C. REID EDWARDS: Please, Mr. Chairman.

DIVISION
NO. 30

AYES:

Hon. Francis S. Hopkins
Hon. Michael J. Connolly
Hon. Thomas A. Dalton
Hon. Dennis E. Flynn
Hon. W. Bernard Richland
Rev. Canon Charles A. Rinkenbach
Hon. Samuel S. Stratton
Mr. J. McKeen Cattell
Hon. Eugene A. Gilmore
Mr. Leopold A. Morse
Capt. Henry S. Kinkenbach

11

NOES:

Mr. C. Reid Edwards
Mr. J. Edward Hollis

2

RESULT OF VOTE: Amendment #3 Prevailed.

TITLE: CLAUSE 24 - ARRANGEMENTS BY STATES, ETC., AND RETRO-USE OF PUBLIC MONEY AND STORES.
CLAUSE 25 - DISPOSAL OF SURPLUSES, ETC.
CLAUSE 26 - POWER TO CONTROL BY ORDER EXPENDITURE.
CLAUSE 27 - LOANS.
CLAUSE 28 - TEMPORARY.
CLAUSE 29 - REPEAL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clauses 24 to 29 stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED.

CLAUSES 24 TO 29 ORDERED TO STAND PART OF THE BILL.

TITLE: A BILL FOR A LAW TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONTROL, MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT OF THE PUBLIC FINANCES OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS AND FOR INCIDENTAL AND CONSEQUENTIAL PURPOSES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that it may be a convenient moment if we now suspend proceedings for approximately ten minutes for coffee and then resume in Committee thereafter.

HON. ALTHAM A. CRAWFORD: Could I ask before you rise, Sir, what the proposed amendments to the Bill which have been referred to the Standing Finance Committee are to be on the rate as proposed?

HON. D. TAYLOR KIRKCONNELL: Yes.

AT 4.28 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 4.28 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.
Proceedings in Committee are resumed.
The Public Loans (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

THE PUBLIC LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

COMMITTEE STAGE

TITLE: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 12 OF THE ACT OF 1970.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSE 3 AGREED.

CLERK: A CLAUSE FOR A DAY TO BE NAMED THE SECOND DAY(CLAUSE 4 OF 1970)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Court of Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 1993.

THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1993

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 20 OF ACT 9 OF 1970.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 3 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 4 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 4 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSE 4 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 5 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 5 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 5 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 6 - INSERTION OF NEW SECTIONS 29A AND 29B.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 6 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 6 PASSED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE COURT OF APPEAL LAW (CAP 2 OF 1972).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting clause do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Port Authority (Amendment) Bill, 1982.

THE PORT AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF LAW 15 OF 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE PORT AUTHORITY LAW (CAP 15 OF 1978).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting clause do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I think that we are still waiting for the amendment on the order of the Presidential Dilegation of Duties Bill, 1982?

HON. MICHAEL A. BRADLEY: Yes, that is being done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, then in that case let us turn to the Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1982.

THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps before I put the question I can just check that I have the amendments. There is a proposed amendment to clause 4 by the Second Elected Member for West Bay. There is notice of a proposed amendment to clause 7 in the name that clause 7 as it now stands is negatived, from the Elected Member for North Side. There is also a proposed new clause 7 which in accordance with the procedure accepted in Standing Orders we take at the end after we have dealt with all the other clauses, I think. Yes, Standing Order 57, paragraph (8). Mr. Clerk are the only three Committee stage amendments of which I seem to have notice. That is to say clause 7 is it not? I will read that one out.

MR. CHAIRMAN (CONTINUING): Clause 4 and notice of a proposed amendment to clause 7 under certain circumstances and the Honourable Chief Official Member's. Because the notice of the and after we have dealt with all the other clauses.

CLERK: You said three?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 4 and clause 7. That one will not arise actually. Now, clause 1 has been read so the question is that clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED BY MAJORITY.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1 OF CAP 2 OF 1984.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED BY MAJORITY.

MR. D. GERARD MILLER: I suspected that, Sir. We suspected the urge to raise it.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. D. GERARD MILLER: Before the vote is taken, Sir, since though I intend to vote against it. Can my own thought would the Honourable Chief Official Member read the full context of clause 3 as it would appear with the amendments in the Bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you really mean insofar by read section 2 of the principal Law as it would read....

MR. D. GERARD MILLER: No, section 2 of the principal Law as it would read with the amendments under....

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we are on, as usual I think I am on clause 3 of the Bill which amends section 2 of the Law.

MR. D. GERARD MILLER: Sorry, Sir, I am pressing the point. My question, Sir, is the new section which I would like him to do that to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, the question is that clause 3 should stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 3 AGREED BY MAJORITY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we move to clause 4 and an amendment has been proposed by clause 4. I think perhaps we should start by.... Oh, you have not called.

CLERK: CLAUSE 4 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am so sorry, I jumped the gun. I started talking about it before it had been read. There is, as I mentioned, an amendment of which I have been given notice by the Second Elected Member for West Bay proposed to clause 4. Would he like to speak to it?

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Yes, Mr. Chairman, although I do not know how much more I can say. I just feel that if we are going to remember a pension I think they should at least contribute a few cents of our monthly salaries. This is evident in other territories and as Government pays us they can subtract a few cents. I am not going to belabour this, Sir. I put the amendment and I am going to stand by it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like copy to read the amendments out because some Members may not have it before them?

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Yes, Sir. Is you mean all of it or just....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so, just to make any Member who not have it.

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH:

"Amendment to clause 4 of the Bill.

That Clause 4 of the Bill be amended by deleting the full-stop, quotation marks and full-stop at the end of paragraph (b) and substituting therefor a semi-colon, and by adding the following new paragraph (c) -

"(c) who, excluding those Members serving prior to 1st October, 1959, exercising a pension shall contribute 5% of their monthly salary towards the scheme, and 5% shall be deducted from the total pension payable not to exceed 10% from 1st October, 1969."."

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that what I am asking is that all those Members after 1960, including those who will get a lump sum payment because of the Bill lately introduced to the 1st January this year will pay 5%. I want to point out that I am excluding the Westerman in this paragraph.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am glad that you did read it out because the version which I have got is obviously an earlier version and it is slightly different to what you read out.

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Alright.

HON. MICHAEL J. DOBLEY: The one before me, Sir, is headed "Amended Committee stage amendment".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, either I have not had it or I have mislaid it. It is very possible that I have mislaid it.

HON. MICHAEL J. DOBLEY: I was going to say, Sir, that the language of this is not absolutely explicit clear to me, and I was going to suggest certain amendments or suggestions. However, I think that perhaps it would be premature to do that until we have voted on the Committee stage amendment. Then if it is passed it does not preclude me from making other further amendments.

MR. CRAIGHILL: I think that that may be wise, because I suspect that unless the amendment to the Provisional Collection of Customs Duties bill, 1864, pass now may not be.... In that event, does any Member wish to speak to the amendment which the Second Elected Member for Port Mary has read out and proposed? Very well then, I will put the question that clause 4 be amended as proposed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. D. SEARD MILLER: May we have a division, Sir?

MR. K. MCINTYRE ROSE: May we have that division, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CRAIGHILL: Yes.

MR. K. MCINTYRE ROSE: What a bunch, they still not bog a bubble but from what they are getting.

DIVISION
NO. 22

AYES	NOES
Mr. A. McKenzie Birch	Hon. Dennis M. Foster
Mr. D. Seaford Miller	Hon. Michael J. Sanders
	Hon. Thomas D. Jefferson
	Hon. Duncan C. Scotia
	Hon. W. Norman Holden
	Hon. Capt. Charles E. McKenzie
	Hon. Russell G. Holman
	Hon. Daphne S. Ornette
	Mr. Linford A. Pierson
	Capt. Henry E. McKenzie
	Mr. G. Hely Prosper
11	8

AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 4 DEFEATED BY MAJORITY

MR. CRAIGHILL: We are now back to clause 4 and I think that the Elected Member for North Side seeks to amend paragraph 2 of the principal law which clause 4 seeks to amend, as it will read if amended in the manner proposed by clause 4, could be pointed out.

MR. D. SEAFORD MILLER: Yes.

MR. CRAIGHILL: I confess that I have not myself got a copy of the principal law in front of me, so it would be helpful.

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: It is really clause 4 he wants me to read out, Sir?

MR. CRAIGHILL: No, it is section 2 of the principal law.....

SEN. DENNIS D. MOSIER: Alright, Sir.

MR. D. EDGAR HILLEY: With the amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As it will read if it is amended in the way that clause 6 of the Bill seeks to amend it.

SEN. DENNIS D. MOSIER: Alright, Sir:

"6.(1) Subject to the provisions of this Act, a pension shall be paid to any person who -

(a) has since the 1st day of October, 1956 served as a member for the full parliamentary terms or for periods equal in the aggregate to not less than six years;

(b) has ceased to be such a member; and

(c) either -

(i) has attained the age of fifty-five years; or

(ii) not having attained the age of fifty-five years, has produced medical evidence to the satisfaction of the Financial Secretary that he is incapable, by reason of infirmity of mind or body of discharging the duties of a member and that such infirmity is likely to be permanent.

(1A). Subject to the provisions of this Act, a pension shall be paid to any person -

(a) who has ceased prior to the 1st day of October, 1959 serving as a member; and

(b) who has ceased to be such a member, and

(c) whose name appears in the Schedule."

MR. D. EDGAR HILLEY: So in inserting out the amendment, Sir, I think that it should read, "prior on or before".

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I think that you have misread the amendment.

MR. D. EDGAR HILLEY: Oh, alright.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that clause 6 changes it now altogether. It does not delete subsection (1). Perhaps you have misunderstood it.

MR. D. EDGAR HILLEY: Alright,read the white thing.

SEN. DENNIS D. MOSIER:

(a) has since the 1st day of October, 1956 served as a member for the full parliamentary terms or for periods equal in the aggregate to not less than six years;

(b) has ceased to be such a member; and

(c) either -

(i) has attained the age of fifty-five years; or

(ii) not having attained the age of fifty-five years, has produced medical evidence to the satisfaction of the Financial Secretary that he is incapable, by reason of infirmity of mind or body of discharging the duties of a member and that such infirmity is likely to be permanent.

(1A). Subject to the provisions of this Act, a pension shall be paid to any person -

(a) who has ceased prior to the 1st day of October, 1959 serving as a member; and

(b) who has ceased to be such a member, and

(c) whose name appears in the Schedule."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's where your amendment is supposed to go in the bill. I think that you have got an excellent question.

MR. J. EDGAR MURRAY: Thank you, sir, that is fine enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is fine enough?

MR. J. EDGAR MURRAY: Yes, sir. I have made mistakes on this point and I will make more mistakes, but I am always willing to admit them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is alright.
I think that you were probably thinking by a call thinking that it explained it, but it is added.

MR. D. EDGAR MURRAY: Part of those places [illegible], sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, I now just put in clause 4 and the discussion to be put in that clause 4 should attend part of the bill. I will put that.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 4 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

CLERK: CLAUSE 5 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 5 do stand part of the bill. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: CARRIED. CLAUSE 5 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

MR. EDWARD A. [illegible]: I would like a division on that, Mr. Chairman.

DIVISION
NO. 22

YEAS	NAYS
Hon. Senator E. Foster	Mr. A. Stefanov Dash
Hon. Michael W. Bradley	Mr. Leonard A. Fleming
Hon. Thomas C. Douglas	Mr. D. Robert Wilson
Hon. Dennis G. Flagg	
Hon. W. Ernest Godin	
Hon. Capt. Charles E. Nicholson	
Hon. Robert G. Johnson	
Hon. Daphne L. Jones	
Capt. Henry S. Klondike	
Mr. S. Eddy Rankin	
10	2

PASSED BY MAJORITY. CLAUSE 5 PASSED.

SPEAKER: CLAUSE 7 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8.

HON. CHAIRMAN: I was unsure whether there I had been given notice by the Elected Member for North Side. It was on upfront conditional notice that he would like to move an amendment to the Bill on the night that Clause 7 was negotiated. The reason for that, if I may explain it on his behalf, is that inasmuch as he had originally sought to move an amendment to Clause 7, I had to tell him that the amendment which he wanted to move was out of order in terms of Standing Order 22, paragraph 7(a), and that the only way in which he could give notice of what he wanted was the way which he has now adopted. So, he may want to speak on Clause 7 to persuade you to negative it. I am not sure.

MR. D. BRIAN WILSON: Yes, Sir. As amendment to my Motion, Sir, I do not think that Members of Executive Council should get a second pension for the same job, even though they may then they have now work. They get more pay while they are in the post, and if Members would favour to vote against the Clause I would then withdraw the option to move an amendment to that Clause in the principal Law.

MR. K. MCKEEVA EGAN: Mr. Speaker, I also feel that in Monday's Hansard pertaining to the Superannuation and Gratuity information, I see that with most of them the Ministers got a Ministerial pension but they do not qualify for a gratuity as an ordinary Member does. There is a complete distinction and I explain this position on those grounds. If they are going to contest as a Member of Executive Council, which I agree, they should collect for a Member of Executive Council. I unfailingly feel that they should not collect as being an ordinary Member of the House also.

I also object on this Motion that there should be three years. I just cannot figure out why three years and I know that no Member in the course of his duties could give a reason why it was three years. I feel that if they are going to put in that section it should be a four year period as our Constitution calls for four years. I just cannot see why it should be three. Maybe somebody can shed some light on it though.

HON. TRUMAN O. BODDEN: Mr. Chairman, on the question of what does Members seek to see as a double pension. I think that I can clear that up by saying that in other jurisdictions like the Members might be saying that the person who has served as a Minister receives pension on the salary which he received as a Minister. However, that is the highest salary at which he was paid during the course of his terms in the Legislative Assembly, and which would be equal to what an Executive Councillor would receive in this Cayman Islands. That is, it is not split in two in other countries, but our salary happens to be split in two. Similar, it is the same principle. They get a pension at the highest salary which they received and the Executive Councillor have to qualify, in fact, only as per with what exists in other countries. Once the qualifying period has been established, that is one course a Minister carried on a Minister to qualify for a Ministerial pension, the same is one more course does qualify to qualify for an Executive Councillor's pension.

It could be put in another way but again that was the way the old Bill was written, it was meaning to leave it as one, as how two different salaries since this is the way it is done.

MR. D. RAY ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of the time, the qualifying period being three years, and the length of the Government being four years, I think that there are many reasons why we should have a three year period. For example, a Member may decide to run for Governor. There could be a by-election. There could be instances where a Member resigned and there would also be an instance where a Member was removed from Executive Council by a vote of no confidence. There are other instances in the Constitution where the Premier could lose his seat and the place would be filled by another Member. However, we have to remember that the Executive Council Member would get a pension simply by serving three years on Executive Council. We must remember the five years as a Member of the House. Is that correct?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

HON. EDWARD D. ROBERTS: That is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you only get an Executive Council pension if he is already qualified for a legislative assembly pension.

MR. W. MARSHALL ROSE: But it is still only three years. I know that for...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have got to have served in the House for five years.

MR. W. MARSHALL ROSE: I understand that, Mr. Chairman. My point is and I think that the Member for North Side's point is that it is these years we are talking about. All these things could come into play as we could happen after the first day.

MR. JAMES C. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I think why it is in there is because while the Electoral Boundaries, one of them, are required to sit in election not longer than four years after the sovereign of the House under the last election. It was considered that if one put four years, one could ensure by ensured that the elections were going to be four years to the day apart. This could be shown by one day, and the Member would have served a full term and still not have got qualified for the pension. I think that this was why those years were used. It means that with the separate of the election process, we have suffered any ill effects on that account.

MRS. DOROTHY E. WALSH: Mr. Chairman, this particular clause which the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council just talked to us about, in my opinion surely amendment could be done whereby four years could be changed in that particular clause. Even if it is short by a few days would this clause not be abrogated by such a way that it includes the four years that is normally served?

MR. W. MARSHALL ROSE: Leave the discretion to ask now.

MR. RUSSELL J. QUINN: In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I think that I would like to explained to me a little more fully whether or not an Executive Council Member outlasting any two different ones for a pension would get more money than if, say, he was just getting a pension based on the number of years he served. Surely the Executive Council salary only does affect. What I am trying to say here is that it was explained that a Ministerial pension is based on a Ministerial salary. I am wondering whether or not an Executive Council pension ought not be based solely on the Executive Council salary, taking into consideration the number of years he has served, whether it was as a Legislative Assembly Member only or not?

HON. RICHARD A. PROFILI: I think, Mr. Chairman, what the Honorable First Elected Member of Executive Council was saying is I understand it now that in other jurisdictions a Ministerial salary is a figure which includes a component as a Member of the Assembly, whereas in our Assembly here it is quite up front and personal figures. So, in fact a Ministerial salary on which a pension is based in other jurisdictions is a figure inclusive of both the parts which we have got in here.

HON. MICHAEL ADAMS: I still feel, Sir, that the Executive Council should be the highest salary which they earn, and most people compare pay people basing the pension on their highest earned salary, I still find the selection of the two regulations odd I would like to see it based on their highest salary, one or the other, Sir, not a combination of both.

HON. W. MARVIN DUNN: This is what we have, a combination of the two situation.

HON. JAMES A. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the explanation given by the Honorable First Elected Member of Executive Council. There is still some doubt in my mind as to whether the Executive Council pension will be based on the highest salary being paid to the Executive Council Member, or on a combination of both. I believe that my understanding of the Honorable First Elected Member of Executive Council's explanation was that it would be on the salary paid to the Executive Council Member and not on both, and I believe that also is where the confusion is coming from and I would like to get this properly clarified.

HON. EDWARD C. ROBERTS: I think that the Honorable Second Elected Member just what I was saying a few minutes ago is that a Member is paid a salary as a Member of the Assembly and then one as a Minister. So he gets a salary as a Minister, a component of which he says he would normally have had as a Member of the Assembly. So, that his total salary in another Administration would be equal to what the Members' and Executive Council Members' salary would accumulate to the figure indicated. Am I making it clear?

HON. EDWARD A. ROBERTS: Yes, it is true that the point which I am making is that the pension should be based on both the parliamentary salary and the Executive Council salary, which would have given a total of both together. It would be on the higher amount of the Executive Council salary. The pension should be based on that, and not on both.

HON. J. DAVID WILLIAMS: Under this Bill it is cumulative.

HON. DENNIS C. ADAMS: You mean in another jurisdiction? I would think in another jurisdiction it would merely say that the Member would receive a pension at the highest salary which he was paid during his time as a Member of the House, which I would normally be the salary which he was paid as a Minister, which includes the components of the basic House salary, as I might say.

HON. EDWARD A. ROBERTS: Yes, the explanation which I required of the clarification which I require is whether the Executive Council Member is going to be paid a pension on the $30,000 per annum which is the parliamentary salary in addition to the $21,000 which is the Executive Council salary, and is he going to get both pensions paid to him?

HON. HERMAN C. FRANKS: As I understand it, that is what is on the bill.

MR. D. CRAIG MILLER: As the bill reads that is what is going to happen. Mr. Chairman, we suspect we are not the only ones with questions, and we have two separate witnesses here. A gentleman remains on monthly based on his highest salary when leaving office. I would be much happier although I am pretty sure that is what is meant if it was only the Executive Council pension that was based only on the Executive Council salary and not the bill, and that's not the provision for the same job.

HON. DENNIS M. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, suppose the Member served say ten years on ordinary Member before he became an Executive Councillor, what would happen then?

MR. D. CRAIG MILLER: His pension would be based on the highest salary which he got, that is who the honourable Chief Official Member thinks the Member, as he is going to be paid a pension on what he received etc. It will be what he leaves it at, the amount of the highest salary which he obtained throughout the service.

HON. MICHAEL J. SHARPE: I think since the Parliamentary Member is trying to say would include the Ministerial appointment. If I have an ordinary Member serving in this House, not on an Executive Council, I would receive a full pay-phase of my salary. If however, I become an Executive Councillor and become just the minimum time, then all the service of eight years would be disregarded for the purposes of calculating my pension rights, which would be calculated only on the short period whether it be a year or three years that I had served on the Executive Council Member.

MR. D. CRAIG MILLER: In most cases, Mr. Chairman, the Executive Council Member is going to be better off anyway, because the salaries which have been quoted here all look quite as for instance one of those people is not going to get any pension at all under this Bill and the others are around thirty years and his pension is going to be $700. However, if we attracted the Executive Council Members a comparable pension based on both salaries, certain Members when they qualified by age at the end of their term would be getting $1,400 a month.

HON. MICHAEL A. SHARPE: Mr. Chairman, my query also is, Sir, if an Executive Council Member has been served three days or four days, but then later he served on the other side of the House, would he be in effect a combination of both since although he had served four years on Executive Council?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under the present law.

HON. LEONARD J. FRANKS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that I did not discriminate other Ministries. That was the statement from the other side and I tried to clear it up as best I could.

MR. D. CRAIG MILLER: We are not concerned about that part of it, Mr. Chairman. However, just one, the explanation there is, Sir, that the Member who served twenty odd years is being, that any year which he served after twenty was wasted. He is getting no remuneration whatsoever for that because at twenty years he has received his maximum

MR. P. JOSEPH MICHAEL (CONTINUING): ... to tell the people to who they have been speaking here all week that they know doing this for, and they were happy to get as much for, mostly them it never might have to become tasks, are not going to get as much as they took them before. They were going to get. As Justice Brown they put up their version.

MS. CYNTHIA A. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, also it would be my opinion that somewhere somewhere within the future that this system of penalties would be paid. I am totally in favour of the Alternative Dispute Resolution and the administrative penalties. However, I am somewhat unhappy with both sets of penalties being paid to the Chairman. I feel that the penalties should be based on a substantive policy of the Legislature as a consideration point in time, and not in part.

MRS. MARGARET J. ZWARICH: Mr. Chairman, if I could just look to my original example, I have back laying to an Employee which the Non-Union Trades Officials Network would like most of us adopt at. If I had earned five eight years as an ordinary Worker and never back I returned to Canadian Cement, but switched or moved to be a Member, I would get $2,942 per month. If I, having earned that eight years plus that entitled as a Member of Legislative Assembly to the minimum possible pension under that, merely serving four years, I would be getting that a total of $2,500 per annum. So I'm told here.

MR. K. MARSHALL STORY: The Member would have?

MS. CHAIRMAN: Well, it would depend how one wants to put it.... I think that there is a good deal of confusion in...

MR. K. MARSHALL STORY: Yes, for I was just....

MS. CHAIRMAN: ...as to what some people have in mind that things should be amended. We have not got a specific resolution in front of us and it is very difficult to proceed.

MR. K. MARSHALL STORY: I would agree with you Ma'am, Mr. Chairman. There is plenty of confusion and I think that the Government should be well to take the advice of the Hon. Member and withdraw the Bill.

MS. CHAIRMAN: I was not attempting the confusion to the Government's mark up as....

MR. K. MARSHALL STORY: I thought that it was helpful we put it, but anyway I might add that the Bill about to withdrawn because I would now that even though some Members misperceive the Bill they are beginning to have other thoughts as well.

MS. CHAIRMAN: I think what I had wanted to happen is get this amendment to go into the regulations on pension ?.

MRS. CHERYL L. GOSLING: Mr. Chairman, I do not have any further thoughts. I wanted something clarified. It has just clarified one that is it.

MR. K. MARSHALL STORY: The Member still did not know what it is some confusion about when they were debating it though.

MR. CRITTENDEN: The question then is that clause 7 as presently drafted should part of the bill.

DIVISION VOTE: AYES AND NOES.

MR. W. ROBERTS PUGH: May we have a division, Sir?

DIVISION NO. 93

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis M. Deacon	Mr. W. Roberts Pugh
Hon. Richard M. Brooking	Mr. Clifford A. Thomas
Hon. Sharon C. Jeffcock	Mr. S. Leonard Miller
Hon. Ransom O. Rhodes	
Hon. W. Norman Stables	
Hon. Capt. Sheridan G. McDonnell	
Hon. Ronald T. Robinson	
Hon. Pauline L. Jarrett	
Capt. Bobby G. McDonnell	
Mr. W. Haig Geddes	
10	3

RESULT OF DIVISION: CLAUSE 7 PASSED.

NEW: CLAUSE 8 - INSERTION OF NEW SECTION 80.

MR. CRITTENDEN: The question is that clause 8 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. W. ROBERTS PUGH: May we have a division, Sir. It would be helpful if we knew what it is we are

MR. CRITTENDEN: I think, They were handed round microphones.

DIVISION NO. 94

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis M. Deacon	Mr. W. Roberts Pugh
Hon. Richard M. Brooking	Mr. S. Leonard Miller
Hon. Sharon C. Jeffcock	
Hon. Ransom O. Rhodes	
Hon. W. Norman Stables	
Hon. Capt. Sheridan G. McDonnell	
Hon. Ronald T. Robinson	
Hon. Pauline L. Jarrett	
Capt. Bobby G. McDonnell	
Mr. W. Haig Geddes	
11	2

RESULT OF DIVISION: CLAUSE 8 PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had heard myself. The clerk will have it.

CLERK: CHANGE 8 - INSERTION OF NEW SECTION 105.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 8 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 8 ORDERED TO STAND PART.

CLERK: CLAUSE 73 - REPEAL OF SECTION 18.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 73 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 73 ORDERED TO STAND PART.

MRS. DOROTHY E. EATON: I think that we have to take the remainder now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that is probably better to have the new clauses before us to do the remaining clauses.

MRS. JEANNE H. SAUNDERS: Yes.

MR. D. DOUGLAS WILSON: They would have stood unnecessarily, then.

MRS. DOROTHY E. EATON: Oh, no.

MR. D. DOUGLAS WILSON: All they stand to be....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did we not already pass clause 7, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have passed clause 7, yes. I did not think that at the beginning of the Assembly we were particularly fast, and in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 52(2), the proposal to insert a new clause part would arise after all the other clauses have been disposed. That is what Standing Order 52(2) says, and I did explain that, which is why we now have the proposal to insert a new clause 7. I will invite the Honourable Minister of Labour to move the amendment standing in his name to that effect.

MR. D. MACKAY ELSTON: I do not have any, Mr.

MRS. DOROTHY E. EATON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, at that point in time I did not give the hon. Member notice, so I would like to use for the suspension of Standing Order 52(2) please. When under Standing Order 52(2) I ask that this may be dispensed, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that I have to suspend anything. I have to give you leave in accordance with Standing Order 52(2) and that I do grant you. I am not sure whether all Members have got a copy of the proposed amendment. How many Members will get a copy of the proposed amendment?

MRS. DOROTHY E. EATON: Everybody should have them, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think everybody has them.

MR. D. GERALD MCSWEEN: Is the Government aware of public anxiety that they are considering their new responsibilities before, in fact, all the details of the Watergate bills get a decision, Sir?

RT. HON. ROBERT F. STANFIELD: Quite aware, Sir.

MR. D. GERALD MCSWEEN: Might it be brought to the House attention.

HON. DONALD C. MACDONALD: We looked at this, Sir, carefully.

MR. R. KNOWLES: Are we debating it now, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing the amendment which stands in the name, that a new clause 7 be inserted into the Bill after clause 6, and that subsequent clauses be renumbered. I was given to understand that all members do have a copy of the motions which is proposed, the effect of which is to provide for widows' pensions.

MR. V. SOBURN JONES: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

HON. ROBERT F. STANFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I think on this point we have not followed absolutely the procedure under Standing Order 971(1). If we are following it certainly now and in the future, I think that technically we have to read it a third time and then it comes up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see, the Clerk has to read the amendment in lieu of the clause. The new clause might.

AMENDMENT MOVED TO BILL C-218

NEW CLAUSE 7
(THE PARLIAMENTARY RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT, 1970)

MOVED BY MR. KNOWLES

CLERK: AMENDMENT TO SECTION 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The clause is not taken as read. Does anyone want the question put on that clause as read a second time. If not the clause is open for debate.

DEBATE ON AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 7

MR. R. KNOWLES moved:

Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, when the Bill was brought forward two days ago, I said that although I had to oppose the Bill, I supported the motion there to make it possible for the old Parliament to get something. This motion ought to be brought forward by the widows of Members to get a pension of at least half of what the Members would have received. I support it, even although I do not support the Bill. However, my point which I want to make is this. In speaking the Bill I said that Government can bring in a Bill which they did not have very much information on. They did not have time enough to get the pensions in the way they were going to work, and Government has known that, Sir. It is a fact now after enough that they have done.

MR. M. MASSEYA REDD: All the challenge which I made just some Members of executive Council reminds of the things which I said, they did not really know what they were doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does any other member wish to speak?

MR. M. MASSEYA REDD: However, I wish that they could have accepted it.

HON. CHIEF CHARLES T. KINNOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman, if he has not understood what has been debated and said in this House, it would be useless for me or anyone else on these Benches to clarify or let him understand it at this stage, because every Member except these two have gone through this exercise with... If he has not understood it, there is no amount of him understanding it at this stage.

MR. M. MASSEYA REDD: Mr. Chairman, I quite understand what was happening. I am saying that I understood. I was all along that Government did not know what they were doing. They did not know how much it was going to cost and they did not know how going to get it. People who they thought would pay it are still not going to pay it. There is a fault. I know all along what was happening but they could not explain it. They did not know. That was my point, Mr. Chairman.

HON. CHIEF CHARLES T. KINNOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that this has been made clear, Sir. I think that the Honourable Chief Minister and the Honourable Minst Official Member, particularly the Honourable Chief Official Member have explained it clear that it was impossible to pay it by one month, but it was within a few months. So I do not want to hear the Member again. It is time we unanimously as it can be done and we are not talking about any large sum of money.

HON. S. REGIS WILLIAMS: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is adding another dimension of people to those who the Honourable Chief Official Member figures on. We could not have included in the figures he gave those people until he knew whether this amendment passed or not.

HON. MICHAEL J. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, one gets really of the impression that the proceedings in which we are engaged can be considered by a short statement of the moment of information. I feel this way go....

HON. SPEAKER: I thought we were making progress, because we knew only got this one and I hope to put the question on this and then on the remaining clause in a moment.

HON. EDWARD O. LUMUMBA: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment, Sir, and to say that what is being witnessed by this Committee was always the intention of Government, and it is that I hope that the Honourable Chief Official Member continued these visits to the constituencies. I think that this is very important at the right... at least when the....

MR. D. SEZARIO MITCHELL: That is not what the Honourable Chief Official Member said us, Sir.

MR. M. MASSEYA REDD: No, that brought it to light, Mr. Chairman now....

MR. GEORGE D. AIKEN: Well I certainly was talking but all those people. Have people, Mr. Chairman. I do not know what happened to use my intention.

MR. H. MINETA TSUK: Well, we spoke to the honorable Parliamentary Secretary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. We cannot have all of you speaking at once....

MR. M. MINETA TSUK: That is right, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...and I am not really certain that we are following the rules of the road as closely as I have attempted now to lead us closely astray.

MR. M. MINETA TSUK: Yes, Sir, I just wanted to make clear position, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, well I think that everybody has had a chance to make his point. I will now put the question that the amendments proposed by the Honorable Prime Minister be inserted . . . new clause 7 and be renumber clauses 7 to 10, as necessary . . . the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO BY MAJORITY. NEW CLAUSE 7 ADDED.

Clerk: A BILL TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS ACT, 1969.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the title as Honorable Member be stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO BY MAJORITY. TITLE AND PREAMBLE STAND ADDED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That does not actually conclude proceedings in Committee because we do have one new Bill to deal with. However, I think that unless some Honorable Members are prepared to assist us to deal with that one other matter, which may only take a couple of minutes, I really ought to return to the Chair and move the adjournment myself. The only thing we still have left in connection to the amendments to clause 2 of the Provisional Collection of Customs Duties Bill and the insertion of clause 8 and the amending clause.

Do Members want to take that now?

MR. FRANK C. JORDEN: I move for the adjournment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that ....

ADJOURNMENT OF STANDING ORDER 1970.

MR. D. BRAND MILLAR: I move that we resume Standing Orders and finish the Committee stages of the Bill, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry?

MR. D. BRAND MILLAR: I think that we should stay and finish the Committee stages of the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if you would like to move....

MR. D. EDWARD HIGGS: I have moved the suspension....

MR. CHAIRMAN: ....and motion is what effect we are now on it.

MR. D. EDWARD HIGGS: That is what I am doing, Mr.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, then the motion is that Standing Orders be suspended to enable me to complete the Committee review before adjournment tonight.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MRS. MURPHY: May we have a Division, Sir?

DIVISION
NO. 24

AYES

Hon. Hazel McCallion
Mr. R. Nixon
Mr. Mahoney
Mr. Wildman
Mr. Cureatz
Mr. Gillies
Mr. Hennessy
Mr. Johnston
Mr. Sterling
Mr. Eves
Mr. Harris
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Runciman
Mr. Leluk
Mr. Wiseman
Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Ruprecht
Mr. Kwinter
Mr. Tilson
Mr. Turnbull
Mr. Stockwell
Mr. Grandmaître
Mr. Ferrier
Mr. Villeneuve
Mr. Boyer
Mr. Jordan
Mr. Wrye
Mr. Miclash
Mr. Pope
Mr. Chiarelli
Mr. Fleet
Mr. Ward
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Offer
Mr. Dietsch
Mr. Partington
Mr. Pollock
Mr. Hayes
Mr. Bossy
Mr. Morin
Mr. Sheppard
Mr. Bisson
Mr. Cooke
Mr. Gigantes
Mr. Laughren
Mr. Lupusella
Mr. Martel
Mr. Mackenzie
Mr. Newman
Mr. Peterson
Mr. Philip
Mr. Rae
Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Reid
Mr. Rotenberg
Mr. Swart
Mr. Wrye
Mr. Yakabuski
Mr. Young

NOES

Mr. Conway
Mr. Kerrio
Mr. Kwinter
Mr. Leluk
Mr. Miclash
Mr. Pope
Mr. Ramsay
Mr. Reid
Mr. Rotenberg
Mr. Swart
Mr. Wrye
Mr. Yakabuski
Mr. Young

5

9

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NOT DEFEATED BY MAJORITY

MR. B. NEWMAN BOOTH: We request each yea then be recorded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is defeated.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DONALD R. KERRIO: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO MAJORITY. AT 4:40 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. TOMORROW, THE 28TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1985.

[illegible] OF THE 1955 SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
HELD IN
[illegible], [illegible], 1955

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

ORIGINAL

SIXTH SESSION OF THE 22ND SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TUESDAY
20TH SEPTEMBER, 1994
(STATE DAY)

1. PRAYERS

To be read by the Honourable Chief Officiating Member of Executive Council.

2. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

THE SPEAKER REMINDS HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT NOT MORE THAN SIX ORAL QUESTIONS MAY BE ASKED BY ANY ONE MEMBER AND SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

NO. 193: ASKED THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HOLDS A PORTFOLIO OF THE PRESENT EXECUTIVE COUNCIL PROGRAMME WHICH IS SUPPORTED BY U.N. FUNDS WHETHER:

NO. 194: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER GIVE THE NUMBER OF DULY REGISTERED VOTERS ON THE CAPTAINCY'S CONSTITUTION ROLL FOR THE PERIOD 31ST JULY, 1994, TO 31ST AUGUST, 1994?

NO. 195: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE HOW MANY OF THESE VOTERS ARE NOW AND HOW MANY WERE ABSENTEE?

THE SPEAKER ALLOWED SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS ELECTED MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND INCLUDED ATTACKS AND VOTES

NO. 196: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STATE THE INTEREST RATES FOR BORROWING MONEY IN CAPTAIN TOWN FOR USE IN THE VOTE DEPARTMENTS?

3. STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT BY THE HONOURABLE CHIEF OFFICIAL MEMBER.

4. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(1) BILLS:-

COMMITTEE OF BILLS

CONSIDERATION OF

(1) THE EXCEPTIONAL APPROPRIATION OF CUSTOMS DUTIES BILL, 1994

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

(3) THE PROHIBITION OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE, 1994
(4) THE MEASURE OF SPORT (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1994
(5) THE PUBLIC FINANCES AND AUDIT BILL, 1994
(6) THE PUBLIC LANDS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1994
(7) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1994
(8) THE TOTE AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1994
(9) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

PUBLIC BUSINESS

(10) THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON CUSTOMS DUTIES BILL, 1993
(11) THE REGION OF LANDS (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1993
(12) THE POLICE FORCE AND CRIME BILL, 1993
(13) THE PUBLIC ROAD (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1993
(14) THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1993
(15) THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1993
(16) THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

(6) MOTIONS:-

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO.13/95
APPROVAL OF ASSEMBLY'S RESOLUTION

TO BE MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER -
LEADER OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

7. GENERAL BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

(1) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.14/95
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICES

CONSIDERATION OF ENABLING PROVISION.

(2) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.15/95
INDEPENDENT TELEVISION NEWS REGULATION PROJECT

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT (1/94)

THAT SESSIONAL SELECTED MEMBERS BE APPOINTED TO WORK, IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 24(7A), THAT MOTION'S MOTION NO.15/95 BE WITHDRAWN.

TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE SESSIONAL MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE.

(3) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.16/95
PARTICIPATION OF INDEPENDENT MOTOR & CYCLING ASSOCIATION IN ASSOCIATIONS

TO BE MOVED BY THE SESSIONAL MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND SESSIONAL MEMBER FOR WEST BAY.

(4) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.17/95
CLOSURE OF SPECIALISTS

TO BE MOVED BY THE SESSIONAL MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND SESSIONAL MEMBER FOR WEST BAY.

(5) PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO.18/95
ESTABLISHMENT OF RADIO CAYMAN AS A GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

TO BE MOVED BY THE SESSIONAL MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE SECOND SESSIONAL MEMBER FOR EAST END.

INDEX OF CONTENTS

	Page
Prayers	1
Questions	1
The Constitutional Validation of Customs Duties Bill, 1981 – Confirmation of Committee Election	2
The Constitutional Validation of Customs Duties Bill, 1981 – Report Stage	2
The Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1981 – Report Stage	2
The Public Finance and Audit Bill, 1985 – Report Stage	7
The Public Trust (Amendment) Bill, 1986 – Report Stage	7
The Court of Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 1987 – Report Stage	7
The Port Authority (Amendment) Bill, 1988 – Report Stage	7
The Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1989 – Report Stage	8
Consideration of Clause 2 of the Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1989 – Committee Stage	11
The Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1989 – Report Stage	15
The Constitutional Validation of Customs Duties Bill, 1990 – Third Reading	16
The Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1990 – Third Reading	16
The Public Finance and Audit Bill, 1990 – Third Reading	17
The Public Trust (Amendment) Bill, 1990 – Third Reading	17
The Court of Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 1990 – Third Reading	17
The Port Authority (Amendment) Bill, 1990 – Third Reading	17
The Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1989 – Third Reading	18
Statement by Hon. Thomas L. Jefferson – Re: Threats to Prime Minister's Family	19
Government Motion No. 9/91 – Amendment to Standing Orders	20
Private Member's Motion No. 14/91 – Compulsory Pension Scheme – Continuation of Debate	22
Private Member's Motion No. 13/91 – Government Sponsored Drug Rehabilitation Facility – Withdrawn	39
Adjournment	40

[illegible]

[illegible] SEPTEMBER, 1986

10:00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: May I invite the Honourable Prime Minister of Dominica Member of Executive Council to say prayers.

THE HON. CHARLES D. LIVERPOOL: Let us pray.

Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power and authority do proceed and without Whom no counsel can prosper and nothing is strong, we humbly 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 Grenada and Carriacou.

Bless Her Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, His Royal Highness Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all who possess authority in our Commonwealth that they may be enabled faithfully to perform their responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen. And now let us say the family prayer which Christ Himself has taught us.

Our Father, which 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 those that trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

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

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Good morning. The Honourable Minister for West Cam.

Questions

THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR WHAT CAN BE DONE TO ACHIEVE SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL GROWTH CONSISTENT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOLOGICAL CONCERNS

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member make a statement on the programme of the present Tuition Subsidy programme which is supported by U.K. Tuition Officers?

ANSWER: Following approval last year by this Assembly, recruiting took place only 3 Chief Inspectors, 7 Chief Inspectors and 8 Police Sergeants have been promoted and all have taken up assignments between August of last year and July of this year. The Sergeants who are on 2 year contracts and the Inspectors and Chief Inspectors who are on 2 (two) year contracts are engaged in their normal operational fields.

All these officers are providing on-the-job training for lower officers. Some progress has already been made in improving professional standards at lower officers and training is continuing with a view to strengthening the Police Force as far as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Member like to ask the next question

THE SECOND PERSON ASKING FOR WHOM MAY BE HAD THE ASSURANCE FROM CAPTAIN MACKAY REGARDING THE INCREASE AND EXPENSE ACCOUNT

MR. IBE: Would the honourable Member state the number of work permits issued by the Commission Secretariat for the period five days, 1968 to 31st July, 1969?

ANSWER: Three Thousand, Five Hundred and Seventy-two (3,572).

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES L. CALVERT: Mr. Speaker, might the Member please state how many persons have been issued since January of this year i.e. since January 1969?

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow the Member if you feel you will be able if you need information about this number of persons I think you may have to put down specific questions because it is not reasonable to expect the Member to be able to provide factual information on every point. It may be that he is prepared to put those questions for you and let you have an answer.

MR. CLARKE F. CARTER: Mr. President, I should be grateful to get this information as soon as it is possible for the Member to do so. If possible within this meeting if he can. Thank you.

MR. S. ERSKINE MILLER: Mr. President, I think the Member agreed earlier to allow a supplementary on how many of these work permits were for person borrowers in the construction industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I think that is so.

MR. DENNIS A. LOUPER: Yes sir, I have that information from this daily sheet that daily 1968 there were seventy-six work permits and two hundred and eighteen (218) renewals and this is common labourers.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Member like to ask the supplementary?

QUESTION NUMBER FOR WHICH DAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AND RECREATION

MR. ---: Would the Honourable Member state how many of these pamphlets were sent and how many were requested?

MR. SPEAKER: One thousand, one hundred and twenty-three (1,123) were sent and one thousand, nine hundred & ninety-nine (1,999) were requested.

MR. SPEAKER: If there are no other supplementaries the First Elected Member for the Eastern Division may ask the next question.

QUESTION NUMBER FOR THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR PUBLIC WORKS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER REPRESENTING THE CAYMAN BRAC

MR. ---: Will the Honourable Member state the economic plans for drilling wells in Cayman Brac for use by the Fire Department?

MR. SPEAKER: Current plans for the installation of a Domestic Fire Service in Cayman Brac are projected for 1982. The introduction of such a service would include the provision of an adequate water supply such as fire wells.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. ROBERT M. MCCOSKERY: Mr. President, a supplementary. Could the Honourable Member state also if it is not until 1982 we are talking about a Domestic Fire Service, by when the Water Authority has employed on the final consideration would be given to drilling wells which would supply the demands because we are having problems with fire?

MR. M. MICHAEL EBANKS: Yes, Mr. President. We would give consideration at that time providing the equipment presented by the Water Authority to implement expansion of drilling fire wells. We will consider it at that time as this would be similar to what we have in Grand Cayman.

MR. SPEAKER: If there are no further supplementaries that concludes question time.

Then I do believe that the continuation

THE CONSTITUTIONAL DISCUSSIONS OF OCTOBER-NOVEMBER, 1981

CONSIDERATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROPOSALS

MR. ---: Please be seated.

The House is now in Committee and the Chair informs the Committee is a bill for a law to make provision for the Constitutional Discussions of October-November 1981 which. We had already dealt with clause 1 and had agreed on that point because on amendment to clause 2 was proposed and then was stood down at which stage which provides wording of this amendment.

MR. DAVIDSON (CONTINUED): The amendment seems to me, I think, attractive. The Electoral Boundaries for North Side may confuse them.

MR. D. BRAHAM HUTCHINS: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have amendments still to be moved by him, that have circulated so I will invite the Electoral Boundaries for North Side to move each of the clauses dealing to the new constituency.

MR. D. BRAHAM HUTCHINS: I think I discussed it enough yesterday, Sir, so I will just move the amendment. I am satisfied with the new boundary. It comprises what I can call an overview of the thirty days or....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that all Members of the Committee, as you rightly say, spoke their mind enough about it and are interested to withdraw.

MR. D. BRAHAM HUTCHINS: I think others that will have a copy - I do not think we should be, I'm sorry colleagues from Eastern Town does not have a copy, Sir, so I will wait Sir. Amendment to clause 8....

HON. MINISTER OF LABOUR: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt. I think just for the record perhaps from the Clerk's information because two days' notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is quite true. We ought to record on the proceedings that I have granted you leave in accordance with the provisions of standing order 8(2), I think it is, by virtue of which less than two days notice has been given so as not that date the Minutes. But you may proceed.

MR. D. BRAHAM HUTCHINS: Yes, Sir, the Member for Eastern Town has been given a copy and I do not think that it is necessary to read it. I think that it speaks for itself and I have not that hesitate except the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question then is that clause 2 of the Bill be amended. Perhaps I had better read it because there have been so many bits of paper floating around that....

MR. D. BRAHAM HUTCHINS: Alright, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

> "(a) by substituting the following for the proposed new clause of sub-clause (1) -
>
> "the constituency, subject to subsection (2) shall for a period ending six (6) months";
>
> (b) by adding the following at the end of sub-clause (2) -
>
> "or if all bills subject to the provisions of the Resolution have not had their third reading within the said two days on which the Legislative Assembly rises shall be the date of the resolution";
>
> and
>
> (c) by substituting "one month" for "five months" in the proposed (3) of sub-clause (3)."

MR. CHAIRMAN (Congressman): Is there an objection to closing the hearing? Does any member wish to speak to it?

MR. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the amendment does improve the bill but my amendment to this will even make the bill palatable to me and I am afraid I cannot support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does any other member wish to speak to the motion? If not, I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. D. [illegible]: May I have a division, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well.

QUESTION
NO. 66

AYES

Hon. Dennis F. Foster
Hon. Winfield J. Crowley
Hon. Roscoe D. Crowley
Hon. M. Morgan Dodson
Hon. Ralph Sherman J. Kirkconnell
Hon. Robert D. Robinson
Hon. A. McKenzie Leigh
Hon. Sydney L. Oswald
Mr. Winfield F. Thomson
Capt. Henry S. Kirkconnell
Mr. D. Samuel Miller

NOES

Mr. D. Philip Dodson

21

1

AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 7 MOVED BY MINISTRY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question now is that clause 7 as contained in proof copy of the Bill. Does any member wish to speak to that question?

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. D. PHILIP DODSON: Mr. Chairman, may I have a division?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

QUESTION
NO. 66

AYES

Hon. Dennis F. Foster
Hon. Winfield J. Crowley
Hon. Roscoe D. Robinson

NOES

ENROLLED
BILL NO. 96
(CONSENT CALENDAR)

AYES

Sen. Horace O. Rhodes
Sen. H. Ramsey Peterson
Sen. Capt. Charles E. Kennedy
Sen. Ronald C. Sinbaugh
Sen. E. Wallace Smith
Sen. Wayne E. Stewart
Sen. Clifford A. Thomson
Sen. Bailey R. Wadsworth
Sen. E. Reuel Miller

19

NOES

Sen. D. Ray Barker

2

CLAUSE 3 AS AMENDED PASSED BY VOICE VOTE.

TITLE: A BILL FOR A BILL TO MAKE PROVISIONS FOR THE PROVISIONAL ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN RIGHTS, AND RELATING THEREUNTO.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the title stand as Chairman Clause as stood part of the Bill.

Sen. [illegible]: [illegible] TITLE AS AMENDED CARRIED PUTSU.

Mr. SECRETARY: That immediate proceedings in connection with a Bill entitled a Bill for a Act to make provision for the provisional adjudication of Certain Rights, and matters connected therewith. The House will now resume.

Mr. C. Ray Barker: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I was not going to deal with this matter by another bill. Are we going to deal with this?

Mr. Chairman: It has to come in Report Stage.

Mr. C. Ray Barker: Oh, alright.

Mr. D. Reuel Miller: We got a promise to debate this.

Mr. Secretary: Yes, we... well, wait and you will see.

HOUSE RESUMED

Mr. Secretary: Please be seated.

Report. The Provisional Adjudication of Certain Rights Bill, 1965.

THE PROVISIONAL ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN RIGHTS BILL, 1965

SECOND READING

Hon. Thomas O. Rhodes: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled "The Provisional Adjudication of Certain Rights Act, 1965" was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

Mr. Secretary: The Bill is accordingly set down for Third Reading. The Statute of Frauds (Amendment) Act, 3/ 1911, 1948.

THE MINING OF SEAMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

MOTION TO CIRCULATE

MR. SPEAKER: Sir. Speaker, I move to postpone this Bill to 3rd August, 1965.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly put down for 3rd August, 1965.

THE PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL, 1965

MOTION TO CIRCULATE

MR. THOMAS C. LOPEZ: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that a Bill entitled "The Public Finance and Audit Law, 1965" was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly put down for 3rd August, 1965.

THE PUBLIC SEALS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

MOTION TO CIRCULATE

MR. THOMAS C. LOPEZ: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that a Bill entitled "The Public Seals (Amendment) Law, 1965" was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly put down for 3rd August, 1965.

THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

MOTION TO CIRCULATE

MR. THOMAS C. LOPEZ: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that a Bill entitled "The Court of Appeal (Amendment) Law, 1965" was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly put down for 3rd August, 1965.

THE TURKS ISLANDS WATERWORKS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

MOTION TO CIRCULATE

MR. THOMAS C. LOPEZ: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that a Bill entitled "The Turks Islands Waterworks (Amendment) Law, 1965" was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly put down for 3rd August, 1965.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL PENSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

REPORT THEREOF

MR. DENNIS F. PAYNE: Mr. President, I beg to report that I have duly entitled "The Supplementary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1972" has been considered by a Committee of the whole Senate and agreed with the addition of a new clause.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Senior Minister and Minister of Finance Economic Affairs has given an undertaking and perhaps he would like to explain.

MR. ERNEST O. MARKS: Mr. President, in accordance with Standing Order 50(1), no notice being necessary under Standing Order 74(1), I beg to move that clause 4 of the Supplementary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1972 be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the said Supplementary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1972 of the principal Act.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 50(1) the Bill be recommitted from the Committee of the whole House be recommitted for the purpose of moving an amendment to clause 4. Does any Member wish to speak?

The Honourable Minister for Home Affairs.

HON. E. MORTIMO BRUTUS: Mr. President, I wish to object to this recommittal and also at the manner which has been proposed by the Government. I object on at least two grounds, Sir,

Mr. President, I have made no notes as I will be very brief. We have stood in this House for a week now debating the Appropriation, the Budget, what should be done and what should not be done. We were told that we were cruel. We were told that we were behind the time. We were told all sorts of things, Mr. President. We were even told that one day you or may need this ; motion.

Mr. President, I oppose this Bill on the grounds that the Government had no reason to bring it back now. They had no amendment to Bill; it is fine now. The other thing we oppose is that Government....

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member must not talk to the Bill. What he is speaking to is a motion that a clause of it be reconsidered....

HON. E. MORTIMO BRUTUS: Yes, Mr. President, but you must admit that.... We must be able to say something about the Bill even if it is an amendment to the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, you are not dealing with an amendment to the Bill. You are dealing with the proposed amendment. The points you made earlier were all perfectly proper matter but now we are dealing only on the different proposal.

HON. E. MORTIMO BRUTUS: I understand that and I will be guided by your decision, Sir. As you rule, I will bear by your decision. However, I want to say with what has been brought, I oppose it strenuously because they told us that they know what they were doing. It now seems that they do not know what they are doing or what they have been doing.

I beg to be it.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Assistant Member from Rainbow State speaks.

MR. D. WADE BROOKS: Mr. President, if we are going to follow the Standing Order 80(2) and the House will be resolved into a Committee to consider it, then to consider the amendment, I think that it is only fair to the Members to know what they are going to consider. You want to consider it as the Standing Order says, if so, we must first vote that the "Aye" be, I think that the Member has an obligation to explain to the House the reason why he now seeks that Committee. I do think....

HON. EDWARD O. DENNIS: Mr. President,....

MR. D. WADE BROOKS: I am not speaking now, Sir. It is clear that the reason for reconsidering any bill is to take action different on it. So, a Member on the floor should be permitted to speak with the reconsideration of his former vote to be done in a committee stage. On the other hand, if he does not know what to vote to be done he may not agree and advise....

MR. PRESIDENT: Could I intervene? I am just a Member. My understanding was that a copy of the proposed amendment will back circulated and I distinctly remember that all Members had had an opportunity to read it.

MR. D. WADE BROOKS: That is true, Mr. President, but unrelated at what stage? After this gentle's Attorney stated I found this as my view here and I do not have the original Act. I might not even be able to find the amendment bill. Certainly, we cannot be expected to go on to take all the problem of the amendment I could therefore just have my just vacated. This is making too much, to use another word politely it is "too much pure for discussion". I think that the Members of this House have a right to know this amendment evidenced on that we may know whether we will agree to the motion for reconsideration or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR. D. EDWARD WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I too would like to oppose the reconsideration of this bill. Yesterday in Committee stage, Sir, I happened the owner of the bill to read into which section we amended, hoping that then and then they would have seen the necessity for this amendment. However, they missed it, and I do not see why they should have a second chance at it. I think this Act has been tested and now this bill has to stand as it is, Sir. So, I oppose the reconsideration of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless any other Member wishes to speak, the Second Elected Member for Kanepa Town.

MR. LAWRENCE A. KAMARA: Mr. President, my comments will be very brief. I have noted from the Committee stage amendment as recommended by the Honourable Minor Minister of Internal Affairs and Local Government that we are in fact moved to reconsider this Standing Order 80(2) which I think most of this House Members have Standing. Also, Mr. President, in reading the new section which is proposed -

"(2) who has attained the age of fifty-five years,"

I would not seem to be a major addition to the new section as was stated.

MR. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI (REPUBLICAN): Mr. President, it would seem to me that we have made, considering what was involved. So, I would request in all fairness how why there be any major objection to having this amendment ready at this stage.

Mr. President, I would support this procedure.

MR. PRESIDENT: If no objection the amendment will be ready to support at this moment. I am glad that's what you are doing.

MR. EDWARD A. GARMATZ: Thank you, yes it is the amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless any other Member objects to what I will put the question. Clerk to report because, the question now is that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 80(1) the Parliamentary Reporting (Amendment) Bill, 1983 be recommitted for the purposes of enabling an amendment to clause 4 of that Bill to be proposed.

QUESTION PUT: (SEE THE VOTE)

MR. SPEAKER PRO TEM: May we have a division, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, you may have a division.

DIVISION
NO. 87

AYES

Hon. Donald F. Reeves
Hon. Michael J. Bradley
Hon. Thomas C. Rafferson
Hon. Gordon D. Blake
Hon. M. Norman Godden
Hon. Capt. Charles E. McConnell
Hon. Ronald G. Hancock
Hon. Stephen T. Graves
Mr. Norman A. Pearson
Hon. Bobby K. Wanamaker

NOES

Mr. R. McKenzie Dean
Mr. P. King Gosden
Mr. D. Gordon McClure

10 — 3

CARRIED BY MAJORITY THAT THE BILL BE RECOMMITTED.

MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance, the House will now go to Order Paragraph.

RECOMMITTAL OF CLAUSE 4 OF THE
PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1983

COMMITTEE STAGE

MR. PRESIDENT: The House is now in Committee. I will put a Bill to amend the Parliamentary Reporting Act, having been recommitted in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 80(1) for the purpose of enabling an amendment to be moved to clause 4 of that Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN (CONTINUING): For the record I confirm that I have given leave to the amendment with the provisions of standing Order 62(2) for the Honourable Miss Elsie Number of Kamaraible Council to move the amendment to clause 2, copies of which have been circulated to Members this morning, and I will not ask her formally to move it.

REV. ORMOND O. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed has been circulated, but for the record in case some members do not know it, I will read it:-

> "That Clause 2 be amended, in the proposed new subsection (1A) of section 3, by the deletion of the full stop at the end thereof immediately preceding the quotation marks and the subsection thereafter of "; and", and the addition immediately thereafter of the following new paragraph -
>
> "(c) has not attained the age of fifty-five years."

Mr. President, the effect of this is that either through the work of the parliamentary council or by some other, the payment granting the pension had arrived prior to the 1st October, 1969 but had not been considered by the Minister that they first had to attain the age of fifty-five years before the pension could be paid, or in the case with other pensions payable under the Act. It was always the intention that this be the case.

This amendment seeks to give effect to that desire. For how many people will be affected by the amendment, but I can think of a few who will be. It is clear that the whole Bill is in consonance to be misunderstood that this amendment is supported by the Crown. I do not think that Members would like the Bill to go through with this loophole, whether it was known or not when Parliament yesterday evening.

I thank you.

MR. G. MAC BRIDE: Mr. Chairman, since the Minister have moved it explain this morning, I have not had the time to examine this amendment, and I wonder if the Member would tell me if this applies to children now employed or only to schools? I have not had time to put the Bill and the amendment together to see.

REV. ORMOND O. EDWARDS: It applies, Mr. President, to the person who has arrived prior to the 1st October, 1969. As do all other provisions...the widow's pension is covered under subsection (1)(c) of section 2, so this would not affect the widow's pension as I see it, Mr. Chairman.

REV. RICHARD J. CRAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may? I think in fairness to the Government position I must say on this amendment that it does not appear to have been a particularly happy way of bringing responsibility to this matter. I think that is quite in my understanding how matters do stand, that we have considerably simplified of the Bill as formerly presented from Committee room to us. Although in its present state, is there an objection to parliamentarians who had served since 1967, there was a prohibition on the responsibility and receipt of a pension before each person had reached the age of fifty-five.

However, in relation to Chairman's own recollection how originally back placed in the Bill which was before the House on Committee stage, as it was thought then in the years of the since 1967, that there would not be any Parliament who had served at that time who were under the age of fifty-five years.

HON. MICHAEL J. COSTELLO: Further debate is necessary, and the Honourable Chief Electoral Officer has already pointed out the difficulties there are likely to arise in the old Government Administration Building and other difficulties in accommodating the full details of Montgomery. Now he says that we do not only in the present Act but also in the past that the Legislature formerly has been pressed with power flows to the people. It is my understanding that there are several Members who would qualify for this particular consideration who are under fifty-five, if their nominations were not to be received.

The amendment was the direct to the previous motion.

MR. [illegible]: I think we just had a question asked the Second Election Member for whom they are acting, if I have got it right, and would it not have been pre-1949 Members or an appeal [illegible] to all responses to the memo about [illegible] in respect of [illegible] of under fifty-five year old pre-1949 Members, have the same sort of entitlement as Members of pre-1949 under fifty-five year old Members. I suppose that then is also the question of a pre-1949 under fifty-five year old Member duly entitled to a pension if accidentally [illegible] like others. Are they, in other words, in all respects on all fours? I think that is what the Second Elected Member for [illegible] wanted to know.

HON. MICHAEL J. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with the previous that the employees [illegible] in the pre-1949 Members, because they have already [illegible] Members and the question does not arise in respect of them.

MR. D. [illegible] KILLICK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we need to play a little longer, why, because someone else might find somebody else who they want to amend the minute to [illegible]. We have already been mentioned, the Second Elected Member for West Bay and I think we have more sort of capacity [illegible] to [illegible], and capacity has many people are included. With [illegible] have they joined recently, a person who can claim to [illegible] whose claims is not [illegible]. Are we likely to have this [illegible] of an [illegible] [illegible] in November, or a few more amendments? Is the Member saying that even though the Member himself who had served under [illegible] entitled to a pension, but we do [illegible] [illegible] has not received [illegible] to under fifty-five, is she willing to [illegible], or does she have to have [illegible] one member fifty-five or not?

HON. MICHAEL J. [illegible]: She is entitled to it.

MR. D. [illegible] KILLICK: She is entitled to it before the age of fifty-five or is she [illegible] on the base on which [illegible] pension is paid.

HON. MICHAEL J. [illegible]: No, we have another [illegible] to have many [illegible] of this amendment were not put through, then there would be several former Members [illegible] under fifty-five who would be entitled to receive a pension immediately this Law comes into [illegible]. The effect of this amendment is to delay their entitlement until they reach fifty-five.

MR. E. ERNEST HOLLINGS: I understand that. What I'm only trying to find out is why the Honourable Prime Minister would take that action yesterday, because, as I know was known out there was now under fifty-five, and he just would decide to establish by a promise of the Government that we would -- fifty-five and be used without having recourse to, to the Members saying that they are going to vote to be fifty-five?

HON. LESTER B. PEARSON: Mr. President, my understanding of the bill and my calculations which were given, I would not place in the least emphasis any importance on the age of the widow. There is no contribution on the age of the widow. The figures which I gave yesterday included Newfoundland entitlement who are not fifty-five. So the figures which I gave the Members yesterday really do not present any problem which would arise, it would seem that the figure would have to be lowered.

MR. E. ERNEST HOLLINGS: I want Members to still consider withdrawing the bill and bringing it back in January.

MR. E. KENNETH RIGHT: Hear, Mr. President. I wonder if the Government would not take a vote on this thing. Why do they withdraw it? Why do they keep doing what they are doing here? They do not know what they are doing. It is ridiculous.

MR. CHARLES S. CROSBY: Mr. Chairman....

MR. E. KENNETH RIGHT: They should withdraw the bill and bring it back another time so they can find out what they are doing.

MR. ROBERT G. PERRY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make observation to the last Member when it was in Committee we carefully the clause before we and had the benefit of evidence of the bill. That has been discussed in the Senate Committee. This is a very simple amendment which seeks to delay the operation of anyone who received before 1960 until they reach the age of fifty-five, which is consistent with the other provisions of the bill.

It was an amendment which caused and it seems to me to be a very simple amendment, and one which is desirable to be incorporated. Whether it has only been sighted or not, it is better to accept something which has been in than to allow it to go on.

MR. E. KENNETH RIGHT: Mr. President, Mr. Chairman.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the Third Member Member for Kent May wants to speak. She caught my eye. I may have....

MRS. DORIS G. CRAFT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In looking at this amendment, that, the thing we have to remember of, nobody is turning pensioner, anybody that came down who is not going to pick pay their age. However, I can see that their benefit would still continue exactly how old they are. However, as in the case mentioned previously, when a woman is a widow she is fifty-five or sixty-five. It would also not have lost her husband through the death of her husband, as I suppose in the case of people in the United States, if a man dies and leaves a woman who is twenty-five she is entitled to get that immediately. They do not have until she is fifty-five or sixty, so I imagine that is what this is meant to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should like to say briefly on a point of personal privilege. I do not think that the amendment was proposed in order to facilitate the establishment of a diplomatic corps in any country.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, if the Honorable First Assistant Minister of Communications signed his name to somebody's social statement, they would pay him. They do not know what they are saying, in my opinion.

MR. [illegible]: The members are interesting.

MR. [illegible]: I think that ...

MRS. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, I was just pointing the Second Elected Member for West Bay would fill the role of the Legal Draftsman.

MR. [illegible]: I would withdraw the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I think that the time now exists to put the question because we are getting very far from the amendment which has been proposed. The question then is that clause 4 of the Bill be amended in the manner proposed by the Honorable First Elected Member for Communications.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

A. E. [illegible] MEMBER: May we have a division, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly

DIVISION
NO. 01

AYES

Hon. [illegible]
Hon. [illegible]
Hon. [illegible]
Hon. [illegible]
Hon. [illegible]
Hon. Capt. [illegible]
Hon. [illegible]
Hon. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Capt. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

11

NOES

Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

3

AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 4 PASSED AT MORNING

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should be grateful now for advice from the Honorable Second Official Member. My understanding was that we should have to consider the clauses as amended again - we still have to explain it to the House.

MR. MICHAEL J. KNIGHT: My understanding, Mr. Chairman is that, after the Committee originally finished their deliberations and reported to the House, that right to the bill in the present subsection form, while it is a simple amendment to that bill as reported and that it is not necessary to have the whole clause.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well, in that case if no amendments will the provisions of Standing Order 55, paragraph (1)...

MR. DENIS H. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. DENIS H. SMITH: I move the report stage be put now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, ordinarily traditionally you should move that the bill as amended in Committee be reported to the House, you have to move that we move it.

MR. DENIS H. SMITH: That be effected as put out of Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Standing Order 56(1)

MR. DENIS H. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Standing Order 56(1) it is moved that the bill as amended be reported to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that in connection with Standing Order 56(1) it is moved that the bill as amended in Committee be reported to the House. I will put that question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO UNANIMOUSLY. That the bill as amended in Committee be reported to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proceedings in Committee are closed. The House will resume.

House Resumed

MR. PRESIDENT: I beg to report, Report. The Parliamentary Pensions

Amendment Bill, 1985.

THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS AMENDMENT BILL, 1985

Report Received

HON. DENIS H. SMITH: Mr. President, I beg to report that on the recommendation of a bill hereby entitled "the Parliamentary Pensions Amendment Bill, 1985" no amendment was made to clauses 2 of the Bill, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Third Reading. The Bill is unanimously and duly put

Bill. Third Reading.

THE INCOME TAX (COLLECTION OF CUSTOMS DUTIES) ACT, 1985

Third Reading

CLERK: The Provisional Collection of Customs Duties Bill, 1985,

MR. EUGENE C. PETTIS: Mr. President, I just to make that a Bill should entitled "An Territorial Collection of Customs Duties Law, 1956" be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled "An Territorial Collection of Customs Duties Law, 1956" be given a Third Reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. S. EATU SOMSA: Mr. President, may I have a division?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes.

DIVISION
NO. 68

AYES

Hon. Dennis B. Foster
Hon. Michael J. Keating
Hon. Thomas S. Jeffreys
Hon. Bernard C. Kenny
Hon. W. Norman Dodson
Hon. Capt. Charles L. McKoy[illegible]
Hon. Robert G. Johnson
Mr. R. McKeone Quch
Mrs. Daphne L. Orcutt
Capt. Abbey S. McKoy[illegible]
Mr. D. Howard Miller

NOES

Mr. C. Wally Richie

12

1

BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED BY MAJORITY

MR. PRESIDENT: Bills. Third Reading.

THE MINING OF DEEP (AMENDMENT) (NO.3) BILL, 1956

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Mining of Deep (Amendment) (No.3) Bill, 1956.

HON. DENNIS B. KEATING: Mr. President, I beg to move, Sir, that a Bill entitled "The Mining of Deep (Amendment) (No.3) Law, 1956" be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the Mining of Deep (Amendment) (No.3) Bill, 1956 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES. BILL GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Bills. Third Reading. Item 11,

THE PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

CLERK: The Public Finance and Audit Bill, 1985.

MR. EDWARD C. KIRYOWA: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled "The Public Finance and Audit Law, 1985" be given a First Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled "The Public Finance and Audit Law, 1985" be given a First Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A FIRST READING AND PASSED.

THE PUBLIC LOCAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

CLERK: The Public Local (Amendment) Bill, 1985

MR. EDWARD C. KIRYOWA: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled "The Public Local (Amendment) Law, 1985" be given a First Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled "The Public Local (Amendment) Law, 1985" be given a First Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A FIRST READING AND PASSED.

THE COURT OF APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

CLERK: The Court of Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

MR. NICHOLAS J. KAGWA: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill entitled "The Court of Appeal (Amendment) Law, 1985" be given a First Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled "The Court of Appeal (Amendment) Law, 1985" be given a First Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A FIRST READING AND PASSED.

THE JUDICIAL AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

CLERK: The Judicial Authority (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

MR. CHARLES T. KIYONGA: Mr. President, I move that a Bill shortly entitled "The Judicial Authority (Amendment) Law, 1985" be given a First Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled "The Judicial Authority (Amendment) Law, 1985" be given a First Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. BILL GIVEN A FIRST READING AND PASSED.

THE PARLIAMENTARY PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

MR. DEPUTY S. SPEAKER: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill already entitled "The Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1985" be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. D. PRASAD MISHRA: Mr. President, with your permission, may I first before you put the question, on supporting the Bill, while also the Honourable Member mentioned one amendment. I submit for your kind consideration to the Bill, Sir.

SHRI JAGDISH S. SHARMA: Mr. President, my submission is that in case supporting on the recommendation of one clause of the Bill, and on that recommendation of the one clause of the Bill there was one amendment on the recommendation in Committee stage.

MR. D. PRASAD MISHRA: Mr. President, I do not think that the Bill had been reported back to that, Sir, because we had withdrawn the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY S. SPEAKER: No, it had been reported, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It had been reported. Yes, it is now. I submit to the Hon'ble Member whether what is just happening in the Lobbies constitute the amendment or not.

SHRI MADHAVA REDDI: Nobody knows until reported to that ...

SHRI JAGDISH S. SHARMA: I supported it, Sir, strictly, and I may also that there was one clause added in it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. Just reported that one clause added. That is quite right.

MR. D. PRASAD MISHRA: I am just trying to make some that we have that they also passed it also. (Interruption).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought that you did not want it actually.

The question is that a Bill to provide for Parliamentary Pensions (Amendment, Act, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT AND AGREED TO.

SHRI D. PRASAD MISHRA: May we have a division, Mr. President?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DIVISION NO. 2

AYES

Shri Jagdish S. Sharma
Shri Madhavrao L. Scindia
Shri Shivraj V. Patil
Shri Ramesh G. Bhatia

NOES

DIVISION
NO. 35

AYES	NOES
Hon. R. Norman Boddam	Mr. P. McKenzie Singh
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Arbuthnot	Mr. D. Leonard Miller
Mrs. Muriel G. Johnson	
Hon. Cynthia L. Ogburn	
Mr. Clifford A. Symonds	
Capt. Bobby T. Whitehead	
Mr. B. Haig Boddam	
12	2

QUIZ GIVEN A TESTED READING AND PASSED BY MAJORITY.

Mr. PRESIDING. It may be recollected by the House generally, as was also true by which of you will remember and to be different, that be characterized by Members of the Government. The Honourable Third Official Member.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HONOURABLE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Hon. THIRD O. OFFICIAL: Thank you, Mr. President, and I am privileged for my remarks this morning. I put considered which some legal matters.

In the revision which appeared in the Legislative Council on Friday, 30th August, 1963, it was agreed that the allocation to overseas fees should not under circumstances increase from $60,000. I am grateful to the Chairman for the comments which appeared in yesterday's issue, and it appeared that the allocation to the Library from Funds and other sources was $64,800. This shortfall occurred because many issues in the United Kingdom were overlooked. As a result high bonds prices in the London were underestimated here. There being no other business the House stood adjourned.

The total number of licences outstanding was 81, with the number of new licences at 25, giving a net increase for the year of seven and a total number of licences at 31st December, 1963 of 100.

To update the information for 1964, that is for January to 30th September, 1965, the original budget estimate of $1,050,000 has been revised in the second revision to that date to $4,450,000, a shortfall of $2,600, the number of new licences drawn at 30 and the number of licences cancelled this year to 15, a net addition increasing to 25, with the total number of licences at 30th September, 1965 of 130.

There are 15 prohibitions outlook, this consideration, which about seven days to the Civil Service.

This statement, Mr. President, is here to inform Honourable Members and the public of the particular circumstances in the different financial years. The information that appears in this statement demonstrates the problems which the International Financial Crisis has in the community of this Territory and the people.

MR. SPEAKER: It is slightly unclear from my reading what was moved, was only 3 for amendments purposes. I think perhaps what others then called on certainly, it will be considered to break for about fifteen minutes now. I will suspend proceedings accordingly.

At 12.15 a.m. the House adjourned

HOUSE RESUMED AT 12.45 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Item 8(viii), Motions. Government
Motion No. 6/85. The Honourable First Official Member.

MOTION
GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 6/85

THE HONOURABLE M. SOARES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Government Motion No. 6/85 standing in my name, which reads as follows:-

"AND IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly Standing Orders, 1978 be amended in exercise of the powers conferred by subsection (1) of Section 33 of the Constitution, and pursuant to Standing Order 88, by inserting a new Standing Order 88, immediately after Standing Order 87, a copy of which proposed new Standing Order is attached hereto."

Mr. Speaker, the attached draft Standing Order reads as follows:

"Any Member of the Government may withdraw or vote against a motion for giving consideration thereto after it is moved in pursuance of subsection (1) of section 3 of the Provisional Collection of Customs Duties Law, 1985; and the question on such a motion shall be put forthwith."

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is Government Motion No. 6/85, the text of which has just been read out by the Honourable First Official Member, as I understand it. Consequential on the publication of Standing Order 88, paragraph (a) this question has to be put forthwith. I am not sure, the question has to be put forthwith that this be referred to a committee as Standing Order. There is, we have not got a Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

In accordance, therefore, with the provisions of Standing Order 88, paragraph (a), I will put the question that this motion be referred to that Standing Committee.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. G. HALL QUINN: Mr. Speaker, may I have a division, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

S/PV.
35

[illegible]

[illegible]

Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

MR. PARKER D. ATHERTON (CONSERVATIVE): Mr. President, I applaud the estimates and wish to congratulate my colleague from the Opposition for the responsible manner in which he has presented his budget address. So when we are looking at the estimates, what the Government has really done is to look at the revenue, what the Government can really get to be able to, in the early looking at approximately $20.7 million.

I remember when Premier Earl Rayside was Premier of this province. The expectation was to create for this province there was a capacity of jobs. I should not doubt, Mr. President, when there was a capacity of jobs at the beginning of this year, but all of a sudden we realized that this was a scary case from 1984. It was not the creation of this new Government.

I am glad also to see the new Honourable Minister of Economic Development and Tourism is here. I am not saying that we have created a full employment situation but at least people are find jobs around. I was a statement released by the Leader of the Opposition where they said that they did a consultation process on holding four jobs, where there are four jobs in this province that could be applied.

MR. President, the economy of this province is essentially working. The ship needs to keep at the course that which was given recently by the honourable Premier Hatfield regarding growth in the Economic Council. Already this year there are a number of business [illegible] facts. There are a number of bank financing applications pending.

Mr. President, this improved confidence in the private sector is due to the new measures by the International Development Agency. I have my visit this position with confidence, Mr. President. As were told by the Opposition Leader that our Lieutenant-Governor opened this session of [illegible] on the 20th of May. Will Members be aware of the Government's intentions, Mr. President, that is the aspects of taking care of it is the very key that we have of all those problems which we pointed out of the water and out of the economy which we have seen the Government in November, 1982.

Mr. President, it is good knowing the things that the Opposition Leader is pointing out. We have heard on many occasions people that enjoy fishing and hunting of I was find any of this, because this is the Opposition or another speaker showed not so long ago, in Legislature which came up during the election campaign last year and in the Legislature recently this year. We are presently looking at our fishing and hunting problems. I wonder if before this session took place we could do those jobs [illegible]. I am sure I may, Mr. President. This goes on the days when I was an officials of this Government. I have a lot of thought in [illegible] people who were living influenced by, because in all the economy. So all the members where will under the responsibility the fishing of the rod on the shore and how to avoid pollution and use [illegible].

MR. President, we are dealing with a Private Members motion which is pleading with Government to consider a moratorium for the people of [illegible]. People who live there they come to the economy of their province that can be assured that there would be some form of pension which are more than we think and are.

Mr. President, the President's previous speaker which is being now moved here may or may not be the Opposition, but one point of it is well known to the Central Provinces and that is the social security fund of all the country called by the United Province Government and which really [illegible] that was present here [illegible] and I am sure will continue to enjoy

MR. KOSSET G. ANDREAS (Ukrainian SSR) (spoke in Ukrainian): The Ukrainian delegation has carefully studied the report of the United States Government on measures undertaken in accordance with article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. President, as time goes on, people's perceptions of those problems are also changing that may not yesterday be considered from this point of view. It is not just that nations have been personally responsible for maintaining the faith they have undertaken. Days in those periods.

Mr. President, one thing which we must be pleased of is that there is serious interest in practical [illegible] the Soviet Union and the United States [illegible] in the process of the general [illegible] which we can only welcome. This is our point of view, Mr. President, that we have been attempted and resolute that in connection with these [illegible] and problems [illegible] [illegible], Mr. Secretaries and persons who work in the [illegible] Secretariat, [illegible] and other organs. What we [illegible] in this region [illegible] which we must [illegible] any form of [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

Mr. President, I [illegible] back to [illegible] which I made my first statement [illegible] Session, I [illegible] my [illegible] for [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] by the United Kingdom Government, [illegible] [illegible], to [illegible], Mr. President, the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Capital [illegible]. It [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] there are [illegible] which are considered. One is a [illegible] and the other a social security scheme. As I said before, Mr. President, the social security scheme is well known to these Islands. There are marked differences between the two schemes. For instance, in the case of the contributory [illegible] scheme the workers' contributions would cease on the attainment of [illegible] whereas in the case of the social security scheme the contributions would continue until [illegible] the contributions would be paid when [illegible] the contributory scheme. Many persons would perhaps die [illegible] the pensionable age. If the provident fund scheme is [illegible] the contributions would be paid into the [illegible] scheme. Mr. President, I am not [illegible] on these things. I am only pointing out a few of the [illegible] I have made. This will eventually have to be [illegible] if the contributions can be looked at. One of the [illegible] I have emphasized this, Mr. President, is only [illegible] who [illegible] be participated in the scheme. Employees and employers must [illegible] which will be determined. It [illegible] by the contribution of those persons and will be [illegible] for the administration of the scheme.

Mr. President, it is said that someone was given some form [illegible]. I am sure that it is the intention of all the persons sitting in this Chamber [illegible] and that we should [illegible] which would, ultimately [illegible] the Commencement of the Legislature [illegible] Many [illegible] I am sure that [illegible] I am sure that [illegible] for the [illegible] and only then can legislation begin [illegible] formulated.

Mr. President, I should very much like to [illegible] these [illegible] of procedure in the minds of Members of this House and I hope that in due course we can have a decision on what legislation we begin.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. D. RICHARD MYLES: Mr. President, I rise to support Financial Secretary's motion in [illegible] for a contribution [illegible] scheme. I am a signatory for this motion, Mr. President, and I have gone in for a lot of research, and we have been at it since [illegible] the last couple of days. However, I would like to [illegible] I have also to allow the [illegible] of a few things so as to cut the second [illegible].

Mr. President, this matter is [illegible] for a contributory pension scheme. It is not asking for a social security system to be placed in the place [illegible] contributory pension scheme which we have just passed into law.

MR. [illegible] (continuing): The person in the opening position would probably wind up paying a premium of around $600 to $700 more than he would under the new system. That is a small price to pay for the protection that has been given to the people of Hawaii for the past 40 years.

Also, Mr. President, the system does not penalize Hawaii for its future and its success. It gives us the right to help ourselves. Because, you know, sir, with that kind of financial base which we have in this unit, the first 10 to 15 years here could be very dangerous, very hazardous to the entire base of the unit. Therefore, we have to go out and get as much money as we can to help ourselves.

Mr. President, I would like to point out that the Hawaiian Civil Service Retirement System is a unique system. It is the only one of its kind in the United States. Also, Mr. President, I would like to point out that the Hawaiian State Civil Service Retirement System is unique in that it is the only one of its kind in the United States. Also, Mr. President, I would like to point out that the Hawaiian State Civil Service Retirement System is unique in that it is the only one of its kind in the United States.

Mr. President, I would like to point out that the Hawaiian State Civil Service Retirement System is unique in that it is the only one of its kind in the United States. Also, Mr. President, I would like to point out that the Hawaiian State Civil Service Retirement System is unique in that it is the only one of its kind in the United States.

Mr. President, I would like to point out that the Hawaiian State Civil Service Retirement System is unique in that it is the only one of its kind in the United States. Also, Mr. President, I would like to point out that the Hawaiian State Civil Service Retirement System is unique in that it is the only one of its kind in the United States.

MR. D. EDWARD ANDREWS (CONSERVATIVE): Mr. President, there are just a few questions that recently came to my mind, and I would like to ask the Minister this morning. Last night, Mr. President, I stayed home on Sunday night and I did a small constituency survey. I took the telephone book and I opened it at random and I chose telephone numbers at random. I called 100 people in Mr. Providence, and I asked them two questions:

"Do you feel that this country needs a pension scheme?"

And the first question, the second question was:-

"Would you be willing to contribute to such a scheme?"

Mr. President, 81 people out of those 100 felt that there was a need for such a pension scheme, yes. They were willing to contribute in some way to such a scheme. 19 of those people, Mr. President, felt that there was a need for such a scheme but they themselves would be retired by the time it came into operation. In other words they were not willing to contribute. Nine of those people answered negative to both questions by way of the questionary.

Mr. President, the only conclusion which can be drawn from such a survey is that there is a desire, a need that a pension scheme of contributory benefits should be introduced.

Now, Mr. President, we have heard that Government wants to study it. They need to get information in order to compile statistics to find out whether this country is ready. There are those small countries in Europe, like Malta, which have had pensions for a number of years. I do not think that we need to go abroad to get information. We have some here and get it across to our own people. Let us stop talking about it. Let us have some action. That is what they're waiting for, Mr. President. I think that it is not an easy or simple thing to do but we have people here right here, Sir. We know that. We can get them there. The four elected Members of Government Council, Sir, with the Chief Minister of course as Speaker, and the Second Elected Member for Work Force would not be on Executive Council today if we had not them there. We have applied this kind of sophistication by other people and with which of course we disagree. It is said that they were the four people best suited to serve the country at this time and we got them there. But I am beginning to have doubts about two of those Members' resignations or sitting, one or two occasions. We just have that, Mr. President, that there will always be some criticism there, especially when we are going to do a controversial thing like this.

You know, Mr. President, they don't call me the honourable Chief Minister of Government now for nothing for from 1975 when I formed Government, "The one person". He would say to me on the telephone and say, "Hey my boy you will regret", Mr. President, "The way I operate". I would like to remind him, Sir, that one finds one's friends. That is quite natural because they have been experienced. Mr. President, you have not guaranteed that one is going to receive one's pensions one is going to become quite entitled. Certainly it was not discriminated from last week. Some of the things which are provided, Sir, are social issues, certainly I may raise and things like that. They were there by having been behind the scene, Sir. I do not know whether we were ground to build those fallen houses down, Sir, and I would state that I commenced my office's life there Sir, with my colleagues here to take action and also in early 1976, we then

[illegible] are quite shy today, Kay, but they are going to take a fishing today because I took them in Friday. They went on a picnic yesterday on Friday, but I brought [illegible] today, Kay, and we are going down to the pond. We are going to show our what they are made of today.

Mr. President, there is only one other matter that I wish to mention briefly from experience and that is the Saturday [illegible] mail delivery. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas. I am in accord with the proposal. I am in favor of the Saturday delivery. I am in favor of the Saturday delivery. I am in favor of the Saturday delivery

MR. O. ERVAN HILLS (CONTINUED): ...Mr. President, Sir, we have a large section of the population which is believed that some of us may be 21 years young when we have still to continue to pension them off. If we do not accept those people contributing now, where are we going to find the funds to pay them? Are we going to continue to have a Government Agency of State, specially the taxpayers' money system? This body, according to estimate given in this Session of the Assembly by one group to raise out almost half a million dollars. Yet they said that it cannot do it. We begin to get nowhere. We have got to get of the system now people, we have got to get of the system now people. We have got to find ways and means. We have to bring people to form societies to play part of this system now people.

I believe that we can find a system which can suit our needs and which can be ready to work. Mr. President, the nature of this motion and myself have, I believe, dealt it personal. I think it is a kind of civilian times we have consequential amendments to the Government which is an attempt to influence them into action to bring something to this House but we have only succeeded. Every one of every, they will agree us to when we have to look to the final form, that they feel to receive a few points or they cannot accept this situation, but we will say time to the Chair, Mr. President. We will see how quickly that brings it, because I believe, Sir, that the Social Security Act which my self I think of this motion is defeated today, have followed our objective to this they are going to have to find a system which can serve. And they are going to have to bring it together to this Assembly, especially to the light of the parliamentary workers legislation which was enacted a short while ago.

Mr. President, as I sat here on today afternoon and just my observations, I was reminded of another saying -

> "It is a curious fact of life that of all the different that human nature, none is quite so curious as that, whatever it says it does, and whatever it does it rejects."

I would ask those Members to be mindful of that saying.

Now, Mr. President, all the views of this motion and myself, the secretary are asking for is that Government find a system and bring it to this Confederation Assembly next June. There is no more time for talk, Sir. We must remember only back then, months to go all the money, because and everybody else which are necessary for the consequential amendments needed as a result to you, Mr. President, that it is a simple system. All we are doing there is taking the part contributory money that should be used for pension purposes, and keeping ourselves a surplus when we should retire. They say that we said that they are true the pension role. I really do mean it sincerely. I know that there is a misconception to the fact that they have to pay some taxes, Mr. President, for most of them that fifty-five years has increased that figure up to four that is the big block. They are not too far off it. They are not quite as far away as I am for a few anyway.

Mr. President, if we just have a look first of this case many they have already saved it for themselves, such a system, they would not have the problem

MR. J. EDWARD ROLLER (continuing): The originator of this Petition, Kenneth Meister, is a Jew. The Soviet Government, we should but to keep a vigilant precedent.

Mr. President, in light of the fact that even though the Soviet Union, for the help and myself fought to the bitter end its totalitarianism dictatorship still exists, why does it have invoked such a provision for [illegible] from keeping the Members of Government, elsewhere the head of the [illegible] and even this matter, and being a signer to this Assembly it have the people of this country can participate in a decision which will affect them, as they have attempted for [illegible] provisions, to continue to block its ability and of persons to [illegible] right people.

Mr. President, some of [illegible] have [illegible] lack of [illegible] have provided. Now of [illegible] have [illegible] however, only one of [illegible] can be granted. I am asking the Members of this House to demonstrate the [illegible] which I know that they have and [illegible] this matter with the [illegible]. If they [illegible] shoulders to the wheel, and they have [illegible] grow [illegible] Any Senate [illegible]. Tonight then, therefore the [illegible] to be [illegible] of this vote on the floor of the House, they can [illegible] that have from the State Governors in March. [illegible] many [illegible] and [illegible] I am requesting [illegible] place on [illegible], to [illegible] that [illegible] which I know that they have and [illegible] have [illegible] from the State Governors in March.

I trust that they will support the [illegible]. Mr. President, one of the [illegible], I [illegible] in the last [illegible] have [illegible] to [illegible], to give them the opportunity to [illegible] this great [illegible] they have. It [illegible] [illegible] minutes [illegible]. One [illegible] is [illegible] more than [illegible] for the [illegible] [illegible]. Mr. President, even if they cannot accept our original [illegible] and to [illegible] by the State Governors in March, I still feel that if they give [illegible] a [illegible] and [illegible] had enough they can get the vote here [illegible]. They have got to [illegible] the time [illegible] with the [illegible]. There [illegible] one or two who can [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible]. So let us [illegible]. Therefore, personally, [illegible], without a doubt they can [illegible] their [illegible] here on [illegible] minutes.

I ask Members, Sir, I note that the [illegible], some of [illegible] came in the [illegible] form. The Members [illegible] would the [illegible] and [illegible] who [illegible] the [illegible] are [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] minutes [illegible] and they can [illegible] minutes [illegible]. Let us [illegible] on [illegible] this [illegible]. Let us get the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Thank you, Sir.

(Inaudible) I think that it will probably be [illegible] of us accept [illegible] and take our [illegible] [illegible] now. However, the Honorable First [illegible] Member has asked me to [illegible]. It would [illegible], if possible, to have a [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] now, because [illegible] to be necessary to a [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] which [illegible] be [illegible] this [illegible]. [illegible] after [illegible] we have a [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] will be a convenient [illegible] to hold [illegible] [illegible]. It might be [illegible] brief, or whatever you [illegible] to put [illegible] [illegible] time.

At 12:45 P.M. the House [illegible]

[illegible]

THE CHAIRMAN: [illegible]
[illegible]
The delegate of Poland, Mr. Kowalski, has the floor.

Mr. KOWALSKI (Poland): Mr. President, I will only make a few comments on the Polish-Yugoslav motion, document A/C.1/L.320, which is before us.

I have heard many views on this matter. I can support the opinion that was put forward by Mr. Tsarapkin, the Soviet representative, and by other delegations. We have studied the explanations given by the sponsors of this draft resolution, and we have also studied the explanations given by the representatives of other countries. In my view, Mr. President, the explanations given by the sponsors of this draft resolution, as well as the explanations given by other representatives, have been quite unsatisfactory. In my view, Mr. President, even if the explanations were true, they would not be sufficient to justify the adoption of this draft resolution.

We could not think about this draft resolution unless we had a basis for it. The sponsors of this draft resolution have not given us any facts upon which we could base our decision. Moreover, the resolution is lacking in many respects. In the first place, it is not clear what is the aim of the draft resolution. Is it the aim of the sponsors to ask the Secretary-General to make a study of the present situation in the world? Or is the aim to ask the Secretary-General to make a study of some kind of peaceful measures? In the case of the former, the Secretary-General would be making the contribution, he would be asked to make a study of the present situation in the world. But if the aim of the sponsors is the latter, then the Secretary-General would be asked to make a study of peaceful measures. However, the resolution is lacking in many respects. In the first place, it is not clear what is the aim of the draft resolution. Is it the aim of the sponsors to ask the Secretary-General to make a study of the present situation in the world? Or is the aim to ask the Secretary-General to make a study

Mr. K. JAYATILAKA SUPRI: Mr. President, may I be in my house to congratulate your Excellency the Minister of State upon having been chosen by His Excellency the Governor-General of which all Members may be very proud. Most members of Executive Council, Mr. President, do not realise what they suppose the position will call upon them to make as much noise as possible.

Mr. President, if I may say so, I have always admired Honourable Members who know what they mean by interjections and what I am saying to do them. Sometimes I wish I had the speaking talents, this eminent gift of making speeches such as Honourable Members on the political platform and in the Legislature possess but I have always envied them their ability to make their interjections which are very often very much to the point.

Since one is going to be taken to task by Honourable Members, Mr. President, one might plead in defence certain limitations of nature, I believe that I am in Honourable Members.

In this connection the Honourable Nominated Member for Kandy has referred to my voice. Mr. President, that is one of the things one cannot help. I was born with that voice and I have to be very glad that I have good lungs. That is the only reason why I can speak loudly. It has been said before, that voice does not matter but what is said. I am very much obliged to the Honourable Member for Kandy for drawing my attention to this matter.

The suggestion of my colleague, Mr. Tennekoon, that I should speak from this side, is a very good one. If I am ever elected to the Legislature I shall do so. I have always been on this side of the House and I feel very much at home here.

I am in accord with the views of the Honourable Member for Colombo Central when he says that all these Members appointed on the recommendation of the Governor-General should not be given portfolios. I am in agreement with him in this matter. I think it would be very much better if they were given portfolios.

Mr. President, I will just refer to a few matters that were mentioned by the Honourable Minister for Local Administration, Mr. Senanayake, in his speech yesterday. There is one matter I am dealing to do today. The only difficulty, Mr. President, is that various subjects that matter to be dealt with, have been mixed up with the Legislature. The difficulty is to know if I am entitled to refer to the Legislature, and what matters I am entitled to refer to. I would, Mr. President, like to have your ruling on this matter. I think it would be very much better if we could have a debate on the Legislature. Government had promised a paper relating to the Legislature, but we have not got it yet. I would like to know when we are going to get it.

Mr. President, I would like to refer to the matter I should mention. That is all these Members appointed on the recommendation of the Governor-General, Mr. President, if there is anything we can do to help you in this matter, we should be very much obliged to do so. I have always been on this side of the House and I feel very much at home here. I am in accord with the views of the Honourable Member for Colombo Central when he says that all these Members appointed on the recommendation of the Governor-General should not be given portfolios. I am in agreement with him in this matter. I think it would be very much better if they were given portfolios.

Mr. President, I will just refer to a few matters that were mentioned by the Honourable Minister for Local Administration, Mr. Senanayake, in his speech yesterday. There is one matter I am dealing to do today. The only difficulty, Mr. President, is that various subjects that matter to be dealt with, have been mixed up with the Legislature. The difficulty is to know if I am entitled to refer to the Legislature, and what matters I am entitled to refer to. I would, Mr. President, like to have your ruling on this matter. I think it would be very much better if we could have a debate on the Legislature. Government had promised a paper relating to the Legislature, but we have not got it yet. I would like to know when we are going to get it.

Mr. President, Honourable Members have, I am sure, noticed that I am in my seat today. I am very much obliged to the Honourable Member for Colombo Central when he says that all these Members appointed on the recommendation of the Governor-General should not be given portfolios. I am in agreement with him in this matter. I think it would be very much better if they were given portfolios.

Mr. President, I will just refer to a few matters that were mentioned by the Honourable Minister for Local Administration, Mr. Senanayake, in his speech yesterday. There is one matter I am dealing to do today. The only difficulty, Mr. President, is that various subjects that matter to be dealt with, have been mixed up with the Legislature. The difficulty is to know if I am entitled to refer to the Legislature, and what matters I am entitled to refer to. I would, Mr. President, like to have your ruling on this matter. I think it would be very much better if we could have a debate on the Legislature. Government had promised a paper relating to the Legislature, but we have not got it yet. I would like to know when we are going to get it.

Col. A. McKenzie Blue (Continued): Mr. President, time will only
[illegible] if I may please. I have been amused by today an agitator.
Mr. Speakerman, I think that I can get the people stirred up as well
as any other politician in this House. I would just state my
[illegible] to the amendment even though I will oppose it. However,
I am [illegible] the Government knows that if they fail in their responsibility
in this country within this three year period, I am going to have one
[illegible] against them.

The Second Electoral Member for Eveleth
[illegible] the document of that nature in 1978. There seem today to
me [illegible] to the Reservation Report of this country and remained
there for eight years. It is my knowledge, at no time in those eight
years did Government take a positive step towards [illegible] a
[illegible] position overseas. Those eight years, Mr. Speakerman, have
[illegible] to take away eight of the most [illegible] years of this country
[illegible] which the National Resources at one point accounted for upwards of
[illegible] dollars. Yes, Mr. Speakerman, this same Minister in his Budget
Speech here just said to that one of the drawbacks of such a scheme
as is being proposed was the [illegible] of work.

Mr. Speakerman, this kind of talk has
to be nonsense to this country. Of course, this kind of talk and care
[illegible] talk as Mr. Speakerman is a real [illegible] these people.
I'll not start an [illegible] to [illegible] these [illegible]
[illegible] to [illegible]. As I said, [illegible] the other
[illegible] talk as Minister said they should support this [illegible],
[illegible] Mr. Speakerman, [illegible] the other [illegible] why they should support this motion, I just [illegible]
[illegible] which the Minister is going to [illegible] a few [illegible]
[illegible] International, before it becomes [illegible] Mr. Speakerman. One of
the main reasons is the same as why the Labour Representation has not
been supported by certain people in this country. That is, Mr. Speakerman,
[illegible] which [illegible] in this country do not want to give workers
[illegible] benefits. That is why this thing will not be supported,
Mr. Speakerman.

Mr. Speakerman, the Member [illegible]
[illegible] were being given with this motion. Mr. Speakerman, as I
[illegible], whether they were to pay that is [illegible] Whether they
were to say that we are being unpatriotic, whether they used to say
that we are betraying the west before the [illegible]. The purpose of the
motion is very, very clear. Mr. Speakerman, if the Minister [illegible]
to the motion he has chosen a time, the twelve years which have been
[illegible] in this country are essentially the days [illegible], but we [illegible]
the years as I would in my speaking [illegible]. There is a kind of [illegible]
[illegible] in this country and our people want security when their [illegible]
[illegible] are gone. They deserve it and it is [illegible]. We have to provide it.

Much has been said by some Members
[illegible] the [illegible] possibility study [illegible]. They will
not be much more [illegible]. Mr. Speakerman, we have had three studies
that I know of, and my contention is that the only study which I agree
[illegible] necessary is for persons to tell the Government how they can
[illegible] these persons with the available [illegible] we have now to take
[illegible]. Mr. Speakerman, we are saying that we need it. Our people
[illegible] used to us only for the [illegible] to tell us how to do it.
[illegible] Responsibility study [illegible] would be told us what we want to do. That
was been decided. It must have been, Mr. Speakerman.

MR. W. MACKAY SMITH (CONSERVATIVE): The honourable Prime Minister of Australia (Mr. Holt) said to the Fifth Assembly and the United States Senate for each day to put it in our Election manifesto. We decided that certainly should be done. My honourable friend on the other side also misinterpreted my speaking remarks about exports. I am fond of hearing about exports here, Mr. President, I do not like them. However, I am big enough and man enough to say that I do not become enraged or embarrassed enough to ignore the value of exports. I still maintain the decision to increase which a national wheat authority, as was said in this Chamber, is a political decision which we must all accept.

As one of a group to get support from most of the workers in the Australian field, I know that, Mr. President, I do not just like what they are looking about for Australia what our people need. I have confidence that the honourable United Australia Senator, Senator Sir [illegible] has like myself and other in the Senate may, wrong for us a little longer than they like myself and other in the Senate may, wrong for us a little longer than they like myself and other in the Senate may, wrong for us a little longer than they

Mr. X. Herald Glass. Mr. President, the leader here [illegible] Mr. Speaker, the Right Honourable Member for Kent [illegible] suggested that perhaps this matter is premature because we have [illegible] for nine months. Obviously they would like this [illegible] suggested that we should take to get the opinion before [illegible], perhaps I should look forward to Lord Denning. Mr. Speaker, this premature business, that kind of talk and kind of mentality are exactly why we do not have a genuine Welfare State, because if we had had other people [illegible] have been getting [illegible] the welfare principle would have gained and Governments would have had to do something. However, they will listen to what they [illegible] for them. I guess that is where we [illegible] Mr. Speaker, they are only nine [illegible]. We spend more time here [illegible] and have more and more [illegible] Parliamentary business [illegible]. Why? Why do we? Is it because Governments are [illegible] Government knowing exactly why it would rather or exactly how much it would cost. They still do not know. So, what are the facts?

I see Members [illegible] on the Conservative benches [illegible]. I have [illegible] of what we [illegible] into account. I have no intention of [illegible] what we [illegible].

Mr. President. I am glad to hear that because I [illegible] Lord Denning [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] the debate on something which [illegible] under.

Mr. X. Herald Glass. I am sure to [illegible], Anyway, I will be careful. Sir, I was just going to say that it is [illegible] Government time [illegible] Members or not to [illegible] the Bill back, who is [illegible], how much it would cost this country, and they would have not [illegible] all the costs to the country. Yes, I am asking Government to [illegible] it a motion to make it possible for somebody to get something.

They can [illegible] it is premature, and that they need more time. I have the same [illegible]. They say that I am destroying the country. Mr. President, I have great admiration for that. They say that they are not going to [illegible] with me. Well, that is their right, but I have great [illegible] in my Member [illegible] building up that kind of extraordinary [illegible] which in any other [illegible] I have brought in this Honourable House in my own [illegible] of being a Member will destroy this country. I would tell the country that would have disagreed with. Maybe this is not the place and time but we would like to have a [illegible] on it. Mick that time comes the people will know.

Mr. President, I am [illegible] to [illegible]. I am happy to do so if I may [illegible]. I will move [illegible] Executive Committee [illegible] Great as I am, I remember [illegible] that we [illegible] to [illegible] my Parliamentary colleagues [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. K. MORRIS HUNT (CONTINUED): ...story to that they have no knowledge. That is my feeling. They are prone to wrong. I would love to be proved wrong on this matter.

Mr. President, one other Member in his speech spoke on how it could be necessary to update the salaries every two years. I would like to know how we can update what we do not know. Since he has already suggested this option before us, but still we just have anything to update. He also said that [illegible] we do we must lay a proper foundation and we must now build the many [illegible] before the foundation is known. Mr. President, that is very good advice. That is very good advice but this motion is the foundation for a national pension scheme and if this Member and any other Member really believes in laying a foundation first, he would support the motion.

Some other Members queried the need and asked parliament why should be employed to consider a national pension scheme. I realize that it would take more [illegible] but, Sir, Government is now considering the Civil Service Pension Scheme. By the end of this Meeting they will be considering the Parliamentary Pension Scheme. Mr. President, who are they really fooling? If they wanted to improve this motion they could. Can it really possible that such men to administer the national pension scheme under this motion, or are they telling us that the Civil Service [illegible] on this side has to [illegible] this motion? It should be left to them on the other side.

The hon. Member, Mr. President, queried also the complications and difficulties which might arise from other benefits such as health care which the system does not give [illegible]. Sir, why worry about creating a benefit which is not even there. Mr. President, this is where the figures can tell a story.

Much has been said during the debate of the possible cost to this Government. I respect agree with that, Mr. President. But will there not be savings about what it is going to cost the Government? I cannot agree that the salary will become a burden on the Public Treasury unless, Mr. President, like other Government projects it will be mis-managed. What can it cost Government? Government is obviously complicated. How many have been it take, 10, 15, 20 or 25 years to [illegible] a few employees? Mr. President, they made their contribution, but I can tell you one thing, they have all fallen by the wayside. It is not true. Their services mean nothing. It is not true. However, if this pension scheme does save a few dollars in employment it, is that not what the taxpayers' money is for? Capital Advantage is one of the biggest [illegible] on Government today and they say that we must do it. The Secretary to Treasury [illegible] Government, but we must do it. We must know it. Our people have to be educated. Education, Mr. President, I will keep that matter back.

MR. SPEAKER: I am glad to hear it because I think that you can [illegible] again.

MR. K. MORRIS HUNT: No, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: You have been [illegible] yourself rather.

MR. K. MORRIS HUNT: I might have been, Sir, and I will be if your ruling [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, my ruling is [illegible]...

Mr. M. McKenzie Smith: Mr. Speaker, I was informing....

Mr. Speaker: My feeling is that you have quite not to repeat yourself, otherwise I shall have to ask you to discontinue in terms of standing Orders. However, you can go on now.

Mr. M. McKenzie Smith: Yes, Sir. I had been talking about the poor white aged people and this province should cost-share. I may not that sometimes, unwisely, it is deliberately for emphasis. However, as I said in closing on this matter, we might better be spend the taxpayers' money on them buying security for our people in their old age, and stability for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I guess that I should round off by on the cost of the aforesaid intervening to really what did not make sense because of my position. I am talking about the evidence put forward by the cost-share support bill. However, enough time has been taken up and I am not going to prolong the debate. I still have some few points which I must raise and I may raise them, Sir.

In closing the motion, one Member suggested that many workers in this country are capable of working when they are 70 years of age. That is good and they will not need to receive a pension which they receive. On the other hand, Sir, if persons of 70 years or 80 years have been unable to work before they are 65 years of age, I would like to hear that we had a scheme which would affect them some day.

Mr. Speaker, I am going back to the Hansards. There are some of the Members here who, I would say one point that many would suggest a scheme would for the economy I want to recommend what was said in by the debate on the Parliamentary Pensions Bill.

Mr. Speaker: It is on the record already to it, because it is in the Hansard.

Mr. M. McKenzie Smith: But, not on this matter usually, Sir, that if you refer me to it, Sir, I will be glad to give myself that I feel that I must make the point that they are debating that matter somewhere. Because that is what it was, they promised that they would support a contributory pension scheme for this country. I would be entered on the record as like to quote what they said.

Mr. Speaker: I think that you have sufficiently made your point.

Mr. M. McKenzie Smith: Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to say just as I follow what you are saying. However, I will try to your talking. I am not going to give a chance that to this house the Members did said that they would support a contributory pension scheme.

Mr. Speaker: I think that you have quite successfully put the House that.

Mr. M. McKenzie Smith: Mr. Speaker, the motion is defeated, I mean. They are going, going or whatever. I have the Daily Gleaner of the 2nd and the Evening Telegram of November which said:

Hon. M. Nakasaka Bush (continued):

"And if any provision was for him out, and especially for those of his own House, he has denied the right and is under fire on [illegible]."

Then he proceeded [illegible] to read [illegible] and [illegible] to [illegible] and [illegible] which [illegible], we are [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] Bill 41, Mr. Speaker, with [illegible] I [illegible] [illegible] Bill 41. He [illegible]:

"And let me [illegible],
[illegible] we [illegible],
I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].
And [illegible] [illegible] [illegible],
What I have [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].
And let me [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible],
[illegible] I did not [illegible],
Proud I [illegible] [illegible]."

[illegible] [illegible], Mr. Speaker, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. They [illegible]. They [illegible]. If it [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: ... Senate the Second Electoral Review for what they're worth and you voters have voted it.

MR. W. MARCUS GREY: Well, what if you voted no to this? If I understand this copy - look, Mr. President, there were a lot of other amendments made here and people who are voted down. They just threw out their whole country.

MR. PRESIDENT: Amendments will have to be moved as well as copies of them circulated.

MR. W. MARCUS GREY: I do not know if they debate it again, Mr. President, if I am allowed the right to put this amendment now, that will be that.

MR. PRESIDENT: What the Honourable Second Official Member has stated is that you have not yet moved it. If you move the Senate may then take as long as you want...

MR. W. MARCUS GREY: Mr. President, we have agreed to be fair and do it here. I therefore beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

AMENDMENT TO
PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTION NO. 24/80

MR. W. MARCUS GREY: I am moving:-

"That the words "believes are remiss for the consideration" as they appear in the second line of the said motion be deleted and substituted therefor by the words "by the 30th April, 1982".

MR. MICHAEL J. BRYANT: Mr. President, perhaps you could be good enough to clarify my mind and the minds of other Members as to whether, as I understand it, Sir, the purpose of the original motion having been withdrawn and amended has right of reply in connection with Standing Order 27(1)(iii), and having exercised such right of reply whether some Hon. Member may not put the substantive question, i.e. propose the amendment under Standing Order 31(1). If he wishes to do so may he do so immediately, Sir, that he may do so. If it is required that someone in fact, maybe I did exercise Members have then I propose to debate that amendment, to speak on that amendment and thereafter the substantive motion in whatever part by you either in the amended or unamended form. However, having exercised his right of reply was to the substantive motion, the proposer of the amendment, being the same person, does not have a right of reply to the amendment under the said Standing Order 31.

MR. PRESIDENT: See, I think that that is all quite correct. Have you finished all that or not?

MR. W. MARCUS GREY: See, Mr. President. That might have been the case. I moved the amendment. If Members have to speak on it, well that is fine.

MR. GERALD J. BENNETT: Mr. President, while it may be true that the Member has not finished the Standing Order regarding the amendment I have grave reservations about the procedure of Members going in by one door, out another, and coming in by yet another door. So, I think that it would only be fair as such as

MR. EDWARD J. ZIEGLER (CONTINUING): ...amendment to read here a supplemental difference to the motion before us...

MR. PRESIDENT: No, no. I think that you may have misunderstood. I have allowed him to put it. I merely pointed out ... that that he had not put it earlier and if we voted without his wanting it it would only be binding on the original amendment. However, he is fully entitled to put his amendment. So it is not going to avoid that delay a... That is why I asked whether he had understood what the Honorable General Counsel Walker said.

MR. EDWARD J. ZIEGLER: My understanding, Mr. President, from the Honorable Parent Official Member was that if he can accurately to the substantive motion before us, then he would be here in making the amendment to this motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, I think that you misunderstood the Honorable Parent Official Member. As I have your understanding is not the same as mine. Mike was then the Parent Official Member for that. May has taken Standing Orders or entitlements to make an amendment to his motion, even at this late stage. I'm not going to do so by the way. So having given any courtesy right now a chance to speak again. When we vote on the amendment and then we vote on the motion either as amended or as the original I'm, in the same way I'm.

MR. J. EDWARD MILLER: Mr. President, I like to correct the statement just by the mover of the motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, that was why I was going to the next Member down here to be a courtesy, I think.

So, now we are on to the question that the motion be accepted. Would the officer just read relevant section to avoid because your husband that you were involved to the motion I understand, do you remember, my understanding is that you thought that the amendment had already been moved and that the motion had already been moved, I wonder whether you would like me to just straight away the question that the motion...

MR. RICHARD F. BRADLEY: Mr. President, with respect, if the Hon has put the amendment I think that it is all other Members to have a right to speak on the amendment then to the put.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have understood that, thank you. I expect my question to the Members, does the Member wish to speak Member, or has he already to effect almost to the amendment?

MR. K. [illegible] QUIN: Mr. President, when were we to speak?

MR. PRESIDENT: What we rather what I thought really was.

MR. K. [illegible] QUIN: Most wrong can be wrong the big may have the time. There was not enough time, well, this is getting then [illegible] tension. However, they will still [illegible] I'm, I know, but I want to before the Chair.

MR. SECRETARY: Well, just as there seemingly fully misunderstood the position, the question now is that the motion as originally moved be amended in such a way that the words "unless the Member feels it unreasonable" be then agreed to in the second line

[illegible] of the Bill relative to petition, and that the Bill be read this 26th April, 1887" be substituted for those words. Before any Member wishes to speak to the amendment, I propose to put the question on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, I would just like to make this ruling. Mine was not the first. My decision to the motion was that it was out-of-order for the reason that it was already known that, in my opinion, legislation only became necessary when there was an affirmative vote that a peremptory period should be fixed, either by the Administration or the Government, in the alternative. That was not a circumstance which we. I would certainly hope, Mr. President, that I will have the opportunity to say anything else further effectively on reconsider, [illegible] the 26th April, 1887.

MR. EDWARD A. TANNER: Mr. President, do we open for further debate?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, we do.

MR. EDWARD A. DYKSTRA: Mr. President, as will be recalled by Members of this Honourable House, I rose in support of this resolution, perhaps and I felt at that time that the proper [illegible] of which the motion was somewhat premature. In the debate until I have heard the Hon. my colleague, Mr. President, that there seems to have been a practice with some of the Members who spoke on this motion.

I am very surprised, Mr. President, to hear the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council rise at this point in time that there is not a quorum. If it cannot have some form of check legislation before this House on the 26th April, 1887, I submit, Mr. President, that there is no genuine interest in bringing this to the House. Mr. President, silence seems to be very long time. I cannot agree with the statement. First Elected Member of Executive Council that anybody in favour legislation which this time frame would pre-empt any studies being done at present.

As I have said before, Mr. President, I will support whatever I feel is in the best interests of this country and my people. Up to today, Mr. President, I remained silent and also last night, particularly my support of the aforementioned Executive Law. However, Mr. President, I feel justified in doing what I said. I felt justified in supporting it. Therefore, Mr. President, the Members of the Executive Council on on this side of the House, my attention to what we have spoken, or put any value on it? In what the Elected Members from Hay River have spoken, I think in this one most important issue here today. We are dealing with a matter which should not be taken lightly. We are not dealing with the things we are going to accept and reject remarks made by the Elected Members from Hay River or other Members on this side of the House. I have Members get up and they say they agree with the principle but not the body. I do not understand these remarks, Mr. President.

We are either for or against this motion. There is no in-between. There is two main issues today. We are either on one side or the other. As I said in my remarks of the substantive motion, I hold no brief for any Member of this House.

MR. STEPHAN A. PITTMAN (CONTINUING): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments. I do not have anything to say concerning the Senate Chamber or any other bodies in here especially or those which I feel to be the legislative arm of this country.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any question in regard to this matter, especially with regard to the Senate Chamber, then I feel that there should be an objective to a task force, as have been suggested here.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether or not this matter is necessary, I feel that the people of this country, especially those that would be [illegible] this House do not wish to rely on the judgment or the integrity of the Legislature, but do have an interest in the judgments of our people.

Mr. Speaker, if there should be a [illegible] and this task force will not give a decision but will not allow a determination to be made. The people [illegible] a decision from this House.

Mr. Speaker, again, I say to you that we have the legislative [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the people of the Cayman Islands and this body in order to [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion, Mr. Speaker, that we should have an investigation or to call this task force [illegible]. Mr. Speaker, I try to be brief [illegible] and I would like to make a motion to the Chair that we should have an investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I have been [illegible] people here in this country to [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I do not [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I feel that this House should [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I feel that the people of this country, [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I would like to [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I would like to [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I would like to

MR. EDWARD A. PATTERSON: So, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: In that case I will suspend proceedings for approximately ten minutes.

AT 3:56 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 4:08 P.M.

THE SECRETARY: Please be seated.
Representative Lee recognized.
Debate on the amendment to Senate Committee Motion No. 24/20. The Senate Finance Committee has amendment, but the nature of the motion and the amendment has prevented it from being in order. In accordance with Standing Orders we withdraw the amendment and the Senate Finance Committee Motion No. 24/20, I understand, remains on which may be put to vote. Is that right Mr. Speaker?

SUSPENDING STANDING ORDER 31(2) TO ENABLE MEMBERS TO SPEAK MORE THAN ONCE ON SENATE COMMITTEE MOTION NO. 24/20

MR. E. MORRISON (NDP): Mr. President, I rise on a point of order under Standing Order 31(2) to enable members to speak more than once on the issue.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member has a point, but I do not think that I have to put a question. Standing Order 31 states that Mr. Speaker may give leave for that to be withdrawn. Does anyone object to that? Have you any comments Speaker. My understanding is that you wish to propose an alternative amendment to the motion. Would you like to give us information about that?

SUSPENDING STANDING ORDER 31(2) TO ENABLE MEMBERS TO SPEAK MORE THAN ONCE ON SENATE COMMITTEE MOTION NO. 24/20

MR. E. MORRISON (NDP): Yes, Mr. President. It seems to me with Standing Order 31(2) I would like to make the following proposal:

> THEREFORE be it now known that a large number of Canadians will speak unparliamentary or extraneous ago and become a burden to our social programs;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that a permanent arrangement be made to terminate before 30th April, 1982, the jurisdiction of Constitutional Foreign Nations for the purposes and that the finishes of such study be announced by Message of this Assembly before June 1, 1981;
>
> AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an immediate meeting of the Legislative Assembly, overseas persons or this nation be invited with a deadline to finish.

THE PRESIDENT: ... is there a seconder?

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I wish to second the motion, Sir.

THE SECRETARY: The proposal before the House, Sir, is that I should say that I think it might be necessary that a bond of two dollars should be paid [illegible] ... [illegible] ... [illegible] ...

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: I take your point. I was perfectly content with you to allocate just to register a bill. I would be perfectly content with the Member who is unwilling, but on the case that I put to him I also said you were entitled here that what was be considered to be the amendment and the mind was clear for just to really discussed matter where were discussed matter.

MR. DARWIN J. CHERRY: Thank you, Mr. President. While I think the Chair is well within its rights to rule that [illegible] in this House has gone as expected. I would like to re-emphasize and say for the record that any changes whatsoever of policy in regard to State Schools will be a step in the direction of [illegible] to vote, and I quote from page 1 paragraph 2 line 3 of page. So you only have two or three words of text [illegible] Mr. President I say this because in the Lenten Estimates and that has happened in all the years I have been here, [illegible] of course.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. J. ROSS MCCALL: Mr. President, would I have some clarification to Standing Order 241? If you are right I want that the amendment be read out,

MR. PRESIDENT: I have just to have had a look at it. We have [illegible] but we have not had any look at this amendment. I'm sorry really have somebody else will have to speak to the amendment. I think that it might be an [illegible] of their rights.

I appreciate what your intention. But if the amendment was read out it would be helpful.

MR. DARWIN J. CHERRY: Mr. President, I rise to briefly say that I am pleased that the member of this Chamber has seen fit to make a way back to the Government side and vote for it.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Hon. Minister for [illegible]

MRS. MARY E. MCGOWAN: Mr. President, I would be very brief. I welcome this opportunity to say that the motion before the House I can support. I do feel that we could be [illegible] as I have said on this House before, but I have been very impressed with the words of the Hon. Member for Eagle. I am happy and glad to have a member [illegible] and I urge all members to support it.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Hon. Minister for [illegible]

MR. LESLIE A. HARRIS: Mr. President, I propose now I will be very brief indeed. I am also sympathetic to what is being attempt by Mr. Cherry, Mr. President, of the Estimates of Education Member's Motion the words [illegible] should there be [illegible] the word seeking which the [illegible] message. Mr. President, while I feel there is [illegible] I would like to be assured by this motion, I feel that we have [illegible] and I think it should be acceptable to the Members of this House, and I move in my full support, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Minister for Lands [illegible] I do not know whether he wishes to answer or not?

MR. [illegible] [illegible] ...ise, Mr. President. I'm encouraged that [illegible] to hear that we may [illegible] soon.

I am happy to see that we have finally [illegible] I think that is [illegible] of our amendment proved [illegible] a conclusion where the Government Bonds seem to be able to [illegible] rate. However, now, Mr. we still get the impression that they do [illegible] have us to bond. They want to be taxed. I hope, Mr. President, [illegible] which this [illegible] study, the views of Members who [illegible] to those experts who are going to be brought in are not going to be [illegible] that will eliminate any possibility of their doing such a service. [illegible] will provide [illegible] with an answer for not [illegible] that [illegible].

[illegible] one more word about [illegible] to discuss the people. I think that it was a misinterpretation [illegible] the Members said that I supported the Administration's [illegible] we will rely on the enforcement of [illegible] I [illegible] personal [illegible] that they will [illegible] I said before, the [illegible] which I hope that they have, and [illegible] the possibility [illegible] but the legislation is [illegible] Thank you, Mr.

MR. PRESIDENT: I now call on Senator [illegible] [illegible] Mr. President, would that [illegible]...

MR. M. MICHAEL [illegible]: Mr. President, if [illegible]

THE PRESIDENT: You have a chance to [illegible] Chair is in [illegible] All in favor [illegible] Mr. President, I suppose that you probably do. Alright. The [illegible] motion.

MR. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD: Mr. President, if [illegible] Senator from [illegible] and the Right of People [illegible] Members have spoken [illegible] Senator Under Control. However, that [illegible] and is [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: Not an [illegible], yes. Mr. I [illegible] right the first time. It is on the [illegible] you will have a [illegible] Mr. Indeed will [illegible].

The motion before the House now is that Senator Mansfield's motion [illegible] be amended by [illegible] right now on the second Monday [illegible] of the [illegible] be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: Now, the motion is that the motion as amended should be agreed.

MR. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD: At this hour [illegible] Mr. President, the Republic [illegible] I think that, Mr. President, the Republic would be grateful if the Chair would be good enough [illegible] now and [illegible] the [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: I will read it [illegible]. It [illegible] by the Second Monday [illegible] Mr. [illegible] to [illegible] to everybody, the motion as amended, as [illegible] and [illegible].

"Whereas in a few cases grave a large number of figures may well result unacceptable expenditure and hamper a balanced economic programme,

Or in accordance with Commission's study of November, 1963, the possibility of a single Community decision should be considered for the fixing of such ceiling as envisaged in Article 7 of this Commission Decision for a definitive period;

Whereas in fixing ceilings due account must be taken of the infrastructure necessary, especially regards the size ceilings to be allotted until a decision is fixed."

Mr. Mansholt, President: Thank you.

Mr. Scarascia: In fact, I think that it would be opportune to speak in the morning as decided but I am in agreement to what they were going here since. Any matter I do wish to speak I will during the vote - my amendment this time apply if we choose. Despite the views, fact is we give priority also to opportunity to vote they want it. My, who never [illegible].

Mr. Mansholt, President: I will be brief, Mr. President. I am sorry that all members are not present, although I think that we have got them off the hook, that is what have happened because of the resolution again, "Time consuming, our fault". The rules of the people in our rules of God. They knew that the people were against that over and we have to the text for that.

Mr. President, I am not going to [illegible] this matter except to say that our hope is that for our part we have found and are involved in the text. Let us, Mr. President, [illegible] to finish the work we are here to do. Let us bind up our [illegible]. For we may be [illegible] another year or so, especially that which we finish here the parts are [illegible] we [illegible].

With many text [illegible], Mr. President, I think that it would be [illegible] if I did not make it. That is why now I have an idea to take to the people I will do it. I will do [illegible]. I have my apologies to make and I will do it again if it be necessary. This Member who [illegible] on of which I made [illegible] because of the problem who [illegible] to [illegible], would like to be to [illegible] on this morning. Anyway, [illegible] that are not [illegible] but it is on [illegible]. For we try to [illegible] together [illegible] the people put us here to do, regardless of how many [illegible] have said. Let us forget about it. Let us try to [illegible] the people want us to do.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. Lapenna: I would now put the question that [illegible] Mr. Leger be [illegible], and I would ask a few [illegible] opt, be passed.

[illegible] out: Agreed.

Mr. Mansholt, President: May we have a [illegible], Mr. [illegible].

Mr. Scarascia: Certainly.

[illegible]
No. 93

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. PERSONEY: Speaker, as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, I support the motion moved by the Minister of Finance. My colleagues on this side of the House have already made their views known on this matter. Briefly, the proposed changes in Standing Order 30 will enable the House to conduct its business more expeditiously. I would seriously urge all members to support the motion so that we can get on with the business of the House.

MR. S. SMITH (Etobicoke): Now, Sir, as with most of my colleagues, I have short comments to make on today's motion. I have no desire to change the thrust of the proposal.

MR. PERSONEY: In that case, I move the amendment, Prime Minister would move the adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. PRIME MINISTER: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that at 6:30 p.m. this evening the House do adjourn until 2:00 p.m. Tuesday, September 26th.

[illegible] OF THE 1975 SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
HELD IN
[illegible], 22ND NOVEMBER, 1975

[illegible]:-

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]

UNDER PAPER

FIFTH MEETING OF THE LAND TRANSPORT
OF THE RECIPROCITIES AGENCY

MONTHLY
(1ST SEPTEMBER, 1985
TO 30TH SEPT.)

1. AGENDA

To be read by the General Electoral Member for Rural Pay

2. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

(i) Electoral Commission Report

TO BE TAKE OF THIS STAGE OF THE PROCEEDS, THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL AGENT - LEADER OF PARLIAMENT FORTHEST.

(ii) Report of Examining Select Committee on Standing Orders

Report of the Standing Select Committee on Standing Orders dealing with Consequent Matters No.8/85.

TO BE TAKE ON THIS STAGE BY THE CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER - LEADER OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

3. OTHER BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

(1) Petition Members's Motion No.10/85
Establishment of Government Motors & Disaster Contingency
in Wholesalers

TO BE MOVED BY THIS ELECTED MEMBER, THE HONOURABLE FIRST AND SECONDED BY THE ELECTED CHIEFTAIN MEMBER FOR WEST BAY.

(2) Private Members's Motion No.2/85
Licensing of Slaughters

TO BE MOVED BY THE PARLIAMENT MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE ELECTED CHIEFTAIN MEMBER FOR WEST BAY.

(3) The Land Members's Motion No.10/85
Establishment of Radio Cabinet at Government Corporation

TO BE MOVED BY THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH SIDE AND SECONDED BY THE ELECTED CHIEFTAIN MEMBER FOR CENTRAL SIDE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
[illegible]	1
[illegible] OF BUSINESS COMMITTEE TO RECEIVE REPORT OF ANY ADJOURNMENT, 1966 - HELD ON THE THIRD	1
[illegible] OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY [illegible] HELD ON 10TH SEPTEMBER, 1966 - HELD ON THE THIRD	5
[illegible] - [illegible] OF [illegible]	8
[illegible] - [illegible]	22
[illegible] - [illegible]	88
[illegible]	97

[illegible]

[illegible] 11th September, 1952

[illegible] A.M.

THE PRESIDENT: May I invite the Second Minister Mother [illegible] to say prayers.

THE REVEREND MOTHER: Let us pray.

Almighty God, Thou who art all wisdom and power and goodness, be present to direct and prosper the deliberations of this Legislative Assembly now convened, 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 Her Royal Highness Princess Margaret, the Queen Mother, Their Royal Highnesses the Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Their children and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that they may do righteously, rule and justly, uphold and maintain true religion and virtue, truth and justice, godliness and piety among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Colonies, the Members of the Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high offices.

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

Our Father, which 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 those that trespass against us and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

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

THE PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Item 1. Presentation of Papers and Reports. The Honourable Chief Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING

THE HONOURABLE R. SOUTER: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the Minutes of the Executive Council Meetings held on Monday, 3rd September and Friday, 5th September, 1952.

THE PRESIDENT: So ordered.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDING RULES

MRS. MARY S. POSTON: Mr. President, I beg to say on the behalf of the Kentucky House the report of the Standing Rules Committee on Standing Orders, Sir.

THE PRESIDENT: So ordered.
Perhaps I should just say for the information of the House that we use the rule in respect of the section report by the Standing Rules Committee on Standing Orders. I just want to give Members an opportunity to read the recommendations made. My recollection is that we have to ask the Honourable Floor Official Member to move the official adoption of the Report and then how to vote thereon. I think that is right, in order that motion can proceed. So the Standing Orders, I think.

MRS. MARY S. POSTON: Mr. President, I think that I did that at the time of the first Report.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but I think then you have to do it again on the move of the second Report.

STANDING ORDER 21(1)

MR. JAMES M. POSTON: Mr. President, I move the adoption of the Report of the Standing Rules Committee on Standing Orders of the meeting which was held immediately previously, this September last.

THE PRESIDENT: So, the motion before the House is that the recommendations with the exception of paragraph (a) of Standing Order 21, the Report of the Standing Rules Committee on Standing Orders of the meeting held on the 10th September, 1981, should be adopted.

MR. MICHAEL J. MARTIN: I beg to second.

THE PRESIDENT: Does any Member wish to speak? If not, then I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT AND AGREED.

MR. O. WISE DOWNEY: Mr. President, may I have a division please?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, certainly.

DIVISION
NO. 28

AYES

Hon. Edwards J. Fusaro
Hon. Michael J. Connolly
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson
Hon. Vincent O. Patrick
Hon. M. Seamus Lodder
Hon. Capt. (Retd.) C. Kilmarnock
Hon. Raoul C. Johnson
Mr. P. Nicholas Nash
Hon. Sophie S. Dowds
Mr. Lionel L. Pearson
Lt. Col. Percy K. Kilmarnock

11

NOES

Mr. O. Wise Downey
Mr. S. Bernard Walter

2

ABSTENTIONS

Mr. Speaker

1

CLERK: Public Law 102-391.

THE PRESIDENT: I think that's unanimous. I think that both the Democratic Members for Health Care and the Second Minority Member for Health Care both voted no. They just have neither a dime's worth of a privilege motion to use. Perhaps the Clerk will just be kind enough to recount the vote. The Ayes will prevail.

CLERK: Sen. Thomas Ayes, the Ayes.

THE PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

CLERK: The Ayes, the Ayes. I'm sorry, the Noes.

EXPUNGE OF THE SENATE'S ACTION ON CONSIDERING CERTAIN PEOPLE AT MARRIOTT

THE PRESIDENT: It does not affect the point that I was making the motion carried. The Senate Sergeant-at-Arms is directed to the effect that Standing Orders should be enacted to the extent recommended by the Standing Select Committee, I am certain that I would remain open about the assumptions of the House's objection, and perhaps could extend Members that I did appreciate whether Standing Orders Standing that I would ask the Honorable Ranking Official Member to move the legal employment put with the amendments expressing my willingness accompanied amendments of the Standing Select Committee thereof, and either unanimously have a majority of Standing Orders, or if that proves impossible to have, at least one, with the amendments included. Once the amending has been done I will formally approve it that by the time of the Majority Whip attends to Orders will prevail.

I think that concludes item 8. The Senate Members' Business. The Pledge of Senator from North Dakota.

ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

NOTICE OF INTENT NOTICE

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 20/93

SUPERSEDING OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY AND ENACTED LEGISLATION IN ASSOCIATED

U. S. SENATOR HUTCHISON: Mr. President, I rise to move to suspend Senate Rule [illegible]. Publication of Government Notice and Proposed Legislation in Newspaper(s), which reads as follows:

"WHEREAS Government publishes by Official Gazette, all Government Notices and all legislation enacted;

AND WHEREAS the Government method of publishing such information by Official Gazette is defective only a minority of the populace;

BE IT RESOLVED that in addition to publishing by Official Gazette all Government notices and legislation enacted, Government Ministries taking the necessary steps to have such information published in one local newspaper(s)."

U. S. SENATOR RUSH: Mr. President, I beg to oppose the motion.

THE SPEAKER: The motion having been duly moved and seconded, is now open for debate and I invite the House to speak to it.

MR. D. CRAIG HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I believe that your pronouncements can be supported in a most strong way by those people who have just auctioned their seats.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the greatest sins of any Government, and that may make it clear that I am not calling the Government names simply for the sake of embarrassment, but that of secrecy. The greatest of sins, for I believe which could befall any Government, be it or we be said about of Machiavellian deliberations going on behind closed doors to the public.

While loyally, Mr. Speaker, Government pledges its obligations to inform the public by publishing all invoices, bona and expenditure statements of the different agencies, I would very much, Sir, like this public the record of legislation to inform the public well in advance to this kind of information by the legislature at large.

Sir, I believe that all Members of this present House sympathize very strongly on an open Government and a strong desire to share in informed positions. I believe that that have kept many of their promises previously, but unfortunately, Sir, I do not believe that the Official Agents possess the great desire of these people to inform them about them. Sir, we go to great and broad lengths of a law as a regulation to be enough. I think that we have a moral obligation to at least provide an equal opportunity for these people to have access to the information.

The Official Agents, presumably, Sir, is only subservient to a small sector of the population. The Minister knows why would be put the onus in the most efficient manner on what can be done by public service people to such detriment, at least give these members of the public who are interested enough an opportunity to go there and read them. So, again, Sir, if the Official Agents are discriminated to all of the cost efficient to the public advertising and provided for the free office time to keep, that would certainly increase the answer to information.

Mr. Speaker, one final remark still and we notice that the most important ingredient in management decision is the input in the management of the information which is available. I believe that if Government is going to succeed in many of the programmes it has to inform the people as to how, why, when and where these decisions were taken on their behalf, and what the motives were.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country have given us the privilege. They have placed their confidence in us to make decisions in the confines of these Chambers which affect their lives in all aspects. I believe, Sir, that that is our duty. Because in this Chamber I merely obligations to provide information in any form which is possible, which might restrict the accessibility and irresponsibility of that information to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I now Endorse to support and pass this motion here today, however I sincerely believe that the people of this country have a right and an obligation to know what is happening in the country. I know that if they take the decision to publish it in the newspapers, there may be a cost involved. However, Sir, I believe that such service given in informing the people would be well spent.

I now Endorse to support the motion, Sir. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The matter is open for debate. Does any Senator wish to speak? The Chair recognizes Senator Long.

REMARKS OF SENATOR LONG IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION

MR. RUSSELL B. LONG: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to make an inquiry of what action would be required by the Senate for Senate Conference Report No. 94-1.

I think that one matter that is of concern is that by not adopting this motion we will be, very certainly on the recess, giving recommendation to people who contend that a lot of our people would like to get more information every day on what we privately, our Government. I think that one cost involved in having this printed is considerable, and certainly be unfair to what our people have been informed and enlightened. Certainly, I believe that if it is going to be possible that this should be a part of the right Committee, and I would like to support the motion, also.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Senator's point is well taken. The question is on the motion. I am not quite sure whether you still wish to speak?

MR. RUSSELL B. LONG: Thank you, Mr. President, Sir. I thought to in the view of holding until after Christmas that an opportunity before actually signing the Joint Committee. However, I do agree that the Senate should Members just must not now, it be disposed of making the right level, so to keep the Committee after I have spoken to the chairman. That last point.

Mr. President, I have listened to the terms of the proposal of this motion and I agree that the Administration-Member for Public Bill to be a capital purpose, a public purpose who fairly and carefully study every of this to make be proper, and that be done not just even or three or more conference problem, the full consideration of the matter.

I would have much happier, Mr. President, if the motion had been that the Government have such time as is possible appropriate to provide for a full discussion as possible to the public of Government matters and I have any substantial legislation. However, that, Mr. President, is not what the motion says. The motion says Congressional members bring the necessary steps to have such information published in the Joint Congressional Record between the necessary steps to have such information published in the Joint Congressional Record, or have been a free press and a free society. As part of that free society and free press, the media can encourage the free to publish or not to publish whatever they wish. They are free to publish or not to publish whatever they wish, they risk, and I have often to complain to the chairman, that the Congress Chamber for a new rule will be able to change the Members of their House that he or he to be happy, that the Government has necessary information steps of work newspapers could not themselves they have to do it.

I am sure that we can fully be changed this one, that we may be different. However, I would be happy for consideration on that. Also, on the basis that it seems to have the public to be well informed as possible, he has made a presumption that the Government should be used the appropriate means of doing so.

[illegible] Mr. Speaker, the Government [illegible] should be encouraged, as well as necessary publications, the services of which are available only to a select few. The Government of this country must [illegible] in order that the Official Reports of the Government newspaper. Such Government newspapers are available by subscription to whoever wishes to read it. It would be unfortunately unfortunate to assume all of the things governments do, have done or intend to do.

However, it is a very expensive [illegible] publication. It is distributed to a large number of Government subscribers. Copies go to the offices of the Chief Secretary for Administration, Ministers of State. Thirty-three copies go to the Financial Department for distribution to all Government subscribers. The police get locally printed for circulation and [illegible] to the police stations and Police Headquarters, and the Director of Administration also gets copies. The only part of all the members of this House, as they surely must be aware, will have that there is a further distribution which is made, a restricted distribution. There is more than enough copies of every Gazette to [illegible] that Ministers should be kept by members of the public [illegible] newspapers. They are sent to the Public Library. They are sold to the schools. They are sold, Mr. Speaker, sent to the prisons. Have departments also, each member of Council to ensure the wide [illegible] of the Legislative Assembly receives a free subscription to the Government Gazette.

But, Mr. Speaker, if [illegible] the circumstances [illegible], as I understand they will, having carefully read and reviewed the issues, I feel quite sure that they [illegible] to the notion of their circulation will welcome any [illegible] to their circulation or to their [illegible] which they would obtain the Gazette. I feel quite sure that having specifically read many times, they [illegible] that they should [illegible] and their circulation and their [illegible] to public readings, to [illegible] to the power of [illegible]. It would be useful if we [illegible] Official Members of Executive Council to [illegible] that they did receive [illegible].

On this basis, Mr. Speaker, [illegible] that form of dissemination. Not only that, but as part of the [illegible] and to [illegible] that the information available in the Government Gazette may result in [illegible] publication, subject to Audit Rules. I understand that all [illegible] the individuals in those islands are also subscribers and they are entitled only [illegible] which they subscribe of [illegible].

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there is an [illegible] whereby [illegible] Government Service [illegible] publication of the Gazette and [illegible] from the Gazette of one member which is [illegible] in circulation or [illegible] publicity to.

The suggestion, however, Mr. Speaker, is [illegible] it will [illegible] form, and I can assure members of the House that we will look and see what [illegible] of publicity under [illegible] can [illegible] more fully and [illegible] as possible, and are available to the public, but the suggestion in this sphere [illegible] that Government [illegible] the members [illegible] to make such information [illegible] in the local newspapers. The Gazette newspapers is a very good [illegible]. They contain [illegible] that many [illegible] information to the workings of Government [illegible] the small community as it is of interest to many people. In that connection if Members, more [illegible] publication, would [illegible] to [illegible], it could only be done by the means of [illegible], by [illegible] of [illegible] functioning in the manner [illegible] publication.

MR. MICHAEL J. MYERS: Mr. President, I have taken the opportunity to separate [illegible] from the body [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. PRESIDENT: I did mention it... However, if you read the Action carefully, it just says, "Government should be taking the necessary steps". My view is the point has been that a serious workday Government is possible under conditions which people would be admissible, whereas a notice obligates Government to do something which will not only be undesirable, ... Those on this Motion that I allowed this motion.

If my other Motion misses to avoid - the Second Elected Member for West Bay.

Mr. W. McKeeva BUSH: Mr. President, I really did not intend to speak on this motion. First of all, I thought that Government was going to accept the motion. Before the vote I will have, I did not know that Government was taking a vote that it would not support it because of the cost.

Mr. President, the honourable Second Official Member said that the Country is not a second class one in that we do pride ourselves, and rightly so, on the fact that we have in our midst that number of the Caribbean, that Government have done so the police structure, the overall system, has been built I think to apply ... modern police force. Mr. President, what he said also as the Government position should be that we look back on the early struggle, when just a few people had any interest in Government affairs and the police did not take any part in voting - they did not have any need to really. However, as I look back downwards since I have been elected, and before, this country is in the situation and has an opportunity from. Although we are a small Colony, we are optimistic for tourist development. We are optimistic a willingness exists in an enhanced tourist atmosphere. We must continue this way, Mr. President.

We are certain, that Government take steps to let the people be more informed. Just the other day I was in a Committee where Government stated that they could not pay to members of the police overtime for certain hours which they had worked for a week. Black workers that is the opinion of the police that Government's position was, and that the Minister, and this was one of the arguments, as well. Mr. President, I was hardly impressed the Minister, that have even of the case people. This sort of $40,000 on the Annual Estimates for police from the police fit, we have a duty in the future ... we are quickly this Government be more open, and what better way to keep in contact with the people, Mr. President. I just wanted the Government policy explained in relation this motion. It would only cost $40,000 ... to the honourable Second Official Member and Government just ... would still where it is going to pay out properly at $40,000 per year. I know it is more than that, but that is their figure.

All we are asking is that we inform the public more. People do not know who to go to the Government may wish, or to go to a more office to see what is happening. They just do not have the time. I am asking Government if it is only going to cost $40,000, to make it fair minded to everybody, and just this motion. But we must take a hard line as happened here with the other motions. So now since we may that Government is going to come up and have to the Lower with unemployment to cost present, anyway we will be going to cost this and that to the country? What better way to spend our money than on a real to, a really positive ... It is a small ... million. It is but a drop in the bucket, $40,000.

I support the motion, Mr. President, and I am asking Government to think again and every police where more funds will be necessary.

[illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the noble Lord wish to exercise his right of reply?

Mr. D. Smith Nielson: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to thank all those who responded to Question 1 [illegible] for clarifying the public of the many ways in which the Speaker is [illegible] [illegible]. I do not think any public [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. D. ROGERS MILLER (continued): Sir, may I say, also, that it is important that other representatives receive the same views of this country that we have had the opportunity to express.

Sir, I hope that the Secretary-General-designate Waldheim has not given us the impression that he will be able to keep in touch by telephone, etc. I am getting tired of always being told that we must obligations to other people, not face to election time when we are making phone calls to find out what the candidates like for their personal meals or the candidates, but encourage the fine work that they have been doing for the United Nations. I know what it is going to be like, Sir, but I agree with the Secretary-General-designate Waldheim. It would be well if we could meet him in person, if he is willing to visit us here, to enjoy the opportunity to get just to know the Secretary-General personally and then to talk with the best policy that we can. I do not think that Governments could be arrested by merely sending representatives to see Waldheim if they had not the opportunity to meet them face to face in Canada, and my representative has expressed it to me well. I think that is a far more positive approach.

Sir, I would like to, and probably will be bringing a motion to that effect tomorrow, which motion, when read, will indicate that I realize that we will be able to do it, but we can be encouraged that we are putting the best voice for our money.

I am not going to keep you too much longer, Sir. If I thought that would help I would, however, in a final conclusion I believe, Sir, that here is a step in the right direction and I am getting tired to hear the public are better informed about what goes on in this country.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that Private Members' Motion No. 17/30, the text of which has been put by the Right Honourable Prime Minister, be agreed to?

AMENDMENT PUT. AYES and NAYS.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would you like a division?

MR. D. ROGERS MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, may I have a division?

DIVISION
No. 75

AYES

Hon. M. Wallace Bank
Hon. Pauline L. Carroll
Hon. D. Ernest Hilton

NAYS

Hon. Pierre E. Fisher
Hon. Richard F. Bradley
Hon. Sharon C. Jeffcoat
Hon. Ralph B. Knight
Hon. P. Norman Lefebvre
Hon. Joseph Charles L'Esperance
Hon. Francis G. Robichaud
Mr. Richard J. Thomas
Capt. (Ret'd) D. Kirkpatrick
Mr. C. Jack Walker

[illegible] MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 26/65 [illegible] OF MAJORITY

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] Minister's motion No. 27/65, I am on point. I could not hear the Honourable Member, Minister [illegible] (Interruption) Order, order. Honourable Minister's Motion No. 27/65. The Elected Member for North Side.

MINISTER'S MOTION NO. 27/65

ADJOURNING OF PROCEEDING

MR. D. SQUARE MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move Ministry Member's Motion No. 27/65 - Adjourning of proceedings, which reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS there is grave public unrest against the proposed proposed legislations about the Prevention of Discrimination to Specific groups of people.

AND WHEREAS the deliberate Intending of proceedings into serious hardship to certain individuals who conscientiously based their opposition with the Terms of the Act to obtain food;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government give consideration to amending the regulations to allow Persons to purchase Individuals, with certain restrictions and limitations."

MR. PRESIDENT: The seconder?

MR. K. [illegible] SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion before the House is Minister's Member's Motion No. 27/65, the text of which the Elected Member for North Side has just read out. The motion is open for debate and I now the member to speak to it if he wishes.

MR. D. SQUARE MILLER: Yes, Mr. President. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately understand by the actions of the Honourable Senior Official Member of Government,

HON. SPEAKER M. PRESTON: Mr. President, Sir, if he could ask the Senior Member the Second Elected Member for West Side to stop mumbling....

MR. D. SQUARE MILLER: I am not playing any, Mr. Speaker. I am in raising on a point of order in that the point of order. If he is not moving on a point of order, he must do what the object of is in, which he did. Does he have a point of order, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: So now let each and my understanding is Understood, that he does not have a point of order.

MR. D. SQUARE MILLER: Thank no should apologise to me, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go to my other accusing book which I have yet in that briefcase you know, Sir, because we unfortunately learned Government into obligation here, and they tried to turn around and make for me invalid decision of a motion on a totally unrelated scheme.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, I like only because of the public who have made representation to me, except those with the subject of processing of prescriptions. But as you have said now, Mr. President, that I should like publicly to congratulate the Member responsible for presenting to the notice of these people the considerations.

Mr. President, I now know what a prescription is, as is a drug publication. Although, Sir, this Member may be less politically because of the opposition views, he has shown statesmanship in humility and flexibility to the wishes of the people. We need more statesmen to take views of that nature, and politicians on Civil Servants who are ambitious to be politicians in certain ways.

And lastly, Mr. President, I wonder if it would not be convenient to take the break as soon as we get the Leader of Government Business time to get back from the rest-room so that he can hear what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: We, I think that is a little early for the break.

Mr. D. Isaac Wilson: Mr. Speaker, the reception demonstrated by the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council in relation to the introduction of opposition to the Legislature this morning, is a demonstration of the true democratic process. You, Sir, that is a very important contribution which I must commend. It is not the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council who has responsibility for Civil Servants who are responsible to the Public, not the Chief.

Mr. [illegible] Any good government, Sir, responds to the wishes of the people. This Senator overwhelmingly [illegible] to his people. Finally, Sir, a good government does not [illegible] the powers of the Government Administration Building, or [illegible] those powers so [illegible] to those [illegible] the matter of [illegible] those that might [illegible] and they still get [illegible]. Moreover, he spoke [illegible] [illegible]. He talked [illegible] [illegible] and he [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. That is what I feel the members [illegible] [illegible] and I appreciate him.

It is plainly obvious, Mr. President, that the [illegible] of [illegible] is not being accepted by the people. When one considers the [illegible] which have been [illegible] to the public in this country, because we can easily [illegible] that representatives [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] that exist in this country, it is [illegible]. Many people have [illegible] on [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] they are going to do with [illegible].

I do not believe, Mr. President, it [illegible] the [illegible] which I have in mind [illegible] that [illegible] with the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. Many people, I believe, Sir, are [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. However, Sir, there is [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. D. Kenneth McCrae (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys if he would permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys accept the question?

Mr. Crouse: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys if he is aware that the Canadian Wheat Board has been selling wheat to the Soviet Union at prices substantially lower than the prices at which wheat is being sold to other countries?

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that. I am not aware of the prices at which wheat is being sold to other countries. I am aware that the Canadian Wheat Board has been selling wheat to the Soviet Union. I am also aware that the Canadian Wheat Board has been selling wheat to other countries. I am not aware of the prices at which wheat is being sold to other countries. I am aware that the Canadian Wheat Board has been selling wheat to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure that the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. McCrae) will be able to ask his question during the time allotted for questions and comments.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. McCrae) has been selling wheat to the Soviet Union at prices substantially lower than

MR. LIGHTFOOT: I believe that is all I have on the subject. I will be available for any questions you may have.

AT 11:21 A.M. THE BOARD RECESSED

AFTER RECESS AT 11:30 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Proceedings are resumed.
The minutes November session No. 2/75 - meeting of the Board will be approved. The Board's decision of December 2 will be approved.

REPORTS OF PRIVATE SECURITY BILLS: NO. 17/75

MRS. GLENN G. MURPHY: Mr. President, may I suggest that we deal with this in two meetings. I am perhaps unfamiliar with the procedure under which we're now operating.

A group earlier was told that all bills would receive three readings. The first is that which is introduced. The second is that which is ultimately accepted, and the third is that which is enacted as being half-finished. Perhaps this can be helpful to the people here because there are many people who perhaps are not completely aware of the principle of the operation, while on the other hand they were invited to do what they did, as in this case where there is an attempt to preserve life in the shallow waters around these Islands. I am sure that there are many people in these Islands today who are really that there are very aware of the dangers that do in overgrazing and unfortunately destroy marine life.

Mr. President, I might have mentioned this already, but I can recall years ago there were four people with the opportunity in the bay where I live. They went out in a family dory to go fishing. When they came in they brought a bag of fish and I was just there and I asked them if I could have it for the boy, and they said sure. There they had a number of fish which they had struck while they were in the deep water. There were many of them, Mr. President, but if they stayed down and stayed there, they would not weigh more than a couple of ounces. There is the case of destruction which has taken place around these Islands, especially here on the shallow waters along Twenty Five and Seven Mile beach, and the south shore area.

A number of people have said during this symposium that they remember the good old days, those who are opposing the establishment of sanctuaries. They have said this as though they were referring to the old days when they used to go out there and catch fish. I am sure they take no pleasure in the use of spearguns, because as the owner of this motion picture I observed a little boy a spearfisherman in an informal of just several years and therefore to the good old days as they have been spearguns.

[illegible] Parents Committee Association: Those were the days, Mr. Speaker, when there were schools of private opportunity for the sons of the wealthy. There were schools, schools of science. It was a day of fun looking for office in the sunshine, a day where with a bit of pay to which regular work of service. There were restaurants and places always waiting around the streets, and with work and time we could always do a good turn. Those were the good old days and those were days when the employers of Nothing.

Today, Mr. Speaker, [illegible] and when and where have those days gone. If one suggests today the return of the whole Nazi system, Germany finds and the whole thing with a heavy emphasis on the [illegible] economy and stability. I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that there are not many people who do really support a responsible [illegible] who would not attempt to destroy these [illegible] in the name of a whole school of a party spirit, but both of the sense and destroy the other half. We [illegible] who are responsible, and very jealous that responsibility in their hands of [illegible].

I should like to [illegible], Mr. Speaker, and I am sure hon. Members will agree with me, that [illegible] that they [illegible]. We [illegible] has been a strong [illegible] of democracy in [illegible]. I think that there are [illegible] in this [illegible]. Many [illegible] which are [illegible] in the name of [illegible] and [illegible] the [illegible] Conservative Party in Scotland, and [illegible] which [illegible] to have [illegible]. I understand recently [illegible] Conservative [illegible] in the Scottish [illegible] which [illegible] to be opposed to the method of democratic [illegible] by the Scottish Conservative Party.

What we will [illegible], Mr. Speaker, is [illegible] the Scottish Conservatives and the Scottish [illegible] to have an opportunity. One of the reasons why [illegible] which [illegible] a number of hon. Members who, I hope, will be the number finally vote [illegible] in the Lobby with us and [illegible] will [illegible] of the [illegible] to [illegible] on the [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] to

[illegible] I suggest [illegible] the position and try to adjust things so as to allow time in the public mind to look, think and discuss matters relating to the various options which Government used to discuss openly.

Mr. President, I am sure [illegible] the Hansard Corrections Board and it was suggested that since there was this discussion in the House tonight [illegible] Government spokesmen, that the Board might suggest to Government that the manuscript of proceedings be extended for another three months to the end of November, at the moment [illegible] expire on the 31st August.

This was accepted by Government and Government spokesmen [illegible]. Following this, Mr. President, a press release was issued on the front page of the Government Gazette of the 18th August, 1964, entitled "Emergency Regulations". This press release was most misleading and [illegible] the whole subject of emergency.

Mr. President, Sir, on the previous occasion that the matter was taken up [illegible] representations made to the Northern Rhodesian Council. The Council [illegible] the [illegible] responsibility upon [illegible] of Northern Rhodesia to the [illegible] of Government [illegible]. I submit respectfully that the representations [illegible]. I suggest that reasons of [illegible] to [illegible] material [illegible] on the use of [illegible] that are [illegible] will be [illegible] of the [illegible]. I am sure that in [illegible] the [illegible] of small [illegible] as I mentioned [illegible], and which many other people have [illegible] already, the [illegible] of the strike will [illegible] use of [illegible] material. I am not [illegible] that [illegible] to [illegible] a [illegible].

Mr. President, we [illegible] these [illegible] [illegible] are [illegible] than the [illegible] will be [illegible] and the [illegible] will [illegible]. At the present time all [illegible] [illegible] concluded.

Mr. President, when the [illegible] was [illegible] in the Assembly [illegible] ago, it was not a matter which had [illegible] by Mr. Speaker. I mentioned then [illegible] the presentation of the Report [illegible], we had [illegible] a period of [illegible] for the Parliament, from the [illegible] and the whole [illegible] which [illegible] and which [illegible] the public and [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible]. I submit [illegible]. [illegible] we stated in this [illegible] have been [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible].

It was stated [illegible] Government [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MRS. GRACE C. JOHNSON (COAST): I did not vote the last day, but I do wish to be recorded. I did not mention the problem of Chinese children but they were also involved in the bonding group also involved the Korean children.

Mr. President, this motion before us includes Member's motion No. 1961 on the Hansard, it proposes to bring really after action has been taken by Government. It seems that the motion is superfluous, unnecessary, simply because action has already been taken. Yesterday but been announced over radio to the whole operations until the new financing arrangements have been reviewed. However, Mr. President, besides the salient points the motion and during that the motion includes the same points to which Government undertook the investigation and financing. I have no difficulties at all to support the motion.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Middle Bay.

MR. C. KAY BAUER: Mr. President, this motion really has its problems, at the first hearing of this house when the Government amended the Hansard Corporation Act I felt at that time, and I still feel now that the Government acted fast. I was one of those people who stood up and the amendments to that Act, although the amendments were not which gave Mr. Government more power, and the Hansard Corporation Board more power to make appointments, and to give directions.

I cannot support this motion because it does not go far enough. Nothing would satisfy me unless there is a complete repeal of that amendment to Hansard. This can be gained by passing a motion which says that we should allow Hansard to operate independently from this will be done by the same body who has shown that their services are totally illogical. The purpose of the Hansard Corporation Act is to encourage racial unity. The Hansard knows this and the Hansard Corporation Board should know it. But, they do not. They give a Hansard to one newspaper in the Hansard Board. Everyone knows that the Herald caters to the needs of one race. If they are really interested in encouraging racial unity, they should not a total ban on the use of Hansard in the Hansard Board, just what they have done so far it is that the Board only gives Hansard to the Star operations and mostly, as everyone knows, operates entirely in the Hansard Board. They are not really under pain to attack one or the other for personal considerations. They are voted, and there by most kinds of treatment. Something should be done with the Hansard so that they provide at least both men have a crack and fund all the Hansards they have. So, how can the Government believe that it is adding encouragement when it acts in this most illogical manner?

It is not the Asian boy who have not broken the law in Hansard Bay, East or North side who is discouraging the racial unity. It is those people who are breaking the law. The natural instinct of the Asian is not against any one race. For years the Government has built up the relationship which exists between the races which exist here. Although those people the Hansard Corporation are especially concerned as the great threat to racial unity. This, Sir, is a Government, who is supposing the Asian on appointment has given instructions to their Asian operations and acted unfairly to the Hansard Board. This is unthinkable. It is unjustified and it is illogical.

Mr. G. Wilson (Conservative): The statements made by the Government Members who spoke really leave the position to decide that the former Government had nothing to do with this agreement, because he spoke about foreign politics instead of the main thing which he pointed out of the hole. I do not know about people in the talking shops, but we take no much notice of any party in the Assembly nowadays and justly accept it for them. The point is that the previous Government had set up a committee to look into the establishment of certain posts. However, that committee appears to be ignored by the Members of the present Government and it has not met since. Everyone knows what has been set up, it is that report which is being ignored. The last Government has brought forward the names of the committee which was set up in 1964 and that is going to be ignored by Members of the present Government, namely, people in positions from the north. This fact is why we are upset with that by not only ordinary right hon. Members of the House, but by all of the people who are being employed in the Assembly Section.

[illegible] necessary of the political committee, and of the Hall, to use our knowledge which and that would be of

The value of establishing the Assembly within of the Hansard Committee seems to provide us a particular fear. It is my contention that this report is one of the most serious that we should [illegible] of the most vital to Derby. Even in the circumstances where the Hansard Members of Parliament have been, also, the people who are being employed because of their specific knowledge and people who have in this Assembly [illegible] hon. Members in this House, which does not [illegible] to have a specific and to the public opinion that the Assembly is a publicity basis. Only we have Derby provided an Assembly, we pointed to some other people, we make to give information to our expenses in the north should be the Assembly place of this Irish and other various life, to usually entertainment. So, to be successful to some have today and this shows this has implemented recommendations, as this has helped to provide extra jobs to be carried on the very heart of it.

The last is unreasonable because it [illegible] with a way of life which has been customary here for many years, [illegible] to Scotland and Wales. The last report has [illegible]. The Government has abandoned this. We should [illegible] a law which is unacceptable, which is not accepted by the public. Certain Scottish Journal [illegible] to the world when we look up the Anti [illegible] the only place in Derby [illegible] the views of the Scottish Council. We cannot just [illegible] people [illegible] to Derby and to carry out a responsible job. Unless this has been changed there we ought to be a bit [illegible], that the name is there and [illegible] to Derby when the Scottish Council [illegible] to [illegible] an independent Body.

I [illegible] to [illegible] that it has been a [illegible]. We have heard a lot about this beautiful, well [illegible] Town page outside London and Manchester on Merseyside. What kind of [illegible] is this? If any Hon. Member thinks that [illegible] Derby, they must [illegible] there to see this for themselves [illegible] the Hansard Members of Parliament [illegible] to be there. The Government has [illegible] the Scottish Council [illegible] to be there. The Government has [illegible] the Scottish Council [illegible] to be there. The Government has [illegible] the Scottish Council

MR. H. MILO KEITH (CONSERVATIVE): The Member spoke about the necessary increase in the military budget. What kind of ... are they talking? What they are doing is insulting. The ... could not comprehend the speaking of Ukrainian. The Member from Red River didn't understand. The Law provides for Ukrainian to be ... only as a special case. Neither we nor others in the House ... the Law.

We become suspicious about this Bonn ... Bonnerang, quadrilateral, and hearing about the parties are not going to participate. What kind of ... is this about the Soviet and their parties that they were not participating? What kind of Law is this? ... a suspicious Law? ... to this a ... legislation. The Law is a good Law, if it is being ... applied. ... (?) the Law is ... Because ... and ... it should be repealed. ... We should remember ... because we will face the realities of the whole world. ... have a Law or ... which nobody is paying any attention to. ... a portion ... anything "beauty is the eye ...". Members ... Because ... Government is ... Jewish they are saying. We didn't ... Because ... Law Book and borrow ... Ukrainian ... Why is ... Ukrainian for ... Is it because ... in the ... people, ... Because ... Government to ... Law to ... the ... Ukrainian ... is ... Ukrainian ... Ukrainian ... Ukrainian

MR. G. ROSS GREEN (CONSERVATIVE): Sir, from the debate I have heard, the Government is apparently quite content, if they should become the nation's public loan. While I agree with the sentiments of the Liberal Member for North Fife, I would like to point out that this nation will not tolerate anything. I would welcome an election a long time and I know that they will not change. We had an election here with a democratic mandate and we are convinced the Unionist Party will once again.

This matter could have come to us when it might have been given public scrutiny and perhaps the regulations. It is my understanding that a petition to annul these Islands Orders was presented. There is a right of appeal in this country. I suggest the petition that it be brought to the because the provision in Orkney is mostly one of a total to allow the Island Assembly to decide, but only those Members would oppose the Bill. There is public support and I believe that the public should be because of the manner in which this whole Election has been carried out. We could not be dealing with this matter today if the United Kingdom Government had not been warned by the Election of the Assembly. My recollection was that it was brought to the House in March. The Government Members have very little to say on what has happened, and since the announcement was required to annul the arrangements the public did not know about it, or they would have objected in the beginning.

The Government has a problem on its hands, but they are capable of solving the problem if it is their intention to. Unionist spokesmen they want it to be on a private and confidential basis, not on a national basis, which gives Conservatives or a special interest group, or to a special interest group.

I think that the situation which has come up in the Government is only matter which will now be organised into action and they will do well to reconsider the Bill or by discussing the Bill, because I do not think that the case needs any examination. I think that the Government of the place to impose a restriction which was not the intention of the Law. If the intention of the Law was that Members would be given only to a handful of the new electorate, the Law should have specified it part. However, having not done so, the Government should take it upon itself to impose a restriction which is not its keeping with the Law and I doubt if they would succeed in a court of Law.

This action, and this is my first submission, would only result in support of the decision the Law to the position before in Order where uncertainty would be used with restriction. That is, a person was only allowed to vote a many first and many people associated with this Law. If they were people who did not obey the Law, people who broke the Law, to use the power of the police to impose the Law. It was the work of the Liberal Government to introduce this Law, and perhaps of encouraging, to bring more people to justice for having broken the Law. There are a few names in mind who the offences were found guilty of offences under this Law. There have been many occupations where the police would have been brought in under this Law. If it was felt that something needed to be done, I would have thought that the Government would have stepped up the enforcement of the Law rather to provide a Law which is unenforceable.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Second Reading Member for Orkney.

MR. EDWARD J. PATTERSON: Mr. President, I would like very much to have had you disallow the House one more opportunity. However, if it is your decision I will go on.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk may possibly speak until about midnight, so please be prepared to be here for a reasonable period.

MR. EDWARD J. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I refer to Order of Business Number No. 27/80 which deals specifically with the licensing of speakeasies. Mr. President, I have on several occasions expressed my disappointment at the behaviour even in this House, even today, Mr. President, I can actually say that I was ashamed of some of the behaviour I see in this House. Mr. President, I feel I should remain neutral while matters are being debated. I have always made it extremely essential information which is going to follow. Mr. President, I do not feel that other Members in this House, and I myself am not prohibited all over. However I have no hidden secrets which I am afraid of being exposed to the public. My file, Mr. President, is an open book and I make no apologies for anything which I have or may do.

I have heard people called "old fools" and I have never been referred to as "the biggest fool". However, the last comment I heard in relation to this House from a Member in this House which is why I am sure that there will be many "fools" like myself. I thought that that was quite wrong. Thank you for your explanation, Mr. President. It now becomes the duty

"A learned fool is more foolish than an ignorant fool",

Mr. President, some big fella said in the seventies, Napoleon or Voltaire or...

"What a fool, what he believed his power to command others"

Many times, Mr. President, silence is golden. However, Mr. President I just sometimes do speak on this matter.

Mr. President, I have known the Attorney General for the majority of the parliament. However, Mr. President, what saddens me is that during the debate yesterday, the Member responsible is just completely ignorant to the manner in which the parliament process has been. Whether we like, Mr. President, this was given by the Member for Development through the Portfolio of Government, is responsible to this Member's responsibility as it is a subject under public debate and under which the portfolio.

Mr. President, I do not suppose the Attorney General Member of Opposition should wish to mark what I noted from this side, when even he suggested that perhaps a committee would be much more advisable than a full one. However, Mr. President, I did not expect words have been done in a responsible India, Indians like you and I, people, the Hindi people that I would emphasise that. I do not say this in a derogatory way - when I say Hindu people in this House I refer to the Tamil Hindus and I believe these people more than - they left out. This was initiated or opposed on in this House. The Government's duty responsible to the Attorney General being raised in this House.

MR. EDWARD A. PATTEN (CONTINUED): The elected Member from Essex also said, Mr. President, that the public is not entirely that knowledgeable or involved. While, Mr. President, I do not agree with the sentiments expressed by that Member in that regard, I cannot agree with that statement. The Chinese Secret, Mr. President, may be the collective process. However, I would submit that there are many individual voters who are totally involved in the entire system of electoral reform.

Mr. President, the Elected Member from North Side also said that the Progressive Labour Elected Member of Executive Council has abandoned his constituents by attending the Jamaican protest. While, Mr. President, I would have no controversy reserved to pass on any Member of this Cabinet, I believe that the most success that was attained from the Labour Opposition's walkout was to show the fact that the Premier responsible allowed that Progressive Labour leader to attend and tried his best to prevent it. Mr. President, on previous occasions in making statements, it is also been mistaken and I expressed that we can handle the Jamaicans. It was known, she said, Mr. President:

> "To stumble twice against the same stone is unpardonable Negroes."

Mr. President, we all understand that we are in search of freedom. I believe that the people of this country are ready for freedom this is there.

Mr. President, yesterday when the Premier was speaking he was at one of his normal tirades. Mr. President, Government knows no responsible for whole issues of this Constitution Order which is here.

Mr. President, I know I must remark that there seems publicly mistrust and fear. That fear was evidenced, Mr. President, as to the three persons who were initiated detained. When a Government using secret police responsibility is to govern the country, one is constantly over looking the shoulder thinking that one unfortunately does something. We have seen glaring responsibility for the last four years, governing this country. Let us not fail in doing this, Mr. President. The elections are in the near future, and I am afraid of results, political campaigning in this Chamber. Let us deal with the issues before us.

Mr. President, this particular issue in the constitution and the amendment to the Order I hope that would make everyone personally in this country that any single matter which we have brought to this House.

MR. PRESIDENT: In my legislature in this Assembly cannot ignore the wishes of the people whom it represents. Many of us sit here, Mr. President, many of us stand here and we believe, and we just in order to give the impression that we were only here to be heard. We forget that our purpose in being here is to represent our people. If our people say to us that they are not happy with a particular section, then we, as the duly elected Members of this House, should listen to them.

MR. PRESIDENT, in the debate on the amendment of the Jamaica Constitution Act I would be quite clear in this House that I am a nationalist, Mr. President, that is a total which really has to be faced and by nationalist means, Mr. President, once not referred to the point of where I would like to hear the people whom I represent.

MR. SPEAKER A. LEWIS (continued): ... have been speaking in this House about the empty vote, Mr. President, we should remove that word.

Mr. President, perhaps this motion was brought at the very last minute but it would seem to me ... I personally deem ... I feel, Mr. President, that a motion like this should be welcomed ... we should move for reconsideration. It is not a very difficult issue, Mr. President.

Perhaps, Mr. President, this motion ... the last hour consent ... agreement to place it before ... a statement was made by the Government Information Services ... in the matter of the negotiations ... Mr. Speaker, I am reminding hon. ... of this magnificent vote ... before we today ... to ... opposition ... demand the answer which have been done to the people of this country.

Mr. President, while I support the ... of the vote of this kind, I reiterate, Sir, that we intelligent people in this Assembly that we need to look not only at the ... but at the net effect.

Mr. President, I realize that it is ... the hour, but ... Thank you, Mr. President, Sir, I have made my point. Mr. President, I believe that the people of this country would be much better served if instead of passing this motion here today, this House came out with ... a full ... of this issue so that it would be reconsidered. Mr. President, as I said, I am against the principle of the motion but I personally do not ... at this time. However, Mr. President, I would support any ... motion to this House.

Mr. President, with those few remarks I would move that I commend the Speaker, but I am afraid that ... would ... the motion.

DR. PRITCHARD: I think ... I ... to commend ... the hon. Minister ... approximately ... p.m.

AT 12.15 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED

UNTIL TUESDAY AT 2.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. ... Minister's Motion No. 17/81. The floor ... Any further Ministers wish to speak? The Leader Minister ... next day.

MR. W. HOUSTON DUFF: Mr. President, I support the motion, Mr. President, I ... said that I have ... and I have no ... to ... the ... of the ... I would ... to the ... of the ...

As I ... before, it would have been ... March, when I ... the ... and ... to ... the motion ... the previous Government had ... but ... just in ... I ... at ... time ... it was the ... that ... do.

Mr. [illegible] I believe that I will vote for the Package of Reconciliation Amendments this week and in March when Congressman Brown brings his amendment bill to the House I plan to vote against that because we have to do something to get our economy going. I should like to consider what they were doing. Mr. Speaker, I know a copy of a part of my remarks and I am going to read them. I have learned on the Democratic Right of How on of Republican Senators have said these words now come back to haunt us. I am glad that in my debate here I have tried to be consistent with what Mr. Kingston, and I am glad I have those words can haunt me. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman in the chair, and I do gladly myself.

> "I see the need to pursue a new positive environment. I realize there is a lot going on which is new in the real economic world, one of the greatest catastrophes and is the possibility of a shock to economic which brings into reality $18 million per year. However, Mr. President, I have two major apprehensions, on this matter which I voiced in the Committee and which are still there. Perhaps our taken into account considerations I cannot support the bill in its entirety.
>
> Mr. President, somewhere in the middle of this controversy there is a small group of Democrats such as those who are in my constituency whose household income is on some of the things which this Bill engages in. I am sympathetic to the real questions who I believe provides a reasonable response to our economic difficulty, and who stands on that one of the gentleman on their team today. I would be very glad to participate in providing those people that if we can lose economic, that is our security of course."

Mr. President, I vote on to raise their questions on the Bill that the people still have to put in our [illegible] for this. At this time I have told you that I was tired of this opposition.

Mr. President, I take no exception to anybody for representing my people on this economic issue. They [illegible] necessary to that they also have said something, and they have [illegible] some messages if they are going to continue to include this number.

Now then, Mr. President, what I would say that a majority of people, are not looking at this thing a lesson, or a few people in the right thing to do. Mr. President, since myself in my meetings with a couple of my constituents have had such representation in the matter. [illegible] that they want to avoid any of the consequences from the situation.

Now Mr. President, yesterday on our Morning Hour in the House, Representative [illegible] was [illegible] and certainly may be [illegible] added to the cost to [illegible] that I believe are terribly late [illegible] I'm a millionaire and I said I only [illegible] to this matter is our Government is not spending [illegible] a number until [illegible] this. The reports [illegible] have been [illegible] that the people to [illegible] the House. So, the Finance [illegible] Committee [illegible] that [illegible] to [illegible] purpose, that we should try to [illegible] consideration [illegible] I [illegible] this [illegible] I [illegible] that our Government will [illegible] Many [illegible] I have [illegible] that I said then. [illegible] Mr. [illegible] Committee [illegible] the House, [illegible] I will refer to a [illegible] by the [illegible] Finance [illegible] from [illegible] Kansas, Mrs. [illegible] as follows:

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. P. MARSH JUST (NORTHWESTERN): I congratulate the Government for what they have done so far. I believe that this motion will pass through and never come back again. Regarding the most foolish of statements by our hon Member for Drumheller, Mr. Hockeright, that most foolish of Governments is the government of the country which he represents. If we in this Chamber or anywhere do not represent the wishes of the people then we are headed for disaster, as indeed parties of the people do not exist as the powers.

I applaud the Member for Lethbridge for his courage and applaud the Elected Member for Lacombe for his initiative in this, and I am sure that Kansas will support this motion. In many ministries of the Crown, Mr. President, there seem to be people that they use the policy to put a kind of a block, I think, between the Crown, who has got to govern, and how it is to be the right kind of the people. I believe that the people must have their say on this unfortunate policy that is in existence. I believe that we should do so to provide for it.

May I say that the amendment was exceedingly constructive and is most certainly acceptable. I think that people who are presently that are doing so for their own convenience. I believe that people who are presently not in the real world. They are not living in this day and age. I would like to see the Member really consult the Government, and I think that Government will take those recommendations into consideration.

I have no more to say, Mr. President, except that again I applaud Lethbridge for the stand he has taken. However, I do urge unfortunately that he had lost the chance for the resolution withdrawal and left the member's name that it could be passed.

I thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hear, hear. The amendment is moved by Elected Member of Drumheller Council.

MR. P. MARSH SPEAKS: Mr. Speaker, in my usual fashion, I will be very brief, but I rise to support Drumheller Member's motion. Although he does not mention specific problems this morning, I think that the Elected Member for Rocky Mountain Constituency is going to get what he wants for his people. For those reasons I have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting this motion.

The constitutional amendment issue, many people have jumped on this bandwagon. We have accepted the Victory Bonds, the Wells Island and Temple in Canadian Confederation outside of this House as to which this constitutional question focuses. Whether we like it or not, Mr. President, many of the constituents outside of this House, many of the things which happen in our country which affect people are constitutional issues. I believe that many of those problems are of our own making, because we of Alberta do like it or not. It is up to governments like this province to provide the answers for constitutional issues. We come back once again to the fact that the province is going to have to accept the fact that if we are to preserve our resources we are going to have to make up our minds to be willing to pay for what is necessary for development. We cannot have our cake and eat it too.

I do not believe that politics should enter entirely into consideration of our own constitutional problems. I hope that I will not be a politician when it comes to finding what happens there, but I will not be a politician when it comes to what will be decided, but they will have to my account to vote.

MR. [illegible] (CONTINUING): It will be remembered that when the amendment to the Marine Conservation Act was brought to Morris, it was anticipated that a total ban on spearguns would take place. However, as a result of the debate, it was decided that we would take a different approach and allow for licenses to be issued under certain conditions. We thought that we were heading backwards to order to accommodate the wishes of the majority. In an effort to achieve unanimity the Morris Board took two measures were kept in mind because reaction to many, many fishermen in this country, everyone thinks that members of this house acknowledge this. We also have to keep in mind that this amendment is here to offer one blanket and we must endeavour to try to improve these inconsistencies in any way that we can. Because of this, certain considerations were made.

We are now receiving a lot of flak and a lot of criticism for this. Both publications and industry should have spoken, also, I want to suggest that I suppose this matter and I feel that it is a good one, and that many spearfishermen should be given to satisfying the wishes of the majority. However, I suppose that if we are to preserve our environment, the initial costs must be accepted that some inconveniences and some sacrifices will have to be made if we are to conserve and enjoy the future of this country.

With these few remarks, Mr. I suppose the motion and I would like you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Chief Elected Member for Hay River.

MR. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the risk of taking exception, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion. My main point from the Elected Member for Hay River is the moral I take about spearguns. I do not believe in the principle of spearguns myself, not at this time. For all my life essentially I have lived right by the ocean and I have seen the deterioration which has taken place over the past several years, although I would make a qualification here, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that spearguns are causing the greatest deterioration. However, from experience I know that certain fish invariably move from where it was decided that our fisheries exploitation was being depleted and something would have to be done, there was a great furore by our people. A number of people have me and others very adamant and they felt that we were depriving them of what was theirs. It took me five months and countless hours to say the fisheries regulation has might not sustained, in spite of the fact that we have been trying to have a ban on certain species upon laboratory can be proven.

The ones that have impressed with the people. Since was assured me that I was the only one would go into the North Slave and that is another reason which I feel that we should have a ban on certain species upon laboratory can be proven.

What I am trying to say here, Mr. Speaker, is at this time, at most people at this, we are going to have to face up to the fact that we have to the water-ways pollution. It's not just us that are responsible for the environmentalists. We have to be the environmentalists. We have to be the people who have to conserve. It is extremely hard to do. It is not easy to do. It is hard to ensure that conservation is given. But I have any that it is primarily been that fine few of our population who are environment. I feel really that more people would be more by not being able to go and shoot. It might be a matter of getting fish and fowl and we can

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Natcher, and I do so because I believe that the Congress should not adjourn without taking some action to help the people of Appalachia. I am not sure that the Resolution as it is now written is the best way to do it, but I am sure that we must do something, and do it soon.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us have been deeply moved by the plight of the people of Appalachia as we have seen it on television and read about it in the newspapers. I have been particularly impressed by the fact that so many of the people who have come to my office in Washington from Appalachia have been young people who have come here looking for jobs. They have told me that there are no jobs for them at home, and that they have no money with which to go to school to learn a trade. They have told me that they want to work, but that they cannot find employment in their home communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us have been deeply moved by the plight of the people of Appalachia as we have seen it on television and read about it in the newspapers. I have been particularly impressed by the fact that so many of the people who have come to my office in Washington from Appalachia have been young people who have come here looking for jobs. They have told me that there are no jobs for them at home, and that they have no money with which to go to school to learn a trade. They have told me that they want to work, but that they cannot find employment in their home communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us have been deeply moved by the plight of the people of Appalachia as we have seen it on television and read about it in the newspapers. I have been particularly impressed by the fact that so many of the people who have come to my office in Washington from Appalachia have been young people who have come here looking for jobs. They have told me that there are no jobs for them at home, and that they have no money with which to go to school to learn a trade. They have told me that they want to work, but that they cannot find employment in their home communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us have been deeply moved by the plight of the people of Appalachia as we have seen it on television and read about it in the newspapers. I have been particularly impressed by the fact that so many of the people who have come to my office in Washington from Appalachia have been young people who have come here looking for jobs. They have told me that there are no jobs for them at home, and that they have no money with which to go to school to learn a trade. They have told me that they want to work, but that they cannot find employment in their home communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us have been deeply moved by the plight of the people of Appalachia as we have seen it on television and read about it in the newspapers. I have been particularly impressed by the fact that so many of the people who have come to my office in Washington from Appalachia have been young people who have come here looking for jobs. They have told me that there are no jobs for them at home, and that they have no money with which to go to school to learn a trade. They have told me that they want to work, but that they cannot find employment in their home communities.

[illegible] [illegible]: might be here, but before we [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] Mr. President, I would like to congratulate [illegible] Senator Inouye on his [illegible] speech which he has made to this assembly since that we have been able to all people and to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. I do not quite [illegible] Mr. President [illegible] Senator Inouye was talking about when he said that this is a [illegible] [illegible].

Now, Mr. President, I commend the [illegible] which the Senate Committee on Rules has in front of it and the [illegible] to accept [illegible] the [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] which brought about the [illegible] [illegible]. Now, we [illegible] the issue of the [illegible] also called [illegible] [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. Mr. President, [illegible] he was not [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], Mr. President, I [illegible] [illegible] that he read the [illegible] that unless they [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Speaker Hayden's Motion No. 17/90 Passed by Majority

Mr. Speaker: Item 9(d), Private Member's Motion No. 17/90. The Standing Committee on Social Development.

Private Member's Motion No. 17/90 Establishment of Public Inquiry re Government Ownership

Hon. D. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. 17/90, Establishment of Public Inquiry re Government Ownership.

During recent times of the House, and during Oral Question Period today, I intend to keep the premise of the motion in the forefront. By the motion which I am going to read for the concurrent motion, later

> "WHEREAS Radio Canada has demonstrated its ability to operate itself responsibly;
>
> AND WHEREAS in many instances private radio has satisfied the direct control of Government;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislature hereby urges the Select Committee presently on the Order Paper to consider whether or not Radio Canada should operate on a strictly commercial basis and, if this proves desirable, to adopt the necessary legislation."

Mr. Speaker: The motion.

Hon. Joseph A. Casey: I second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Prior to the deliberation of the House, I confirm that the Member has given the notice as to the terms of this motion, and have I granted that leave which pursuant to Standing Order 19, because in my view the motion is not substantially or materially altered the terms of, or procedural requirements of the motion. I believe that I did read the Motion as to date, that copies of the motion have been distributed to all Members.

The motion has now been duly moved and seconded and is open for debate. I will invite the mover to speak to it.

Mr. D. Cassidy: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Radio Canada, or the Broadcasting Department of Government has many, many, very honourable Members of the House to be commended on the publication of the development to this point. Over the year 1985, it is unfortunate to mention in the single existence of several, and consolidation of the Canada Labour, that the service generated by the Department would be satisfactory, while expenditure would be very substantial, or there would be a profit - I do not propose to run into the usual length of Government, Mr. Speaker, but there would be serious financial considerations of additions. This obviously indicates that the radio station has always been financially.

The most often heard complaint we find is received by many people in their everyday society, that, is that they believe that the news and other programmes on Radio Canada are controlled by Government, whichever Government is in power at the

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] problem [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, in the execution of this section I just do [illegible] I should say a few words in explanation of this section. As the report of the [illegible] sec, I am not inclined to [illegible] but I am in a [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible], but I am in an [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Mr. President, I am not an [illegible] man.

MR. President, I did say in my [illegible] I wish to [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] of my [illegible] that I would [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible], and this is the [illegible]. Finally, Mr. President, I congratulate and [illegible] fully the [illegible] who are [illegible], and they will [illegible] to get my [illegible] which [illegible] necessary.

Mr. President, the motion before us [illegible] seeks to [illegible] a budget [illegible] consisting of the [illegible] items, to penalize [illegible] in our [illegible] [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] unnecessary [illegible] in the [illegible], and [illegible] necessary to [illegible] [illegible] necessary legislation.

Mr. President, it is only fair [illegible] [illegible] and for this [illegible] [illegible], the very good work which [illegible] done by the [illegible] [illegible] the very efficient and wise guidance of the Honorable Floyd [illegible] Senate of Pennsylvania [illegible], whom [illegible] [illegible].

Radio Engineering [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I have given some further thought to what the public reaction might be to the two plans mentioned, and recommend the stability be maintained.

Mr. President, for the other reasons stated, I feel that the former Soviets would be much better served if actual invasion is given by making the entire situation a stationary army.

Mr. President, without repeating my previous statement of the Soviet Government, I should like to say, that the idea of taking the entire Soviet Union [illegible] will be [illegible] to the Soviet people.

Mr. President, I suggest the meeting be adjourned.

MR. [illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Chair recognizes the Representative from [illegible]. Before you speak, I'd like to ask that the record will be kept as a public one only, so [illegible] to have to take your statements [illegible]. Do I hear anybody [illegible] objection to the request?

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: Please be recorded.

Chairman Gonzalez's Motion No. 18/45.

Those opposed. The Chair declared motion [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Please note, Mr. President. On the motion before us for reestablishment of Radio Cayman as a Government corporation, my [illegible] have voted in favor of amendment to [illegible], as stated. Should it [illegible] to make it better. Nothing has been said which would [illegible] Radio Cayman [illegible] to a Government corporation would make it [illegible]. If Radio Cayman is to be kept [illegible], then we [illegible] very well [illegible].

Mr. [illegible], I would like to say [illegible] that we have [illegible] we cannot [illegible] Radio Cayman. When the [illegible] Radio [illegible] petition [illegible] which will be [illegible], I would hope that the replacement would be someone who cannot be [illegible] or bought, who would be true to the [illegible] and [illegible] Government who might wish to [illegible] what it does or not does on Radio Cayman. However, for the present time Mr. Speaker, [illegible] doesn't believe we [illegible] a part [illegible] and so I [illegible] one in the near future. I do not support the motion of this point or view. Maybe at the [illegible] which might be [illegible] should arise we can [illegible]. I will have to [illegible] my views at the present time with the [illegible].

Thank you.

MR. [illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable Elden Officer [illegible].

[illegible] Mr. President, I rise to support the remarks of the minority leader. However, there are a few comments which I would like to make, but before we start, I would like to thank the Senate Members for their floor and phone Senate Members for their support for the kind compliments which they paid to me. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I like the Wind Chester Amendment but may believe that will sacrifice is certainly worth it should serve to unite. Mr. President, we have our work cut out for us and I'm sure we're going to have enough time anyway, one major thing which has been mentioned is the original capital investment, plus unemployment and I'm sure, if this was passed, Mr. President, I do not think that we would have time to do good.

Mr. President, it is easy to say that we have a extreme working department, but it was the only unit with cooperation of the department. While it is going to happen Mr. President, they are going to find another things to do, expenditure and so we will be able to have get the extreme [illegible] cuts.

What concerns me, Mr. President, is [illegible] Speaker, I would like to thank the Majority Leader for his hard work, as well as the Minority Leader for the hard work they have put in. Mr. President, I would like to assure this House that my vote on the [illegible] is predicated by the participation of the Government [illegible] Mr. President. Perhaps there is [illegible] I'm not [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] Mr. President, I would like to [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] Mr. President,

Mr. LEWIS H. LARSON (Parliamentarian): I will not anticipate what the Rules Committee will decide on. However, I will repeat what I said at some of those stages of the game, that the rules can be changed or be overruled. If the pace gets too slow [illegible] Rules Committee will, then, have to be concerned in my mind.

With those few remarks, Mr. [illegible] the speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to speak from the floor wish to comment on the General Electrical Worker [illegible]?

Mr. H. MARSHALL KING: Mr. President, I hesitate to speak only because I am the Elected Member for Mount Pearl [illegible] to this House, but as parliamentarian, Mr. President, I feel it is [illegible] I said there was not done. I recall an agreement in the Senate that I was under the impression to be [illegible] Rules Committee completely of the whole House should be put in position to consider Rules Report as Government proposes. The Rules Committee [illegible] to which [illegible] the principle were not [illegible]. Anyway, not at the moment I would not [illegible] Rules Committee. I am not [illegible] of the House. The fact I make a [illegible] against [illegible] for [illegible] there has I believe in a free [illegible] without a free [illegible] democracy [illegible].

I do not [illegible] to the way that [illegible] to be, that I am happy to see [illegible] to a debate [illegible], and [illegible] to [illegible] the night. I thank Mr. President. [illegible] of the night's [illegible] some of the [illegible] [illegible] are [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] to half [illegible] I have [illegible] they may [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] might be [illegible]. My [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. MICHAEL D. WOODS (CONTINUED): I think that the issue of reference was appropriate but I would like to say that this House and the people of the Queen Islands should not be shy about a discussion of the wording and the quality of the statement provided by Middle Cayman.

It is always unpleasant to have confrontations, Mr. Speaker, but having first given the Caymanian delegation a vote here, and having stood up for this Caymanian delegation for the last three years, I have decided I have no hesitation in saying that I have the highest concept for the employment, culturally and moral wise, of the people of Middle Cayman. This problem of invisibility of individuality of which our people seldom may be proud. The very fact that people do not always like what they put out to be viewed a problem. They sometimes choose independence through their own integrity, and through the leadership of the Honourable Third Official Member. Circumstances this issue have been very much my attempt to integrate my thoughts of Caymanian with that independence or integrity.

I should just like to finish by saying that I am happy to support Motion Number 10/05. I am happy to support Motion Number 10/05, as amended, but I think that Members of the Third Constituency should consider this, for there be a solution because of the sensitive a statutory corporations be free out of necessity seek to say more independent. Nothing is done in any thing and that is to ensure that we keep very keen the direct responsibility and accountability which the Honourable Third Official Member is pursuing and for the withdrawal of that statement to this House.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. D. KEITH MYLES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank Honourable Members for their support. I too would like to add that the problem besides this involves one not to cast any reflections on the professional ability of the staff or their performance at Middle Cayman, but to be aware that the Honourable Third Official Member hopes it is going to do, and that is to accomplish what we came to do in the future so that we can benefit in the right direction.

I will leave Members now, Sir, with Appreciation to support the Motion. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The question then is that Private Member's Motion No. 10/05, as amended, the terms of which were read by the Clerk, be agreed to, please be put to the vote.

QUESTION PUT: (ALL ARE AGREED)

THE HONOURABLE MINISTER: May we have a division, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

DIVISION
NO. 76

AYES

Mr. Dennis D. Hunter
Mr. Michael J. Bradley
Mrs. Diane C. Hoffmann
Mrs. Bonnie C. Minnis
Mrs. E. Benson Barnes
Mrs. Capt. Charles L. Siebenmark
Mrs. Nancy J. Johnson
Mr. W. McKenna Ross
Mr. Stephen J. Peterson
Capt. Wayne D. Kirkconnell
Mr. W. Bernard Walton

11

NOES

Mrs. Eugene L. Genetti
Mr. C. Ray Rankin

2

SENATE MEMBERS VOTING NO. 76/88 DURING DIVISION

C. PRESIDENT: Mrs. Genetti, how do you vote on this Order?

MRS. EUGENE L. GENETTI: Mr. President, this has been a Committee for the Appreciation of a Select Committee. Because everything under this...

C. PRESIDENT: If not, then you may rest. And if I'm to be a Committee of the whole House, I think, now is next. Will I be called, "This Honorable House adjourns a Select Committee" - or, Committee of the Whole House, pro.

MRS. NANCY J. JOHNSON: The Honorable Senate Official Reporter

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE
STANDING ORDER 69(2)

C. PRESIDENT: I have the information, but I think it nevertheless that it really is appropriate that the Honorable Official Reporter should chair this particular Committee, because the principal purpose is not to draft legislation. It is to consider the principle the question of whether a statutory corporation be created. If that decision is once reached then I think then the question of drafting legislation would render by it. Right to the extent to it.

So, I will nominate the Honorable Their Official Reporter to be the Chairman of the Select Committee.

MR. W. MCKENNA ROSS: Does he really want to be the Chairman of the Committee? (Laughter).

C. PRESIDENT: I am more likely place to handle the Act.

MR. C. RAY RANKIN: I think that we would be putting the ... many difficult questions to have him Chairman of the Select Committee.

MR. W. MCKENNA ROSS: We should place it to the Honorable Their Official Reporter.

MR. D. FRANK MILLER: Even though it is his evidence, I think that he can contribute as a Member. However, I think on the Chairman's ruling my objection on him as a witness because of the Committee which he has chaired so far I have been quite happy about, but I think in normally -- and I would just like to be consistent with somebody else as the Chairman has, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to avoid just more confusion with somebody else as Chairman but I do not think that it is unreasonable to ask the Honourable Second Opposition Member to re-instate yourself the Honourable Second Official Member already as Chairman of one of the Select Committees that are in the process of meeting. I would be quite happy to invite the Committee to select you as Chairman. Failing that to the second Honourable Member Standing Order 69(3) says in that if I do not make a nomination, the Committee would invite one of the Members to be Chairman.

MR. D. FRANK MILLER: No, Sir, the Committee might never meet then, Sir.

MR. MICHAEL DONNELLY: Mr. President, with due respect, you already ruled.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it is probably evident to Honourable Members that we are to stay neutral.

MR. D. FRANK MILLER: Maybe the Honourable Third Official Member can volunteer, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that that was intended.

MR. MICHAEL DONNELLY: Mr. President, with respect, if you do not appoint a Chairman then why do it Wednesday because....

MR. SPEAKER: I was just working out.

MR. MICHAEL DONNELLY: ....because then if no Chairman is appointed, the first Monday in each month of the Session would be the logical conclusion Wednesday of the week that appoint. There may be difficulties.

MR. SPEAKER: I was about to say that because the Member with the longest service is not living with us, and therefore there may have evening this Morning or the previous Monday. So I can see that there could come some difficulty.

MR. D. FRANK MILLER: I would be happy with the Honourable Third Official Member but....

MR. SPEAKER: I think that I might point by my neighbour that since it is his problem, I really do respect his knowledgeable modesty in this particular matter, appropriate that he should chair the Select Committee.

MR. M. MICHAEL DONNELLY: As long as Members be assured, Sir. Only insofar that Wednesday, Mr. President....

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we can appoint the Second Official Member for next Day or Thirty Days for the purposes of convening Committee meetings by all Members on this particular Select Committee.

MR. H. HOCKEMA stated: Mr. President, if that was possible, Mr. [illegible] that they might have a great deal more. However, I will abstain[illegible], Mr. [illegible] a lot of Members having absent [illegible] and we cannot get much done. Sometimes we come here and we do not even have a quorum. I certainly like [illegible] and I think that Members should be there [illegible] and be here for Meetings whenever a Committee is scheduled to act up.

MAY. MICHAEL J. [illegible]: I think, Mr. President, that it is appropriate to suggest that the Second Phase[illegible] for Mrs. Kay [illegible] Chief Judge because he [illegible] Monterey.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, I think that this is our Committee and proceedings and I will [illegible] Mayor [illegible] Monterey to make his announcement before I [illegible] him to [illegible].

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. JAMES H. [illegible]: Mr. President, I make this announcement: [illegible] Monterey, 32nd Assembly, [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: The recess to [illegible] Monterey on next [illegible] Monday, 22nd November, 1965, which is the next Monday [illegible] Committee to be called to the Budget Dip.

MOTION FOR: ADJOURN.

MR. PRESIDENT: Before taking [illegible] I just thank all [illegible] for their cooperation in the Chair [illegible] Meeting, it has sometimes been a [illegible] to my Member Meeting, but I know I can always [illegible] the consideration which all Members have shown to my colleagues, which I hope they will reciprocally [illegible] when I am [illegible] carried. Thank you all [illegible].

AT 4:55 P.M. THE MOTION [illegible] UNTIL 10:00 A.M., FRIDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER, 1965

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

   [illegible]

2. [illegible]

   [illegible]

3. [illegible]

   (i) [illegible]

   (ii) [illegible]

   [illegible]

   (iii) [illegible]

   [illegible]

   [illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE i

NEW HAMPSHIRE TITLE 12-B: BANKS AND BANKING - PENALTY AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS 1

[illegible] - PROVISIONS OF INTEREST TO CONSUMERS 11

APPENDIX 42

PRAYER

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] I will now ask the Rev. Edgar Tipton to say prayers.

PRAYER

REV. [illegible]: Let us pray.

Almighty God, Your Word tells us that the prayer of the righteous availeth much. We beseech Thee as in prayer and petition the Administration of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon Her just and honest considerations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands, Whose Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Barbados, Captain General and Admiral of Barbados, Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Consort of Queen Victoria, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, Prince of Wales and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that truth and righteousness, mercy and peace, love and goodness, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Colonies, the Members of Her Majesty's Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly, that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high offices.

All this we ask for His sacred Name's sake. Amen.

The Speaker, Mr. [illegible], Members of the Senate, Ministers of the Crown, Members of the Diplomatic Corps, Ladies and Gentlemen, Boys and Girls.

Before we proceed with the business of the day, I would like to welcome the Ambassador of the United States of America to Barbados, His Excellency [illegible] and his wife, Mrs. [illegible]. I would also like to welcome the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, His Excellency [illegible] and his wife, Mrs. [illegible]. I would also like to welcome the Ambassador of the Republic of China, His Excellency [illegible] and his wife, Mrs. [illegible]. I would also like to welcome the Ambassador of the Republic of [illegible],

MR. PRESIDENT (UNINTELLIGIBLE): We still have only two of the Assembly there are still more lovely ladies. We hope that they will enjoy their stay. We hope that they still people and I know that all Members will behave in the most seemly manner to show that we realize our efforts valuable, what is still a balanced and gentlemanlike and ladylike position. Thank you.

The Honourable Chief Official Member.

Public Accounts of Papua and Territories, 1962

HON. THOMAS C. [illegible]: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Audit Statement of Accounts and Explanations of the Papuan Islands for the year 1962.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.
Table, Chief Secretary.

The Appropriation (1962) Act, 1962

First Reading

CLERK: The Appropriation (1962) Act, 1962.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled The Appropriation (1962) Act, 1962 be formed to read. Does anyone wish a short time to do so? Does for Second Reading.

Second Reading

Clerk: The Appropriation (1962) Act, 1962.

HON. [illegible]: Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled the Appropriation (1962) Act, 1962.

DELIVERED BY
THE HONOURABLE J.C. TIBBETTS, M.B.E., J.P., C.P.A.
FINANCIAL SECRETARY
TO
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE
BUDGET ADDRESS, FOR THE YEAR 1986
ON THE 29th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1985

Mr. President,

It was eight months ago that the Budget Address was presented to this Honourable House. Therefore this address can be a less detailed account of the financial affairs of Government together with a general overview of the state of the economy. It is my privilege Mr. President to present the financial statement in support of the second Reading of the Appropriation (1986) Bill 1985.

The economy sustained a recession during 1984 and 1985. Not unlike other countries of the world the economy of the Cayman Islands has cyclical movements as well. We are affected by the state of world Economy and the International Financial Market. During this period the Insurance Industry experienced much difficulty. The Banking Industry including Savings & Loan Institutions witnessed many mergers, some many failures of major banks while others actually did fail. In addition, World debt position concerned all economists and financiers of developed and developing countries. Although the United States economy improved, the unemployment was high and indicators experienced increases and decreases estimating the uncertainty of world debt position and budget deficit in that country.

In the second half of this year the Cayman Islands economy improved with increased employment, construction and business activity.

As have duties this year, Mr. President examined carefully the capacity in major Government departments although the task is not yet complete, we have devoted more time and funds to ensure that the infrastructure is upgraded to service the local public and international investors.

Mr. President and honourable Members we need to ensure that the development of these Islands is well planned and that all levels of society benefit from it. For it is (in answer to) maintaining the harmonious society we cherish. Those who come to work among us should commit themselves to preserving harmony and make their contribution to improving community participation and citizenship. We are our brothers keeper.

2. THE ECONOMY 1985

a) Financial Sector

(i) Banking & Trust

For reasons that are not readily apparent, 1985 was seen an unexpectedly strong growth in the number of institutions applying for the grant of offshore banking licences. It is estimated that, by the end of the year, approximately 40 new licences, emanating from a wide range of countries, will have been added to the register, bringing the total number of licensed banks and their branches to about 485. As usual there were a number of licence cancellations in the early part of the year, but as in recent years, these were largely the result of group reorganisations and did not reflect upon the continued attractiveness of Cayman as a banking centre.

Although I am aware of the concern expressed by some bankers that the signing of the narcotics agreement last year, and the current negotiations on a proposed treaty have deterred some banking business from coming to the Islands, it is difficult to see from the indicators available, that there have been any particularly serious effects overall. It is possible to point not only to the continuing interest shown by a number of licensee applications, but also to the volume of business done within Cayman. Although I was somewhat alarmed in my Assessment earlier this year of the likely outturn for 1984, recent data indicates that the total foreign assets of the banks, Cayman Islands offices stood at US$157 million at the end of 1984. The basis upon which this is compiled has been adjusted

slightly since 1993, our rate is approximately 121 times that a comparable figure for the previous year, a rate of growth which well exceeds the estimated overall growth in the macroeconomy market.

However, we certainly cannot afford to be complacent and it is this Government's firm commitment to do its part in setting the right environment for the development of first class business in the Islands, and to allow for the diversification of service services in the offshore sector. We are only too well aware of the potential fragility of a sector which is dependent not only on continuing confidence in Cayman as a safe place to do business, but also on the maintenance of favourable economic and monetary conditions overseas, factors which are entirely outside our control or influence. It is not our intention to jeopardize, in any way, a sector which contributes so significantly to the Islands' economic development.

This contribution overall is difficult to quantify because of the numerous spin-off benefits to the tourist, commercial and construction sectors, but the direct expenditure of the licensed institutions in Cayman during 1994 exceeded CI$44 million of which CI$4.7 million was accounted for by licence fees. Naturally the largest contribution, about CI$15 million, came from those banks and trust companies maintaining staffed offices in Cayman. At the end of 1994, these institutions employed 877 persons of whom 75% were Caymanian and net salary bills totalling over CI$19 million. However, total employment in the sector was only marginally above that of the previous year, a development that has to be examined as the expertise and efficiency of existing local staff improves and as outsourcing becomes more prevalent.

(ii) Agricultural and Industrial Development Board

The Agricultural and Industrial Development Board has granted loans of approximately CI$162 thousand in the farming sector and CI$150 thousand is being applied for in the small industry sector to be approved by year end.

Although research funds are nearly exhausted, new lines of credit have been approved by the Caribbean Development Bank of CI$1.1 million to be made available to borrowers by early 1986. This figure also includes a Student Loan line of credit.

(iii) Cayman Islands Currency Board

The total assets of the Cayman Islands Currency Board as at 31st January 1985 were CI$16 million. This figure is equal to the assets required for December of 1984. Seasonal fluctuations in the amount of currency in circulation, which tends to increase over the last few months of each year, reaching a high in December should cause the Optional position to be more improved by year end. Currency in circulation as at 31st January stood at CI$9.9 million. Bank notes redeemed and subsequently destroyed from January to December 1985 amounted to CI$2.8 million.

Throughout the year the Board's funds have been shifted from shorter term deposits to long term bonds, to take advantage of better interest rates offered on the bonds. As at 31st December 1985, United States dollar bonds amounted to CI$11.0 million, with fixed deposits totalling only CI$1.5 million.

The numismatic coin programme has been expanded so that many coins in stock, previously unavailable are now offered for sale to the public. This has resulted in a substantial increase in income from the sale of coins over the past few months. The 1985 proof set was not offered this year, due to a slump in the collectable market for this type of programme. However, a gold and a silver coin, to commemorate the 250th anniversary of Land Grant Settlement in the Cayman Islands, are being minted and will be available in the first quarter of 1986. A silver coin featuring the Turtle is also being minted for 1986. A museum version samples of all Cayman Islands coins minted and notes printing since 1972 has been established.

In 1985, the Board transferred CI$1,783,719 of its 1984 net profits to the Government's General Revenue.

(iv) Companies Registration

The Registry of Companies continues to play an important role in the collection of Government revenue. The financial year has brought an appreciable increase in revenue collection over 1984, for the period January to September 1984 some 1,530 new companies were registered, the figures now available show that for the similar period in 1985 1,413 new companies were registered. Revenue derived from Company Registration in 1984 amounted to $1,3.9 million in comparison with $1$5.8 million for the same period in 1985. The revised revenue estimate is $1$6.5 million.

The Registry has recently moved from the Government Administration Building to new Revenue Building in George Town. These new facilities have provided much needed office and safe storage space. The facilities are so designed that it should be another decade before it will become necessary to consider any major changes in these facilities.

(v) Accounting Firms

The Registry of well-known International Accounting Firms have an office in their Islands, which promotes a positive image of the services available here.

There are over 140 staff, 50% are Caymanians and earn $5.1 million locally. Training of local staff candidates to receive attention, presently 11 students are pursuing studies overseas and 13 are preparing themselves locally prior to external overseas training.

vii) Companies Companies

The Companies Management Law came into effect in July 1904, and regulations to accompany the law have recently been made by the Government also Mr. Woodward L. Levy, being appointed Inspector of Company Managers. The purpose of the Law is to control and regulate all of those companies who carry on within the Cayman Islands the business of Company Management. To date some fifteen applications have been received, producing revenues of CI$? thousand. There is the potential for greater revenues to be collected from this source, and as the regulations are now in place, the Inspector of Company Managers will now be considering each application and making the necessary recommendations to the Governor in Council through the Honourable Financial Secretary. Once the appropriate licences have been issued, it will clear the way for the licencees to pay the stipulated fee of CI$1,?? to the Government in respect of each company managed. Here again the computer will play an important role, as it will enable the Inspector of Company Managers to determine how many companies are under the control of each licencee and to charge accordingly.

viii) Annual Fees

Seventeen students are sponsored by the Local organisation and two by Government. These are scheduled to graduate as follows:

1987	1988	1989	1990
5	4	5	3

viii) Insurance

Insurance Business operating in the Cayman Islands is divided into two categories, domestic and offshore. The domestic market provides local coverage for homes, cars, health insurance, condominiums, offices, aviation and shipping.

Twenty-eight companies are licensed to write this business. Of these, 27 are large overseas companies with agencies on the Island, or agents representing them, and two companies have head offices in George Town.

The estimated premium income to these companies is $17 million and is rising steadily.

The offshore or captive market has been favourably affected by the unsettled state of the world insurance market. Over the past 12 months many international insurance companies overseas have cut back or withdrawn completely from certain classes of business, with the result that clients must look elsewhere for coverage, and the Cayman Islands has been the choice of some very substantial companies.

Thus, we are optimistic that license applications will increase during 1985. To assist the creation of additional business a Captive Insurance Seminar was held in May of this year which was successful. Preparations are now being made to hold another Insurance Seminar in mid-1986.

Revised revenue from the issue of insurance licences is expected to exceed $1.1 million dollars, adding benefits to the Islands in other expenditures is estimated at $5 million. Employed in the industry are 107 persons, the majority of whom are Caymanians.

a) Tourism

Nineteen eighty-five was a highly competitive year for tourist. A strong United States dollar during the first half of the year was one of the major contributing factors toward a decline in air arrivals in the summer. Special advertising and promotions were implemented by the Department of Tourism with the assistance of Cayman Airways and the Hotel Association in order to increase late summer and fall

arrivals. The future promotion of tourism will require greater participation of all concerned. Certainly the Hotel Association has to play a prominent role in upgrading its facilities and ensuring they are equal to the rate charged.

The new 60 room Grand Pavilion Hotel is a welcomed addition for this winter season and the new Britannia Golf Course has already proven to be an asset to our tourism structure. Moreover new restaurants have opened during 1989 providing the public also a greater variety of places to dine.

The possible completion of the Hyatt Hotel and Paradise Manor in late 1990, will increase the total accommodation by over 500 rooms. This addition will provide job opportunities for Caymanians, a substantial increase in business to all Tourism related industries and revenue for Government.

Grand Cayman has now became one of the most popular ports for cruise ships. It is estimated that 1989 will show an increase of approximately 12% or 65 thousand cruise passengers over 1988.

c) Construction Sector

Activity in the sector has increased with the start of the Hyatt Hotel during the summer. It is most encouraging to note the sale of the Unfinished Marina Mall and the start of a new office complex in central George Town.

d) Transport Sector

Cayman Airways Ltd.

The Airline for economic reasons withdrew its services from Tampa and Belize but continue to operate its existing routes to Houston, Kingston, Cayman Brac and Miami.

e) Electricity, Water, Gas and Communications

The services of the corporate activities these services continue to operate efficiently. The staff in the Sector is 156.

Although the Cayman Water Company experienced some difficulty with supply, caused by plant breakdown occurring at peak periods of the season. The Company's problems have now, to a certain extent, been overcome by the completion of a new 175 thousand gallons per day plant, bringing their rated capacity to 675 thousand gallons per day. The Water Company was allowed to increase its prices by 10% in July, the bottom price of their water is now $1617.49 per one thousand United States gallons plus a fuel adjustment factor of almost $182.00.

f) Government Sector

(a) Internal & External Affairs

(i) Immigration

Although revenue from Trade and Business Licences and General Tenancy Licences will fall short of that estimated for 1984, revenue from other sources is showing a healthy increase. The overall revenue picture for 1985 is encouraging and collections by the Department of Immigration should exceed the budget.

Efforts will be made in 1985 to strengthen the Department's enforcement capabilities providing additional resources. The future accommodation needs of the Department will also be examined.

(ii) Police

The major re-force training programme that commenced this time last year is now in full swing, since the appointment in recent months of six United Kingdom sergeants on one year contracts. In addition to on the job training on ordinary station and street duties, the United Kingdom officers with specialized skills are

training in other areas such as corrosives, driving, firearms, marine, photography, fingerprinting, self defence, accident investigation and forensic matters. Officers at all stations will receive a certain amount of this training, and Cayman Brac will be included.

In February the Administration, Traffic and Commercial Crime Branches were re-housed in the Town Building, thus allowing for much improved accommodation arrangements in the Central Police Station where the Uniformed Branch now occupies the ground floor and the Criminal Investigation Department, the upper floor. This in turn has improved administrative control and supervision.

Steps to continue to develop records at local officer and in addition to the local training, a small number of specially selected officers go overseas for technical or managerial training. Further promotions of local officers have taken place in 1985 and more are expected before the end of the year following two promotion boards held in September, 1985 as 26 candidates.

(11) Prison

At the beginning of 1985, rapid inmate population growth took place, which reached the unprecedented high of 113 on 10th April, 1985. However, by the middle of the year, a significant reversal had taken place.

Previously planned construction of living accommodations for female prisoners was commenced with projected completion in early 1986.

The inmate agricultural/horticultural programme was expanded during the past year to include chickens, ducks, goats and rabbits. Our efforts were rewarded in self-sufficiency in the supply of eggs (for about 8 months), as well as some welcome vegetables and herbaceous crops.

Remedial classes in English commenced in September, 1985 conducted by a teacher from the Education Department at the Cayman Islands. Projects will continue in 1986 to further expand the Agricultural and Educational programmes, and possibly to implement other programmes designed to aid the process of rehabilitation.

(v) Government Information Services

After three years as a contracted function at the Cayman Islands News Agency, the Government Information Services are once again within the Government system, re-established as a unit under the Portfolio of Internal and External Affairs. With offices in the Tower Building, the unit is staffed by a Senior Information Officer, an Information Officer and a secretary, all experienced and knowledgeable about Caymanian affairs. A useful start has been made in providing a reliable flow of news about Government affairs to the local media, and in the first nine months of the year over 350 news releases had been issued. Other activities have included the publication of the Annual Report for 1984, the updating of booklets providing facts on many aspects of business and life in Cayman and answering the many letters of enquiry, which arrive every week to show the World's continuing and growing interest in our Islands.

(vi) Personnel

In last year's address I reported that the number of established posts in the Civil Service was 1,313, this year the figure is 1,101. Personal emoluments rose from $23.7 million to $26.2 million. The cost of training in the Personnel Division in 1985 will be $100 thousand. Great emphasis continues to be placed on local and overseas training for serving officers to improve their skills as well as their promotion prospects.

The move of all departments affected to the Tower is now completed. The total number of Government offices in the Tower is 20. In addition, there are offices on the first floor of the building for Members of the Legislative Assembly.

As outlined in the Throne Speech earlier this year, the reorganization of the Public Service Commission as a Government Department with major responsibility for recruitment, discipline and advising the Government on other personnel matters is complete. The task of rewriting Public Service Commission Regulations has been completed, and approved recently and the new General Orders will take effect early in 1986.

A new SX-200 240X telephone system has been installed in the Government administration and Tower buildings in an effort to improve telephone communications. This system is more efficient, has a greater capacity to handle calls and should eliminate problems experienced by the public in the past. An additional SX-200 240X will be installed shortly to provide more incoming lines to these buildings.

v) Broadcasting

The Broadcasting Department over the last four years has achieved a great degree of self-sufficiency with collected revenue approaching the Department's recurrent expenditures. Although some recurrent expenditure such as printing, and Capital Expenditure are built by other Government Departments, and when taken into account show that Radio Cayman is taking a small surplus.

The Department can operate at a great degree of self-sufficiency with the continued prudent guidance that has helped it achieve its present status.

(b) Finance & Development

i) Ship Registration

At present ship registration in the Cayman Islands is governed by the 1894 Merchant Shipping Acts of the United Kingdom, and under this law the Registrar of Ships has no power to refuse to

register a ship once the stipulated requirements have been met. However, before the Registrar registers a large ship in the Cayman Islands, an explanation is given advising that the Cayman Islands Government is not a signatory to the various International Shipping Conventions, and as a result, any vessel registering in the Cayman Islands may experience problems with port users in other countries. Where the shipowners or their principals insist on registering in the Cayman Islands, arrangements are made with either one of the six major classification societies around the world for the issuance to the various vessels, at the owners expense, the required safety certification which are required to enable the vessel to operate. It should be noted that these certificates are in a class apart as more convention certificates and subject to detailed scrutiny, which can lead to delays and extra expenses.

Consideration is being given to creating local legislation which would allow the local Registrar the power to refuse to register ships, which do not meet the safety standards as well as power to remove similar ships from the Register.

(j) Revenue & Expenditure

The current financial year began with a balanced budget of $69.7 million, comprising of $50.1 million in recurrent expenditure, $0.8 million in locally financed capital spending, $2.6 million in loan financing. With more than ten months of the year now behind us and year ending the revised financial position for 1995, it is anticipated that the year will end with a deficit of approximately $2.5 million. This has resulted mainly from shortfalls in Customs Import Duty $1.5 million, Revenue Stamps $1.5 million and Currency Fees of $0.5 million. Some heads of revenue will exceed the estimates

-7-

Revenue and control of expenditure should result in $1,0 million less than anticipated, the revised position is summarized below:

Balance at beginning of 1985		($548,748)
Revenue: Local	$54,921,855	
Loan	155,825	
Less Expenditure: Recurrent	49,124,204	
Capital	7,837,851	
Estimated balance at 31 December, 1985		($2,474,423)

(ii) Public Debt

At 1st January 1985 the public debt of the Cayman Islands Government was $11.7 million. Net changes during the year amounted to + ($985 thousand) leaving a debt balance of $10.7 million at the end of 1985.

Self-Financing Loans to Port Authority students and the Agricultural & Industrial Development Bank administered by Government was $3.6 million at the beginning of this year. Further advances and repayments netted $0.4 thousand, leaving a balance at 31 December 1985 of $3.7 million.

(iv) General Reserve

The General Reserve stood at $7.6 million on 1st January 1985, and as provided in the 1985 Estimates $3.2 million have been drawn down leaving a balance at the end of the year at $5.5 million. The Financial Secretary has agreed not to move $4.5 million in the reserves that Butterfield Bank which has funded the loan on the Tower Building.

v) Marriages, Births and Deaths Registers

The Registrar of Marriages, Births and Deaths are also located in the Registrar of Companies Department in the Tower Building. The Registrar is concerned about the increased attempts by some Caymanians to obtain birth certificates and registration of children not born in the Cayman Islands. A procedure is in place which requires for parent or parents to attend the Registry with their copy of the notification of live birth issued to them by the hospital, which is then compared with the Registrar's copy. Without the two, suspicions will be aroused leading to a delay in the registration of the child, and possibly the involvement of the police for an investigation.

vi) Customs Department

The additional officers provided in the 1985 Estimates served to establish Internal Audit and Task Force Sections. A serious look is also being given at the possibility of introducing a shift system at the airport to cover the two late scheduled flights. Steps are being considered in this Budget to effect it in the new year.

Again this year, through the auspices of British Executive Services Overseas, Britain's Development Agencies for the secondment the services of a Customs Training Adviser for the period January - March. This has been of great benefit to the officers, and we are indeed grateful to British Executive Services Overseas and to the adviser for their invaluable contributions to the betterment of the department.

During the adviser's stay, he also wrote Customs Procedures which were accepted by Governors and are fast a manual for the department. This will be especially useful for new entrants, as it covers all the rules and instructions which were previously passed on verbally to new staff during their on the job training.

One Assistant Collector attended the Customs Management course in the United Kingdom this year. This officer is in charge of Customs operations at the Airport, and every effort is made to make the knowledge and experience gained on this course pay and will be of great benefit to him and to the Service.

The headquarters, that is, Administrative and Collection Officers have been found in the Tower Building with the former being located on the 5th floor, and Collections on the ground floor.

This idea took care of a long existing need to have Customs staff provided with accommodation of the standard enjoyed by all other Government Departments.

(vii) Computer Services

During 1985, Information Systems was renamed to Computer Services, a reorganisation between Personnel and Computer Services took place to transfer the mail, telex and photocopier services to Computer Services. Mail distribution posts in the Tower and Administration Buildings have been manned by Computer Services to provide some of these functions along with computer printouts.

Staffing adjustments were made to accommodate the Distribution Post functions without increasing the overall complement of the Civil Service. Other staffing changes included the retraining of Executives being posted as programmers, and a recruiting effort in the United Kingdom and Canada to fill senior officer posts left vacant, as a result of existing personnel erring.

The VAX Cluster, consisting of two VAX 785 processors i.e. consoles and peripheral equipment from Digital Equipment Corporation, was delivered at slightly an scheduled, however, delays in renovation of the Tower and Administration Buildings have prevented completion of the new Computer Centre. This is now expected to be completed by early January 1986, with installation of the VAX to

follow immediately. A plan to move all existing users from the DEC 11/70 computers on the VAXs is being developed with work to commence as soon as the new hardware and system software are installed. By the end of 1986, it is planned that additional terminals will be installed, and that a full range of courses for accuracy correction to specific software applications will be made available to a significant number of Civil Servants.

The services of an adviser from British Executive Services Overseas was requested to assist with the upgrading of our facilities and planning the base of computer operations. As a result, a Computing Policy has been approved by Executive Council and distributed to all heads of departments. The adviser having returned this month, will assist the staff in finalising a long range plan, which will be placed before the Computer Steering Committee for its consideration.

(c) Judicial Department.

Due to increase in criminal work, particularly where the accused elects trial by jury, and the consequential knock-on processes, the machinery of the Courts Offices is heavily pressed. Further, the effect of a provision in the Consumer Protection Law, which requires the Courts to have the records of all cases tried in the Courts, has meant more work on the staff of the Courts Offices.

At the opening of the last Criminal Session in September 1985, there were 12 cases listed for trial during the Session. This is the first occasion, that there is a continuous criminal session from one session to another.

Cases are also long and complex, one case of obtaining property by deception lasted 10 working days. Another case of attempted rape and burglary lasted 12 working days.

Government has strengthened the Court Staff by posting locally trained local attorneys-at-law, who were recently called to the Bar as Deputy Clerks of the Court.

Provision is contained in this Budget, for four Marshalls to attend each Court and Chambers to administer the oath to witnesses, also forms of arrest or the Court's Bailiffs. These will replace the police officers who have carried out this function in the past and presently.

On occasions, an additional Magistrate has been brought in to do a particular case where perhaps the substantive Magistrate imposes himself.

d) Legal

The Department continued to deal with all aspects of Government Legal work including criminal prosecutions, drafting of Bills and subsidiary legislation, the development of our Law School and the handling of all Government, civil, legal work. In the first nine months of 1986, some twenty-seven laws were drafted in the Attorney General's Chambers, passed by the Legislative Assembly and assented to by His Excellency the Governor. Of these, mention shall be made of three significant legislative enactments - the Motor Licensing Law, 1985, the Rehabilitation of Offenders, 1986 and the Finance and Audit Law, 1986. Appearing in criminal matters on behalf of the Crown in the Supreme Court, Grand Court and Court of Appeal, the Chambers have also been a party to certain matters, which will shortly come before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London.

Four young Caymanian lawyers, who have qualified overseas, are presently in Government legal service. With several others due to return and the first graduates of the Cayman Islands Law

Second qualifying. It is hoped that both in the public and private sectors, the presence of Cayman lawyers will be more noticeable within trade and commerce.

(e) Development & Natural Resources

1) Portfolio

In April 1989, the Hon. Mrs. Truby and Financial Secretary for Development and Natural Resources, along with the Deputy Director of Cayman Turtle Farm, joined the United Kingdom delegation to the 5th Session of the Conference of the Parties on which would have analysed Cayman Turtle Farm to engage in international trade of turtle products was presented. Despite the thorough and painstaking preparation of the proposal, it was not approved, due in large part to conservation strenuous efforts by world environmentalists to protect the green sea turtle. Although the decision was disappointing, the decision was taken not to abandon the turtle farm, but to devise means of strengthening its economic base locally. To this end, the farm is currently making overtures in diversifying into shrimp culture. Its tourist attraction potential is to be fully exploited and it will step up meat production for the local market.

In agriculture, efforts are being made to upgrade the Government Demonstration Farm and to promote the development of private sector agriculture. To this end, an Israeli agriculturist stationed in Jamaica was invited here in August to advise on a plan of campaign. Having met with farmers and merchants and toured farms, he is to assist in securing the necessary expertise to operate a four year Agricultural Development Plan.

A dog control programme is currently under consideration, as the already too prevalent the menace of rabid canines. PAHO has agreed to provide assistance in the establishment of the programme. Should the necessary approval be given by the House to appropriately amend the relevant law, implementation of the programme by the Department of Agriculture and the Public Health Department will follow.

It is expected to be able to present a draft Building Code on the Kodak early in 1986. An advisor from the Irvine Company, who is to do the actual drafting, in consultation with the Building Code Committee, arrived in early November. Once the Code is approved, it will be administered by a Building Inspector/Code Division in the Planning Department.

A Petroleum Agreement was this year finalized with assistance from the United Nations, and signed in September with Hadarbus Oil, a Texas company. The Agreement provides that in the event that oil is discovered, the environment will be safeguarded and Government royalties augmented.

Still on the subject of oil, there was a blow drill in September on the docks, which was handled with a creditable degree of efficiency under the supervision of UNDP. Also in September, the Portfolio requested and obtained an advisor from U.N., who reviewed the newly prepared "Seven Islands Oil Spill Contingency Plan" and made recommendations.

In the area of conservation, a recent census commissioned by the Portfolio has been completed and a written report is currently under preparation. Consideration is also being given to an iguana study and census, as well as an extensive census on Little Cayman.

The Marine Parks project, which has been under consideration for some time, is now to be presented to the Cabinet again in order to obtain full public endorsement before its submission to Government for final approval. A five-year special implementation for the project has been prepared and implementation is scheduled for 1986.

During the year, a number of channels have cleared and markers erected. This was particularly useful in the case of the North Sound.

(j) Housing Development Corporation

Renewed effort was put into the raising of funds to continue mortgage financing. A style which therefore is already has been quite successful, and the corporation will shortly be considering new applications. Policies revised during this year are tailored to assist persons in low and middle income groups. To other changes, the HDC offices have been moved from the airport terminal to Pyle Road, and its management is now shared with that of the AIDA. These changes have substantially reduced overhead costs to the Corporation.

(k) Water Authority

In the field of water supply, the East End Waterfield and Reservoir Scheme was completed in March, the cost of these works was $1$100 thousand. The waterfield is capable of producing 1.9 thousand gallons of potable water per day. It was completed just in time to relieve the worsening water supply problems associated with the severe dry season drought experienced in the beginning of the year.

The Water Authority is presently formulating plans to provide a piped water distribution to Centre Town. This urgent and critical need, together with the uncertainties of viability, have caused the Authority to reverse its initial policy of primary development of ground water. It is now working towards a phased distribution, based initially on some form of desalination. At the time of writing several options are being considered, it is anticipated that before year end, a decision will be made and plans finalised in order to commence construction in 1996.

Work has commenced on better defining the ground water resources of Cayman Brac, with the intention of their development for public use, providing a much needed emergency supply of water to that island.

-24-

In the field of sewerage, considerable advances have been made in the design and implementation of the West Bay Beach Sewerage Project. The initial problems experienced in constructing the design have been overcome, and it now seems assured by the Water Authority, the estimated cost is $154,793,000. A loan of $487 million has been negotiated with the Caribbean Development Bank. Prequalification and contractual arrangements for consultants and suppliers are well advanced, and construction is scheduled to start next year, with completion in the first quarter of 1988. All properties within the drainage area, presently pay sewerage fees to Public Beach, will be connected to the main sewerage, and the sewage generated will be treated at the Municipal Sewage Treatment Works, located north and east of the garbage dump.

(f) Health, Education and Social Services

(i) Social Services

The Department of Social Services has grown both in staff and in expenditure on services. Defining the pathfinder stage during 1985 were three Caymanian graduates bringing the present staff complement to twenty seven. Expenditure on certain services has increased significantly. For example, spending on Child Care and Protection has increased from $60 thousand in 1985 to an estimated $119 thousand in 1986, while also more persons benefit from welfare payments (called Poor Relief) amounting to some $150 thousand this year.

A Comprehensive review of the Juvenile Law, which has been enforced for ten years, is in progress with completion expected during the first half of 1988.

A Foster Care Programme and a Home Health Aide Programme are being planned for introduction as soon as possible.

-25-

(11) Education Department.

Total enrolment in Government schools rose from 1,952 in 1984 to 2,150 in 1985 an Annual increase of 1%. Non-Caymanian students now represent 11% of the population in Government Schools, while the percentage for private schools is 31%. Twenty Percent of the total Government Primary Schools population is at the George Town Primary School, and as a result 450 places, did not fill. It is not too soon to begin planning for an additional primary school for the George Town area.

Budgeting on education continues to grow with the rising rolls triggering expansion in plant and staff accordingly. Recurrent expenditure increased from $5.9 million in 1984 to $6.5 million in 1985. Included in this increase is for expenditure on the Hotel and Trade Schools formerly, under Tourist, Aviation and Trade.

Revenues, though small in comparison with expenses, are also increasing. Revenue collection exceeds for 1985 Budget of $200 thousand by approximately 25 thousand derived from:

		CI$
a) school fees	=	150,000
b) examination fees	=	17,000
c) book rental fees	=	25,000
d) community college	=	50,000
e) miscellaneous fees	=	3,000

The Education Department is subsidized 97%.

The Department is pleased to be able to offer a B.Sc. Degree in Elementary and Special Education to 35 serving teachers through the University of Miami. Government will assure the costs at 140 degree which are a function of distance with how total costs to Government being approximately $47,010 over three years. Costs related to instructions are going borne by the individual teachers at approximately $5,720.00 for Caymanian teachers and $7,184 for Non-Caymanian over the three year period.

(iii) Health

During 1985, steps to deal with the problem of patient accounts that remain outstanding were intensified. All accounts have now been signed on the Government computer system and registered letters have been sent to all persons who have not responded to the previous bills sent. More than $1.3 million remain outstanding at this time, and Government intends to initiate legal action to collect those accounts that are in arrears. All Caymanians and residents are asked to meet their financial obligations to the health services to enable it to function more efficiently. It must be remembered that the health service is already heavily subsidised at 90% i.e., the revenue from hospital fees is only 10% of total expenditure at the hospitals. Another way of explaining it is that the fees charged to the patient only cover a nominal portion of the actual cost.

Nineteen eighty-five recred the first full year of operation of the extended care beds located at The Pines. The average occupancy of this unit was approximately 90% with operating costs totalling forty-two thousand. The provision of this service has greatly reduced the overcrowding and unnecessary utilisation of the acute care beds at the main hospital.

A Health Fair was organized for the first time in the Cayman Islands on 15th April 1985 at the Courts Building, and was very well attended by the public.

The most significant feature of dental treatment during 1985 has been the initiation of a preventative fluoride treatment programme for children in a pilot project at the West End and North Side Schools.

Because of the large incidence of dental decay among children in the Cayman Islands and the nature and progress of this decay, the introduction of this mobile health method of treatment at this time is urgent, necessary and timely.

The Pan American Health Organization has made a short term consultant available from Geneva, and the first month of the consultancy was spent in developing forms and procedures and the training of staff from the dental clinics, as well as the teachers in the North Side and East End schools, to carry out the toothbrushing and fluoride rinse programme. This programme is monitored by the Dental Officer and AAH information with the participation and cooperation of the Education Department.

Additional staff is being requested in this Budget to cope with the demands for routine dental care by the public and also significantly to expand the preventative and outreach programmes for children throughout the Cayman Islands.

Local private practitioners continue to provide services at the hospital conducting out-patient clinics in internal medicine, paediatrics, psychiatry and ophthalmology.

The arrival of a physician to the staff, in a supernumerary post, has markedly increased the services offered at the hospital, and it is difficult to imagine how we could operate in the future without this service.

A refurbished C-Arm X-Ray Unit was acquired at a cost of US$10,000. This equipment which has a one year guarantee, and which is covered on the same service contract as the other X-Ray units will greatly facilitate the performance of some orthopaedic operations. Visiting specialists have in the past declined to perform some types of surgery because of the lack of such a unit.

The rapid development in the private sector with the introduction of two new medical centres has created increasing pressures for work at the hospital, and we have been running at full occupancy recently with a demand for every ward bed space.

The programme on drug and alcohol and improvement of psychiatric services, which began on a limited scale in 1984, has continued to receive attention from the Portfolio, with consultations with overseas experts scheduled to take place during the remainder of this year, with a view to formulating comprehensive plans for its expansion.

(v) Tourism, Aviation and Trade

1) Civil Aviation

The new Terminal Building at the Jean Kehoe's International Airport formally inaugurated on 26th January 1985 at a total cost of $10 million. The Civil Aviation Department's monthly income for rental and concessions was increased from $15 thousand to $57,500. Except for some unusual difficulties with airconditioning and car parking systems, the building and equipment functions properly and is a blessing for the handling of the 30 thousand passengers and well-wishers arriving at each month. The old terminal, adjacent to the operation in 1946 was demolished and materials given to the needy as soon as it was evacuated in January.

Revenue is expected to exceed that of 1984 by $178,132 due to the introduction of a passenger security fee, car parking fees and the additional space and amenities offered at the new Terminal Building.

Expenditure will also increase compared to 1984 because of the additional commitments to be met associated with this larger well equipped facility. Despite this, however, the surplus of revenues over expenditures is expected to exceed the 1984 break-even figure by $353 thousand.

The major repair undertaking for the Gerrard Smith runway was completed by the Public Works Department, and services to the NICA returned to the Sister Island last December as sufficient

sections were completed for limited operations. The total cost of the project, which also included the completion of runway lighting, was slightly more than $1,2 million.

The old aircraft parking apron is now being utilized as a General Aviation Centre and accommodates private and executive aircraft, flight training, maintenance facilities and terms operations. A General Aviation Terminal has been opened to accommodate this traffic and is staffed from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. by officers from Airport Security, Customs and Immigration. This relieves congestion of the new terminal and which as there are always quite a fleet of private aircraft on the island.

(i) Labour Office

Eighty complaints and disputes through August 1985, have been handled by the Labour Officer in consultation with the Ministry of Tourism, Aviation and Trade and have been resolved informally. Advice on working principles and conditions was also been given to prospective employers.

A Labour Survey to increase the number of unemployed persons was carried out in February 1985, and as a result, 158 persons registered in Grand Cayman and 7 in Cayman Brac. Between the period January to August 1985, the office was able to place 110 persons in suitable occupations. Forty-eight school leavers registered, and five were referred to the Community College and are presently attending various courses being offered. Sixty percent of the others have been placed in jobs with the assistance of the Office.

(ii) Fire Service

Nineteen eighty-five was a busy year for the Fire Department. There was a 14.5% increase in fire calls.

The increase can be attributed to the numerous bush fires, which were prevalent throughout the Cayman Islands, experienced from late 1984 to the middle of 1985.

During the first nine months of 1985, 25 structural fires were dealt with and 21 vehicles were damaged by fire. This is a significant reduction from the previous year, when 35 vehicles were lost over the same period.

Fifteen fire wells were constructed at a cost of CI$74 thousand. The wells are for use in the event of water fires and is strategically placed throughout the Island.

Improvements in fire prevention and vehicle maintenance are being realized by the employment of a fire safety officer, and a mechanical supervisor earlier this year.

Four junior officers attended the Florida State Fire College and successfully completed courses in fire fighting, rescue and emergency medical treatment.

(b) Communications & Works

(i) Postal Department

On 15th March 1985 the new Post Office moved into new premises, the building of which was spearheaded by Captain Theo Bodden of George Town. The public continue to make use of the services provided at this establishment.

During the year the Postal Department made an attempt, though with little success, to collect outstanding revenue from radio licences. Efforts continue to be made to effect satisfactory control over the licencing and use of all types of radios in the Islands.

The sale of postage and philatelic stamps has been a slight increase over the same period in 1984. There has, however, been a decrease in the sale of revenue stamps.

New post office boxes for the district of West Bay have been installed by the Public Works Department.

11) District Administration - Cayman Brac

Cayman Brac and Little Cayman began the year 1985 with an unemployment situation. Government is the largest employer of labour on Cayman Brac and during the first quarter of the year, there were no capital projects charged. This resulted in a significant percentage of the Island's work force unemployed. Coupled with this was a further reduction in the work force at Cayman Airways Ltd. However, with the reintroduction of jet air service from Cayman Brac, tourism showed a modest increase. Arrivals by jet into Cayman Brac for the first ten months of the year were 6,351, while departures by jet were 6,327. No information is compiled on arrivals or departures on the Trilander.

During the second quarter of the year, Government's Capital Works Programme offered steady employment in both building construction and the roads programme. The largest project for 1985 was the continuation of the Bluff Road towards the lighthouse at South Bay. This road was completed to the lighthouse in August at a cost of $220 thousand. The other major project for 1985 was the ongoing project of upgrading the South Coast Road. An additional 1.75 miles of road was completed at a cost of $75 thousand. Some minor roads in Cayman Brac were also upgraded.

A new classroom has been added to the Cayman Brac High School and an addition to West End Primary school was completed.

In Little Cayman the work on the Salt Rocks dock had been completed and the dock is now open. A crane has been mentioned

in Little Cayman to ensure that the dock can function effectively. A boat ramp and boat shelter were constructed at Blossom Village and the Government launch for Little Cayman has been put into service. Work in progress on the dredging of a passage inside the reef on the south coast of Little Cayman with the use of a mechanical excavator from the Government Central Funding Scheme.

Cable and Wireless (WI), inaugurated its submarine cable between Grand Cayman and Cayman Brac in February and telephone communications have greatly improved as a result.

(iii) Port Authority

From the inception, the Authority has made an impact on all facets of the Islands economy. Goods are handled efficiently, and losses to pilferers have been significantly reduced. The fast turn around of ships ensures that stocks of various types of merchandise are adequately maintained, shortages of supplies are no longer experienced. In spite of higher operating costs it has not been necessary to increase port charges, the Authority has continued to meet all financial obligations. The Government's investment in the Port Authority has been most prudent and will continue to pay dividends in the years to come.

Estimated revenue over expenditure of the Port Authority for the year ending 31st December 1985 will be approximately $1512.1 thousand and present cargo trends indicate an increase of five percent over 1984.

With the increase in containerized cargo, it was deemed necessary to convert an area north of the existing dock complex into a marshalling yard. The project entailed the construction of a retaining wall, the raising of the level of the area to the point of the existing concrete paving and hot-mixing. Work was contracted to

the Public Works Department and completed on 31st July 1985. The project was completed recently. The initial estimate has been revised and the final project cost is now £1,178 thousand.

(v) Public Works Department

The recurrent expenditure of the Department is projected to total £2.1 million, while the overall Capital Works Programme of buildings, roads and civil engineering construction is expected to represent approximately £3.1 million.

Modernisation of peripheral towns and the second spray and chip application on almost five miles of the North Side/East End Road will account for £150 thousand of expenditure under the Rhodes Construction Programme. A section of new road linking Eight Avenue and Anita Road was constructed at a cost of £187 thousand. An access road to Agricultural lands in North Side was excavated at a cost of £25 thousand. The intersection of Eastern Avenue and North Church Street was signalized at a cost of £29 thousand.

The kitchen and seating mess facilities at the George Town Hospital, with associated staff and patient parking, was completed in 1985 at a cost of £59 thousand. The project had been estimated to cost £60 thousand.

A civic centre was constructed at East End at a cost of £45 thousand as estimated. The Golden Town and East End Town Halls were renovated at a cost of £34 thousand.

Work is underway on a new female cell block at the prison, expected to cost £200 thousand.

Renovations to the Courts building were completed in 1985, providing a new Court room and office for the Supreme Court and additional office space for other members of staff. These alterations were achieved at a cost of £157 thousand.

Refurbishing and renovations were carried out at the Government Administration Building, at a cost of $50 thousand in 1995 taking a total of $130 thousand, following the demolition of the Tower Building to which certain refurbishments were timetabled. Works to the Tower Building structure to Level 3 thousand were executed in 1985, having a cost of $493 thousand to date. The building is now almost fully occupied.

At the Sports and Cultural Centre complex, changing rooms were constructed at cost of $145 thousand with $22 thousand to be donated by the Lions Club. This facility will complement the swimming pool built by the Lions Club. The football pitch was topsoiled and seeded; drainage and irrigation systems installed, and the running track is being hot-tiked, all at a total cost of approximately $210 thousand. One hundred thousand of this was spent in 1994. The Bank of Nova Scotia has donated $125 thousand to the complex.

5. THE ENSUING YEAR 1995

Mr. President, the 1995 Budget was prepared to effect greater stimulation of our economy by providing funding for a number of capital projects.

The Budget is $67.4 million, an increase of $6.8 million over 1995.

Estimated Ordinary revenue is $55.9 million, a decrease of $2.5 million contribution from General Reserves. Early Ordinary Revenue forecasts for 1995, in relation to the level of expenditure requested indicated a significant reduction in all areas where cuts became quite obvious that new revenue measures would be required to balance this Budget. These measures should produce $5.5 million.

This year the proposals are two pole affecting the offshore and general public. Local residents are being requested to assist with additional revenue which previously will be utilized to maintain and provide services to the public.

I will briefly outline the new features:

The Public Health
(Garbage and Refuse Disposal)

Fees payable by private houses and apartments have not been increased since 1975, and the garbage and refuse collection is now costing Government $450 thousand annually, with revenue from this source amounting to $63 thousand. The cost per household is approximately $100.

It is recommended that the annual fee be increased from $15 to $50 per annum or $1.00 per week and increase other fees under the Law as well.

		$15		$50
2)	Condominiums units from	50	to	100 per annum
3)	Hotels			
	a) up to 19 bedrooms from	$00	to	600 per annum
	b) 20 to 39 bedrooms from	900	to	1,200 per annum
	c) 40 to 60 bedrooms from	1,200	to	2,000 per annum
	d) over 60 bedrooms	1,800	to	2,500 per annum
4)	Restaurants (with or without bar)			
	up to 30 seats from	200	to	325 per annum
	more than 30 seats from	500	to	525 per annum
5)	Bars	100	to	200 per annum
6)	Lodging houses other than hotels	150	to	300 per annum

b)	Business Premises			
	a) offices	24	to	60 per annum
	b) other offices			
	i) small	40	to	70 per annum
	ii) medium	160	to	280 per annum
	iii) large	400	to	1,000 per annum
c)	Large complexes	800	to	800 per annum

ARMS AND ILLEGAL WEAPONS

It is proposed to increase the annual fees payable under the Arms and Illegal Weapons Act as follows:

		FEE INCREASE	
a)	Category "A" Licence fee	27,500	to 30,250
b)	Category "B" Licence fee	8,500	to 9,000
c)	Combined Pistol/Rifle fee	750	to 1,000
d)	Restricted Licence fee	5,500	to 6,000

MOTOR TAX

The travel tax charged is substantially below cost recoverable, and it is proposed to increase it from C15% to C15%.

TRAFFIC FINES

Vehicle registration and drivers licence fees have not been increased since 1976, while the cost of road maintenance and construction of additional roads over the decade amounts to millions of dollars. The proposal is to increase all fees under the regulation. Thirty items are affected and perhaps they are too lengthy to list. But as an example, private cars annual registration fee is proposed to increase from $18 to $100, a cost to the owner of $1.92 per week.

INSURANCE LICENCE FEES

The Act which was passed in September 1979, and operated on occasion has experienced no change in the fees, and it is considered timely to upgrade them this year. The increases are as follows:

			Cr DOLLARS
a)	"A" Licence	from	1,500 to 2,000
b)	"B" Licence	from	3,000 to 4,500
c)	Agents	from	100 to 150
d)	Sub-agents	from	50 to 75
e)	Brokers	from	750 to 1,250
f)	Underwriting Agents	from	5,000 to 7,500
g)	"A" Licence where the company is carrying down its business	from	1,000 to 1,500

TRADE AND BUSINESS LICENCE

Fees under the Licensing and Trades and Technical and Commerce Sections comprised of eighteen items are proposed to be increased. No proposal for fees under the Professional section are now forward as these were increased in 1984. These fees have not been increased since the mid 70's. An example of the increase is the fee for a Merchant and Shipowner's A which is proposed from $300 to $1,500, a cost to the owner of $28.85 per week.

CUSTOMS DUTIES

Import duty on motor gasoline and diesel oil has been $.78 per gallon since 1977, and it is now proposed to increase it by $.15 to $.93 per gallon. Prices at the Service Stations must not exceed $.05.

Mr. President, I've examined the effect of these increases, as would find the following annual payments by certain groups of residents:

a) Those who own a home and no car would be required in 1986 to pay $50 per annum to Government for garbage fees only.

b) Those who own a home, car, one dryway license would pay $200.00 per annum to Government for garbage fees, vehicle inspection and registration and drivers license.

There are not, Mr. President, many countries in the world where the populace have such a high standard of living, good quality services and pays so little in Annual fees. We are indeed fortunate to have so much at such a minimal cost to the public.

4. CONSTRUCTION

Mr. President, the estimates for 1985 was done with great care taking into account historical trends and the world economic situation. The latter being given the larger weight, and it resulted in a Budget of $1.5 million over 1984.

The 1985 revised estimates financial position of $2.5 million deficit will cause further measures in expenditure control to be exercised by Finance & Development.

We realize, of course, Mr. President that some Government services must be properly funded, but we will continue to view it in a learn-leaning position.

The 1985 recurrent expenditure displays this lean-leaning position while providing the required services to the public.

Capital expenditure of $18.8 million is following economic theory to stimulate the recovery, when it is experiencing a recession or has bottomed out on a recovery trend. This will create more employment in construction and the output effects will be positive in 1986.

Mr. President, I have great confidence in the future development of these Islands over beyondering that constituency must not be allowed, and private and public sector working together is our objective in achieving greater benefits for these Islands and their people.

Mr. President, allow me to express my sincere gratitude to the staff of My Portfolio, Finance & Development, for their support, they exemplify the fine example of dedicated civil servants.

Mr. President, I recommend the Appropriation (1985) Law, 1985 proposing an estimated sum of $83,873,357, to cover Recurrent and Capital Expenditure and Debt Service in 1986. Excluded from this are the statutory provisions covering pensions and loan repayments amounting to $3,515,571. The estimated expenditure is, therefore, $87,388,928.

Thank you Mr. President.

[illegible] necessary recommendation. Mr. President, I move that the motion on the budget objective be withdrawn until tomorrow, 5th October, 1948.

MR. PRESIDENT: My understanding is that arrangements have been made already by the business committee not that the debate on the general pleading of the appropriation bill for Wednesday, 6th October until Thursday that Members of the House should have a fortnight to study the estimates and the budget address before the debate.

The question is that the motion be withdrawn. As many as are in favour will say "Aye" [illegible]

GOVERNMENT NOTICE NO. 1048

PROVISIONAL DELIMITATION OF CONSTITUENCIES

HON. MINISTER OF INTERIOR: Mr. President, I move government notice No. 1048, dated 30th September, 1948 Delimitation of Electoral Districts Act, 1946 (Act 34 of 1946).

"And be it enacted that in the Delimitation of Electoral Districts Act, 1946 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act) section 2 of the principal Act is hereby amended -

(a) by the deletion in paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of the word "and" at the end of that paragraph;

(b) by the deletion in paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of the full stop at the end of that paragraph and the substitution therefor of a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(c) by the addition after paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of the following paragraph:

"(c) in the case of the Provincial Division of Western Cape Province, 1st October, 1948."

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Hon. Member wish to explain his amendment?

HON. MINISTER OF INTERIOR: I think that I can explain my amendment that is a motion which may be moved either at [illegible] under 48A, [illegible] of the new Standing Orders which was accepted at the last Session. The amendable Act provides [illegible]

MR. JAMES K. POOLE: Mr. President, just so we know that this document cannot be delayed and in person automatically?

MR. PRESIDENT: Let me answer my explanation if I may. If you will read your Standing Orders, you'll see that you waived the Monday when both the last and the Standing Orders were amended, you will find that there is also a Standing Order #84. The provisions of that Standing Order are such that a motion of the kind just introduced is not entered and the question is not debatable. However, the provisions of the law otherwise unmentioned in the motion which has just been introduced today are such that the motion can only have effect for ten days, a total of 10 tax days....

MR. RICHARD A. BRADLEY: Mr. President, one could always imagine that the bill be rejected, or the bill is not introduced within ten days.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sorry. I do not share that I followed all of that. It was.... Well, let me say that the provisions of the law are such that the motion only has temporary effect and that it will not be introduced or have permanent effect in the manner within that specified period. The bill goes dead on the next day.

MR. JAMES K. POOLE: Well, I apologize to the Standing Orders. I just assumed that we, in the mail the day before yesterday. I have not read that yet. However, I am advised, by President, that it was necessary on our minds without the Standing Orders having a chance to debate it. I would remind the Members of this House that they should remember the Boston Tea Party.

MR. PRESIDENT: If the Member will just bear with me, the last Standing Order would have banned that the provisions which we have entered to establish precisely what is followed in the House of Commons in relationship and in the manner and sequence of the consideration. The Order....

MR. JAMES K. POOLE: That is....

MR. PRESIDENT: The virtue of the Order will then not be complete if, in that it does not oblige the House to debate resolution of which Members know and have notice, a practice of which the Royal Elected Member for Dublin East complained at the time of the last budget.

MR. JAMES K. POOLE: I did not mean that I understood about because I have only just heard about a lot of things recently.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Member must not mean me. Copies of the motion have been distributed and in accordance with Standing Orders I will put the question.

The question is that the Government motion No. 10/76, the terms of which have been read out be adopted.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. G. WAIT POOLE: Mr. President, may I have a division please?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, of course.

PURSUANT
RES. 75/22

AYES:

Hon. Michael J. Woolley
Hon. Thomas G. Duffy
Hon. Barbara G. Brooks
Hon. W. Norman Gordon
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkpatrick
Hon. Nancy G. Johnson
Hon. Dudley D. Carroll
Ms. K. Barbara Reed
Capt. Ruby B. Kirkpatrick
Mr. E. Vincent Miller

10

NOES:

Mr. Richard L. Pierson
Mr. James A. Gardner
Mr. C. Tody Watson
Mr. John C. Watson

4

CONSIDERATION RELATIVE TO 10/04 UNDER BY BUSINESS:

Mr. Chairman: What concludes the business which we must deal with on the Order Paper for today. However, before the adjournment is moved, perhaps I could just ask the Clerk whether I am correct in assuming that a motion which some Hon. Members may wish to move, on official publications which Hon. Backbenchers are to be taken away, or at what time they are to be taken?

Clerk: It must be taken at the time indicated immediately following the budget debate.

Mr. Chairman: Are they to be dealt with outside the Chamber or in the House or where?

Clerk: See.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, perhaps Members could be kind enough to remain in the House until the Speaker after the adjournment has been moved.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. MICHAEL J. WOOLLEY: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 22, I move that the Honourable House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. on Monday, 2nd December, 2002.

Mr. Chairman: The motion is that this House do now adjourn until 10.00 a.m. on Monday, 2nd December, 2002.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: If no one is put up, I would remind Members of the Standing Order relative to a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association tonight. Dinner for, in the 8.30 p.m. or...?

Clerk: 8.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: So, I take that Members will be able to attend that. Thank you.

AT 12.40 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.00 A.M., MONDAY, 2ND DECEMBER, 2002.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

[illegible]

2. [illegible]

[illegible]

3. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

[illegible]

Sec. 135. [illegible]

[illegible]

Art. 136. [illegible]

4. [illegible]

(1) [illegible]

[illegible]

(2) [illegible] -

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]

(b) [illegible]

(c) [illegible]

(d) [illegible]

(e) [illegible]

(3) [illegible]

[illegible]

(1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible]

(3) [illegible]

(4) [illegible]

(5) [illegible]

[illegible]

(6) [illegible]

(7) [illegible]

(8) [illegible]

(9) [illegible]

(10) [illegible]

Table of Contents

Page

Abstract ii

Supplement Reports on the Puerto Rican Parrot Conservation Program – Land to the Sea iv

Abbreviations v

Dedication of Research Grants as per CP vi

The Aguirre-Luquillo Model Forest Initiative, 2010 – Vision and Action Agenda 1

Summary Budget 61

Report Format and Data Entry 63

The Land Acquisition Agreement, U.S. 2010 – First and Second Reactions 64

Bibliography 70

[illegible]

[illegible] October, 2001

10:00 a.m.

MR. [illegible]: Please be seated.

I am sorry. I have no opening remarks. Would you please proceed with the first witness?

MRS. [illegible]: Call my first witness, Honourable Minister of Health and Environment, Mrs. [illegible]. Mrs. [illegible], please remember that you are under oath.

Honourable Minister, please proceed with your presentation.

MR. [illegible]: Please be seated.

My apologies to the House and to you, Mr. Chairman, for coming late. I was held up in traffic. I thought I left early enough, but I was not. I apologize for that.

Mr. Chairman, Honourable Members, I am pleased to be here this morning to present the Ministry's Budget Estimates for the year 2001/2002. I am also pleased to present the Ministry's Strategic Plan for the next three years.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to inform this House that the Ministry has been able to implement most of the activities that were planned for the year 2000/2001. Some of the activities that were not implemented will be carried over to the year 2001/2002

MRS. THOMAS C. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate
do adjourn.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey that the Senate adjourn. Without objection, the motion is agreed to, and the Senate stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:00 P.M., the Senate adjourned.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I have a message from the House of Representatives.

QUESTION

THE CLERK WILL READ THE BILL FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE SENATE.

CLERK: Bill No. 129: Shall the Pennington Borough school board be authorized to use the second floor of the Borough building, including vaulted space, for additional land for parking?

ANSWER: The total cost of the Borough building is $1,252,416.00
Broken down as follows:

Purchase Price		$1,071,250.00
Renovations 1973	$90,166.00	
Renovations 1980	$120,000.00	$210,166.00
Land for parking lot	$ 67,250.00	
Survey Only	3,750.00	
Interest	71,250.00	$142,250.00
		$1,423,666.00

The total payment per year for the first 10 years
$80,000, Annual Pay, $22,666.00 = $102,666.00

QUESTIONS:

MR. D. BRUCE MILLER: Mr. President, Does the Borough
Clerk have any idea how the people in the neighborhood will be going to react to convert the land into suitable parking?

MRS. EDNA C. THOMPSON: Mr. President, I would like to know what information have you?

MR. D. BRUCE MILLER: Mr. President, I would like to ask of the Borough Clerk why should be the part of the land that the cost per square foot?

MR. [illegible]: Is this Borough property to the additional land for parking?

MR. D. BRUCE MILLER: Yes, for additional land for parking.

MRS. THOMAS C. JOHNSTON: Mr. President, I will recommend to vote this bill favorable to the Borough. However, I am not for a purchase this morning to give us.

MR. T. [illegible] BOSSERT: Mr. President, I do not object to the value for the legal fee ranking, but the dollar sign at the front of the number is a very high cost for the creative people

PROF. THOMAS C. GRUNFELD: Mr. President, since speak I have to the record. I am assured by the owner of [illegible] because I did not [illegible] that [illegible] be assessed based on the sale of [illegible] that [illegible] because of [illegible] of [illegible] be in rights of a [illegible] the cost [illegible] would [illegible] a fee.

MR. G. [illegible] BOSSERT: Mr. President, [illegible] speaker, since the [illegible] by right of the [illegible] may have [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: I think that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Finance Minority, I would like to ask a question. [illegible] Senator Dole, [illegible] Senator Moynihan, [illegible] Senator Bentsen, [illegible] Senator Packwood, [illegible] Senator Chafee, [illegible] Senator Roth, [illegible] Senator Heinz, [illegible] Senator Wallop, [illegible] Senator Grassley, [illegible] Senator Armstrong, [illegible] Senator Gramm, [illegible] Senator Durenberger, [illegible] Senator Symms, [illegible] Senator Boschwitz, [illegible] Senator Mitchell, [illegible] Senator Baucus, [illegible] Senator Bradley, [illegible] Senator Gore, [illegible] Senator Riegle, [illegible] Senator Lautenberg, [illegible] Senator Metzenbaum, [illegible] Senator Matsunaga, [illegible] Senator Daschle, [illegible] Senator Conrad, [illegible] Senator Boren, [illegible] Senator Breaux, [illegible] Senator Chafee, [illegible] Senator Roth, [illegible] Senator Heinz, [illegible] Senator Wallop, [illegible] Senator Grassley, [illegible] Senator Armstrong, [illegible] Senator Gramm, [illegible] Senator Durenberger, [illegible] Senator Symms, [illegible] Senator Boschwitz, [illegible] Senator Mitchell, [illegible] Senator Baucus, [illegible] Senator Bradley, [illegible] Senator Gore, [illegible] Senator Riegle, [illegible] Senator Lautenberg, [illegible] Senator Metzenbaum, [illegible] Senator Matsunaga, [illegible] Senator Daschle, [illegible] Senator Conrad, [illegible] Senator Boren, [illegible] Senator Breaux.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Senator Dole, [illegible] Senator Moynihan, [illegible] Senator Bentsen, [illegible] Senator Packwood, [illegible] Senator Chafee, [illegible] Senator Roth, [illegible] Senator Heinz, [illegible] Senator Wallop, [illegible] Senator Grassley, [illegible] Senator Armstrong, [illegible] Senator Gramm, [illegible] Senator Durenberger, [illegible] Senator Symms, [illegible] Senator Boschwitz, [illegible] Senator Mitchell, [illegible] Senator Baucus, [illegible] Senator Bradley, [illegible] Senator Gore, [illegible] Senator Riegle, [illegible] Senator Lautenberg, [illegible] Senator Metzenbaum, [illegible] Senator Matsunaga, [illegible] Senator Daschle, [illegible] Senator Conrad, [illegible] Senator Boren, [illegible] Senator Breaux.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Senator Dole, [illegible] Senator Moynihan, [illegible] Senator Bentsen, [illegible] Senator Packwood, [illegible] Senator Chafee, [illegible] Senator Roth, [illegible] Senator Heinz, [illegible] Senator Wallop, [illegible] Senator Grassley, [illegible] Senator Armstrong, [illegible] Senator Gramm, [illegible] Senator Durenberger, [illegible] Senator Symms, [illegible] Senator Boschwitz, [illegible] Senator Mitchell, [illegible] Senator Baucus, [illegible] Senator Bradley, [illegible] Senator Gore, [illegible] Senator Riegle, [illegible] Senator Lautenberg, [illegible] Senator Metzenbaum, [illegible] Senator Matsunaga, [illegible] Senator Daschle, [illegible] Senator Conrad, [illegible] Senator Boren, [illegible] Senator Breaux.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Senator Dole, [illegible] Senator Moynihan, [illegible] Senator Bentsen, [illegible] Senator Packwood, [illegible] Senator Chafee, [illegible] Senator Roth, [illegible] Senator Heinz, [illegible] Senator Wallop, [illegible] Senator Grassley, [illegible] Senator Armstrong, [illegible] Senator Gramm, [illegible] Senator Durenberger, [illegible] Senator Symms, [illegible] Senator Boschwitz, [illegible] Senator Mitchell, [illegible] Senator Baucus, [illegible] Senator Bradley, [illegible] Senator Gore, [illegible] Senator Riegle, [illegible] Senator Lautenberg, [illegible] Senator Metzenbaum, [illegible] Senator Matsunaga, [illegible] Senator Daschle, [illegible] Senator Conrad, [illegible] Senator Boren, [illegible] Senator Breaux.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Senator Dole, [illegible] Senator Moynihan, [illegible] Senator Bentsen, [illegible] Senator Packwood, [illegible] Senator Chafee, [illegible] Senator Roth, [illegible] Senator Heinz, [illegible] Senator Wallop, [illegible] Senator Grassley, [illegible] Senator Armstrong, [illegible] Senator Gramm, [illegible] Senator Durenberger, [illegible] Senator Symms, [illegible] Senator Boschwitz, [illegible] Senator Mitchell, [illegible] Senator Baucus, [illegible] Senator Bradley, [illegible] Senator Gore, [illegible] Senator Riegle, [illegible] Senator Lautenberg, [illegible] Senator Metzenbaum, [illegible] Senator Matsunaga, [illegible] Senator Daschle, [illegible] Senator Conrad, [illegible] Senator Boren, [illegible] Senator Breaux.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Senator Dole, [illegible] Senator Moynihan, [illegible] Senator Bentsen, [illegible] Senator Packwood, [illegible] Senator Chafee, [illegible] Senator Roth, [illegible] Senator Heinz, [illegible] Senator Wallop, [illegible] Senator Grassley, [illegible] Senator Armstrong, [illegible] Senator Gramm, [illegible] Senator Durenberger, [illegible] Senator Symms, [illegible] Senator Boschwitz, [illegible] Senator Mitchell, [illegible] Senator Baucus, [illegible] Senator Bradley, [illegible] Senator Gore, [illegible] Senator Riegle, [illegible] Senator Lautenberg, [illegible] Senator Metzenbaum, [illegible] Senator Matsunaga, [illegible] Senator Daschle, [illegible] Senator Conrad, [illegible] Senator Boren, [illegible] Senator Breaux.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Senator Dole, [illegible] Senator Moynihan, [illegible] Senator Bentsen, [illegible] Senator Packwood, [illegible] Senator Chafee, [illegible] Senator Roth, [illegible] Senator Heinz, [illegible] Senator Wallop, [illegible] Senator Grassley, [illegible] Senator Armstrong, [illegible] Senator Gramm, [illegible] Senator Durenberger, [illegible] Senator Symms, [illegible] Senator Boschwitz, [illegible] Senator Mitchell, [illegible] Senator Baucus, [illegible] Senator Bradley, [illegible] Senator Gore, [illegible] Senator Riegle, [illegible] Senator Lautenberg, [illegible] Senator Metzenbaum, [illegible] Senator Matsunaga, [illegible] Senator Daschle, [illegible] Senator Conrad, [illegible] Senator Boren, [illegible] Senator Breaux.

MR. G. KEITH SUTTON: Mr. Treasurer, which requires in the first of $64,100.00 for interest. While would imply that payments are going to be made over a certain period, which one number was of this $64,100 is the interest paid for this year, or is that the total interest eligible which will be paid over the life of the refinancing of the property?

MR. JAMES E. HARRIS: The interest is paid over the refinancing period for the duration of the contract of land sale in FY84,000.

MR. JAMES E. HARRIS: In lieu of the explanatory remarks which were given, Mr. President, I would like to request that the Treasurer's Office be present to answer any questions that may arise. It seems that the price of this item is very high. I wonder whether the Airport Commission has considered other alternatives, may have a reasonable explanation for it. I certainly, believe that going rate should be the first in question and not have any major problems in any real estate deal. However, in the interest of time, I would like to request that the Treasurer's Office be present to answer any questions that may arise.

MR. JAMES E. HARRIS: Mr. President, I would like to request that the Treasurer's Office be present to answer any questions that may arise.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, the general fund is in the Treasurer's Office. I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said. [illegible] Mr. President, and thank you for your patience. I would like to ask the Treasurer's Office about the [illegible] which was [illegible] Mr. President,

MR. JAMES M. BOOGER: Getting to the first question we will be sure of the offices which have been assigned, would we have the square footage contained in the Texas Building?

MRS. CHARLES C. STEPHENS: I am still guessing, Mr. President, that the estimation time by Mr. Frost. The outside square footage of the building is 60,000. The assigned office space is square feet including the basement, is 50,000. There is 45,000 square feet for office space, plus the basement of 5,000.

MR. JAMES M. BOOGER: Based on the square which have been given to the House, Mr. President, by square foot estimates, the Government has made approximately 45% net square feet for the Texas Building. Would the Member advise the House what percentage would normally be used as settlement of net square, whether that is 10%, or 5% more?

MRS. CHARLES C. STEPHENS: Mr. President, from working in dealing with various Government supplied expenditures, such as the Austin Bureau and the Criminal Building, there would be 10%

MR. JAMES M. BOOGER: The Chair would ask the Sergeant, anyone wishes have to vote, that announcement for a longer, short.

MRS. FRANCES C. SMITH: Approximately, Mr. President. Since the Members should consider the method of construction of the Texas Building is comparable to any of the other Capitol Complex, the price of which is square?

MRS. CHARLES C. STEPHENS: Mr. President, I think that the answer is that by approximately to that the square footage is a combination of a mixed basement with concrete. I think that it is similar to the Governor's Administration Building. However there is more wood in the Governor Administration Building than the Texas Building, and perhaps the design is different. However, I do not think that it is so that this is maybe more than the building is not as expensively.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that we are confusing a little far from the original question. We are also having problems with this one and I am concerned that there is a lot of more practical in the Texas Bonds. I think it would be... well, I will allow one more minute period. The Chair would like actually simple my last time.

MR. D. ROGER WILSON: Mr. President, according to the figures given by the Member concerning the square footage per the actual office space, it looks like, total square feet of the building is nominal, or approximately 75 per cent. Is that correct?

MRS. THOMAS C. REAVLEY: I am not sure exactly what the number is. Perhaps the difference between the Universal and the net size square footage would be in reference to... or some measure that kind of accordion pleat to create the Texas Building or each floor because of the design. One has to make completely round of each floor. Perhaps that is where it is.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair declares another Mr. Nelson from.

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: [illegible] was just asked to [illegible] any buildings. The statute mysteriously [illegible] should not be the case. My question deals with other areas. I [illegible] the Members would advise the House whether any ongoing [illegible] reasonable or any unusual [illegible] in the 1982 budget would be figured as being [illegible] to achieve? I would ask what [illegible] would be applied to move [illegible] a serious [illegible] which we may be [illegible] over in [illegible] 1983 [illegible]

MRS. THELMA C. STEPHENSON: I do [illegible] ask the [illegible] to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I [illegible] in my [illegible]. I can only say that as a person [illegible], it would [illegible] to me that we should [illegible] a building [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: I think [illegible] we have [illegible] Rule 136. The Chair [illegible] Member [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: Would you [illegible] to [illegible] Rules 150 and 151, [illegible], Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: That [illegible] I think.

THE FIRST [illegible] MEMBER [illegible] TIME ON ANY ONE [illegible] FIVE [illegible] MINUTES FOR ANSWERS AND [illegible]

MR. TAY: Would the [illegible] Minister [illegible] how many [illegible] were convicted of [illegible] by the courts in 1982 and how many in 1983?

ANSWER: A total of 73 [illegible] were convicted by the courts in 1982 of [illegible]. The difference [illegible] non-[illegible] [illegible] by some individuals having [illegible] convicted of more than one [illegible].

In [illegible] 1983, 73 [illegible] have been convicted of [illegible], and a further 23 are awaiting [illegible]. The number of [illegible] would [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: If the Member wanted to ask [illegible] Mr. Speaker, [illegible], then [illegible] Both could be in order, I would [illegible].

THE FIRST SUPPLY MEMBER FOR [illegible] TIME ON ANY ONE [illegible] FIVE [illegible] MINUTES FOR ANSWERS AND [illegible]

MR. TAY: Would the Honourable Minister [illegible] how many [illegible] by categories, were [illegible] in 1982 and in the [illegible], 1983?

ANSWER: The [illegible] of [illegible], by [illegible], [illegible] here in 1982 and to the [illegible], 1983?

Counties	[illegible] persons
Canada	8,668 persons

And the [illegible] for 1983 so far are as follows:

Counties	1,800 [illegible]
Canada	3,042 persons
Rate (%)	[illegible]

MR. JAMES K. JONES: Mr. President, as this point I really don't have any explanation. I apologize. I will now go to the budget address. I am only trying to find out consensus and it seems as though we are not dealing the content of the efforts of Congress.

MR. DANFORTH: If my colleagues have a misunderstanding, perhaps the First elected Member from Indian Head would like to ask the next question.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FROM INDIAN HEAD HAS THE FLOOR.

MR. TEE: Would the Honorable Member state his reasons for the United States Congress, for more representative group here tonight, and now working with the Royal Guyana National Police Force. In what public and confident to what degree?

MR. JONES: Additional approval took place on this morning, considering legislative and Policy Implications. I understand that 8 Delegates have been nominated and all have taken an interest between August of last year and May of this year. The legislation also was on a paper nominate and the Congressional Policy Inspectors who are on a paper nominate are experts in their particular specialized fields. The main mandate is will not any delegation function including in Royal Guyana with a view to improving professional standards. The names of the officers and the duties to which they are concerned are as follows:

APPOINTED	FULL NAME	POST
25 Aug 84	Cpl Tony Fredericks	Administration
1 Nov 84	Cpl Shaw Finley	CID
22 Dec 84	Cpl Jacob Scott	Europe
1 Oct 84	Insp. Walter M.	Fingerprints
1 Nov 84	Insp Jones	Traffic & Communal Duties
16 Jul 85	Insp Thomas	Commercial Crime
4 Jan 85	Sgt Richmond	Traffic & Dispatch, Headquarters
15 Apr 85	Sgt Jones	Complaint & Radio
16 Apr 85	Sgt Rankin	Photographic & Source of crime
25 Apr 85	Sgt Bloomfield	Mrs. Duncan & Personnel Records
8 May 85	Sgt Rodriguez	Mrs Duncan & Traffic
8 May 85	Sgt Mahoney	Narcotics/Police Representative

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS:

MR. JAMES K. JONES: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wanted whether we could be informed whether all these officers are employed to assume the Commissioner are being assigned by them to the specialized to Indian, so that the Royal Guyana Police Force is possible to take over the duties which have been assigned to these people?

MR. HERBERT E. PORTER: Yes, Sir, there is provision in the contract for the withholding of some money from the engineer in the event of unsatisfactory work or unsatisfactory performance of the contract. This is true in the case of commercial projects. However the withholding is limited by statute. The most that can be withheld by Insurance Claims. The rest of their work has to be released by the owner.

MR. LANDGRAF: Is there in the provision anything...
Sorry.

MR. JAMES K. DOUGH: Two of these assignments for Tuesday are a little worry. On the assignments for Tuesday, the Senate confirmation hearings of Clarence Thomas and Robert Gates, will Senator Dole attempt to pursue the Bork nomination, and whether there will actually attempt the people and receive the votes necessary, or whether they are just trying? In the case of the hearings I find it difficult to understand why we would have the senior Senator from Kansas discussing Judge Bork's nomination on the Senate floor on the 23rd. I wonder just as much as the Senate Judiciary Committee does what they are?

MR. HERBERT E. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, on the first assignment only, the first part of it, the Pacific Offices... I think that the question was did they discuss issues of annexation? Due to the best of my knowledge, Sir, whenever they are ready or they need to go, they will do. I guess that they attend to their work as well.

On the second question, Sir, the person assigned there is not attached for the purpose of working the 23rd, Sir. There is quite a difference between working and operating the desk and operating the law. I am sorry. The first but I would specifically point the difference out. Sir, the hearings there is going to take place to hold. Every one member is that week they go on I said or something on the other like that, they will send the law and like to suppose it, whereas the person during the desk duties the desk and that is it.

MR. JAMES K. DOUGH: I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the Members assigned to the earlier session were all members of the Pacific Affairs and they covered here Pacific issues. I am concerned as to whether the law of Pacific is whether or not enough to cover the Pacific Rim, or is it not enough to warrant the action. So, I wonder how much help is being rendered? In the same case, Mr. Chairman, on the Pacific matter, I have two conferences in the next very certain conferences in the Islands especially. I have never been one of those Pacific Affairs Officers there. I do not think it should be left to the local officers in the event to make sure that they know that a decision conference has taken place. This is where they can manage and maybe they might help our Pacific Territorial Governments. God bless, they are just enough. So I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if these officers could receive more direct review or be used to support of them?

MAJ. DONALD M. HOUSE: Yes, Sir, I will pass that on. There was one point which the Marine Reserve officer on Guam raised recently because. They were about the fact that officers are making towards the change of our laws or rules to that effect.

HON. DENNIS E. MACKAY (Assiniboia): If it is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that this item has a committee which is looking at the traffic law. It was last session, right now I am sure, Mr. Chairman, I cannot really see whether the right from these people is going ahead from what we thought the road of the Traffic Committee, then that's legal to publicly open records or the votes, Sir.

MR. JAMES E. COWAN: Mr. Chairman, I do have another question I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the Member could advise the House whether these respective officers are employed on permanent casual positions, or whether it is the normal procedure, Sir, to have them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not really think that is a supplementary which arises out of the original question. It is a completely separate question and the Member can put it down as a question some time. However, I think there is just better place on.

MR. JAMES H. TAYLOR: I am quite willing to have the answer at this point. I just wanted to find out whether they do have the qualifications and how expensive they are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs have a supplementary. Alright, then we must go on to the next question.

MRS. SYLVIA L. WESLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the Honourable Minister whether I am right in assuming that, Sir, because of the casual nature, is disbursed to their employees, the casuals or their normal duties as well?

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Second Honourable Member for Wolseley has the next question.

QUESTION ASKED BY MR. JAMES H. TAYLOR: What was the Honourable Minister's reply to the total amount paid out in municipal pensions up until 1970 December, 1969, giving a breakdown for each Municipality?

ANSWER: No payments have been made to date. The total amount paid out in municipal pensions up to 1970 December, 1969, is $9,911, as a result of the recent Superannuation legislation September, 1969, payments to be made in December, 1970, for the calendar year 1971 by December:

To Municipalities (continued)

Swan River	@ $ 34,475	= 835.00	
West Lake	@ $ 64,400	= 930.00	
Souris Rural Municipality	@ $ 34,450	= 817.50	
Taraporte/ South Souris	@ $ 84,475	= 930.00	
Dauphin Rural	@ $ 84,475	= 835.00	
Virden Town	@ $ 84,450	= $ 9,000	
Deloraine Town	@ $ 34,450	= $ 1,850	$130,000.00
		O/S	$130,942.50

$ 225,220,980.00

To Minister of Housing - Operations:

Deputy Min.	1 @ $38,850.72	= $38,850.72	
	(Plus Luxury Tax @ 6% only)		
Asst. Dep.	4 @ 34,824	= 139,296	
Soldier Town	1 @ 49,974	= 49,974	$ 11,930.72
			$228,176.72

To Minister of Resources - Development

George Town	1 @ 41,514	= 41,514	
Asst. Dep.	1 @ 69,[illegible]	= 32,[illegible]	
Jamestown	1 @ 83,[illegible]	= 83,[illegible]	
Salmon Inlet	1 @ 35,[illegible]	= 32,312	$ 2,[illegible]
			$[illegible],304.72

To Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Resources

George Town	1	$34,[illegible].20* (Constitutional Amount of $[illegible])	
Asst. Dep.	4	144,[illegible].20	
Soldier Town	1	8 [illegible],[illegible].00	
Fort Neil	1	32,[illegible].24*	
Assets Sale	1	8 2,249	
Salmon Inlet		8 [illegible],[illegible]	$ 36,[illegible].40
			$[illegible],[illegible].60

NOTE: (a) * Pension for serving as Speaker should be included.

(b) Unemployment Insurance is [illegible] until the pool when an application has been processed to validate the claim for benefits.

(c) All other previous amounts have been submitted to the Treasury for payment in December, 1966.

(d) Penalties payable to the Tax Act, Tax be being held by the Crown.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. James M. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, Further the Minister advise the House whether the payments of these penalties are still being held up by the Financial Secretary, or is it that Government cannot afford to make the payments at this moment?

Mr. Orville C. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, no payments are being held up, Sir. The Treasury has its procedures to abide by, although the amendment was passed in September, 1966, it takes time to be processed before the Treasury Department. There are still some outstanding Ministerial, there are many claims which are coming through for which we have to seek clarification to support the validity of the claims. All Government may be as per usual practice. The payment for pensions have been submitted to the Treasury with the exception of those claims of Ministers. Some Ministers departed from which we have yet to receive the clarification from them.

MR. M. MARSHALL (Lab): Supplementary, Mr. President. Is the total figure given of £800, would the same figure relate to the debate in September?

MRS. THATCHER (Con): Mr. President, in the first month, before I answer Mr. Marshall, the hon. member for Vauxhall (Mr. Tilley) asked about "Operation Yellowhammer". Apparently the hypothetical date did not occur to him or that one.

I believe that I answered the Member to my one this one which I gave in May October. I believe that I answered quite clearly on I do make plans for Yellowhammer while engaged on work I say that I was giving a figure on Yellowhammer and a figure on Kosovo as I have to do all the time. This figure on Kosovo was not contingency because I do make that there are other Kosovos who did not present any risks to us going to military base statements.

MR. PRESIDENT: The next question. Perhaps the Member would like to ask her

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WEST SUFFOLK (MR. JAMES PAICE) [Question Withdrawn Personally for Written Answer]

Q3. MR. PAICE: Would the honourable Member say whether there has been any recent consideration of the Territorial Army regiment to train on other weapons?

MR. HOON: There has been no recent consideration. There is no change from the Conservative Government's plans on other weapons.

SUPPLEMENTARY:

MR. M. MARSHALL (Lab): Supplementary, Mr. President. I do not think whether I have it correctly or not. Did the Member say that there was no discussable body expenditure in some 300,000 of damage?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that the Member knows quite well that he did not have permission.

DECISION OF STANDING ORDER 22(7)

MR. D. DEVLIN (Lab): Mr. President, could I move that Standing Order 22(7) be suspended to enable the discussion on the Order Paper?

MR. SPEAKER: To my Standing Orders shows to me. Standing Order 22(7), whose I am reminded, said.

MR. D. DEVLIN (Lab): Sorry, Sir, Standing Order 22(7).

MR. PRESIDENT: Certainly you are very wise. I do think that it would be right that very long to consider before we accept question time. I think that it became the custom of the House to suspend Standing Orders when these questions such as the Order Paper had not all been asked by 11.00, we might find ourselves suspending Standing Orders daily, and we might encourage a habit of making a very great deal of announcements.

MR. PRESIDENT (presiding): I now have [illegible] to tackle the various [illegible] questions have not yet been resolved [illegible] the options.

MRS. MICHAEL J. [illegible]: Mr. President, point of [illegible] I do not think we need to do that.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Bell, I was just trying before the Member spoke to read through my Order Paper [illegible] last night. So do not need to do that. The question will be put on the Order Paper [illegible] at a later date...

MR. D. BRIAN [illegible]: Yes, Mr. ...

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: I hope it passes, Mr.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion that I put to be that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order XX(7) shall be suspended to enable the [illegible] Friday's Order Paper to be dealt with. Does any Member wish to speak to this motion? If not, I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. [illegible] accordingly, in accordance with Standing Order XX(7), to enable the [illegible] Order Paper to be dealt with.

MR. PRESIDENT: The next item, the second elected member for Rose City. Question No. 222.

MR. R. JOSEPH [illegible]: Mr. Minister, are the [illegible] online on the [illegible] Stockton Mine, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: Oh, I think we have finished the [illegible] questions. Well, I do not know. Perhaps if we [illegible] supplementaries, [illegible] enough, yes.

MR. R. JOSEPH [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I [illegible] question No. 135, Sir. I think I will have more [illegible] the debate.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR ROSE CITY TO ASK THE QUESTIONS LISTED ELECTED MEMBER FOR [illegible] CONSTITUENCY [illegible] ON BEHALF OF THE [illegible]

QUESTION 222: Would the Government Leader advise Council whether progress to exercise the option terminating the lease-purchase agreement to purchase the two Delta 2 underground engines of the mid-80's [illegible]?

ANSWER: There is no objection, at this time, to exercise the option to purchase the two Delta 2s [illegible] to the lease-purchase agreement.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: Is the answer that we will not exercise the option to purchase at this time, but that we will negotiate with the [illegible], or is the answer that we will not plan to exercise any [illegible] option to purchase [illegible]?

REP. W. NORMAN ADAMS: Mr. President, no decision has been taken as yet as to the question you have raised. That is a matter that we will consider with the PEP's later on.

SEN. JAMES M. ROBERTS: Is it contemplated on your part of the PEP's to finance of the PEP's?

REP. W. NORMAN ADAMS: Like anybody in business nowadays, I cannot say that is the answer. However, it is certainly an area which is being examined.

MR. O. WILLS ADAMS: Mr. President, will the Petroleum Exploration Purchase Agreement expire in the end of 1985?

MR. TABUCANON: Is your mean if his option expires at the end of 1985?

MR. O. WILLS ADAMS: Yes, the question arises...

MR. TABUCANON: It is the view this Petroleum Agreement which expires. It is the opinion, I think.

MR. H. LEWIS BURDEN: Yes, the question arises, Mr. Chairman Minister proposes to terminate the existing Petroleum Agreement, which I understand expires at the end of 1985. I am asking whether the Minister will ensure that the option to purchase expires on 1985 or not.

HON. A. NORMAN PEDDIE: Mr. President, generally the option to purchase does not expire on December 31st. I think in the Lease Petroleum Agreement provisions are made that the option could be exercised up until December, 1985. However, it certainly does not mean, I think that we will necessarily receive at this date.

SEN. JAMES M. BODDEN: Would the Government be seeking the assistance of some body experts and specialists before they would decide to go ahead with the PEP's to finance of the PEP's?

HON. W. NORMAN ADAMS: I believe that the company, Mr. President, has encouraged expert advice and enough expertise available at this time to make that decision, I will be sensible that that is the course the company should take.

SEN. JAMES M. BODDEN: Is the decision depending on the economic advice which was tendered by the Petroleum Team, or what other advice is he basing his reply on?

HON. W. NORMAN ADAMS: The advice would be based partly on the report from the Petroleum Team. However, some other Petroleum Consultants did a study for Cayman Airways on exploration and we have also already invited to comment on the Petroleum's decision on this matter.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Is there not express statute of making the decision clear that relying on the report when the Minister has mentioned?

HON. W. NORMAN ADAMS: I am sure that there are people who Cayman Airways who are capable of giving Petroleum decisions. I think that when decisions are made they should be properly considered and it is the role of the Board of Cayman Airways and Government to take these views and make the right decision, a decision which will not be misunderstood.

MR. JAMES M. BARRY: Can you do that now in sufficiently comprehensible terms for this audience?

MRS. M. MERRILL ROBERTS: As this fiscal analysis, Mr. Chairman, I think the decision should be made. However, I feel that I am capable of explaining the actions which I and four others did in this fiscal matter before making a decision. I would ask, sir, as to how the decision would be made.

MR. JOHN M. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested to note that this Government is capable of making a decision. However, I agree by far that the decision is better made to give the GSA's over the GSA's. because then we will know for sure.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order. The Chair must ask the audience not make statements.

MR. JAMES M. BARRY: I agree, Sir. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

THE CHAIR DIRECTS MEMBERS' ATTENTION TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE MATTERS: AMENDMENTS FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. LEE: Would the Honourable Member state for which course will it when seats formally be originally been found in expense and assistants been employed by Gen. Armed Affairs Committee, Israel?

ANSWER: Since November, 1963, there were 4 foreign experts in the Scientific Development and Research Institute, namely, Yehuda Dinstein as Deputy Dean, Agricultural Engineering Division on a grant of approximately $34,440.00; Dan in the Tropical Agriculture and Plant Protection Division on a grant of approximately $27,979; Dan in the Scientific Communications, Works and Transport Administration providing Public Administration and Law Enforcement on a grant of $26,431.76, Dan in the Department of Physical Education with Physics in Conditions, Research Development, Chemistry, Industrial Applications on a grant of $82,203.00; And Dan in the Scientific of Marine Engineering and Education. Surveys the Fields of Marine Oceanography and Education. These, however, were funded by the United Nations Development Fund and the GSTT Government and Technical Cooperation respectively and I have no more to this statement.

The total number of foreign experts and technicians from November, 1963, to December 31.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. DALE DOUGH: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if the Agent on Health has made the arrangements to ask the question?

MRS. ERNEST M. ROBERTS: Mr. President, I do not object that I was unsure that I was to ask the information about I have gathered but I do not really have the answer to that, sir.

MR. G. MAYO OLSON: Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if the report on Building Codes discussed the work which has been done specifically on the building code, or is the building [illegible] also under?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: Mr. President, I believe, Mr. [illegible] the answer was in working closely with the Board of Standards or Assembly, by way of [illegible] a code which is acceptable and which would apply to the municipalities [illegible].

MR. R. MERRETT SMITH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Have any experts brought to [illegible].

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: No, sir.

MR. R. MERRETT SMITH: Not [illegible].

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: No, sir.

MR. R. MERRETT SMITH: 1969?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question returns to the motion of [illegible] December, 1969, so I do not think possibly that supplementaries [illegible] have legal [illegible].

MR. R. MERRETT SMITH: Thank you very much, sir. I believe I will get the question answered [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Oh, it is a perfectly proper question. It is just not a proper supplementary. If that answers the supplementary I think perhaps the Senator might take that answer [illegible]. So I will suggest [illegible] not have, I am afraid.

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: I did not rise on a point of order as a supplementary on this question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I apologize. I guessed for a moment and did not see anybody standing up [illegible], I'm sure [illegible] supplementary, I will accept that.

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: Are the services also provided for [illegible] Assembly rooms included in this?

HON. DENNIS E. FOSTER: No, sir, that is [illegible]. That is a [illegible]. It is not included in this at all.

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: Is the question [illegible] to [illegible] at the [illegible] Provincial [illegible] [illegible] by the agreement with Government to [illegible] by the New Form of [illegible] in making the [illegible]

HON. DENNIS E. [illegible]: The answer, sir, was in [illegible] by [illegible] of the Members, Mr. Speaker, [illegible] Provincial Buildings [illegible] [illegible] which is a [illegible] that another [illegible] responsibility for. Secondly, we have advised the Members that the Government [illegible] responsibilities regarding the Provincial [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. COLLINS: Based on the questions and the discussion, Mr. President, I think that my question would be appropriate for voting, because the question does deal with two amendments. I wonder whether the Member would advise the House if under the terms of the Presidential and Vice-Presidential debates who were brought in, is that still bound by the agreement with Government or would it be type of journals in the holding of votes?

MR. PRESIDENT: I really think if the Member wants to ask that, it needs to be a parliamentary inquiry. The question certainly could have now on which issue and at what stage have been brought in. If an explanation could be given, in the detailed questionary about kind or way of the misunderstanding with on each of the various amendments, then I think that it is really not going to be possible for the Member who amended originally to deal with the bill. I think having entertained the two, if you want to ask questions about the different amendments did or recommended, or whatever, they could deal to the appropriate questions addressed to the appropriate Member.

MR. JAMES M. COLLINS: Well, I am sure that there will be no trouble ascertaining the vote whether because it will be readily understood. Is it possible for the Speaker Pro Tempore to make a decision without having to venture into areas

MR. PRESIDENT: I think there is perhaps a physical question. The Second Elected Member for West Bay will then the Second Member for Middle Town.

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, a supplementary, Sir. Was the original brought in as a Private Member?

MR. JAMES M. CONNOR: To the best of my knowledge, Sir, they were one before, as far as I know, Sir.

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

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Before what, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town. We remain on task before.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Mr. President, I would like to put it that figures given at the most moderate, the figure paid by the agencies, or does it also include additional remuneration, also please and we can?

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, yes, yes, this is all included. A lot of our agencies are also Caribbean Associates Insurance and we give them a credit [illegible] per week, and so [illegible] accommodation. If we really had to pay the high price of salaries to outside experts it would cost us a lot more, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. BODDEN: Mr. President, I do agree with what the Member just said. It is a good thing that we can start using people. Even the experts have knowledge [illegible], or else to provide rental accommodation such as hotels, who will we provide them with accountability for their entire stay?

MR. DENNIS H. DUNN: Mr. President, in the view of my brother, Sir, we generally plan a recess from time to time so that we have opportunity to be advised by the leaders of the House, whether or not there is any business, or what have you. I think that we should recess, sir.

MR. PRESIDING: As there is no objection by the gentleman, I will put that motion immediately. Motion agreed.

AT 11.2- THE HOUSE RECESSED

MONDAY MORNING: 22.07 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated,
Item 2 on the Order Paper, Government Business. (1)(a) Acceptance of Standing Orders.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 46 (a). 1/

MR. MICHAEL J. HARRIS: Mr. President, Standing Order provides that notice shall be given of a certain number of days in advance of which it is to be put down. Normally Order 46 provides that any Bill shall be printed and thirty copies thereof may not all Standing may be taken on the next day.

Mr. President, knowing unless you instructed to make amendments fully, frank and informed discussion takes place on matters before this Assembly. However, Standing Orders are not our masters but our servants, and while I am normally reluctant to any attempt to move the suspension of Standing Orders, I have no hesitation in doing so tonight, in particular since there is no point to be obtained by the public interests that such Standing Orders should be suspended to enable, as will happen in this instance, certainly the effect of taking out an amendment to be considered immediately.

Mr. Speaker, as I will explain in greater detail later, if Standing Orders are to be suspended by this honourable House today, I will move the second reading of a short Bill entitled the Appropriation (Supplementary) Bill, 1967 which will provide all moneys taken which are under the Appropriation Laws, but, because of an oversight, that has not been brought into force.

This suspension of Standing Orders, Mr. President, is, I would urge members of the House, for the public good so that an unfortunate situation may be avoided if such is possible. I would move and ask that all members agree to the suspension of Standing Orders so that if the amendments which I am going there is

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources in connection with the publication of Standing Order 37, speaking Order 37 and 37 be suspended for the purpose of receiving all stages of the Petroleum Placers Protection Bill, 1974 in the House. How may Minister wish to speak?

ISSUANCE OF SUBSCRIPTION OF SECURITIES UNDER BILL 37

HON. G. MILLS (PEACE): Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of the Honourable Member dealing with the bill I would like to express the intention of these Standing Orders.

I do not agree with what Mr. Speaker in Friday that it should be presented to the House. However because of the grave nature of this bill and because of its very importance, we cannot allow this bill to be withdrawn through the House in one day.

The bill has not been presented. The bill was not read in the House to date. The bill has not been given to the public. The bill was not discussed in the Cabinet for which I am in duty to be not a requirement for bills. Nevertheless, important legal matters must be dealt with so that we can get some feedback and I am very glad that this bill is being put forward by this Member by . Government has decided to do away with what they called the withdrawing of bills through the House without public knowledge.

I am also pleased that suggestions by the Standing Orders be sought to deal with a piece of retroactive legislation, when the new Government was elected before the general that there would never be any retroactive legislation.

I will be dealing with the contents of the bill if the motion is successful in getting the Bill before the House. However, I am going to warn this in every way I must not be a party to any would pursue this case already been considered.

I intend to move the introduction of the bill as soon as I am assured the suspension of the Standing Orders, and would suggest that members in the Opposite of the public take the action really which is necessary to have this Bill published in the Gazette so that the public may see what is in it before we deal with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the mover of the motion wish to exercise his right of reply?

HON. MICHAEL J. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the circumstances of dealing Orders is necessary for the public and for the whole Body of the Cabinet Cabinet. What is now happening by Mr. Speaker, is to suspend Standing Orders with a view to withdrawing all stages of the Petroleum Placers Protection Bill, this is the latter today. This is not a rush action in Cabinet. It is a rush to make sure that the public is aware that we intend to stop the effects of the Petroleum Placers Act which was passed in 1973, and the Petroleum Act passed in Standing Order Order passed in 1972, that is just which we are dealing with. Some of these Bills and the work and preparation which have been made for withdrawing of Bills people have worked upon for, that we know it is possible that there people be amazed that when we have to this date and the House might pause and think properly. We do not recommend legislation. We do withdrawing here before and want by the Speaker right of Standing Orders based on the assumption that the Act was to be withdrawn so we have the Act and have brought this procedure.

MR. MECHEM of [illegible]: Mr. President, I will explain the [illegible] when, if necessary after the disposition of routine business, I move the Senate recess at the close.

MR. MECHEM: The question is that Calendar Order No. 1 be suspended and noted by the unanimous consent agreement for the purpose of enabling consideration of the Mutualized Income Maintenance Bill, 1960 to be taken.

CALENDAR NO. [illegible] A BILL AND NOTE

MR. [illegible]: May I have a statement, Mr. President?

MR. MECHEM: Certainly.

AMENDMENT NO. [illegible]

AYES

Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

NAYS

Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

[illegible]

ANSWERED BY NEGATIVE: [illegible]

BY PRESIDENT: So, the [illegible].

THE [illegible] BILL, 1960

FIRST READING

CLERK: A BILL [illegible].

THE PRESIDENT: The bill will be read a first time and is set aside for second reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE [illegible] BILL, 1960.

MR. MECHEM of [illegible]: Mr. President, I beg to move the second reading of a bill recently submitted the Mutualized Income Maintenance Bill, 1960.

Mr. President, for many years the [illegible] concerning the disposition of [illegible] has been the Senate for [illegible]. In 1958, a number of [illegible]

HON. MICHAEL J. MASSEY (CONTINUING): ...changes were made to local election legislation for the United Kingdom by the Representation of the People Act of 1969 and the Representation Orders Act of 1970. A new law establishing the Electoral Commission was introduced into the Legislature previously in May 1979.

This new law (or Act), which was known as Bill 100 and signed by the then Governor, was first drafted in the 1960's and passed by the Legislature, after a number of changes to the Law. Briefly, in discussions the underlying principle of a simple one man one vote should be an absolute guiding force, though in fact it may still be a ground for the inclusion of the names of persons who are ordinarily but temporarily absent. Secondly, we are told that the particular remedy of a decree of disqualification of elected members was abolished, and it was considered that it would no longer be possible for an aggrieved candidate to petition his opponent's election, he was for one member elected for his party's candidacy.

Thirdly, a penalty was put of ordinary £1,000 was no longer held as sufficient grounds for dismissal, and the rule by which candidates party could bring proceedings for dismissal until the campaign had elapsed for three months had been modified.

Fourthly, it abolished the Governor-in-Council because the cause for the purpose of financial qualifications and property requirements. In other words, the abolition of the decree also since it was provided that disqualification should not be grounds except all disabling matters had been removed by other orders. It provides that a decree of disqualification would not be granted unless the marriage appeared unlawfully in more broken down. In view of that the question of consequential of a married officer into the Magistrate.

It also provides for the abolition of party lists in which for a determination of nationality and will contain clarifications regarding the acquisition of foreign citizen descent.

Mr. President, that Law which unfortunately changed the basis of our Act of Parliament, which was an enlightened measure, passed through all its stages in mid 1979. However, clause 3 of this Law provides, and I quote:-

> "This Law may be cited as the Representation Orders Law, and shall come into operation on a day to be appointed by the Governor by notice in the Gazette after the requirements of Her Majesty's pleasure has been obtained."

This phrase which was used in the Government's wisdom was made necessary because under Royal Instructions of 1962, which are the responsibility of Power from Her Majesty the Queen to the Governor of the Cayman Islands, it is provided that in relation to any Bill for the Peace of Parliament, that such will not be assented to by the Governor unless it contains a clause suspending the operation until the Majesty's signification of her pleasure has been obtained. That clause was contained in clause 2 of the 1979 Law. It is a clause which was necessary so that Law became it is one of the matters which under Royal Instructions is required of sufficient importance to the peace of these Islands and to the Crown of these Islands, that Her Majesty's Government has Majesty will be informed before such Law goes into effect.

Mr. President, after this Law was passed in June, 1979, we then received the Deputy the Governor can notified by a Secretary of State that the Bases of Disqualification would not be examined in respect of this Law.

MR. MICHAEL J. SPRIGGS (HAMPDEN): I notice in my constituency newspaper, the Clutha Leader, of 6th February, 1977, on Monday, 14th February, which is tomorrow week, at Balclutha, there is a meeting to be held at 8 o'clock in the Balclutha Town Hall, and the explanation which was the explanation regarding the Retrospective Clause has also stated that it had been requested by the Secretary for Justice on the 9th February, 1977. That explanation appeared on the front page two columns, and I quote:-

"Date of Operation 14 February, 1977".

However, there was not mentioned in that Gazette Notice whether the Governor approved such date as the date on which the Act came into operation. It is merely given through to the public in the form of the Act that it came into operation on that date, if in fact that was not so.

Does the Attorney-General, because of these circumstances, intend to do such as to ask the Governor from that date to have published in the Gazette. Those matters do not appear in the Gazette Notice whatsoever, Sir.

Since the fact, the Retrospective Clause has been brought into effect, both of the provisions is that the Act applies. Some of that legislation is unclear. However, I would say it is unfortunate that the fact is apparent, the Penal Code of the Cayman Islands was since 14th February, been interpreting to exclude the Philippines and powers under that Act. It has the power to do so, until legislation again, including decision of Director and Military made unfortunately under that Act, have no legal effect.

In order to regularise the position and to give the force of law to the actions of the Penal Code since that date, it is necessary that a retrospective Act should be passed by this Legislature Assembly. That Bill which is entitled the Provisional Clause Validation Bill, has to my mind the support of this Honourable House. That Bill, Mr. Speaker, is a short one Clause Bill, and after the short title, the second clause states:-

"Anything which has been done between the 14th day of February, 1977 and the 2nd day of December, 1977 in pursuance of any power conferred by the Provisional Clause Act which would have been lawfully done if that Act had come into operation on the 14th day of February, 1977, shall for all purposes whatsoever be deemed to have been lawfully done and shall have effect as is deemed to have had effect accordingly."

The short Bill has been prepared and has the blessing of the Honourable Chief Minister. The Bill seeks to do nothing more than legislate to give effect to what every person in this Assembly understood to be the position, namely that the 1972 Provisional Clause has come into force.

Consequently with the recommendation of this Bill before this Legislative Assembly, there has to be certain necessary Orders today, been published a notice which appeared today, the 2nd day of December as the date upon which the Act became into operation. The Bill which I commend to members of this Honourable House seeks to cover the period between the time to the Honourable Speaker with recommendation and the time to which it actually be brought into operation.

MR. WILLIAMS of PRESTON (Conservative): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion, Mr. President, in the fervent hope that effective and immediate steps be taken to remedy the not only that, Mr. Speaker, as the MP for Preston that this will provide, if this Association takes no action, some relief to that people in our community will know that there is someone who they thought to care; and that House will be in recognition, we understand the disturbing when people are cause that the Government in power would like to be thought here.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as a MP, I would hope would have the unfortunate misfortune of the Minister of this House. It seems to me a disagreement between you and unresolved for many years.

Mr. President, I commend the Bill to the favourable consideration of this Assembly.

HON. SPEAKER: The motion is that a Bill entitled The Assignment Orders (Maintenance) Bill, 1973 be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. The Second Elected Member for George Town Central has the floor.

Debate on Second Reading

HON. TIBERIUS A. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I think that I have not spoken before since I have been in the House this year, and I will confine the Government Bench by supporting this Bill. However, this supports to the idea contribution that the present Government would like the Bill have on record.

Generally, I am also appreciative of the difficulty which is being faced by the people in the Islands in these two areas in most cases of late.

Mr. President, I do not see the purpose of this Bill. While I too am inclined to sympathetic explanation, as I will be discussing these points. I can see that this explanation of this Law cannot be achieved. Section 6 of the Bill for a fine to maintain some from under the Matrimonial Causes Law Cap. 9 of 1970. Under this any matter which has been known that this day of February, 1973 be so fair.

Mr. President, in the given matter which we have before us, and I understand that this was being published today, we are where this Bill comes.

Section No. 3 of the Gazette which carried the Law did not contain in this Gazette any notice whereby the Governor appointed a date. This is to have a great confusion. I believe that since the Gazette was not read this is to be interesting to. Particularly that since Part VI Section of the Ordinance that was also known.

The only observation which I may Mr. President, in this Assembly, is that perhaps the Attorney-Generals Office Senior should have taken a little more time to do a proper compilation of this amending Law. Such errors I can appreciate that the amendment made in 1972 took me a long way, it is still my feeling that much more could be done to improve the Law. I am sure not only be done in the interests of Government but to make it good for the people who will make the Ordinance.

I am happy that the Constitutional Review Committee will, that I serve, that the Legal Department will take the opportunity to consider this Law again in the near future, with the view to producing a more workable and flexible Law. You may have taken the full interest of the Law in this session.

Mr. Speaker, I support this motion.

HON. [illegible]: Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Deputy Director for Eastern Times.

MR. C. RATTRAY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to intervene in the debate of this Government which regard to this Law. I shall speak what ought to be taken to prevent abstainers to occur. What I am impatient to hear I will also hope, should matter being we just begin.

The Bill before the House seeks to validate certain of the acts which were done in good faith. However, the members of this House today cannot do such unless, in fact we can validate the actions of the courts done under the Law, the Law must be in operation. In the first instance it is advisable for the Government that the Law has not yet been into operation. One sentence reads as I quote:-

> "As a matter, even though it is subject to the fact of the Law that it came into operation on that date it is just not yet so,"

In another paragraph it reads, and I quote:-

> "Since the Multinational Courts Law has not in fact not been brought into existence I am precluded of the opinion."

So, it is clear that the Law is not in operation and no certain actions of a Law which are not in accordance, without the Law into operation.

Now, I heard about a memorandum which will be published today to put into Law into operation and the notice which I have a copy of almost put this Law into operation today now only other time, because of one Lord at the time the Bill mentions, and will see that the two ways that it will come into operation on a day to be appointed by the Government. The notice which is put out is saying that Secretary-General of Community is putting the Law into operation. If one considers the interpretation of the Law, that will see that the word "Government" is not defined. In most of our Laws, the word "Government" is defined as meaning the Government-in-Council. However, in this particular Law, the word "Government" is not defined as Government in Council. So, the word "Government" here means the Government in the ordinary sense. This principle upon why I mention already in the Bill before them is that the Secretary-General, which I understand has now duly carried out this Law into operation, because the Minister should that Secretary-General appreciate the fact of Kenya, that on the day on which them was shall come into operation, and the Government has no authority of all these this Law. It is simply the Secretary, which I feel, have only for give that when the word "Government" appears without a definition to mean Government-in-Council, as mean Secretary-General, and this will mean Government-in-Council. So, how can Government-in-Council put into a motion to bring this Law into operation, when the Government-in-Council has no authority under the Law?

So, here again, we have a very ambiguous - mean that Minister think that we should amend the Law, the original Bill to change the word "Government" to Government-in-Council, or add it in the interpretation so that how we they Government-in-Council can take the action of view to help, or the administration will have to be carried this matter that was immediately as it were void, at that things that we just might.

MR. G. MAYO ADAMS (COURTENAY): I, too, welcome the Bill, even though I am not quite sure that even the legislation on the original basis can properly be considered by the Executive Council. They seem to have been made by a hand-picked team for the month, and are called the Provisional Council Rules of Procedure, made by the Local Government Act by the Governor-in-Council. So, already we see the situation that the actions are matters of the Governor and the Council, and not necessarily matters for the Executive Council. So, while it is a perfect right and one often legally allowed, it is not necessarily welcome

MR. SPEAKER: [illegible]

MR. DUNCAN G. PAIRMAN: [illegible]

Mr. Speaker said that he was surprised that when we were debating this legislation [illegible] Government Business Law (Cap. 2 of 1978).

[illegible] the Bill because the present Government was the last Government. The speaker drew to my attention to the fact that under Section 4(2) of the Interpretation, Revocation and General Provisions Law (1978 Revision), the power to revoke, amend or vary orders, rules, regulations, proclamations, notices, directions, schemes, plans, agreements, bylaws, licences, permissions, authorisations, delegations, appointments, designations, recognitions, registrations, certificates, securities, consents, permits, instruments, conditions, forms, fees or charges made or issued under any Law or other instrument made under any Law may be exercised in like manner and subject to the like consent, conditions (if any) and procedure as are prescribed in the Law in relation to the making of the original instrument.

I am concerned, Mr. President, that Members could have the publication that although a Bill of this nature can also [illegible] Members of this newly elected House thought that they were getting a Bill which would be implemented immediately [illegible] Government's policies on [illegible] Law. Mr. President, I should also like to [illegible] I am also surprised at the suggestion of the Minister of Health, Housing and Social Development that when we were debating this Bill that we should also be debating the Government Business Law (Cap. 2 of 1978).

One Member said that he was surprised that the Minister for Health, Housing and Social Development would call the vote on the Bill, and suggested that when we were debating this Bill the House should also be debating the Government Business Law (Cap. 2 of 1978). I wished the Speaker would note that the Government is in a dilemma and that is even acknowledged with it. Mr. President, this dilemma was caused by the 1972 to 1976 Government, not the present Government or the last Government. The reason given by that Minister was to [illegible] bring this Bill. That is that under Royal Instruction, 1975, which the Constitution gives to Her Majesty to [illegible] Colony, [illegible] the absence of [illegible] the Governor [illegible] I would humbly [illegible] that is that Her Majesty's representative in the Law must be considered. [illegible] July 1976 and placed in the Law which the Law was passed in 1978. It was in February, 1977 when the Constitution which was [illegible] took place. That was when the [illegible] Government's [illegible] Law [illegible] the Law as [illegible].

I am concerned, Mr. President, that Members could have the publication that although a Bill of this nature can also [illegible] Members of this newly elected House thought that they were getting a Bill which would be implemented immediately [illegible] Government's policies on [illegible] Law. Mr. President, I should also like to [illegible] I am also surprised at the suggestion of the Minister of Health, Housing and Social Development that when we were debating this Bill that we should also be debating the Government Business Law (Cap. 2 of 1978).

I am particularly disappointed at the [illegible] legislation and the suggestion of Standing Orders be [illegible] through this House. However, Mr. President, this is still [illegible] may benefit the community as [illegible] be changed, [illegible] Government to do what is supposed to do, and that is to [illegible] this Bill through [illegible] of the House [illegible] I do not believe that we should be [illegible] the public interest. [illegible] the passage of this Bill is [illegible] which was done between the 20th day of February, 1977 and today, that is anything which was done or authorised to have been done under the Interpretation, Revocation and General Provisions Law (Cap. 2 of 1978).

I do not believe, Mr. President, that it would be [illegible] for Members to understand why it is [illegible] Minister or Members of this House to be [illegible] that it does appear to be a [illegible] Secondly, Mr. President, [illegible] which would have worked and carried [illegible] of the Minister, I believe that as a [illegible] of Government, it is my duty to [illegible] the [illegible] of people who have been [illegible] Bill.

MRS. ROSEMARY D. STACHEL (CONSTABLE): Mr. President, I wish to move to dismiss these cases, not due to their possible lack of merit or consideration of the 1979 Amendments. With reference, if we can be given an assessment, maybe someone can comment on the application of the 1979 Amendment.

MR. JAMES M. BOLLES: On a point of order, Mr. President,

MR. PRESIDING: If you have a point of order, yes. Does your call me under what standing order?

MR. JAMES M. BOLLES: Standing Order 21(a).

MR. PRESIDING: Standing Order 21(a). Sure, if you would direct my attention to the point, then.

MR. JAMES M. BOLLES: Mr. President, I was actually glad the Member spoke [illegible] on the floor of this Order Book Assessment the first time, and did not interrupt. The second time I could not do so. I have [illegible] on the personal property. The Law does provide exemptions of which this Member speaking was an integral part.

MR. PRESIDING: I really do not think that this is a point of order. You have a chance to come and now make your point during the speech.

MR. JAMES M. BOLLES: Yes, Sir, but it is an important part of it, Sir. I'm explaining to you why I am objecting.

MR. PRESIDING: You are explaining it to me not a point of order. The Member to my left and right is anything which he has a say.

MR. JAMES M. BOLLES: To the end of order because it is an inaccurate statement.

MR. STEPHEN A. PERRONE: On a point of order, Mr. President. It would seem, Sir, that if the Member is substantially misleading the public and the Member wishes to inform or correct misleading information, then it is a correct point of order.

MR. PRESIDING: I think that it has been made plain already that the Law was originally passed in 1979 under the Amendment. However, the Statute was split in February, 1979 under another Amendment.

MR. JAMES M. BOLLES: Mr. President, this is inaccurate also, because in this Order, particularly since the Amendment to Section [illegible], it quite clear that the responsibility for a county [illegible] passed by this Order, is on [illegible] responsibility of the Elected Member of this Board. It is the responsibility of personal and [illegible] personal. Some of this [illegible] which were sent to Personal Property to be published on [illegible] as the [illegible] published. I received [illegible] which you read I am fully aware of this. This Law has printed [illegible] the Assessment Act [illegible]. It is on every page of it. So, this [illegible] the [illegible] of the Duly Elected Assessment and I will not accept it as [illegible] and keep my mouth shut.

MR. JAMES M. BYRNE (CONTINUED): I will also bring to your attention as I stand here that this responsibility primarily of the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General was also responsible for what happened to me Mr. Speaker who was the learned Leader of the Government of which the Member was a part of. If he had any knowledge to his duties charged of proper policies ...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Premier, you rose on a point of order. I would like the Member now on a point of order. Now I am not prepared to give way to the Member to make a speech.

MR. JAMES M. BYRNE: I am not making a speech, Mr. Speaker, what he seems to be that I will keep this from being unconstitutional by his interpretation. I am not convinced there that. I am relying on a point of order that the Speaker to misleading the public of Canada that I for one will not stand idly by and let that happen, because that....

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister, you have made your point. I will now rule on it. As I repeatedly have that at which the necessary notice should have published in the Gazette was February 1979, that is the time after a formal election of the time that the Government in power was not the Government which had been in power at the time the writs issued. The responsibility is by the executive that is for the Attorney-General and the Province, not for Canada as a whole or any majority of majority from Lewisporte.... (INAUDIBLE).... So, I will finish - brought into force and effective I think that that is a fair matter to make.

MR. JAMES M. BYRNE: Mr. Speaker, I am very thankful to your clarification that there is the responsibility of not only the Attorney-General the Province, the Executive Council.

MR. SPEAKER: order to repeat the point. The mistake was made in February, 1979. I think that is why the circumstances of the officials concerned, the Minister and...

MR. JAMES M. BYRNE: What is quite relevant. I am willing to accept that, but not to accept what the Member said that it was the responsibility of the Holy Name Government, because it certainly was not. It was Newfoundland under the Executive administration.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that if the Member had been present, he would have noted one of the outstanding qualities making it a speech parliamentarians should and should not have. Now, just stop it, please and keep. Now. That is not for us to say. However, I do think that it is unfortunate that this debate should be dealing into an argument about House politics. I do not think that it was the Honourable First Elected Member of Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, Hon. Member of the House.

MR. JAMES M. BYRNE: Mr. Speaker, again, I rise objection to what you said that if I had been present. I have been here in the Chamber all morning, since we opened. I think I was one of the first Members to arrive in the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: However, you were not for a quarter of an hour, lucky minutes earlier.

MR. JAMES M. BUCKLEY: I was in the Committee [illegible] and, but nobody [illegible] that we just couldn't have [illegible] there.

MR. PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon. I did not know that you wanted.

MRS. [illegible] D. [illegible]: Mr. President, if the Secretary has finished with his [illegible] I would like to point out to the Assembly, in view of the remarks which I made [illegible] that the Government is to be [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: Well....

MRS. [illegible] D. [illegible]: What was in existence as a result [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. BUCKLEY: Again....

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order. Would you, Mr. [illegible], please [illegible] remarks are [illegible] on this point at present [illegible] and [illegible] that point. Would you please [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. BUCKLEY: Mr. President, please....

MR. PRESIDENT: No, I am [illegible], please [illegible]. If you have a point of order you can [illegible] Rule [illegible]. Secretary, [illegible] the amendment [illegible] 2.10 p.m.

AT 12.50 P.M. THE MEETING ADJOURNED

RESUMED AT 2.10 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Before we proceed with the debate, I would just like to make one point concerning a point that I may unwittingly have introduced the Rules into this morning when giving a ruling. I said that it would be in order additionally to the proposed ability of the Secretary-General to take action to [illegible] that any fact should have resulted by this Regional Treaty, was also [illegible] a provision which said that it was to be brought into effect by a majority published in the Assembly [illegible] that all which it was to take effect, was only that effect. I made that mistake [illegible] Secretary-General would be responsible for [illegible] Rules, as it is a little bit more complicated than that.

It would appear on the [illegible] that, for example, in case a case which was [illegible] Khalkuna the Mandate from Administration [illegible] of the [illegible] Mandate to facilitate the action because it would be [illegible] the date we should be brought into effect.

MR. PRESIDING OFFICER: We would probably profitably vote the recommendation be brought back to-night. What I am not sure of is the part of the law which we have been discussing, because the law which we have been discussing, the Environment Control Law of 1972, was the responsibility of the then Attorney-General. So, it would have been the Governor and the Attorney-General because then who should make looks the motion.

However, I did not want Members to be left with the impression which I think I gave wrongly earlier that it would always be from the Governor and the Attorney General. It could depend what particular Members are responsible for the Bill in question.

The Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council now Managing. However, I am not sure whether the First Elected Member for Sudden Lane had another point of order.

MR. JAMES M. SAUNDERS: Yes, Sir, I have a point of order. The Member said I do not know if I can quote him exactly but in his speech he gave the impression that I was not in the Chamber and that I was not paying the attention. I was in the Chamber as I am sure the Member recalls, because I rose at once the same time that he did. However, knowing that my colleagues had unanimously spoken and wanting to hear what the response would be from a position, I sat down in deference to him. Now this is why I remained the Member....

MR. SPEAKER: I think that this is getting beyond a point of order. A point of order has now been made. I did not hear him say that. I thought that I myself said it and have, as I always, complete confidence. However, if the Member did say it, then it is noted that he may have been mistaken.

HON. LEWIS D. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I did say that the Member was not in the Chamber and I was correct. It was in the circumstance of the Chamber that he was not in the Chamber. It was in the Committee room as he admitted himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Some of the time he was in the Chamber and some of the time he was in the committee.

MR. JAMES M. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, on the point which he has just mentioned, I was in the Chamber and I rose to my feet to speak. He rose to his feet. I sat down and let him proceed.

HON. LEWIS D. EVANS: I am not blind. What do you I think that the Member left the House in the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of interruption I was saying the point that my colleagues as elected Members of Government was proffered by the members, and understood to become sure by the Members when they are elected, that if any elected Government was in the House for what happened. It could not be the 1972 to 1976 Government. It would have to be a 1976 Government, and I submit to them, Sir, having made the qualification if any elected Government is to be bound.

The Law which is now passed in 1977 was properly drafted, properly passed, and the unfortunate incident which we are having to pursue today, occasioned by the time there has been a change of Government.

[illegible] SPEAKER [illegible]: [illegible] I will [illegible] speak that bill, which [illegible] I am [illegible] I will accept [illegible]. [illegible] special [illegible] brought [illegible]. That [illegible] understood. That is, no [illegible] from [illegible] [illegible] of the last [illegible], it has been [illegible] the law is therefore [illegible] in effect.

I should [illegible], Mr. President, that this bill [illegible] have been passed without debate. It was not my intention to speak on the subject. However, there is one point on which I might as well answer [illegible]. Since [illegible] I will not [illegible] be able to be present [illegible], if I am [illegible] in the [illegible], what happened on [illegible] when [illegible] the question I will [illegible] to take [illegible] expressions [illegible] the minds of the [illegible]. I am [illegible] to object, [illegible] personally [illegible] which I have [illegible] a year ago, however, I have never done anything to the [illegible] of [illegible] the help of [illegible] I am not going to do it on the [illegible].

This bill, as I understand, has my [illegible]. There are many [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] are [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. As a result, I believe that Government [illegible] [illegible], for [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] will [illegible] have effect [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

There [illegible] [illegible] more I can add, Mr. President, to what I have said and I believe that [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible]. Therefore, I am [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible]. I am just going to ask [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

Thank you.

MR. MCCARTHY: The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

MR. JAMES E. CARTER: Mr. President, I wish to [illegible] of [illegible], I would like to bring to the attention of Members the [illegible] [illegible] regarding the [illegible] [illegible]. It says [illegible]:

> "[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

HON. GEORGE H. GRANT (CONSTITUENCY): ...this present Government is only trying to rectify a situation which was brought about through circumstances not taken care of when it ought to have been. At this time, I would like to place my full support to the passing of this motion, if presented today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Chief Minister and Minister of Development Council.

HON. CAPT. CHARLES F. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support of this very short motion before the House. It is a most capable bill and a very delicate one. I am not inclined that either the 1974 or 1976 administration is responsible for the unfortunate arrest of criminals or criminals committed between 1970 and 1974. Until you find out, Sir, I take pleasure of the opinion that once a bill left the House, it was then in the hands of the Legal Department and it was entirely the responsibility of members of this House or of the Executive Council. I assure Members that it was the responsibility of the Legal Department to follow through on whatever was necessary to make the bill into a law.

Having said that, Sir, I think that we are only spending valuable time trying to blame each other. If we don't believe in retroactive legislation or the enactment of Ex Post Facto law for the purpose of maintaining a bill through this House, however, this is an exceptional circumstance which requires immediate action on our part. We must not fail to act responsibly to correct this very unfortunate error. It is not only in the interests of some unfortunate people, but although my Party of these views do not consider passing of this motion to be most appropriate Constitutionally, but it is vital in the interests of the country.

I would like to ask the Members to just participate and not necessarily.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Elected Member for Pecken Town.

MR. JAMES H. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my point to all Members of the House that I do not rise to speak on this Bill from the point of view of opposition, because I realize fully the implications of this Bill. In the first analysis I am prepared to support the Bill. What is not the point on which I rise to speak. I rise to speak particularly the points which have been made on this Chamber by the hon. Member who has now in Executive Council, on the first few years of the Party from administration. These are the points which I am going to belabour.

This Law should be supported, as the Bill of this Law was being properly prepared owner to blame on the Party from Government. It was not intentionally our responsibility. This Law was passed on the 26th June, 1970 and it came to operate July. The hon Attorney-General who now responsible for piloting this Bill through the House in the years 1972 to 1974 happened to be Member by the Party from administration from 1970. The responsibility for this Law was entirely the responsibility of the Government and the Attorney-General. If the then Attorney-General had not been a busy playing politics, he would have paid full attention to his duties.

Something and the legislation of Law body, very unlike those in countries around. I personally Member of Executive Council for eight years, and as such I would only have been to object the measures that is to Executive Council were withdrawn by the Government which were being taken to appeal to the appointed day as I am.

Mr. [illegible]: [illegible] one of the main points which I wish to answer. That is that once a law is passed by this Assembly it is then the responsibility of the Executive Government, which has been delegated through its Agency by the Attorney-General of this country. It was a law which [illegible] and therefore the responsibility is completely passed to us and then the Government. It was not the responsibility of any Member of the 1967 to 1969 Liberal Government.

If this [illegible] had been a law which was piloted through by an Elected Member of Executive Council, and [illegible] the responsibility of that Elected Member would have been placed if he had not provided the Attorney-General to say that those matters were given. Finally, I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, by just to point out that one of the Elected Members of Executive Council [illegible] the Attorney General to look into matters which [illegible] the result of his prosecution. That is virtually the responsibility of the Attorney-General. I appreciate with the people who are affected by this case. I even appreciate with my colleague who [illegible] Elected Member of Executive Council spoke about. He said that he would not want him to be a political [illegible] to be put in the Chamber now. I still respect my colleague and a point here although with the former speaking would have been a big enough mind not to make [illegible] prosecutions [illegible] this all. I think that it was a big.....

Mr. [illegible]: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not bring my [illegible] on here. I spoke on the phone.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I think that you have stated in the House that a Member giving up a point of order loses the point of order. Can you say that point of order is [illegible] or not?

Mr. Speaker: In point of fact, I am not sure that that is a point of order. However, let me hear before I would say that.

Mr. [illegible]: Well, I hope that excuse mine be still [illegible] a point of order.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that [illegible] there was no doubt in the mind of the people who [illegible] in the minds of the people who may be [illegible] enough to hear this discussion is to say the matter was [illegible] Member, that particular person who is [illegible] a bigger mind than he still [illegible] be [illegible] to have.

I fully [illegible] Mr. Speaker, and I am quite [illegible] and under [illegible] I did not even accept a copy of the [illegible] and I am [illegible] I did [illegible] to speak of this to anyone. I would like to [illegible] that I did not want a [illegible] that I would have to keep this secret.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite [illegible] the actions and the words which have been spoken [illegible] by the Honourable Elected Member of Executive Council and [illegible] of his willingness to [illegible] of this, [illegible] Legislature and [illegible] Sir Kenneth Jackson. [illegible] to Zaire Government of the [illegible] and sought [illegible] to this on many occasions when he was [illegible] to make quick [illegible] in the public through [illegible].

MR. PHILIP M. ENGLISH (CONSTITUENCY). It does not seem necessary that we put in the whole legislative machinery which we have had to put in the Irish Free State Constitution Act, 1922, I think that I can assist here the speed of that machinery by my name on the Paper which has only some of the amendments which are necessary to make the Bill work. I am sorry that the Government have not seen their way to put down amendments to the Bill themselves. I quite realise that there are many things which it would cause delay to put down now. Nevertheless, we should have had some of the more important amendments down on the Paper. I do not propose to move them myself, but I am hoping that the Government will do so. However, I would like to mention that the necessary legislation will be passed by this House and by the Senate before the Irish Free State is established. There are many other important things in this country which need to be attended to. I am hopeful that this responsible Government of which he speaks, when it comes into be will have the responsibility to see that we have satisfactory good Government.

One Member has to have said and said that there should have been no unseated seats. Mr. President, even though I may disagree with what is said by a Member in this House I am of the first opinion that there can be unrestricted no control over the House. That is why I have previously said that I am against the Standing Orders which forbid debate in this House for four hours. Any Member who has been elected by the people and has had the confidence of the people to stand through thick and thin with them, they have their time to speak. No Member should neglect to attend here. He may not agree but they have the right to disagree.

Some Members also speak about unseated Members. Mr. President, I am not afraid of bringing that case or any case, because when I got up to speak I have always been there to do it and can still speak my mind in spite of hell. I will continue to do it, and I take great difficulty to any Member who would make those suggestions. Is it because that particular Member did not have the ability to speak out his convictions?

MR. JAMES M. COOPER (CONTINUING): ...the Member from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher] stated that people should be in the Capitol for them. That is quite correct and this is one of the reasons that in the old Capitol and also for this Capitol, because I do not have to travel any considerable distance to get to my office. I would suggest this seriously as a possibility, especially one who has come from this comparatively small area. I hope that they will remain Democrats [Mr. Cooper's district is known for its strong Democratic tradition] but you never know in the event of losing that we learn.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. [illegible].

MR. H. ROBERTS [illegible]: Mr. President, this is a very serious threat of Federal intervention and one which needs no fighting in this House. It is a bill which I have to support. Because that Act, Pendergast has no business in the Senate [illegible] in November last and so I have to say there is not a fight between this Government and the opposition, as stated I say the Government which was elected in November, 1964 and the opposition. However, it is a disagreement between those who voted in the 1970 [illegible] and the Democrats of 1970 to 1974. I assume a reason during these years should make [illegible] very serious mistakes. As I see it, the problem, if a Member of Congress [illegible] in one of [illegible] in his colleague's [illegible], it is not only to [illegible] how about it and to make certain they receive [illegible] such as the one which the bill is hoping to validate today are corrected.

I [illegible] the Constitution, an [illegible] Federal legislation. However, Mr. President, even the Holy Bible seems to be when the Government on this [illegible]. The bible says:

> "When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement and give it in her hand and send her out of his house. When she is departed out of his house she may go and be another man's wife."

Mr. President, there are a lot of [illegible] which I could quote this afternoon, but I have a [illegible] I want to discuss. This [illegible] of legislation has to be brought here to [illegible]. What is this law will result? Let us quickly look at the facts. The Court has [illegible] of the 1965 but it did not [illegible] the legal [illegible]. A few [illegible] were elected in November, 1970 and [illegible] Democrat [illegible] might have [illegible]. They do not represent the [illegible]. Of course...

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: I [illegible] of asking the [illegible]...

MR. H. ROBERTS [cont.]: What is the Democratic [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]?

MR. JAMES M. COOPER: I point of [illegible]...

MR. H. ROBERTS [cont.]: [illegible]...

MR. SPEAKER: Gentleman will state.

MR. H. ROBERTS [cont.]: Point of [illegible]?

MR. [illegible] M. [illegible]: Mr. President, I would [illegible] that it has been misquoted by gentlemen, I think that [illegible] and if, that I think that [illegible] and I think it was possible. If you [illegible] of this Assembly [illegible] by [illegible] of this Assembly.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, I think [illegible] quite [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: Well, [illegible] I would like to [illegible].

MR. M. [illegible]: Mr. President, I do not [illegible] it is. They have [illegible] and I [illegible]. I am making the point here today that any Member of Association Council who [illegible] a violation of a [illegible], or a [illegible] of the Principles of this Association should say and [illegible], especially [illegible] as [illegible]. I am saying that with [illegible] because [illegible] to make [illegible] with it. [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: We have got [illegible].

MR. M. [illegible]: Well, the Member should say it [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order.

MR. M. [illegible]: Mr. President, [illegible] the one which [illegible] in 1976 and ended four years, can be [illegible]. That is my opinion.

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: Mr. President, may I [illegible]...

MR. M. [illegible]: That is my opinion, Mr. President. Let the Member [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: A point of order, Mr. President. This [illegible]...

MR. M. [illegible]: What is the point of order, Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT: Please [illegible]. All the Member said was that the [illegible] to be held responsible for the [illegible]. He did not say that they are to be held responsible for [illegible] ... [illegible] of this effect. I think that the [illegible] responsible from the [illegible]. If we [illegible] that they are responsible for [illegible] of these offices I will [illegible].

MR. M. [illegible]: Mr. President, they failed [illegible] to [illegible] up the minutes during [illegible] years. The fact is, Sir, that [illegible], that is the [illegible], [illegible] of this House to [illegible]. That is what [illegible], that [illegible] is [illegible] from [illegible]. [illegible] is [illegible] for [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] from the [illegible] of this [illegible], so I [illegible]. The Members [illegible] up here and make a [illegible], keeping them [illegible] [illegible].

MR. [illegible] said constitutionally it be the duty [illegible] that the people's representatives [illegible] country [illegible] Government [illegible] to be the duty [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: Hebrew. Is it correct?

MR. M. MAHMUD ALI: Well, I do not [illegible] Speaker [illegible] the moment. Personally, Sir, this review of legislation [illegible] effect me. On Friday last I intervened [illegible] Bill, however, we had before [illegible] Bill being [illegible] people, [illegible] people might be guilty of [illegible] section 124 of the Penal Code, which [illegible] punishment [illegible]. I will give [illegible] Mr. President. I do not mind seeing [illegible] should have been there a long [illegible] mistake which has been [illegible] Sir, [illegible]. So we need [illegible] he will [illegible] Government [illegible] [illegible] worked up over [illegible].

I feel, Sir, [illegible] [illegible] Sir, [illegible] [illegible] Members are [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

SEN. HARRY B. HARPOOTLIAN (CONTINUING): So let us put our hands and our heads together for the betterment of the Organic Law and let us get on.

With those few words, Mr. President, I oppose the bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Senator from Horry is recognized to speak a third time to move to reconsider his motion of reply if he chooses.

MR. MICHAEL F. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. President. I have listened to the hours which have passed since I proposed the second reading of this bill, and I think, Mr. President, that we have not really grappled on this floor as we should with one of the issues we have before us. I would point out to the Senate that we have a provision in our Constitution, Section 7, Article III, which provides that this bill is required to be read on three separate days unless two-thirds of the Senate dispenses with the rule. I think, Mr. President, that the people who this bill is supposed to aid, the people affected by the bill, deserve consideration on the part of those people. Section 7 provides a period of time whereby that consideration can and should be accorded, which would produce wisdom, wisdom born, wisdom appreciated for aggrieved persons to take advantage of the dispute in the Law. And it is my hope and it is my intention that we should go through with the steps of this bill today.

I do not come to delay the progress of it through this House but I think there is very essentially certain in the private sector, that I should provide clarity a couple of points which were made by Members in the course of the second reading debate.

The first is that I was misunderstood by Members of this Legislative Assembly a short while ago regarding the Environmental Quality Control Act that this House voted like packed crowded by section 7 of the Act. I should explain the House action that the Environmental Quality Control Board published today, and that certainly, because everyone is entitled to, that this House did affect just today. That action provides that it be brought into effect by the Environmental Quality Control Board, because while the Administrative Law Division 70, Article 6 Environmental Quality Control Act, 1972, that Administration was not created by necessity by the provisions of the 1972 Constitution which read in section 7(1):-

> "The Governor shall, subject to the following provisions of this section, consult with the Executive Council in the formulation of policy and in the exercise of his powers conferred upon him by this Constitution or by any other law for the time being in force in the Colonies, except in the exercise of -
>
> (a) [illegible] any power which by the Constitution or by any other law is to be exercised on discretion, either expressly or by necessary implication, to be exercised without consulting the Council;

As legal opinion is this House, Sir, as well as my knowledge, I would advise this House that the wording of the notice bringing this Act into force and effect today is proper and is made in the proper form. I hope that the Members of this House and persons on the outside will not have any doubts as to the validity of that notice.

MR. MICHAEL F. MYERS: May I add also that a bill should not be in operation for it to be published, because the essence of publishing parts of it is to publicize the proposal and to invite comment.

The second point I would make, Sir, is that as Attorney-General of this State I have got a responsibility and a vital function. In my personal capacity, under the law and the present place to be by where I am. I am to my discretion I determine and direct when prosecutions should be undertaken, either over or discontinued. I have power to undertake prosecutions. I have power to [illegible] which either

In my official capacity, Sir, I am government's chief legal adviser and Government is in the necessity of a client of which I am the attorney. In that capacity, I need instructions from Government and I will be unable with those instructions to draft[illegible] legislation, in order to [illegible] in all which matters involving prosecutions, agreements and so on. In 2079 and 1027 it so happened that the person with responsibility for the original content of the Bill[illegible] was also the then Attorney-General. He was accountable for that, not in his capacity as Attorney-General necessarily, but because he had responsible responsibility for it. That being said, I am not going to [illegible] the matter before and in the interest of the Government of the day we have made sure that it was brought into effect.

I do not know the history of that part, but I only hope that if so while [illegible] that it will be available for me to the [illegible] role of Attorney-General to accept responsibility for the Bills on back of Books in the past, so that it does not be used as a [illegible] Government that Members of this House, on [illegible].

Mr. President, this is a short Bill. It is a Bill which was brought before the House at the behest of Government. The second point is [illegible] one the people who would benefit were [illegible] would [illegible] of the [illegible] of their [illegible] in the Bill as [illegible] of a number of [illegible] the [illegible] of this Bill and the passing of the Legislation intended to remedy it.

[illegible] are no questions that it seeks to [illegible], that it seeks to [illegible] which it would be [illegible]. I would be [illegible] that [illegible] of [illegible] Government [illegible] Members of this Assembly the [illegible] which should be [illegible] I said in moving the [illegible] Sir, are the interests of this House and not the [illegible]. The reason that they are there for [illegible] [illegible] will be the [illegible] Government.

Mr. President, for the sake of any person who has come in as a party to any proceedings in the Grand Court under this Law to [illegible] [illegible] to be [illegible] for the sake of [illegible] I do hope [illegible] have a [illegible] those family and social ties for the sake of children who have been born there since [illegible] legislature [illegible] for the need of the children and the [illegible] of women who have died when this Law would [illegible] for the sake of the people of this Cayman Islands as a whole, Mr. President, for this reason I support of this Bill and do [illegible] would that once we discover a defect in [illegible] as quickly as we can to remedy it [illegible] the good government and the stability of this country, and for the sake of its [illegible] people, I commend this Bill to Members of this House.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is on S. 1111, entitled the Watershed Claims Modification Act, which has been placed on the Consent Calendar.

QUESTION HOT: YEAS & NAYS

MR. P. MORRIS HOT: May we have a division for the record?

MR. PRESIDENT: Duly noted.

DIVISION
(By rising)

YEAS NAYS

Sen. Donald E. Knutson
Sen. Richard P. Bentley
Sen. Barbara L. Johnson
Sen. M. Morton Bodker
Sen. Ralph Charles L. Eisenhower
Sen. Donald L. Johnson
Sen. E. McKenzie Bush
Sen. Daphne L. Arnett
Sen. Richard L. Thompson
Ralph Nelson L. Eisenhower
Mr. Alden M. Hilton
Sen. C. Craig Peterson
Sen. D. Chadwick Wallace

13

ALDEN: WILL ENTER A DOUBLE NEGATIVE.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think possibly we could be wisely wise to take the customary afternoon break. Before I do so though, perhaps I might just say that there does seem to be some considerable confusion, for which I am partly responsible, about exactly what procedure the Political Leader will choose, and why has their responsibilities after Bills have been enacted by the House, for saying that they are brought back here. I think that it might be helpful to Members if a clarification could be given during the course of this morning, I trust more widely explaining exactly what the requirements are so that all Members will know for the future. Then if, after I have chosen [illegible] the matter, perhaps have clarified, we would then be clear as to the rights different purposes, if one may be discovered. However, I do think that at the moment a lot of people are not altogether sure what is supposed to happen and who is supposed to be responsible for what. I think it would [illegible] if we did that here.

At 9.40 a.m. the House adjourned.

HOUSE RECESSED AT 1:40 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. The House is now in committee. The Environmental Council (No. 2) Bill, 1982.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

CLAUSES PASSED

CLAUSE 1. SHORT TITLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT. AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CLAUSE 2. REPEALING OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT. AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED.

CLAUSE 3. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3 OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT. AGREED. CLAUSE 3 PASSED.

CLAUSE 4. REPEAL AND REPLACEMENT OF SECTION 5 OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Public and Statutory Notice stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT. AGREED. PUBLIC AND STATUTORY NOTICE PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Councillor Mrs. Cartwright to introduce the Bill entitled "A Bill to validate acts done under the Environmental Council Act. She needs only a majority.

THIRD READING

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

MOTION PROPOSED

HON. MRS. M. CARTWRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill entitled "The Environmental Council (Amendment) Bill, 1982" be read a third time by the Clerk and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly read for the third reading.

Bill, third reading.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

BILL READ

CLERK: The Environmental Council (Amendment) Bill, 1982.

MR. G. MILO MOSBY (continued): Under section 8 of the old Act, if land were needed for a public purpose, and if the negotiations to purchase that land had broken down, the Lands Board could order the Administrator to enter upon the land, proceed to acquire title to water rights and take possession of the land compulsorily in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know whether or not the Administrator is in a position to say whether he would do so, but assuming, the question and particularly that paragraph (b) presents that responsibility fairly squarely upon the Minister, I think that the Minister's legal advisers will say that it has always been the Minister's responsibility and, generally, discharged by the Lands Board, on the many occasions when land has been compulsorily acquired it has always been on Executive Council action.

MR. G. MILO MOSBY: What I am thinking of, Mr. Speaker, is that the many hectic things now going on would certainly cause the Executive Council which will in future take the decision to compulsorily acquire land.

MR. SPEAKER: As it has been in the past.

MR. G. MILO MOSBY: Mr. Speaker, although I do not want to argue with the Chair, this will be home rule in responsible government. So there has to be some delegation and it is quite proper.... The wording of this Bill....

MR. HOWARD A. PEARCY: Mr. Speaker, while the honourable member may be right, I am a position of uncertainty now. It could be maybe as early as 1967 a matter of months. I am happy either way.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is how it is now.

MR. HOWARD A. PEARCY: Mr. Speaker, as I said so, what is being done in clause 8 of the Bill is to put into legislation, not to alter the existing distribution of responsibility which existed under the Act as amended. That is that the Administrator in fact has responsibility for discussions with quasi-judicial and purely administrative powers. In carrying out his quasi-judicial functions under, in particular, clause (a) proposed to the legislature, then in such quasi-judicial matters he was not acting in accordance with the wishes of Executive Council, because by necessary implication under the Commissioner's quasi-judicial function would not in fact exercise it by the exercise of that one which is now delegated to the negotiations only.

In administrative functions he could be, and I think subject to what the honourable minister says, that this is for clarification, that this Honourable Member may wish to direct, by phone.

MR. G. MILO MOSBY: What he mentioned was right. I am glad the Minister of Northern Affairs and Transport (Mr. Chamberlist) is here. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and Transport in the absence of the Commissioner in his discussions of the Yukon with the Executive Council.

Mr. de Lisle (Trinidad and Tobago): I am grateful that the simple motion has been made here to take the sense of the Assembly on an exceptionally important issue in the hands of the Secretary-General, at such a delicate moment in the history of the Middle East. While in the light of the failure of Egypt and Israel to reach agreement on the question of Egypt withdrawing from Israeli territory, and the Secretary-General's call to the parties concerned to exercise restraint, one could readily see that it is much to be desired that Israel unconditionally withdraw from the occupied territories, the Secretary-General does not have the authority to compel Israel to withdraw by force.

Under the Charter, it is appropriate that it was the Security Council that should be entrusted with the responsibility for peace and security, and not the General Assembly. So, in granting to the Secretary-General, which the present draft resolution seeks to do, the power to take whatever steps he would think necessary to implement the resolutions of the Security Council, might be tantamount to giving him the power to take decisions which have been reserved to the Security Council.

Under the Charter, it is appropriate that it was the Security Council that should be entrusted with the responsibility for peace and security. So, in granting to the Secretary-General, which the present draft resolution seeks to do, the power to take whatever steps he would think necessary to implement the resolutions of the Security Council, might be tantamount to giving him the power to take decisions which have been reserved to the Security Council. While I am grateful for the opportunity to speak briefly on this matter, I do not wish to delay the Assembly any further.

Mr. de Lisle (Trinidad and Tobago): I am grateful that the simple motion has been made here to take the sense of the Assembly on an exceptionally important issue in the hands of the Secretary-General, at such a delicate moment in the history of the Middle East. While in the light of the failure of Egypt and Israel to reach agreement on the question of Egypt withdrawing from Israeli territory, and the Secretary-General's call to the parties concerned to exercise restraint, one could readily see that it is much to be desired that Israel unconditionally withdraw from the occupied territories, the Secretary-General does not have the authority to compel Israel to withdraw by force.

Under the Charter, it is appropriate that it was the Security Council that should be entrusted with the responsibility for peace and security. So, in granting to the Secretary-General, which the present draft resolution seeks to do, the power to take whatever steps he would think necessary to implement the resolutions of the Security Council, might be tantamount to giving him the power to take decisions which have been reserved to the Security Council. While I am grateful for the opportunity to speak briefly on this matter, I do not wish to delay the Assembly any further.

Before I do that, I should like to make a statement on behalf of my delegation. Although we have been associated by name with the sponsorship of the draft resolution, we have not had the opportunity to consult with the sponsors. We have not had the opportunity to consult with the sponsors. We have not had the opportunity to consult with the sponsors. We

MR. MARROW C. PARKER: Mr. President, since I have to leave in a couple of minutes, I would like to give my vote on this bill.

I suppose this will end a very unusual Session that many have nothing to show under this. With respect to this last session, I would say unfortunately we didn't get enough done that was worthwhile to the Commonwealth of this piece of legislation dealing in the Governor with the admission and signature of the Executive Council. I wonder how many, and I myself as have had serious misgivings about that in this country and of course of the laws whether the whole concept of the Governor's Executive Council, which is a remnant of Royal days, has any place in our present day and age. Also, do we need a member of Executive Council?

The last two times that the opportunity, Mr. President, arose here, with the Governor-Lieutenant Governor on the ticket we had this chance to have separate votes for the Governor and Lieutenant Governor. Then the idea arose of getting Government progressive minded citizens if there was any separateness with that, that because of the pressure I and the Senator's parents - the Governor's responsibility to him under the law, I presume that is the plan applicable at that voting time.

The Senator spoke here to resolution, also, that I would like to remind him that it was about one hundred of the Commonwealth's land. There is a beautiful picture of him on the front page saying that.

Mr. President, as the Senator knows, this will be coming up fully in the law in many respects as it has been studied over the years. The opportunity has been taken to perform the changes which have taken place on the Executive since the bill was originally introduced.

I applaud it in its own right and I know the Senator that I have had that the Governor will change only accept good bodies when dealing with land. I think the Executive Council should continue that the executive phrase in this law is that the land must be acquired for a public purpose. So, it cannot be acquired to finance a political purpose. It has to be demonstrably necessary for a governmental purpose.

I think you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair thanks the Senator from Second District, Mr. Parker from Middle Bucks.

MR. JAMES H. DOYLE: I certainly recognize the necessities of the bill, Mr. President. However, I would like to give my endorsement on behalf of the words said by my colleague the Second District Senator from Middle Bucks. It is true that a bridge needs in the Executive Council, but the Governor can by the Governor pitcher, the bill, however that was passed on this Session, that is, operated not under the Constitution which is operative today, and in the end of 1970 the Administration there was the Administration voting without any action of all Executive Members. I see where to the extent with the necessity of changing the difficulties. However, if to exist without, the executive, to this House, or it should be the case, that is a substantial change because it is very obvious to Pennsylvania. Certainly, under certain conditions the Governor is bound to accept the advice contained to him by his Executive Council, unless he does for to do otherwise and to notify the proper and responsible officer for Commonwealth.

MR. HARRY H. POOLE (CONSTITUENCY): I do, in my opinion, quite gratuitously make clear that it is the elected members who will be speaking this at this time, because otherwise it may be that this could have been put up by the Attorney-General or the honourable Royal Official Member or the Financial Secretary. Their official business, however, instead of that it is to be borne in mind through the House by the Standing Committee for Finance and Financial Secretary. This seems that when this Bill is passed it will then come into the Executive Council. So, to me it seems a very extraordinary change which has been made, and I would like some explanation might be kept secret. I think that the House should have been told what this was a tax-exemption change because it is different. It is being changed from what we felt under the arrangements to which of this was under Executive Council, the four Elected Members and the three Official Members would be in the Chamber. That matter has to be taken.

I would, in addition, mention a case of the cases which the Elected Members Council of this country has made in the last year to further under that with persons which could be, under present circumstances.

With regard to the Financial Final Elected Member of Executive Council's speaking about the Final Financial Memorandum for Finance Year Ending 31 March, I fail to see really the relevancy of that memorandum, however in the Order of Business responsible for Land and Natural Resources are not specifically mentioned. So, it is to be necessarily difficult though. The matter of their responsible capable may have been put of the House page, we do not know.

However, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that a further explanation of this should be given by the Chair and the public should be told that it is a consultation perhaps and not the other things which we have been told to do.

I thank you, Sir.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE: Mr. Speaker, I did not intervene in the debate earlier. I thought that I had been on my feet long enough in the day. There is, however, one point that has been raised which, I think should perhaps be clarified, or if not clarified, be clarified. That is the question as to whether or not the proposed clause 4 of the Bill is subject to public representative change to the Land Acquisition Law.

Clause 4 of the Bill says, and I quote:-

> "Section 5 of the principal Law is amended by deleting the following word definition immediately after the definition of "Court" -
>
> "Minister" means the Minister responsible;

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Land Acquisition has been originally passed and brought into force on the 6th December, 1948. In the U.K. Legislature, 1948 is to be my understanding that the constitutional status of the Legislature did not be taking certain about to see authorized to be under way but practically our Land Acquisition were, prior to take on duties by the Ministry of the Crown the Council as then was. The effect of that was that Chapter 81, the Land Acquisition was provided that the Administrator is to be all the matters laid out to them for in the Ordinance.

HON. MICHAEL J. MAHONEY (Hoylandbridge): In 1973 there was brought into force on the 28th August, 1973, the Cyprus Relandia Constitution Order. That 1973 Relandia Order provided at section 37(1) [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

REP. HARRY B. MCGUIRE (CHAIRMAN): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, it did not strike me that there was any need to pursue my position 2 in particular, because it was not there originally when it came. That is the Supreme Court decision. That is what has been recommended, Mr. Speaker, but it does not strike me that there is any good reason for wanting to amend that section.

So, I recommend the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is shall the bill be read the third legislative time. Shall it please pass?

QUESTION PUT: AYES, NOES. THE BILL PASSED A THIRD READING.

MR. SPEAKER: I make the point that Substitute to Amendment Number 1, as introduced by all the people participating on another bill here. Perhaps the Honorable Clerk's Office or Human Rights might have to issue the statements.

ADJOURNMENT

REP. DAVID M. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 tomorrow morning.

QUESTION PUT: AYES, NOES. AT 4:37 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., TUESDAY, APRIL 7TH, 1981.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

[illegible]

2. [illegible]:

(a) [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]

(b) [illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]

[illegible]

(1) [illegible]
(2) [illegible]
(3) [illegible]
(4) [illegible]

[illegible]

(5) [illegible]
(6) [illegible]
(7) [illegible]
(8) [illegible]
(9) [illegible]

[illegible]

(10) [illegible]

[illegible]

(11) [illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE 1

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC PROVISIONS OF AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE TAXPAYER, SERVICE AND EXCISE AMENDMENTS, 1965 - DATE OF THE TABLE 1

STATEMENT SHOWING THE EFFECT OF THE CHANGES IN RATES OF TAXATION - DATE OF THE TABLE 3

SECTIONS

THE CORPORATE (ADJUSTMENT) ACT, 1965 - RATES AND EFFECTIVE DATES 15

THE EXCHANGE (ADJUSTMENT) ACT, 1965 - RATES AND EFFECTIVE DATES 18

THE FINANCE (NO. 2) ACT, 1965 - RATES AND EFFECTIVE DATES 30

THE CORPORATE (ADJUSTMENT) ACT, 1965 - RATES AND EFFECTIVE DATES 42

THE CORPORATE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1965 - TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS 52

ACCOMMODATION 54

MR. SPEAKER: ... members. The Council elected members for West Bay.

PRAYERS

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: ... Lord our God,

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.

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

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

Our Father, which 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 those that trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever, Amen.

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

SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Presentation of Papers and Reports.

The Hon. Donovan Ebanks.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table the Report of the House Committee. The Committee held two meetings the first was held on the 22nd September, 1995 and the second was held on the 31st December, 1996.

SPEAKER: So ordered.

The Interim Report of the Select Committee on Labour Legislation.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON LABOUR LEGISLATION

HON. MICHAEL L. RYAN: Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 79(2) of the Legislative Assembly Standing Orders provides that every Select Committee shall before the end of the Session in which it is appointed make a Report to the House upon matters referred to it...

MR. MICHAEL J. MASAOKA (CONSULTANT): Where a Committee Print could be so inaccurate as to misrepresent before the end of the session, it would be rejected by the House.

It is my understanding, Sir, that this meeting will be the last one before the end of the Session in which the Select Committee on Internal Legislation can appropriate.

I beg to report, Sir, that in recognition with that Standing Order that the Select Committee be appointed this it has been unable to accomplish the investigations and begs to lay its Interim Report upon the Table.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

MR. MICHAEL J. MASAOKA: In doing so, Sir, I would like to express briefly, not the contents of our deliberations but the scope of them on behalf of this Honourable House and the people of the Cayman Islands can be assured that we have been pursuing our task diligently.

The Select Committee was appointed by Laws of this year and you, Sir, nominated me as the Chairman of the Select Committee. The Select Committee has on five occasions this year, one unfortunately attended by the necessary quorum each of the organizations which made representations to the Select Committee. We would like to place on record as a Select Committee our appreciation of all the organizations which submitted recommendations to us to assist us in our investigations. We are also very grateful that representatives from those organizations were able to attend a Meeting of the Select Committee and for their further assistance and the correspondence which given.

Your Select Committee, Sir, will report the recommendations in their Report upon the conclusion of the investigations. It is now well established that the Select Committee has not the statutory power to take evidence on oath and that the correspondence received from the organizations mentioned is not necessarily conclusive.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I take it that I am right that all the steps required to adopt the Report are to be undertaken and accommodations.

We are highly grateful, Mr. Masaoka, for the first Elected Member for Bodden Town.

QUESTIONS

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SENIOR ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AND AVIATION THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

QUESTION 1: Would the Honourable Member please whether reference from Mr. Owen Roberts International Airport and Cayman Brac and Gerrard are to be supplied to answer, or have they been, requests also to the Caribbean Development Bank in respect of the loan mentioned in some part of their query?

ANSWER: The response from Owen Roberts International Airport and Cayman Brac and Gerrard are to be supplied to answer, or have they been, requests also to the Caribbean Development Bank in respect of the loan mentioned in some part of their query.

ASSEMBLYMAN:

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Supplementary. Could the Minister advise the House the amount of revenue collected so far in 1982?

HON. W. ROBERT DOUGLAS: Mr. Speaker, I have here the estimated estimate for 1982, which was $1,407,000.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: I have only the anticipated amount. I am asking whether the Minister has the amount which has been collected.

HON. W. ROBERT DOUGLAS: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the exact amount that I have a revised estimate from for 1982, which is $1,810,010.

MR. JAMES M. TODOSY: So, to the best of the Minister's knowledge the income so far is more than was projected? Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that has been stated. That was on the answer to the original question. Well, no problem if that has been stated. It is more than was considered the Member says. However, I think it follows.

If there is no further supplementary I will direct the Member to ask the next question standing on his own.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR ROCKY POINT TO ASK THE HONOURABLE PREMIER WHETHER PLANTED MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RECOMMENDED FOR MONTHLY PAYMENTS FOR MONTHS PRIOR TO 1982?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member please what has happened to pharmacare for the registered pension organization for 1982?

HON. W. ROBERT DOUGLAS: Mr. Speaker, I have undertaken the new pharmacare programme from Tokyo to the Cayman Islands commencing on 1st December, 1982, Cayman Express, establishing Cable allowance will be commencing a new programme from December to December, 1982.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: Supplementary. Could the Member advise the House whether there are monthly and regular cheques that have been negotiated in 1982, or whether these were accumulated and paid by negotiated before 1982?

HON. W. ROBERT DOUGLAS: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there are two pharmacare programmes which were dealt with during 1982. There is knowledge of any such payment being accumulated previously.

MR. JAMES M. SCOTT: There are monies are being done, I think, with Cayman Express, the same people who have been doing the Ministry and they have monies. What is relative. I have got a question and I would like to put it. It is not out of time. It is hard to decide what he is doing whether I am out of time or not. I am going to have to make a question. There have been negotiated with the same people who have been carrying on the two roads and Ministry members. All it was the result that Members were entitled payments accumulated given them and paying negotiated with those people? Is it absolutely also who have taken on the Council system?

SEN. H. MURRAY ADDED: The Senate took up [illegible] Cyprus Treaty programme but I know no knowledge of any negotiations [illegible] to Cyprus prior to 1965. In my discussions with Cyprus Treasury [illegible] they told me that they were contemplating [illegible] a charter from Ottawa but made no mention that it was [illegible] by the Senate who is now making the statement.

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: Could the Senator confirm the Provincial Secretary sitting behind him denied any negotiations had taken place with the Province to [illegible] Dollar and Nelson?

SEN. H. MURRAY ADDED: Mr. President, apparently he has no knowledge of this matter.

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: I am very pleased to see that both of them have denied the statement. I hope there will be more success on the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SEN. H. MURRAY ADDED: Any [illegible] I may have to [illegible], Mr. [illegible] the Member is on basis of his question as I am by anyone that he is [illegible].

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: I am very sure of my question I suppose this would have to be on the [illegible] Administration [illegible] relating to this and relating to the discussion with [illegible].

SEN. H. MURRAY ADDED: I think the only thing is that the Premier is ready to [illegible] anything he had to do with.

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: I have another point. It is only those people that [illegible] Senate's [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.
Unless there is another supplementary....

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: I will ask the Member the same question, which [illegible]. How Cyprus [illegible] as I stated [illegible] point.

MR. R. NORMAN HOWARD: Thank you speaker, Point of fact I am the Managing Director of Cyprus Airways, [illegible] the Member was [illegible] on the scene. As far as airfares is concerned, that was applied March 1977 when Cyprus Airways [illegible] foreign airlines agreed to [illegible] the British Airways [illegible] were charged about before [illegible] on the scene.

MR. JAMES H. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, I do not see how this can be, because Cyprus Airways was formed under the Malay Year Administration and the Member speaking [illegible] to have been at that time the manager [illegible] for the old Cyprus Airways. He was then appointed Managing Director of the new company. So, I cannot see how he agreed to Cyprus [illegible] before he did.

SUB. M. SCHOOL BOARDS: Captain Aldridge, Mr. Speaker, since it has to be brought up, and I mean in 1982, that the baby boom post-war Captain Aldridge, they formed a national play-wreck for [illegible], according to the United States under the 200 Summer Olds to vote each night. That was the scene on 1st December, 1977, at 7 to note how the Minister is getting to bed--watch for everything that happened to Captain Aldridge they before they came in....

SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. GARRY M. SCOTT: I am not looking upwards for anything else....

SPEAKER: Order.

MR. JAMES M. DOUGAN: I am asking this House to decide that very date.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that we now [illegible] further debate on this one until the advice on the Budget Address originally was given. I think that we have responded fair enough that explanations to the question which was originally asked. We had better pass to the next question now.

THE HON. LEADER (MRS. PAT DOYLE): NOW TO ASK THE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, WHETHER HE CONSIDERS THE RECENT APPOINTMENT TO THE

MR. SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member state what is the exact point he is objecting to? I would like to [illegible] this by those remarks, for the establishment in question Mr. Speaker is this Honourable House, as the Member under whose portfolio. The minister of Captain Aldridge [illegible] I am not responsible for the day to day management of the economy, Mr. Speaker. I feel that this question is a [illegible] and I will reply to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The next [illegible] is whether the Minister here is [illegible].

QUESTIONS:

MR. GARRY A. TUCKER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to clarify a statement made by the Minister who spoke last. We have heard in this House, Sir, that the Honourable Second Elected Member for Executive Council has made an express statement that he is not responsible for the administration of day to day operations of Captain Aldridge. I believe that this is misleading because the public and there needs to know who is ultimately responsible for the operations of Captain Aldridge. Once it was stated to a meeting I feel that somebody needs to know who is ultimately responsible for the actions of Captain Aldridge. Because what we have been, Sir, is that a number of Ministers and Members are taking the credit for certain actions of Captain Aldridge. We need to know,

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, is that a question or a statement, Sir?

THE PRESIDENT: ...said, let me....

H. RICHARD A. PIERCE: Mr. President, I said that I would shortly

THE PRESIDENT: Please, please. I was going to suggest that I do not think that is a multi-pronged question. I think that the Senator has indeed a point of some publicity importance. It is certainly one which it might be helpful if the Members concerned did ... comment made a statement. However, I do not think that it is ... right at exploratory to this question.

On the general point I would remind the House that Richard Kennedy from Oregon Town, who I think was previously ... at the time, does also require age, I assume only if previously ... at a hearing similar to this part, I did advise committee Counsel Mr. ... on the question of whether or Members of Congress should ... obliged to answer questions about Export Airways. Having investigated ... and having found NASA the committee in Washington was ... United Kingdom Ministers did not answer individual questions about ... do so by reason of ministerial responsibility to the United ... I pointed out the Members for Scottish Airways and Trade was ... entitled to refuse to answer questions about the day to day operations ... Export Airways.

However, while also I can understand that perhaps some sort of supplementary ... might be helpful. I ... strictly confine the Member's attention to the point which has ... ... and not have if we would consider it as appropriate time making ... such a statement, as that the procedure is.

MR. RICHARD A. PIERCE: Thank you, Mr. President, I think ... the information of the honourable Royal Electoral Member of Preston ... would of no use ... to me....

RT. HON. ROBIN W. COOKE: On a point of order, Mr. President....

MR. RICHARD A. PIERCE: He would have known....

THE CHAIRMAN: We spent over fifty ... on that statement....

MR. RICHARD H. PIERCE: He would have seen that I was not....

THE CHAIRMAN: Please will you ...

MR. RICHARD A. PIERCE: ...probably a very interesting question.

THE HON. ROBIN W. COOKE: I have not had ... Prime has arrived. ...

MR. JAMES H. BOYLE: I have a supplementary. The figure given ... 811,000 for ... Could the Minister advise how ... ... that that is an overnight ...?

MR. H. THOMAS BOYLE: Mr. Chairman, this ... to discuss ... ...

MR. JAMES M. BOOKER: Is it fair to assume that there is now only eleven separate Union Pacific bridges here on the Wasatch Front?

MR. W. MORGAN BOOTH: To my knowledge it is.

MR. JAMES M. BOOKER: What is the average number of locomotives per mid-day Ogden Hump job?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not really think that that is a question which comes out of the consent calendar. I think that it would have to be a separate question in itself.

MR. JAMES M. BOOKER: I will withdraw my last bit in relation to that item. Thank you Burton....

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, it is pertinent to the cost of operations in Ogden Area, but not really germane to our discussion. I think.

MR. JAMES M. BOOKER: Would the Member state what is the present time to evacuate four flights per hour to and from Ogden Area?

MR. PRESIDENT: I really am not going to get into a discussion on an original question. I think that it would have to be a separate item down in the case load.

MR. JAMES M. BOOKER: As far as that goes, Mr. President, we are going to be obligated to get all the questions answered which we have been discussing looking at the record that I put in, officially I think once only those on the Union Pacific for today. We will be here a long time.

MR. PRESIDENT: Unless there is a further explanation, the Second Electric Member for next Day.

THE SECOND ELECTRIC MEMBER FOR NEXT DAY MAY BE ANY THE PREVIOUSLY ELECTED MEMBER REPRESENTING THE TERRACE AREA EXCEPTING ANGELO

MR. Lee: Would the Honorable Member state how many have been issued this January to October, 1964, and how does this compare with the same period of 1963?

ANSWER: The number of guided orientation licenses issued from January to October, 1964, totalled 1,958. The number for the same period in 1963 was 1,779.

MR. CHARLES J. MORRIS: Mr. President, after considering the question I made further enquiries and they would merely permit where they issue as a new permit. So, this individual might have a renewal because it is a new permit issued. It also includes transferring permits or perhaps for some one who is a company and going to another company a new permit would have to be issued. What is all included in this, Sir.

QUESTIONS:

MR. J. RAY SMITH: Mr. President, can the Honorable Minister for the Environment or Member for the Peace

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: I can only assume, Sir, that there are not as much demand for people in Iowa as there was in 1974. That is all I can assume, Sir.

SEN. G. RAY BODDY: Is it correct to say that the Senator's assumption has been arrived at on the possible loss of funds from the General Fund for the work permits, there will now not be the moneys available and other areas during 1979 as there had been in 1978?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: I cannot really say that, Sir. The decrease in revenue funds may be in the lumping together of any other industry. Anybody is told that the Government has taken a policy to try to replace any expenditure possible who is here illegally in Government until some of our own people coming on stream.

SEN. C. RICHARD MYERS: Supplementary, Mr. President. Did Mr. Speer just state that Government is replacing their people? Current unemployment are not on work permits. Are they employed in this State?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I do not have an idea. It is doubtful. It works in various industries. Sometimes there is more need for a person in one type of industry than the other.

SEN. C. RICHARD MYERS: Mr. President, I think that under the Constitution that Government employees are exempt from such reports. So, there is no question or doubt, Sir. They are not included or they should not be.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I will invite the Senator to read the Constitution. Thank you.

SEN. G. RAY BODDY: Senator Speer, you have my support in your efforts to replace illegal aliens with American citizens. I would like to ask you a question relating to the Senate Bill 2 which is now in Ways and Means Committee. Would you please explain the provisions of Senate Bill 2 relating to the Work Incentive Program?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Senate Bill 2 is the Work Incentive Program. It is a program that is designed to help people who are on welfare to get off welfare and into the work force. It is a program that is designed to help people who are on welfare to get off welfare and into the work force.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I do not have an idea. It is doubtful. It works in various industries. Sometimes there is more need for a person in one type of industry than the other.

SEN. C. RICHARD MYERS: Mr. President, I think that under the Constitution that Government employees are exempt from such reports. So, there is no question or doubt, Sir. They are not included or they should not be.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I will invite the Senator to read the Constitution. Thank you.

SEN. G. RAY BODDY: Senator Speer, you have my support in your efforts to replace illegal aliens with American citizens. I would like to ask you a question relating to the Senate Bill 2 which is now in Ways and Means Committee. Would you please explain the provisions of Senate Bill 2 relating to the Work Incentive Program?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Senate Bill 2 is the Work Incentive Program. It is a program that is designed to help people who are on welfare to get off welfare and into the work force.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I do not have an idea. It is doubtful. It works in various industries. Sometimes there is more need for a person in one type of industry than the other.

SEN. C. RICHARD MYERS: Mr. President, I think that under the Constitution that Government employees are exempt from such reports. So, there is no question or doubt, Sir. They are not included or they should not be.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I will invite the Senator to read the Constitution. Thank you.

SEN. G. RAY BODDY: Senator Speer, you have my support in your efforts to replace illegal aliens with American citizens. I would like to ask you a question relating to the Senate Bill 2 which is now in Ways and Means Committee. Would you please explain the provisions of Senate Bill 2 relating to the Work Incentive Program?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Senate Bill 2 is the Work Incentive Program. It is a program that is designed to help people who are on welfare to get off welfare and into the work force.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I do not have an idea. It is doubtful. It works in various industries. Sometimes there is more need for a person in one type of industry than the other.

SEN. C. RICHARD MYERS: Mr. President, I think that under the Constitution that Government employees are exempt from such reports. So, there is no question or doubt, Sir. They are not included or they should not be.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I will invite the Senator to read the Constitution. Thank you.

SEN. G. RAY BODDY: Senator Speer, you have my support in your efforts to replace illegal aliens with American citizens. I would like to ask you a question relating to the Senate Bill 2 which is now in Ways and Means Committee. Would you please explain the provisions of Senate Bill 2 relating to the Work Incentive Program?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Senate Bill 2 is the Work Incentive Program. It is a program that is designed to help people who are on welfare to get off welfare and into the work force.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I do not have an idea. It is doubtful. It works in various industries. Sometimes there is more need for a person in one type of industry than the other.

SEN. C. RICHARD MYERS: Mr. President, I think that under the Constitution that Government employees are exempt from such reports. So, there is no question or doubt, Sir. They are not included or they should not be.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I will invite the Senator to read the Constitution. Thank you.

SEN. G. RAY BODDY: Senator Speer, you have my support in your efforts to replace illegal aliens with American citizens. I would like to ask you a question relating to the Senate Bill 2 which is now in Ways and Means Committee. Would you please explain the provisions of Senate Bill 2 relating to the Work Incentive Program?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Senate Bill 2 is the Work Incentive Program. It is a program that is designed to help people who are on welfare to get off welfare and into the work force.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I do not have an idea. It is doubtful. It works in various industries. Sometimes there is more need for a person in one type of industry than the other.

SEN. C. RICHARD MYERS: Mr. President, I think that under the Constitution that Government employees are exempt from such reports. So, there is no question or doubt, Sir. They are not included or they should not be.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I will invite the Senator to read the Constitution. Thank you.

SEN. G. RAY BODDY: Senator Speer, you have my support in your efforts to replace illegal aliens with American citizens. I would like to ask you a question relating to the Senate Bill 2 which is now in Ways and Means Committee. Would you please explain the provisions of Senate Bill 2 relating to the Work Incentive Program?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Senate Bill 2 is the Work Incentive Program. It is a program that is designed to help people who are on welfare to get off welfare and into the work force.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I do not have an idea. It is doubtful. It works in various industries. Sometimes there is more need for a person in one type of industry than the other.

SEN. C. RICHARD MYERS: Mr. President, I think that under the Constitution that Government employees are exempt from such reports. So, there is no question or doubt, Sir. They are not included or they should not be.

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Mr. President, I will invite the Senator to read the Constitution. Thank you.

SEN. G. RAY BODDY: Senator Speer, you have my support in your efforts to replace illegal aliens with American citizens. I would like to ask you a question relating to the Senate Bill 2 which is now in Ways and Means Committee. Would you please explain the provisions of Senate Bill 2 relating to the Work Incentive Program?

SEN. DENNIS D. SPEER: Senate Bill 2 is the Work Incentive Program. It is a program that is designed to help people who are on welfare to get off welfare and into the work force.

d. the student must not have been convicted of a serious criminal offence or a court of law.

It should be stressed that students who do not come up to the above prescribed requirements, could receive the primary leaving certificate on the case of exceptional circumstances.

QUESTIONS:

MR. M. ALEX MUSYOKI: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if my opinion has been made to determine the certificate that the candidates should have on attaining the age of fourteen years?

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. President, those candidates who fail to complete their primary education will be allowed to repeat the standard in which they failed to attain marks that will enable them to proceed to the next class. But it should be noted that not all candidates who sit for the primary school examinations will be allowed to proceed to secondary schools, because only those who pass will be permitted to attend the secondary schools.

MR. M. ALEX MUSYOKI: Mr. President, my supplementary question was: What I was trying to find out is if any number has been imposed on students themselves to get their certificates in order to avoid this type of regulation which would not prevent a bright student from continuing in the primary schools if maybe there should be a teacher who does not like the child?

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. President, as already the question has been answered, I wish to see how any bright child could be affected by this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs.

MR. J. KAMAU MACHARIA: Could the Member give this House the precise circumstances that all the children and the parents have been subjected to these new rules?

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. President, these qualifications have been under consideration by the staff of the school from 1972. The chief of the school believes that the criteria had been approved by the Ministries, in fact established the criteria for the 1978 examination. When I found the chance to I asked the Secretary to please invite those children who had been debarred to take part in the presidential swearing, which was done. I think that was already the knowledge of the officer.

Mr. President, the reason why the criteria was not permitted to be implemented in 1977 was because I wanted to be assured that parents had understood the criteria which are being set, and that it would have a reward and punishment effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assistant Minister for Education, Sport.

MR. M. ALEX MUSYOKI: Mr. President, may I ask the Member why the system of parents responsible for the upkeep and the education of children with problems are not?

MRS. DORIS O. MATTHEWS: Once the emergency has been met, it is for the general assembly to decide what to do with it.

SEN. C. RAY BOGGS: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if there are any provisions for an appeal against the decision of this committee?

MRS. DORIS O. MATTHEWS: I doubt, Mr. President, if there is, I think that this is an administrative decision and once the contract has been published there is no appeal.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further explanation I will invite the Second Elected Member for North Bay to ask the next question.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR NORTH BAY TO ASK THE MINISTER OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES

MR. LAW: Would the Honourable Member state whether the Indian Band Council Chief is accepting the living quarters down the street?

MEMBER: The Chief does not occupy the living quarters above the office.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. F. MCCLEAVE BOSE: Supplementary, Mr. President. May I?

HON. DORIS O. MATTHEWS: Mr. President, there seem to be a number of reasons. However, chief among them is the fact that the accommodation at the moment does not suit the requirements of the worker and her family presently stationed there.

MR. F. MCCLEAVE BOSE: Supplementary, Mr. President. Is the house occupied now?

HON. DORIS O. MATTHEWS: Yes, Mr. President, the premises are presently occupied by one Mr. Ng, a graduate architect working with the Indian Authority.

MR. F. MCCLEAVE BOSE: So, it is fair to say, Mr. President, if Government is paying out rent then for this family, the money will just simply somewhere else?

HON. DORIS O. MATTHEWS: Mr. President, we have also in mind for any other Public Health nurses, or in any other instances. I would imagine that it would be no more than would be paid for the person who is occupying it.

MR. C. MILO BOUCHE: Mr. President, will the Member give us the details of why the premises are not suitable?

HON. DORIS O. MATTHEWS: I understand that there is overcrowding accommodation.

MR. PRESIDENT: I believe there is any further explanation I will invite the Senior Counsel Member for Public Law to make the next question.

THE SECOND EXPERT WORKS FOR AGENCY THAT IS NOT THE HEADQUARTERS FIRST EXPERT WORKS FOR RESPONSIBLE FOR PROPOSAL AND CURRENT REGULATION

MR. ZEE: Would the Honorable Member please specify what qualifications and experience are required for the post of housekeeper? The Personnel Section finds it hard to understand the conditions of service including the hours of work?

MR. SMITH: The post of housekeeper at the Seaman Soldier Sailor Home requires persons holding a fairly recently qualified who at least 5-7 years experience in a residential activity preferably. Alternatively, the candidate must have 10 to 12 years experience working with children or well in domestic and institutional and general management skills.

The conditions of service are exactly the same as those applicable to all Civil Servants.

The housekeeper lives on site and therefore unfortunately is duty twenty-four hours a day.

QUESTIONS:

MR. DAVID M. JONES: Supplementary, are there other applicants considered for this position and if so, how many?

COL. DENNIS E. PORTER: To the best of my knowledge, Sir, there were two other applicants.

MR. JAMES M. WOODS: Supplementary. Presumably, what type of qualifications were considered as being necessary to appoint to the previous occupant of this job?

COL. DENNIS E. PORTER: I am not quite if I understand the question, Sir. I think that what I would say is the person was appointed. I am confident that is only the person could apply.

MR. JAMES M. WOODS: My question is, Mr. Chairman, when you last were considering filling, what type of criteria did we look at that time for the fulfillment of this position, and where did we determine as being necessary for the qualifications, and whether or not a similar procedure and a similar advertisement in this case?

COL. DENNIS E. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge the previous housekeeper were appointed. I would imagine, Sir, that similar advertisement to us, and which would not have varied from one time to the other. However, I am not certain, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. WOODS: Could the Member be asked to the Home which the advertisements which can put out for this when the most was filled like this?

COL. DENNIS E. PORTER: No, Sir, I do not have that info-

MR. [illegible]: Would the Member care to undertake to obtain a copy and circulate it to all Members?

MR. DENNIS A. BOSTON: Yes, sir, I would be glad to.

MR. HENRY K. BROWN: I would not just like to see that one. I would like to see the advertisement before then.

MR. DENNIS A. BOSTON: I think that I am not both, sir.

MR. HENRY K. BROWN: Not how many or somewhat for the previous interviewers have conducted? At not so, what happened to terminate it?

MR. [illegible]: I do not think that that is really a supplementary which arises out of the original question in the terms in it. The original question deals with the qualifications and experience required for the post and the conditions of service. It does not relate to that because of the particular complaints of the [illegible].

MR. HENRY K. BROWN: Well, all people can make different statements, but the question does not deal with the conditions of service. The conditions of service can be broadly interpreted, Mr. President. However, if you do not want to have an argument at this time, there will be another occasion.

Could I ask another supplementary? In view of the concern that the people who conducted before had about the number to go for their interviews?

MR. [illegible]: I think that also is the same supplementary in another guise.

MR. DENNIS A. BOSTON: No, sir.

MR. H. RAM SCOTT: I was going to ask, Mr. President, if they had more than one people to go?

MR. DENNIS A. BOSTON: No, sir.

MR. [illegible]: How were the candidates to apply that particular people?

MR. [illegible]: I think that that again is not a question which is a proper supplementary. However, the Member should be very clear that decisions of this kind ultimately are taken by me on the advice of the Public Service Commission.

MR. H. RAM SCOTT: Mr. President, may I ask if the persons who were on either of the two qualifications are not to the answer? What is, do they hold a family planning certificate with an [illegible] years general experience? Or, do they have the 10-12 years experience dealing with children?

MR. DENNIS A. BOSTON: I think that they hold the latter, sir.

MR. H. RAM SCOTT: Could the Member tell us where their experience of dealing with children was obtained?

SEN. JAMES H. PEARCE: Mr. President, the Senator should know that better than that. It is not a matter of jurisdiction. . . . .

MR. JAMES H. PEARCE: Somebody should be able to answer that question. However, I am sure that I cannot be held out of order in this case. This supplementary is covered in the question and it is covered in the earlier. What is the pay per year for each of the members?

MR. PRESIDENT: That is fair.

SEN. DENNIS H. MOORE: Mr. President, the honorarium pays $50,000 per annum and the honorarium $14,000 per annum.

MR. JAMES H. PEARCE: Does the Member not agree that this Act lacks the good political manners and a good political right?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SEN. DENNIS H. MOORE: I am....

MR. SPEAKER: No, what are you....

MR. W. MORRIS KUSO: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member say how many Commission members applied for the position

MR. SPEAKER: The Member has, I think, already said that he is not in a position to know any other Commission unless applied.

W. W. MORRIS KUSO: I did not hear correctly, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Has he confirm that. That the Commission unfortunately.

SEN. DENNIS H. MOORE: One Commission actually applied, Sir.

MR. W. MORRIS KUSO: That is the one within not the President

SEN. DENNIS H. MOORE: Yes, Sir.

MR. W. MORRIS KUSO: Thank you.
Supplementary. Is the Member minded to say whether the work carried out by the previous Public Accounts Committee is continuing?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I do not think there is a....

MR. W. MORRIS KUSO: .....not affected, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I should think that that is a fair supplementary answer, no. I think that we have probably exhausted the permissible topic. Not Albright.

MR. C. KAYE ADAMS: Is the Member aware of circumstances not the qualifications, is he saying that they have the same experience but he wants to know whether the appointment was political? Or is he saying that they do not have the experience? Or is he saying that they have it and he does not know where it was picked?

MR. ERNEST F. PORTER: I am saying, Sir, that they have been encountered. If they have not had an earth-moving, they have had to work under that case.

MR. JAMES M. BROWN: Any example that would have been helpful for the Board to have as it considers the Section 7 issue?

MR. ERNEST F. PORTER: No, Sir, that is not within my purview.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Second Alternate for Mary Kay and then the Third Elected Member for next Cap.

MR. M. MARCUS BROWN: Is it accurate to say, Mr. President, that the interpretation is a national standard? Is it consistent to say that the homelessness and first consume of the Second Elected Member for Golden Isle?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, sure (INDISTINCT).

MR. C. MAIO BROWN: They are not relative to me, Sir. (INDISTINCT).

MR. M. MARCUS BROWN: They consider [sic] to be empty, Sir.

MR. C. MAIO BROWN: They are not related to me, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. BROWN: I gather she was a teacher, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the Third Elected Member for Mary Kay.

MR. PATRICK E. OSTEEN: Mr. President, I preface my question with what I was going to ask if it was fair to ask of the witness for a teacher for many years. The Manual just said that's what he was.

MR. C. MAIO BROWN: That was question, Mr. President. The witness spoke about a family business, which I think he characterized different from, say, a teacher who would be a primary owner or a high owner. Does the Manual have that there to a substantial extent a family business and, um, a teacher as Senate's Cabinet?

MR. ERNEST F. PORTER: Yes, Sir, they are different.

MR. JAMES M. BROWN: I would note that both questions were objected because it is a part of the policy. The policy objection that the remittance of assets are exactly the same as those applicable to all Elected Servants. Even this inside attendance counters against the objection, supplying per one another, and we finish up with the result question that a third comment here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Sir, the Third Servant does not actually do that. However, to the best of my knowledge, Sir, a lot of their business does not work that from the counter.

MR. JAMES M. BROWN: It may have been part of the discussion to have been in this place that I do not object to, just asking to that a part of the second Chief Justice would

MR. DARRELL F. POOLE: . . . It is not a legal term, Sir. However, in these circumstances I think they have a general accepted meaning. Perhaps some of those giants who are here could help us a little on [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. ROGERS: Well, in case someone else might want to [illegible], is that a way to get a [illegible] which [illegible]?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think [illegible].

MR. F. MARRIOTT: [illegible]

MR. DARRELL: Well, you have got thirty seconds.

MR. F. MARRIOTT JONES: [illegible]

MR. DARRELL: I think that [illegible].

MR. F. MARRIOTT JONES: [illegible]

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. [illegible] I do not [illegible] that the [illegible] are considered to [illegible] [illegible] I [illegible] that the [illegible] [illegible] Are there any questions that [illegible]? [illegible]

So, we move on to Item 4, [illegible] Bill. [illegible] of the Companies (Amendment) Act, 1968.

THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

FIRST READING

TITLE: THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] I will [illegible] that the [illegible] will be [illegible] in the Committee stage.

I will entitle the Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1968, and it should be [illegible] a First Time and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

TITLE: THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

MR. PRINCE C. LOMOTEY: Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled [illegible] for it [illegible] the Companies Law (Chapter 68).

The Memorandum of Objects and Reasons, Mr. President, is as follows. Since it is quite [illegible] that there is one [illegible] of Liberia who may [illegible] a company. Mr. President, Clause [illegible] is amending Section [illegible] of the Companies Law which [illegible].

MR. STOCKS (Continued):

"Any check or money payment received for any lawful purpose may be deposited to a checking account of association, and withdrawals or multiples thereof on the authorization of this law in support of organization, form or incorporated company, with or without limited liability."

The amendment is seeking to replace "may check" by "may draw".

The Committee has, Mr. President, had before it for many, many years and some of the sessions are devoted to keeping track of the many legislative proposals. The proponents of these measures do from a company does not in any way hold any particular magistrate of Corporation. Neither does it help in any way the person who owns or runs the company. What he does is he seeks to own a company so that he gets more profit by incorporation for his. Although he has these numbers of shareholders, the company is owned by one person. Therefore, there is no need to have this requirement that you must have three shares issued in order to form a company.

Since I seek to amend section 8(3) by substituting further the registration of association, the names of which exclude women. When we look at section 2(15) we find that the Registrar of Companies has been given the power refusing to register any company whose name includes the word "Bank" or "Insurance", without having the authority of the Governor - Gen, Mr. President. It has worked very well so far. However, since we were amending the Companies Act, we thought it was an appropriate time to amend this, that the reason for clause 7.

Clause 8 seeks to, therefore, as the constitution is sought to be made for a new province (12) to be inserted into the Act, substituting the name of Provincial Bureau and Provincial Branch. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Provincial Bureaus are big business in the United States. It is the United States market and their market which was already 75 times more, and has made much for the last eight or ten years, in many ways. The Companies Act at present does not specifically authorize the issue of Investment shares or give it any legality to act. In the United States businesses, Mr. President, a person invests how much a month or how much a week he is going to invest into this mutual fund. It could be $50. It could be $10. What happens is that at any given time, the $10 may not amount to... the fund would reach to $2 immediately. So, when that company does its investment evaluation, it has money which accumulates in part of a share and it, accordingly is unable to have that investment shown in right now.

I know, Mr. President, that since you took a number of mutual fund operations in the United States, accordingly the reason why we are so is because that provides this amendment particularly Investment shares. I am also moved this in order to recognize the needs of the rural Bills that does only that the Societies shares issued prior to the making into law of this Bill, so that once this Bill does not by chance make that not illegal. What it does is to cover all previous activities. This point is why, Mr. President, I duly consider here to make, because if we are really to recognize mutual funds which are going to come to us in the future, we accordingly need to recognize the mutual funds which are already known.

Clause 9 and 7 seeks to replace section 11. Section 11, Mr. President, is a penalty for carrying on business with less than three members. As we are seeking the number of members from three to one there is no need for this section.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] question in [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. C. ANTO RAIOS (Guinea-Bissau): Most of us in reading or [illegible] those of the past Philosophy and moral [illegible] those qualities of [illegible] without the necessity of [illegible] of a more and more [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: I believe that this should circulate some footsteps on the economy registration. I do not agree that the Second District Member has Bobbie Sue's interpretation of things right. I have never said that I am against representative legislature. There are going to be some times it's going to be necessary and I have indicated not to vote such broad sweeping statements. Anybody [illegible] section 21 of the Tax Code that says to convey, in my mind it, to silence on [illegible] abstain. It does not say that [illegible] should not be voted. But even if you say [illegible] should be silenced, I do not think if you are to silence on it that anyone who may have [illegible] would have contributed a cause. I think that we are very unlikely from the [illegible] should be silenced. I think it is a good move and I support it.

The rest of the bill, I agree, is [illegible] that there are [illegible] I see no [illegible] to continued development of economic development in the Ozarks Region. It was also good to hear that the Planning Commission [illegible] those [illegible] people who are [illegible] because that is the kind of thing which will [illegible] people, and [illegible] of the right composition of economy [illegible] in the Ozarks. Therefore, I hope, Sir, that the committee is also going to deal with the economy development regulations and the Economy Development [illegible] I have had complaints - not really complaints but I know [illegible] people [illegible] of the Economy Development [illegible] which would [illegible] people who are managing a [illegible] are finding it difficult to work, although I do realize that is not the intent of the Economic Development [illegible] Commission, for instance, is required [illegible].

I believe, Sir, that this is the kind of legislation which can only help in the development of the economy throughout the Ozarks Region and I support the bill, Sir.

MR. [illegible]: The United Steelworkers [illegible] Thank you, Sir.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of [illegible] for a fair to amend the Constitution [illegible] as I look through the old law, Sir, I notice that since 1917 we have had [illegible] as the constitution up to 1972, and perhaps more since. I would, however, take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the Constitutional Revision for the responsibility [illegible] in [illegible] this committee bill. Also I am aware, Sir, that the committee which worked with him provided the [illegible] recommendations to this measure.

On the question, Sir, of [illegible] there, since they seem to be the [illegible] point [illegible] discussion, even though this may not be specifically spelled out in the principal law, for most of the lawyers and other [illegible] organized [illegible] the interpretation and [illegible] of corporations. I think it was well understood that we [illegible] a company that specific shares were necessary. In other words, if you [illegible] the subscribing names of these people, were [illegible] that they [illegible] there also. I do not think that it was [illegible] to have that subscribers to the Association should have [illegible], as per name of a [illegible] it was come or whatever. So, in support of what the Second District Member for Bobbie Sue said, in order [illegible] of the committee bill which amends section 21 of the [illegible] Constitution. However, it is recommended [illegible], which I feel is necessary.

MR. EDWARD A. DARMAN (Pennsylvania): I also support the Executive Director's request to visit various State capitals to discuss the commission's proposal. One of our financial problems is the Council schedule. Because of time and the availability of the members, it is not always possible to have a quorum at a State capital. Perhaps many because of the fiscal note which has accompanied all legislative bills, I thought both Executive Director and I also have to validate that. However, be that as it may, I feel that there is necessity for that visit and I believe that Mr. Bennett raised some of the problems which have been experienced in the past.

Taking the executive session on the criminological order out of the bill, I feel that section 2 of the executive bill which amends section 4 of the principal Act is very necessary. By the substitution of one phrase for another, it makes it much more flexible for Executive to serve at the pleasure of the Governor and not be a category or tenure as to any other member relative to a compensation.

One Member mentioned that this will prevent the problem of removal. Well, I disagree. There may be a little misunderstanding of the Member's mind regarding the use and purpose of removal statutes. My understanding, prior to that amendment, was based on basically of a misconception. Because the office is one not provided for [illegible] removal statute. To use removal statutes for [illegible] to fight the attorney. After the attorney was found, that State Administrative Adjudication Act is a procedure to appoint hearing examiners. The same problem relates also to the question of terminations, where Executive may appoint alternate directors. So, my point on that bit of misunderstanding, Mr. [illegible] that is the [illegible] to remove or alter procedural point.

Section 2 of the executive bill is also important because it amends the manner which the Governor appoints office [illegible]. Section 4, "Executive Secretary," it will legalize some of the acts which he has taken such as the terms "Chairperson", "Commissioner", "Chair" or whatever. In fact, he did this under his capacity and now with the legal backing of the Act.

Section 12 of the principal Act is repealed, which is a re-enactment of the present [illegible] of the criminological Act. There is no longer a need for these administrative functions. Specifically Mr. [illegible] that there is a Committee Study amendment with regard to section 120 of the principal Act, which I also feel is most important. I think that a report would re-instate the [illegible] objectives sought for by this Act. I would like members know what this Committee might [illegible] if I agree that this is necessary.

The only problem which seems to occur is when there is one member of a company and one is using a specific technique, because it would then seem that he wants to disqualify [illegible] of the members. However, I do agree that it is a case like that it would read that one person could then [illegible] this special technique.

The other section of this amendment [illegible] of probation of a juvenile person and change [illegible] the "extraordinary medication" to "special medication", so it will be [illegible] necessary to have the "extraordinary medication". I also [illegible] the penalties of this Act that the "extraordinary medication" [illegible] necessary.

MR. LAWRENCE A. FUQUEA (CONTINUING): ...this "extraordinary relationship" that apparently brought about a special relationship which became, as was explained by the Chairman of the bill, in the subcommittee. This was most unnecessary.

In closing out the enlightenment, I think that it would also be wise, because they are not normally given the "Bonus," to recognize the efforts made by the Legal Department and in particular the Legal Department. I think that we owe them a tremendous job on many of these cases.

Mr. President, with those few words, I give this unanimous bill my full support.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Chair thanks Member from Fuquea Area.

MR. JAMES K. ROGERS: Mr. President, I was recognized by the Honorable Third Official Member on the side of the aisle trying to understand the Committee vote. If he is in the appropriate mood I'd appreciate him for his efforts on this bill.

I would have liked to have made a more comprehensive review at this time because the Committee has been in the chamber here for many hours. In keep in line with Chairperson's request, and in deference to an important Financial Report, it is incumbent on me to make the necessary technical edit without foregoing thoroughness. It is only fair I explain that this Member can possibly support the bill because I would not choose it was necessary to penalize a vital segment of people in the community. However, in this circumstance that is not so. We can only do what is right. I think the history of the Legal Time in the Islands who have enlisted in this in the past. I unanimously feel that this private Financial Corporation has carried out enough experimental plans like in the case of the employment of the Seamen during World War, the export of the conch shell and on, and so on. This is only one more case of attempting to help individuals. In this context, Mr. President, I will give myself in the position by voting against the recommendation of the Legislature, but fully appreciate every task of the Bill that they did.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Second Elected Member for West End.

MR. K. WILFRED ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr. President. I support the Bill. I believe the economics in this Bill which makes it possible for our people to have a company in Jamaica which will help promote to those islands, and I would, I would like to see more and more of it happen. I have quite a long statement that I have here, but some of the points pertinent to my statement were made. In order to save time, I will support.

MR. A. MACKAY RIFE (FREDERICTON): I would make one point, Sir, in respect to what I said yesterday concerning paternalistic legislation. I make that I am against it. However, on how to pass that principle, we also have many good friends of some people on this. Some rights have been sought for legislation which I do not support, Mr. Speaker, paternalistic legislation such as was brought to this House in 1969 on the purchase and use of alcohol by minors. Just Wednesday evening, about this time, we were discussing [illegible] I am in favour, as I said yesterday, of lowering the voting age to 18 years. I think that is the way it is going. [illegible] I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I can say that on the way it is. Because of what I read to be some of the other views for amendments to the Canadian Law in our country. Personally it was made clear that our Law at the moment does not provide for freedom of a minor until the age of the majority to do what they will have, knowledge to make financial decisions to give effect to that.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are not supposed to anticipate legislation in our debates. However, I think in the same way that members discussed the [illegible] we ought to make every possible [illegible] of the Canadian Bill before us. Some consideration to [illegible] the possibility of adoption and implementation of [illegible] at some point. It is possible that a motion brought into this discussion could have [illegible] to Order 11(1). I think that this would [illegible] the wishes of this amendment.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this Government is not aware and will never be [illegible] of it, [illegible] of federal powers in the form of legislation on [illegible]. The question from which that amendment arises, Mr. Speaker, is an opinion we will agree in that type of thing, as I would see when considering that this Government would be [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak to the amendment which is before us, the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council?

HON. ROBERT D. DOWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my support to this Bill. Sir, and in particular refer to what Members have said about the detrimental effect of section 4 of the Bill. I would like to assure the Members in this Honourable House that if this amendment is put to the people of Canada, I would not be surprised to [illegible] a majority of people. I would not be surprised to [illegible] have without my knowledge and consent. However, Mr. Speaker, I can see why this amendment be put to the way it is. Because of what I read to be some of the other views for amendments to the Canadian Law in our country. Personally it was made clear that our Law at the moment does not provide for freedom of a minor until the age of the majority to do what they will have, knowledge to make financial decisions to give effect to that.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are not supposed to anticipate legislation in our debates. However, I think in the same way that members discussed the [illegible] we ought to make every possible [illegible] of the Canadian Bill before us. Some consideration to [illegible] the possibility of adoption and implementation of [illegible] at some point. It is possible that a motion brought into this discussion could have [illegible] to Order 11(1). I think that this would [illegible] the wishes of this amendment.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this Government is not aware and will never be [illegible] of it, [illegible] of federal powers in the form of legislation on [illegible]. The question from which that amendment arises, Mr. Speaker, is an opinion we will agree in that type of thing, as I would see when considering that this Government would be [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Queens-Lunenburg-Shelburne. I can stand up for one minute and say something during the right period that I was in the Administration or the manner in which it was [illegible] of misapplied in this Administration.

MR. CHARLES O. LUCEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, when one speaks I would like...

MR. JAMES M. QUIGLEY: I do have the gentleman from Kent also, but the Senator was talking. I hope the one who spoke first...

MR. CHARLES O. LUCEY: Really, I would like one chance at a question, the one which believe in the one which just did.

MR. JAMES M. QUIGLEY: The only one I have might be the gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Again, order.

MR. EDWARD G. KEATING: Well, I object to that characterization, the Senator appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I would. I welcome these amendments and I look forward to the more enlightened amendments which will come in the course of the Senate and conference which Governor Quigley is in his eight person is active. We will do it outside the room later.

Thank you very much.

MR. QUIGLEY: Does any other Senator wish to speak to the matter that is currently before the people?

MR. CHARLES O. LUCEY: Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I will certainly try to be brief. Firstly, I think reasonable Senators of their opinion of the bill. I think that may all have many points of importance on the bill.

One point, Mr. Speaker, which does seem to be still hanging in the air a little bit is the Constitutional change. However I will try once more to explain it as I understand it.

The Convention felt that we must maybe be Constitutional change. It is silent on the Constitutional change are concerned. Therefore, there is nothing illegal about changing provisionally change. The reason for the amendment is to make people know the Executive has some recognized Constitutional weight. This constitutional weight is existing the Governor has, Mr. Speaker. I personally feel or would prefer one, recommend changes. When you have for a short period of time to function of the Act Council is it a study on the United Kingdom Executive and can't we consider our legislature for it will consider a Minister financial control. That report or study produced by the committee and the recommendations which we have before us now the first from there. I say, Mr. Speaker, as one Member inclined, would have liked to have read through all the recommendations of the time. If we decide for this, Mr. Speaker, the Constitutions are still to wait... going to this time next year. I thought to myself that it, the interests of Australia that Governor Sir Mike Hill, we should then make it more difficult to appoint or disappointment thereafter.

I was happy to hear the Senator Kennedy Member for West Bay say that, and I hope that I am not quarrying him correctly, anything I would be under pressure to create earnest.

MR. W. ROBERTS SIBON: But we have not spoken though. Time should be kept in mind. Gentlemen,

MR. CHARLES E. JEFFERSON: I rise in reply, Mr. President. It is my

Mr. President, I too would like to unite with the Legal Analysis and thank everyone together and absolutely who has made such fine contributions to us at short notice. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that I shall certainly be glad to have a look at the proposed modification to Second Reading.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED

MR. M. MCKEOWN JONES: May I make a suggestion, Mr. President?

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well.

DIVISION NO. 78/85

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis A. Foster	
Hon. Michael F. Ferguson	
Hon. Sharon C. Jeffcott	
Hon. Dennis D. Brooks	
Mr. M. Norman Gallop	
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Kirkconnell	
Hon. Russell S. Johnson	
Mr. M. McKeown Jones	
Hon. Eugene F. Steele	
Mr. Clifford A. Pickram	
Hon. Hedley G. McKeough	
Mr. James K. Foulds	
Mr. G. Ross Gordon	
Mr. L. Leonard Willis	
14	9

AGREED: THE COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985 CARRIED (BRIAN ARNOTT).

MR. JAMES M. RENWICK: Mr. President, on a matter of clarification, I like to make for clarification sake. However, how does it help to call this a division when somebody has voted in favour of a bill and there is no point to it?

MR. PRESIDENT: That is not a question for me to answer, a supplementary and I cannot help you. All I can tell you is that I have taken the view of a number that may be available to us because they have failed to have somebody voting for.

MR. R. ROBERT NIXON: What is it, you are not, Mr. President. Just maybe we can't on the record so that people can talk about it, but they have to note what they say they will vote.

MR. LEONARD J. BRANDY: If that identifies, Mr. there are such to abstain.

MR. M. MCKEOWN JONES: That is right.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] I think it would be useful if Members could be assisted. Perhaps I think if a Member could just [illegible] some short change allow it. (interruption).

I think we have just [illegible] to adjourn on another Bill and we have [illegible] Legal Families, the Evidence (Amendment) Bill, 1988.

THE EVIDENCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

First Reading

CLERK: The Evidence (Amendment) Bill, 1988.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled the Evidence (Amendment) Act, 1988 is deemed to have been read a First time and to be set down for Second Reading.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRANDT: Mr. President, I rise on a point of order Members. Mr. President, I think that if I might my learned friends speak, I'm all will ask later and view especially that it was for the Evidence Adjournment.

MR. PRESIDENT: I see. I thought that perhaps it was [illegible] Members. However, if it is [illegible], then possibly the Bill and Evidence Bill can be dealt with. Would the Members wish to become [illegible] at 2.30 p.m. or, since we are [illegible] Bill become available? Would 2.00 p.m. suit Members? Well, then let us [illegible] and we shall [illegible] 2.00 p.m.

At 12.55 P.M. the House adjourned.

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2.00 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Bill. Second reading.

THE EVIDENCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

SECOND READING

CLERK: The Evidence (Amendment) Bill, 1988.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRANDT: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Second Reading of a Bill entitled the Evidence (Amendment) Bill, 1988, be now read.

I would like to apologise to Members of this Honourable House for my misjudgement and explanation in commencing my Second Reading speech of this Bill before the lunch hour. Previously in years gone by, I would have had no hesitation to delay it, because Bill was such as this dealing with [illegible] and legal matters, I would have been content to remain and [illegible] responsibility to Members about Second Reading speech, and then deal with the details of the Bill after we have [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible] As we will know, our Constitution [illegible] Law of one of the Japanese and one of the [illegible] which which the property and the dignity of one citizen [illegible] depends. Most all are seeking to [illegible] the [illegible] Law as [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE (CONTINUED): Rule 4 of the Fifth Schedule is replaced by the following expression. Section 6 says:-

> "Section 2 of the principal Act is amended by substituting 'Judge or Registrar' for 'Court' in the second place."

'Judge or Registrar' for 'Court' - what does this mean? Section 2 is the section concerning the jurisdiction of the Court. Section 6 is the section which deals with the powers of the Judge which are exercisable by one Solicitor and Client Costs:-

> "Determination of a disputed matter as to any matter relating to the satisfaction of the order to be executed may be made by Arbitration;"

Therefore, the Solicitors are clearly complaining that there was a dispute as to the satisfaction of the order to be executed and that the matter was referred to Arbitration. However, the Solicitors are clearly complaining that there was a dispute as to the satisfaction of the order to be executed and that the matter was referred to Arbitration. However, because the solicitor has a right to ask questions of the Law Society before I want to make the following:-

> "An objection to the solicitor's account of charges and professional disbursements, every objection should be specific and should state clearly and concisely what is disputed and the grounds for such objection."

I think it is important to note that the Law Society has not made any comment on this point. It has not made any comment on this point. It has not made any comment on this point. It

U.S. Supreme Court recognized as known by the finder when subsequently used prejudicially to the client? Is exception accepted which would prevent evidence that the finder committed perjury in order to conceal evidence that the finder received the confidences relating, one of the finder personally, the same witness. There was a long debate of many, seven pages, leading one different view might exist of evidence prejudicial evidence beyond...

Now, Mr. President, for reasons unknown to me, because I was not instructed by Judge's Memorandum of State Issues at the time, Judge Jones does ignore the Criminal Procedure Rule 16(a)(1) record, assumed to and understood of our law, that Criminal Procedure Rule, says at the said relevant as an afterthought, an exception 16(b), requires motion of the Prosecutor pertinent and available. Now, the Prosecution may have been at this time that there was no intention legislation providing for the court of possible accusations by finder testimony. In fact, it has not happened and the duties of finder testimony have a procedure such that if one wishes to make accusations, one must go through a time, consequence and financial procedures of having a witness, of investigating the witness's credentials and going through a long procedure.

Mr. President, the other consideration which was urged in favor of the said Prosecutor's motion was very brief, one very simple and is not used when the witness in the courtroom is dead which may otherwise be absent or dead at...

It is a commonly accepted fact that the efficient operation of criminal investigations and of prosecutions, that prosecutions sometimes may be proved by finder testimony, and that it tends to assist the finder privacy of evidence, shows a lot of the Rule before this Court is dissatisfied with any prosecutions for such evidence. The case places a heavy burden upon the state that has not overcome, one considering a motion that merely a prosecution conviction may be proved against a person, subject to the safeguards clause of the Investigations of Procedure but which the proper problem that given by showing that confusion provided the finder private of the person investigated was real and the same

It goes on the procedure for prosecutions against by and on behalf of the Commissioner of Police complaining that evidence of the finder private confidences with the certificate are then given, and provides a method whereby these may be resolved in advance.

There is a further procedure which was a new section 243 to the Criminal Code, which provides rules for criminal prosecutions. A person by a duly authorized person certifying that finder private law shows of the person charged with the offence, or of any other person which, subject to the appropriate Attorney General, be sufficient evidence of that fact and of the authority of the person to make the report. In the absence of evidence to the contrary it shall be proof of the facts contained therein as to the finder private.

However, subsection (2) goes on and provides a safeguard for the citizen, and provides that that matter which I have just mentioned of proving with leave of finder private, shall not apply in respect of a record produced by the prosecution to the person charged with the offence not less than seven days before the hearing of the trial, or leave the person charged with the offence not less than one day before the hearing, has served a notice on the prosecution that he has no intention to adduce the finder private evidence. So, not only has the prosecution the burden of proving all the elements, but there is a duty imposed on the person charged that the failure may have a substantial effect on the conduct of the trial. If that requirement has been met, then evidence must be given by the person charged.

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. MICHAEL J. COCKRANE (CONTINUED): I think, Sir, that it is the view of lawyers in this assembly, of the chairman and of the police prosecutors, that the unnecessary qualifications relating to minors and illiterates to make written statements, be removed.

... As a small personal point, Sir, since I also speak to amend section 42 of the principal Law by adding a new subsection (3), which says -

> "Whenever, in a written statement tendered in evidence in criminal proceedings by virtue of subsection (1), objection is taken to particular statements in those proceedings which he thinks may be false or does not believe to be true in spirit of an offence, the Registrar shall cause to be brought to them not exceeding seven years."

This, Sir, was a matter which again was drawn to our attention by the learned Chairman of Justices, who pointed out that sometimes in magistrates' Courts a witness makes a statement in a position that the person making the statement realises that he or she would be liable to prosecution for perjury in which event he or she undertakes not to continue in the statement. Sir, these legal technicalities I know to some extent provision in one Law for making such a false statement.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to keep, I can appreciate what may be politicians to members here, but which may be to public persons who have the responsibility must make written statements, a procedure almost and sophisticated world. I apologise to the House if I have taken too long over it. I just wish to say, Mr. President, that we had our law extraordinarily I manage to cover all the points available, and the ingenuity of members will not prevent some fiendish something which I have not mentioned, or missing some points which I have not thought of. The only consolation which I am offended, Sir, is that I know as sense a right of reply.

May I commend this Bill to the Members of this House.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled: An Ordinance (unanimously) Bill, 1968 be given a second reading. The motion is open for debate.

The Second Elected Member for Castle Rock.

RIGHT OF AUDIO RECORD

MR. C. MIKE SQUIRE: Mr. Speaker, I especially wish the Member that speaker - a small chance because there are many more people who will be able to speak on the original Law.

In dealing with the matter of evidence I suppose perhaps to explain a bit the new Bill, under section 42(1) of the old Law, I imagine, the criminal proceedings a person charged by a responsible authority to do by the Criminal Code of Police and certainly that person brought are those of the person charged with the offence or of any other person which, subject to subsection (2) is additional evidence of that fact and of the authority of that person to make the decision and so on. I would like to see, though there, the power of the Magistrate, if asked to, a police officer not before the Bench of Magistrates.

(a) [illegible] the notice for this to that person [illegible] in the event [illegible] in which [illegible] that person [illegible] of the [illegible]. Such notice shall not be given for any [illegible] which has been [illegible] by the Commissioner of Police. A notice [illegible] from [illegible] to a police officer [illegible] the rank of Inspector.

If the [illegible] of this section [illegible] in [illegible] to make [illegible] under section [illegible] which [illegible], the Registrar [illegible] that the court may [illegible] [illegible], on the application of a police officer [illegible] rank of Inspector [illegible] that person [illegible] by a constable. So, although the two things are different, the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] a difference between a constable and a police officer above the rank of Inspector. So, in our [illegible] [illegible] the penalty, only [illegible] could be dealt by Magistrate, if he [illegible] that those matters were not [illegible] in the hands of a constable, but may be quite [illegible]. I would like to see that [illegible] always be dealt, [illegible] police officers not below the rank of Inspector".

One of the other provisions [illegible] I am [illegible] with is the acceptance by the service of a [illegible] [illegible] which appear to, [illegible] certain [illegible] not, [illegible] dismissal. This is a very serious matter. In section 27(3) it says:-

> "Subsection (1) shall not apply to a person [illegible] on behalf of the prosecution -
>
> (a) [illegible] a copy [illegible] [illegible] with the offence not less than [illegible] days before the hearing or
> (b) where the person [illegible] the offence, not [illegible] than six days before the hearing or [illegible] before the hearing or any such later time [illegible] as the court may in special circumstances allow, was served a notice by the prosecution stating [illegible] of authority mentioned in subsection (1)".

This seems to me to be [illegible] of the [illegible] to which [illegible] we are [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. We have the British [illegible], who would [illegible] us no [illegible] [illegible] trial system. After the [illegible] trouble there could be no [illegible] a [illegible] this Legislature which will [illegible] to the British [illegible]. [illegible] is a very serious [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] the right to cross-examine the witness [illegible] the accused [illegible] his lawyer has made an application and has subpoenaed the witness [illegible] the trial. What it seems to me is that this may [illegible] often. The witnesses may come up during the trial. The lawyer [illegible] the accused might be [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] of the trial. [illegible] might even have the witnesses there [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] before the court [illegible] and [illegible] of this. [illegible] I [illegible] person he may not know [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] which is [illegible]. Certainly this has to be a [illegible] on the [illegible].

The Bahamas has a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] safeguard the rights of the accused to [illegible] the evidence [illegible] the trial. Quoting from this, it says:-

> "Where [illegible] [illegible] a [illegible] statement made by the person may be [illegible] in evidence by [illegible] of this section

MR. C. HAIT ROSES [illegible]:

> [illegible] party by whom or on whose behalf a copy of the statement was caused [illegible] power to give evidence, and"

[illegible] the statement goes:

> "[illegible] such an application, or on the application of any party to the proceedings pursue that the person required [illegible] before the court and give evidence."

I do not [illegible] what stage of the trial we have got, the accused in the English law would have the right to call the person who will [illegible] to give evidence. We don't [illegible] person could [illegible] would [illegible] appear to be in our [illegible] the accused does have the right to cross examine of his obligations [illegible] before the trial and although, however, there [illegible] discretion, a think that there must still be a procedure for the accused to call the person who had been the maker of the statement so that that person can be examined. If we do [illegible] [illegible] to study the rights of the accused in a fair trial [illegible] I would like to refer to some of the [illegible] rights. Article 14 of the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights says:-

> "All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, every person shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law."

My contention is that the accused must have the right to challenge the evidence, whether it be unsworn or only at any time during the trial. I'd like to say that here-

> "Should have the right to examine or have examined the witnesses against him, and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him."

So, he should not [illegible] his rights to [illegible] the witness at any time, which apparently this could do, it would seem to be that he must challenge the evidence before the [illegible]. I am saying that he should have the rights to challenge it at any time.

The [illegible] which I am [illegible] to use that I spoke about. That is this unsworn statement [illegible] a criminal offence [illegible] the Zambian evidence [illegible]. Despite [illegible] the right to examine or have examined witnesses [illegible] and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses against him, [illegible] I am alarmed by what has happened to [illegible] since January. We are quite presently the prosecution [illegible] charged and nothing was said. Nowhere [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. G. Wilf Jones (Nottingham): Also, in any revision of these rules, we must consider what we are trying to achieve. We are trying to get rid of the delay and uncertainty that is caused by the Chief Executive having to give his consent before the Writ is issued. That is the only thing we are trying to get rid of by the Chief Executive's consent. We are trying to see that there is no possibility for challenging the petition unless it is challenged before the period. It is not always possible. So, I would like to put the provision which gives the Chief Executive's consent into the Writ.

While I do not wish to differ unnecessarily from Mr. Brown, I hope he will consider my amendment to correct these defects.

The Returning Officer of the new Bill, Mr. [illegible], says:-

"Writ does not need sign before the hearing."

and I maintain that never does not sufficient, because there are many instances unnecessary people have to appear who [illegible]. It is not always easy to ascertain which time can the Writ of return ought to not sufficient.

Also, there is a grave defect in election petition dealing with petitions from those persons who are unable to read and write. Subsection (2)(b), of section 9 reads:-

"If the statement is made by a person who cannot read it, it shall be read to him before he signs it or affixes to it his mark and shall be accompanied by a declaration by the person who made the statement to him as to the fact that it was so read."

This provision is not clear and can never be enforced to ensure to their fullness. The statement should be read to the person by a member of the Bar or some other responsible person. It cannot be left open so that a statement can be read to the person, only by a responsible who is unscrupulously the same. This must be changed, because this is a matter dealing with criminal matters where the uneducated person might be given a death sentence or a very long period sentence. Since matters cannot be treated lightly simply to avoid up administrative matters.

In connection with [illegible] of the Bill I have just sought, I would like to put an amendment to section 5 of the Bill to change the word "secretary" to "[illegible]" the name of [illegible]. Also I would like to see that section 5 of the Bill be amended by the addition of a new subsection which I specify above:-

"Notwithstanding that a person may be any person may be authorised or authorises by virtue of this section

(a) the person by whom or on whose behalf a copy of the report was served may call that person to give evidence, and

(b) the court may of its own motion, or on the application of any part of the person may call the person and give evidence."

U.S. ... RULE BOOKS (INTERPRETING): I would also like an amendment to section 2 of the bill to make it clear that the existing safeguard in the rule section 34 do not apply to preliminary enquiries.

I would also like to see the role of lawyers changed in Juvenile Court. As I mentioned with regard to hearsay a statement read once by a person who is dishonest, it should not be open to a question of the person not being available by any process.

Finally, I would like to say that in any of those matters, that any person giving any evidence, whether in the shape of any written evidence to be used in a criminal matter, should be entitled by the defendant or solicitor to visit that person. While the prosecution, perhaps, would like to appear as if we were the spokesmen of justice, we have on occasion found that people entered into a plea of guilty on impulse, either by threatening that unfortunately to single out one person who may possibly implicate him. While still in fear one which should be prohibited or should be changed etc. It is the police who have to deal with the administration of justice, and I have discussed with the Chief Constable of Leeds, I discuss lawyers and senior lawyers with this question the solicitors' organisation which I have approached.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member wish to exercise his right of reply?

MISS HERBISON (Minister of Pensions): Yes, Mr. President, I wish to exercise my right of reply.

Mr. President, the Honourable Second Elected Member for Dublin Town did not take notes. He is unfortunately not here. I know lovely boy to make a record of the points which he has raised and I should like to deal with them, however or I can, in the order that he raised them, very briefly on the memory of his summary of his speech.

The first point, Mr. President, to which we have to answer is one which I would have thought, I would say, would be rejected by a somewhat shocked, perhaps, or amused by a somewhat shocked audience, be asserted, that the Honourable Member would like to be changed to a prosecutor rather than he must be a police officer and below the rank of Inspector.

Let us go back to the days when perhaps the Chairman following did not have the degree of formal ability or sophistication which the police force now have. Let us go back to the person who was unemployed ... Why to be the policeman for the period of unemployment under the Minister Secretary June 10 of 1934. What person there was any member of the Labour Party or on or the part of corporate, or any person officer appointed or made by the administration, or any ex-officer of the Labour Government... I would hope that it was just the intention of the Honourable Member to point that the attempt of unemployment and standard of living of the members of our police force have changed in the twenty-one years since the outgoing Minister Parliamentary Under Secretary [illegible] to be ... making to his suggestion, by no innuendo.

One will be the powers proposed there were people in overall significant percentage to those contained in the Local Criminal Justice Act of the United Kingdom, which says that a certificate prescribing to be developed by or on behalf of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, and then goes on to say it a certificate purporting to be signed by or on behalf of the Chairman of a police or other prosecuting by or on behalf of

[illegible] Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the person who has anything to say on behalf of anybody has got to be a member of this parliament if we have any qualifications.

I, as Gentlemen, agree to the thought by this honourable House that the person entitled to appear, or be heard, I personally feel that I have not spoken to my satisfaction. I would have only great objection to proceeding on to the normal level of consideration which has been set down for the [illegible] stage.

May I move to the normal motion, Mr. Speaker? That is that the honourable member of [illegible] be heard now or at some other time, and that he should not be able to proceed this bill [illegible] be most object to be reasonably taken [illegible] to be that normal understanding the other provisions, that a petition presented which is signed on behalf, may be the subject of a requirement by the Clerk or the petitioners of any party to the [illegible] to be heard before the Council and [illegible]

I am sorry, Mr. President, if this is [illegible] a point to understand why the honourable Member should be asked to appear [illegible] Council [illegible] to be considered on the United Kingdom legislation [illegible] the Criminal Justice Act, 1967 which says that notwithstanding that a petition presented [illegible] by any person who is [illegible] a matter of private privilege by virtue of this section, the person [illegible] the proceedings may have [illegible] on the petition, or on the application of any party to the proceedings requires that person to be heard before such report and [illegible]. By implication, Mr. President, it does [illegible] to that Ordinance [illegible]. Secondly, why a Member [illegible] be asked to [illegible] has taken certain actions [illegible] of our Ordinance [illegible] to [illegible] last seven years ago, and I quote:-

> "Notwithstanding that a certain statement by any person may be objectionable or criminal by virtue of this section ..."

> "[illegible] the above may, of the said petition, or on the application of any party to the proceedings, [illegible] to appear before the Court and give evidence."

"It be done, Sir, by those who have been [illegible] to [illegible] Ordinance [illegible] on the statute book, it is not necessary [illegible] to be heard unless one should [illegible] by making a direct [illegible] by any further than a simple [illegible].

Mr. President, the next question which arises and which we would [illegible] to change [illegible] of the Bill to provide that the administration of [illegible] would not apply to [illegible]. As I said [illegible] Monday, one great reason why we should [illegible] make [illegible] to persons who are under [illegible] which already [illegible] of [illegible] by persons other than [illegible] to go through the [illegible], [illegible] which is not necessary. The [illegible] to give [illegible] to [illegible] of [illegible] over the age of [illegible] and only [illegible] to find out [illegible].

MR. MICHAEL J. BERRY (CONTINUING): [illegible] point to make, Gary, is that we would like the period of grace [illegible] to be shown to [illegible] to be considered in existence. [illegible] days from actual [illegible]. The whole intent of passing a law is the enactment of the [illegible] and to provide a fair balance between giving the [illegible] reasonably to know the [illegible] being given [illegible] to allow [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE SUCCESSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2013.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Treasurer, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill shortly entitled the Cayman Islands Succession (Amendment) Bill, 2013.

As I explained in my Second Reading speech on the Succession (Amendment) Bill, 2011, that Bill seeks to harmonize certain provisions of the Succession Law, 1972, with recommendations in the Wills Law, 2011, which is necessary as the latter seeks to provide for a system of digital printing within these Islands. If such law is passed, as I hope that it will be, then the present Wills Trusts Law will be redundant and of no necessity going forward.

In that vein, Sir, I would therefore move the Second Reading for the repeal of that Law by the second reading of this Bill.

SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled the Wills Trusts Repeal Bill, 2013 be given a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate. If no Member wishes to speak I will put the question.

CLERK: THE WILLS TRUSTS (REPEAL) BILL, 2013 GIVEN A SECOND READING

SPEAKER: Next Bill.

THE SUCCESSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2013

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE SUCCESSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2013.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill entitled The Succession (Amendment) Bill, 2013 be moved to have been read a First time and to be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE SUCCESSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2013.

MR. WINSTON C. MCLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill shortly entitled The Succession (Amendment) Bill, 2013.

The purpose for my moving the above referenced Islands Bill is to amend the administration of estates, in the Succession Law, 1972, which largely consists of a consolidation of a number of old Law dealing with this subject. The provisions of this Law have become dissatisfactory and proved to be inadequate in a society multi-generational by financial systems. With the complex legal issues and administration work that is now carried out in these Islands, the present Succession Law which was not built with the complicated issues that is encountered in dealing with the estates of deceased persons.

If I may quote a number of examples. There was an application made for the executor to administer the Will which was made in Quebec on behalf of an executor domiciled in Canada, where the deceased was also domiciled in Ottawa, leaving assets in those Islands. In Quebec there are three ways of validly

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. MURPHY: Mr. President, the remarks I have made for my amendment can be explained in a comprehensive and new conception law enacted, which would make the transfer permissible as was envisioned. However, we do still have to provide for such a law, such as the removal of the drafting committee, to be located in the main statute, in the meantime as an interim measure to remove from the responsible place the provisions in this law as presently drafted, unless you have some substantially other suggestion regarding implementation, then with my amendment the Board would promulgate and conform to the provisions of this statute, that the interim provisions should apply.

This provision has had the blessing of the private sector of the legal community. It is the judgment of the author and has the support of the members of my staff.

I commend this short bill to the Honorable House.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a bill entitled "An Act ... amendments" shall be given a second reading, for which the ayes are ... If any Member wishes to speak to this question.

Question put: Agreed. THE SECOND [AMENDMENT] BILL, 1987 GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. SPEAKER: The next bill now on this Order Paper is a bill entitled the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1987 and other bills.

THE LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1987

COMMITTEE STAGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.
The clerk is now in session.
A bill for a law to amend the Land Acquisition Law (Chapter 21)

Clerk: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 1 do stand part of the bill. If any Member wishes to speak to this clause

Question put: Agreed. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

Clerk: CLAUSE 2 - AMENDMENT OF LAW.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 do stand part of the bill.

Question put: Agreed. CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

Clerk: CLAUSE 3 - AMENDMENT OF LAW.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 3 do stand part of the bill.

Question put: Agreed. CLAUSE 3 AGREED.

MOTION: CLAUSE 4 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 4 be agreed to by the Committee.

MR. G. RYDE (Lyons): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I welcome both the ability of the Corporation of Somerville to make an application to Somerville-Council, because this is a decision publicly made available to the Members of Somerville Council. I think that they already have too much power and I would like to remain on it was in the old Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am aware that the Council in Shropshire is the only Council which has to consider whether they do or whether they do not have the power, now the Act has been passed, to make an application to the Minister for the change of name. I take it that you will vote against the clause?

MR. G. RYDE (Lyons): The only amendment I would have to it is the clause by which would be given if I were satisfied to, I understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we merely give evidence that by [illegible] I will put the question that clause 4 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES ARE TWO

MR. G. RYDE (Lyons): May I have a division please, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

DIVISION NO. 4/1/67

AYES

Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

NOES

Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

16

CLAUSE 4 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

MOTION: CLAUSE 5 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 5 stand part of the Bill. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 5 PASSED.

[illegible] CLAUSE 5 - ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 31.

[illegible]: The question is that clause 4 do stand part of the Bill.

[illegible] AGREED. CLAUSE 5 PASSED.

[illegible] CLAUSE 6 - ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 32.

[illegible]: The question is that clause 5 do stand part of the Bill.

[illegible] AGREED. CLAUSE 6 PASSED.

[illegible] CLAUSE 7 - ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 33.

[illegible]: The question is that clause 6 do stand part of the Bill.

[illegible] AGREED. CLAUSE 7 PASSED.

[illegible] CLAUSE 8 - ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 34.

[illegible]: The question is that clause 7 do stand part of the Bill.

[illegible] AGREED. CLAUSE 8 PASSED.

[illegible] CLAUSE 9 - ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 35.

[illegible]: The question is that clause 8 do stand part of the Bill. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 9 PASSED.

[illegible] CLAUSE 10 - ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 36.

[illegible]: The question is.....

[illegible]: Did you ask for the views on clause 10?

[illegible]: I did. I think that you have spoken for your colleagues. I am aware of your stance on it.

[illegible]: I would like to be associated with a few words.

[illegible]: Well, how many do you want? I could be of great help to Members. Please I beg you.... I would be prepared to allow a division on clause 10 if you like. What you like a Division?

[illegible]: Yes, Sir.

[illegible]: Alright. Since the clause is part and parcel of the Bill. A Division.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. GERALD M. BOARDMAN: Mr. Chairman, could we take another 15 or 20 minutes? Where is section 2.(a) and 2(b)? My associates and I have just received 2(a) and 2(b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that there is.... If you can explain why a Township Trustee or a prosecuting attorney who is also elected to that, that would be helpful. However, I think that some body across of Columbus have said it is not a conflict. We have any known precedent for taking a clause in the Ohio?

MR. RICHARD M. SKINNER: I think that the Members really achieve the objective by putting an amendment to delete whichever of the two sub-clauses is considered objectionable. We would have no problem, and having succeeded in deleting one clause or the other, would then vote for the section whether or not it remained.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that is a logical way. Personally, I do have that view. I do not think though that I can split up a section that is a Standing Order or even Rules. Any other section of Rule.

MR. JAMES M. BURNS: My thinks are similar to Mr. Skinner's. I have not had time to read that yet, I will vote on acceptance of clause 2(a). I will vote to eliminate that section 2(b) as relating to the municipality.

MR. MICHAEL J. CONNERY: I take it, Sir, that the Members of Council have agreed to Standing Order 2(a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is what I was just looking for.

MR. JAMES M. BURNS: Well, all the previous parts that which is second more appropriate to a Bill before this House really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the just finished with the Committee here to which Members of this House, which first the Government of Ontario, Ministers accepted motion for which Standing Orders amended. I am personally that you are seeking leave to do that so....

MR. JAMES M. BURNS: Well, we have had no such assurance of Ministry rights and freedom here. Sir, in this House that I do not recall. However, I have been in the House and about fourteen years and I have that we have a Standing Order which deals with it, but in no case part of the reason to Committee we have always taken a vote on the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is where I can find mine?

MR. JAMES M. BURNS: That is what I am getting. Now, if I have to ask for the Standing Orders to be waived I will ask. Mr. will only take some more time. I will ask that Standing Order 2(2) be waived to allow us to vote on amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right.

CHAIRMAN ROSS: The House will be in order.

CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Speaker, I would move, Mr. Speaker, under 5213, to recommit the bill, with instructions, to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report back forthwith an amendment striking out section 201 of the bill.

CHAIRMAN ROSS: The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for one hour.

MR. JAMES A. BYRNES: Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the gentleman yield?

MR. JAMES A. BYRNES: Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I move the previous question on the motion to recommit with instructions.

MR. JAMES A. BYRNES: I demand the yeas and nays.

CHAIRMAN ROSS: The yeas and nays are demanded.

The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit with instructions.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 12, nays 3, not voting 416, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS

Mr. James A. Byrnes
Mr. C. Wesley Cheshire

NAYS

Mrs. Dorothy P. Fuller
Mrs. Mildred C. Hayes
Mrs. Thomas G. McGovern
Mrs. Barbara C. Mikulski
Mrs. M. Spencer Pollard
Mrs. Gladys Spellman
Mrs. Parren J. Mitchell
Mrs. Margaret M. Schweiker
Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley
Mrs. Marjorie S. Holt

NOT VOTING 416

12

3

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF RESULT OF VOTE:

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, two thirds having voted in the affirmative, the previous question is ordered. The question now is on the motion to recommit with instructions.

CHAIRMAN ROSS: The yeas and nays.

MR. JAMES A. BYRNES: May I have a division?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

STATISTICS
Sec.32/95

AYES	NOES	ABSENTATIONS
Hon. Lorenzo M. Fowler	Mr. James M. Hodges	Mr. F Holcomb
Hon. Winfred A. Bradley	Mr. W. Ely Rankin	
Hon. Thomas G. Jefferson		
Hon. Leonard O. Stevens		
Mr. K. Wayne Rankin		
Hon. Capt. Charles McClanahan II		
Hon. Ronald C. Johnson		
Hon. Sophie L. Dennis		
Mr. Winfred L. Pierson		
Lt. Col. Henry S. Blackmon III		
Mr. D. Ronald Miller		
22	2	1

CHANGE IN PASSED BY MAJORITY.

TITLE: CHANGE 12 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 32.

SEC. NUMBER 2. PURPOSE: Mr. Chairman, Willie is requesting the word "majority" may soon appropriate in some numbers Senate Section, Chair. I find that to be a typographical error and should be "majority".

SEC. [illegible]: Chair, may I be heard briefly I could ask for the Committee to approve, as we have in all recent Resolutions, that any typographical or clerical errors may be corrected by the Secretary Council Counsel? We have brought this up in open session, but there may be others either in this bill or in other bills. Is that not agreeable to the Committee? I think that is our normal routine now.

So, subject to the corrections which have already been noted, as stated by the Chairman in open session I move that part of the bill. I will not elaborate.

AMENDMENT NO. [illegible] STRIKE OF PASSED.

CHAIR: A BILL NO. may be made the same determination now.

SEC. [illegible]: The question is that the Title and Preamble stands part of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. [illegible] SEE STRIKE AND INSERT STRIKE PHRASE.

SEC. [illegible]: The second bill is the Corporation Commissioner bill, next.

THE OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION BILL, 1975

CORPORATION COMMISSION

SEC. [illegible]: Before we attempt to discuss this bill, I have certainly been given notice of the amendment which will be presented to attempt it. My understanding is that notices of that amendment have been circulated to Members. Is that accurate? Sir, I don't have got it. Must be older than. Well, take us some to attempt I am to take it.

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO. CLAUSE 1 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1 OF CHAPTER 22.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 3 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 21.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, on clause 3 I have to give notice which needs to be given to the introduction of the amendments which have been placed before us concerning the question of appropriate penalties, whether or not they should be in the present Bill or in subsequent Bills, or in "subordinate words". My understanding is that any legal impediment that might exist in an all-encompassing one-year administration situation, in fact, would have vanished with the Bill passed. Subject to what the Honourable member of this House, I feel that I should ask leave of him, Mr. Chairman, to have a consensus obtained prior to voting on clause 3, that the amendments should be dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave is granted. So, the amendment to clause 3 "or other" should be deleted. If Mr. Bradley wishes to speak to his proposed amendment, I will put the question thereafter. I be advised by the Honourable Second Opposition Member.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 3 AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now have to debate 3 as amended. If the Member wishes to speak to that I will put the question that clause 3 as amended do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 3 AS AMENDED STANDS.

CLERK: CLAUSE 4 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22.

MR. DE FREITAS: The question is that clause 4 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. F. HUGH ANDREW: Mr. Chairman, I strongly object to the existing part of this clause, which makes the declaration of State land unless exceptions be taken retrospectively. I feel that it is wrong. There is no necessity for it, and I personally cannot support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A vote of those who will be voting against it wishes that wording to remain. Am I right?

MR. F. HUGH ANDREW: Yes. I would move against the inclusion of it. I feel that the people of this Island should be the ones to decide on the merits of whether or not they support the clause.

MR. SMITHWICK: Do Brian agree with the question as to Section 5 of the second part of the Bill. I would put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. M. LEAD HOUSE: May I have a declaration please, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMITHWICK: Yes.

DIVISION
NO. 58/88

AYES

Cllr. Dominic L. Dorgan
Cllr. Michael F. Fitzgibbon
Cllr. Thomas C. Heffernan
Cllr. Mrs. Josephine M. Lalor
Cllr. F. Richard Roche
Cllr. Capt. Charles L. Kirkpatrick
Cllr. Richard C. Nelson
Cllr. P. Mahony Ryan
Cllr. Caroline L. Dorgan
Cllr. Stephen A. Pearson
Cllr. Mary G. Kirkpatrick
Cllr. D. Gerard McGlue

NOES

Mr. Fiona K. Pearson
Mr. C. Hedy Cockle

AYES 12 NOES 2

QUESTION PUT: CARRIED. CLAUSE 5 PASSED.

CLAUSE: CLAUSE 6 - REVISION OF SECTION 24.

MR. SMITHWICK: The question is that clause 6 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: CARRIED. CLAUSE 6 PASSED.

CLAUSE: CLAUSE 7 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 27.

MR. SMITHWICK: The question is that clause 7 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 7 PASSED.

MR. M. MCVEIGH ROSE: Mr. Chairman. May I just query whether in your take note of these technical matters in order to finish ...

MR. SMITHWICK: If I had realised how many technical things I'm going to have to do, I think this is it!! Do understand if we go one at a time, then it takes forever. We might take some of the later ones together.

CLAUSE: CLAUSE 8 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 31.

MR. SMITHWICK: The question is that Clause 8 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 8 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL 1981.

MR. WILLIAMS: This is the clause to which an amendment has been circulated by the Honourable Deputy Official Member. I will ask him formally to move it.

HON. THOMAS D. JEFFERSON: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave of the Council to move the amendment to clause 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: Leave granted.
Do you want to speak to it as well as to explain it to members.

HON. THOMAS D. JEFFERSON: Mr. Chairman, section 126 of the Income Tax Act, paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). Paragraph (a) is not necessary arithmetical specification mentioned in (b). Therefore, the whole of paragraph (a) should fall away. The amendment which I am seeking to move at this committee stage would effect that. It is that clause 2 of the Bill be substituted by the following -

"2. Section 126 of the principal Act is amended -

(a) by inserting "and" immediately after the section 11 (b) at the end of paragraph (b);

(b) by substituting a full stop for the word at the end of paragraph (b) and by deleting the word "and".

The first thing we do is paragraph (a). It is proposed to omit that word "and" at the end of paragraph (b), which leads on to say -

"(b) if the company has received a special exemption regulation the company to be aware of profitability."

R. CHAIRMAN: Am I right in understanding that the words there which are to be omitted are also being in the second substitution clause 126?

HON. THOMAS D. JEFFERSON: No, the last line above in section (b)(c).

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is right.

HON. MICHAEL E. BRIDGE: What I was going to say, Mr. Chairman is the substance of the change is to introduce this as amendment for the purpose of Standby Order 2(2), as therefore it is considered an amendment to the present clause.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would only therefore like to deal on each basis. I must look at Standby Order 2(2) myself.

HON. THOMAS D. JEFFERSON: It is also possible to amend a clause of the Bill. It is possible to substitute a new clause and I might be amending for that purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that it is possible to accomplish that. It is certainly acceptable that it be a new clause. However, to be valid a clause which seeks to amend another Act of the parent, I see. Therefore, for that purpose I would be inclined to regard it as an amendment, such as a consequential amendment clause 2 of the Bill.

MR. STEVENS of [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the amendment which substitutes a new clause 8 in Bill, for a different clause 8 in Bill, be not a new clause. I move that the new clause be only three lines and that clause be a Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it your understanding a clause which has an entirely different purpose. If you intend I think you have substituted a clause which accepts the general principle [illegible] of the Act. Instead of an amendment [illegible], I would have felt bound to suggest that it be a new clause. However, we now still proceed to amendment [illegible] of the Act, which is what the original clause 8 sought to do. It is not necessary to amend it in a publicly different way. Without wishing Section Hay very carefully I would not really know what [illegible] would be. However, it seems to me not unreasonable to allow consideration of this clause as it stands in the Bill. I feel assured [illegible] we can't think the amendment should be made, that by defeating the [illegible] clause". I hope that you are satisfied now with me. Does anyone else?

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, I have it here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I am sorry, we have not it. Yes. [illegible] Yes, I see.

The question is shall clause 8 be [illegible] as the Honourable third Official [illegible]. Those who favour [illegible] signify [illegible].

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: AGAINST. AMENDMENT TO [illegible] CARRIED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question now is that clause [illegible] as proposed [illegible] of the Bill.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: AGAINST. CLAUSE 8 AS AMENDED CARRIED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 9 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 16A.
CLAUSE 10- AMENDMENT OF SECTION 17.
CLAUSE 11- AMENDMENT OF SECTION 18A.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is shall clauses 9 to 11 of [illegible] of the Bill. I would now [illegible] questions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: AGAINST. CLAUSES 9, 10 AND 11 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 12- AMENDMENT OF SECTION 19A.
CLAUSE 13- AMENDMENT OF SECTION 20A.
CLAUSE 14- AMENDMENT OF SECTION 24A.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is shall clauses 12, 13 and 14 [illegible] of the Bill.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: AGAINST. CLAUSES 12, 13 AND 14 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 15- AMENDMENT OF SECTION 26A.
CLAUSE 16- AMENDMENT OF SECTION 28A.
CLAUSE 17- AMENDMENT OF SCHEDULE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is shall clauses 15, 16 and [illegible] of the Bill [illegible].

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: AGAINST. CLAUSES 15, 16 AND 17 PASSED.

[illegible] A QUESTION AS TO WHETHER THE AMENDMENT WAS GERMANE.

MR. CRAWFORD: The question is on the thirty cent increase proposed by the amendment of Mrs. Pyle.

SECRETARY TODD: AYERS, THE CLERK WILL CALL MR. CRAWFORD'S QUESTION AGAIN.

MR. CRAWFORD: I think it is an important question. When the Pyle amendment is up there is no time to debate the Committee Report of seventy cents. The House must therefore vote against

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. CRAWFORD: Please be recorded.

CONTINUED:

MR. CRAWFORD OF PHOENIX: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of these hours until 10:00 tomorrow morning.

MR. CRAWFORD: The question is shall these hours adjourn or not? Adjourn until 10:00 tomorrow morning.

SECRETARY TODD: AYERS. [illegible] THE HOUSE ADJOURNS UNTIL 10:00 A.M., WEDNESDAY, THE SEVENTEENTH DAY

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

PAGE

1

2

5

6

WEDNESDAY

8TH DECEMBER, 1993

10.04 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Prayers. The Elected Member for North Side.

MR. D. GIBBS HILLMAN: Let us pray.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Presentation of Papers and Reports.

The Honourable First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

SIR ALDEN O. BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table, Sir, the Report of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly appointed to study Private Member's Motion No. 11/93 and No. 13/93 dealing with the prohibition of liquor and cigarette advertising in the Cayman Islands.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

HON. DENNIS D. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, Senate Member's Motion No. 12/86 which is the motion which initiated the steps of Private Member's Motion No. 11/85, and was really the subject of study by the Committee, reads:-

> "BE IT RESOLVED that the terms of reference of the Select Committee appointed by Private Member's Motion-No. 11 of 1985 be enlarged to include the consideration by the Select Committee of advertising of intoxicating liquor and tobacco products in newspapers, magazines, cinemas, radio, television and all other ways in which advertising may be introduced to the public in the Cayman Islands."

While motion was passed on Wednesday, 28th May, 1986; Private Member's Motion No. 11/85 which became Private Member's Motion No. 13/86 moved, Mr. President, recalls-

> "Whereas medical and scientific evidence has proven that the use of liquor and cigarettes is highly dangerous to one's health;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House hereby requests a select committee to study the advisability and practicability of either legislating legislation or by some other means prohibiting the advertising of liquor and/or cigarettes by local establishments."

At the sitting of the Legislative Assembly on the 23rd May, Mr. President, you appointed me as Chairman of this Committee. The Committee held three meetings on the 26th October, the 2nd December and the 30th December, 1986.

Your Select Committee, has appointed recommends that all tobacco products and liquor advertising in Public Places be prohibited by January all existing be complied with and not be renewed, but that no new contracts be entered into. It also recommends that all government controlled and corporations be required to eliminate all tobacco products and liquor advertising as quickly as possible, by January all contracts to expire shall not be renewed, they shall be so endorsements be written.

Thirdly, it recommends that a warning be prominently placed on all advertising relating to tobacco products or anything printed or published in the Cayman Islands, as is required by Law in the United Kingdom and the United States. The said warning is to follow the warning used in the United Kingdom and be in a form determined by the Executive Attorney-General in Chambers.

Fourthly, all advertising displays on vehicles to tobacco products will not be displayed in any place except the existing stipulations given.

It is also recommended that tobacco products and liquor advertising be prohibited in sponsorship of sporting events in the Islands in the future.

Sixth, it recommends that all tobacco products and liquor advertising in cinemas be prohibited. The Committee believes it is also recommendable, Mr. President.

Seventhly, it is recommended that that legislation be introduced to cover the recommendations as set out above.

Eight, upon the approval of the Select Committee Report by the Legislative Assembly, the Attorney-General's Chambers are requested to draft such legislation.

MR. ROBERT EDWARDS (CONSERVATIVE): Thank you, Mr. President, and as regards the specific recommendation, if this report is accepted by the House, Government is prepared to proceed with the necessary legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that I am right in assuming that in effect the Member is moving that the recommendations in the report be adopted.

MR. DENNIS O'BRIEN: Yes, Mr. President, I ask that it be passed for being so disemphasised, but the point has already been made by my colleague a bit.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case, the Report is open for debate if any Member wishes to speak on it. If none should so, then in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 72(1), I shall put the question. Nobody seems to be objecting to it, so I will put the question that the Report of the Select Committee on the Privatisation of Higher and Secondary Education in the Cayman Islands be adopted.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED BY MAJORITY. IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 72(1) THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE WAS ADOPTED.

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. If the Right Honourable Member for Finance does not yet have, perhaps he has been delayed by the rain, we could start with the other questions and come back if he has arrived by the time the questions have been moved.

So, the Second Elected Member for West End.

QUESTION

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM, AVIATION AND TRADE

Q.1. ASK: Would the Honourable Member kindly state what total trading debts Cayman Airways has outstanding unpaid as at June, 1986?

ANSWER: Total trading debts outstanding unpaid as at June, 1986, were US$5,807,000.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. N. HORACE EBANKS: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Honourable Member say whether this employee that is owing to Government?

HON. V. MORGAN ROBERTS: No, Mr. President, the amount of US$5,327,000 does not include amounts due to Government.

MR. D. OZZARD MITCHELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Honourable Member please state what these trading debts relate to? Is it fuel 1985 or do they go back several years?

HON. V. MORGAN ROBERTS: That figure would cover the amounts owed up to 30th June, 1986. However, the debts would not have been incurred in that one year. They were certainly brought forward from previous years.

MR. M. MCKEEVER NOTED: Complementary, Mr. President. Could the Secretary-Treasurer help us?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think [illegible], as the statement says, we have been told for 1984/1985 have changed. The accounts for previous years have been laid and that information is available from them. I think that the accounts for 1984/1985 are on the statement before us today this meeting.

MRS. M. SCHMAL DOUGLAS: That is correct, Mr. President. The accounts are ready as at 30th June, 1985 and they will be laid on the Table shortly. As regards the superannuation moneys [illegible], this figure would cover all the previous accounting periods mostly. It is an amount which is brought forward from previous years. If the objective is to make a note thereof, I agree point out that the trading return as at 30th June, 1985 were [illegible].

MR. S. MARY MORGAN: Mr. President, may I ask the Member, the Finance Committee appointed at the end of last year a sum of money which would be used to pay some of the debts of Cayman Airways. This money was to have been taken from the Reserves of this Authority. Could the Member tell us the disbursement of this money was used to pay the trading debts at this time?

MRS. M. MCSHAN BODDEN: Mr. President, only a portion of this amount which was approved by Finance Committee was used to pay some of the outstanding trading debts which Cayman Airways had at the time. The amount was [illegible].

MR. D. LUCKEN KELLY: Could the Member state whether there are any trading debts outstanding as the end of the financial year ending, 1985, or were they [illegible] after that?

MRS. M. SCHMAL DOUGLAS: They were [illegible] as at 30th September, 1985.

MR. S. MARY MORGAN: May I ask the Member of the Finance Committee how he reconciles the [illegible] as in the accumulated [illegible] sheet before us?

MRS. M. SCHMAL DOUGLAS: If the Member is referring to the [illegible] as at 30th June, 1985, this is an accumulation of debts over the years. Normally this covers the accounting period ended 30th June, 1985, and there would be [illegible] brought forward from previous years.

MR. G. HAIG-SCOTT: Mr. President, the question seemed to have been trying to ascertain the trading debts, which I would think the trading debts were, may, the last twelve months. Is the Member in a position to say what trading debts were outstanding since the 30th September last year?

MRS. M. SCHMAL DOUGLAS: The trading debts? Mr. President, I will have to write on my records to some extent as this because those figures are not in front of me but generally speaking. However, as of November, 1985 the trading debts of Cayman Airways at that time were found to be [illegible].

MR. G. WHITE FORBES: May I ask if the money paid from the Revenue has applied specifically to cover the existing debts during the last twelve months, or was it applied to current bills in the post?

HON. E. DOYLE LEWIS: Mr. President, the amount of money, the $1.8 million which was taken from the Revenue, was paid to pay wages for outstanding fuel bills, department for maintenance carried out in one of the ministry's engines. A bill of payment was a large amount which was due at this time and the company did not have the funds to meet the payment.

MR. LORNE A. KENNEDY: Mr. President, supplementary. In view of the information which is being forthcoming from time to time regarding the Hydro problems, I wonder if the Member would say what is the amount of the amounts presently at that time period at the end of June, 1975, of $8,800,000 was applied against the revenue payable, what the net position owing would be $8.8 million, and not the $8.3 million?

HON. E. DOYLE LEWIS: Mr. President, I am not in possession of that. I would need the Member to repeat that because we were dealing with accounts payable. I believe that the Member is referring to accounts receivable of $8.3 million and deducting it from the $8.8 million. Would he please repeat that question for me?

MR. LORNE A. KENNEDY: Mr. President, I would be happy to. The point I am trying to move to what back up the existing information as to amounts, which are the most accurate figures and current accounts. This figure of $8.3 million is quite correct. However, the point is the wrong impression if we were to assume that the $8.3 million is also an amount which should have been collected and is to eventually be collected by Saskatchewan, and would be applied against the accounts payable.

HON. E. DOYLE LEWIS: This is correct, Mr. President, and the accounts for the year ended 31st June, 1975, which the Member refers which has accounts receivable of $8.3 million. This is so.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further supplementary I will invite the Second Elected Member for Rosthern to put his question. (INAUDIBLE). The Second Elected Member for Rosthern?

QUESTION ASKED BY THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR ROSTHERN (MR. DE ART) TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR EXECUTIVE COUNCIL APPROPRIATION ACT BEFORE TREASURY AND PUBLIC SERVICES

MR. DE ART: Would the Honourable Member please tell this Government precisely to the operation of the Plans and how many residents have their jobs lost by Government?

HON. E. DOYLE LEWIS: To 1975 Government has contributed four thousand dollars ($5,000) to the Plans. At present we are not paying fees for wages in the Plans.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no supplementary, since the First Elected Member for Cumberland is not here, may he designate any other Member to ask his question on his behalf, or to ask that the question be postponed?

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUING): Somehow there still lingers that when all the questions for which oral responses have been called, a Hon. Member may question which has not been asked by reason of the absence of the Member in whose name it stands. In which case, another Member may, if deputized by the absent Member on his behalf, indeed ask the question or request the postponement.

MR. SIDNEY A. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have not been asked by the Member but I would ask that the questions be postponed until a later date when he is not here to ask them. I would suppose that they may be postponed until a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: Incidentally, he should have deputized you to ask. However, I think we can probably allow a point and it can be postponed. So, I will ask the Clerk to proceed with the business indicating that they be put down for another day.

Item 2 on the Order Paper. Statements.

STATEMENTS BY THE GOVERNMENT FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME

HON. DAVID A. CROSBY: Mr. Speaker, the question of Daylight Saving Time was raised in the Legislature Assembly during the May, 1966 Meetings. At that time an undertaking was given that the position would be kept under review.

Public response was received by the Chamber of Commerce, by Rotary Clubs' Open Line, and by the Legislative Members. Copies of the two Opinion Surveys undertaken and the Government information were delivered to the honourable Members personally. The privileges of the remarks of the Hon. Member.

Chamber of Commerce	61 for -	76 against and 18 indifferent.
Open Line	7 for -	15 against.
Legislative Opinion	8 for -	22 against.
The totals	76 for -	108 against and 18 indifferent.

The total position indicates that the majority of people polled are not in favour of daylight savings time. Therefore the Government has decided that no steps will be taken to introduce it.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 3, the Appropriation Bill, 1966, Consideration of Second Reading. Commencement of debate. Does any Member wish to speak? I will remind Members that on a previous occasion we were all pleasantly when there was a remarkable reluctance on the part of all Members to be the first speaker. I propose to wait for one minute. If at the end of the minute nobody has risen to speak, I shall put the question. Anybody wish to speak? The honourable Second Elected Member for Springvale.

THE APPROPRIATION (1966) ACT, 1966
AND 1966 SUPPLY ACT

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

HON. HAROLD G. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are quotations to be made this afternoon. Perhaps should be the first to make a few of the debate on the Budget Address, an address which is hopefully the Government's.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that I am one of the Newfoundlanders, although there I would just add one more word of congratulation.

First of all, Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the honourable Minister of Finance on this year's budget, the excellent way he presented it, the thoroughness with which he handled it. I would say to Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the budget.

I know the difficulties involved in balancing our budget because I, myself was the financial secretary of this country for seventeen years until 1967, then I resigned and handed over the job to my successor, the honourable Chief Minister, who in fact wasn't responsible for the position of the Current Account Surplus. Mr. Speaker, I came to work this year really for those seventeen. I see now that he is indeed a wealthy man and I might as well congratulate him for that.

Mr. Speaker, a financial secretary does not have an easy task by any means. It is a difficult task with the budget happening the way of the country with the problem of unemployment and the money which is available for the Treasury. It is difficult to understand the position which is brought forward in this Assembly because what we receive and what we spend happens in this Assembly because what we receive and what we spend happens in this Assembly because what we receive and what we spend happens

MRS. MARGUERITE S. JOHNSON (Continued): the budget, but we do seek to ask the Department again and again what their budget is based on and to persuade us that we could avoid increased taxes. Mr. President, it was only when Representative Gubbrud and I were satisfied that they had thought hard to eliminate unnecessary, and the budget was cut to the bone, that we supported increased revenue or taxes, whichever was more prudent at the time. Mr. President, I can say in all honesty that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee followed the same principle.

So, you see, Mr. President, the budget is really a simple matter if we want to look at it in that respect. The people pay this Government revenue which is required to carry the functions they need. All a Government does is directly the level of needed spending and allocate the funds, the revenue accordingly. In other words, Mr. President, the country pays for what it gets. Like the cost of services rendered, we also pay the payment.

Mr. President, the people are now in a position where we have told them that their fine budget cannot and certainly will not be approved. Why because of the supplemental bills, Mr. President. The choice is to pay the increased cost for the same amount of goods, or spend only $100, philosophize the whole process.

Mr. President, the choice is really up to the public. The people can elect whomever they choose. We have told them what the economics of running the country will be and the additional funds needed to carry the load. The people of this country have the choice now. If they do not want to pay increased revenue well, Mr. President, all they need to do is to tell us. It is as simple as all that. By any the people's economic and we will abide by their decision. If we withdraw the increased revenue measures, we will then have to advise you, Mr. President, what services the people will have to do without, for the Budget is twelve, cent cents. We owe it both by them to administer the affairs of this country, no more no less.

Mr. President, every penny of this revenue is being spent in Government and on their individual direct and indirect. The money is not going elsewhere, nor is the money being squandered. Before you decide on the session, Mr. President, you should know the facts behind the increases and the financial position of the country presently, to better be able to decide what to do with this budget.

First of all, Mr. President, the country has no General Reserves. Early in 1967 the projected deficit was $11 million. $11.2 million was used to balance the 1967 fiscal budget $7.9 million. This year, 1968, $3.3 million is being used to assist Capital Projects spread bills and that is it, Mr. President. The balance is held by the Bank as contingency for State funding loss. Otherwise there would be no funds for new revenue measures as we are proposing in this session.

Mr. President, speaking of Capital Projects, since 1957 the airline has made this country $26 million to date, plus $11 million investment directly in this department. That considerable liability was in order that the leasing arrangement for the two jet aircraft may be used by the airline would be put in place. That was negotiated in 1965.

We have heard that the airline carries a large deficit to the economy. We have heard that millions of dollars of dollars are still going in spite of that the country has to operate during this year.

MR. MORRIS C. BUDGE (CONTINUED): Mr. President, we should begin to consider this matter of public funds. It is alright while we have money to augment the national economy, what happens to this when there is no money? Are we going to supplement the public purse for this magnitude of new programs? Mr. President, the Democrats can only pay what it is given to accomplish programs in line. That means will cover the operation of Government services on a reasonably high level of efficiency.

Mr. President, what we must ask ourselves when we take given phase into consideration, is where do we get the funds to keep Legal Services flying? Where do we get money to improve vocational curriculum and to fund new programs which should have come out last May, because Government funds at the time were terminated and employees released?

Mr. President, the answer is simple. The answer is that we must seek funds by some means, and the only means which we have at our disposal is by increased revenue resources.

However, Mr. President, we do have other means, other choices. We have an alternative increasing revenue for the next three years if we do not increase ourselves, and if we allow Congress already scheduled to consider for Government to begin. By which shall it be, Mr. President? These are some facts which we must consider. We should not be concerned here and philosophize things which we are trying to do to improve the economy's image. We must ask ourselves this, do we go forward, or do we go backward? What kind of Government do the people of these Islands want? Do they want a Government which overwhelms the people to give prosperity, or an honest Government which will tell them only needs to be done, and how much it will take to pay for this?

Mr. President, we were elected from our districts and territories, and we will hold fast to those principles as matter what happens. Mr. President, during the last election the people of these Islands were unanimous, Mr. President, let me tell you that we have intelligent people in these Islands. They know what the cost of living has increased over the years. They understand that the effective real spending Government buys them they must build. They see the Government services moved to improve the conditions of the Tower Building. They see the rising trends of improvement in the Government services and, Mr. President, they know that the level of services they have contributing would not remain with these costs. This was the meaning in voting three-quarters for Mr. President, the people elected the Youth. They wanted a Government who would tell them the economic state of the nation's economy and not be afraid to say how much it was costing the Government to operate its various services.

Mr. President, we have just before the people what the position of the Judiciary is. Right or good of it. Is one thing, we are not going to say that the Judiciary is making a profit when it is operating at a loss.

Mr. President, we must again speak of a picture of the nation's state of affairs, and we have owned to the people. We have elected to be them on the basis which was presented, and we must continue on this basis, Mr. President, the decisions as we have them. We have recommended additions as we see them, too.

Mr. President, if you would explain a different concept of costing, please tell me, and please tell me why. Should we eliminate Legal Services, that can relinquish to the outside world and put hundreds of lawyers out of jobs so that we do not have to fund the additional revenue? Should we increase the Head Tax

Mr. [illegible] C. [illegible]: [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

SIR. Please be brief.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. President, I am very grateful to you for your kindness.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to you for your kindness.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to you for your kindness.

MRS. MARGE C. VUKMIR (CONTINUING): Mr. President, increased revenue has not always been raised in such haste. There have been occasions of abuse of plenty as well. I would especially those increases in the years 1981, 1983 and 1985 especially as the Minority Leader, Mr. President, those years were so good for this country. In fact, Mr. President, over the past eight years that Democrats have controlled our purse strings for the state of Wisconsin, our revenues increased by 3200,000,000, in 1982 revenues increased $700,000, in 1984 revenues increased $2,000,000, in 1985 revenues increased $7,000,000, and in 1986 revenues increased over seven, $2,000,000. These revenues, Mr. President, totaled over 30 times of revenues increased a total revenue of $2,547,000.

SEN. ZIEGLER: I have not wanted to interrupt the former speaker as it did not seem to have required a response. However, we have passed the time when we customarily break. Does it suit the Senator to stop now?

MRS. MARGE C. VUKMIR: Sec, Sir, I am done.

SEN. ZIEGLER: Then in that case let us suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

At 11:35 A.M. the Senate recessed

AFTER RECESS AT 11:50 A.M.

SEN. ZIEGLER: Please be seated.

The Secretary will call the roll on Concurrence of Second Reading debate. The Honorable Fourth District Member of Executive Council.

SEN. MARGE C. VUKMIR: Mr. President, I believe when the break was taken, I was giving a breakdown of the revenue increases that occurred over the past eight years. Those revenues, Mr. President, amount to three of billions, and the total amount of revenue which they produced was $7,547,000. Among those 30 occasions, Mr. President, there were seven times. Multiple occupation licenses were raised three times and postal rates three times on mail. Liquor was raised twice, cigarettes twice, corporate taxes, legal fees twice and trade and occupancy licenses twice.

During that time, Mr. President, the personal tax which was often referred to by the Democrats as taxes was only increased from $5 to $10 in 1979. That sort of specific increase on the individual poor person was never considered before that.

Mr. President, there were, as I said, a number of times which were considered and I am just mystified that my colleagues across the aisle would understand that to be not fiscal as this has demonstrated some that power again that are the responsible and party favored. They have to face a responsible kind of the fiscal management.

MR. WILLIAM J. MARKS (continued): Mr. President, I will admit that the present machine which we are discussing on this occasion is no doubt higher than it was of the previous years. However, Mr. President, I have mentioned already, the reason why this is so, and why especially this Government has to introduce this measure to that extent. It is mainly that for the first time in many years we have been left to help pay for the running of overseas. We already received quite a few millions.

Mr. President, these are revenues which we are anticipating we will embark upon in addition to what we have been receiving. It was only, Mr. President, when we were faced with the choice of either increasing our income or increasingly borrow to balance the budget. We chose the former course, and it is for this reason, Sir, that we are introducing this measure.

Mr. President, while coming to office, this Government has accumulated considerable spending and debt commitments. We inherited a number of highly paid expatriates mostly, promoting expenditure, and increasing the efficiency of the operation at the same time. Mr. President, Sir, we have attempted also to maintain a reasonable balance between the Government and the private sector, so did not rely on taxation to make for additional money for unnecessary expenses because, Mr. President, we are dealing with the people's money, and it must be spent wisely and honestly for the good of the greatest number of people and of all times.

Mr. President, without the people's co-operation and understanding we as a Government cannot function well, and cannot represent the people to the best of our ability. We need to have some kind of communication and understanding with the people, without this there cannot be a true democratic government.

Mr. President, we are here for one purpose and one purpose only. We are here to serve the people to the best of our ability, and, Mr. President, our standards are very high. We are here unlimited time, Mr. President, initiative must be a catalyst for progressive suggestions and behind it all must be our basic concern towards building a better Cayman Islands.

I therefore, Mr. President, would encourage this Legislative Assembly to see the Government's case in spearheading the Budget which is that we must look at the people of tomorrow. It is the only responsible thing we do so. The people must understand, Mr. President, that they have many things to be thankful for. The prosperity alone which we have built here is something which has made the Cayman Islands the envy many of the Caribbean and many others of the world.

It is one of the things which will not stay constant today in the international financial market. People go broke and they might the most affluent financial centres. Some of them have vanished. That is always occasion of that sort in the Cayman Islands, circumstances have made us which place because the Government stability is still here.

We should never think that we have arrived. That complacency is their downfall. That everyone of them individually in these Islands, and because of the success of Government between this Government and the United States in the release of prohibitive legislation in connection with [illegible]. It is hoped to have seen of the financial industry that individuals and our business because of the fact that the United States administration would seek of the legislation which was necessary to maintain confidence in which to invest as I have just outlined, there is hope for us in the circumstances and the relation.

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES (CONTINUING): Mr. President, we are of the opinion that the less foreign securities that come to these Islands, more of them there are to take part in the financial business here, it is not really something which a foreign Government should interfere with by the method of imposing withholding requirements because in any case most of the world, whether it be the United States, Canada or the United Kingdom or Switzerland or France or whatever, there are millions of people today who are not paying either their proper amount, some way of avoiding or minimizing taxes within their own country. If these Governments had spent sufficient time on looking at the revenue and expenditure which they gain/sustain they would have found a way, and perhaps they would object quite a lot to [illegible]

Sir, Mr. President, I propose the purpose of the measure [illegible] with a foreign jurisdiction when its terms and its base [illegible] hoping to that country's note economy. This is where [illegible] financial situation. Mr. President, it is the Government's hope that the surplus which is now being negotiated between the United States and this Government through the United Kingdom will [illegible] be mainly aware of this [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. PARKS [St. Andrew Southwest]. Mr. President, this was mentioned all the night through when we approved for the Jamaica worker this year.

...Use of priority use the word for a shortage again for the Jamaica Banana Scheme. Now, Mr. President, the lack of this facility has caused a health hazard, which could in the event of an epidemic destroy the tourist industry and place Jamaica in a serious financial position.

Mr. President, regarding the water problem, the Authority must ultimately develop the Yallahs and Hope and Dykes for the benefit of revenue and to avoid the problems of future droughts. The wells in those areas function by satisfactorily. They are being closely monitored to ensure that no harm is done to the water table.

However, Mr. President, will water for the local industries be curtailed for irrigation or hydroelectric which is processed by desalinization. This system would, in my view be very expensive. To pipe from the eastern end of Kingston, that is to say it would be expensive to pipe the water here from west Kingston. Also we shall have to give thought to the harbour, extending from the present system. I am sure that experts looking at these areas would have worked recommendations given them.

Mr. President, it became quite evident, to the Water Authority that future water supply for Kingston, or for that matter for Jamaica as a whole of the resources will have to be by desalinization process, whereby the Government will later on have to supply to Kingston. In developing new sources we must endeavour to make economical sources are simply to Kingston. In the Water Authority looked at the possibility of a water system for George Town. Mr. President, if we look at George Town today we will see it as a township system. We will see it as a holiday resort. It is private in its capacity. If commercial stores, one must speculate hotels and other commercial buildings going up. The Water Authority made a survey of George Town to see what the demand would be like before it embarked on any system of supply for George Town. It was quite evident that apart from those people who use those commercial system, the demand was not so significant. So, with light, Mr. President, the Water Authority found necessary to determine the requirements of a George Town water supply system and this is now going ahead.

There are two alternative supply sources now available, desalinization of water such as Caribbean Desalinization, Petro Jamaica, and the second is underground water. Both sources consist. Mr. President, these systems are being carried out, possibly to ensure a reliable supply while at the same time securing the best possible price for the public.

Mr. President, it is planned that pipe water would begin flowing in George Town in the latter part of next year. However, of course, we will take some time before the electricity is completed.

Mr. President, in either of the two systems which I have mentioned, the water will be purchased under a turnkey arrangement by the Authority, the one who gives the bid. The water will be pumped on the new River Authority for distribution. Mr. President, the Water Authority plans to build a new pumping station and to completely renew the pipes.

Mr. President, the total project is expected water loss funds for this project. The cost is estimated at $2,000,000. The money will be on loan to the Authority to be repaid to Government as in the case of the Port Authority Bonds.

MR. WILLIS (CONTINUED): It is to be a financially viable scheme. In other words, the Bauxite will be able to meet the overhead cost and repay the loan. I should also mention, Mr. President, that an interconnection of a second water supply for Cayman Brac will be undertaken in early 1988. If sufficient ground water is located in the Bluff, a development similar to Town Hall/Spot Bay will be provided for Cayman Brac.

Mr. President, the Bauxite Mills Project deserves support as also will the Hog. The mine is estimated at 70/80 million. Caribbean Refractories Limited has been approved a loan for the scheme in the sum of [illegible] million. This loan is given on terms we would regard as reasonable today. These terms are a five year moratorium on principal repayment, which facilitates a five year re-payment of principal repayment. The balance of [illegible] million, Mr. President, will be provided by this Government from local resources, however, an additional loans to the loan for the other schemes. So, in other words, Mr. President, although Government may be providing money for these schemes, these funds must be repaid at lower rates than the Government to be repaid from the schemes of the Authority.

Mr. President, the Water Mile Beach area is one which should be able to meet the cost of the service and provide revenue to allow the Water Authority to operate with financial stability. The scheme will not be a burden to Government the design for the project, Mr. President, is now complete; and the programme has already been implemented and is on schedule, I understand.

Consultants for the project have been retained and will be engineer by January, 1988. The project, Mr. President, is scheduled for completion by early 1992.

Mr. President, during this year there were complaints about an unusually large number of mosquitoes, especially in the George Town area. An investigation of these complaints revealed that they were aware of the problem. They endeavoured to get out the reason for it which I will mention. He said that the highest rainfall in Grand Cayman recorded a similar amount of the rain just completed as the last time that it was, but higher than in 1986. Although the numbers were high in 1987 and 1988, they were still considerably less than they were at the peak of the year. He said that in the areas where insecticide spraying was the only method of control, mosquito numbers were considerably very high, especially in the areas of North Side, Breakers and Frank Sound. This was due to the fact that the heavy rainfall came at times that had not been planned for at least while during the very dry season. This was coupled with the unusually low tides at the beginning of the rainy season. It was not until the end of August that tides returned significantly to prevent rain water from running off or standing into the mangroves in these areas. By this time a very large egg base had accumulated in the mud, leading to a very large emergence of mosquitoes.

Mr. President, the Hospital Board and Council will plan to take a programme to apply pre-emergence larvicide in the mangrove swamps. These areas are particularly North Side and Breakers and on the South Side areas. This should bring about considerable reduction to those experienced on the west side of the Island. This is commendable, Mr. President, not only to ease the situation in the eastern districts, but because mosquitoes from these parts often migrate around the North Sound and affect the western end of the Island.

MR. PRICE of Illinois: The question of this gentleman's being [illegible] to the session and has since also viewed a particularly bad economic season in Illinois [illegible].

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to mention something about agriculture and some of my other legislative [illegible]. However, this might be a convenient time for the House to recess.

MR. SPEAKER: The House being in agreement, the House stands recessed until approximately 8.15 p.m.

AT 10.45 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

FROM RECESS AT 8.29 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: [illegible] Consideration of the Second Reading Motion on the Appropriation Bill, 1959. The Honourable Deputy Minister of Industries [illegible].

MR. VASCO G. CORDEIRO: Mr. Speaker, at the break at Recreation I was just discussing on Research and Animal Husbandry and I would like to speak on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, Agriculture in these Islands has been unsatisfactory for the [illegible] many years. In recent times, however, the Government decided that it was about time the Department would [illegible] so as the Agricultural matters [illegible] concerned, or to decide the future of the Department.

Mr. Speaker, it should [illegible] there has been rising [illegible]. At the beginning of this year an Agricultural Development Committee was established [illegible] Department could be guided and [illegible] Chairman. Mainly [illegible], perhaps [illegible] a person would be difficult to [illegible] there are no qualified [illegible]. So, it was decided to seek the advice of someone who is [illegible] to look at the islands, what we have at present and to say what the future lies so [illegible] Agriculture develop [illegible]. It is thought to be a wise [illegible] which is a Government department [illegible] whose people [illegible] Agricultural matters here.

Mr. Speaker, we had plans of [illegible] we have not been able to as the [illegible] available. At present [illegible] I may [illegible] have [illegible] and [illegible] to have [illegible] to the [illegible]. The persons recently [illegible] and also the [illegible]. They will advise their report shortly and [illegible] Government will have to the report, and deal with the recommendations accordingly. It seems as though the [illegible] have on the farmers [illegible] to be carried out [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I [illegible] people who would [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Agriculture in these [illegible].

HON. TERRY C. [illegible] (CONTINUED): ...the Government, unfortunately, has missed on its promises of freedom. The Government is now getting politically into deep water because of the failure. This will continue to 1993.

The Government is committing the development of the economy. Money that used to benefit of investment Jamaicans will rather have invested into the Islands. This shipment consisted of cassettes, buffalo and tobacco. This is of course, Mr. President, in keeping with Government policy to upgrade the local sector. The Government provided the necessary funds for this venture.

In the area of natural resources, Mr. President, the Government is also moving ahead with this. It hopes this year a new variety of tobacco known as Mr. Williams Hybrid will be introduced from Canada. Of the 7,000 seedlings which were received, 500 were sold to farmers. 200 were planted at Bodles Food Station, and 300 were planted at the Demonstration Farm in Lower Village. Those planted at Bodles Food were showing signs of eight hand leaves at five and a half months and attained a height of sixty six feet. Mr. President, one of the advantages in this crop is known as [illegible] plant more seedlings per acre. The farmers produce [illegible] quality plant, hence their price increase and they can more easily [illegible].

Mr. President, the Department has also begun a study tour. This tour is ongoing and will serve the number of requests for spraying from both farmers and private [illegible]. So, the public has been advised of this. The service is available for anyone who needs it.

Mr. President, the Department has imported a number of foreign varieties with increased [illegible]. Among them are [illegible] Hybrid, a local company [illegible] is an amended soil with [illegible], which is part of local material. The first product should be on market in December, or should I say late month.

The second is a proposed [illegible] farm in Lower Orpen [illegible] and now in the management of the tourist [illegible]. This is considered a useful development as a tourist attraction. It is hoped that the development will move ahead fairly quickly.

The other development, Mr. President, is the change from the Japanese garden to the Bamboo [illegible]. The development has already started. However, it is hoped to be completed by January next year. The land preparation for this development has already started.

Mr. President, the Department also requested that the Agricultural Show which was held in February this year was the best show in five years. The exhibits were of a high standard despite the problems which we experienced at that particular time.

Mr. President, moving on to the Department of Planning. What I have found in the Department is a shortage of staff. Mr. President, this Department has the multi-component of staff of any Department in the Civil Service. It has a total of eighteen people. It includes only one Institutional Planner who has responsibility to cope with all the [illegible] in the entire Island. Mr. President, this is a [illegible] and it is no wonder that so many plans [illegible] are being created in the Island. Besides the plan [illegible], Mr. President, there is almost a [illegible] by many people, namely the builders, to follow the [illegible] guidelines given by the Central Planning Unit.

MR. MCCALL (CONTINUED): There are many such cases and it is difficult when people already on pension planning procedures, especially when amendments were into employment wages. In many of these, Mr. President, it is the public who is suffering in hardship while building inspectors search and succeed to see nearly a half of them. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that this situation, a lack of adequate staff, must be borne in mind when we are considering estimates for Government Departments. I do not think that we can ignore this most important. I am not saying that is the situation, Mr. President, although proper submission was not made to Government for staff. First, I understand that it is just to recent time that concern is being expressed in the Department about this situation.

Similarly, Mr. President, we will continue to have also serious community and more important environmental problems to come to the estimates, we will be making accounts for an increase in staff there.

Mr. President, the Department of Lands and Survey has just moved into the Lower building, some of these smaller Departments are moving. Nevertheless, for instance in terms of Rawlinson House. They were currently in the old Public Works Department compound, the Department of Lands and Survey is now in the Lower Rawlinson building. They are doing quite well knowledge to improve. Their final expenditure for this year will show a budget area in regularisation to some areas, although this idea not necessarily result a decrease in the estimate. On the contrary, Mr. President, the normal process indicate a steady and healthy growth in the most modern sector. It indicates that this new recruitment. So, it is anticipated that there will be a rapid growth, according to indications, in the manufacturing development, that this will accelerate on the heels of tourist and natural tourism, and for which other areas stand.

Mr. President, there has been an indication that during 1988 a new zone of development emphasis is coming towards the east side of the West Bay Road. Several important land transactions have occurred in this area recently which further emphasises the anticipated development in particular.

Mr. Speaker, going back to some of the matters I mentioned this morning, in speaking about diplomatic and consular activity in Cayman's image, the currency which I used was United States dollars. In the case of Miami each injection, I said that the amount was one million. In fact, an injection was $500,000 instead. I should have mentioned now, Mr. President, that with all the money which has been injected into Cayman through the subscription initiated by us by Government for its activities, Cayman Airways at the present time is in the order of only four million dollars. In other words, Cayman Airways will perhaps applaud in one hour a large applause taking into consideration the participation which was made by Private Companies recently and which is not yet told on the Table here. The accounts reflect a large expenditure that should be represented in airfield and other things. The amount of $4 does not reflect more than the small Subscription. So, Cayman Airways is more or less reasonably on a proper footing.

Mr. President, I mentioned this morning that we are not the only one to introduce new measures. I gave a statement of some of the measures which were introduced over the last eight years. However, first of all I mentioned that it is not only in recent years that we consider revenue measures. However, if we look at the years 1969 to 1988 which were considered the busy years and we are the most prosperous period in the history of this Cayman Islands, we will see that new revenue measures were introduced in three of these years, 1969, 1982 and 1985, and that these three years' measurements totalled a sum of $16 million.

MR. PASTORE. [illegible]. Please move the yeas and nays. Government had generous use I am not grousing at this. All systems [illegible].

In 1974 the personal tax, which is at present assessed at an income tax by the Opposition was increased from $2 to $10. Maybe, and you know, Mr. President, this is not like [illegible]. Anybody who can buy a motor car can afford to pay $100 a year instead of $2. Because, that $10, as in $10 the most the most you pay. Yet it was increased from $2 to $10. And what can be done? The Opposition and the people who always talk about patronage, increased [illegible].

Mr. President, you know what we have [illegible]. I bet you account yourself. We have reported that [illegible] to more people and nobody is the society [illegible].

Mr. President, over the last eight years [illegible] the Government of the time introduced new [illegible] of persons, totalling a sum of $7,5[illegible], $10 [illegible]. Mr. President, surely that this the Senate were there [illegible] painful necessities Governments every asked those times and points since were taken three times. Well, you think the Government of the day will enjoy for what there was [illegible]. We are not [illegible]. Mr. President. However, when we come to a situation, when there are no measures and improvement in the services of Government and [illegible], when there is no money left in the kitty to finance these additional costs and we have more [illegible] people and no revenue resources to supplement the need and, Mr. President, that would be not only [illegible] in this immediate Government, that need applies as well [illegible] the need of the national [illegible]. If we add also [illegible] [illegible] in the [illegible] budget, what has been struck off recently, Mr. President, had those needs not been there [illegible] would have been able to pay its debts and there would [illegible] for new measures.

So, we must not lose sight of the fact that if we are to maintain this [illegible] of a reciprocal service, we must pay the price. Of course, I would not encourage any Member of this Government to go out for what Members of the past Administrations [illegible], that many points of the Treasury could be given to [illegible] in the end. I think that we should [illegible] take a hard look at the position before we have to [illegible].

Mr. President, I would recommend to the Honourable Members that the Budget as presented [illegible] would [illegible] maximum requirement for this Government. We spent [illegible] and many [illegible] since this Budget will be [illegible] we have raised one [illegible] and I personally, Mr. President, have [illegible] to [illegible] so much that I do not enjoy [illegible] to it. What we are presenting here, Mr. President, is almost the [illegible]. If we have to [illegible], I would prefer [illegible] to [illegible].

Anyway, as I said earlier in my address, I am presenting a budget. It is simply the people's [illegible]. The money [illegible] provided there is to pay for services which all [illegible] in this [illegible]. It is unlikely as to what to say whether [illegible] these services that I have outlined [illegible] services, [illegible] education heavily subsidized, health services and all the [illegible], people [illegible] very little for those services and pay [illegible]. Mr. President, because the [illegible] of being taxed [illegible] what we enjoy. However, I have warned this House [illegible] to [illegible] a saturation point where the price of service is the [illegible] withdraw to consumption. If we are not [illegible], we are going to [illegible] people [illegible] out of the service. If that happens, Mr. President, good-bye.

Mr. PARRA S. (Guyana) (interpretation): We have no wish of discrediting the country. Our Government and the Parliament would not do anything to damage any of them. But we do not want to be misled by Governments to believe that we have been there already. We cannot afford to delay the implementation of a postal savings system otherwise how can we solve other and real problems without a financial industry.

So, Mr. President, let us not let ourselves and our small saving services remain and not provide them with the facilities available to us. We have to become convinced to know, to believe that everything is true and that they will face responsibility. Well, that is not my Mr. President. A few of mine have been just into the building of the Guyana Industrial Assembly over the years. The task has just off because we have always considered to be responsible party to do all that we did. We intend to maintain a stable Government and an atmosphere of investment here. Therefore who go around looking for an office? Look on which to do business and come to Guyana Industry, wealthy people of my Member. This is a process already in all of us who have shared in the development over the last two decades or so.

Mr. President, I recognize that there have been issues in this Assembly in the past. However, I am sure you will also be interested in Guyana. If we have only a report from our Secretary and for the people who live here, then we should endeavour that consider in the manner in which we deal with the questions of this Organ. I hope that a few initiatives can take place from time to time. Therefore, to all of us those that have a view of confidence when we forget about the politics of ourselves and give more strength to the hands of the country and the people.

Mr. President, I support the proposal that concerning appointments for 1982, and all the necessary arrangements. I would like to thank you in particular, Mr. President, for your indulgence during the time I have been on my feet, and I would like to thank the Secretariat staff Officials Members for the assistance and cooperation given.

Thank you, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: The United Kingdom has the floor.

Mr. D. PARRIS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I also would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the Secretariat on their excellent budget document, presented in most understandable way.

Having said that, Mr. President, I do not agree with, nor did I welcome the decision to increase the budget which places the level of growth to four times. So, Mr. President, I have a little bit to say and I am going to ensure your indulgence and that of Members to allow me to make changes in my opening notes so that I can get it all into perspective, because I would hate to have to wait for the Standing Orders to be suspended.

Mr. President, this budget document was first presented to us, Monday preceded the rise of the Assembly over the last few years and remarkably that is the work of conservative but economical Governments, who are also responsible in their approach to the running of the Secretariat.

Mr. D. Orlikow (Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, there is one surprise, Sir, and that is that my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is not here. On the 15th March, Sir, between the hours of 7:45 p.m. and 12:00 p.m. I unsuccessfully attempted -- unsuccessfully, Sir, to get through this Honourable House and the vote was undecided. The Globe Newspaper of that morning, Mr. Speaker, said:

> "And as it stands Members from each opposition party concerned should propose the exact dollar-per-barrel Canadian Petroleum Markup they'd like to see this Honourable House for consideration at the meeting of this Honourable House to-night. Any Member of Parliament for consideration."

That is what it says, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I can thank that that is how you passed. I have heard very little about this economic plan. I realize that it is difficult for the Minister, Sir, I appointed a programme engineer. I hope that the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce will be taking notes, until in his working up debate, Sir, about some light on what has happened to our economic plan and why it was not studied in the nation early, with any input. However, Sir, I firmly believe that the determined ingenuity and success of this country depends very heavily on sound economic planning. I believe that it is vital to the continued prosperity of this nation that we take the time to plan where we are going and how we are going to get there. Sir, policies which are formed, especially economically in the House should not be lightly formulated.

Mr. Speaker, the previous measures introduced in this Budget are to some extent inevitable and I'm wondering, Sir, if they are going to affect all areas of the country and all the people of these regions, not only the little rich. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any of these measures are catastrophic. I hope that they are merely adequate to ensure the needs of the country, maintaining the financial credits that the country is in. Quite recently, Sir, there was an article in the Vancouver entitled "Blueprint to prosperity". Mr. Speaker, that is the honeymoon is over. However, Sir, like all good honeymoons, including my own, for which I'm grateful, we had a good time. When I took my wife on our honeymoon we had a good time. We went to the finest restaurants. I bought her the finest gifts. We stayed at the most expensive hotels. We even gambled a little in Reno. However, Sir, I am still paying the Royal Bank of Canada back for it and that is the actual position which this country is in today. We have had nine years of great prosperity and honeymoon and now, Sir, the time has come to pay.

These measures might create more unemployment in some areas of the country. They might even have inflationary effects on the cost of living. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that they are going to really create any great problems for the people, because the services are being provided and the corporations have to be paid for. However, Mr. Speaker, hereby increased taxes measures to increase the revenue we as individuals must make certain that the citizens of this country who can afford to pay these taxes get services which they deserve. They have to pay higher for gasoline. I hope I did not ignore the Honourable Minister as badly as he said he was, Mr. Speaker. He asked me to point this out.

MR. SECRETARY: I wonder, on the Medicare bill, if we could be given to speak for four hours, or six hours, whether we might take to recess for lunch for a period while other Members can give statements to take their necessary statements known. Would that be a convenient moment for you?

MR. D. DOUGLAS DILLON: Yes, sir.

MR. SECRETARY: Very well. I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

(A brief recess was taken.)

AFTER RECESS AT 4:15 P.M.

MR. SECRETARY: Please be seated.
Continuation of the Second Hearing before the Appropriations Bill. The Clerk will call the roll.

MR. E. CONRAD DILLON: Yes, Mr. President. Mr. President, in the opening part the statements presented by the Honorable Secretary that the budget this fiscal year, I am also both should be more healthy and would lead to the [illegible]. Mr. President, I would like to point out some of the areas which I feel this Budget makes [illegible]

First, I would like to look, also, at the statements also of the budget. [illegible] 22 [illegible] with the Military, the Civilians and their pensions for which Congress [illegible]. Mr. President, in the 1950s and early 1970 also Civil Servants pay was $400 or $500 per month, the maximum at which they started and [illegible] the [illegible] and the maximum were raised, I would classify some of these [illegible]. Secondly, Mr. President, both under the existing [illegible] $3,000 in [illegible] I like to [illegible] to [illegible] has been for a [illegible] Civil Servants are [illegible] [illegible]. In 1948 there were 2,400 Civil Servants. In 1960 there were 1,200. In 1964 there were 1,200 and it is [illegible] there since 1964 to 1,237. Mr. President, the [illegible] of the Civil Servants today in this country as one we [illegible] the [illegible] of the private sector in this country was [illegible] [illegible] is being at $75 per month, for [illegible] I [illegible] to [illegible] Government [illegible], Congressional [illegible] [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Mr. President, I would like to [illegible] [illegible] Senate Committee I will be happy to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

MR. C. RICHARD WITMER (CONTINUING): The money involved in these three activities, Sir, is not a big problem. It is a $128,520. It will be $128,520. In 1975 it is going to be $108,870. That is a reasonable amount of money to be paying out in terms for military and such. That is one of the areas which I believe, if we remove from the budget, the defense could be reflected in other areas of the country's economy which do not exist today.

Sir, my final plea is for the maintenance budget of $91,500 under Personnel for maintenance. If there is to be some sensible objectives to keeping in overall parity or a direction for peace in the areas, that is a lot of money for maintenance. It is good to see, Sir, that $140,000 is included under Construction for training. However, Mr. President, I hope that this indicates the policy to be established in the next session that they are going to be given the opportunity to vote it, because I can well remember, Sir, as a child Supreme Commander Eisenhower's comments on disarmament. At the end of the day we were told, "No, we are not ready." One afternoon days you will get a chance to vote it, but you know we have to first successfully to include your plans before we can proceed again. This seems to be a final answer, Sir. One which is experience and the other side of qualification. If one does not have the qualifications they will fail, the second the qualifications. It is left to unilaterally and gone altogether and never look with a qualification that they will have what be needs experience. Mr. President, that the Minister is going to support the benefits which are to improve your three remaining programmes and those people who attend them and to be successfully the policy to be given the opportunity to perform and address in the Civil Service.

Another area of the Supplementary Estimates, Sir, which gives no cause concern is Sick Leave and Overtime. There are for what they will never understand. In 1974, Sir, this figure was $318,213. In 1975 is to be increased to $384,400. Now, Mr. President, this Government must be making a lot of noise and they must be the responsible kind, Sir. The more responsible course only to maintaining the essential number of people which exist in the Service. I noticed this point of Planning Conditions in Korea, and the Honourable Third Official Member mentioned that he was going to investigate it and look at the possibility of putting this area out to public bid. I can only assure, Sir, that it is to avoid undue investigation as I have seen no advertisements for vacancies in the newspaper.

I did so that, Mr. President, that we are presently to spend under Capital Budget $91,500 to buy vehicles for transport, police and fire communications. Mr. Mr. Peterkins, whose everything be done to reduce the cost of maintaining these radios to Government, as now cannot this figure to be over higher in 1975. Mr. President, something to occur. The want to help, noting over recently a row on radio communications in Ocean Pilot's.

Geographically, Sir, I think that the highest point in this country is 23 feet and that is the part of my Constituency of Mount Sion. This, Sir can happen that Government already has obligations to Local Town radio towers which are over 200 ft high and that does not include the radio signal tower at the Civil which would be utilized. I am not a radio man or an electronics expert, Sir, but I believe that there are ways of relaying which could be used. That would obviously improve the communications system than the practice of duplicated towers. I have a small boat, Sir, and there are those times because I have great difficulty communicating with the land authority from my base in Mon Point. Something needs to be done, Sir. My radio is good. I can operate under 2 to 3 miles off shore I can contact from Alexian, Holly Court.

MR. S. SIBUSE MUSONE (CONTINUED): October 1990, which gives us
2004 more reasons to celebrate 92-200, Nyasaing. Mrs. Mr. President,
in this Budget we are proposing to spend $1.8 million on housing of
I am only aware separately about Government in this country in 1992,
that, again in the Capital Budget there is a figure of $65,000 for
Government and Parliament in Government Houses. Mr. President,
that total $1,850,000 is unacceptable. I think we must go and go
to spend on health care. It is unfair to have one group to enjoy
in social services. It is time that we made up our minds
in the Judicial services. Mr. President, I do not know what we need to
do to reduce this figure but we need to do something. $2.8 million to
house expatriates Civil Servants in an extravagant amount of money.
If we have to find out of these cuts we have now and have had many
cuts now elsewhere, there have to be savings which must be realized
Mr. President, Sir, we in the meantime, the Queen Salaam in the
first to fifth world Parliaments I can think that especially would want to
visit. Since it is Queen Salaam, we have a good climate. Also
some of these people want to whether visiting in England or Australia.
I can pay their personally pay for their house down here. There is a
lot more to, I should say, we do not know to worry about
this is our Middle East that there might be a contribution that Government
pay their property. Should we have had our cuts that there might be.
However, I do have really believe that they is unrealistic, Sir. There
is going and suffer. There are all kinds of benefits to be gained
by visiting in the Queen Salaam. These people are getting big
salaries and good jobs, they do really afford their contribution.
It is not time to give them tickets. We do have to get rid this waste.
$1.8 million in housing alone.

I will now be moving a motion to
Finance Committee to remove that vote from the Budget. Is the only
other possible Parliament there is more to move, Sir.

MR. President, also in the Budget there
is a $8.5 million which is to be made to subsidy in the domestic route
of Cayman Airways. Now Mr. President, I really do not believe that
this country can afford more, Sir, as I really believe that we need
to subsidize the domestic air route, because I believe that there are
private flyers who are willing to provide or pool a service on the
Frichardson principle today, as a better service of an route by Government.
They like these private flyers land on the remote areas of Grand
Cayman or Cayman Brac they are ready to have to pay landing fees as
they would be business for Government. They are going to be charged
landing fees on the way. They are going to have offices space in the
Owens Buildings and, Sir, anything which can increase the revenue to
that site Government we have to do, because we have a heavily vote taxpayer.
I still personally cannot see why we should have spent, Sir,
the Government in order. We are going to have to pay for it.

Mr. President, I would like to place
a reminder upon the people of this country to pay tribute to ourselves
Cayman Airways Limited's domestic routes to the extent of $8.5 million
when in the case of the Caribbean, Sir, we have a Government who do
not subsidy of that airways. I know at least four private Companies
which are fully qualified commercial instrument rated pilots of
Sir Fly Brac. Of course, Sir, they are being very much used to a
reliable service and to work as a commercial pilot for the airline
they have got to look for hours flying. Now, Sir, how do we remedy this,
keep upgrading Government to get the hours flying or we are also
also to fly with the services which they have? Instead use people
whose do subsidize. It comes back again to the fact we, Sir, of
tourism and multiplications.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to know of instances where other young people have come back to this country with the same qualifications, but they absolutely had unsatisfactory which none of these fine young people have, because they were denied by the airlines without the 707 known experience.

Mr. Speaker, apart from the case of Transatlantic, they are getting these young Canadians that British subsidiary that we have 707 known qualities type of training under the circumstances which exist. They are fully qualified through qualifications noted points by United States standards but the British rule in this case is very stringent. Six hours are not enough. They must have 700 hours. However, Sir, the Transatlantic service is necessary. That is allowed by the British to go-ahead under the more British regulations, but the CAA regulations which are more stringent say that other, I think it is, 10 passengers, and I agree with them to some extent, they must have a co-pilot. We agree with flexibility, Sir. It is either or. Either we are going to abide by one set of rules or we are going to abide by the other set of rules. We cannot have these changed for economics to suit certain individuals.

We have a customer very recently where two of these five pilots, one of whom is a member of my constituency and that is how I got involved in this, came over qualified. I think all five people, my friend the Minister of Labour and those others there are many people because they could show how well qualified of this type. Now, Sir, I do not believe and I would hate to make any mistake, Sir, that these young people's rights were played with so that they were set up to have most for some people with airline jobs who might be coming behind. However, Mr. President, these people were terminated. They were told off on a memo with a day's notice and the story goes very unfavourable from there on. Firstly they were told that they would be given transportation rights to the job. They were entitled for rights and some of these rights entertainment. And they were told the two young people were sent out to Calgary. They did not understand, Sir, that they would be given a schedule of their interviews, a schedule of their interest, education, training. Sir, in the first instance all they were given was about a quarter of a page of a standard British Aerospace writing pad with, one name and one telephone number. The two young people were given instructions and instead they would go anyway and do the best they could. They arrived in Winnipeg and there were no reservations or instructions to follow. Again, they were flown anywhere and they got no follow. They found a hotel and a place to stay.

The next day they went to the building that they were told that the interviews were going to be held in only to find out, Sir, that they were in the wrong building. They persevered, arrived elsewhere and eventually found the right building. They attended the interviews. They were told on the first day by the interviewers that they were not going to come. They persevered, and the next day, both of these young people had unanimously passed the test and the recommendation was that they be flight engineers to go on a simulator, but they were not told that they had to do an exam at the end of this two week period. They were told that the IQT exam was absolutely essential. They would not get on the simulator without this exam.

They sat the exam for the second time, as the pass is 70 percent and to get the pass grade for the FAA exam. Now, Mr. President, my sympathies are not for the airlines as they are where most of the fault lies. They owned the simulator that was being used for Cayman Airways. The instructor could not be here today and he would have to wait the Cayman Islands to find another

MR. D. JOSEPH WILSON (PEMBROKE): Mr. Speaker, this Government, Sir, is supposed to have previously granted a number of pilots for Ogoja Province. There were all kind of rumours about people being given the many awards. They did not have enough awards and things like that. They were told after the case that the case could not go out for Ogoja Province. They were worried to meet their colleagues working on Monday night at 7.00 p.m. and they requested a call from the Ogoja Province people to return to Ogoja again on the first available flight because they had failed.

Now, Mr. President, after they got back to Ogoja, my constituent member was not there to be involved in it. I attended a meeting and my colleague the Imperial Ambassador friend from West Bay, the Samoai Tourist Member for West Bay was also there. These people met on Monday, Sir, in the Chairman of the Board, of which I received a copy, exactly what had happened. It was the whole shenanigans. At the meeting, I asked those in attendance at the meeting to send the letters which I had received, which they did. I was told that the letters were an accurate account of what had happened. Mr. President, I submit that questions at that meeting set the atmosphere. Sir, in most ways our national airline has a flourishing economy, a flourishing place to work. Some people who have been retired at flight engineers level I used grade 'A' in our book. However, there are good people here, there people of no par merit. I was by colleague the Second Elector, Member for West Bay City, that anything with the impression that everything was going to be done to model these big young people. They were going to be given another opportunity. That is just words only, Sir. They are still waiting for substantive for that new opportunity.

Yesterday afternoon I was told that they are going to be offered, Sir, the opportunity to fly on their own in essential, that is the Colombia connection, the Fairchild flights that is two to three flights morning. They are going to receive training re-conversion. They are supported by pilots somewhere else. Mr. President, Sir, I doubt that these two young people can fly from 7.00 to 8.00 p.m. and yet in a Cessna they're used with any agency the next day. Mr. President, I know that other people, for whatever reasons, whether it was because of [illegible] of one kind or another were allowed to work in the operations section of this airline and join experienced before they were sent on their course. Mr. President, in the final analysis, what these young people are being offered is absolutely no offer whatsoever.

So, Mr. President, I cannot support and ask the families of these people and other people in this country to keep those where are going to provide an unnecessary subsidy for the domestic route. We must have one standard and it must be fair to all people, Sir.

Mr. President, as I said earlier on, while I support these measures to increase revenue to provide services for the people of this country, I also want to see, Sir, improvements in these services. Again I understand that the unprofitable internal network of Nigerian Airways [illegible] to be given one out some 200 million from the budget which was announced to them by the Administrative Minister of the Civil Service. I believe, Sir, that there are still some improvements where there is the need to [illegible] to Government. I also believe, Sir, that there are some improvements, improvements and [illegible] to Government.

Mr. P. Veera Raju (Kothacheruvu): The Point of Order Secretary, Sir, which I think is an unnecessary harassment, in the Water Authority. Two years ago, Sir, I was given a survey which was prepared by the present Chairman of the Water Authority which was in connection with the absolute necessity for a Water Authority for the purpose of the Water Authority in this area. The interesting thing about that survey, Sir, is that he had his salary fixed for three years at Rs.1,000 per thousand per month. The total, Sir, in the 1980 budget that a study has already amounted to Rs.2,00. I think that all of the other expenditure for the study had been written into that salary. The total amount estimated in this budget for the Water Authority was Rs.2,00.

Now, Mr. President, I would be the first to admit that some planning should go in into giving water supply in this country. I also recognise, Sir, that this country, the Water Authority, is not the creation of the present Government. However, Sir, I am saying the Planning of Executive Council that unless they put this matter in a shape, we can't really go into Drinking Water Schemes in our lands. The reason why I feel that the Water Authority is unnecessary harassment, Sir, is that I feel that it should be confined to a regulatory function of Public Works Department. The technical wing which is part of the Water Authority and which I will be the first to agree that this technical wing, belongs under the Public Health Division of Government where the skilled people dispose of.

Mr. President, I was under impression that we are planning to spend Rs.2,00 to provide a water supply for Ongole Town. Now, Mr. President, I believe that this money can be better spent in other areas, because if I might even guess, Sir, the wellfield which are developed in Ongole we have told that they could take the calculation of our water problems for years to come for Ongole Town, Kothapatnam and Kodur Town, and even beyond that. I do not know, Sir, whether the water up there is so much that it cannot be said any more on what the position is. Because, if this programme in the provide piped water for Ongole Town I question the Ongole, Sir, the area and the decline. Most of the people in Ongole Town including the big commercial institutions around here have their own storage facilities. Even I have seen a water tower recently which is near the Bank of India Kendra Building.

Mr. President, those people who have storage facilities are not interested, I do not believe, in piped water supply. In fact, I believe that what most people do this country is to a source where they can get good potable water when their pipelines run dry. I believe that many few people would connect to piped water supply in Ongole Town. I certainly do not believe that the Water Authority will be expected to do so a Government organisation will pay the same way. This would only create a piped system.

Mr. President, when I read in the press that Government is doing right I consider certain areas to be rehabilitated, and we drive by the agricultural fields and there are hundreds of feet of bore wells dried up in the ground unnecessarily while, I doubt very much, Sir, that this country of 75,000 people can provide any of these heavy supplies of water. What the people of this country are used to dealing with, Sir, is handpumps. There are people in this country who can sell handpumps to people themselves, whereas when they come to a piped industry they look behind them, wonder where to go and what to do in these matters again, they had to rely upon. Rehabilitation plant in that region were working as they should and not of water failure any more.

MR. D. DEANS MYRIE (CONTINUING): I do not believe, Sir, that the solution for the future operation of water in this country lies in massive capital, nor ground water of which we have no inkling, since Barbados still scientific tests that have to continue for instance, Sir, I now tell you that I know at least one house where the well water has been reduced in quality because of the pumping of salt water for that restaurant. I remember hearing the Second Elected Member for Saint John say in a Meeting, Sir, that one thing we should not get from that water was that we should not be allowed the water for the nights, there would not be any water. My brother knows in that area, Sir, that when we talked the water we did not get any water in our nights. However, I also think the Hon. Member today, she gets some of her water in the night. Sir, that scientific tests can give. When we talked the water we did not get any water in our nights. However, I also think the Hon. Member today, she gets some of her water in the night. Sir, that the general problems and the experience of the people in these areas will tell you that the ground water is being depleted and reduced in quality.

Mr. President, this country has many untried applications to water problems. We have left the industrialist provision to a private firm, the Government should not be a private firm. The ground water in this area, on the same way, should be taken responsibility by a private firm. All of these things are being done until we come to Government and our economic responsibility for Government. I think in 1985 the water investment may experience of about $15,000 in Government. I would hardly suppose, Sir, that what we mean to do since water in this country is to privatise but the provisions to provide firms who might be in through Specifications, we are not going to give the provisions for by.

I do not think that Government has any business in businesses with the production of water. The other thing which is being looked across about providing power water there ought to be the Caribbean Caribbean Corporation, I will talk with you what my opinion of that is, Sir. I believe that that is a chance for more economic negotiations. If they get in we now contract negotiations required before the water provisions to be given, there is not going to be any water provided, because all of a sudden we are going to have that it comes in some unknowingly.

Sir, I have been very cautious encouragement from this Hotel industry. I think, Sir, that we should leave the production of water to the private sector. All the country needs is an adequate provision of water for necessary purposes. People of this country, Sir, I believe only need one rate only which is willing to pay for a water supply which they need it when all a sensible economy and it was to maintenance of their house, that is my investment question, Sir. They should pay fifteen cents gate and I would not mind at all. This would allow the business water connection to stay in business and we have an increase small businesses in this country, Sir.

Now quite I would like the time to point a comment to the Government Senate, on the report that we may say, that I will be bringing a motion in three weeks time for investigation of anti-tenant and anti-monopoly laws in this country. I would have brought it in this Meeting, Sir. However, I did not get a copies of the various amendments and anti-tenant laws to come to substantially debate the subject. The Minister Minister is going to speak on this, Sir, so it will be here.

MR. D. DOUGLAS WILDER (CONTINUING): Mr. President, another department which plays an important role and which I feel that the people of this country are not getting enough for money is the Public Works Department. Mr. President, one of the problems around which we have a duty to examine is the budget in one year. That is what it comes to boils on the needs of the Virgin Islands. I believe, Sir, that if we are going to ask people to pay more to invest on the needs of the Virgin Islands we are going to have to make sure that money is spent in Public Works on the needs, is merely spent will be not wasted.

Mr. President, I will give you a few illustrations of what I think is wasting in the Public Works Department in the building of roads. Most recently in my district I suggest equipment in some other districts on St. Croix I took my time out, Sir, to observe Public Works at work and on one day that is what I found.

On the Centerline Road in Mt Pleasant there was a grader and a mixer. They were building a road with natural shale and were continually going back and forth. Assuming I parked my truck for 45 minutes. In that 45 minutes they passed that grader approximately six to eight times in each, the mixer and the driver were idle for the full 45 minutes. There were no level surfaces on the side of the road to guide the grader as they were building. As a result the road was broke up and there were ridges on it. So it is a very unpleasing piece of road.

On the same day on that Mt Pleasant Main Road, I made the following observation.

MR. PRESIDENT: I regret to interrupt the Senator on the middle of this interesting site. However, we have reached 1:30 p.m. so we [illegible] that we have a quorum on the point of consideration a particular piece of business. I think that the Senator [illegible] for a while yet and therefore proceedings will be adjourned in the usual way to reconvene with Standing Orders.

MR. D. DOUGLAS WILDER: Alright, Sir.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. ORRAN B. MOORE: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

PROCEEDINGS: AGREED. AT 1:30 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. THURSDAY, 6TH DECEMBER, 1984.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(1) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(2) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
Finance Committee Report on Motion Carried on 17th September 1985 - Held on the Table	1
Report of the Select Committee on the Establishment of Radio Rhema as a Government Corporation - Held on the Table	5
Questions	7
Financial Intermediaries Amendment Regulations 1985 - Laid on the Table and Disallowed by the Legislature	24
Insurance Companies Ordinance 1985 - Regulations Laid on the Table	26
Communications of Debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation (1985/86) Bill 1985	
(a) General Debate	39
(b) Private Members	47
Appointment	48
Adjournment	48

TUESDAY

6TH DECEMBER, 1960

10.30 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayers. The First Elected Member for the Cayman Islands.

PRAYERS

THE HON. MISS D. KENNEDY: 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 Legislature assembled here, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations to the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Princess Anne of Wales and all the Royal Family, and grant to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that wisdom and happiness, strength and direction which may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of the Executive Council and Members of the Legislature Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high offices.

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

Our Father, which 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 those 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.

Be seated. The First Elected Member for the Cayman Islands.

Please make those chairs which we can be provided with as comfortable as we can. The Lord's Day Observance Law is not quite as severe as it used to be, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Papers to be laid.

Finance Committee Report. The Honourable Third Official Member.

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

HON. JAMES C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the Finance Committee Report of the meeting held on 25th November, 1960.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

HON. JAMES C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, on Wednesday, the 23rd November, 1960, Finance Committee considered a recommendation made by the Chairman of that Committee after having considered the Journal of Executive Council to put the matter forward.

Mr. JAMES T. MCINTYRE (continued): It would, Mr. President, also provide for payment of Cayman Air Aviation and Cayman Airways Limited in respect of sums of money due to them. The total sum provided, Mr. President, is $10,281,813.96, approximately $7.8 million of this sum, Mr. President, is the loan which was granted in March, 1982. That loan which was granted in March, 1982 was a part of the total sum of $12 million. The $12 million, Mr. President, was distributed $4.5 million for airport capacity in Cayman Airways and $7.5 million to Cayman Airways.

Cayman Airways has not been able, Mr. President, to make any repayment on this loan. We have in recent years written off against the interest due by Government Cayman Airways on the loan, all effective interest. We have applied the interest which accrues on the Airport Fund at Barclays Bank in Dallas, a sum of $6 million which was paid for the BAC 1-11s and is presently held in escrow for the name of the Cayman Islands Government and Cayman Airways which holds the loans on the two Boeing 737s.

A breakdown of this Eighty Six point seven, Mr. President, in the previous loan, i.e. Cayman Air Aviation of $4 million, the interest free loan Cayman Airways of $2.2 million and interest on loans to Cayman Airways. Mr. President, while records after allowing off all Government officers not agreed to of $184,000, also went to Government Departments by Cayman Airways in respect of landing fees, customs and immigration and Ground Handling fees. Lastly, Mr. President, there was advances granted by this Government in the months of 1982 and January, 1983, totalling approximately $1.2 million.

The proceeds, Mr. President, from the investment will give due to Government to share equity. In summary, Mr. President, there is no cash movement at all because the advance which was given in December and January of this year, that is already been given out and is presently written off as an advance. Therefore, the loan and the interest at those loans and the same due to Government Guarantees will be converted to share capital and the advance receivable ministry on the books should be charged off against the 1983 Appropriation Number Four, and also incremental into share equity.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we all a very, on the one hand we are to have the Cayman Airways and what we are seeking to do at this stage is Cayman Airways to let us have some shares commensurate to the sum which we have as a loan, and therefore share participation in order the airline and the ways that to Government Guarantees.

If I am, may, Mr. President of clearly the aims as regards sums due to Government by Cayman Airways through the Mid Estimates, 1983. Accordingly, with the subsidy which is provided in the 1983 draft estimates, subject to it being approved, we cannot do it possible to pay the debts to Government each year.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 47, paragraph 2, this House is deemed to have agreed to the motion.

Reports of Select Committees: The Honourable First Official Member.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF RADIO CAYMAN AS A COMMERCIAL CORPORATION

THE HONOURABLE M. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the report of the Select Committee on the re-establishment of Radio Cayman as a Government Corporation.

Sen. SPARKMAN (continuing). Mr. President, the Senate Committee met two mornings, one in the late afternoon, and one on the same afternoon.

Mr. President, the discussions of the matter centered around the first part of the section, that is to say whether or not Rock Queen should remain as a statutory metropolitan area.

There was much discussion about that. Mr. President was eventually in favor of a vote and it was defeated nine to two. Mr. President, it may be of help to Members of this Body and to the general public if I explain what is said in the Select Committee's report. The motion which led to the consideration of the Committee action centered around whether Rock Queen should remain a statutory metropolitan area, which made an area eligible for the direct method of financing. Mr. President, this discussion is applicable here. However, it should be said that the small town representatives in Rock Queen were in favor of removal from the statutory metropolitan area. Some people may express themselves as being in favor of removing Rock Queen from the statutory metropolitan area for the purpose of eligibility when not competition.

Mr. President, let me make completely clear my position on this amendment. I have very serious reservations about the advisability of Rock Queen's remaining eligible for the direct method of financing as they should be left with the same requirements as to the rest of the State. That is not to say that they never need any relief. They would be justified if they sought some aid, just similar to a certain necessity.

Let me give a extreme example. Members can recall that the earthquake over near Rock Queen in the State of Washington was to be the subject of an open door conference. Some of the people from Washington and Oregon objected to the Governor's recommending saying that there was likely to be a great deal of aid to the nation. This raised the question whether it was to be considered a new policy. The Governor may already committed the Attorney General to the basis of the advice which he was then given, he stated that the subject should be dropped. I cannot recall the exact words. It was nothing more than good sense. It is hardly good sense to assume that anybody likely to lead to direct assistance to Washington. How do I believe that the majority of the Oregonian people would welcome assistance if it is necessary, or anything offensive to friendly, neighborly relations.

Mr. President, I hope to have additional time to discuss such matters of the amendment that it may be helpful and I do not consider this opposition either. It is quite reasonable and justified disagreement.

Let me also mention briefly, as what I should do hereafter. Before the long recess discussion and suggestion was made that the Committee should be authorized to hold hearings on the bill. I do not be authorized and when it was first considered it was not thought necessary to be involved. I withdrew the Senator's name from these matters and do not think that was an irregular move. I am reasonably interested that Committee report be informed regarding the opposition on the desirability of the amendment. However, I doubt if additional information could even be secured. Even if such information could be secured, there would be some point of disagreement and somebody would have to decide who was to be interested in the record. In the recent Alaskan where the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings, considerable opposition for the amendment was made by the Governor of the State. If additional hearings were held, I suggest that Mr. Gruening could believe that the members were chosen for political purposes.

MR. DERRY H. ENGLISH (CONTINUING): Gentlemen, most of the Members will have had a new phone see on the Union Calendar a few months ago. That procedure was brought on the initial responsibility Speaker has to introduce a per rather than always Members himself. So, there can be, because when on a stationary relationship with the British Broadcasting Society's Legislative Branch from control. This procedure is more because public opinion will not allow it. That, in my view, is the only real explanation and it is a explanation here too, the Secretary that any improperly would become public knowledge and would lead to disagreement concerned to quite sufficient to enable that meeting have not happen.

Mr. President, I hope that Members will be able to identify things a bit on this and I move that the report be printed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Clerk of Members for North Side.

MR. H. ERSKINE WELSH: Mr. President, I wish to object, sir, to this Report being laid on the Table of the Assembly for two reasons. The Minutes circulated are inaccurate and, Sir, it is a tendency to delay the discussion of the unfavourable first official Member who was Chairman of this Committee, because the discussion is just based was probably longer than the whole Committee meeting on the decision as to whether Radio Queen should operate as a privately body or not.

The discussion of the Committee, Sir, did not, as the Minutes suggest, centre round the witness. This error, and I quote from the Minutes, Sir:-

"Witness

Discussion ensued in relation to the advantages and disadvantages of Radio Queen operating as a Statutory Corporation."

The Committee, Sir, were confused on the Memorandum briefly setting out the first paragraph of the motion. The first paragraph of the motion reads:-

"WHEREAS Radio Queen has demonstrated its ability to maintain itself financially,"

We were told that briefly back said either or that Radio Queen was making money and this a questionable conclusion, we were told in that Committee Meeting that it was not financially even because things are, unfortunately, extremely difficult, but not been financed in. However, I noticed in the memorandum Chief Official Member's Budget Address this year, Radio Queen is showing quite making money.

Secondly, Sir, I wish to unfortunately that I was unable to attend the meeting at which the Report was approved because of study commitments on Wednesday, the Minutes of the second meeting which I was present from, Sir, and which the Minutes contained that I was absent from with apologies, right to the first paragraph:-

"Motion by Mr. D. Ernest Mellor

Mr. D. Ernest Mellor having previously submitted questions for answer at this Meeting tabled a motion for the Clerk's office on the Hon Secretary that for the Select Committee's consideration that three of his issue be included in the Minutes of the Committee's first Meeting."

MR. D. SHEAR MACKAY (Continuing): Just as I conclude, Sir, the point which I wished to be answered in the Minutes which were circulated at the first Meeting, were not the views of the Chairman, they were the views of the Chairman which counts, and this is what I read in that letter which I handed with the Clerk of the Assembly on the 31st October, 1966:-

> "(a) The first time the motion, that is the meeting, be adjourned, Councillor, Mackintosh, withdrawing or publicly was taken Mentioned. Robin Cox Mackintosh objected strongly that was consistent with the Chairman's subjective opinion, who declared the Meeting with the pronounced opinion.
>
> (b) The statement,"

and the statement was made by the Chairman, was not Spit. Please Minute":-

> "Made by the Chairman that the Chairman was under specific instructions to close all committee meetings which were put on the map.
>
> (c) The statement made by the Chairman that the minutes was to inform him what the minute for Monday night's Town Clerk Committee would be put on the Monday before for his consent."

That is what I would proceed on the Minutes. Unfortunately, it is impossible on a technicality because I was not here to move it, however, Sir, my legal and experience in bringing this matter to the attention was that Rates Committee would have taken view in light of the present circumstances of Rates Crisis as a Government imposes the Chairman, discretionary of changing the powers out a public Council Committee and given thereafter, considering the Rates, Revenue and Expenditure, a decision would be taken which would have affected the Ratepayers in a way which could have put a substantial end for all concerned the present intolerable of Rates Income on a Government Assessment to the amount owing, or whether it was a matter to put to us a public Assessment.

Anyway, Sir, I see no point in the Motion before Meeting on which the question was put to that the Minutes, should stand as they are objected. I am very disappointed that we did not achieve this objective, but I will never, never, never, although I would not delay the matter by this decision, because the rate increase as required by Council Rates have not expired and will be enforced in March, I will then be publicly a matter for Government to discuss fully in their capacity and call it to the public of this Meeting, and for the public note the Chairman, councillors, ratepayers, or to a public Local Government because this will only serve to put the finger of doubt.

Mr. President, I move for this Motion being carried.

MR. [illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak on this case? I will put the question that the Corporate Minutes

QUESTION PUT.

MR. [illegible]: I am just enquiring whether the person moving the motion has a right of reply?

MR. SPEAKER: I am so sorry. You are quite right.

MR. J. DONALD KITCHEN: The question has been put, Sir. With respect, Sir, I think that you incorrectly put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: I did but I think that I am entitled to correct a mistake if I make a mistake. It has been my practice if I have made a mistake and discovered a Member in opportunity to speak should be given him. I think that the rights of Members are that it makes sense, the backbench Members as well as the Members of the Government Benches.

MR. DONALD MACDONALD: Yes, Sir, it will be only unnecessary to hear his reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Member wish to reply?

MR. DONALD M. MACDONALD: Yes, Sir. (LAUGHTER). I am afraid that the Member will be very disappointed, Sir, because what I am going to say is short and sweet.

The whole procedure of this thing is, that there were votes taken in the past, that is why he is so disappointed and that is why he objected to the Report as it is. We must learn, Sir, to have the decent humanity when he puts it.

I am not going to prolong it, Sir. I was sure the Members and their wives would appreciate it. I am sure that I would not discredit me by saying, to a considerable extent make people there. I mean, he will go to sleep, Sir. I would think this is why I suspect it, that things should end like that. Even I am beginning to, I am depressed and I shut up shop. I think that is what the Member should learn to do.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Now I will put the question. The motion is that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. S. PASCAL MILLER: May I have a division, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly.

DIVISION BELL RANG

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Mrs. Bonnie M. Dobson	Mr. S. Pascal Miller	Mr. M. McKenzie Woodward
Mr. Richard A. Hawkey		
Mr. Thomas G. Hoffmeister		
Mr. Duncan D. Hooks		
Mrs. M. Norman Jenkins		
Mr. Clerk Wheeler A. Lieberknecht		
Mr. Russell H. Johnson		
Mr. Carlton R. Ogburn		
Mr. Henry D. Sherrington		
Mr. James A. Snider		
Mr. A. Kelly Trivett		
Mr. John R. Walker		
12	1	1

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE (INDEX TO MAJORITY VOTE)

Mr. Robinson: Item 2. Queensland, the Royal Diamond Jubilee Trust Fund.

QUESTION

THE FIRST QUESTION BEFORE THE HOUSE IS THAT THE HONOURABLE THE SPECIAL MEMBER RECOMMENDATION FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Hay: Will the Honourable Member give the total cost to date for all advisers, consultants or similar experts employed or appointed by the Government in which the Island since 1st December, 1982?

ANSWER:

NAME	CONSULTANT	AMOUNT
Dennis Whaley	Customs Advisor	15,154.12
Samuel Smith	Financial Negotiations	22,807.50
D.W. Jacobs	Economic Development Expert	29,568.55
Mark Attipetty	Review procedures of TCD	13,270.80
Tim Bradbury	Reconciliation of TCD Receipts	3,045.47
Anthony Pratt	Shipping Advisor	50,195.45
John Cornell	Minister	2,877.19
Gregg & Company	Legal & Admin-Secretarial Assistance	90,207.66
J. Symes	Valuation	282.50
Sir Sam Pandrell	Legal advisor for ADB Negotiations	35,881.50
Steve Leighton	Customs Training Team	57,760.79
		$320,554.93

MR. THOMAS C. STEPHENSON: Mr. President, Sir, I rise to speak to the motion that the Chair be duly informed and whether they should be disqualified, in whether they should be put on microfiche, and the entire report of Government records. The subjects put there as Members may be somewhat misleading.

QUESTIONS:

MR. J. MAC LEGGEY: Mr. President, may I ask the Member if the Flag of Crew and Company be a legal flag or a public relations flag.

MR. THOMAS C. STEPHENSON: Mr. President, perhaps in the answer I should have clarified that as well. It is a public relations flag although it does have many legal people working within it.

MR. J. MAC LEGGEY: Mr. President, may I ask if it is correct that we received only thirty five thousand pounds for this flag?

MR. THOMAS C. STEPHENSON: Mr. President, this is almost certainly in my opinion. I think in essence, Sir, the flag was commissioned at a time when we were trying to deal with a lot of negative publicity about the Cayman Islands and what it appeared its financial offshore centre reputation, structure. I do think that the flag has served, in my view, very well and the £40,000 which was spent I would not object to.

MR. G. MALE KEEGAN: Mr. President, I think that we heard during this hearing about some mistakes in the principle of fiscal responsibility. Are any of them included in this list?

MR. THOMAS F. GALLIGAN: Mr. President, if the Member is referring to the solution for the Building Code who has just arrived, which is not on this list. If he is referring to any other solution I think that he needs to be more specific so that I can say whether he is here or not.

MR. JAMES K. HOGAN: I think that we have been told that there have been solutions from EEC and some of the other countries in the United Kingdom. I do not think that I see any of those items on this list. The solutions from EEC and the other United Kingdom countries and the solutions who I believe we have had to respond to the Court of Justice, I do not see any of those items over either.

MR. THOMAS F. GALLIGAN: Mr. President, perhaps we should have more specificity as to where the solutions came from. The various Ministers and the Parliamentary Ministers were recommended from British Columbia Government. They have the aquaculture solution, the financial responsible solution, the economic solution, the computer solution, the Canadian coal mine in the list. I do not know if we have an solution on pension.

MR. G. ALEX MCCOY: Some time ago there was a report about an solution being brought in, to which we have to pay every year. I think that is mentioned in the budget address. Has this solution been included in these figures?

MR. THOMAS F. GALLIGAN: Mr. President, I would like to answer that question in relation to whether the pension was analyzed by Government or not, the financial solution was not employed by Government. We did have had to come up something else's opinion.

MR. G. ALEX MCCOY: I think that I remember hearing on the Premier's speech something about an Ignace location. Would there also have been a consultant to prepare this problem would the work be included in this?

MR. THOMAS F. GALLIGAN: Mr. President, I think that the Second Chamber Report for Quebec does have a good memory. It was mentioned that there was going to be an Ignace survey and possibly a drywall mine as well. However, I do not think that any coal has been mined by Hanley on solution in the this for us to put.

MR. G. ALEX MCCOY: Some time ago I heard about an Ontario mining a lignite resource. In the case of that person expert's work [illegible] was employed or merely solutions?

Mr. THOMAS C. HOLLINGSWORTH: ... we did not have an opinion by the time [illegible]. I understand that it was done intentionally, without knowledge.

Mr. PRESIDING: My hon. colleague, the Chief Electoral Officer, may please reply.

Mr. THOMAS J. PERRY: ... Mr. President, I can assure that the appropriate number for English publication and Gaelic translation is very limited and essential expenditure. However, this is an average of past years [illegible]. Could the Member indicate on what these changes were [illegible]?

Mr. THOMAS C. HOLLINGSWORTH: Mr. President, the increase in the Chief Electoral Officer for Wage may be [illegible] expenditure [illegible] $2111.00. We were given one of the [illegible] agencies. I am not sure whether it is true or the other one. Anyway, the [illegible] figure.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Hon. Commissioner Pilgrim....

Hon. THOMAS C. HOLLINGSWORTH: I think I got it right now. In your [illegible] for Ministerial responsibility, the City Court to Government was [illegible].

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Chief Electoral Officer for another time.

Hon. THOMAS M. DOOLEY: I should like to ask if there is any possibility we may expect some [illegible] for the report on the other matters?

Hon. THOMAS C. HOLLINGSWORTH: Mr. President, I am not sure if this is the [illegible] Member to [illegible] to answer [illegible] this or the [illegible] of [illegible].

Mr. PRESIDENT: Unless [illegible] Chief Electoral Officer [illegible] Government [illegible] Mr. President, I would like to [illegible] Government [illegible] Government [illegible] Government

MR. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3RD: Mr. President, I am not really participating in this session. Since I was the Member before the current Government, I thought I should not speculatively or otherwise express a point of view.

THE PRESIDENT: I think that would be perfectly fair.

MR. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3RD: Please pass, Mr. President. Speak up all, but not above the din. We must progress and we must be guided by time. I say, Mr. President, this is our third session of Monday morning. I just, I say that during my administration we had a policy not to hold a meeting until we had a quorum. We had begun punctually at 9:30 a.m. and we did not wait for anybody. We established a new precedent. We established a new policy. We have not established many rules which have not withstood many, many years. I suggest that we have to find another means....

THE PRESIDENT: I think that the Minutes can indicate what has happened. However, we must not object to anybody who wishes to express the majority of views.

MR. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3RD: Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting to anyone expressing his views because it was said by the Member who called the meeting a while ago and he does so by his or her own decision.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, I was just curious about the change in the position of the representative of the Netherlands. I am an optimist and I am sure we will hear from him.

MR. PIERRE M. TRUDEAU: Mr. President, on the question of the Netherlands, I would have, if I could have a statement to make?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I do not want to have a long debate about the merits of... You could tell us whether you have a proposal or request or intervention, however, I do not want to debate about whether the normal procedure is better or worse than the existing procedure.

MR. ROBERT G. MUGABE: Mr. President, all the statements so far delivered have been long. Most probably some would be brief. I am not for that. However, I know that there is a big need for the opinion about the peaceful utilization of outer space. As a member of this we are looking into the matter in the present time. Whatever old system we used previously cannot apply today. The programme is being assisted by World Health Organization.

MR. PIERRE M. TRUDEAU: Could we then, Mr. President, make a brief explanation? Essentially we a statement...

THE PRESIDENT: Not too much about every time.

MR. PIERRE M. TRUDEAU: Well, the statement that was made should be in order to ensure that work on the study will serve our nations. Is that correct?

MR. ROBERT G. MUGABE: Mr. President, I should have said that we have no objection to this particular study of outer space as have being assisted by World Health Organization outside of the country.

Mr. M. MACKAY asked: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the honourable Member say whether the Government has any further study report in this matter here?

Hon. THOMAS C. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, the answer to that is no.

Mr. M. MACKAY asked: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the honourable Member say whether the Government has any intention?

Hon. THOMAS C. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, the answer to that is no.

Mr. HOWE B. HARKER: Mr. President, I would like to get the ruling first. It is a supplementary. Am I to understand the Member has been unable to be absolutely up to date to Parliament for the Canada Government statistics?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the original question for which notice was given, and other further notice, by I would take the answer was that there has been no note. Whether there will be no I may refer the honourable gentleman.

Hon. THOMAS C. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, in replying the question, I forgot to indicate the person was claiming the dividend, whether he was an estate and whether he was living. explained by this Government. The deceased veteran was not employed by this Government. Whether or I aware of any such which may concern the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that perhaps we should pass to the next question by the Member would like to ask.

THE FIRST SESSION ASKED FOR SUPPLY WHAT IS THE TOTAL SUPPLY REQUIRED FOR PENSIONS AND DEPARTMENT

Mr. [illegible]: would the honourable Member state what are the terms of the national health grant that was paid in behalf of the Province in 1955 and how does the expense with 1954?

Mr. [illegible]: the amounts of the national health grant for 1955 and estimate in 1954 are:

Province	1954	1955
National	[illegible]	$3,068,500.00
Capital	[illegible]	[illegible]
	$3,810,000.00	$3,100,500.00

[illegible] are agreed to be October, [illegible] estimate for the middle [illegible] December, 1955.

SUGGESTION OF CHANGE UNDER SECTION 28(1) THE (2)

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. President, in this regard I ought also to suggest that we [illegible] Section 28(2), which would allow by additional questions to be answered this morning, in view of the evidence received which would [illegible] report, which may [illegible] which would ordinarily be received for question time.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion which the Member is moving is not in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 23, Standing Order 8A(7) is considered to provide adequate provision and the time remaining precludes an Emergency Debate under Order 23.

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Standing Order 8A(7) and (8).

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry? Standing Order 8A(7)?

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Standing Order 8A(7) and (8).

MR. SPEAKER: Well, because Standing Order 8A(7), as I understand it. I thought that if Standing Order 8A(7) was inappropriate the alternative being Standing Order 8A(8) would also apply. Anyway, for the elimination of doubt Standing Order 8A(7) and (8), if you like. Does any Member else wish to speak?

DR. D. ROBIN MITCHELL: I second the motion, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED.

STANDING ORDER 8A(7) AND (8) SUSPENDED TO ENABLE PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED ON THE ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT.

MR. JAMES M. BRADY: Thank Mr.Speaker, could we now proceed with the Business of Parliament this was reasonable for the Leader to ask, namely the Honourable Chief Minister, to respond for a period just to answer for the Leader to ask, either?

MR. SPEAKER: This was not strictly a new issue that I introduced, I do know that the point has been made already. Question, or alleging an impropriety which really is... Is there any further supplementary? Perhaps the Member would like to ask the next question then.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR GIBRALTAR TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER REPRESENTING THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

No. 120: Will the Honourable Member give the names of engineers employed on daily fees or duty connected to the construction of the Queen Motel pool?

ANSWER: No engineers, other than some specialist structural consultants and steel fixers with unacceptable (i.e. unavailable) work capability, have been employed duty free or duty exempted by the construction of the Queen Motel.

The above mentioned specialists have been employed duty free for a period of eight months from April July, 1985, at which time it will be re-assessed. Building is expected to be completed. The specified period will mostly be the payment of U.K. VAT/CIS in respect duty. This payment is reimbursed by the contractor's local turnover.

[illegible]:

[illegible]: [illegible] may I ask that they then go on the record and the other day introduced which they brought the

[illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]: [illegible] Is there any [illegible]? In that case we can move to Item 4 on today's order paper. Private Members' Motions. Private Member's Motion No. [illegible]. I think that the Member who first introduced it does not have a number of amendments to the motion. Since the proceedings under the provisions of Standing Order 30(7) - page - I intend to put the amendments, the Member can move the motion in its amended form.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[illegible] MOTION NO. [illegible] - AMENDED

AMENDMENT TO THE [illegible] - [illegible]

[illegible]: Mr. President, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. [illegible] standing in my name. Permission was sought from hon. MPs, and the motion amended to read as follows:

> "BE IT RESOLVED that Government consider carefully the Post Authority Regulations to review the relationship between Ministers, Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs in relation to what they may represent and other matters and report."

[illegible]: Mr. President, I second the motion.

[illegible]: Mr. President, when these Post Authority Regulations were created in 1972 by the then Minister, there was [illegible] which has followed me. [illegible] this motion is seeking to do is to ensure the system, I am merely [illegible] Regulations to be possible for the Parliament to have the same rights as the Minister. Mr. President, in my first debate here in Kenya, I presented the allegations to the House that I wanted-

> "The situation is not looked out, and rectified quickly [illegible] something ugly to take place and our country might be caught in the middle."

Now, this is something which we cannot afford to happen and that is why I have brought this motion. We [illegible] Government wants to [illegible] which can pave the way for [illegible] which have equal rights. Somebody like, I will be [illegible] Minister in which he can [illegible] to do that. The [illegible] have come to [illegible] which is [illegible] to our [illegible]. While talking to [illegible] have given [illegible], [illegible] which a lot of our people [illegible] to provide their families [illegible]. I see now in the future [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] because money will be needed to [illegible] [illegible], so, money might be given to [illegible].

Some people are not going to like what I am saying to be because they feel that [illegible] [illegible]. However, Mr. If that was the only thing which [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] would be used [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] in this case.

Mr. Al Jazairy (Iraq) (interpretation): Nothing has been said so far by the Iraqi delegation that could be interpreted as a threat. We have always said that we want peace and that we are for peace.

The Iraqi people, Mr. President, like any other people in the world, like peace and security. However, peace, as we know it, is not simply a matter of words. Peace is a matter of deeds. It is a matter of principles and of the application of the principles of international law. Peace is not a matter of one side. It is a matter of both sides.

The Iraqi people, like any other people in the world, like peace. But they also like dignity, honour and respect. They will not accept peace at the expense of their dignity, honour and respect.

Peace is not a matter of one side. It is a matter of both sides

Mr. DeGARMO ATTORNEY: Mr. President, I wish to express this notion was an ex-emplastic phrase made by my colleague the second District Member for Knox City. Will that have a speaking over a moment. It is like a speaking name, Sir. It is nothing unusual by the day. I had a public meeting in Marsh Hall last Thursday night and two people entered their complaints about disturbances. Jack Brown, the person said that he was fishing off the south bank with a policeman on a boat, and had his line over the side. His policeman was watching the fish, as usual fashion do, through a water glass. Well, of course the fishes who come near have probably never heard of a water glass, so they promptly informed their fellowmen of it in the best sound and wave that they were doing. The fishes were not trying on the fishermen's line for public comfortableness. The fishermen made a very big blunder as we call it here, Sir, but unfortunately he did not keep the fishes as he had hoped to do, and his neighbor had complained that when he was watching the fishes in the water glass. Sir, bearing this in mind Jackson's complaint, that would have been an unfortunate decision, because had he heaved into fishes, Sir, I can assure you and this Honorable House that unless the fishes knew as much as you would about fishes in the water, you would be unable to guess what fishes in the aquarium and I will tell you more big words in my vocabulary, Sir.

> "I have never in my life thought a whole while fishing as I was going to break the object which I considered that the Jackson was a mistake, and I was going to pound it as please with my mistake."

I think believe, Sir, that that was meant this literally. Unfortunately, unfortunately, he had caused quite a disturbance, Sir, the person on the north side of the Island, two days prior to that. It is unfortunately a fact that in fishing in the way mostly people practice that one is apt to get caught on trees and bushes on the water. People who specialize big and small in anticipation of a big catch like those caught during the Jackson last show more than 100 fish caught. Now that fishermen asked me to question as to what could have happened to this last big fish that got away. I think, Sir, that the two would have to be prosecute him because the fishes did not have to stay.

So, it is not only these people who have disturbances but also those going to the fish from the piers and causes problems. The Inspectors, of the people in my district, a lot of them fish for a livelihood. There are a couple of families depend on fishing for their livelihood. Most of the people in my district, Sir, do not fish for sport. They fish to get something to eat. Fishing is a serious venture with them and they are fishing. They have to get fish to sell for bread for their table, clothes, shelter, and to feed the family. I have seen circumstances where a fisherman is unfortunately to get into accidents which might happen to a fisherman's house. The fishermen will be unemployed. It has been hard enough for most people during recent years, trying to make ends meet, and I am sure that this House does not like to see any fishermen lose their livelihood. To most fishermen it is a matter of life. The fishermen plan to obtain food to feed on his canvas and have no chance of livelihood the chance one is going to lose fish his experiences.

They don't have to fish a competition, Sir, and I believe that measure will have to be amended to make it acceptable. Pollution - could also affect the chances of these people fish here, Sir. If I am not in my presentation-hour tonight my family for a week I would think the fish guide of a nice boat for the Kids Creek shows it

[illegible] MR. D. SEARS [illegible]: Okay sorta. If I can put the shoe on the other foot for a little while, the [illegible] I will now be glad accept[illegible] to you. What do [illegible] to [illegible] be [illegible] to that? I think what it is [illegible] to consider some amendments to the Open Legislature to deal with [illegible] when they are considering the [illegible] question, is mine [illegible].

Just as not his question, Mr. [illegible] to this motion, the only [illegible] to [illegible] to make the Republicans [illegible], and people for their purpose. However, the other question is [illegible] to raise this. The Republicans may [illegible] but it is [illegible] [illegible] Those are [illegible] in the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: Minister's Question No. 12/82. The Honourable (Miss) Minister of Education, Science, Technology and Manpower.

HON. M. MORGAN (MINISTER): Mr. Speaker, the Member has asked for information which would place a considerable burden on the Department of Education. I feel that I should not be expected to answer such a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Member for Bonavista North.

MR. R. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I am disappointed with the answer that I got from the Minister. I think it is very important for teachers and the general public to know the qualifications of teachers in our province.

I would like to ask the Minister if he has any plans to implement a policy whereby all teachers will be required to upgrade themselves every so many years in order to maintain their certification.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Member for Bonavista North.

MR. R. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I am disappointed with the answer that I got from the Minister. I think it is very important for teachers and the general public to know the qualifications of teachers in our province.

I would like to ask the Minister if he has any plans to implement a policy whereby all teachers will be required to upgrade themselves every so many years in order to maintain their certification. I believe that certification of this province should be given only temporarily, and that teachers should be required by the Department, every so many years, to take a set of exams that will be recognized the same as other professionals.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those words, I have no difficulty whatsoever in giving this notice of motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other Members who would like to speak? The Member for Bonavista North.

MR. R. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that there seems to be a problem which is not being dealt with easily by a simple answer to the Member in charge of the department. I would have thought the necessary steps to avert the problem are going to be before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Member who is speaking has right of reply.

MR. R. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, certainly.

I think those Members who spoke and who expressed the concern, do not want to be unnecessarily alarmist. I would not like to see a few teachers who are not performing to the best of their ability, I guess we may have unnecessarily upset the minority of teachers who are performing to the best of their ability.

MR. K. MARSHALL DOSS (CONTINUING): If there are attachments outside which would have to be removed the tenants industry, we on a responsible Government have to be encouraging to seek out that problem.

The other point is that the dairy industry is employing hundreds of Bahamians. Mr. Speaker, that is not a minor statement. I do not want to get in the 2nd phase of the Government speech. I think that we have been making those note in this Meeting. However, that is not a true statement. Let us not be deluded that the dairy industry employs hundreds of Bahamians. Also, Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself I am very much of perceiving ways and methods so that we can plan employment for foreign labour. That is all that is happening.

However, I am glad that we do have a dairy industry and I will do all that I can to help because it, but it has to work both ways.

The other point was that the nurses are not Bahamians. Mr. Speaker, since I rose to speak to this Motion I have been so because I see a need which I think can be rectified. I am sorry if Members who say they are opposition do not pick it up. That is their duty. That is what they should be here today. The people who complain, Mr. Speaker, are some of the same people who, they take off to their political meetings who stop and say, "Doc, do this". That is right Mr. Speaker. Some of the same people....

MR. J. LEE ARCHER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker....

MR. P. MACKEY BIRCH: Mr. Speaker, I have some people....

MR. K. MARSHALL DOSS: A point of order. I must object to the use of my name. If this....

MR. SPEAKER: Quite right. You must not call Members by their names. You must refer to them under Standing Orders....

DR. K. MARSHALL DOSS: Yes, Sir, I quite understand that but I was only quoting. I have just to the Second Elected Member for Bodie Town.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, when I Public Servants here that should be taken seriously. I have them seriously. As far as this thing being done. I would like to the statistics in an annual 1974. I wrote a letter then and again some time in 1973 or 1972 I think it was. Between these statistics as they should why these nobody has authorized on these people knew about the problems. The same Members who is saying that this need not have taken time and a Second then I wrote the letter.

HON. C. WILFRED THOMPSON: It is not here, Mr. Speaker. My letter came to me.

DR. K. MARSHALL DOSS: Mr. Speaker, I have copies of these letters. I might not have it here today but I can bring it, and I will bring it.

MR. SPEAKER: We might have copies of a letter but we cannot draw by me.

MR. X. MORRIS GUEST: Mr. President, the Senator used to have Senators, at that time they would not put Members such as myself. They were not passing the people when they needed more people helping and also Senators, or else would not have been here today. The Senator is correct, he has done his job.

Mr. President, anything to Chairman on Senate Bill 1? I will sponsor. I am not going to say any more. I just hope that Members can vote favorably and I pray for this motion.

I thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I will put the motion to the vote. The motion is that pursuant Member's motion M., 10/05 on the Calendar Page, that be recommitted as amended by the Members be rejected..

SECRETARY MAY: ROLL AND VOTE.

MR. X. MORRIS GUEST: Mr. President, may I have a Statement?

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well.

SENATORS
NO. VOTES

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Mr. Derrick H. Carter	Mr. Jack M. Gordon	Mr. Leighton A. C.
Mrs. Margaret L. Dowling		Mr. L. Ray Ross
Mrs. Thomas C. McGowan		Mrs. John D. Wilson
Mrs. Donald C. Stamps		
Mrs. M. Thomas Taylor		
Mrs. Capt. Thomas Greenhouse		
Mrs. Thomas G. Upshaw		
Mr. W. Morgan Bush		
Mrs. Stephen T. Oppel		
Mrs. Mary L. Bonvillain		
Mr. D. Russell McNeil		

11	1	3

SENATOR DERRICK'S MOTION NO. 10/05 ADOPTED BY MAJORITY

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator Derrick's Motion No. 10/05, The Senate Rejected Members for Next Day.

SENATE BILL 1 REGULAR NO. 2/05:

AN ACT TO ENACT A NEW SECTION OF A REGULAR SESSION ACTS

MR. X. MORRIS GUEST: Mr. President, I beg to move Senate Bill 1 Regular No. 2/05 standing in the name which reads:-

"Whereas Senate Bill 1 Regular Session 2005 is passed by the Senate Senate Schools and a vast number of young people are participating in Senate;

MR. [illegible] (CONTINUING):

... it is resolved that the Government appoint a Committee ... for the establishment of a National Youth Council, which shall be determined by the recommendations from a Committee of the various appointed representations.

... be it further resolved that this Council be considered for ... official representation at such Youth's Birthday Celebrations.

MR. P. [illegible]: I have to second this motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is duly moved and seconded and is now open for debate. I am ready. You are quite right. Is the Member who speaks first.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, the thinking behind the creation of a National Youth Council is one with me. The idea first came about, I believe some time in 1971. I think about it in my political meetings and in other forums as well. The idea came about when I first envisaged a complete re-vamping of the Social ... which has proven to include a youth and community affairs section which would have responsibility for sports.

... I do not know, Sir, whether I will ... the re-shuffle now. I am hopeful that a separate Government is to create ... I am sure of the many opinions that we should have such a ... Government in Government to which this Council belongs.

Mr. President, our youth, our young ... right to all the advancement they can get. Our young people ... part of a better world. However, if all around them they witness ... decay, injustice and disenfranchisement, they will never talk ... international.

If we fail all duty to these fundamentals ... of encouragement, and there are some, in finding the kind of job ... are best suited for or even training they need then inside themselves ... possibility of some ability, we are going to have trouble. In these ... many capable Caribbeans are genuine. We think they are justified ... their impatience for changes and improvements of their lot. At ... with the shortcomings of society which exist at times, but ... have the maintenance of life, some of them are wise in the ways ... the problems of the problems and difficulties posed by us, their ... relevant reasons. They then decide their own manner of action.

Mr. President, they simply seek a share ... the shaping of the world which they must believe, a world where they ... feel realised what Caribbean and social objectives are going ... to. A good membership of our young people have taken offence ... they believe created by some Caribbean people in our community ... should be in jail. However, Mr. President, will once one honestly ... face and say to me, "Why cannot my child be more like me when I ... their age", because, Mr. Speaker, in today's world of change ... cannot sanctimonious. It is hard for young people to keep pace ... to be and standards high. Unfortunately today, young people are rebelling ... and exploiting the collapse of their parents, and are searching for a ... cultural self-guidance and the ways of their change in the greatest ... ways of all.

Mr. President, I was impressed last night ... I attended the Christmas concert of the ... where ... was filled by a group of young people, children, plainly ... their best to keep up their Christmas duty task. My heart was glad to see ... the children seemingly something of our culture and performing it.

MR. [illegible] (phonetically): When we have got this thing behind us for Right Duty, I would personally like to see the Prime Minister, the Leader of our Delegation, Ambassador-at-Large, or a group to go and get down to the root of this problem, this is what is all about; reconciling our young people to the fact of peace.

The great Indian poet once wrote:

> "The young grow, sometimes more successful in finding a bridge to the world, or perhaps a purpose for themselves than the world. At length the wealth would can accumulate or build a connection with them."

Ambassador for our young people.

Mr. President, as everyone knows recently all the leaders of this country are gone by the Christian Science. Well, Sir, I am of the humble opinion that the spiritual side of our country because we're the Lord's Chosen [illegible] our creation and anointed by the Quintessence here.

It will, I believe help to build up this feeling of national consciousness and pride, knowing that we have created an honest union [illegible] our country and self.

Sir, which he says, is the most important of these two issues I have spoken about be made on a level which people will respond. Also we already necessary for the future our [illegible] has been developed because of this problem to enable that the ownership of this income to continue for efficient presentation of the Society's Christian [illegible].

I am specifically asking this because of Columbia's high regard for our Canadian role. Mr. President, I may attempt to make to obtain the transfer of funds on behalf of a [illegible] and some we might [illegible] may be will make no request, and no dispositions whatever on the part of our Christian people.

I think that in the early days, there may possibly will have to be convinced to accept to continue the [illegible] of the country that whereas gone from an island country [illegible]. I am [illegible] forward with the view that the first among will be [illegible]. I look forward with a great deal of anxiety, Mr. President.

Sir, the young people of the Upper Canada have proved without a doubt that they can do the upper hands in it comes to sport. We have there now our own scholarship internationally to the point that they have been [illegible] scholarships to attend Christian colleges. All of us in this Assembly from the Upper Canada Island we will should take our hats off to these fine young athletes who have emerged under such [illegible] conditions [illegible].

I believe the time is past by [illegible] to those over the years who have worked to create our young people to become [illegible]. They have done a good job considering the chances of growing [illegible] and I pay a big word of thanks.

Sir, we are going [illegible] in the [illegible] Upper Canada Island [illegible] and [illegible] Mr. President, and I am a [illegible] that it is good for people to have that I have the young people to become [illegible] in Sydney and I do a good job as a representative, if I should say so myself. I [illegible] and organized a Senate in my constituency to honour of our children [illegible] from Sydney and I have to say, the [illegible] project of our Sydney Riddle in Upper City. Mr. President, I was encouraged by the large turn out at that function and thankful for the new [illegible]. However, most of all I was extremely happy with the hospitality and the kindness from the audience, whose faces were lit up and whose eyes had a twinkle of fun [illegible].

Mr. [illegible] ... to matter how small, and in, Mr. President, one always likes to be reimbursed a little bit.

Many of that said to me that they were unemployed and would look harder to bring more trade to the Cayman Islands. We have a fine group of young people. We have to work to ... something to help them. I believe that people can ... a national and historical identity and that it will bring motivation ... the growth of our country. If the citizens are split there are ... citizens, Mr. President, they are all there together. It seems as ... possibilities for education and employment. More importantly, it helps to ... one young people for the important job of Nationhood in the ... country.

Mr. President, if this motion is passed ... would be another history in these Islands. The ... and ... of such an event, I believe, gives our young people ... to work towards something they would be real proud of in ... to come. Let us ... a Government, prove that by making this ... move, and please help I say for all the parliaments in ... Cayman Islands. What say the Members?

Mr. [illegible]: The honourable First Elected Member of Cayman Brac.

Hon. [illegible] B. Scott: Mr. President, I would like to ... the views of the motion on this presentation and, in fact, for the thought in bringing this motion. Government is pleased to accept this motion.

There are just one or two points I would like to make in regard to the Member's presentation, Mr. President, just to be on the record. The actual number of young people who are participating, or were ... the implementation of the scheme, I think is very important to ... Members that many people are going to be very much involved in the ... of the community as teachers, supervisors and assessors.

I would like to congratulate the Member for ... for having brought the question for the ... and as well as Cayman. The only disappointment I have is that he accepted it when I am off the island.

Mr. K. [illegible]: Point of clarification, please.

Mr. [illegible] B. Scott: I had attended the seminars in ... last night, Mr. President, so by ... I can ... on the high standard of performance at that seminar. It was unfortunate to ... I left the Islands last night and I am telling him again what I have already mentioned that performance, he can not expect anymore in the very small increase in the ... which are proposed in the Budget, because he must realize now that at least what is meant in ... is going into effect.

With those few words, Mr. President, I would like to support the motion. Thank you.

Mr. [illegible]: The Third Elected Member for West End.

Hon. [illegible] E. Bodden: Mr. President, I wish to support of the ... from the establishment of a national sports ... Anything which we can do to encourage our young people certainly is acceptable, which I would like to wholeheartedly stand behind.

MR. [illegible] (CONTINUED): I'm sorry that I won't be able to witness the performance which my colleagues have put together, but I just might do that. However, I was aware of this trip long before the Meeting here yesterday. I received a call saying that this was going to be taking place that night and I had no earlier opportunity. However, I must unfortunately or pleased I do know that the children of the Boat Boy school are continuing to do what they have been doing over the years.

I am heartened by the positive results which have taken place in many of the fields of gaming practice. I have especially in mind, many where I know our family background which otherwise would not have ever been able to travel overseas. Having travelled in space has given them an opportunity to [illegible] to participate, to meet other children and to see their world. We have had a few who have dropped by the wayside but the majority of them have done extremely well. I have been pleased and I am sure so grateful for the great results which I am sure the disciplines aspect gives people, the many of them who are participating who may otherwise because they realize that their lives have to be fit in order to participate in sports. I am extremely pleased.

If there is any way in which [illegible] in which we can [illegible], and any way in which we can play, the recognition of our athletes, I wholeheartedly support it.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of wishing [illegible] I am to the many schools who I see having time out to visit with these young people. There are those [illegible] who may receive awards [illegible] in Nigeria, in Guyana and in other areas, while the [illegible] would just [illegible] to be a [illegible] time out to work with our young people. Many of them are representatives. We have [illegible] and we [illegible] for that I must [illegible] to [illegible] and to [illegible] we [illegible] to [illegible] and to [illegible] and to [illegible] and

MR. SPEAKER A. PATRICK LOCHHEADWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. Member for Grand Bank for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I would also like to thank the hon. Member for Fogo for his contribution to the debate. I know, Mr. Speaker, that not only do the people of the Grand Bank area but also the people of the Grand Falls area, the Gander area, the Bonavista North area, the Bonavista South area, the Trinity North area, the Trinity South area, the Carbonear area, the Harbour Grace area, the Port de Grave area, the Bay de Verde area, the Placentia West area, the Placentia East area, the Fortune Bay area, the Burin area, the Burgeo area, the St. George's area, the Port au Port area, the Bay of Islands area, the Humber West area, the Humber East area, the Humber Valley area, the Torngat Mountains area, the Labrador West area, the Labrador South area, the Labrador Straits area, the Labrador North area, the Menihek area, the Eagle River area, the Naskaupi area, the Mecatina area, the Mealy Mountains area, the Lake Melville area, the Hamilton Inlet area, the Cartwright area, the Fogo area, the Twillingate area, the Exploits area, the Gander area, the Terra Nova

MR. LUCERO: [illegible]: This is one of the reasons, Mr. President, why a national sports arena with [illegible] entertainment to these individuals. Decisions cannot be made on our budget for all existing conditions in this country. However, these, Mr. President, [illegible] be carefully explained. Only in certain cases are grants given. Many of our sportsmen and sportswomen have to [illegible] and do their training in their spare time. They are given no consideration whatsoever in [illegible] Therefore, it becomes a special grant to help them. Nevertheless, it becomes a special need for this [illegible] and we are asking them for.

Mr. President, as I stated, I am [illegible] that the Government Department of Health Education and Social Services was not put [illegible] the necessity for a [illegible] community center in Tierra Amarilla. I was told at a meeting that I have to convince them of this necessity. Therefore, Mr. President, that I have some more explanation about it. Then I could try to impress on their minds the importance of such a facility.

I have done all in my power to say and [illegible] to them the need for this facility. If they cannot understand me then God help us. I cannot do any more to convince them. The people of this county deserve it. The people of this county have been neglected. The Hispanic people of this country are being neglected, and What I say Hispanic people of this country, I do not matter to anybody, as one of the Democratic leaders stated in his [illegible] statement. I am sorry for people of that mentality. When they will take off for the [illegible] of the people of this country to [illegible]. That about concludes my [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] before the Election I was the only member who referred to the Hispanic people as [illegible], winning with [illegible] trying to get their vote. They were not little then, they were not because they should help. Any time I hear any member of this House try to exhibit the Hispanic people of this country, or make any [illegible] remarks, I believe you me, I have my floor for [illegible] with him, I am handle it as well as the most number of this House. So they can call me what. I will have my say.

Mr. President, I have always a [illegible] interest in the young people of this country and I have also shown a particular interest in the [illegible] of this country. I have given speeches on this [illegible] in the Senate Association, in the State Association and to many, many more. However, I do not intend, every time I speak up in this House, I intend my share and ask for [illegible]. I do this because I see the need for this in this country. To be fair, Mr. President, with the leaders of this country encouraged the Hispanic people in this country. The [illegible] will recognize these people for what they are.

I intend to say a little bit more during my budget debate. So any member who feels that I am out of order I do not speak against what I am saying, but just to clarify, however I will deal with this in further detail in my budget debate. I will have the opportunity to say what I like so be accepted with the Hispanic people of this House.

The personal identity of the people of this country can be preserved through a national center for sports. Mr. President, in closing may I again congratulate the House of this minute. I trust that this honorable House will give the [illegible] full support.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other member wish to speak? The Chair recognizes the Majority Floor Leader.

MR. E. REESE MILLER: Mr. President, I too would like to offer my congratulations to the mayor of this nation on his 60th anniversary. He told me five nights before that that he was not going to run. I'm not sure whether that night last he had quit too or to sustain his title. Anyway, I guess that that will come in the election as because he has been doing quite well.

Mr. President, I feel, also, in expressing the sentiment that it is a fitting and appropriate thing that we should, together with the rest of the world, recognize the United Nations Organization on the 25th [illegible] of our youth when they go wrong. I think that it is time to start recognizing them when they do something right. I do not believe, Sir, that the terms of this section is entirely after getting any more blood, because I believe that we are enough on that now. If the 4,000 people there like Obama more than I did for a long time. The interviews are pending, Sir, and I support this section. I hope that the needs to notify for the full extent's financing considerations.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Affairs.

MR. ERNEST E. MORRIS: Mr. President, I rise to support Senator Medley's motion so ably and also Honourable Minister for the establishment of a national security council.

Mr. President, matters of any nature could be a social activity. I cannot think of anything else in the social matrix which arose before recently. I would say that the problems began to be recognized in Jamaica. By the earlier article in Gleaner by the former Finance Minister one can be encouraged to believe just that, especially of people.

Mr. President, we cannot say many words in the Senate Chamber, a small country of merely 50,000 people. However, we have enough for these reports have gained prominence in [illegible] and that all the things which we would like to see established or provided for this discussion would take time. I am sure that we have gone in there will be many more to speak. Sir, we appreciate opposition comments that we have gone on too, there is still be [illegible] who can perhaps bring [illegible] to the country.

Mr. President, it is not all social people who like [illegible] to socialize. Sports groups [illegible] society [illegible]. People of all walks of life become involved in sports. Sometimes it is one of the means of keeping fit. Mr. I do not see why the [illegible] to be brought into this [illegible] should go [illegible] to the system be considered, because they have taken a very [illegible] part. I am sure that they are being consulted by many people in developing themselves in the field of sports.

Mr. President, I have not given support to [illegible] in the [illegible]. However, I can assure you that I have no contribution to [illegible] at [illegible]. It is not fair to the [illegible] in the [illegible].

Mr. President, I am sure that many [illegible] in the country and organizations will [illegible] to the [illegible] in the community. I am sure that all those who can afford to [illegible] do [illegible].

MRS. [illegible] G. [illegible] (Guatemala): Mr. President, I do not think that there is need for any debate on amendments like mine. The only thing that the Committee is not going to have the support of this House.

Mr. I will give my support to this ... Mr. President, and hope that other Members will do the same.

Mr. [illegible]: I think that it does come a bit slightly [illegible] the time when normally we would break for lunch. I imagine that there may be one or two other Members who wish to speak on this matter exceedingly late night of night.

Mr. I think that I will suggest ... Proceedings would approximately 1.30 p.m.

AT 12.45 P.M. THE MEETING ADJOURNED

HOUSE RECONVENED AT 2:07 P.M.

[illegible]: Remain be recited.
Recognition of Visitors on Private Members' Motion No. 207/91.

Does any other Member wish to speak. The Elected Member for the [illegible] Islands.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Private Member's Motion No. 207/91, Establishment of a National Sports Council.

I have a long association with sports. I feel it is a step in the right direction, in anticipating our youth and their subsequents.

I feel the opportunity as a prerequisite of membership on Caribbean Scholarship to attend the conference. It will help considerably to me to receive the record, and more knowledge in relation to the administration thereof.

I hope this can be guaranteed into an Act which will really be meaningful, and looking forward the history of the Cayman Islands.

I would like to congratulate the Elected Member for East End for bringing this Motion to the House, and also to congratulate him on his presentation. I feel he has a great deal which he has put into co-ordination of the youth of our country, and I appreciate his efforts. With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Motion.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Elected Member for East End.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, the Motion before us for the establishment of a Committee for the establishment of a National Sports Act, is one that I can support.

I feel Mr. Speaker, that whatever is taken to maximise the potential of sports in these Islands, should be done.

Sometime ago, I was very pleased when [illegible]. Above was recognised for his work in this area. I feel it is a very great move, and these Islands will benefit from it.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we see a amazing resource in sports. We see not only football, but netball other minor sports, cricket etc. We see also that it is a lucrative point for some, especially some of our youth.

I know for myself, Sir, of several times where we may say that someone was on a trial basis, perhaps in a new enterprise, employed to study, and quite frankly I have seen a tremendous, and quick effort in new related an exercise.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I took note that Elected Members pointed discrepancies on the amendment, as to how far they would allow for the benefit of monies in Black Islands. I would like to say that I am no exception. I have had the opportunity to visit the Cricket Association. I have also for myself seen many centres in regards to grounds for the netball and the sports, facilities which they would enjoy, and will really for many years to come.

Mr. JOHN B. PATRICK (CONTINUED):

...I'm sorry, Mr. President, that was part of my platform. I promised the Commissioner of Agriculture, when I was elected, I would endeavor to receive appropriations in the General Appropriations Act for the Department of Agriculture, and I am hopeful that the Government of this day will continue to give us their support, as this is one of the things I have declared in my campaigning here for my district.

We need to place every emphasis on tourism.

Mr. President, the cost figures are on there. As in every one, we have those who are weak in mind and can't be influenced. This seems to be the problem we have faced this. To be perfectly real, it is not only here in the Dayton Islands, it is a world-wide thing. Each being a small territory, it place is necessarily to be able to attract it. We must move rapidly.

I would like to congratulate the Members who have brought forward this matter. I feel it is a good one, and like I have said, I have no hesitation in giving it my support.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other Member wish to speak. Does the Honourable Minister wish to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. E. HUBERTA ROSS: Mr. President, I will be brief. I will specially thank those Members who spoke in support of the Motion, also for their kind remarks, especially some of them already have. Even we realize in one speaker, and try to have it one of the other ...

Mr. President, I am sure I must say I believe, and also every speaker, and I am sure we can be supported by. I would like, one thing I did hope that this particular debate ...ribute of the measure, would not turn into something big, or small. Nevertheless, I will thank all Members. I think there was been a lot of ...honesty in what has been said.

Mr. President, I am not a glutton of the kind of speaker, and will not be obligated for the night. I just sit on the sidelines and cheer them on, and give them a helping hand ...ere I can. But for, especially, I would like to get involved ...personally in any kind of sports where I would benefit financially.

Mr. President, I believe we have ...ing history, and also I can see how we can prove people in, those ...t to work in for the new ways to it.

I thank the Honourable Members for ...heir support of this Motion.

Thank you Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Honourable Member's Motion be agreed to, moved by the Second Elected ...ember for West Bay, be adopted.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AYES AND NOES.

Mr. E. HUBERTA ROSS: Mr. President, may I have a division.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly,

[illegible]

AYES	NAYS
[illegible]	
[illegible]	
[illegible]	

M. D. BERARD HOLDER (continuing):

"(d) An agreement between any operator or shipowner and the Canada Labour Relations Board that such operator or shipowner is a party to the collective agreement between the Seafarers' International Union of Canada and the Canadian Merchant Service Guild, Inc. and relating to the employees in the bargaining unit described in such agreement, or

"(e) An agreement between any such operator or shipowner and the Canada Labour Relations Board that such operator or shipowner is a party to a collective agreement between the Seafarers' International Union of Canada and the Canadian Merchant Service Guild, Inc. and relating to employees in a bargaining unit described in such agreement."

Page 181-(2): I am replying to Mr. Knowles' question of yesterday, as to the establishment of a Government ferry to Nanaimo. I believe that the Transportation Act provides adequate machinery for dealing with such matters should it be considered necessary.

I regret to tell Mr. Speaker, Sir, that as soon as Parliament rises, I will be going to the Northwest Territories, and this is another reason why I have also been told that we should not have Government ferry operations. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think the United States pattern is a desirable one. Unemployment is very high now, and why not have some employment through the construction of the Mackenzie Highway? Surely, Sir, we have many of the unemployed fishermen on the Pacific coast, who could be employed on the construction of the Mackenzie Highway. I think it is a very worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, in answering my debate when we finished yesterday, I was talking about transportation rates as they will then, under the Freight Rates provisions in my Bill, be established by the Transport Board. In the same way, Sir, I pointed out the possibility of the Northern Ports Road, and I made the following observations. When I completed, the impression there was one bulldozer and one driver, but this is not the case. I spent one hour and 20 minutes there, and in that time my observation of the bulldozer operator is not misleading, and that is all. This is the road, Sir, that the Minister of Northern Affairs told us in the budget debate, that $50,000 had been spent on it. Sir, for that $50,000 we received scarcely 20 feet of road plus an inch or two, because we can see nothing like inches out of the tape. Sir, that is a very expensive piece of road. Because I have just received a quotation from a private firm to build a road for exactly the same purpose in a subdivision at Cooper Town. If we assume that of the 20 feet of road we roughly do have built, it has cost roughly $250.00 a foot. The quotation I received from this private firm is, which includes a cul-de-sac of a minimum of 100 feet also included, and backgrounds [illegible] of four inches thick, works out at roughly $30.00 per foot, that is $30.00 per running foot by 20 feet wide.

MR. D. KIPKEMEI ARAP KOSKEI (CONTINUED):

Mr. President, Sir, we are expecting ... people coming from all over the country, like Mr. Leshoomoo ... and the Leader of Government Business, Sir. So we must see what has been provided for ... people, like the road which has been marked ... by a bulldozer. ... we will understand Sir, that is that particular road ... have built over the hill. I drove over the hill in my truck with ... three-year old son standing beside me in the cab, and he did not ... Sir, before Easter, after having the machine to fill ... to make the hill, then levelled the hill and blew it all up in the air ... the rocks so our cars and lorries can pass. So that will ... where the expense went. It went Sir. On the same day, I went ... River Ewo to Ram River. The equipment there being a bulldozer ... and drivers, the same again Sir. Same I provided. I stayed there for ... hours that one minute, that only one 10 yard trench was loaded with ... for that time there.

Mr. President, Sir, now our other ... we have the 650 feet of road that was built several years ... by a certain firm. That road, Sir, built on the gradient from ... built at less than eight months. The bulldozer and machine arrived ... about eight o'clock. The bulldozers are mistaken, the men take it ... and he was building the road through pressure and cliff. At about ... p.m. the bulldozer operator arrived again bringing a grader and ... the bulldozer away. Trucks brought the fill from both ... sides. At about 5.30 p.m. the bulldozer operator arrived again ... leaving the scraper, and took the grader away. At four o'clock I ... the shape for the work the Lord Provincial Commissioner, the grade ... Rivers Authority which has been carried by Government and approved, ... the sum of £5,000.00, and the men work on the road. Besides this ... that came road had taken three months of most skilled to the ... fill fought by public works, and one part of their road money. It ... that Sir, yesterday urging me to do it.

Mr. President, I could give other ... of mistake in my district. The fact is Sir, we have to ... going the people of Lake Kamnaty native for their money. The ... is only, now we have to produce if we are going to ... people to provide services.

I have been told Sir, that a study has ... done to reorganise the Public Works Department. For which, I give ... present Member full credit, but I will tell him that I do not ... that this will solve the problem. I mean the reduction to the ... Public Works Department; Sir, in the reorganisation to a Planning, Design, ... Supervisory and Inspectorate Departments, with second maintenance ... is to cause, because of whatever being put out to the Public Service ... a public service basis. I believe Sir, that until this country ... to programming budgeting, this is the only way we can ... any kind of use of most Public Works agencies in any ... sort.

The Hon. Vice Minister will constantly ... under mind from now to position, to answer up ... figures.

I do not think we have to worry Sir, ... putting the people who presently work on Public Works, out of ... The private firms will have them. On Tuesday still, they can ... entrepreneurs, and form their own construction companies, ... to the work.

MR. O. BRIAN MAHER (CONSTITUENCY): Mr. President, during the Estimates of the Public Budget in March, the Member responsible for Communication [illegible] Administration, promised me that they were going to [illegible] a canteen at the Civil Centre in South Side. The person could look after the Post Office, the Clerk, the Port Office, the Police and the Hospital, and it would be a full-time job. I know it is a [illegible] case in this multi-lane budget. I have been unable to find [illegible], the personnel service being reluctant in terms of [illegible] of the Post Office is [illegible]. The Post has completely gone [illegible] working there. Every time I hold a public meeting in that area and I pay Treasury Stands I have been in the [illegible] of having to apologise to the people present for the fact that was in the Post Office. Last Thursday night I had to go up for an [illegible] of two hours, for people to ask me, I think the present [illegible] is providing a [illegible] sum of money to look after that Post Office. Mr. President, I [illegible] to the appointment of a full-time caretaker for the Civil Centre in South Side.

Mr. President, while I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Honourable Chief Official Member responsible for Post Authority, I do hope that he continues to meet with the financial obligations. I have reason to [illegible] the efficiency of operation. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that on some occasions we have to call on other experienced [illegible] to [illegible] the level of efficiency of employees, for, many of my constituents, have been trying for quite a year to provide telephone facilities in the Province of George Town, as required under the present [illegible] Law. We wonder if we are [illegible], and we going to do it with people who are employed to do it. Mr. President, this [illegible] of which I am speaking, if Members did go to the Cayman Brac [illegible], I noticed for one, that the particular Captain in the Department of Civil Aviation of Cayman Captains. I do not think, Sir even, that you get [illegible] a person who has higher or more qualifications [illegible] a Master Mariner. I doubt very much whether [illegible] can [illegible] the other side of the coin of [illegible], because this particular Captain has done it all, including sailing out the Mayor [illegible] the 'Bridge Hour' since it was launched [illegible]. Mr. President, this has now been [illegible] almost for over a year. This country owes a debt to people like him, who have worked the seven days and five seven. It [illegible] them security, so that people like myself and others can enjoy what we are [illegible]. When they return, is there an opportunity for them to provide a service to the country, and have a thing. We have an obligation to provide it. The reality, Sir, when the present service is [illegible] [illegible] and by unqualified people. I am not speaking in any of this. Sir, [illegible] to [illegible], because I know the [illegible] here to [illegible]. Mr. President, fortunately this profession is a [illegible] like myself. It amazes that he is being [illegible] by [illegible] to [illegible] and to being deprived of [illegible] himself a livelihood, by people who have a [illegible] in the [illegible] of this Cayman Islands. We have to be very careful when dealing with people like him, Sir. I can assure this House that in this instance, we are dealing with an [illegible] [illegible] as well. In the first [illegible], he might not get the experience [illegible] provide the pilotage legally, but Sir, [illegible] is going to be provided legally in the form of this [illegible] in the very near future, [illegible] it is not to be decided by the [illegible] of this Country.

Thereafter Sir, when I read in the paper the Members of [illegible] have been appointed to [illegible] the [illegible] profession for this entire entity, I have to [illegible] as any, I do not know which one is to use. Where there [illegible] I ask help [illegible] appointed, I doubt very much whether they have registered a ship [illegible] flying over the face of their [illegible], and they are talking about [illegible] ships of over 1,000 tons, and [illegible] on the [illegible] positions.

... D. SCHOOL BUILDING CONSTRUCTION: The Saskatchewan Government, Sir, on the entry of the Province into Confederation, was very much concerned ... I was making this ... I would like to be satisfied and capable of locating the ... buildings on the right location, because he has also undertaken a few ... in a few different locations around this world in his day. ... Provincial ... that although this Government agrees that if these ... buildings are constructed according to the plan that I have given, ... the Local Authority will never, ever again, have the financial ... responsibility. I understand that these plans have been put to work. ... hope so, Sir.

Mr. President, another area of the ... might I would like to mention, Sir, is education. It is good to see ... that this country can still afford to meet the ever-increasing demands of the educational requirements of the people of this country. As a ... result, being in the proud city, I discovered the former Member taking ... credit for the modern good works in the education system. Sir, I ... know, even knew that Member after me resided in the present Member. ... So both the predecessor and his successor for the years 1967 to ... 1971, I am sure that the "guilty plaque" will be placed to give the ... former Member his credit for what happens in the next two or three ... years. Mr. President, one concern I have about our education system ... is what I believe it should be speaking our types of graduates. The ... graduate who is always confused, and will go into the professions ... otherwise to be law, medicine, accounting, dentistry or whatever. The ... other, will be self-employable. Electricians and mechanics, ... I know needs, skilled graduates who are provided a service and ... enjoy themselves. At this time, Sir, I have my doubts as to ... whether the present system is providing enough of either of those ... two types. I would also point to say, Sir, that I think we must ... place increasing emphasis on our primary education system. I ... ... the Member mentit, Sir, for the new technology courses. ... Sir, I just that maybe them discouragingly students at ... junior levels to greater heights. The world now seems to be divided ... into the two technocrats, Sir, will not even accept the Education ... System. So the people now only going to get the technique of the ... world that they pay.

The model would be one point ... changing, Mr. President. The proposed plan left by the former ... Member and his administration is so disappointing. That I do not ... ... believe that "guilty plaque" can memorialize at this outstanding ... ... in the future. The diametric might call on the Canadian, ... new facility, but I would hasten to add, Sir, that it should ... ... consider the erection of a new facility until proper facilities ... ... in which can be given, and maintenance is provided to better ... utilize the facilities which they now built, and offer better service ... to the people. I get complaints daily, Sir, about the healthcare ... ... situation. I get so many Sir, that I have begun asking people ... to put them in writing, and one of these days, Sir, I am going to ... compile a book of my own.

Mr. President, I now to the Budget. ... Pursuant unto the Estimates for there are two ... in the floor of this Honourable House, many times Mr. President, I ... ... was bothered considered about the necessity to provide it at home ... ... Members. An explanatory note says that ... to be a Constituent, who is presently employed in a part-time basis ... ... part expense. But, Mr. President, if the three dismore seems ... ... appointed, which I am hopeful to suppose. I trust that the re-think ... ... at the Provincial will be instituted, and that we may ... ... a little easier to keep Nursing there will be ... ... available to us, as only if the facilities exist now.

...Mr. Speaker, I look at the ... [illegible] ... budget. I see all kinds of funny things, Mr. Speaker ... [illegible] ... which Secretary did need $1-M to have to a note of $14,000 to be paid to maintain the idea of private practice. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Honourable Member was not [illegible] ... [illegible] ... Mr. Speaker, I would [illegible] ... between $12,000 and $15,000 per annum, and he [illegible] ... [illegible] ... [illegible] ...

MR. C. RICHARD WATSON (PROGRESSIVE): Mr. President, I have quite a few questions that we can ask Public Service Registration now [illegible]. I believe Mr. Mary Ann Sullivan [illegible] is not here to [illegible] by the officers. I hope they take it as not going to make that [illegible] consider [illegible] Richard Digby. I was [illegible] Mr. Digby [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Col. D. EDGAR MILLER (CONTINUING): The people who are today telling us that we are not being killed in the big American cars, the ... cars, Chargers, Trans Ams and Camaros, they are being killed... by cars like Toyotas which have no steel in them. The whole purpose of the safety bumper that is required by Federal Government regulations ... U.S. Congress, Transportation has been steel in the bumper ... Toyota car. I have letters and received from the officers in charge of Graffiti, indicating that they feel the collision in the Queens Islands, is to be the big and high ... cars. Mr. President, we have heard enough about cannabis, we do not ... any acceptance telling the people in this country that they support ... Coalition, you cannot drive alternatives from because the people ... Mr. Big, you can only endow something that has already proven to not ... in a lot of the ways, if you want to get rid of the ... these are two ... which is the positive step to better relationship of the ... and substance abusage people. When I am allowed in the road ... people officers today, the only thing he chooses personally, is ... particular because attacks on my car. I would like to say that ... police officer has the knowledge and love my lovely, have we ... whose power that I have increased, have no problem proof that I have ... carried arriving because, now for the people go through a divorce ... circumstance when they go back every three years, to see their ... divorced. Another alternative is that people should only get for their ... duties once after they have gone through an interest education ... driving. However, once this, they become an accredited bank agent, ... they go to the people's Department and take their case over and ... until they have. There are a few people who go through the ... system until, but I do not know of it to approved by Government ... now, but the driving without which is unlawful. I know of one ... police who want to get his license back then out, and he has ... failed. I think he has been employed in an element of fear of ... the organisation, the fact that he was driving for of 20 and asked if ... the policeman was friendly, as he had only hit a tree. If you ... a cabbie [illegible] of persons on the road, fine and also, although ... I do not have any proof of it, there are rumours that a police bill ... in your day have note your license removed if they ever ... going to the police station, I hope that is not true. Mr. President, ... cost of the collision from the Germans would, at least keeping their ... damaged cheap, no insurance firm would deal people to pay. I ... will be the first to admit that a lot of people involved in this ... driving drive stupidly, but not very people who. Those I ever just ... in a stupid mistake. Most people have a long more attachment to the ... world. When driving at 20 miles per hour in Brook Road, then they ... have to be driving to 20 miles per hour at the Bay Road, they ... might go be slowly driving at 20 miles per hour be more of the pedestrian; ... are 20 miles per hour then they are going to be victims. So, ... Mr. President, I would like to [illegible] the question to Senator ... Bishop, who have do something about it - what the Minister off the road ...

Mr. President, there was some of the ... that I believe this subject was be raised among and as I know ... said, I will be replying to the Address Debating. I did not just up ... here of a joyful day last time, because we mostly did not know the ... news, but like to the Leader Senator Gair. I would like to say ... to the Honourable Peter Cleland Morgan, that if we were to the White Be ... suggested, one of Churchill had been about to suggested a 20 mile morning. ... Gair had what was, after leaving one hundred of the Hon. Senator ... would vote the whole bridge. In case he overused that he might have ... not been elected, but we are so not sure Sir. It is not the first ... time that I have been told to shut up, by Leader Members, but be quite ... I my hands like water off a duck, Sir. It most always be pleasure that ... I will always be for a right, Sir.

MR. D. EDDIE WALKER (CONSERVATIVE): Mr. President, I have very much enjoyed the Throne Speech. I had intended to [illegible] but I've heard one or two speakers now, before I could place on [illegible] how this government did a good job on the Throne Speech. I note with pleasure in addition, that they are going to do something to increase the offset and the expense on the relocation of persons from the areas where people are employed to the mining areas. I have heard Members opposite that they have attempted to [illegible], and out of 30 houses, two people [illegible] house. Now Mr. President, it is very important to have houses [illegible] Saturday, which happened to be [illegible] on the hospital! The only things which [illegible] were the snowmobiles on the boat. So, very [illegible], we look to be assistance from these previous instances, to be used as the [illegible] for the people.

Mr. President, as I have said, I commend the Throne Speech as presented by the Honourable [illegible] Premier. After all, Mr. President, the [illegible] so much more until the 1981 Budget Session, do not the [illegible] - in fact, be the probability [illegible] I can't [illegible] on the point Mr. [illegible] I think it is necessary [illegible] to have a definition of the 'little mik', because I am not sure what to expect. If all those [illegible] the boat will [illegible] on the land [illegible] people, then Sir, [illegible] of the Budget which is going to affect them is the gasoline [illegible]. They, will have any [illegible], and [illegible] 'little mik' [illegible] these interpretations are [illegible] Sir, it is not a little [illegible], and it may well [illegible]. Now, [illegible] 'little mik' to pay $60.00 for a gallon [illegible] right [illegible] to [illegible]. I believe that most areas in this country [illegible] at least a dollar per [illegible] by the Public Service [illegible].

Mr. President, since [illegible] going to be asked to pay [illegible] per gallon [illegible] year. Also, we [illegible] Labrador, [illegible] per [illegible] [illegible] per [illegible] [illegible] per [illegible] per [illegible] per

MR. SPEAKER: When I will suspend proceedings for approximately 15 minutes.

AT 3:58 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

MORE THAN AT 4:18 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Mr. Premier, before the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Will be available. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. S. PAUL MARCHAND: Mr. President, since the last time I have many questions directed to the Legislature, the answers to which have not been forthcoming. The answers to questions are supposed to be filed. Have they been, Mr. President, my personal experience is up that would indicate that is the case. I personally do not have problem receiving my answers promptly for a job. I may have had five or six questions on the Order Paper for a year. The figures of my business or a daily grocery trade there, they do not indicate, this the answers to them. Of the questions, Sir, my monthly gross income for newspaper from January to December this year is shown where it was in 1969, and the problem I foresee in my small town of 34 per cent lost gross. Now, Mr. President I am not a business politician, and none of this is attributed to my lack of knowledge, or what might be considered a business decision, was made it is to my students' assignments. Now, if I am failing in the grade, they have to be re-examination. December, last year, this above a of our gross income over November 1969 and is talking to one particular restaurant owner in Gimli which leads into night, who has spoke the same thing. Her words to me were "I do not know what has caused or what the Government has done, but November was like a ghost town". December 1969 showed a 28 per cent increase over September, but my instructions are Sir, that business is growing. I like with a smile of hope that may be of business trying as bad, and that the increase in trade and business figures may be terrible, that they are going to be unacceptable to businessmen and will close their doors.

My business will have a business for those in the Gimli area that stands at 8.19 points per week. I believe I can share this with the present unemployment to not suffer any great hardship.

MR. Speaker, I must mention, and I have expressed my personal views, that I express the serious decisions because Sir, to the due process of matters of the Order Paper that exist in Committee of Supply, Ways and Means or Committee of Privileges and Elections and Public Accounts to provide the time of consideration.

Mr. President, I have complained that the Government Bench can further lengthen the proceedings of the Session, and perhaps the adjournment of the session that I have already indicated to my Schools, but as I said earlier, I believe it is necessary and the opposition will be duly split to them.

Mr. D. GRAHAM MCCRAE (CONTINUED): I also believe that, when they have an intelligent and informed decision to make, they will make it.

I supported the decision taken in the Province [illegible], and I believe, Sir, that the people of the province [illegible] have not [illegible] ... [illegible] been unfairly treated in the matter, and that this country should move ahead with a minimum of delay. [illegible] I believe will show a positive way in this direction, and will in fact give some hope for the future [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] ... [illegible] I am a great deal [illegible] ... [illegible] I would like to [illegible] ... [illegible] I will speak [illegible] ... [illegible] I would like to [illegible] ... [illegible] I believe, Sir, that we have [illegible] the needs of this nation, and which [illegible] ... [illegible] [illegible] ... [illegible] [illegible] ... [illegible]

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Bridgetown.

Mr. Peter M. Simpson: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Member spoke on a very important point. He now will agree that he is in the Commonwealth Caribbean, and the rules have given him an opportunity of noting, that the people of this country want to have more say in order to change the bitter enemies they have been known by. I am very pleased that a member of a professional union was back up what I will be saying in my speech.

Mr. P. Reece Miller: My apologies to the Honourable.

Mr. Lloyd M. Erskine: I would like to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Security for his wide knowledge of the country. I have also considered the long period in the responsibilities of this Honourable Assembly. By perusing his speech, and discovering the topics, I am readily understand the difficult task he has had to perform. My hand goes out to him, and I congratulate him. In particularity, Sir, I would like to make some words of compliment on this point to the Commissioner of Police. Officials have been put in motion, and I hope, as time progresses on some of the other points he has made. Sir, I envy the reality going to serve him, as suggested in this Chamber this afternoon. I have had the privilege of associating with him for many years in Government Service and I have very high regard for him. And will take it more than serve, his hope he will enjoy his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I agree with the statement of this country, I agree of the Minister Government, to I agree to this motion for the removal of persecution. It appears to me that the Government with which these two particular Statute Laws were enacted, we are the cry of oppression. I have hoped to many times in the past. As it has nothing more to me to think that it would be anything different this time.

In our geographical country, we have to expand to build up our economy, business in Security, and we should have a decline business atmosphere that we have. The present Government seem that they would come out this which is only for more expenditure, and they would bring a wealth of the Queen Economy which everyone would enjoy for the most for hundred years, because of their policy here. By this time, Mr. President, the world economy began that this is happened. We have by their performance, it is nothing new to me, I predicted it, because I have had experience of them. They have brought us into trouble, that they have left us into a pile of despise.

It is just the case for the Minister of Trade that which my colleague and I experience. I have always had the feeling, that once elected to this House one finds oneself in the Cabinet or a Minister, and not in an Executive capacity. However, this time I have to take exception, because problem to us have been taken from the Members Public.

The Deputy Minister spoke about Industrial Estates, but I do not know where he's coming from. I never entered this country, was employed, and then was invited to leave because of the lack of employment. And now I like to commend the Government of the Right Honourable Lloyd S Erskine Bushe that they would come out this which is really needed from Independence. I understand that we have Industrial Estates there in Chase Village and it would be here, I think it is. They are people which have played an instrumental part in this country's progress. If this is the Government policy which we are thinking, we do not mind it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. [illegible] to the discussion by the honourable Minister of Economic Development, I would like to remind the members that the Agreement has been negotiated on this territory. This is a particular situation, as far as I am concerned, of the Canadian Agreement, which has been reviewed both by the Yukon Government and the Federal Government and the United States of America. Many people are involved, people who are now waiting to get under the blanket and may it be a wonderful thing, but a lot of work is going. My Board people from the banking community may be valid [illegible] the country, etc. I am very pleased to see that the natives ... seek to protect the welfare of this country have participated. Along with this, I would also warn that the Agreement is not to be [illegible] hastily. It will always be our commitment, as elected members of the New Democratic Party of Canada, that we will [illegible] a full-blown treaty at this time.

The figure for Yukon stands at one billion [illegible] of 250 million dollars, is a very substantial sum. It is a large amount of money, and I am sure that if we know how [illegible] amount, it would be much more than this, however, it is encouraging to know that by [illegible] of this money can be utilized for the Yukon economy.

By reading the projected budget for this year, we are moving to [illegible], and none of these [illegible] to mention, I will oppose. The revenue of this country comes here from [illegible] sources, ranging from $11,000,000 in 1978 to $21,000,000 in 1982, or an average increase of 20.5 per cent, annual increase. This represents a very large increase in revenue. We are not always with [illegible] of increase dollars, and in this part of my [illegible], I will not attempt to deal with it, but I will go ahead.

In 1975 when I was given these figures, we [illegible] that this financial [illegible] has tentatively convinced the people of this country, which is also [illegible] to [illegible] difficult. The main trend which happened in the administration of 1972-1975 is now happening during this period. We have a General Revenue Fund of 2.1 million dollars, and a [illegible] of $2,430,768.00 after the [illegible] of that day had increased $2,307,621.91 which was on an [illegible] basis for my response to the [illegible] debt. Therefore, the actual amount of surplus in that year was 1.5 million dollars instead of a deficit. This is continually happening in this country, and from 1977 to 1978 there is a plan of 42 million dollars in general revenue sharing based [illegible] capital expenditure. All the power under the administration which is now headed up by two of these Members of the 1974-1978 Government, there are only 81 million dollars, that could be used from the general [illegible] - suppose that will be 43 million dollars which is used. In this [illegible] they increased between 1969 and 1975, $2,000,000.00 [illegible] a volume between 1977 and 1982 [illegible] 5%% [illegible], of this 3,143,732.95.

In 1978 the public debt stood at [illegible] of the total revenue for that year, and it represent [illegible] of the general revenue to service the [illegible] debt, a point to which you are [illegible] in any economic theory, namely that you should not get to that point. In 1975, after [illegible] had been done by the administration, it only represent 19.9 per cent, the [illegible] 20.0 per cent of general revenue. To only have two and a half per cent of general revenue to service the long-term debt.

Mr. JAMES M. BROWN (CONTINUED): In that order the people of this Administration, the country will then again be faced with a revolving debt structure, and the public debt will be nearly 70 per cent of gross national revenue. In fact some months they will have to go to the 80-90 per cent that it was in 1979.

Accordingly in the months ahead by the responsible financial Secretary, in his new months of 1980 there has been an increase in the assets of the Caribbean Bank. I notice that for the two years of their Administration there has certainly been a contribution of nearly two million dollars from the Caribbean Bank. I should never then it was a political Mr. President, that they have used up in this short time all of the personal resources that were left by the Unity Team Administration. They are using up the Caribbean Development Bank to a very great scale, and if they keep it up, by 1982 the Caymen Islands will be a point of pride as to how much the Jamaican Nation.

Another point on the Budget Speech that I wanted like to comment upon, and of which I feel very proud because this was again set up by the Unity Team Administration, is the great step forward that has been taken in the beginning of our social programmes in the Legislature. It is right that our people, who have the ability, should be given an advance on the Pay Packet at this period.

Another point, is to ask the Minister in this Honourable Chamber of this country, what was another item we speak. The General Loans has all kind for this in the Unity Plans, and it has shown a lot of progress, and I am very interested in the Housing Loans.

Again, referring to the Speech, I was glad to be informed that 1,868 jobs or thereabouts approximately 28 new ones in 24,000 square passengers came here, again, I am proud to say, seriously to what the Minister may be able to give us update. This the groundwork for built now that by our Administration. If it had not been for that good groundwork, they really would be in a hell of a mess today. Mr. President, the problem with some of these people is, and I will deal with this later on my discussion also, is that they have never got their feet into Parliament Caribbean Development Bank or Investment. It's point to be agreed, I will deal more fully with this very terrible dilemma.

I refer to the Speech on page 1: where it says a capital start has been made possible; a notable list of main items Government officers in his home works. Mr. President, while this was encouraging step we are not going to bring to the people. Under our Administration, we felt that it was adequately developed before. It is being done under a different guise now, but it's exactly the same amount of money, and one is giving out the same money, either step is a no-no Government. The previous Government was exactly wrong. I would like seriously to look at the new step that is exactly what now, and look for criticism to be accepted as constructive. Look at what we are getting now, and look at the services that they collected to have in it.

This statement represented Estimated Budgets, and Statements of Expenditure. These are the Estimated Revenue that have to be accepted and brought into fully for the people to understand. Like to this I have taken no exception, and I wish the Government of the House, when I get to it, as far as some of Estimates I set of all the figures, and I would not want to misquote any of them. We are not what has happened, when we pass it. A large deficit is on hand. The previous Government did not become the Budget, they did not consult estimations, in fact expenditure is this, many times has increased tremendously.

MR. CRAIG M. PURSER (CONTINUED): I predict that when the actual financial figures are released in this House sometime next month, for the year 1981, it will prove that we will have had twelve figures of about $1 billion dollars for this, it will probably be unnecessary in the nature of a million dollars.

Those same pundits who predicted disaster in the Treasurer's budget do not seem to be around, and they manipulated figures to the point where their graphs look more like a ten year old school boy, in order to try and prove their point. I might add further, that people who put themselves up as being such financial geniuses should know better by now. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, for one thing. Since [illegible] I think the figures, they have what they want. So, the present Government will have to get out and put some hard figures they can put any more out. That is what I want to find out, and can they going to put these measures into, particularly what they [illegible] the rate of budget which is being presented to this House.

Earlier this week, I mentioned [illegible] Another speaker on it said he cried [illegible] had nothing to do with the budget, it was not their budget, it was a Party [illegible] This was not the Party that budgeted, and this year is to not their budget again, it is the people's budget. Why the devil will we have this budget for in 1982?

Mr. Speaker, I happen to have been a member of the Government for eight years. I am quite aware of how the people are put together. What I would like [illegible] which guide with the expenses which the people [illegible] on behalf of the Minister responsible, Treasury, so they must not try to pass it off on the shoulders of a former Government. They must accept us will have responsibility for what this budget does to this country in the next three years.

On page 26 of this Speech, it says, "I am so sorry to have a Building Code, and that we would be looking [illegible] I am forced to the conclusion [illegible] to do this for us. It will probably have to go to the back to house the money to pay for this Building Code.

We now move close to Christmas, and I wonder how many businesses usually every year. It was decided to [illegible] the South Frenier Building Corp., and we [illegible] I am sorry [illegible] to accommodation, an unpaid bill this for the Government, to [illegible] them open for a while here. and so is [illegible] up there on the shelf. However, I imagine it will [illegible] the [illegible] and Redevelopment Planning Can did many years ago.

The current Petitions speak of the Provincial Agreement, the Petroleum Agreement or the [illegible] of Provincial petroleum in this country would have a negative effect as well as [illegible] effect. I would not say and would have to this point, and will just [illegible] I would [illegible] to it. There is one thing that I will remark upon, and that is under the present system, the homeowner can only claim for charges. There is no penalty on businesses, if it should be found in the economy, and I think this is homework. I do not think that this will be [illegible] with the people of this country. However, I would make [illegible] that by this time, the members of this Legislative Assembly should have [illegible] with either aspect of the Agreement, or we should [illegible] this Agreement, saying what our thoughts,

MR. [illegible] (COMMITTEE): Although [illegible], Mr. President, but I cannot agree [illegible]. I do not want [illegible] to take [illegible] for [illegible] of [illegible]. It has been [illegible] the Chairman [illegible] the [illegible] general [illegible], and we did not use [illegible] to do anything [illegible] to Senate. [illegible] what I have just said. The work of the [illegible] will [illegible] [illegible] have been done [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] for the Legal [illegible]. I will [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

I am sorry, very pleased to see that we thought it [illegible] of such great [illegible] [illegible] we had [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible], in particular the [illegible] of the Captain Islands. I think [illegible] may [illegible] [illegible]. I think it [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible], and [illegible] [illegible] to take [illegible] of the [illegible]. Of all the important things that [illegible] this [illegible] is [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible], speaking about [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to protect [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] and the [illegible]. Why do they not put [illegible] in the [illegible] that affect the country, and [illegible] help the [illegible] to [illegible] our [illegible]. I will be [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], as this is [illegible] by the Government.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please do [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] we can [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible]. Members [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] of the meeting.

MR. TAKEO K. KUGIYA: Yes Sir, I would like to [illegible] all the [illegible] [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: I will [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to move the [illegible].

ADJOURNMENT

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I move the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 10.30 a.m. [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: The motion is [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 10.30 a.m. [illegible].

[illegible]: At 4:50 P.M. THE HOUSE ADJOURNED UNTIL 10.30 A.M. [illegible], 8TH [illegible], 1981.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

[illegible]

2. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

7. [illegible]

(a) [illegible]-

(i) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(ii) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(b) [illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
HEADING	2
REVIEW OF THE DECISION APPEALED FROM AND RELEVANT FACTS - LAND IN ERIE COUNTY	2
ARGUMENT	3
THE DEPARTMENT ERRED IN FAILING TO CONSIDER THE ENTIRE RECORD BEFORE MAKING ITS DECISION	3
THE DEPARTMENT ERRED IN FAILING TO PROPERLY APPLY THE STATUTORY CRITERIA	5
THE DETERMINATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD OF APPEALS SHOULD BE REVERSED	6

MR. SPEAKER: Prayers.

The Honourable Chief Minister.

HON. DENIS F. HOYLES: Let us pray.

Almighty God, from whom all kindly and protecting Power do we receive and profess the sufficiency of this Legislative Assembly most acceptable, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

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

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

Our Father, which 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 those 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 countenance to shine upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Presentation of Papers and Reports.

Report of the Select Committee on the Education Law. The Financial Secretary.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EDUCATION LAW

HON. MICHAEL J. DUCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the Select Committee appointed to study the Education Law.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

MR. MICHAEL J. HOOLEY: [illegible] Select Committee of this Honourable House appointed to study the then existing electoral law. I had the honour to be Chairman of the Select Committee and I have had the honour to be Chairman of the revenue Select Committee. All of that time the Members of the Select Committee who were all the Members of the House, most thoroughly and carefully the existing Elections Law and made a number of recommendations which were reflected in the 1967 Elections Legislation presented to the then Legislative Assembly, passed on the second day of December and came into Law on the 2nd of December, 1967.

It was on the basis of this electoral Law, that the last General Elections for the Cayman Islands were held in November of last year. After that Election it was thought fit and proper, since there had been so many innovations made many changes, this Honourable House be looked to make representations and recommendations to the Legislature the Executive. A number of Members studied themselves of this and on the basis of these, the House determined that it was appropriate that a further Select Committee be appointed to study and make recommendations in the light of the experience of the 1968 General Elections, what further, if any, changes either to the Law or administratively should be recommended.

Accordingly, Sir, at the second Meeting of the 1968 Session, on 21st May, Honourable Members of the House passed resolutions appointing a Select Committee consisting of all the Members of the House, to study the recommendations already made and to consider further recommendations with a view to introducing an amending Bill.

As previously stated, Sir, that the honour to be appointed also Chairman of that Committee. That Committee held four Meetings, at the first of which unfortunately Mr. Burrows was overcome due to the heat of a caucus. However, there were three very substantive Meetings in September and October. At those Meetings the Select Committee considered recommendations and recommendations made by the Supervisor of Elections, by four Elected Members and by one Official Member. In addition to those considerations the Supervisor of Elections, Mr. Rodney Tibbs, at the head of the Committee presented the Elections and explained fully the value and the experience in relation to the 1968 Elections.

Honourable Members of your Select Committee also went carefully through the Elections Law and it is on the basis of those deliberations that Mr. Recommendations are made to the present Report and Bill.

The Principal Report, Sir, contains eight important substantive recommendations commencing chapter 2. the Law and also three important recommendations concerning administrative and non-Law matters, matters.

In addition thereto, there were recommendations made, seven in number, of a miscellaneous or consequential nature, and a further seven recommendations, to which reference is made in the Law. Honourable Members will see these in the Report.

However, there are a number of minor drafting recommendations which I won't enumerate, but I would only ask Honourable Members to go through them.

The first is perhaps the most important and the most significant and it relates to section 6 of the Elections Law. At present, Sir, the Cayman Islands is divided into nine Electoral Districts which are fixed in the Law. Each of these Electoral Districts are represented by three Members. Two Electoral Districts are represented by two Members each. Seven Electoral Districts are represented by one Member each.

ROLL RETURN & EMPTY ENVELOPES: The recommendation of your Select Committee is that the Electoral Records in those cases which have multi-dwelling be sub-divided into single dwelling constituencies to correspond with the number of Returning Officers, but that the general Electoral Procedure remain the same. Apart from the particular circumstances that no change be made at the instance of the Lands Tribunal.

The effect of this recommendation, May would be that in Crumlin there would be, if implemented, ten Returning Officers and there would be one Returning Officer for the whole Colonia.

When I make some comments on the recommendations, May, I might state it would be only fair and proper to indicate that recommendation and to say so because what I consider should be the procedure to be followed in connection with that recommendation.

The second substantive recommendation made was that there be an amendment made to section 22 of the Law of Property, section 22 which deals with the qualifications that the Registering Officer should, among other things, possess to appointed the name, address and occupation of every person qualified to vote in the Electoral District for which he has been appointed and state opposite the information he may register by a letter to whose enquiry.

The Committee is also recommended to provide for the establishment of a Registering Officer by the Registering Officer or such assistants, where any person who wishes to register may go any one of the Registering Officers, if he is to publish: Registrar appears who has to register should be written to inform to person.

The next substantive recommendation for change to the Law is to provide a further procedure whereby in any Election it should become known that a Returning Officer should discontinue, either by death or by part of a polling station for which a postal ballot, should be arranged in a postal return "box locked and marked as appropriate with Form 37.

[illegible] of necessity because whereas the United Kingdom Election Rules, which in other respects have only slightly differed in the Election Rules since early years, already stated that deliveries could be either by hand or by post, there is presently in our law no such provision.

The final recommendation of substance in respect of the Election Rules relates to the withdrawal of nomination papers at the parliamentary election. That was done away with by the Representation of the People Act 1969 and had through inadvertence no doubt survived the earlier repeal of section 29 of the Ballot Act 1872. It is proposed now that there be a provision to the effect that if a person dies between the time when his nomination paper is delivered and the time when the returning officer has, subject to certain provisions, given notice of the election, then there may be elected in his place another person.

Those, Sir, are the recommendations principally arising out of the Act. There were other recommendations which were made by the Select Committee of this Honourable House.

The first relates to the supervision of elections and the recommendation is that the Government of Northern Ireland necessarily by a Privy Council Order be appointed on a continuing on-going basis and be paid on a per diem basis. I would, Sir, emphasise that in making the recommendation that the Supervisor of Elections should not necessarily be a civil servant, that the Select Committee was in no way criticising the overall performance of Elections. I think that we are all agreed that in the last Election he did a superb job. What the Select Committee is saying is that in the future a situation could arise where there could be a conflict of interest in the Secretary of State not willing to take on this extra job. It might subsequently not be necessary for a Civil Servant to be released of the very onerous duties attached to that office.

The second administrative recommendation was that in future elections that the Government take administrative steps to ensure that there is a sufficient distance between the polling provided for the counting of the votes and the members of the public in the precincts.

The final administrative recommendation on which I am glad to say that Government is subject and it is to be implemented, that the Attorney General have the authority to make any further necessary administrative arrangements in the Act.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the first matter I mentioned was perhaps the most significant. That is the recommendation that the Chief Electoral Officer be invested with discretion to change into equity [illegible] circumstances. I think that it is true to say that in the feeling of great amusement that the system should be operated and enjoyed, but that it should be made quite clear to the public of the Queen Victoria that is acceptably used during the system, that Government has not yet received a final view on this particular recommendation and that it is the feeling of Government that there must be much more public debate and public input before the recommendation is to be implemented.

If we [illegible] the recommendations were to be implemented, I think that it is only fair and proper to say that it would be the intention of Government to introduce such legislation as requires the Attorney [illegible] of the present multi-member constituencies as would ensure that it was done in a fair, impartial and [illegible] way.

MR. RICHARD J. DALEY (continued): It is inconceivable to other parts of the Commonwealth, and it is a question which I feel that members of this House would wish to follow, that when necessary additions are made, as they inevitably are going to be, to punishments, there should be appointed a Roumanian Ambassador who would be a person that without the qualification, and a person who had held high judicial office in some other place, that this Roumanian Ambassador would come to the Islands of great unrest to take place; what he would say there, what he would investigate, what he would make inquiries, that he would sit very long, take all manner of care before making his decisions in regard to homicides.

This is unfortunate case, Sir, because it is an embarrassment, owing to the fact that the United Kingdom and the Islands which I have had the honour to visit, that the boundaries in the Caymen Islands are constituent territories which have existed for many, many years. To find, it might be true to say that they have existed from time immemorial. To find, the boundaries in the old Dominions can have many private disputes and it is in the Caymen Islands that there have been the private disputes which

MR. CHAIRMAN (interpreting): The question now is that the report be adopted. Does any member wish to speak? I think that the Financial Member from Nepal should be given an opportunity to speak first.

MR. D. BAHADUR KHANAL: I would like to personally give my support to the Twenty Fourth Report for Deepa Zone, Sir. However, I think, Sir, to suppose the recommendations contained in this Report, they will be a heavy load of burden under which I sincerely fear, and I will express with the Hon'ble Deputy Leader Mr. Regmi on this Table, the most Right/Known recommendations will be the Report. And I have what the leader of Government Business suggested yesterday, maybe this recommendation would not have come here. However, it becomes, Sir, that the Deputy the Leader and the recommendation to this regard as well, the Chairman the Ministry.

I can have from the printed summaries of the Honourable Financial Minister that there is still plenty to be done fighting drug addiction. However, I believe, this is a significant and a necessary change in the Fund. I believe that is still being collected, although I have already passed the Members's Budget in March this year, suggesting the same thing.

Then, Sir, as I said then, still today condition of drinking. It still was already the people of these islands in any social crime in economic standards, however, may I thank Government officials, could be finished by the Government agencies in order to maintain the state of all diseases, whatever annual and economic benefit.

The other changes in the Fund, Mr. President, I also recommend that, Sir, I think that it is possible to take note of those people who were present and those people who were absent during the deliberations of this Committee. The recommendations made to close up the Fund in time, otherwise, are certainly quite helpful when the next discussion is held to study the subjects.

I also suppose secondly, Sir, the recommendations of several Departments of Industries, and the appointments of a subsidiary, an ADB especially the construction of workers that be an on-going process rather than taken to some remote hazards countries, order to seek solution to remove that all these people who are entitled to live and given the opportunity.

I also support secondly, Sir, the recommendation that these people who are entitled to make the loans be to absent from the Zonals should be allowed to come by direct route.

Mr. President, I recommend this Report to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Second Financial Member from Kosi Zone.

MR. LUMBOR P. PRADHAN: Mr. President, the Report before us, the Eleven Districts of the Eastern Zone, to one which I recommended should be set up and should be dealt with as this House, mainly because I felt that more time should have been given to Subdivisional Headquarters to a lot of important of our Districts too.

When Government Notice No. 7/21 was brought to this House, I expressed it as an unfortunate move not only with the method adopted but, to my opinion, that I felt against these changes.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. President, my position in this respect has not changed. In my judgment the Supreme Court of this State has performed under these facts, that they appear to be able to reach any reasonable decision.

Mr. President, the only reason that we do is to get the public's reaction to the public school, together with their rather good reasons, I intend to do. This building, as indicated by [illegible] on the adoption of the recent building as a new plan. [illegible] that might arise with some new educational or [illegible] because [illegible] be well considered that reason. Building which contain [illegible] some passed through this house will be passed, which [illegible] of the [illegible] educational [illegible] have in the State, whether or not [illegible] good job this country.

The chairman [illegible] first point also, Mr. [illegible], touched of the [illegible] reasons of [illegible]. I wonder if he would be feeling his [illegible] way if he [illegible] on one of the [illegible] bills which will be adversely affected by the changes being recommended by him.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the [illegible], the system as [illegible] of any such, [illegible]. But I do object to the [illegible] that this [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] to be said, if the Department [illegible] the last election, that because [illegible] were [illegible] with [illegible] that the [illegible] would be changed. I have looked [illegible] to this [illegible] and while I will [illegible] the Democratic Caucus [illegible] Monday for [illegible] of the changes made, I submit, Mr. President, that a matter [illegible] has been [illegible] for [illegible] I understand [illegible] a Democrat [illegible] and it is my decision [illegible] as an individual [illegible] to [illegible] Democratic Caucus [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] on the [illegible] of the Supreme Court [illegible] and I believe that [illegible] of racial [illegible] in these changes. I believe, Sir, that it [illegible] serve the interests of this [illegible] to [illegible] of the people

Mr. [illegible]: I would like the [illegible] out of order in the event that a matter of this kind could not have been [illegible] the [illegible] of the Committee, because it would require a change in the Constitution, and I [illegible] to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Lloyd A. Fitzgerald: Thank you, Mr. President. A most [illegible] statement has been made in my own [illegible]. I feel to your [illegible], Sir.

The system which now [illegible] within the [illegible] has been [illegible] accepted by the people of the Queen [illegible]. There is no need why the people in this [illegible] for the [illegible] Democratic or Republican [illegible] why they [illegible] they please. There are those people to place the Democratic [illegible] why should not the people [illegible] Queen [illegible], [illegible] the next day [illegible]. [illegible] be decided [illegible] made [illegible] the [illegible] people who they feel should [illegible] to be the Board. Why are we spending so [illegible] to [illegible] to serve the [illegible] of certain [illegible]?

Mr. President, as I stand on this [illegible] to debating the motion before the House, I consider this a very [illegible] position. I consider [illegible] of the [illegible] of assemblers in the Queen Delphi and I believe that [illegible] of racial [illegible] in these changes. I believe, Sir, that it [illegible] serve the interests of this [illegible] to [illegible] of the people

MR. JAMES A. [illegible] (Continued): ...this country back the cost of the stamp. We have tried to follow one country in this country for ages, Black and White Cable. It did not matter to all mixed together.

Such a change in the Principle has still brings about a lot of responsible for this country, and that is to not already have it. However, may be our Representative.

Section one more thing concerning the Hearings. The reason I did not attend the Meeting is the reason which you will see here in the note which was taken from section 6 of the Act. It would have been a waste of time, a reason applied to waste my time. If we look at the Minutes of the Meeting of the 7th October where the speakers to motion 4 was overcrowded, we will note that the people invited for this by originally were the Honourable Second Official Member, the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council, the Honourable Second Elected Member of Executive Council, the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council, the Honourable Second Nominated Member of Executive Council, the Second Elected Member for Georgetown, the Second Elected Member for North Rupununi, the Third Elected Member for Demerara

This is why I mentioned it a while ago that I attended a few of these Meetings. We come here to these Meetings and we already know what the position is going to be. A few of the Meetings are a waste of time. If I was a Civil Servant with a steady salary, then I would have to attend Meetings. However, as a Member who has to sacrifice his own personal business I have to forfeit many minutes of the day.

Mr. President, the most effective section of these amendments is section 4. I really cannot have any with motion 4 as the law and it would not make any difference, because of the Government Bench decision that this will be accepted, it will be accepted. However, I hope that the people of the Guyana Islands and in particular the constituency of Demerara-Essequibo will take note of the names of the people who are responsible this change, not that it will affect some of us because I believe that some of us will have the ability to contribute more of the people in the future than others. The disadvantage will fall entirely on those people will be less, again. The danger of this section is that we are going to erode the existing rights in part. We do not want this in the Guyana Islands. We have seen this sort of thing happen in Jamaica. We have seen its happen in the Windward Islands. We have seen its happen all around us. And we have certain fundamental rights and freedoms which we all like to see the continuance of the Guyana Islands instead of the type of thing that. I will not comment at that point further because I have that in the motions that I am talking about. However, nevertheless....

MR. H. [illegible]: Mr. President, on a point of order, Sir. I wonder if the Member would read section 4 of the Electoral Law Reform.

MR. JAMES A. [illegible]: While I am not a lawyer, Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree, it is not a point of order.

MR. H. [illegible]: I was just giving the Member a chance to clear up the misunderstanding.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] a minute when you are finished, please?

MR. RICHARD A. PITTMAN: If the Senate wishes to determine its rules [illegible], Southern Pacific thinks the preceding Congress and Government are the proper point of order. This is no point of order. What I am talking about here is a question which should decorate this meeting. It is unfortunate that some Long Lines people, some of the more individuals do not understand this. The remarks in this chamber are very extensive could be quite accurate, quite [illegible] they are said. They do not relate [illegible] Long Lines people [illegible].

Another point, Mr. President, before I am really through with [illegible] the changes made in the administrative [illegible] of this case. I do not know [illegible] to change the minutes of a meeting [illegible] Public Service Commission. The purpose I got up for was [illegible] this is one of the most significant [illegible] of this country and [illegible] Southern Pacific. How can we change [illegible] which have [illegible] without those Commissioners [illegible] to [illegible]? Mr. President, as I said, I should almost have one hell [illegible] I am through.

I'll be [illegible] to explain [illegible] of the conduct of the Government, what [illegible].

MR. D. EDGAR HILLIS: Mr. President, on a point of order, Rule, Standing Order 30(4) and (5), I think that the Member is making [illegible] irrelevant [illegible] and I think that he is also [illegible] remarks to other Members. May I have a ruling from the Chair, sir?

MR. RICHARD A. PITTMAN: Mr. President, this is a [illegible].

MR. D. EDGAR HILLIS: Will the Member please sit down until the President rules.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Parliamentarian, has that the Senate Finance Member [illegible] to say that the proposed amendment to Case [illegible] made in the Yukon Territory report [illegible] in order to enable [illegible] to appeal that matter to a position. If that is any [illegible] of order.

MR. RICHARD A. PITTMAN: Mr. President, I rise [illegible] to assist [illegible]. Quite [illegible] I will [illegible] anyway. I [illegible], any one of their [illegible] of [illegible]. I'm [illegible] the [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: It is [illegible] [illegible], I am [illegible].

MR. RICHARD A. PITTMAN: [illegible] of their [illegible] is not out of order, Mr. President, with [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: Oh, yes it is, because it is [illegible] of [illegible], and the [illegible] is [illegible] by [illegible].

MR. D. EDGAR HILLIS: Thank you, sir.

MR. LINCOLN A. CLARKE: Mr. President, regardless of the problem, we have the position and the world about -[illegible] standing for almighty dollars, the Grand Grabbed Nation for Decade Term. I am here speaking about [illegible] will affect the people and generation to come in the future America.

I [illegible] that it was the Grand Nation for North Side who pitched the [illegible] Market's system and I also know the reason why it was done, and the Nation knows that I would [illegible] I have told you. My [illegible] of how many times he tried to [illegible] me in this issue it will not nullify the effect of what I am saying.

MR. D. SAMUEL MILLER: Mr. President, on a point of order, Sir, I think that the Member is misinterpreting the Speaker, because it was not he who pitched the motion. The motion was under discussion was pitched in this House by the Leader of Government business, the Honourable Chief Officials Member.

MR. LAWFORD A. PETERSON: Mr. President, I rise the motion as moved by the Honourable Chief Official Member, which is seconded. However, I think that the Grand and Decade of this House will make what the Grand Member for North Side the most [illegible] misinterpreting this.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, Sir the point raised I may like to elaborate certain matters which other it has been by Grand Constitute Report which is today of the main item, that I would [illegible] in the manner the [illegible] of [illegible] before to decide Question time to be taken.

Suspension of Standing Orders

MR. CHRIS K. OKOTIE: Mr. President, I would like to request time to appeal to the Standing Orders [illegible] question. I would like this motion to [illegible] my [illegible]. The House is about on this time for questioning and time questioning should expire at 11.30 a.m. I think that it is [illegible] the [illegible] I [illegible] to be [illegible] before Question time. It means that the people in [illegible] the [illegible] Member's [illegible] Grand Member from North Side [illegible] Time to motion now by this motion. I took on the paper here today. We have the budget to be debated. I come prepared to debate the budget. The [illegible] motions which will take us all of the time of the House today. Why could they not have been interpreted [illegible] This is another [illegible] this particular motion before the House. I move to [illegible] the [illegible] to be [illegible] I am prepared on that particular point to go through the [illegible] and [illegible] to [illegible] that time is a [illegible] Member [illegible] by the Members of this House.

Mr. President, the way that this House is being run now, I [illegible] this one today. That is to say as you as President of this House, as Chief Commissioner [illegible] Grand, [illegible] the House they have not been for long [illegible] and [illegible] to be [illegible] the work of the [illegible] of the [illegible] of God".

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, as a member of the [illegible] Committee, Sir, may I draw the Council's attention to [illegible] of the Standing Orders which clearly lays down the order of business for the day. The business listed here as motion [illegible] is the motion as defined in the Standing Orders. The motion was as follows:-

"(a) [illegible]
(b) [illegible]
(c) Reading of the previous minutes and [illegible]
(d) [illegible]
(e) [illegible]..."

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, Sir, a point of order. I am one of the [illegible] of the Standing Orders. We do not need the Member to read, since everybody has one.

MR. [illegible]: What he was a point of order. Would he please quote the chapter and verse of the Standing Orders which he is referring to?

"(e) [illegible]".
(f) [illegible]."

MR. [illegible]: Would the Member please sit down. I think that we have several learned points of order. The Second Elected Member for Castle [illegible] on a point of order, we have already a long way gone in.

I would like to say to Members of the Elected Members for Nairobi that a similar task and opportunities will arise. The only way in which we could [illegible] would, of course, by [illegible] Parliament to [illegible] provisions to be taken after the [illegible] of this Constitution Report has been completed. What I think will be the view of the House [illegible] on the [illegible] Committee Stage.

I think that I would like to finish [illegible] to the Motion, as it is certainly true on the Elected Member for West [illegible] pointed out, that the Standing Orders do require that Reports be laid before questions are taken. However, I think it [illegible] Members are aware [illegible] Reports [illegible] which are [illegible] to be laid on the subject of [illegible] that they are laid, but are discussed at a later stage. In the circumstances, we shall [illegible] until [illegible] to [illegible] the course of the Meeting, that all questions have been answered. I think that we ought to find some way of [illegible] [illegible] question time and obviously we could [illegible] [illegible] speak as soon as I have finished, because I have one point [illegible] [illegible] to be answered Monday or two o'clock. I would invite the Business Committee to have a look at [illegible] might be possible.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I do not [illegible] because I have been a Member of this House now for [illegible] and I do not recall to be reminded every time of this rule. We [illegible] Standing Orders. We have seen the Hon. Elected [illegible] Interpretation Question, Sir. The Question [illegible] and it was left out. If we had a Minister [illegible] [illegible] a few weeks before Easter [illegible] and we could then go on to Question Time, that is what was done.

MR. JAMES M. BRIDGE (CONTINUING): Since I am saying so, this is taking away the rights of this Township Meeting. I am just asking if this could not be done the Tuesday after Town Meeting. The Selectmen would not be the budget deciders, neither then these workers, rather than the question.

MR. M. MARSHALL BLOOM: Mr. President, I am a member of the Finance Committee on the Budget Study. I'd like to say that myself and the Selectmen would welcome any comments you have.

MR. JAMES M. BRIDGE: I thought the Moderator announced he'd a Committee. I did not expect to hear such words from the Moderator.

MR. M. MARSHALL BLOOM: I am only a Consultant on the Moderator.

MR. JAMES M. BRIDGE: I do not.....

MR. PRESIDENT: Please not down. Order, order.

MR. JAMES M. BRIDGE: .....like the Moderator.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order.

MR. M. MARSHALL BLOOM: If the Moderator.....

MR. PRESIDENT: Please sit down. Please. Mr. Bush has the floor.

May I explain briefly, as I imagine, a hopeful number of Members will of this wish to speak on the Report of the Select Committee on the Selectmen's Role? Should any Members who can going to wish to speak on that front should for a moment? Then will already invite going to be a long debate. Under the circumstances, may Members wish to vote a motion that I speak subject to questions the Honorable Select Committee, but I would have thought that it would be possible to continue standing before the Chair, that further discussion of this Report will be the wish of the House, as they may wish to take the meeting. Could we not suspend standing orders to enable that? It may be that everyone wants to go on, or at least that the majority want to go on debating with qualification expected. It will make that an obvious motion.

MR. GEORGE C. BRUSH: Mr. President, who decides how often we should be adjourned. Previous, however, of another Committee which have been debated already, I suppose that they are not the ones that can be discussed up.

MR. M. MARSHALL BLOOM: That is right.

MR. JAMES M. BRIDGE: Mr. President, as Mr. Bush's Finance Committee which would follow the Selectmen Study is,

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, I think that it would be possible. To go back then if it's a question of, and the majority of Members wish. If you wish to vote that Committee agree to be taken separately the recommendations of the Selectmen Committee. Subject to be taken at a later time, I would accept the motion. However, it is a motion against which others may vote. It does not mean that the matter will pass.

ADJOURNMENT TO AUG 14

MR. JAMES K. [illegible]: I would understand that and I understand the way in which decorum works here. However, I am reading Order Standing Order 23 as the Whip and the Budget Address have already been given their proper consideration. I am of the opinion that the debate on the Budget Address should continue. What I anticipate is going to take more of Monday than the other motions which are on the Order Paper today, and those motions down for debate after the debate on the Budget Address have taken place, will not be reached under the debate for the Budget Address.

MR. S. MAYO SPEAKER: Mr. Treasurer, I would like to second the motion that moved that the matters before the House be suspended or adjourned so that we may continue with debate on this....

MR. [illegible]: ... I have understood it correctly. The effect of the motion needs to be purely administrative, that is the normal standing debate on the representation Bill to the top of the Order Paper is applied, as usual....

Have any Members wish to speak to that motion?

MR. S. PAUL MILLER: I notice at present, Mr. Treasurer, Standing Order 23 allows for Standing Orders to be suspended. I wonder if you would kindly to be the motion pertaining Order which is going to allow the change in the order as suggested, sir?

MR. [illegible]: I think that possibly it would be standing Order 24. Because we have a Order Paper before [illegible] as long as the provisions with not under the general provisions of Standing Order 24. My concern was Standing Orders to accordance with the order in which matters are put out. The motion to this Standing Order should be suspended to enable that we may be able to take the items on today's order paper in a different order, in a different sequence. I believe that will be sufficient to enable.

MR. S. MAYO MILLER: Any of the Standing Order 24?

MR. PEPPERCORN: Well, in accordance with the Standing Orders as they is we are changing the order in which items on today's Order Paper are taken. I think that this is a completely proper motion. Does any Member wish to speak? I think that the third Observer Member for Hope Bay who wishes to speak on this, but I am not sure. Sir?

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us which was moved by the First Elected Member for Kaolak Bay, I would like to say here, Sir, that as the Territorial Council is aware, it is of vital importance that these Ordinances [illegible] and Ordinances of the first part for the full discussion of the House, plus all the other Ordinances of the whole House of which the First Elected Member for Kaolak Bay should have some or most of the work. I rose to seek clarification of this to make sure that we are now proceeding with the agenda as the Budget Address. However, Sir, whether or not we do have other business appear this time is not as important as those that. However, Sir, when we decided to have Friday, as a result of the business of this House to enable to implement the agenda, as guidance of the business arrangement

REP. [illegible] (CONTINUED): I would like to say again, Sir, that I am not in support of this motion.

REP. JAMES M. WILSON: Mr. President, just one comment there, Sir. If I know Lieutenant Commander [illegible] I know him, I really don't [illegible] and I would look at the situation by Task [illegible]. Also, I am willing [illegible] to the prohibitive order of this [illegible]. If the Senator would like to see what has kept me [illegible] of the Senate I will be very glad to [illegible] and but how can it be [illegible]. Does she want to [illegible]?

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator, madam. Does any other Senator wish to speak?

SEN. JAMES M. WILSON: Maybe maybe like that would keep the Senator busy too.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honorable Chief Executive of Kamehameha Division.

SEN. DANIEL K. INOUYE: Mr. President, I suppose that we may or with the [illegible], that [illegible] has maybe just be still have to be voted on but I am not going to support it. I think that [illegible] the Order of the Day is now before us and to get on with the business.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Senator wish to speak?

SENATOR TOM: [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: May we have a [illegible]?

ROLL CALL
NO. 01.25

AYES

Sen. Hanford K. Peterson
Sen. Joseph H. Farias
Sen. G. Ross Tom
Sen. John P. Nelson

NOES

Sen. Daniel K. Inouye
Sen. K. Kamoku Kahoe
Sen. [illegible]
Sen. Grant T. Anderson
Sen. [illegible]
Sen. Gordon T. Burns
Sen. S. Parnell Wilson

EXCUSED

Sen. Daniel S. Foster
Sen. Richard K. Brown
Sen. Thomas C. [illegible]
Capt. Henry C. [illegible]

NOTICE THAT THE SESSION OF THIS COURT SHALL BE [illegible] BY [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: Since it is now [illegible] this body shall be normally assigned [illegible], I will [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible].

AT 11:00 A.M. THE SENATE ADJOURNED

Issued December 27 11:00 A.M.

Mr. President: Please be seated
The Secretary General invites the Delegation
from the Republic.

Mr. Ernesto A. Pilapil: Mr. President, just before the break I was dealing with the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Declaration. At the point of the break, I believe that I was pointing out what in my opinion was a disservice to the people of the Solomon Islands and the most effective and efficient solution in my opinion.

Mr. President, the provisions of Article 5, the first paragraph states that Provincial Governments or Local Governments which have self-Government shall be established into single Member constituencies as compared with the number of Representatives that Provincial Governments would normally have. It follows, Mr. President, that further due to the provincial circumstances, no change will be made to the Provincial Islands.

Mr. President, I consider this provisions circumstances would apply to the Western Islands which would not be one of the other Provincial governments namely the Gilbert Islands. As I stated, Mr. President, I was also concerned in the last paragraph a possible explanation which the people of the Western Islands, possibly Members of the Assembly will be directly affected. I was also not certain of Article 5 and any additional paragraphs that would become within the Western Islands. Finally, Mr. President, as the Western Islands have been left as one country with one member representation of the Assembly, Provincial or Local positions. However, Mr. President, this constitutes my first speaking.

Mr. President, as you being aware of the Western Islands was given a dissolution power as one Party delegation to the position of certain other activities and countries. This amendment to the Electoral Law by, in my opinion, is totally unnecessary and I speak of the time of the Assembly if this Power is dissolved. It should never be in your hands.

It appears to me, Mr. President, that any Act which is incompatible to provide Members of this Town can already be done by others. Principle objectives of the people of the Western Islands are unnecessarily the Executive Council or the Party in Power should be responsible.

The Powers of this Power has said that he would not already as reason that he would not attend on this House without knowing us. Well, I am sorry that Mr. Speaker has to be going to have a lot of support because I was here the other day to express my views. I know, Sir, that there will be a number of Members jumping up as soon as they can, however, I believe that with the history of the Western Islands will prove that I am right but when, Mr. President, I am not discouraged by possibilities because I believe that by the time we may have I am very sure that independence candidate for this House. Of course, I have been reluctant for the country I have, so this as it may be, Mr. President, many times under rules for our Local, and it is hard to win votes with others.

Mr. President, we come in all many fears a situation that we in the Assembly will be in another Government or election in this country, especially of the ethnic minority as compared with that individual. We need to ourselves as well and Legislative Representatives and Presidents.

MR. LAWRENCE H. SMITH: (continued) ... [illegible] ... which the Chief Justice, I would think, perhaps already or shortly a month later anticipated would be passed at the Meeting of the 6th October, 1982. The result I guess, Mr. President, is what we do the balance of business. I'm really thinking about an amendment which specifies that the Democratic Floor Assistant Whip, Mr. Jimmy Hastings who was once acting Democratic Floor Leader, specify the Floor Steward Member for the Senate Caucus, the Floor Steward Member for Post 182, the Floor Steward Member for Radio Shack and the Floor Steward Member for Post 9999. I do not anticipate Mr. Speaker, that all the names which we provide in the Senate will be finally approved by the majority.

Mr. President, I have before me [illegible] Democratic papers from the Senate Floor Steward Member for Post 182 where he enthusiastically believes in the concept of the war, who never has agreed with the Constitutional Convention because he felt that he would lose the opportunity to [illegible] and he was right. An endorsement or statement on this would be [illegible] the people. This is exactly what I intend to do on Wednesday night. Tomorrow I will also take that opportunity to present my Cabinet at the Senate.

[illegible] recommendation made by the Floor Steward Member for Post 9999, he usually appointed six. That we have others on Caucus, the Third Floor Member for Post 9999, the Floor Member for Post 182 can usually [illegible] while the amendment [illegible].

Mr. President, on a vote, I know [illegible] of Members will be [illegible] of the [illegible] which they would make their position right to the people. However, I hope that the people will [illegible] Democrats of [illegible] which we are noted and so [illegible]. I guess that they will also remember this in 1982.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Floor Steward Member for Radio Shack.

MR. [illegible] SMITH: Mr. President, I will attempt my debate [illegible] some of the words of Robert Burdette. He said I do hope for life:

> "To write right on the [illegible]. To write right on the [illegible]. To write right on the [illegible] and to write [illegible]."

[illegible] this is the hour during which [illegible] to my constituents [illegible] to the [illegible] votes. I am sure, all my other colleagues will never [illegible] what we vote right. Therefore I have six more amendments which I would like [illegible] is continually plugging the [illegible]. I appreciate the [illegible] which [illegible] have this morning. The [illegible] of this [illegible] very constructive. This is commendable, in my opinion, which should be dealt with after we have [illegible] of the [illegible] as a whole.

[illegible] of the multiplicity amendments may be asked to [illegible] and why that I am speaking, this may [illegible] I [illegible] just a consideration which has no [illegible]. I am sure in any decision of this body may [illegible] to re-[illegible] it will [illegible] and as [illegible] my [illegible]. However, that is all the points [illegible] mind today.

Mr. Speaker Sir, [illegible] The [illegible] Chief [illegible] something which has been spoken, proved and tested. [illegible] Bishop Lekhanya today. I have why it is being broadcast [illegible], because [illegible] the whole time through. [illegible] [illegible] Basotho attacking [illegible] this one.

[illegible] the constitution has to be changed to allow that only Ngakoanana as Commander of Defence [illegible] Lekhanya, with them [illegible] Constitution and [illegible] Basotho today. The Constitution of the Kingdom of Lesotho is [illegible] to protect the people and to uphold the principle of the Kingdom Lesotho, the people who are in the [illegible] and [illegible] people of the years have [illegible] to [illegible] Basotho [illegible] in the [illegible]. Those are the people I am speaking about.

I have a [illegible] [illegible] I am not [illegible] [illegible] the people [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Hon. Joseph O. Culkin: Mr. President, could I ask some Honourable Senator some questions?

Hon. Chairman: As the Senator has pleaded, I think really that the point of order has arisen and I should not allow questions. Does any other Senator wish to speak?

Hon. A. Gomez Jones: Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Report of the Select Committee on the Electoral Law which is presently before this Honourable House. I first wish to thank my colleagues on the Committee for the honour they conferred on me in appointing me Chairman of the Committee. I do not know what prompted them to do so, but I do not feel competent enough to be the Chairman of such a Committee. I would refer you to the Minutes of the Select Committee held on the 2nd October, 1968. The Minutes present are clearly stated and the opinions received were from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Mr. George McConnie, the Honourable Second Elected Member of Roseau South, the Second Elected Member for Roseau Town and the Second Elected Member for Soufrière Town.

The Minutes also state that the Elected Members do agree that discussion should take place on the Report before the Committee considers the Bill clause by clause. The Minutes further state:-

> "Three Elected Members in their Report which have not been considered by the Committee, urged that the Secretary of Representations, the Chief Electoral Officer, should be appointed by the Governor-General on the recommendation of the Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition."

Another is also stated:-

> "Due to the possible disenfranchisement, no change to be made in the Electoral Law before the General Election."

The question was put. Those who are in favour and those who are against please say "Aye". I am satisfied that the Second Elected Member for George Town will not be able to have sufficient votes to change the Minutes of the Minutes of the Select Committee before proceeding to this Report and taking such an unnecessary adjournment.

I would also like to say that we have prepared to proceed and I really do not know who is before me. However, I want to assure him or anyone else that is in charge of this House that I am ready to stay as long as I can. I might not stand as long as he or the Honourable Member for Soufrière, but I am ready to be here as long as necessary.

I do not suppose single Member constituencies and I have my views. As I said, I was not at that meeting and I did not vote on the amendment. I have the mandate of George Town who obviously elected me by a large majority in 1967, and again in 1969 to vote and I was elected on a one man one vote basis of the people of George Town and I want to emphasize to be able to represent all of my people of the time. Because my opinion comes from a cross-section of them in Roseau, the town, the middle class, the well off, the aristocrats, the black, the brown and the white. The First Elected Member for George Town is capable of representing them.

MRS. A. SCOBEE [CONTINUED]: I believe, Mr. President, that small, poor people should have Christmas seconds, just as Congress. I would have a resolution of that kind to offer, but I was not prepared for this to be discussed at this time. I would not consider such a resolution I feel, however, indicates that the people in my constituency what I represent that this would be the greatest Christmas present they would want to have.

I mean, sir, that I have made my position clear on this. Another point I would like to make is that I am surprised that the Opposition have taken this attitude on it, and it is known as a foreign commission that will have the same effect which would bring this division about. Thank you very much, sir. This is merely a report from the Private Committee and I think the public should understand that there was no move to put this person into private consultations with the public of this country.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio of Executive Council.

HON. DONALD O. CAMERON: Mr. President, as I said, the length and tenor of this debate has taken me by surprise. However, I believe that in respect of justice, the matter can rightfully be pursued as far as I did not unite aware of feelings under an area of the Province who contact was this, and some will wonder the use to which.

Mr. President, in one of the resolutions of the 1949 Convention which we were speaking under, I would like to refer briefly to the report of Lord Oxford and Asquith, the government also agreed to which we the...(illegible). Surely, Mr. President, some members seem to think that I am not being honest, I was saying that I would recommend to Newfoundland this step, and the report of Lord Oxford and Asquith, the Commission had taken, and really the position was related to the formulation of our present Constitution.

In that report it was said that it was to the report that he had been unable to proceed the people in Confederation with Canada, Constitutionalism and that we could hope that the new settlement would give persons representation in the...

The idea, Mr. President, of single Member constituencies is not for any minister or any one suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, but it has been in the possession of some people since and before in this country, something which has never been thoroughly into existence, or for or from which it. The reason for single Member constituencies, Mr. President, is to guarantee some democracy. In a democracy, there is one man, one vote. Under our system, in the multi-Member constituencies, anyone has three votes and it is possible for a minority of people to control a block of constituencies such things and constituencies which is unfair.

The other point is, Mr. President, as the Honourable Leader of Opposition stated the case, I think that is a report from a Select Committee, and I think that you in putting the matter before this House and the Honourable Leader of Opposition to suggest it is quite given that there was no intention to introduce these recommendations. Even if they were accepted, additional justice will be one of consultation with the public.

SEN. SPONG: I would like to... My reason for suggesting it, Mr. President, was specifically to get public input on this matter. My own feeling is that we would have simple majority support but I'm just trying to get the lay of the land. If the majority of people in these Islands feel that what we operate under is what they want to retain, so be it. That is democracy.

Certainly, Mr. President, the rationale behind the recommendation in this report is not that the Minority Leader or anybody else supported it, but simply in deference to all the many suggestions we have received in this area. What this Member should have emphasized on, Mr. President, before making such a rash statement, was the fact that by an overwhelming majority and was elected to this Legislature in consideration of the Constitution. It took an order of the court to change this. That is the depth of this democracy, Mr. President. I am not sure that by referendum we should change.

The encouragement, Mr. President, that he and his colleagues found it appropriate to debate the subject substantively came as no surprise to me. As I say--the election yesterday really did, and the floor fight to create opinion did grow. As for the building itself, Speaking of the battlefields and fighting in the Senate, one can only fight if they are here, Mr. President. While I can understand that the Senate was ill for one Monday, the majority was not ill for the week. We have been given to attend all of the meetings except this morning. The committee chairmen not being present. Most of the questions on the Capitol Complex Project, I think it was, were in the record. We were here to ask them. We did not postpone anybody to ask them. So, Mr. President, let me assure that gentleman and his colleagues that they are free as they might choose at any time but this Government will not be run from the back benches of this Senate. We are here and we do our job and work it.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have no objection just which I would like to withdraw. However, the necessary legislative measure appears to provide for my absence. So, I need not interrupt proceedings. If we could finish this item by 4:30 p.m. I will make myself available. I will be back up, I imagine 8:15 p.m. and we will probably resume proceedings.

HON. SENATOR D. BRANT: Mr. President, I will keep what I have been saying on the matter short but amend the resolution, that is this Report of the Select Committee. The public of these Islands should be given the opportunity to express their views on the proposed Capitol Complex. I would like to make it clear in my opinion it is not the desire of this Legislature to abolish these multiple Member constituencies or even to vary or to allow for additional representation of all groups and communities. If I thought otherwise, I would not support the resolution. One vote is a true democratic process.

If this were to come into effect and I were to run for the Cayman Islands, I would have to pick people from all districts. I would be dealing in every way. I'm not shy nor do I go crying to my constituency. I have enough confidence in my ability to the confidence of the people of the districts if that be, then wherever I stand I would be elected.

MR. ERNEST N. MORIAL (Interpretation): That is why I am just pleased of this visit, and today, I have democratic process being introduced into our discussions.

Again I say that what the distinguished Member from Golden Rock should be concerned about was the fact that he had no more respect for the Constitution than to use Emergency Powers to arrested citizens and that he was fortunate under the Constitution to be here today. That was only a matter duly. I still want misunderstandings as to what he was doing, of the citizens of the area, pending my being able to discuss matters that I may have with the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs.

So I said, I would like to go on record again, Mr. President, as saying that his non-appointment was not to create any misunderstanding as to my position in the Legislature.

Thank you.

HON. JOSEPH N. HOYTE: The Chief Minister and Member for Mahaica Rural.

MR. CHEDDI B. JAGAN: Thank you, Mr. President.

I had not intended to speak on this matter but I think that on all occasions, being a Member of the Committee dealing with this matter, that I must throw some light on what actually took place. I was a little surprised when the Second Elected Member for George Town would refer to Members here, Elected Members of Executive Council, inquiring into my being arrested and not being able to ascertain one's case. I take it now that a majority of those on the Front Elected Members for Action does also subscribe to my ability to debate any subject matter brought forward in this House. I would like to make it quite clear that it is the responsibility of the Government to take steps to see that no person is arrested and detained without trial. As far as I am concerned, if it were my privilege to have been approached, and not here as a Member for an area, then as the First Elected Member for Georgetown, I would have done, I would hope that in the course of the inquiry which I might have been asked to carry out, it would have been made clear to me that the Government was not going to take any steps to see that no person is arrested and detained without trial. As far as I am concerned, if it were my privilege to have been approached, and not here as a Member for an area, then as the First Elected Member for Georgetown, I would have done, I would hope that in the course of the inquiry which I might have been asked to carry out, it would have been made clear to me that the Government was not going to take any steps to see that no person is arrested and detained without trial.

As far as being an accusation against the Government, if that is the case which I must carry for the present Members of the Government Bench, I will be happy to be charged with that crime. I would like to assure the Second Elected Member for George Town that no matter how much he may, unless there is some type of an accusation made, nothing will stop me from speaking once on the matter and, with a declaration in which I have the faith which I have in these matters, I should have proudly to be associated with them.

I would like to bring to the attention of this House, Mr. President, that it was the recommendation of the Second Elected Member for George Town. It would not be just to say that there were certain members of the Government Bench who would like [illegible] of a Select Committee of the whole House, and he would like to see [illegible] Committee to be appointed during the next Session of the Legislative Assembly.

MRS. GRETA D. GIPPER (CONTINUED): The Committee was impressed. The Member was impressed to hear Jewel Ridley on that committee and to give on his enthusiasm and to have given Jewel the encouragement which he needs. His presence perhaps contributes to his not being able to concentrate to that Member will have the right kind of direction. However, the House should not lose all the good Members who were there. The very thought of bringing in anything like racism into this House is really repulsive to all of our philosophies. I do not know what the Great Plains Member from Gem is trying to accomplish by his Statement of George Lucas, but I must question his motive and take to do with his racial problems in the United States. If there is anything which is true it is that there are, in the end, no Black, White or Chicanos. There is only one race of human beings and that is human. It does not matter what color one's skin is, what sexuality which exists between two consenting adults and what they are white. If we go back far enough we will find that they are not all white. Where the lines are drawn.

I think and I have confidence in all of the Members that are in the House of these good Christian men and women of integrity, that this Government would discriminate itself in the interest of racism to any group of people, and I question and I question. I am appalled, I am disappointed. At first, I am here that racism should be made in this House about who is Cajun and who is American and who is Anglish. As fine as I am concerned this Great Freedom Member from Gem should hang his head in shame, because if an Englishman wanted to come for citizenship in this country, a three day difficult session why he should be required to register in the Office of an American Indian Agency for citizenship here. I am still wondering whether he has received any negative evidence that what I've said inadvertently has or just been misunderstood.

I am of the opinion that the Members who walked out of this House did nothing more to unite our people. However, I am pleased that the majority of our people have enough sense to think for themselves and to know that this Government is here to remain a free nation. If the Government of the United States were not for all the people's peace Members would not be here. They should know that this Government is not here to be only used against one certain choice.

I would like to remind the Great Educated Member from Gem that I have one more thing which I do not intend to take until I am in this house. One, first and foremost thing Christian principles. I will be the last one I will ever be a member, responsible and fair representative of my position. The last thing that my name will be associated with is any thing related some, any sort of Black-hoods Ku Klux Klansmen, or anything else of that sort. Whether I am here for four years or forty, my name will be clean when I leave this place. I urge that the Member will be quick to say the same when he is through here.

The Member misunderstood what he just heard. I do not care to insult anyone but I feel that if a Member of this House is not well versed internal problems should be instructed in the House. I would like to say that the Great Ku Klux Klan will keep their hands off of our people. We have never asked to our neighbor even the Chicanos of our people and we will not do it now. However, perhaps there are other Members who may not be this house who are already convinced that the war is over, and the people will be united.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I think the only point that I would like to say that I have misquoted the Honorable Member from Gem and I will apologize to him if an inadvertent statement for whatever purpose I have to change my mind.

[illegible] I do not have a problem, because as far as that goes we discussed a few minutes before [illegible] Thank you very much. Please [illegible] Thank you. [illegible]

Thank you, Mr. [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]
of Saskatchewan

The honourable [illegible]

[illegible] Mr. President, I [illegible] Saskatchewan [illegible] Friday. However, the [illegible] Saskatchewan [illegible] Mr. President, I [illegible] Committee on the [illegible] Committee [illegible] Saskatchewan [illegible]

Mr. President, I would like [illegible] Committee [illegible] Committee [illegible] Saskatchewan [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] Saskatchewan [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] Saskatchewan [illegible] Mr. President,

NON-CONTROVERSIAL LEGISLATION (CONTINUED): ...have legislation. The United Nations calls, Mr. President. We have pledged to the United Nations that we would support it. We are presently back to the public and to the nation. While in the position which the Senator Delaware is in, and I was in the last Congress. We are hoping the resolution for a real,honest, hard working Government and we have to really give Government back to where it will run its own affairs and we can all feel comfortable in it.

Several Members have a real interest in Social Security Matters. But they were busy so that a big part of their morning when they might get the opportunity of a Democrat by attending the Select Committee Meetings and making their statements and making their contributions. They never showed up one day. They never even had the decency to write in and to inquire, for a period. What is her name, Mr. President, so that the Members of the other side have just been, will not after the country's problems. This is exactly what they have been, worked away from the problems which they have created for the country. They are trying to get out and deceive the people and make them believe that this Administration which was here only from November, 1968 to the present time morning, noon and night to blame on the wage stabilization Price Freeze Review Board for inflation that and the politicians who are now trying to run and hide from it.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware, when the Administration was here last, I can assure you, Mr. President, it has been my sincere wish that I have not had a disagreement, and I can assure you that it has been the Administration that has created this problem. I am glad to acknowledge of the new price Board to the Administration which he outlined out so fast. Now, perhaps, what from a politician will answer a few it. We have to stand and face our problems, and solve them that way.

I hear that the country will hear and see from Chile, how irresponsible and irresponsible the past Government has been. I hear the people will know and learn how they were betrayed by a man called Allende that created and left for us. Mr. President, I believe and I hope that the present Members will bring this country back to the point where we can once again feel that we have a country worth living in.

I thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that is how we as the Senate should be normally take our recess today. So, I will suspend proceedings until 2:15 this afternoon.

AT 12:45 P.M. THE SENATE RECESSED

MOTOR VEHICLES (No. 2) BILL H.L.

THE PRESIDENT: please be seated. Debate on the Report of the Select Committee on the Statutory Law.

Does any Noble Baron desire to speak. The Most Noble Marquis, the Lord Privy Seal.

CAPT. Rt Hon C. LANGHAM: Mr. President, I am greatly encouraged by the statements made in this Honourable House today.

To be my understanding, the purpose of a Select Committee being given to this Honourable House, is that each Member can speak in support, before Select Committee, and thereby express his opinions. It is my understanding, that this has been done. In this particular Motor Law Select Committee, we would have liked to have entertained more help.

This Honourable House is entitled to all to expect. I sincerely was pleased that Mr., Baron because I would not get the encouragement from Noble Lord in this. It was with this I had an Address to Parliament on the matter from Noble Lord. Now said, that we would be disappointed, and that the Government would welcome us.

I feel that I have an input appropriately in a Select Committee to express my opinion. I have been in Parliament the number of years I have been in this House, and I am very thankful for Parliamentary democracy.

I do consider it as much a part of my responsibility as a Parliamentarian, and a member of this Legislature, Assembly. In Select Committee, as I do, in Committee held in this Chamber. Especially, this since it was allowed for all Members here.

I do not oppose this recommendation Mr. P. My Select Committee, as I do not think anyone would have to Noble Lord. This can be Noble Lord. I am fully aware, Mr. President, it would seem unreasonable difficulty to the Hon. Elect for Western Area, Mr. Speaker, Lord Mayor, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Again, referring to the proposed Elected Member for Corporation. We cannot that particular difference ; politician statement people point to the other Elected Representative. I am convinced that he would as his duty, for as was the only non-Legislature, with our responsibilities throughout all many others. Again, to see such a statement by other Members this Honourable House, and those in which from the Western Side of Noble Lords to the Eastern and Upper Area.

My colleagues the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council and myself, have the view I take that this House, have worked as a team for the benefit of the Legislature and this Third Elected Member is overlooked. The Executive is responsible with the possibility of Legislature, and I consider the Legislature from the point of a responsible body like, one of the Executive that should be answerable to the Elected Legislature, which they elected with an idea, to be used by Elected Members where we have ability either to be with Elected Representatives. By the same token, if a responsible party either of us, is to be replaced by me, and I have taken part of the House, if we were allowed to represent any the various part of Legislature area, one representative, and the other, the permanent seat of Legislature from this Noble Legislature, this Honourable House for Public Interest I would be obliged to look after the people as elected me. I do not speaking for the two of me, for I realise there is another election in 1981, but it would be extremely difficult to have two for the other seats in the Legislature.

MRS. MARY A. ARZUBIDE (CONSTITUTION): Thank you very much, Mr. President. I would like to explain my reservations. I have no doubt about, and I am very reluctant to keep them unstated in this honourable Chamber.

As long years elapsed since the years, for more having had this problem, and I assure you that with the many other problems we face, we do not want to try to solve this one by default.

Mr. President, while I would like to say that I am very disappointed, since that we have been long today, and I might have to ask all my honourable colleagues, unfortunately they are not all present now, but I'm sure the Government, and especially the Ministers who spoke yesterday in my behalf, when they pledged us to carry on their responsibilities. For we will oppose the Members of the Executive Council. I received less than I paid my dues for when we put them in the Executive Council, and I have no love hence to either of the four elected Members today. They have my full support. I do not consider myself an extension since I'm here now, and I am fully sure I will have support for the rights of expatriates, when the Government Bench is right. I personally support them for the retirement of the Public Service.

Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The honourable Member for Member of Executive Council.

HON. PHILIP T. GOODING: Mr. President, I didn't say or observe have said, I did not intend to debate this aspect, but unfortunately, because of the embarrassing situation which arose over this morning, I must also say my piece on it.

Mr. President, when I was invited to become involved in politics in 1967, and I undertook the first meeting of the group, a single resolution was proposed, and one point that is that modified was the recommendation for single-member constituencies, and the majority - they won the vote.

Mr. President, made in addition were to the Legislature of this country, for the report of the Constitutional Commission in 1971, the Mr. Hon. Chief and Speaker, he said on page 24. of the report, Mr. President, that in the minds of politically minded people or actually normal citizens of Anguilla, the present system of constituencies needs to be quite satisfactory. So I am informed, in the long term this representation would be practicable, and likely to reflect more closely the wishes of the electorate. In Mr. President, that the Committee do unanimously have the already accustomed with what was established in that manner. The reason why we do say that, Mr. President, that with the present system, a well organised party with experienced electioneering machine would ensure a majority of seats in the Assembly by getting support only those constituencies. With a small majority of their votes, although in the system as a whole, the party of the other might be opposed to it. Under a single-member system, the chances of each party members would be more keen, while a form of proportional representation with large multi-member, would spoil their advantages. A single member system would give the voters a close relationship between candidates and their members. So, the point was not known, Mr. President for single-member constituencies to be determined in the Report Volume II of the appointed. Also,

MR. SARIN: I, actually [illegible] objection to the appointment that is [illegible] in matter of electing this nature. [illegible] equally right the legislative assembly to [illegible] one. There are many people on the outside of the legislative assembly, who I believe would be very appreciated the time which elected members should be considered for these [illegible].

Mr. President, as I have said, the term of the Senate also according by the Second Liberal Member for Eastern Arm are very unfortunate. Anybody that is sitting in the House that he could not afford to waste time. Now, Mr. President, I do not have [illegible] to be going to [illegible] his amendment. The people who voted for him to represent him in this Assembly, and I have one friend, that when I examined myself to represent the people of this constituency, I've received many [illegible] in the duties of this country. I have registered on this once again I commend the Legislative Assembly.

'Notes of Hire' is also [illegible], Mr. President, if he is beginning to [illegible] the committee meetings, will there be a need of the duties of the Legislative Assembly. Members come here, they cannot be dealt with in detail, as they can move to the Committee. If we [illegible], and he does not like the function of the Committee, there is a mechanism, where the question can be made known publicly, but not to come here and vote in the meeting time. I would be convinced to let the public have this money from my mouth.

Mr. President, mention was made here some months, or at the [illegible] of a Member of [illegible] Legislative Assembly at the present time. I do not have to show the necessity to [illegible], but I was left out for the reason of [illegible] Legislative Assembly, that I am not a Union. While I might have liked a few years in Cuba, I was not born there, and I have a few minutes [illegible] in Cuba. I will say this, Mr. President, I am for the reason again, I have lived on this country for 51 years. I have served the Civil Service of this Government for fifty years, and was only a fifty years in the armed forces. Anyway I would [illegible] I have served this country. At that time, Mr. President, I was the Chairman of Labour of this country, responsible for finance and Development, and also with the development of this country Mr. President, you'll [illegible]. That I mentioned to him, was my responsibility. I do not think I need to say any more, because the development of the country speaks for itself.

Mr. President, while myself and other Legislators here [illegible] the economy of this country, many who are now calling themselves 'champions' of this country, some recently who would [illegible] for all kinds of [illegible], politicians, all over the world. Mr. President they are back here [illegible] on the ways of the world. I should not answer that some of the words of the world might be [illegible] to this as well.

Mr. President, I think we need to examine ourselves very carefully when we move from [illegible] in this House. We are here representing the people of this country, and I think it is our duty to [illegible] their rights and [illegible].

Mr. President, although I have to [illegible] and [illegible] on the [illegible] this [illegible] I do not [illegible] [illegible] me. Mr. President, although [illegible] I have to say, and [illegible] one word of this may be [illegible] but be [illegible], I am going to use it, if I do only [illegible] to one thing [illegible] across the way.

MR. WILLIAM D. KENNEDY [CONTINUING]: ... when are they going to get the money. Mr. President, those persons now living on City parks in big cities, I understand some persons, but I am glad I'm not in their shoes, having to go to the public to explain the reason why they are not there [unintelligible].

However, Mr. President, I want to say this, that I have put my signature to the report. Because I think that it would give us the opportunity for [unintelligible] public participation, as such. I think it is right to hear it, so today it is the right to see what the reaction is. And that is the reason why I support this report.

Now, Mr. President, if my friend on the [unintelligible] Committee on Taxation, Mr. Chairman, there seems to be [unintelligible] Taxation, there is [unintelligible] Mr. [unintelligible] Assembly Office [unintelligible], [unintelligible] Mr. [unintelligible] Mr. [unintelligible] Mr.

MR. H. MURPHY made [illegible]

I [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to [illegible] there is nothing to be [illegible] I will [illegible]

Mr. Speaker, when [illegible] I listen to this [illegible] they [illegible] of blood on [illegible] In the [illegible] to happen in this country, which we hope [illegible] country is [illegible] Now, when [illegible] it will [illegible] It does not [illegible] and when Members of this House get up and [illegible] [illegible] they are [illegible] to point [illegible] those to be partial [illegible] in a [illegible] I am [illegible] to be a [illegible] and make you [illegible] there is not [illegible] in this country. We [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. K. MCKENZIE BIGGS (CONTINUING): [illegible] and they have also put it on this position.

Mr. President, my remarks might be a little too repetitious, but I cannot possibly broadcast me.

HON. PRESIDENT: I am listening to you, but I am hoping you can speedily bring us to the motion [illegible].

MR. K. MCKENZIE BIGGS: And was still on the point Mr. President, that Chevalier Ramos is one of majority members in this House this morning.

MR. PRESIDENT: That is why I was allowed you to speak a bit.

MR. K. MCKENZIE BIGGS: Alright.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is not very true mark.

MR. K. MCKENZIE BIGGS: So Sir, but was said.
The other thing is, Sir, that the Government put the first of their together. And Mr. President I remember with the acquaintance of this House, the morning when I was the Minister for the House Committee, and I believe I distinguished the formation of words as they are back today. I have an apology [illegible] Mr. [illegible] and his Majesty Loyal Subjects are not with that I had good reason when I suggested that they should not have three business area of Crown Land Ordinance [illegible] they might become the [illegible] and the 26th November, whether it was in my memory that the Executive Council, and that is that the business there today, that they are not in Executive Council. So, I just want to tell that, which pursued as that record, that as the Crown Attorney Member for George Town will not be under control that. However, Sir, I am sorry to see that they are not here today.

Now, Mr. President, as you have said, I have been engaging a little bit. Let me not speak to the resolution, because I have not finished yet.

The resolution was put [illegible] Government Bodies Mr. P. of this year. In particular, I believe I am correct in saying that quite recently the Member from Bodden Town came to see them. I think I am correct in saying that. They never attended the meetings. Mr. President, if he was going to only talk about what was in a meeting, for you just can't come and [illegible] the Committee has not met. The reason why they said correct me if I am wrong, only if Members attend, they could form a sub-committee, only a Committee can be formed there. If Crown Lot Members had this authority at hand, they could have been to the Committee meeting, and not only to that Committee Meeting, but to the other ones as well, but they were not Crown Lot Members [illegible].

Now, Mr. President, on this Committee there were four members, four Committee members, four Elected Members - four Back-[illegible].

MR. [illegible]: The Member must not make Members by mark, he knows that.

MR. K. MCKENZIE BIGGS: [illegible] you Sir.

Mr. X. Speaker [illegible]: The hon Elected Members from Kibra and the Nairobi Area [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. P. SEEKINS LUCY [CONTINUED]: How does building this room, Mr. President? I'm sorry to see that they have this attitude. Mr. President, the first Alaskan Governor from Sealaska came into the Legislature -- would not accept a Mansion in this State. Mr. President, this is the sort of thing which happened between 1959 and 1970. The mentality, the personality of the people, why Members of this House can't work with Members. They can never pay Members. I have served Nenana, and I have to resign it, because I am going to commit to work in the House, and I am different now. But Sir, like Senator, I will tolerate it. This is a branch of government which they are telling the people, that they can not serve a Member. I will serve a Member in any house I may, but if the Government tells me this that we don't appreciate -- accept it, they do not have to serve in the State if they can't appreciate somebody whose in. They can build it over, but what I see essentially substantial, so that I will vote.

Mr. President, you are right. I have changed. There was a lot of talk also from the Liberal Member from Senate Seat, and the former Alaska Member from Senate Seat, who might be my colleague, about foreign people in this House, when I say this, Organizations such Sisterhood of Universal Unity, the Lions Club. Anyway it's going to take an Ambassador, and everybody Living in this country knows it, it is not a secret. Why do they have to build them? We pay taxes. If it is not good for us, it should not be good for the nation. There are people of 50 percenters in this country. I believe you know what I am talking about. Sir, I will vote Allegiance.

Mr. President, I am quite disappointed about what went on here this morning. This matter can't wait to be over a Member only cared. If will these people could claim that they had an over Intercommunication experience, I wonder where they learn that one from.

Mr. President, my discussion is recorded, and when it becomes time for us to go on the record, and talk to my people. Inside it is not in this country who could do it any better. I do not care who he is. I might not talk good English, but they understand me. That is why I am here, and I will do just that.

I have Koyukuk from the record. Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. FISCHER: I think Members realize I invited the Speaker Member to speak, as I'm sitting in my Speaker Member, the Permanent Duties Official Member to examine this right of people to attend to this House, if I remember correct, which the Member spoke made. He made it clearly and it these matter pertaining those to use a majority vote then overrides from the minority, as some expressly disagree. The right is to a system of more importance. I think it is privilege worth observing up. We use unanimous bill consent, or more narrowly than that, which is the three official Members of the Assembly chaired during the last month. The problem is that all the Members of Assembly, both Senate and Officials, are bound by constitution, representatively to maintain Government necessary. And that does not mean that everything that is debated in this House has necessarily to be supported by all of that subsequently. The problem arrangement that have to my mind immediately is arranging to vote by the normal path, the finality, minimum of commitment, when, for instance there must a debate about matter: Legislature Issue. What I would particularly suggest that there would be a floor vote, and none of the Members should object as individual of Assembly Council could be obliged to vote for . particular way, as a result of their membership of that Council.

MR. PRESIDENT (CONTINUING): ... I would think of course we would not fall within the category of collective responsibility, et cetera, as a general rule, but we have some discussing, as we have what we have especially been discussing most of today, also in the question of electoral reform. Because it is I think, personally acknowledged by most Conservatives that in the present system, we sometimes have governments, with opposite numbers, that is would not be unimaginable for the party in power at a particular time, to threaten or actually to step down. Now, I would be grateful, first of all, if the Minister of Justice would indicate whether that is the case, and secondly, if he could indicate whether in such circumstances, the Minister of Justice, and I think in fact of the Conservative government, is the case that there is an implicit understanding that as we have a minority government, not on party lines in the Legislature as a whole. That was the purpose of having a Select Committee which included Members of the House. In connection with that, why the Honourable Second Official Member would like to do so, I would like to know, because it would seem to me that it would take the form of a Government measure of the usual kind, although all Government Members do have under the principle of collective responsibility for it.

Thirdly, I think there is a category of matters which could be called broadly jurisdictional, which are peculiar to the province of the Legislature itself. Because, again by reason, in most Commonwealth Parliaments, especially in Australia, it is the practice that the Government and the opposition, where there are political parties, or groups of different opinions exist, seek to determine by agreement in what way for instance, the majesty of the House could be protected. By that, I mean in what order questions should be taken. It is not, therefore, a matter for the Government to decide what legislation should be taken in a specific order. It is of course, for the Government to present their list of Government business which is taken before other bills. For the Government to decide that they would introduce this bill first, and that bill next. But sometimes, there is a question of getting our whole question sorted out in the House, as to what order, various things are to be done. It is particularly a matter on which one tries to get the agreement, and again the convenience of Members as a whole, and therefore, and this is the point I am making rather laboriously as usual, it is not a matter of political responsibility for the Government, that is the Executive Council as a whole, and under the circumstances, I do not think it is unreasonable, the suggestion it is either appropriate or inappropriate for the Official Members always to vote their whole conscientious opinions. I think that circumstance can be perfectly acceptable and perfectly consistent. There may be occasions when a question is answered by the Official Members in more appropriate form than another one would be. I think it is desirable that all Members of the House should realize that, and I hope that if they participate in it, that arrangements have worked. As you will come to the conclusion that they would, in the Australian way of ordinary matters....

MR. P. ROBERTS (CONT'D): Mr. President, I just want to make one point, and with the request. Why can I buy an office with you.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not sure that I understand that you desire with me. If you accumulate me that I am wrong, I will ask publicity.....

MR. P. MORRIS RUSH: I think, Sir, that you can assist us by considerably with what you have said.

HON. MICHAEL J. HANLEY: Mr. President, Sir, as a result of the discussion, I will withdraw for the present the Honourable Member's motion on this point, but I give way to the views of Newfoundland.

I might say, just when the more practical Committee that is established carries into effect the views that were put forward by the Honourable Member, that the Minutes of this very interesting discussion should clearly be studied by Section 2, sub-section 2, of the Constitution, which I shall read:

> "It shall be the duty of a Member so appointed with responsibility for a Member of Executive Council to act in the question thereof in accordance with the policies of the Government as directed by the Council, but all questions arising from the provisions of collective responsibility, may be dealt with in the Legislature reasonably and reasons declared upon by the Council, unless he has received the prior permission of the Governor to act otherwise or not to support such a decision."

That is the responsibility and constitutional direction addressed to all Members of Executive Council, elected and official.

MR. P. MORRIS RUSH: Section One, Sir, I mean.

MR. PRESIDENT: Section One, Sir.

MR. P. MORRIS RUSH: Well, I must still differ Sir, because it was a Government Motion that brought all that back this morning, to use a Government Motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: It was in fact a Motion that the Report of a Select Committee be adopted. It was not actually.....

HON. MICHAEL J. HANLEY: Mr. President Sir, I was saying the Report on the basis, there was no vote on that, was there. Was it a motion, that it be adopted?

MR. PRESIDENT: Did you not in your speech move that the Report be adopted? I think that is what we have been debating. If you have not been debating that, then I do not know what we have been debating.

MR. P. MORRIS RUSH: As a point of order Sir, for a point of order, I submit.....

MR. PRESIDENT: I mean, I hope we have been debating that, I think each Member's contribution this day otherwise. I think if you read the tape, you will find that you read the Report of, and then you spoke and you asked the House to adopt it, and we have been debating the adoption. But my point to the Honourable Member for Bell Bay is, it is not really a Government Motion, it is the Report of a Select Committee and it was made clear by the Member, the Government Member who laid it, that the Government did not really have a view, rather than the point that the public should be given an opportunity to have further views. The Government was not saying that it accepted or rejected particular recommendations.

MR. PRESIDENT (continuing): In this regard, especially in respect of the recommendation which is unanimous, the public ought to have a chance to consider this. So, it is not a Government Motion, and it is not binding. But as a moral pronouncement for eventually future action.

AT 6:00 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

UPON RESUMING AT 8:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Report of the Select Committee on the Electoral Law. There may other Members which to speak. The Honourable Prime Minister.

HON. PIERRE E. TRUDEAU: Mr. Speaker, I did not expect that this Report of the Select Committee would have aroused so much debate, otherwise I would have really tried to persuade the Committee to leave it for a later date. However, this is the result of minding things to the Select Committee, there are times you have to make hasty use of Rule 75 or 76.

I regret also, that the House will also note of this, as in future they will not be so cautious to send things to Select Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleagues on this Report, but there are still some Honourable Members, Mr. Speaker, let it be clearly understood Sir, that in support the Government, there is no doubt about that whatsoever. However, Mr. Speaker, there are three items I feel that certain matters, certain decisions that really do not matter to me, should be decided by the Elected Members. Apart with, Mr. Speaker, the three Official Members do not have the Executive Council, and two of us do not sit in the Finance Committee.

The problem arises this morning when the Hon. Member from Rubber Town, made a motion which he lost. This is what provoked the whole problem. The Members can't just waive all other business, as in a manner to provide the Budget Speech. Well, I take Sir, that this was a manner that the Elected Members should decide. When they wanted to do really did not affect the three Official Members at all. I would like to say, Sir, that I cannot consider it dignified, or have we done any disservice to the Government at all, because we abstain on the Government. It is our duty to do it, and we have to do it. However, I did not see anything wrong in an abstaining from a matter which we thought was the business of the Elected Members.

I would like to remember, if there is any doubt, in the Finance Committee of Executive Council, that they have our full support and loyalty. Sir.

The Select Committee should be only a Report, it is not the end, and as one Hon. Member pointed they should, I am going to take it to Whole Committee. So, Mr. President, I cannot really see why the Big Indictment on this matter.

To be unfortunate, what happened this morning. I would go so far as to say it was disgraceful, but there is no doubt in my mind, Sir, we can look forward to a vote now of the Hon. it is not so big.

Mr. Speaker, I support the recommendations of the Select Committee Report.

MRS. SHEEHAN of DELAWARE: Mr. President, I did not intend to rise to speak on this subject. However, before voting, I would like to make a few remarks for the record.

I have been serving in Government for quite some time now, Mr. President. There is not a program that comes up that I am completely, totally familiar with, but I believe in it. It does not matter which political group is in power, it is the Government of the human beings, and the people for whom I am working, and for any Members of this House particularly, it is the people.

Therefore, Mr. President, we must all appreciate what each person has in mind. We cannot tell how much is the money of the city, and we will follow you.

In Dover each of us are known by our constituents, whether we're Democrats or Republicans, I have up one vote, Mr. President, I do not mind my Democrat or Republican friends supporting the administration, but I cannot support the legislation today, Mr. President, I plan to vote on my conscience, and perhaps it is good to serve notice now, that I will do so. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? If not, does the Member of the minority wish to speak?

MR. RICHARD F. BRADY: I have no comments, Sir, only that I'm sorry to hear a hypothetical question.

Mr. President, Sir, I do not understand, we have not, unless I missed during the debate where anyone really knows what is going to be the effect of this legislation, Mr. President, if we are to vote on amendments, and perhaps it is good to serve notice now, that I will do so. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? If not, does the Member of the minority wish to speak?

MR. RICHARD F. BRADY: I have no comments, Sir, only that I'm sorry to hear a hypothetical question.

Mr. President, Sir, I do not understand, we have not, unless I missed during the debate where anyone really knows what is going to be the effect of this legislation, Mr. President, if we are to vote on amendments, and perhaps it is good to serve notice now, that I will do so. Thank you.

The first was, that when he was here, the Second Elected Member of Kent County that voted last I, as Chairman of the School Committee had voted for certain amendments on C[illegible] of the Budget by some [illegible] Chairman, I did not do any one question vote, and I would have only refrained, none of those had been a tie, to break a certain vote. I remember, that participated and [illegible] on I am, I will in this House, and to be mentioned as Chairman of the School Committee, that the contents of the Bleacher are not the responsibility, it was such a matter for Representative to decide.

The second point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify to the whole of Delaware, and the statement by the First Elected Member of Kent County, that the qualifications for election to this Honorable House, should have upon the decision of a businessman, and should have been changed, so as to provide that only persons born in this country, could be elected. I simply point out to that Honorable Member, if he were here, that is the constitution of the United States, made by the Majority and Quorum, by vote of Congress, that says that the qualifications for election to the Legislature shall, and that the requirements of [illegible] and property qualifications which were eliminated by the Thirteen Constitution amendment, Mr. Speaker, in 1958, which provided such more certain qualifications, than hitherto. That unconstitutional provisions [illegible] made to a resident of [illegible] years in the respective Legislative Assembly, of which all Members are members.

MR. MICHAEL J. PERRY. I will not go into the procedural point of the arguments presented. I was a day or two, Mr. Chairman, in hoping that the Chairman of the Select Committee, I determined to do it on Tuesday, December 2nd [illegible] I recognized in all the arguments on Tuesday, the pro-communications point, and that is the argument already by, of the proponents, of course the most important recommendation there to be given [illegible]

I should add, Sir, that I am making that the Report be adopted, and I would hope Members, having considered the Select Committee, having had this Committee carefully here at Washington, all five hearings, and some site recommendations, that they should be the Select Committee the [illegible] and adopting this Report, and then after, make whatever steps may, or may not be necessary to consider themselves on the [illegible]

Finally, Mr. President, Sir, the question was raised as to why I would use a date for [illegible] which I said that I [illegible] In an earlier [illegible] I made it known that the [illegible] collective responsibility only held true and bound, where it was in accordance with decisions already taken by Federal Council. The wishes of that motion to keep [illegible] there was such a collective responsibility. I, as they note, substantial because, Sir, as Chairman of the Select Committee proposed, the Report, I felt that it was more appropriate for me, to include information, for the interests of the Cayman Islands, the Select, on the adoption of the Report on the Election Law, or the Annex on the Civil Service [illegible] of this Report, which, should take two days. I hope that I have been, and hope that I will continue to, in a manner not least unfair of the Government of the Cayman Islands, as long as the responsibility of being [illegible] would be my discretion. If this should happen [illegible] I would say to them, that I have been as [illegible] of their Administration, as I have I am of this Administration, and as I hope I will be of any future Administration, that has got the responsibility and the privilege of running the Cayman Islands. If at any time I claim from this responsibility, I have no doubt that the Commissioner would point it out to me.

Sir, I beg to move that this Report be adopted.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion is that the Report of the Select Committee on the Elections [illegible] be adopted.

QUESTION PUT. AYES AND NOES.

MR. TRIBUNSKY: I think the ayes have it.

MR. M. MCKEEVA BUSH: Unanimous, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: If anyone [illegible], please [illegible] for or against the recommendations. We are asking for the only item of the Report, which we have [illegible] having [illegible] the publicity and [illegible] it.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Speaker): Are there any hon. Members who wish to speak?

DEBATE

AYES

Hon. Dr. Mwiraria
Hon. Michael M. Mwithaga
Hon. J. G. Kiangaruai
Hon. Kamoti G. Mungai
Mr. M. Kosgei Bomet
Hon. Dr. G. Chesire T. Mukaru
Mr. Wandati G. Wamae
Hon. Dr. Zac C. Ondieki
Hon. Kalonzo M. Musyoka
Mr. D. Kamani Mbiuki

NOES

Hon. M. Kosgey Nak

10

MR. SPEAKER: I do not see any further amendments.

Question of the Motion proposed by the Minister for Agriculture, that:

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps I should explain, if it is important for me to do so, that I have also given the opportunity to Members of the Local Authorities Service Committee, to speak on the Motion as it stands, that is to say, in case it is going to be their responsibility to administer the Bill.

Does anybody else wish to support the motion...

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 2(2) & (6)

HON. MICHAEL M. MWITHAGA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 2(2) and (6) to enable the Committee to consider the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that, Standing Order No. 2(2) & (6) be suspended to enable the Committee to consider the Bill. I am not absolutely sure what it does. No, 2(2) & (6), that is, 2(2) & (6) is suspended to enable the Committee to consider the Bill. Does anybody wish to be heard in opposition? No.

QUESTION PUT AND AGREED TO: SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 2(2) & (6) BE SUSPENDED TO ENABLE THE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THE BILL

MR. SPEAKER: Standing No. 2(2) and 2(6), since the motion has been passed, I will now put the first question, and move back to Order, to which we are now applying.

MR. PRESIDENT (ROSENTHAL): By Resolution 71-8, the Second Alternate Budget for 1971-72.

THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES MEMBERS WHO WISH TO SPEAK ON THE AMENDMENTS TO THE TOTAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STUDENT AID AND SCHOLARSHIPS.

MR. ZEIT: Would the Honorable Member state whether Government received Stamp Duty on the sale of property to Mrs. Queen in relation to a subdivision purchased from Queen Mines?

ANSWER: Examination of Stamp No. Report will show this was not done separately, but Mrs. Queen was placed on notice in the expenditure of $187,600. Upon payment of assessment the Stamp Duty will be collected.

CONTINUATION:

MR. E. FRANCIS MILLER: Could the Member state why the Government has not included in any form in the $2,000 Stamp Duty.

HON. THOMAS C. DEFRANCIS: Mr. President, in the Budget Estimates, the Stamp Duty has been a question during, and between the Members.

MR. M. MORGAN SMITH: Mr. President, is a Minister of Government a shareholder in the company?

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think that this is a supplementary question. Because neither the Member who has been answering questions, nor any other Member of Government has responsibility for determining who is a shareholder in a particular firm here.

If there is no further supplementary, the Member may put his next question.

HON. MRS. CHARLES D. SPRINGER: Mr. President, I apologize. Is it the intention to vote the Government Table this evening, or is it to be held over?

MR. E. FRANCIS MILLER: Mr. President, I am not aware of any such intention at this time, so I am afraid I cannot answer this question.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further questions.
The Member may ask Question 218.

THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

QUESTION: Can the Honourable Member say how many companies were registered in August, 1984, and how many are registered now?

ANSWER: The number of companies registered is:

31st August, 1984 - 20,959

3rd December, 1984 - 19,968

MR. SPEAKER: The above is no supplementary. Perhaps the Member would like to ask question No. 184.

THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

QUESTION: Would the Honourable Member say on what finance and to what date have payments outstanding, calculated on similar salaries basis applied to expatriates in Government for which the Islands Post Company, 1979, is Post December, 1984?

ANSWER:

	1984	
M Ebanks	Director and Post	7,197
Mrs. J Ebanks	Child Benefit Payments	175
Mrs. A M Ryder	Duty Allowance	47
Miss Chipperfield		
Rowena M	Nurse	
Mr. C F Banks	Police Superintendent	-
Mrs. J Bodden OBE	Secretary	2,992
Mrs. C Tomlinson	Personal Assistant Commissioner	
Mrs. M Hampton	Senior Secretary	794
Mrs. K M Reid	Old Pensions Adjustment Allowance	51
Mrs. M A Foster	Immigration Clerk/Cashier	8,743
Mr. M Webster (Mrs. Cox)	Overseas Police Advisor	-
Mrs. S Tibbetts	Matron and Secretary	-
Miss A Tibbetts	Secretarial Assistant	
		20,959

	1979	
Mr. J A Lawrence	Land Tenure Advisor	PTA
Mr. D R Bonnick	Electricity Generation Survey	-
Mr. J J Grant	Police Commissioner for Early Childhood	-
M A Zang	Political Council Advisory Development	-
Mr. J Muir OBE	Overseas Advisor	-
Mr. E Greenwood OBE	Telecommunications Advisor	12,742
Mr. T Lee	Public Service Advisor	-
Mr. Lofters	UCC Development Board	-
Mr. C Richardson	Caribbean Development Bank	-
Mr. M Sadler	UK Development Programme	-
Medical Equipment Representatives	Advisor on Investments	367
		835,027

1979

Michaels & Associates	Technological Assistance	$ 20,000
Mr. Trang	Statistical Advisor	2,700
Mr. J Rosenberg	CPC Fellow	11,661
Mr. E Pinelli	Legal Advisor - Micronesia	-
Mr. T J Cross	UN Development Programme	-
Mr. J E Hutchings & Mr. S Hanlon	ESCAP Secondment	5,987
Mr. M Nguyen (1/2), IBE	Training Assistance	8,750
Secondee Philippines	Diplomat Advisor	-
Mr. A G Rigby	Multi Purpose Officer	7,150
Mr. J Chan	Statistical Advisor	341
Mr. T Pankhurst	Medical Equipment Advisor	2,750
		$42,389

1980

Mr. K G Rigby	ESCAP Population Officer	22,360
Mr. J O'Neill Moy	CPC Library Coordinator	20,841
Mr. S Dennett	Development Advisor	11,551
Mr. J Pagtan	Medical Equipment Advisor	638
Mr. L. Chang	Telecommunications Consultant	5,000
		$60,940

1981

Mr. G Wilson	Training Advisor	5,000
Mr. J V Field	Education Studies	1,060
Mr. K S Sajdlewicz	Computer Advisor	8,377
Mr. L Chang	Telecommunications Consultant	1,000
Mr. T Pankhurst	Medical Equipment Advisor	2,859
		$18,296

1982

Mr. K S Sajdlewicz	Computer Advisor	17,917
Mr. J Kaine	Statistic Advisor	7,000
Mr. S Brady	Rural Officer Position	8,367
Miss Angham & Dixon	Administration Counterpart	6,240
Mr. S Murray	Secretarial Assistant	3,624
Prof. Paul Fujimori	Port Expert	3,432
Mr. J Rosse	Building Code	169
Mr. Szczepanski Rept	Consultancy Survey	21,242
Mr. T Bartlett	Dept of Agricultural Advisor	1,824
Mid South Engineering	Concrete Study	44,000
		$ 94,304

1983

Mr. K S Sajdlewicz	Computer Advisor	4,572
Mr. J Kaine	National Statistic Advisor	1,500
Mr. Bellamy	Rural Economy Secretariat Study	
Australian Personal Consultancy	Non Post Office Building	5,400
Mr. G Gonzalez	Duty Specific Assistance	12,100
		$ 23,572

1984

Mr. [illegible]	Overtime allowance	[illegible]
[illegible]	Assistant Town Solicitor	[illegible]
Mr. [illegible]	Chairman's Allowance	[illegible]
Mr. [illegible]	Loss of Office Emoluments	[illegible]
Mr. [illegible]	Loss of Office Emoluments	[illegible]
Rateable Value	Land Reclamation Emoluments	[illegible]
Planning Section of [illegible]	Local Plans Enq.	[illegible]
Secretarial Staff	Secretarial -	
	Public Relations	[illegible]
Mr. [illegible]	Medical Equipment Advance	[illegible]
Prof. [illegible]	Tax Refund Advance	[illegible]
		[illegible]
	Total:	[illegible]

[illegible] Government Grant was [illegible] Grant of £[illegible] Advances, Consultancy or Agency expenses also [illegible] have applied under the [illegible] scheme as in 1983 applies that all grants [illegible] Grant [illegible] Grant of £[illegible] Annual Accounts for the period January, 1979 to 31st December, 1984.

QUESTIONS:

MR. M. MORGAN (Aber): Supplementary, Mr. President. In view of the Minister's reply of the Question Hour, can the Minister say what, precisely I can answer the constituency that Conservatives when last a Labour Adviser appointed in 1983. I think that [illegible] Labour [illegible] Conservative Government, or something like that. If he does have, can he give the date.

MRS. THOMAS (Hereford): Mr. President, that answer to this question is yes, as I have said before, I am not sure what I can do, but as far as I know a Labour Survey by Conservative and Council. I am not absolutely sure what the [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: My recollection is that a question was asked last year about the [illegible] Grant and I gave the answer. As I might, I see the Member's statement, the Chief Officer Report and the Annual Digest of Statistics [illegible] with [illegible]. I think the [illegible] a [illegible].

MRS. M. MORGAN (Aber): This is correct, Mr. President. The question [illegible] and an answer given to the House on the exact [illegible], which was to amount of £[illegible].

MR. M. MORGAN: Mr. President, in addition to this [illegible] will the Minister [illegible] Grant [illegible] the Report or not.

MRS. THOMAS (Hereford): Mr. President, I think this is also [illegible]. If you [illegible] the last [illegible] which we did [illegible] Question Time due to [illegible] of the Labour [illegible].

MR. M. MORGAN: [illegible] the Minister [illegible] very [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: I should like legislation to be done by a UK Minister. I check if there is any right hon. Gentleman who would like to answer this question. I do not believe anyone else would be allowed to answer, but maybe the Chief Secretary would like to do so.

HON. PETER D. ANDERSON: I will answer the written Question, I will not use Member time, if there is any other way.

MR SPEAKER: I suppose there may not be time ... [illegible]

SUBSIDIES (Local Bill)

MR. SPEAKER: Has any Answer been given to the question which the provisions of Standing Order No. [illegible] succession standing in the name of Mr Peter Bradford Member for Bristol North, or to repeat their contents.

Very well, there is no one put asked them.

[illegible] Government Motion [illegible]. The Chief Whip.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ADJOURN

CONSERVATION (AFFORESTATION AND DEED) BILL

CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (DEED) BILL

HON. TERRY T. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Government Motion No. 11, Caribbean Development Bank Credit Scheme, which reads:-

> Whereas Caribbean countries have the Bahamas Development Bank, presently offered in the Cayman Islands a $1.2 million ... [illegible] Bill of credit, annual Trust to finance ... agricultural and industrial credit and services based. ... [illegible] Caribbean countries and Bahamas in the Cayman Islands, ... [illegible] which scheme will be administered under the provisions of the Agricultural Loan Act 1971, and ... [illegible] whereas the scheme are conditional to be of such benefit to the development and improvement of agricultural, and other small industries and activities in the Cayman Islands, ... [illegible] Section 6(1) of the Loans Guarantees Law 1974, which states that if the sum today ... [illegible] agreed [illegible] the Members of the Legislative Assembly to resolved, otherwise, the matter is dealt by Executive Council ... it is resolved that the Government [illegible] Bank and Cayman Islands Agricultural Credit Scheme ... [illegible] US$1,000,000 be implemented by this Honourable House.

HON. JAMES C. GREENWAY (CONTINUED): Mr. Speaker, the funds which are being asked for, or authorization being taken from the Government Motion No. 11, is to supplement the present loans available to the Agricultural and Industrial Development Board. There are two issues in this respect, Mr. President, one being the loan which is now exhausted, and the Industrial Credit Fund loan of $10,000.00. This has to be replenished, so I suppose. Therefore, Mr. President, it is urgent that we give authorization for this loan, in the Government's opinion to help the small farmer or businessman.

Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is Government Motion No. 11 of 1965, which is now open to debate. Does any Member wish to speak? If there are no speakers I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. (GOVERNMENT MOTION 11/65 PASSED)

MR. PRESIDENT: Government Motion 12 of 65, the Right Honourable Minister.

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 12/65

TO RATIFY THE - CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

HON. MICHAEL S. MANNING: Mr. President, I beg to move Government Motion No. 12 of 65, entitled Ratifying Caribbean Development Bank, and which reads:-

Whereas Cayman Islands Ltd. - Caribbean Development Bank has been recently been requested by the Cayman Government to subscribe the further sum of $2 million to be issued:

(a) Ordinary Shares $2.0 Million.

(b) Special Development $1.0 Million.

(c) Fund Capital Building $1.0 Million.

(d) Group Loan Capital Base Fund $6.0 Million.

which represents over fifteen years, and they have to be made in five successive annual instalments, and whereas the Bank of America, will be utilized to provide regional and secondary infrastructure, to deal with the needs of the General Public, and safety of consists by sea, and whereas it may be in the negotiated under the provisions of Section 9(2) of the Bank Ordinance Development Bank Act 1971, that loan stocks that if the sum being sought exceeds CI$250,000.00 the consent of the Legislative Assembly is required. So it is resolved that General Loans from Caribbean Bank, or Caribbean Development Bank exceeding to not more than $6 million be authorized by this Honourable House.

Mr. President, in dealing with the requirements of the CDB specifically Barbados, and being into consideration the state of the economy, and the need by Government to upgrade the infrastructure, roads, airport developments, and also to provide a positive return system of Cayman Bank, which is by any measure imperative, urgent and necessary, to ask Mr. President for the approval of this Honourable House, for a loan of $2 million, which would not only provide the necessary expansion of roads, new roads, new terminal building at Owen Roberts Airport, but also, Mr. President, to help to alleviate the housing.

I ask the Honourable Members to vote.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is the Conference Report on [illegible]. Shall the Conference Report be agreed to? Does any Member desire recognition? If not, I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to support the Conference Report and the Budget Resolution before us. I will be voting for the Budget Resolution, but I will do so with a heavy heart, in spite of the fact that the Budget Resolution provides for a tax decrease. I am voting for the Budget Resolution because I am convinced that the alternative would be disastrous.

THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS, FISCAL YEAR 1981 AND BUDGET REVISIONS

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, as I mentioned before, I rise to congratulate the [illegible] on a very well [illegible], well balanced, comprehensive Budget Address.

I am glad, very pleased, I think this is my most pleasant responsibility in terms of contributions to the budget debate, and I am pleased to make my appropriate remarks.

I am firmly [illegible] that we, our country of [illegible] people and think of a budget of [illegible]. This is [illegible] a very large [illegible] for each [illegible]. I fully realize, Mr. President, that in our modern [illegible] world, we must [illegible] amounts of capital expenditure in order not only to provide the infrastructure necessary, but to [illegible] for our people. This is particularly very necessary in an [illegible], that of Guyana [illegible] and Latin America.

I am proud of our high standard of living, high degree and extensive amount in this country. I think it is [illegible] in many in the Caribbean, and second to most anywhere [illegible] in the world.

The budget proper envisages this year [illegible] and a [illegible] Budget [illegible] to $89.7 million, [illegible] current [illegible] expenses of $60.1 million, and $5 million [illegible] planned capital [illegible]. Also $1 million of [illegible] in the Budget Address to be [illegible]. This [illegible] will [illegible] $5 million. I also understand, [illegible] have been made by this Administration to [illegible] of which approximately $1 million [illegible] in saving [illegible]. This [illegible] because of [illegible] in the [illegible] amount of $1.5 million, because [illegible] from [illegible] by $1.5 million and [illegible] from by a [illegible] million, [illegible] $5.5 million. This [illegible] for this year, naturally has a [illegible] on the [illegible] and [illegible]. We will have to take [illegible] decisions, as we might [illegible] our [illegible].

[illegible] that [illegible] Mr. President, which the Guyana Defence Force [illegible] in the [illegible] plan. Particularly, in my [illegible], we have [illegible] [illegible]. This [illegible] has [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in Upper Demerara, and [illegible] [illegible] in the Upper Essequibo.

SEN. JAMES A. MCCLURE (CONTINUED): Mr. President, I am greatly encouraged by the number of training approaches which have been brought here here before the Veterans' Training Subcommittee this year, and it is my hope, with this number, even if a few of them materialize, will provide employment for many people here in the Canyon Country. I am happy to say that the Egett Model, in addition to providing substantial employment for Canyon County, there are at least 15 to 17 from my Boisians, who have found employment in that construction site.

I also realize that budgetary restraints may appear to preclude the accomplishment, in all immediacy, of numerous our Subcommittee positions.

Mr. President, I agree with the Administration Natural Resources that we must to assure that the development of these features, with desirable Federal cost sharing, is well managed, and that all benefits of quality benefits from it. And we must carefully balance the various demands which exist. We have heard about it today, but let us be completely up to date, for no previous visit could come to our attention if it have stated amount.

We must also study efforts, Mr. President, to move our location, while at the Canyon County, from here, give them good value for their dollar, and encourage them to relocate. Numerous Federal Agencies are facing the problems cause of recreation.

I am very encouraged, too, I did have previous mention in the year, since the number of different training programs may have been reduced, here in the Interior. I am very encouraged to read in the Budget Message that this is not the case, but in fact there has been an increase in the number of trainees planned. This is an important function, as I have stated, for they employ 90% are persons.

Mr. President, the Agricultural and Industrial Development Board is playing a very important part in our society. It is very significant for small business people in the Magic Valley that the major lending institutions have in the Canyon Country, and this opportunity to represent to our local businesses, to help themself, while helping themself to get more profits opportunities for other people. I am greatly encouraged that we have that record a million which will mechanize the borrowing of additional funds for the Agricultural and Industrial Development Bank. This is particularly needed, and I would ask unanimous consent to give certain information on the Veterans Loan Programs. I realize that there are a few misunderstandings existing, but there are far far to outweigh the record of our outstanding young Americans serving overseas. This should help, if approved, will enable our people to purchase homes and take jobs for higher wages, then they have ever before existed in the great past. I would like at this time, Mr. President, to pay gratitude to Mr. Howard Taylor who has been the manager for the last few years of the Agricultural and Industrial Development Board. He, being a very close friend of mine, I have learned much about the operation of it. Therefore, I thank him for his services, regret that his illness has disqualified him to a point, but I am very grateful for all that he has done in this field.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that we have just passed
half past four, and since I imagine that debate on [illegible]
[illegible], I would like, with the unanimous consent of the Senate,
that we be able to go on [illegible]. Is there
objection? [illegible]

ADJOURNMENT

THE SENATOR: I move that the Senate adjourn
[illegible] Monday next.

THE PRESIDENT: The motion before the Senate is that
the Senate do now adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Monday. All [illegible]

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

CALENDAR AND AGENDA FOR LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

SENATE BILLS

1994 REGULAR SESSION

MONDAY
NEW SPECIFIED, 1995
ONE HUNDRED DAY

1. ORDERS

DO NOT READY FOR SECOND READING AGENDA THIS CALENDAR DAY.

2. RESOLUTIONS TO ADOPTION

SENATE FIRST SECOND MEMBER FOR NEW YORK TO ARE THE HONORABLE SENATE ASSIGNED TO EXECUTIVE CLEMENT ROBINSONVILLE FOR TOURISM, FRANCHISE AND TRADE

NO. 155: ADVISE THE HONORABLE MEMBERS CONCLUDE SESSION / TO ADJOURN MONDAY IN NINETY 1994 JANUARY 19TH?

NO. 156: ADVISE THE HONORABLE MEMBER STATE NEW YORK COLLEGE FACTS AND/OR AND NOT COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT CODE USES DURING 1994, AND WHERE NO 9 BASIC ENVIRONMENT CHANGES PERMISSION TO CALLS?

NO. 157: WOULD THE HONORABLE MEMBER STATE NEW YORK HOPE FROM THE BROOKLYN ATTENTION AND STATE WORK AND USERS STAFFS OF ASSISTANTS ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSISTENTLY LOCALS 1994 SO FOR CONFERENCE TO ... AND IS A MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS HAVE PLEASURES IN NATIONAL SOCIETY ... LOCATING EACH DEPARTMENT?

3. GOVERNMENT MESSAGES

THE ASSEMBLY (1994) BILL, 1995
AND 1994 SENATE ADVISES

CONSIDERATION OF SECOND READING AGENDA:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
[illegible]	1
[illegible]	
[illegible]	5
[illegible]	8
[illegible]	12

ASSEMBLY

SIXTY-SEVENTH YEAR

TENTH A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayer. The General Blessed Mother

Sir George Fame.

MR. LAURENCE A. FITZROY: 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 that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundation for the glory of Thy name and for the safety, honour and happiness of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Commander Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all who minister unto her Commonwealth that they may serve in righteousness, truth and justice, holiness and duty they be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of the Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to carry out the responsible duties of their high offices.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen. Let us repeat the Lord's Prayer.

Our Father, which 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 those that trespass against us and lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Leave be granted.

Questions. The First Elected Member for Middle Side. Is he in the House? Does any other Member have reason to ask the questions which stand in his name or to answer those questions?

MR. G. MILO BODDEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to ask what the Member would like the questions previously asked now to be dealt with, be here, which may not be answered.

MR. SPEAKER: Could you ask him to be kind enough to put a message to the Business Committee? I will ask them to reschedule the questions as notified, if that is alright? I do not know whether you are prepared to answer for this now, but perhaps it would be good if the Business Committee can put those in the same letter to the Business Committee? Is that alright?

The Hon. Administration Business. The Second Elected Member for the Western Districts was speaking.

THE APPROPRIATION (SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND NEW BEDFORD HARBOR) BILL, 1965

Capt. [illegible]: Mr. President, since I have not had the opportunity to speak on the Department of Public Works, Transportation and Industrial Development estimates, however, if I had I would have my heart in saying a few words in connection with the Saint John Harbour and the Saint John River. However, I would like to comment very briefly on the estimates which appeared in the Saint John Telegraph Journal this morning, which in my mind indicate that I had attempted to impress the Prime Minister [illegible] upon the problem of combining his offices. For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the Standing Orders of this House, the debate must be terminated. If no-one responds when the President asks if any other Member wishes to speak then the President immediately asks if the Honourable Member moving the Bill, the Honourable Prime Minister would like to reply. Therefore, I am not able by speaking this morning to [illegible] the Prime Minister from [illegible] his [illegible].

I am sure, Mr. President, members recognize as I do the power [illegible], which I do not [illegible] members simply that this place is not the Honourable House of Assembly. Mr. President, if I am out of order for speaking on this [illegible]. May I [illegible]?

MR. SPEAKER: Traditionally, Members are allowed to range very widely during the Budget Address. On the assumption that the Member will relate whatever he has to say to the Budget Address, I shall allow him to continue.

Capt. [illegible] A. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to make sure that I was in order.

As I recall, on Friday we were advised by the Deputy Minister of the Saint John Harbour Board, which became upon [illegible] of the Maritime Provinces Harbour Board, that it would. Acting Chairman, the Honourable Leonard J. Fenety moved that Mr. Speaker be authorized to issue that Warrant. That could be taken after question period. I notice that before the House did it was announced, also that the Hon. Leonard Fenety [illegible] that a certain, as I mentioned, that he supported the Minister on the Select Committee's Report on the Harbour and proceed with the debate on the Appropriation Bill. This can [illegible] a time and it can [illegible]. Therefore the Report of the Standing Committee [illegible]. The Government plans the legislation during the separate [illegible] that is the way that I understand it, Mr. President. I would ask all Honourable Members to remember that just a little over a year ago we went to the electorate and made many promises as to how we would conduct ourselves in the affairs of this country. I feel we have a responsibility today to [illegible] as I said then, as I did when I stood on the campaign platform. I think that's just good for all Elected Members of this Honourable House.

I feel that it is my duty to attend a Select Committee as I do the Meetings of this House. I do all I can - I give [illegible] of responsibility over [illegible]. We commend it to the Chair of our Standing Committee [illegible] the Select Committee as well as this House. [illegible] the Select Committee is the most [illegible] of all. It has been made clear the [illegible] has no say. For [illegible] I plead that I might have been unnecessary and of the minority, and I was Member at that. However, I [illegible] had the privilege of expressing my opinion in [illegible] as I do today. Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. ROBERT D. RAASCH (CONTINUING): Referring to my concurrent remarks, the Queens Chamber Corps appropriation is justified with only authorized $1,662,700 in General Revenue for 1985, which was cut by projects passed during the legislative session. It is indeed astounding that this has been an unsuccessful area the past years.

Mr. President, I would like to introduce the proposed Administrative Rules from the Civil Service. I am happy to add this. I did not support the Senate Capital Projects Bill because legislative flexibility is this important. I am very thankful that it is so some quick work. I think that it should be. I would like to give special thanks to the Appropriations Chairman Senator Lyons and Senator Demuzio this time, and also to the staff of the Appropriations Committee for the good job they have done.

I think, Mr. President, that Senate Bill 1 can be appreciated more by the people of my District than by the people here in Capital Square. This is undoubtedly because of the thought that we really have that is going on here in the Senate, the proceedings in this House, which of course have been very lengthy. Only this weekend I have had a lot of constituents to express that my constituents, whom I would not have had if not been for Redistricting, Capital has been accommodating the proceedings of this House. They are doing a great job. I just want to once express Senate Caucus and all of those staff for the job which they are doing. Thank you.

Mr. President, it is especially to see that the Senate still does have the ability to fully work through problems so that we will have more Democrats in the legislature. All the indications which have originated this are to be followed. I am very grateful that our Party people have the opportunity to work differences at home. Probably more may not be able to afford the great expense of developing primary campaigns, and it will enable them to better themselves and serve more people.

The Appropriations Department, Mr. President, is a department which is very important to the security of our country. They have a hard job and I think they do well. However, I would like to state, Mr. President, that in the Legislative Investigation Law, there is a section specifically stating other Committees which may not be affected. I have had many, many questions from members of my constituency, and they feel some of the decisions made in the Rules Committee may have been affected. I do not wish with the process, Mr. President, but I feel that if this could be explained in simple language to the public, it would eliminate a lot of the anxiety which they are now experiencing, and knowing whether they will get it or will not. If there are questions which it, if these could be explained so that people then we will not [illegible] inconvenience.

Establishing and Natural Resources, Mr. President, is a Committee which is very important to the security of our country. They have a hard job and I think they do well. However, I would like to state, Mr. President, that in the Legislative Investigation Law, there is a section specifically stating other Committees which may not be affected. I have had many, many questions from members of my constituency, and they feel some of the decisions made in the Rules Committee may have been affected. I do not wish with the process, Mr. President, but I feel that if this could be explained in simple language to the public, it would eliminate a lot of the anxiety which they are now experiencing, and knowing whether they will get it or will not. If there are questions which it, if these could be explained so that people then we will not [illegible] inconvenience.

Establishing and Natural Resources, Mr. President, is a Committee which is very important to the security of our country. They have a hard job and I think they do well. However, I would like to state, Mr. President, that in the Legislative Investigation Law, there is a section specifically stating other Committees which may not be affected. I have had many, many questions from members of my constituency, and they feel some of the decisions made in the Rules Committee may have been affected. I do not wish with the process, Mr. President, but I feel that if this could be explained in simple language to the public, it would eliminate a lot of the anxiety which they are now experiencing, and knowing whether they will get it or will not. If there are questions which it, if these could be explained so that people then we will not [illegible] inconvenience.

Miss Mary E. Kennedy (continuing): Also, it is most encouraging to see the strong position which is going on. It is hoped that this would add revenue, and again will enable delivery to our rural home.

Also, much progress has been made in maintenance. I am very grateful to see that we have additional funds to give us advice. I had the opportunity of talking with Mr. Jacobs Anderson when he was here. I learned much about many of his issues. He told me that we could solve our problem in the Pigeon Islands by putting a proper sewerage disposal which would eliminate all of these unpleasant odors we have. He said that is the way in which the Seaside Beach problem. They ought a solution for our problem which they have.

I would like to say, Mr. President, that in the Pigeon Islands, we do need the services of the veterinary officers more frequently than we have since the privatization. I hope that we have these responsibilities here in Grand Cayman. However, with our cattle population and other animal population, we need to ensure that they are healthy. Even then we have to have other means of care which we may be using. It is crucial to recognize that the veterinary officers could visit there on a regular basis and the cattle-ship for a trip to the Pigeon Islands once or twice monthly would be helpful. I have spoken with the Medical Officer Women, for he says that he has very little experience in livestock animals, and he would only work directly under the instructions of the Chief Veterinary Officer here in Grand Cayman.

We would also like a little more information given to our farmers in agriculture, especially, though I would be given or I would like to see a development plan in the Pigeon Islands which would keep the people just here in Grand Cayman, for we have very little. I guess we could add the agricultural farmers who work for very little, indeed. Often when fertilizer due to drought and other things make it very discouraging. But, they have remained over the years to do their traditional agricultural work.

Another thing which is quite encouraging to me, Mr. President, is that the Housing Development Corporation is very re-sensitized and they will soon be able to offer loans to the people who do not qualify to borrow from the commercial banks. This is most encouraging, Mr. President, for though many in the Pigeon Islands are very fortunate, there are still people who have a very difficult time to live as they are elderly. The housing rehabilitation mortgage, will be a great asset to this whole Islands community.

Mr. Acting Speaker. Probably water is needed in all districts on fairly large quantities. The water authority will help us in providing this. It will also help us in conserving the quality of the water which we get from our wells. That, Mr. Speaker, is most important for our health. In addition, to their duties providing water for the community, the Water Authority is playing a very important part in the provisioning of plans for employment, particularly in the area of plumbing. This is very important, for water development plans are geared, and geared with the proper plumbing installations, drainage and all those things, and we wish again to be encouraged with this. It is also most encouraging that they will be employing an additional people under the Water Authority. This, I am very encouraged about

Sen. Hatch (R. Representative Hinckley): I am happy to hear of this bill to do that. Question, Mr. President, that we have the second largest state to study desalinization of water, and possibly how well is that coming. I was wondering if some arrangements could not be made with the Central Utah Water Conservancy District, similar to the study which I understand is under way with the Dominguez Water Conservancy District here in Central Utah to utilize their water here.

Also on the Department of Development, a very important department for the Department of Planning. Many counties have been pushed by the Department of Planning by the Governor Planning Advisory Council because many millions of dollars and several very large projects. This department has been reduced with a percentage of only four-eighths throughout the years. So, members of the Natural Planning Advisory, in order to encourage development have had weekly meetings whenever necessary. Some of the meetings have gone on from 1:00 to 7:00 p.m. might be easier not to delay any pressing approval which might participate into a comprehensive plan for the future. We realize that there was a need for an update to our economy and we have not felt that we could waive. I think that the Planning Department should be commended for the study work over the years.

Another very important department is our Department, Mr. President, is our Social Services Department. They have a task which most people do not even know to realize exists here in these Statutes. This covers many fields such as poor relief, child care, responsible parenthood, foster parents and rehabilitation. In the Senate Committee we have a Social Services Review who are helped in Community to participate. The needs of that community. I do feel, Mr. President, that the time has come to the Social Services should participate in such policy. It is our right that Government should have this service which will be the particular matter to have to make a profit from the people of these Statutes.

Many people ask in the House Chamber to know what our actual tax burden is before paying. Many individuals look for their property taxes and they are all very proud to pay their taxes. This will enable them to specify at home and they are all very proud to pay their taxes.

Public sums in Social Security and the Income Taxes is of a high standard and it's a difference. They envision to increase although we have a lot of problems in the economy.

Capt. WARD O. PUNCHARDELL (Republican) [illegible] Hospital to Congress [illegible] of the best equipped hospitals [illegible] Caribbean. It serves approximately 1,500 people. We are very fortunate to have our well complex of doctors and staff, plus an anesthetist, [illegible] regular physical examinations can be performed [illegible] Telemia.

Mr. President, I could not speak of the health services in the Leeward Islands without referring to that former officer in charge there, Dr. Spence who served us for many years with very excellent services. After [illegible] and many other communities in the United Kingdom and America for many years, he left that we were then to speak more like an Honourable and we decided to retire. I think since I always [illegible] community of that Islands when I say that they will deeply appreciate all he did for us during his service. We are very grateful to him, that he [illegible] Cayman Brac so well that he and his dear wife Enid have become so much [illegible] there and they have built a retirement home. I, on behalf the Sisters Hospital would [illegible] for us a happy voyage.

Tourism Activities and Trade. The Lacy Bodden Terminal building is indeed a credit to Cayman Islands. It is [illegible] to the [illegible] and prestige of the Islands as a whole. We have in this Appropriation Bill a sum of [illegible] to renovate [illegible] on the Cayman Brac Airport and Harbour. Mr. President, we have too great needs for the Sister Islands. The first and most important, in my opinion, is the possible employment for our people who have registered unfavorably during this year. It is my hope that funds will be made available as early in 1967 as possible to get this [illegible] Pier on I think there is serious [illegible] and we need this. The second great benefit will be, as I have said the Lacy Bodden International Terminal Building, that it will [illegible] to our Government and enable us our travelling public as well.

Minister Administration. Mr. President, Cayman Brac and Little Cayman have experienced a great [illegible] during the past year. We have an [illegible] which seems almost impossible to believe. Government in the Sisters and I might [illegible] say the only [illegible] in the Sisters Islands. As with [illegible] and many, there is an [illegible] taking place in the Sisters Islands of any significance at the present time. Nearly all the people who have employment seek it from Government. During the final three months of this year alone, there were no [illegible] projects under way in Brac and there was a great need. Unfortunately, again in October, [illegible] was in December it began to slow down. Most of the development in Cayman Brac is capital projects and [illegible] in the [illegible] and the [illegible] of other [illegible]. This [illegible] was [illegible] in the [illegible] to Little Cayman. Communications was completed on the Tibbetts School. It had the [illegible] opened in 1965 and a [illegible] in the [illegible] at the High School.

It is easy to see that there are little employment offered by Government for [illegible], needs and [illegible] of that nature. Therefore, they have had a very hard year. Recently there is [illegible] carried on in Grand [illegible] the area on the south coast of Little Cayman. This was [illegible] road for opening up the west end of Little Cayman. When it is [illegible] enough the people would be inside the area and [illegible] on the eastern land on the eastern part of the island. However, it [illegible] to mention that they had to [illegible] with this [illegible]. With this [illegible] again, they will be able to go safely inside the area and carry on their agricultural [illegible].

CHIEF WISE'S ADDRESS (CONTINUED): Mr. President, all the people of the Inland Districts whom I represent, as well as those of the Middle Cayman, are fully aware that sometimes inconvenience is a costly item. The need for the presence of the Government Representative in the Lesser Islands is necessary because we are miles from Georgetown. Also, communication by letter also increases the cost of living. Short flights from the United States to the Lesser Islands is approximately 50 per cent higher than to the United States to Grand Cayman. We also maintain more branches in our merchandise because it is impossible on some day, and sometimes every delayed in Grand Cayman three to four days before we get our merchandise.

Mr. President, I am again asking if the administrative procedure could be established so that we could pay the import duty on the actual gross invoice from the United States to Grand Cayman and not have to pay import duty on the additional 25 per cent, as all import duty is calculated on cost, insurance and freight. This may not sound like a big item but when businesses are struggling to survive, it is important. I would like to make it understood by all that all merchants pride themselves for the work.

So the time is here to say, the more the merrier the merrier.

We also, living in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, must pay $65 for a power unit from Cayman Brac to Grand Cayman to do business with the Lands and Survey office or to get our passports renewed, or anything else which we need from Central Government. All of this increases the cost of living in the Sweet Islands.

I spoke earlier of how also Cayman has lost in Cayman Brac was Little Cayman. I was talking on the airport this morning before leaving, with the manager of the Fish-mix plant, the only major-fish resource plant on Cayman here. We said to me that during the entire month of October he experienced only seven grade of mackerel. During November the entire month and so far in the 5th December there was a half inch fish, that will give the fishermen Members an idea of how also unfortunate it is the Sweet Islands.

With a population of 1,500 approximately, the islands of mine there are very small. Most businesses are experiencing today a reduction in sales of over 50 per cent of what they were in 1983. Mr. President, I am fully aware that if we want more capital projects to provide employment, an infrastructure for our people, we must pay our share of revenue. This we are not opposed to paying if we know the money is to be used.

I have carefully studied the various revenue measures and have observed that with so many of my constituents as possible. They are financial difficulty because they do not have the money to pay these additional fees with the new legislation. I feel, Mr. President, that the increase in the price of gasoline and diesel can be really disastrous. We have had to go to those two major industries and fix to increase. These prices do keep us outside the regional prices. We with that, and all my people understand. Also, persons with boats have stay outside when much too low to begin with, and then can be taken care of. There is some discrimination in the vehicle registration fee, but that fee I feel will not unduly that much of a burden. Since the start of our economy, the most problem we've with the shore and landing fees which have been increased substantially. I would like to ask all honourable Members here today if some consideration and concession could not be given to the Lesser Islands with regard to the Trade and Business Licences. My position that the

[illegible] 5. Environment (continued): In 1977 when these [illegible] were made of a package step of the new act. A [illegible] radiation was given and we fixed high then, with the [illegible] increase, 300 per cent increase I would like to get Assemblies' [illegible] of amendments would not be given to [illegible] and business income in the Lesser Islands would see some [illegible] the capital [illegible] and if some [illegible] [illegible] take place by next year, the situation may look much better.

Another thing to which I would like to [illegible] unfavourable Customs [illegible] here is, as we sometimes [illegible] us. Incidentally, the [illegible] stamp all they are offered to [illegible] at Christmas. In early January they have all the [illegible] through the whole [illegible] is most necessary, the [illegible] year [illegible] Stock and [illegible] Stamps have not [illegible]. If these [illegible] would be allowed to be sold on a [illegible] basis it would relieve [illegible] of the restriction the people are suffering from because, Mr. Speaker, a [illegible] to be very honest with you, some of the people [illegible] had a problem to pay these [illegible] and because Stamped [illegible] they are looking for [illegible] or [illegible] to [illegible] because [illegible] of [illegible] is [illegible].

Mr. Speaker, the budget of Mr. [illegible] for an increase of $2.3 million over [illegible] Budget, I [illegible], she proposed to afford greater stimulation of the economy by providing funding for a number of [illegible] projects, which [illegible] [illegible], is very necessary.

The recurrent expenditure are [illegible] $68.7 million, as a [illegible] increase over [illegible], or an additional $7.7 million. The President, our recurrent [illegible] are very high [illegible] must be made to control recurrent expenditure.

Of the increase in our Budget, $2.3 million is going to assist Cayman Airways. Also, I feel, is a step in the right direction. But this [illegible] [illegible], Cayman Airways' picture would not look as bad as it did [illegible] to see the [illegible] there.

Two things concerns me, Mr. Speaker, because we hear of [illegible] that Cayman Airways [illegible] the whole [illegible] of it be sold to [illegible] for the [illegible] service. I would like to [illegible] to the [illegible] Leader and to the people of the Cayman Islands that I feel that it is an [illegible] responsibility of this Government to provide air service to the Lesser Islands as it is a Social Service. I do not feel that every [illegible] of a [illegible] that is owned by [illegible] to the Lesser Islands, I think that [illegible] have brought to this [illegible] where we have lost on the [illegible] and also we have lost on the [illegible] service and also we have lost on the [illegible]. These are Cayman Islands, Mind you, I think we could see where the money has really been [illegible].

I am very grateful for all the efforts which have been made in the recent months to improve [illegible] Cayman Airways with the [illegible] services, also for the major efforts which have been made to reduce the [illegible]. Cayman Airways, in my opinion is a very essential service. It is playing a very vital role and [illegible] in the Lesser Islands we really [illegible] how dependent we are on Cayman Airways. I feel that we should support Cayman Airways at this time [illegible] efforts must be made to reduce the operating [illegible].

Mr. President, I think [illegible] Government will continue to improve Cayman [illegible] and that the people [illegible] and that our development will result in a very high standard.

PRES. UNGO J. ESPINOSA (CONTINUED): ...explain which is why we do the drawing because for their Congress might change our thought and our opinion completely. I do hope that those Governments will continue to develop that office employment and the facilities here in Brazil - Argentina. We are also hoping that some of the developing countries here will also be interested in the Inter-American Telecom.

Mr. President, in conclusion I would like to again congratulate the Honorable Mike Gravel for his hard work, his well prepared, fully understood budget address. However, I do ask him, in closing my, if he would give serious consideration to those which I have written here today. I thank Mr. President, once for again, for the people of the Inter-American Telecom who put me here to this house to represent them.

Mr. President, I suppose the appropriate (sound) rule, plus and I look forward to talking and looking with the Finance Committee.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Chair recognized Senator from Puerto Rico.

SENATOR L. NEGRON: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President I just would like one thing... In fact, on the Inter-American right now, I just wanted just to comment. In December last year when I went my maiden speech in this Assembly there, I said that one I would like to propose that I am both saddened by and encouraged by what I consider Ocean Mail by economic and practical point there in Puerto Rico and I am saddened by filling that position to not just a job. It is a children mail for Puerto Rico and I am saddened by that. The people because my best compliments, best salutations to Government.

Mr. President, as I look around these, activity because we are behind me, I see some fine, honest, hard-working and capable men, distinguished men and women here. They give me a sense of pride because I am at they have the good of everyone in this country as their duty, which is their duty, which will go on in Puerto Rico. If we will look carefully and think a little, we will realize that most of these fine men in here have gone up with a silver spoon in their mouth. They know what it is not to have everything at one's disposition. Those is my point that they would like for every Puerto Rican to enjoy. The taste of success as they have. Because of this, I feel this no-one minority should ever feel that we have a predominant here which is the interests of the rich and forgets the poor.

I think that we are a very minority in comparison to many in the Caribbean Archipelago and we need certain special legislation. It is possible for people to the Caribbean Archipelago who have the determination to do so, to enjoy a success of their life. We may not become millionaires but we can certainly find ourselves able to get along well in the Puerto Rican economy.

The value of our Commonwealth, I feel, are so capable minds, most least of whom is the Honorable Miguel Hernandez Agosto I would like to speak on. In my opinion, Mr. President, if in a few minutes we have them what I considered from previous as capable as our economic financial secretary. After all, he is a Harvard Negron. They what you will about my Harvard have some fine, honest people and I am proud to be associated with the Honorable Miguel Hernandez Agosto. I feel that he has done an proud in the presentation of this document. We hope and to be a very close friend, pen. We have had to travel over the years. We appreciate the many helpful suggestions which we of the finest Secretary we have given, indeed in these relations, some points that the have been very helpful

MRS. DAVIES [St. Helens (Conservative)]: It hurts me greatly, Mr. President, to realise that now we are rudely shocked by the Government of the day—[Interruption.] I am grateful to the hon. Member for Leeds, South-East (Mr. Hattersley) for his intervention. Whatever the political views of the Government, there should be a degree of sensitivity to the anxieties of the people. Whether we like it or not, we are creating a very beautiful environment for new towns. I do not [illegible] else who pulls in disinterested people from other districts to [illegible] to stand up for what might disappear. ..

I am indeed my colleagues in the House with the honourable Third Official Member, Mr. Chairman, and in the absence of [illegible] will have to guarantee the budget allowance. Even, indeed, for me, that [illegible] of today, because I too [illegible] have said [illegible] we do not [illegible].

I think [illegible] the problem [illegible] by Chairmanship of [illegible]. There are a few areas which I am not really happy about and those I will [illegible] the interventions of [illegible] I go on with my remarks today. For the present [illegible], however, I feel that it is a right and well-balanced budget.

Mr. President, in every family, as most of us have experienced, the longer it lasts the greater the expense. As more money which the electors have to [illegible] rises and increase of wealthy [illegible]. This government [illegible] a sensible [illegible].

It is reasonable to know that the Honourable Financial Secretary and the Government in general have received carefully the warnings in major Government speeches [illegible]. It is evident that they have to work for this [illegible]. It is [illegible] the Government [illegible] the Labour Party [illegible] the Conservative Party [illegible] Secretary, this Government would be unwise [illegible] the [illegible] should be well managed and that all [illegible] [illegible] Mr. President, it is the [illegible] Official Member [illegible] Chairman [illegible] Government [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Mr. Speaker, it is noted that there has been an unacceptable growth in the number of backbenchers applying for the grant of opposition Opening Statements. I do not think that that should be encouraged. I mentioned a while ago the period of this Government and I feel that while the Opposition is quite entitled to criticize, and as a matter of fact they have a duty to criticize, I feel that sometimes their criticisms are not fair. I shall not pursue the matter further but I feel that this Government is the kind of Government that they are duty bound to support in each instance.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been the convention for some years now that the Opening Statement is for the purpose of outlining the policy of the Government and not for the purpose of criticizing the Opposition. I feel that sometimes when the Opposition makes their Statements in this House they are trying to create the impression to the public that they are the Government and that we are the Opposition. I feel that we should adhere to the rules of this House as laid down by our forefathers and not allow any Opposition to do as they please in any particular instance. I feel that we can look forward to an opportunity to debate the Budget and the various Estimates and I would like to see a return to the days of efficient debating and the people who elect us to come here to do business within our Parliament.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture may be very annoyed because I did not mention his name but that is not because I have disregard for his position as Minister of Agriculture but I feel that the most important thing that we should be concerned about is the people who elect us to come here to represent them. Mr. Speaker, I am not unfamiliar with the duties of the Minister of Agriculture and I would like to say that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be very busy attending the Agricultural Conference, he undoubtedly cannot afford to be unprepared. If the Minister of Agriculture just concentrates on the people in Selkirk constituency, Mr. Speaker, this session he will be much happier than he was during the last session. I am not unfamiliar with the duties of the Minister of Agriculture and I would like to say that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be very busy attending the Agricultural Conference, he undoubtedly cannot afford to be unprepared. If the Minister of Agriculture just concentrates on the people in Selkirk constituency, Mr. Speaker, this session he will be much happier than he was during the last session. Mr. Speaker,

Mrs. Margot E. Kidder (continuing): Mr. President, I should like to extend the appreciation of this House, as I said in my maiden speech, this day shall pass. We will not be here for ever and decisions have high on the political ladder as may accept, be assured that there for sure. When I do not wish to see them withdrawn, only as there for Cyprus will have. That signify the making sure of our country. It includes a lot of other things, most issues of which is building roads and improving with housing, and negotiating in many other areas such as providing good medical services, providing educational facilities, etcetera. All this is a part of this, but we must never allow any marginal matters to cause us to abandon from what overshadows issues for our policy here. No matter if we come into office, if we do anything other than what will benefit our people, we have failed in this Honourable House.

Mr. President, the trade and the overseas have contributed much to the Cayman Islands. It is necessary to note that many of the Caymanian people are employed in most areas of these are important. Mr. President, here again in an area which causes me some concern. I would have that our Caymanian people will recognise how fortunate we are in having employment in these areas. I am conscious, Mr. President, that increasingly in these we provide that local people, that every effort is made to see that they receive further education and training, so that they can fill top management positions. However, I realise, Mr. President, that there are times when getting in the top of the ladder takes a little time. I would here like to congratulate all of the men people with this extensive overseas service, "I am a Caymanian." I am sure we crept and grew and have it "in" as we progress in the industry, as we will still need the expatriate, as unfortunately we will find getting just enough people with this experience. However, as with anyone, we have to make the best of the situation, and I am sure that we will be able to control, the most qualified be chosen, and those that show an interest in these professions where we do not have sufficient experience will be given them. I am happy to see that we have in our Caymanian people the desire to progress in the Cayman Islands by getting more and more involved in the Civil Service. It is encouraging. However, even this does, I regret will call upon the Chief Secretary to assure this House that adequate efficiency is necessary to discuss all which has been recommended that discrimination, and I do so in a very firm sense, particularly where promotion and efficiency are very important and I have no doubt in my mind that the Caymanian people can fully succeed, as has been seen in many instances, even now, in the top and responsible positions as well as many expatriates which are also doing so much.

All I can say in this, Mr. Speaker is that we are proud and appreciate and very much appreciate what people in the Cayman Islands, Mr. President. While they are not to decide that every recommendation is agreed will there will be, however, difficulties, and hopefully, providing we manage, of course, and there for them. It is difficult to learn every function. However, I realise that we are always correct, it is important that they understand, while looking there and following this there is a necessity, should receive an honest appreciation for answer. So even if it is, Mr. President, There is no doubt in my mind that we do it. Local recruitment within the service must be given hard by the Government. There are a few teachers here and there who will not be appointed, but we can do it. I took pleasure in the very short time I was here that the Cayman Islands is full of a particular well trained, and some qualified here and some qualified to fill them. I have great faith in our Caymanian people and they can do it.

MRS. [illegible] I'm not sure that this [illegible] agreement [illegible] the [illegible] and on [illegible] which will help [illegible] the [illegible].

MR. [illegible] I wonder whether the Member has provided a balanced break in her speech. If so, I will suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

MRS. [illegible] Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AT 11.22 A.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11.37 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

The Second Member rises on the [illegible]. The Right Honourable Member for West Bay.

MRS. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will [illegible] for the Budget and [illegible]. Now, Mr. President, it is good to note that much has been done in the area of [illegible]. Between us all of us here, they voted for much progress and are [illegible] looking in the area of business. However, it has not been that there was only a marginal improvement in the number of these [illegible] that were over last year. That is so far as the [illegible] the [illegible] is concerned. This causes me some [illegible]. I think that this is an area that will have to be looked at carefully. As employers [illegible] Bahamas have recently experienced visible [illegible], perhaps [illegible] will be reversed.

I feel that we as a business [illegible] to provide [illegible] of employment by diversification of the economy. With a number of [illegible] on the drawing board, it is hoped that we are [illegible] to see an increased number of [illegible] that will [illegible], we will be able to [illegible] have to [illegible] be that a diversification of employment will not become [illegible] to take place in the near future.

It is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that [illegible], perhaps of the larger projects which it is hoped to see started in the near future, will [illegible] a reality and that there will be [illegible] to creation of employment within our Bahamas.

Going on to the Government [illegible] Budget [illegible] I was pleased to note that funds are going to be [illegible] for a student [illegible] of credit. Many of our students, Mr. Speaker, are not able to [illegible] because. It will [illegible] to [illegible]. I would [illegible] that I am aware of the [illegible] which were [illegible] by the [illegible] while in the High School, and some of those of the [illegible] which is [illegible]. We have many students who have brought [illegible] and they are to be [illegible].

REP. DARRELL L. PRATT (CONTINUED): As Mark Boy we have very proud of those who graduated from the High School this year. I think of a total of seven night or two honors graduates, that they were able to attain three of those. We have a young man, although chronically ill two young ladies, Nicky Rimke and Linda Keeney and they did as well as well as all the others who went through with very good grades. It have to be able to provide those students who are desirous of continuing to pursue postsecondary courses with the opportunity of doing so. The High School has been continually improving and we are very grateful that this facility is in place so that students are able to further their education and not have to be distracted or embarrassed from going to the 2-4 because of a lack of funds. It only highlights the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is committed to excellence. It is committed to helping the students who have a desire to get ahead to have the opportunity of doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, it was noted that a lawsuit for funding of the Rogers Temple coins minted and notes printed after 1972 has been established. I feel that this is an issue which should be encouraged. I feel that it is necessary that we in this Government recognize that often times of short projected cost overruns are discouraged or eliminated, and I can recall just little about what we did not how we did in years gone by. As in any other major economy, one finds that a firm commitment by any Government is very important.

I am pleased to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that we have a commitment to that and people are embarking on a program of making us a world leader in that. Statistics which will display a fine collaboration, we have, of course economies with our exciting knowledge.

With regard to economic opportunities, I was quite pleased to note that of the new jobs created, 80% are full time employment. Mr. Speaker, as all Bermudians know of this Government, there was quite an overwhelming amount of money put this year in payments which are now been established, it will be noted from the report of the Finance Committee. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this encouragement to develop the construction industry will see much of education continued. Simply multiplication purposes, Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that the total should cost with the assessment coming in saying that there are estimates in the Government. However, as all of us will know, there is no reason why such fees should be outstanding for such long periods of time and put pressures needs on the banks of the Registry of that nature.

It was noted that with regard to the accountability fees we now have the requests of will have information that varies from corporations here. As the Government Statement correctly notes, this creates a position large for the Government and the services which it are able to offer. It was noted that there should be some of the wrapping of the accounting fees are Corporate. I would hope to see, Mr. Speaker, in the future that this procedure would be an even requirement and treated as known modified, and more realistic positions which these accounting fees. I do note that there are twelve eight new jobs are necessary in Bermuda. These fees are not accountability as this area are to be computerized and many economies should be given to our Bermudian students to ensure these fields are to view by which particular companies.

MR. [illegible] (continuing): In this connection, Mr. President, we have that there is potential of creation of [illegible] management companies. When the main negotiations come in front, I feel that we should be able to devise quite a good amount of money for this area.

The legal framework is satisfactory, I will. Mr. President, as is mentioned, we have Companies Ordinance which is satisfactory. As I said earlier on, I feel that our Companies people are able to cope up in any case. We have in place [illegible] to cope up with this [illegible] as well.

It is noted that in the recommendations made by Digha Tribunals have been the objects of some unfavourable comments. Mr. President, I would like to mention this before the Hon'ble Members of the House which I am sure the Government of the day in the manner why the awards [illegible] Tribunal is the misunderstanding of stability and fairness and therefore the Tribunal, because they feel they do not get what they [illegible] they can make from Tribunal. The Industrial Financial Corporation of India that the Industrial Development Bank of India should [illegible] from these sources to assist [illegible]. However, it is difficult to say, unless [illegible] of the [illegible].

Mr. President, Sir, there are [illegible] Industry, where I [illegible] only, but the [illegible] Corporation. I would like to [illegible] here that we are in receipt that Corporation are not doing [illegible]. In every case we have that there is a need of [illegible] within the [illegible] Corporations working in their [illegible], and taking [illegible] of our economy. I would [illegible] Industry, [illegible] in the [illegible] Industry. Perhaps there may be those which [illegible] in this [illegible] however, I am [illegible] Corporations [illegible] in the [illegible] Bank, [illegible] Corporation to be more [illegible] and [illegible] to speed up [illegible] in the [illegible].

On the [illegible] Sir, [illegible] was a highly [illegible] year. This [illegible]. People want to speed their [illegible] in a [illegible] way. I feel that the Bihar Tribunal [illegible] of the [illegible] for [illegible] to go [illegible] to award a [illegible], especially [illegible] Industrial [illegible]. Absenteeism and [illegible] are [illegible]. In this [illegible], Mr. President, I feel that the Hon'ble [illegible] for Tourism and those who are [illegible] with him are [illegible] of the areas in which such [illegible] be done. It is not [illegible] but [illegible] of the [illegible]. It has to be the right [illegible] of publications geared to the right type of [illegible] and to help [illegible] the Bihar Tribunal. The [illegible] of tourism [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible]. Yes, Mr. President, [illegible] to be [illegible]. The Hotel Association [illegible] to play a [illegible] in [illegible] for facilities and to ensure that they are kept [illegible] the hotel charges.

Mr. President, Sir, in my [illegible] I have been given a number of [illegible] from [illegible] in some of the [illegible] as which they enjoyed. It is [illegible], Mr. President, that because of these [illegible], [illegible] Industrial [illegible], are being [illegible]. Mr. President, Sir, I can [illegible] in [illegible] these [illegible] and [illegible] in the [illegible] in the [illegible] [illegible]. The people [illegible] to believe that they [illegible] to a fine [illegible] and [illegible] their [illegible]. Recently, in [illegible], the [illegible] they have [illegible] [illegible] of them, I am told, not prepared to leave [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] they found it [illegible] [illegible] in this [illegible], for which it is [illegible] charged at a very high rate.

...I. Speaker, I just think that the Government has to be very firm in its commitment to rehabilitate, to realize that the tourist industry is one of the main pillars of our economy. If the property is not maintained in the manner it ought to be, I do not feel that Government should be using public funds to repair those properties when the owners do not pay. If necessary, those places should be closed down and the concessions revoked in favour, because in this industry we may lose many people when they are given the thing to do entertainment and consider later on, they get bored to those places. Otherwise those properties will eventually be rotten and raise charges while the facilities continue to go down the drain. Mr. President, we have to be careful that we do not price ourselves out of the market. I still feel, Mr. President, that in many cases the service charges are exorbitant. I cannot see why they do not adopt charges similar to Jamaica or any service offered in this country. It is my first occasion, Mr. President, that in many cases this morning there is need to accomplish two purposes or objectives, and of those proposals one might be negative or have bad. It is difficult for one minister to please everybody all the time and that is why we pay a top remuneration package and that have to pay a very high service charge as well. It is a risky job, Mr. President. Sometimes you have gone out of your way to be honest, in my opinion, to have assured investment to the country of services offered in many instances. There are certain privileges, Mr. President, but I feel that because a person might be going to be asked to pay some more fees than the fact is that service and those services

...Gib. Government has to ensure that we do not have a lot of offices, as some other countries have. One of the main reasons for people certainly have to become of the privatisation of the Gibraltar service. Mr. President, I would have like every Gen, Clerk and Army do not employ in those areas, unless it can be seen they are going to provide an excellent and efficient service to the tourist industry which will survive. This country's image and will result in expenses checks by those people going after wards. I feel that there are many of our people who have been in this industry for a long time, even those here who continue to display an attitude of inefficiency and lack patience.

We need to ensure that we do not let any foreign influences impair the image of this country to be what it ought to be. At the same time, I implore upon our Government people to treat the tourist well. We have a few of them who can become a white bee elsewhere and eventually we would like to see them back on the main plane out, but they give bad name to us. I would hope, Mr. President, that as this Government moves ahead as we are to see the image of the Gibraltar tourist industry plays and a life please enjoy the weekend, in spite of the fact that he might be a bit a hundred things to go and see while on the here, really show by those that we are not here merely to work, to make money.

Mr. President, it is encouraging to note that the golf course which is now in place has caused a great asset to the tourism industry. The architects are to be congratulated. Of course, it is hoped that this event will continue and that members of this area will continue as a very good place for the future.

The Gibraltar Pavilion Hotel is a very fine structure. It is, certainly as the Honourable Financial Secretary also mentioned additions. We practice that more cases should be done in the best, Mr. President, to avoid problems in this precise manner. Now there should be the three other things, if we offer anything other as one mentioned offer a place and with more physical. We can offer a relatively short visit to the premises I think the cannot afford to pay high prices.

GEN. TOMAS A. GARCIA (interpreted): Mr. President, I was asked that very odd unfortunate word. Again, I have heard complaints and talk of high prices and high customs charges, but the shortage of the food of a number of basic articles was then what did not exist. Mr. President, I would like that on this country we will find that those people who are in charge of these instruments facilities should be considering high standards of food and services and also the reasonable supervision of these instruments facilities -- keep clean and well maintained.

I also wish, Mr. President, that these workers, those responsible for these properties could get loan from retirement. I feel that every standard of hygiene and cleanliness should be displayed and that no stage of contamination should be found around such properties. Whatever I said my fault, the place is clean I was to say what is basic like water a difference as the food I ever ate.

Mr. President, the Port Royal said I would like to be noted should be finished by late 1982, and around 500 extra rooms. In addition that should just accommodate for tomorrow. In this area, Mr. President, I would like to make here also I have been although there are a number of the problems on the housing boards, but one development will be ready and will not create a reluctance here where it does exist and we have to bring into this country those foreign nationals that do not necessarily work. Then nationals should come here and I think that, for the most part, do not take our jobs. I feel, Mr. President, that we need to create a situation where everything is shown to the fore, and that later on here the world we have a discussion of problems. The government and the people are ready for work. Jamaica always welcome them. The Government looks on this policy very well heard, and that the people will be satisfied to see the Government succeed in it to it's end.

Mr. President, not to want to see some of the problems which have taken place. It is good also to see that different members of the Jamaican House is really going to assist the Government in solving the problems. I hope that it will not take too long to be successful in solving.

Mr. President, also wanted to thank representatives and Secretaries who took us the Region Jamaica, and also give the people of Negril, namely but in particular there, there are a number of those of whom I feel service needs to be mentioned, as well those of the Development Bank and the Tourist Development Company, the Coral Cliffs Apartments, the Tourist Development Centre, the Colonial Club, the Jamaica Club, etcetera. We can go on and on but time and we will not make any more publicity.

Mr. President, I just hope this Government has to maintain not only the number of rooms but the kind of facilities which are needed in this country, and also that the standard and that they do not take any of the Common Islands. I would ask this point, Mr. President, like to congratulate Prime Minister Mr. Edward Seaga and the people of the Cayman Islands. I have I mentioned here, and I do this and however I am concerned what the property is developed, but I think might now, Mr. President, of Mr. Orson Bodden who every time has not only done much for the development of Jamaica's tourism, but it is unfortunate to note that the majority of the employees and organizations who have to realize with him for years. We have gained much knowledge and he has contributed much to these islands. Many of these people certainly these have served us tremendously. These have contributed here. Some have died and unfortunate. It is certain point, Mr. President which divorce from the fact that there's a close contact on the part, not only to visit there but people but they have Ministers to meet.

MRS. DORNER [CONTINUING]: Mr. President, Japan has now become one of the most popular posts for envoys abroad. I thank Ambassador, Mr. President, of Canada for his kind words and for his hospitality for some time afterwards. While Ambassador Arnold is congratulated for all he has done in this area.

Mr. President, I feel that I have an opportunity to speak about the Japan Scholar's Program. It is noted that Japan unfortunately participates in the Fulbright Program, a 25 year old program. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of meeting a number of people whose lives were in these scholarships and it resulted in their publishing and lasting success. There are a number who have not yet published but have developed in valuable and useful ways. Mr. President, the Japan Program should be strengthened. We must have a program which is substantial. We must have permanent ones who will become leaders of the Japanese people. Mr. President, Japan will not have that opportunity for all of us, there will be pressure to provide as much diversity as possible. I would like to suggest that Japan should be encouraged to provide more scholarships for those who are truly interested in Japan and its culture. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of meeting a number of people whose lives were in these scholarships and it resulted in their publishing and lasting success. There are a number who have not yet published but have developed in valuable and useful ways. Mr. President, the Japan Program should be strengthened. We must have a program which is substantial. We must have permanent ones who will become leaders of the Japanese people. Mr. President, Japan will not have that opportunity for all of us, there will be pressure to provide as much diversity as possible. I would like to suggest that Japan should be encouraged to provide more scholarships for those who are truly interested in Japan and its culture. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the [illegible] of our fine [illegible] who carried our [illegible], are helpful and are friendly. I say that it is a pleasure to [illegible] which are given by [illegible] plant some of our [illegible] are [illegible], not packing, according with Japan and being friendly and helpful and having Japanese whose [illegible]. I [illegible] of these people. Of course we have I feel that [illegible] of [illegible] Japanese Scout Jamboree, and the [illegible] [illegible] in a fashion which depicts only the [illegible]. I will give you a [illegible] and I get your [illegible] and [illegible] off. Mr. President, I would like that [illegible] at that point will be [illegible] I [illegible] in these Islands [illegible] [illegible] which [illegible] to [illegible] to be [illegible], will give an [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. Sure [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] Kennedy Round negotiations. Our policies in recent - I think, that we agree on every one of those points. I would have been happier if I knew for a fact, Mr. President, that each of them really was included in the package about to be sent up. I hope that we will have a chance to discuss this matter further. I feel that the United States Congress should participate in the development of the Kennedy Round position. Congress can improve the package from the standpoint of the American farmer, the American consumer, and the American industrial worker. I hope that we will have a chance to discuss this matter further.

I am pleased that you mentioned the Export-Import Bank. I think that the Export-Import Bank has been very helpful in the past in helping to finance exports of American goods and services. I am pleased that you mentioned the Export-Import Bank. I think that the Export-Import Bank has been very helpful in the past in helping to finance exports of American goods and services.

On the subject of immigration, I am pleased that you mentioned the Export-Import Bank. I think that the Export-Import Bank has been very helpful in the past in helping to finance exports of American goods and services.

[illegible] Indians in [illegible]. They are being involved within the [illegible] which they have to work. They are able to get involved with other groups as well. As the years pass, Mr. President, I do not think this will diminish in any [illegible] I would like to see this bring to [illegible] the responsibilities of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and every member of the Indian Department who is working to this end. There is more for improvement but in my opinion, Mr. President, the more just that the morale of these departments has been enhanced in the [illegible] to me.

It is normal, Mr. President, that [illegible] officers have been successful or improved [illegible] but I would hope that one of the areas which we specifically looked at was how employment rates [illegible] specific areas. I think, Mr. President, that we can make some [illegible] officers. We have a problem with [illegible] of employment in many [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] to be had.

Mr. President, perhaps we need to consider the area of, as I've mentioned, the Indian [illegible]. What might need [illegible] to do. I do not know that we can [illegible] on the problem of [illegible], Mr. President, it is something that is [illegible]. I know that it has been said about [illegible] to [illegible]. However, looking on experience, Mr. President, I do think that perhaps [illegible] have always been [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] to

Mr. Adams of Ocean County: The Atlantic Orlando Government Information Service is quite right that the Government system, and I am pleased, Mr. President, I feel it has been replaced. Mr. Jim Reeves, Vice Fort Thomas and the officer staff are well suited to handling this function. They know the Atlantic Islands, the people, and they can put more on as long as might be satisfactory, and I am pleased with this. Again which has taken place. The part time participation of the Armed Forces and the quality of the Atlantic, and the possibility of information for overseas stations, I think is a very important job, and I am pleased with those now in this area.

Great emphasis continues to be placed on local and overseas training for the Navy Reserve, Mr. President. I see a third purpose for this system, and I enjoyed the time that I was there, Mr. President, I realize that there are people who are not dedicated Navy Reservists, but I am glad that they feel strongly a small percentage of our Navy Reserve. I am pleased for those who have spent many years there, and the pleasure of their association, who have only been working for a short while, it is becoming to note that great emphasis continues to be placed on local and overseas training for these people. We used to have more up within the Navy Reserve, as well as more field participation activities. We used to have the President, able to fill some of the place which was not filled by experience, and it is becoming to see that this training continues to progress.

The Navy Training has expanded many of the personnel from the Government Administration Building, and I felt that this was a good move. The work of the telephone service, very essential, because as well I will use it, President, this was a good move. Because nowadays when you call the Government Administration Building the telephone service is very, very important. Sometimes when you dial just a telephone, the switchboard operator, when something's wrong, and sometimes very unhelpful. Perhaps, fortunately for I will just to the good part of it, there have been who have been a good telephone operator here, and they answered and I have got quite well, but the replacement of this need is unnecessary, and I congratulate the Government for such a move, and for the handling of the present difficulties there. It is certainly an area to which I am pleased.

The unsatisfactory circumstances, Mr. President, in connection in many areas I am very happy to say, and in which I do not. I would like to say here and many times of this, this time I brought a letter to the House earlier this week about speed and efficiency. There have been many good observations in these areas in the public, they have at least one of the day, and to and also, and they are great reminders of the importance of training and safety. Mr. President, when it comes to engagements, I am a very hard fighter to get made. But I realize that my duties in the Government still I may attend in the United States. I would like Mr. President, that as a Navy officer, the U.S. Delegation will the many fine Christian workers we have in the world today, I am not successfully here to be elected for the same type of speech which is at the U.N. Then from January to January. And this is not necessary that the Navy is interesting. I am pleased to hear that the Navy is interesting U.N. Navy, the activities of people working, but on Sunday they get something else to them, and a Bible ought to be eliminated. Another point, Mr. President, only on the morning when I get up, I like to listen to sermons, and I like to listen to religious broadcasts, this is one without equal. However, to do and the highest duties of work on my good reception on the radio concerning and planning and fellowship as this is on the morning. Everything needs to be done in right time at a terrific pace through the day, to a time when one can relax about it.

MR. [illegible] (CONTINUED): [illegible] I have also noticed that the Mayor [illegible] I am pleased with his action. [illegible] Mr. President, I am glad to see that [illegible] Mayor [illegible] Mr. President, it would be a lot of good if this Mayor [illegible] Mr. President, I am glad to see that [illegible] Mayor [illegible] Mr. President, I am glad to see that [illegible] Mayor [illegible] Mr. President, I am glad to see that [illegible]

MR. LEONID I. BREZHNEV (TRANSLATION): Mr. President, allowing myself to begin my statement, I would like to express my appreciation for the cordial welcome accorded to me and my colleagues in the United States. I feel that the Soviet-American negotiations on limitation of strategic armaments are of great importance for the cause of peace throughout the world. I am convinced that the Soviet Government's decision to accept your invitation to visit the United States was correctly understood by the American people and by the Administration. There has been much speculation regarding the Soviet-American talks. It was noted that [illegible] Agreement on Prevention of Nuclear War. The Soviet Government has always attached great importance to the Agreement and has been carrying out its provisions consistently and scrupulously. We are convinced that the Agreement has been useful to both countries and to the cause of peace. We are ready to continue the talks on the basis of mutual [illegible] for the benefit of both countries and the cause of peace throughout the world.

I am glad that a meeting took place between the Soviet Government delegation and the United States Congressional leaders. I am sure that this meeting will be useful. I am also glad that I have had the opportunity to meet with the President of the United States, Mr. President, and to have a frank exchange of views with him on the most important international issues, including the Soviet-American relations. I am sure that this exchange of views will be useful for the further development of relations between our countries in the interests of peace throughout the world.

Mr. President, I would like to express my appreciation for the invitation to address the Congress of the United States of America. I am fully aware of the responsibility I assume before the people, the Congress and the Administration of the United States of America in addressing you. Mr. President, I think that it is very good when [illegible] of the different views which may exist on questions [illegible], and I do not exaggerate when I say that [illegible] we look at the work of this very distinguished body, we find [illegible] which [illegible] and the members [illegible] to [illegible] to find [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] and [illegible] which [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] to

MR. ABRAMS (Interpretation): Again, this is an area where the Minister is taking positive action. Officials from Labour Immigration, and I personally, have had a conversation in which Canadians are selecting the objective of local Pakistan. It is a delight to go into the airports, and to see the professionalism, backed by sophisticated technology, of Canadians who are helping to facilitate travel. I think they will certainly be welcomed, and stated, and from my visit earlier this year, extraordinarily warm significant impression.

I feel, Mr. President, that the first twenty questions on Customs Management, the money spent on this was quite wisely, and I believe he will continue to do so provided. It is good to see that in such a complex of customs investigations of the airports. It is of which Canadians, it is an area where some of our activities could be, and I look to with to a final two years. The only item in the Customs Building must have been a more welcome position in the eyes of Government, for the Customs officials satisfactorily staff. I must say, that the questions which they considered would hopefully come here from Scarborough, and I am pleased and happy that they will move to be housed in the Lester Pearson Wing, where the situation is much more comfortable, and appropriate.

As far as the Judicial Department is concerned, Mr. President, I would that the workload of the Courts Office has been rapidly increased of late. There has been an increase, to unbelievable, and it was extremely welcome news for the staff of the Courts Office. It is heartening to know that certain offices which have been created by recent legislation.

Again, Mr. President, it is indeed this recently to see the first executive wing, there has been a tremendous extended penalty from the accused of murder, which has been announced in our Criminal Laws. It will be good to be continuing very carefully our Social Insurance System. It will be, incidentally, that we have to create even more effort in the area of the prevention of crime, rather than reacting to, as has been noted by the number of people who were involved in Correctional Projects. The Committee who are going to be presented for the Courts Office, I feel that this is a very good move, the Justice Office will not be used much more appropriately in other Canada wherein the Federal Government.

The Legal Department has had its busy year of late, of course. They have been very busy, and I like to congratulate them for the many new Acts which they have been able to draft. The Honourable Senior Official Member and his staff are to be congratulated, and in which more to me. There is one problem that arises out of this, according to all that the Honourable Minis Officials Member has given us in his budget speech, here. Your young Canadian lawyers have recently qualified, and are lost to our Government Service. The result of this country need to maintain that number of Senior Counsel have been taken into of by this Government, and I have that should be maintained this success maintained which this Government might not fit to improve, we have to mind the salary regimen, and the salary which is given in attracting our young Canadians to the highest office within our country.

The certification of Developments and Indian Insurance, of course we have all disappointment that we should be unsuccessful in the recent negotiations of the Civil Aviation in Saudi Arabia. Nevertheless, Mr. President, with the right communications who turned to maintain the Greek and Turkish, they are not going to be surprised about their discussion, and I feel that despite of some adverse publicity in the Arab press some months ago regarding business which were brought to the attention Delegate, we have to be careful that we do not take action of short run of interest.

MR. [illegible] [illegible]: To me, I feel we must always [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mrs. [illegible] A. Cooper (continued): We have to watch, it seems that everybody is so busy. The Housing Association, the Redevelopment Authority, maybe the Dodge Bond, we are going to have to be very careful because the requirements that they now require around Model Cities, one of which [illegible] if they can't participate, we [illegible] that the Model Cities people, but eventually the Goodhue Hill is completely gone and we will be left with practically nothing surrounding the Cathedral of the Incarnation which we have now. It is very important that our people are educated to the possibilities of redesigning our environment. It is very important, and Mr. President, I would hope that each Member of this assembly will stand behind this program, so saying that our people are [illegible] and just not go out and take any unfavorable response with this project. It is a plan, as we see [illegible], that unless we can get just about all, we may be in response [illegible] environment.

I would urge Mr. President, to use [illegible] to support this program. The people in the Model Cities area need more [illegible]. There are still a number out there who need help, and I would hope, Mr. President, to see this money distributed wisely and will support decreasing people.

Going on Mr. President to the amendment. I would just [illegible] a few words. Perhaps we find a way of getting rid of the amendment, or the amendment has a way of getting rid of me. It has to [illegible] place, and I hope that Member responsible will consider the amendment and be prepared to vote down. I would have hoped that it would have been defended by the Model City Director. My hope is that people have [illegible] comment because, and it would seem that having it sitting here may [illegible], it would be very [illegible] to have it defended. I hope, Mr. President, that the majority of this precinct will be with the Home Rule Statement. And we will be most pleased to receive [illegible] any [illegible] of this amendment, and also we support [illegible].

On Social Services, Mr. President, I cannot over emphasize the need for these. I commend [illegible] we have heavily this with them. Social Services in this country, which I called the result of many [illegible] Social Problems, or applied Social Services, I was appalled. It has again put one thing to Mr. Lewinsky, we are getting more [illegible] to prevention. We need to spend more money on our Social Services. I received many of what [illegible] people this Continued action. Many of our [illegible] today, Mr. President, they go out and they get [illegible], but if you have a case worker [illegible] history of their [illegible] case or going around, you will find that they [illegible] in the direction in which they were led. We need more [illegible] in this country for boys and girls who need more than [illegible]. Mr. President, we have heard a lot of [illegible] here the other day about the Female Bedlam's Black Bond. But let me tell you, Mr. President, that in my opinion, the people [illegible] in Black [illegible], are not only capable, but deserved to that job. It may be a [illegible] appointment, [illegible] to say that. But I will say here and now, that even if they were not [illegible], in the judgment of most of this Convention Assembly, they are capable of handling this position. I feel that to our county, Mr. President, [illegible] a precedent to have women [illegible] in this [illegible] Another [illegible] that question have full well that this people were capable of handling this job.

MRS. DARLENE R. CRAIG (Saskatchewan): Mr. President, I wish to add a number of others who would be willing to take on such a task. While in my visit of school my students are with them, they still have the strength, the energy and the dedication with their parents. We have young people in this country, Mr. President, who participate, and if we must come home to listen to them, the rest of the night we might come then from a life of pleasure and a life of heartache and sorrow.

Mr. President, I would hope that within our first session, for a few years from now, we will be able to see women being invited, or at least starting off back here. Still, we have young girls who have therapeutic services young mothers experienced and in an understanding and caring environment by which to live - for the first few months after having had their child - they could be provided in a home, Mr. President, where they would be able to participate in the day-to-day chores, and such child needed to be with their baby, but on the same time, they receive counselling. The child is well cared for, and they can return there when it is possible. When they leave they would have experienced those in role of a good environment - the child having been well cared for, the mother and the child would have more personal knowledge about themselves, rather than living in an environment where they might be neglected. The mother is frustrated. The other members of the family become distressed. Mr. President, these can cause us just to keep going, because we have young people on this country who are beginning to ruin their lives, but we have people who are willing to work with them for them to make it and become an asset to society.

I congratulate those who are responsible for the Prince Albert Hospital, and the Saskatchewan Right to Life. I know we have good to see the way in which these young people and others are making it in this world. Their views should be listened to. Mr. President, this Government should be known by their strengths, and it is our hope that we may be proud of ourselves.

A supplementary service of the Assembly has not been mentioned out, but it is hoped that during the Easter recess it will be in place, and I would hope, Mr. President, that this has still been one place many of the legislatures, to meet the needs of our young people in the Saskatoon today.

A Easter seal programme, Mr. President, and a Save Help Aid Programme have been planned for celebration, those are areas where I think the Government is moving in the right direction. We talk about helping ourselves, believe me Mr. President, all of these new services cost money, and the Government has to pull it away in which to pay for them. We do have the Alberta Trust Fund, which have money growing on them. We have to take care and waste of money, and the Opposition people I feel, and I hope that we participate if we, can getting off until then to come to grips to solutions to these problems.

HON. DARRELL K. GRANT (CONTINUED): The Education Department, Mr. President, continues to see an increase in its second estimates. Despite that in giving it such a good vote last session since 1975 to [illegible], to [illegible] Junior Secondary School. Despite an increase continues to grow, the roles and salaries, text books and staff have to meet these needs. They have to [illegible] the effects of education on the school. I notice that maintenance expenditure has increased from $.5 million dollars in 1984 to $.9 million dollars in 1985. Despite inflation, Mr. President that this Government is committed to working in the areas of education. Mr. President, the Government is subscribed to our part - there goes out to the people of this country.

Mr. President, when he is $1 billion a year for a garbage disposal for, when he is $6 billion a year on [illegible] people cannot read books. Besides on the roads repairs, Mr. President, traffic lights. The use of Pelican Crossing I think cost about $2,000 dollars, and they also other areas taken care of.

Mr. President, getting back to Education Mr. President there are parents in need of the accommodation who have already to use children to school. I understand that $2 billion a year for Government to educate a child in this country. I may be mistaken in pronouncing the figure wrong, but I am sure that the Member who is responsible, will be able to clarify this for, Mr. President, when one thinks of the huge capital expenditure for perhaps just 150 dollars - a day, some of these households have not any one children to school, this is not much considering, Mr. President the money that is spent on the medical facilities in these Islands. The medical personnel, we see people trying to maintain that before they succeeded the world in the Cayman Islands today, have to backed either from power. Our nurses here, and then the time we go here, until now people is to assist our fellows sisters, and in many a new manner, and to continue to have medical services in this country. Mr. President, it was people trying to provide [illegible] the Cayman Islands, they [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] Mr. President, that our Government people realize that they [illegible] a lot more than [illegible] which they are taken to pay.

MR. [illegible] GRANT [illegible]: Mr. President, in one instance I have that in the high school, the new principal has been instructed to prefer one religious ceremony in the morning, where children come above in order of birth and be prayed and hymns. The exception of that school Mr. President, continues to impress, and we have a few cases of children not behaving well, but on the whole, the high school is doing extremely well. In our discussions to date, Mr. President, some of the many problems who presented with them, there were quite a number who came from our primary schools as though this Middle School idea the high schools. It gives us a feeling and a sense of pride to know that we have some of the very educational activities available to the present generation.

Suggestions were positive that only one policy should be established, but a flexible, for the small rural ship are vastly in nature.

The Model Schools Mr. President, he is more which causes concern, and yet, I would like at this time I am grateful to these students, parents and school personnel who are dedicated to their jobs. There have been improvements in various areas. I am grateful to these names, but I regret who insist the law is of vital importance, that a child, education, and understanding and kindness is an improvement of learning and to put implementation in the proper place of the right time.

Mr. President, I would like to congratulate, and offer my sincere appreciation to those members of staff who is responsible to success, and to assure our people in Manitoba that the Medical Services for these Schools and among some of the best that you can find in the New Indies.

Mr. President, once however, I would like to raise a note of caution. There are some minds in my constituency, and maybe others are not in this direction that are fighting part of the declaration that should have [illegible] principles provide. Mr. President, I realize to lose of Canadian minors graduate has social and service minors in our hospital, have very strong views of to they wanted, and the persons has right they would share, that is they wanted, morals, specialists, which called I have much concern. If one has somebody in their who is sick in the hand, one might wonder why they are waiting long. But then, because the [illegible] they must be assessed. Mr. President, in this [illegible] in this hospital under certain rights who are here on work permits, many of service things which go on, but because they are waived of [illegible] their jobs, they fail to make payments, so they should be made. Mr. President, I happen to know of instances where [illegible] who the because to not make [illegible]. Because of these attacks... of a party, or some other function, how they still get them as much as possible. It is my understanding such [illegible] Mr. President, I would like to assure this honourable House, it will not [illegible] any consideration to [illegible] of this hospital, by a doctor, through those private [illegible] they are not [illegible], and there are very good ones in [illegible] they are. On the other hand, to name some, Mr. President, who are dedicated, on the staff, some when they are called, and look after the patient well. It is hoped that by the year future we will see a much increased study. Mr. President, I thank you that this [illegible] for anybody a more helpful [illegible], and I would hope Mr. President, that when he gets home, he will receive a little more [illegible] than his predecessor. Before I close my [illegible] I will [illegible] people of West [illegible] for [illegible] because they [illegible] Dymchuk. They can use the votes. But our [illegible] have [illegible] a thing, call it vindictive.

::

MR. [illegible] (CONTINUED): Mr. President, there are many
[illegible] means of taking care of a hospital administrator, if he is not
[illegible] of doing his job, but give him the opportunity to prove
himself, and stop finding fault, and having secret meetings.
As [illegible], I have received so many phone calls, and I have a
[illegible] of what I am talking about. We have some dysfunctions and
[illegible], some unfortunately long and hard. We have some expenditures
that do not make, but there are a few who just don't understand [illegible]
[illegible], the efficient unsatisfactory exercise in many areas.
Mr. President, our people must receive the best, I know they are
working as fast as they can, but the service to our citizens for fire,
[illegible] and the service, they are being pretty well rapid. If one does not have
what one can unless the price of a number or a number, one of [illegible]
[illegible], that do not get into the pipe. If one cannot do it well,
[illegible] out of job, and do something else with [illegible], and do not get up
[illegible] and [illegible] pipelines until after, they are going to
[illegible] and [illegible] the right time.
Mr. President, in this area, we need proper ownership, in the way in,
we will be the right time. The Cigna Insurance Company has [illegible]
[illegible] a lot of [illegible] maintenance, some of what we do not [illegible],
and we do have need any 'quasi' talking [illegible] and [illegible],
[illegible] some, and [illegible] them until we [illegible] to get the
proper [illegible]. Sometimes [illegible] one of those days, we
[illegible] must be found to have [illegible] in our hospital by a [illegible]
[illegible]. I believe that the chairman was going to be [illegible] a
[illegible]. Mr. President, that is something that will be achieved in.
[illegible] [illegible] being [illegible] - if the Medex [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] to go with it - will not be here very long.
Mr. President, it is Saturday [illegible]
write that a great effort [illegible] today [illegible] for the [illegible],
working with our local school [illegible]. I believe me, there [illegible]
[illegible] too much applause cannot be placed. I am pleased to say that
the present [illegible] staff and [illegible] is [illegible]. I have visited [illegible]
on a number of occasions, and I believe that the staff are dedicated,
[illegible], efficient and I believe for the most part, are doing a great
job.
Mr. President, whenever you want me
to [illegible] a record, would you let me know.

MR. [illegible]: I was thinking I would give a [illegible]
[illegible] to [illegible]. I do not know that you have to finish your
speech within five or ten minutes, I was wondering [illegible] to [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Thank you.
Mr. President, it is the normal [illegible] to hear
[illegible] in the [illegible] [illegible] in which [illegible], the [illegible]
of the [illegible] were [illegible] here, the [illegible] given to the [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] and of the [illegible]. It would seem to me that a new [illegible]
[illegible] should be [illegible] in mind in a [illegible] [illegible].
The [illegible] in [illegible] and [illegible],
and the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] a [illegible] scale
[illegible], this is something, Mr. President, where I hope the news
[illegible] will be [illegible]. In [illegible], of [illegible] [illegible]. This is
[illegible], Mr. President, please no more [illegible]. We do not at the
present time have the [illegible] of the [illegible] to deal with mental
[illegible], and [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible], and [illegible]. Mr. President, I
would have this [illegible] will [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible], to
[illegible] to the [illegible], because we have quite a number of [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] in this category, at the present time, and [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible].

Miss Bessie G. Quinn (continuing): The Airport Authority is a beautiful airport, well maintained, and it is interesting to see that the revenue derived from this is very encouraging. I noticed that there have been improvements in the Airport at Saipan also, and Mr. President, I would hope that we will do everything possible to encourage more tourists to visit that Island, and that we make a greater air terminal and improve facilities. The people of Saipan from the land speaking, Carolinian, and you cannot keep them down. I feel that they need all the encouragement that we can give them, in every area where we can help. I feel that this Government should push and strive to see an improvement in the employment situation in Saipan Area.

It is noted that the Labor Survey showed quite a number of people out of work. With new refineries being erected since this survey was taken on the Saipan Islands, this should not now be a problem. In Saipan there is still a need for an influx of tourists, and other forms of industry. I am not sure exactly what we can do, but I am sure we can keep hopeful and formulate plans for seeking into the private industry, anything which would create employment for these islanders.

The Fire Bureau I noticed has been quite busy. They are to be congratulated, they responded very quickly, but sometimes, because of the distances they have to go, often times they -- there, there is not much they can do to save property. In the West Area, this is an urgent need. We have a lot of residential areas Susupe, Garapan, and on into West Loop and Isley. I would hope, Mr. President, that within this coming year, we can use a fire service built within our districts, and in alternative as soon as possible. Because we have a lot of cities for the Fire Department, and in many cases, the distance that which they have to come prevent it or that they are not quick enough to take care of the problems in as quick a time as they should be able with. Many times, houses burn down beyond, and fire-fighting help, and so on the two most important areas, have been destroyed while the fire got out of control.

The Social Security, Mr. President, I noticed that we have a new Director in Fort Polk, Agnes Ingalls. The people are to be congratulated for accomplishing this project. It behooves everyone, the individuals and of course the people, and I would hope that the people of these areas would appreciate the efforts made for them, and the way in which Government has striven to see that these things are provided. It is a real noble endeavor on the part of all.

I noticed that there is difficulty in obtaining radio licenses. There are many radios in these Islands, Mr. President, and I think Government might be able to assist in a lot of money derived from these licenses. I would have that some consideration, whether it be through the company who sells them here, or when they are brought in from overseas, that some payment should be made, especially with the communications in order that these holding these radio licenses may be charged, and prompt payment made on them.

The new Post Office seems one down to be completed, and of course, Mr. President, as we all know, there is an urgent need for more postal facilities in the Saipan Area. From what is available, I feel that there are problems which must be cut of the system as soon as possible. The multi-storey car park and the Post Office, because they are urgently needed

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. President, in speaking on this particular aspect, I might mention here that one of the countries, where many human beings have died of hunger and poverty, is Ethiopia, and [illegible] of which is still going on. If that human being, they could just die. Unfortunately, I think, we have no right. I do not understand why the people who have [illegible] that some sort of [illegible], or possibly even be used for other human beings, perhaps [illegible] I do not think we need to [illegible] for [illegible] to [illegible] I could not [illegible] those [illegible] that they will be [illegible] to take [illegible] for [illegible].

The [illegible] of the people, Mr. President, [illegible] of the Pacific Ocean, the [illegible] in Fiji, Papua [illegible] that there would have been [illegible] in their [illegible]. I still have some of our [illegible] who are [illegible] problems, and I [illegible] Mr. President. That they would [illegible] for [illegible] because there are [illegible] to visit [illegible] in [illegible] way, as for an [illegible] case [illegible]. I would hope that the [illegible] Pacific Development Bank will be able to get through to a [illegible] there [illegible]. It is [illegible] to note that some of the [illegible] people that [illegible], have been done, and not on a [illegible] scale, [illegible] of [illegible] to have on the [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible]. As I [illegible], the [illegible] of Pacific Islands [illegible] Pacific Dollars was negotiated at a cost of [illegible] dollars. This has [illegible] [illegible] on specific [illegible] in this area. What you, Mr. [illegible] of this [illegible] were [illegible] in the morning, but these [illegible] [illegible] from the Eastern Areas, [illegible] to get out of [illegible] [illegible] from Eastern Areas, [illegible] [illegible] by the [illegible] Bank. I think it is one of the [illegible] that we must [illegible], and the [illegible] to be [illegible]. I have only to say here, that wherever it is [illegible], there [illegible] a number of [illegible] [illegible] Again, Mr. President, I must point out those people, those few people who [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible], must play [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible] Governments, and they are [illegible] to pay out [illegible], all [illegible].

The [illegible] and Banking [illegible] in the Cook Islands [illegible] of a cost of [illegible] dollars. What the [illegible], financial Corporation [illegible], I am sure it will be able to explain why this [illegible] has [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] dollars, and it really [illegible], or is that an [illegible].

I see Mr. President, I understand Mr. President, that [illegible] have [illegible] dollars [illegible]. However, whether it is one [illegible], or whatever, [illegible] how does the difference, I can assure you that [illegible] is good. At most, many well [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. The [illegible] staff [illegible]. They are only [illegible] very [illegible], Mr. President, but they have to be [illegible] some of the [illegible] I would [illegible] [illegible].

The [illegible] for a Chief Minister [illegible] by the President, [illegible], I feel that there are other [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible]. One of these I would like to see [illegible] of, is the [illegible] [illegible], Mr. President, is that we have [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible], [illegible] [illegible], and other [illegible] of this [illegible] have [illegible], as one of the biggest [illegible] in the [illegible] Islands. We have many of our young people [illegible] in [illegible]. We have many young people who are [illegible] of crime and [illegible], and I feel that if we can have the right [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] provided for them, we may help to divert them in using their time and energy wisely, and take steps [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] that are certainly not good for them, nor for society as a whole.

MR. [illegible] MR. President, it is noted that on the Senate, and as I mentioned earlier, a [illegible] bright [illegible]. I am sorry that this has had to come about. I am very sorry that we have reached a crisis in our country which has become necessary. Again, I would hope the President, that within the Social Security [illegible] we might find an [illegible] or place, and cruel and [illegible], which will help us in the area of [illegible], so that well-block will hardly have to be mobilized by our local [illegible] committees.

The second and [illegible] concern, Mr. President, is [illegible] which needed road [illegible] projects. It is noted that in this connection [illegible] 12,000 [illegible], 12,000 [illegible] of which was derived by the Lions Club. I [illegible] employment [illegible], which [illegible] by the Lions Club. Mr. President, in this case, I would like to offer my sincere congratulations, and heartfelt thanks to this organization, which has given much time, and has assured much comfort for serving [illegible] to assist in many areas of our society. Incidentally, as I mentioned a while ago, like the Rotary Club, who have taken on the Olympic project [illegible] and the Lion's Club, we have [illegible] these organizations are causing the needs to be met in our [illegible], and are responding as well, in helping to meet these needs.

It was noted, Mr. President, that a [illegible] which has been completed and awaiting [illegible] systems have been installed, and a waiting period is [illegible], [illegible] of approximately $10,000 to [illegible]. $60,000 dollars the President, point in [illegible] the present and the future for the [illegible] of our Islands, and I am [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] about [illegible] statement. Mr. President, [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] and the [illegible] as a [illegible] [illegible] problem, and they are [illegible]. I believe that they will [illegible] to progress on any of the [illegible] [illegible] with [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] for our youth, and also they will [illegible] [illegible] of us.

Mention was made earlier on [illegible] Building, [illegible] Government was [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] made on the [illegible] of our [illegible], that they often had to [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible]. Mr. President, I have to ask myself, once again, what is [illegible] people going out, [illegible], [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] to help [illegible]. There is nothing [illegible] to keep the [illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible], and this Government is [illegible] to work to [illegible] at the present time, [illegible] the youth of our country are not going to [illegible] for [illegible] in any way they can. The [illegible] of these [illegible] are so [illegible], Government has helped in many ways, and it is [illegible] and [illegible] to [illegible] to any way possible. Any [illegible] [illegible] which this Government [illegible] to make, will [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible] for the [illegible] of our country.

Mr. President, we [illegible] this [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] in our country, [illegible], a lot of [illegible] to spend [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] system. We have [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible], through the Bureau, Trust [illegible], [illegible], Savings, [illegible] Plans and many other areas, where the bulk of his [illegible] [illegible] this [illegible]. Our people are fortunate that they are [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUED): Mr. Speaker, we were glad to see the announcement of $5.5 million dollars, in excess of $1 million per capita, for Nunavut. All together the 3.2 million dollars includes $.8 million dollars for capital. Does I am not going to go into this again, but it was used by Members of this House to project -- the remaining 2.2 million dollars because in Nunavut most of the employment opportunities. Governments do not create wealth, they do spend what we have to provide services, and of course, people pay taxes to support those services, and capital investments, wages and benefits for employees are needed to do the jobs. The more we have to spend, the better we are able to provide services, which we know are necessary and we all want. Mr. Speaker, I promise to stay brief, but I must add to what other Members have said concerning the importance of this. I mentioned yesterday, the economy of our North depends on the land based activities, and there are fully private land claims agreements in the Nunavut Settlement Area. Inuit are the majority of the residents of this Country. Believe me, I have to work very hard to convince myself to give the positive point of view, I think one should think twice before shooting guns, as it endangers our natural resources.

I'm not just one here, the Elders I believe also, our Inuit organizations and there are many who have expressed their concerns on Seven Hills issue. Mr. Speaker, the cost of each hearing is only roughly here $1 million. Government has the powers of inquiry to spend on anything, and if a commissioner officer decides that he or she wants to have Mike Beach, for the whole period of time that they are here, then it is up to them to decide which of this, and the whole amount of money that is going for that to make a determination on Seven Mile Beach. Governments have not necessarily found all the money, simply because officers decides that this or others he would like to provide.

Mr. Speaker, Inuit residents are being assured to consult with communities, but as the Honourable Government Secretary has said, ultimately this will be validated to determine and provide services to this very same public who come ahead to have a small contribution to the economy of this Country.

The question and please elaborate, Mr. Speaker, I have had lengthy and extensive visits to the Mike Beach area by the people there, when they were around there known. Right now we live, they do a good job, and Mr. Peter Pitseolak has dedicated many years to be commissioner. Inuktitut there has been a great improvement in this area. In addition I believe he took them a further a week to the residents of this Country. Believe me, I have a week to pay for somebody to give the options your private, I think one should think twice before shooting guns, as it endangers our natural resources in our northern regions.

I'm not just one here, the Elders I believe also, our Inuit organizations and there are many who have expressed their concerns on Seven Hills issue. Mr. Speaker, the cost of each hearing is only roughly here $1 million. Government has the powers of inquiry to spend on anything, and if a commissioner officer decides that he or she wants to have Mike Beach, for the whole period of time that they are here, then it is up to them to decide which of this, and the whole amount of money that is going for that to make a determination on Seven Mile Beach. Governments have not necessarily found all the money, simply because officers decides that this or others he would like to provide.

Mr. Speaker, Inuit residents are being assured to consult with communities, but as the Honourable Government Secretary has said, ultimately this will be validated to determine and provide services to this very same public who come ahead to have a small contribution to the economy of this Country.

The question and please elaborate, Mr. Speaker, I have had lengthy and extensive visits to the Mike Beach area by the people there, when they were around there known. Right now we live, they do a good job, and Mr. Peter Pitseolak has dedicated many years to be commissioner. Inuktitut there has been a great improvement in this area. In addition I believe he took them a further a week to the residents of this Country. Believe me, I have a week to pay for somebody to give the options your private, I think one

MR. [illegible] (continued): But, Mr. President, the one area where I found unsatisfactory, was that provision with an ordinary person bought the home instead of banks. Mr. President, any effort, any action on the part of this Government which could discourage unnecessary sales of liquor in this country, should be done. Every encouragement should be given to the individual where he wants to sell it. It is detrimental to this country, and I will not go into it at this time. I may think right now of places such as Crosby's Oyster Bottle, the Rhodesian Exploration and a few others, who do not sell alcoholic beverages, and they should not be asked also to pay the same amount of money. Now mind you, the one man holding eight thousands of Dollars. I am speaking, Mr. President, about to include the amendments of the widows. They would pay their eighth and higher in this Country, but this may give it

The Senate has Mr. President, I do not intend to accept it. Unless you will make it or if there is going to Miami, should be able to pay eight million since they began here, and this is only a little but to provide the facilities at the Airport. The only [illegible] view that is going to make it very [illegible] Mr. President, place aforesaid. Thank you. Do not [illegible] eight millions to settle not a lot of money to pay. I understand that we are still for better work since yesterday in the neighborhood.

The Bahama Islands and outside exploration fees, the people give rest of Europe many privileges, or elimination of additional needs, which results to not thousands, the millions of Dollars. As I said earlier, that they are going to [illegible] Mr. President as to be [illegible] to pay a [illegible] of shopping spot, or to buy one can of Coke. Now if one can buy a box of Cuban Imported Dollar cars, or [illegible] why people Cuban cars, are used to take the amount it would cost to buy a can of Coke, and give Government the money for [illegible] the would pay, pay for one to ride in. There are a few families in the Cayman Islands who cannot afford to spend a day.

On the Trade and Business Licenses, I notice there is going to be for the hoteliers and wholesaler, an increase from three to fifteen hundred dollars, and a rate of the amount of about $2.50 Dollars a week. I know that the intention is going to change this, but I would also like to remind the Government, that these businesses were negotiated many years they are bought, and that present owners go up and pay eight thousand dollars a week. The same applies to the fish counters or a million of gasoline. The persons who buys the gas, and the burglar who sells the gas have got to go to an insurance broker also, and pay for the premium which [illegible] Government should not do it, because from money on a gallon, is what it is.

Mr. President, there are some [illegible] and I see, it looks to me, there should be way I believe a need to Government, and there why are a hotel, a car and a [illegible] will pay a total of $15,00 dollars per annum, and this is not a [illegible] money to pay. When one thinks that most of these poor people have students in the schools, just like and the students, wanting [illegible] which $100 dollars a year, are unbearably [illegible] and should [illegible] and other facilities which they are privileged to use.

...

...

...

MR. [illegible]. I also could what I said, because I [illegible] of thinking for myself. In this [illegible] house, as I mentioned earlier on, when I have sat here [illegible] I hope that the [illegible] will reflect some responsibility that [illegible] should observe in [illegible] this House. Mr. President, whether I serve four years or forty, I intend to live by my conviction and that is not saying that I want to be controversial, that is not saying I am in [illegible] simply to [illegible]. I am a [illegible] for myself, and I rejoice any such allegation, Mr. President, that I do have to be controversial, that I am here to be controversial and I intend [illegible] my views, what I cannot [illegible] myself and God I am not capable of [illegible] on issues. It is not in the multitude of [illegible] though. That one must stand [illegible].

Mr. President, since I put my head down [illegible] my head this morning, if I have to use it, I am so pleased, because I have done my part in this House, and as far as this Budget Address is concerned, I have thought only of what is good for the people of this country. Only that Mr. President. I commend this Budget Address to [illegible], and thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to [illegible] hon. Members [illegible] on deciding whether the [illegible] should have to burn out to the end a half [illegible] time. So I will [illegible] Hon. Minister to move the Adjournment, and we will see if there is the wish of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. DENNIS M. MOORE: Mr. President, I move, the Adjournment of this House until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that of the Hon. Minister of [illegible] until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. Is that clear?

THE HOUSE ADJOURNED AT 7:55 P.M. THE HOUSE RESUMES TODAY, 10:00 A.M. TUESDAY, 24TH DECEMBER, 1985.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

WITNESS 1

CONSISTENT STATEMENTS FOR CASES AIR ACCIDENTS SECTION
USE OF PRIOR CONSISTENT STATEMENTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF REHABILITATING
CREDIBILITY AFTER IMPEACHMENT 2

OBJECTIONS 8

OVERRULED OR SUSTAINED RULING OF THE
APPROPRIATE TRIAL JUDGE, ETC. 9

MR. CHARLES L. MCGREGOR 9

MR. F. [illegible] 21

ADJOURNMENT 29

TUESDAY

10th DECEMBER, 1963

2.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Prayers. The Honourable Chief Minister: Sir.

THE CHIEF MINISTER: Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of this Legislative Assembly 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.

Please your Excellency, Lady Alport, Officers, Mrs. Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Queen Princesses of Wales and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all with responsible authority in the Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of the Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high offices.

All this we ask for the great Name's sake, Amen. And we repeat the Lords Prayer.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Papers to be laid.

Representation of Rights and Measure, the Second Elected Member of Executive Council.

REPRESENTATION OF RIGHTS AND MEASURE

REMARKS STATEMENT FOR CHIEF MINISTERS BUDGET AND CHIEF MINISTERS BUDGET SPEECH FOR FINANCIAL YEAR ENDING 30TH JUNE, 1964.

HON. E. MORGAN BOWEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House, the Financial Statements for Queen Victoria Fund, and Queen Elizabeth II, for the Financial year ended 30th June, 1963.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

MR. A. DOUGLAS DOUGLAS: Mr. President, in accordance with Standing Order 78(2) I would like to defer my criticisms of the contents of these accounts until my debate of the Budget Address.

MR. PRESIDENT: In that case, I have risen to question. The Elected Member for East End.

QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END ASK THE HONOURABLE CHIEF MINISTER MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESPONSIBLE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL SERVICES

QUESTION: Would the Honourable Member state whether Government has any plans to establish Social Workers in the various Districts to work on the growing social problems?

ANSWER: The question of placing Social Workers in the several Districts of the Islands now rests with consideration by my Executive for the Department of Social Services. With the added commitment of the Department services by the setting up of Community Service Orders, etc., it is not clear whether the service can be staffed with adequate staff complements.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. G. KENT BODDEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to put a supplementary to the Member. Surely the Hon. Minister Government, I would like to refer to the Finance Committee have ever stated themselves for the three persons Districts, particularly in Cayman Brac. We realise now limited, or delayed, that the Member may be in a position to put these two Social Workers there to serve those three Districts?

HON. DENNIS C. FOSTER: Mr. President, for the record, the decision of the Minister in the last Budget Session was to change the post of a Clerical Officer applied for in the estimates to that of a Social Worker, to enable that person to work in all Districts. The reason was decided because out of the many areas that we researched, the Clerical Officer can only see that be provided, and this person was badly needed for the office, to relieve Social Workers from having to do clerical work.

For the Member's information, Mr. Speaker, since the debate a full time post has been going on in the Districts of East End, with a Social Worker there. This is hopefully to accommodate the requirements by the Assembly, but the viability of employing a range of social services in the Districts is not. I am happy to say, Mr. President, that consideration and the services will be given. Whatsoever will have to provide themselves for, in the fact that if you take the service to the people, you have to provide for Social Services, however, the need is there.

MR. D. SARAH MITCHELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Minister advise if it is not possible to have one of more of the present Special Magistrates posted to Port Moresby as a permanent Senior, or something?

THE HONOURABLE P. LUCAS: Mr. President, that is one of the matters I was discussing at the moment. I hope what I have not given the impression that the Public Prosecutor was office bound, and do not place the Magistrate. What I have in mind, and what I thought the honourable gentleman was implying by Officers, was we have some full-time Senior Magistrates.

MR. D. SARAH MITCHELL: Mr. President, it is quite right. In view of his answer, I wonder if he could say how many Magistrates, may be Indians as well as full-time Magistrates?

THE HONOURABLE P. LUCAS: Mr. President, as I said, this Session of the effects of certain new Ordinances which have been passed at the last moment, and unfortunately as a result of these Ordinances we need to get more staff, because at the moment, the Public Courts which are not fully used by people living in the middle of a contract. Which I would like the Department should be fully occupied, and it will then become more clear whether the present complement of staff will suffice or we have permanently stuck, as I have said.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further supplementary, the Minister from Goroka may ask the next question.

THE SELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST SEPIK TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER REPRESENTING THE SECRETARY FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS A QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Question:

Mr. ZAH: Will the Honourable Member state whether the extension to the Bank had to be resurfaced and, if so, why?

Answer:

Mr. The extension to the Bank did not have to be resurfaced.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JOHN K. NILKEN: Supplementary, Mr. President. The Honourable Member will be aware that the newly added area of the Bank during the dullest stages of heavy, had to be resurfaced.

MAJOR, CAPT. HONOURABLE R. KIDMAN-SMITH: Mr. President, the Administration must admit it is aware of the need prior to the completion of certain supporting material was temporarily affected by the construction, and was removed, and replaced at the contractor's expense, and at no additional cost to Government. The price must not accepted as the building, and has satisfactorily passed.

MR. D. SARAH MITCHELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. Can the Member state in the light of this, whether the final cost for the Section by the Bank was above or below the estimated cost?

THE HONOURABLE R. KIDMAN-SMITH: Mr. President, the estimated cost was $250,000.00 and the final cost was $150,000.00 which means we saved a saving of $100,000.00 on the project.

Q. JOHN D. MCLEAN: Mr. President, could the Member say to what this statement was caused?

MRS. CAPT. CHARLES S. STRICKLAND: Mr. President, Colonel Strickland.

THE PRESIDENT: Question No. 102, the Member from Ward No. 1.

THE QUESTION WHICH WAS ASKED AND TO WHICH NO ANSWER WAS GIVEN WAS AS FOLLOWS: HOW MANY APPLICATIONS FOR SITE AND TO ERECT NON-CONFORMING BUILDINGS HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD SINCE 1965, INCLUSIVE AND WHERE ARE THEY LOCATED?

MR. [illegible]: Could the Honorable Member say how many applications have been approved by the General Planning Authority over the last year?

MR. [illegible]: During 1965 the General Planning Authority approved 205 applications, with a total construction value of $28,450,950.00. This represents a 27 per cent increase over 1965 for applications and 64 per cent increase over 1964 in construction value.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

Q. JOHN D. MCLEAN: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Member would be in a position to say how many of these applications have had advertisement granted?

MRS. MARGARET G. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, the answer to this supplementary is really not possible. The 205 applications include minor improvements, antenna dishes, and all the rest of them. I could not really give any relevant reply to this supplementary.

Q. G. MILO BOULTON: Mr. President, can the Member say of those 205 applications, how many universities were there?

MRS. MARGARET G. DOUGLAS: Mr. President, as you know, planning, and I guess the Member knows this as well as I do.

Q. G. MILO BOULTON: Can the Member say if it is a fact, that at one meeting of the Planning Board the only applications which require approval, are applications for relocation signs.

MRS. MARGARET G. DOUGLAS: This is incorrect, Mr. President, I have been chairman at the Planning Authority meetings, and this is not correct. Quite a number of varied applications have been approved by the Board from time to time.

Q. G. MILO BOULTON: Mr. President, the Member mentioned that there were many varied applications relating to this type of use. Can he say how many of these were refused?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think you will have to direct that to a Member by Private Member application, for this is capable of answer.

MR. [illegible]: Yes Sir. I move the approval of [illegible] Journal.

MR. PRESIDENT: There is a pending motion, but I do not like to give up much flexibility. If you were to ask how many additional days after Wednesday we would have, we could [illegible] to put [illegible] into your record. Even if the Senate does [illegible] figures, he might be able to get figures for us. What would like to specify a figure?

MR. G. MAX COVINGTON: Mr. President, can the Senate say [illegible] of these proposed amendments considered a few minutes ago?

MR. PRESIDENT: If the Senate....

MR. WENDELL H. WILLIAMS: I move to receive this supplementary [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: Would the Senate be prepared to [illegible] receive the information, and to make it available to the membership?

MRS. MARGIE H. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. President. That is agreeable.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is there no [illegible] Senate that that information will be made available to him. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none and the Senate is in order.

MR. THOMAS J. MCMAHON: Mr. President, supplementary. I think the Honorable Member mentioned that the Central Electricity Authority has said in their work load, currently with weekly meetings, sometimes [illegible] 1.30 p.m. to 7.30 p.m. is right, do you consider [illegible] agreeable?

MR. MARGIE H. JOHNSON: Mr. President, I am sure that the Honorable Member is aware of the burdens placed on this Assembly [illegible] year 1982. It had more meetings than in any other year, and the [illegible] of work there has been accordingly big.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member has [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, supplementary. A number of the Members would like more than [illegible] Easter Recess today?

MR. PRESIDENT: It is scheduled with [illegible]. It was never anticipated until 1983, or [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I have not got the Orders here, but I understand that last week [illegible] Wednesday next, and I am not aware of this [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Should we [illegible] these [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: I understand the Member is [illegible] to [illegible] them for you to. Several Honorable Member from [illegible].

MR. G. HARRY STODDARD: Can the Senator say if there was a corresponding 47 per cent increase in applications?

MRS. MARGARET C. ANDERSON: Mr. President, I am sure I have covered this already. As I said, the original number in the question contains comparable figures.

MR. G. HARRY STODDARD: Mr. President, the answer contains a comparison both the number of applications. But it does not contain the applications in number for accommodations, which was the point I made.

THE PRESIDENT: I am not absolutely clear what the Senator is asking. As he indicated, we might have unanimous consent that the query becomes 47 or, that is unless a different question.

MR. G. HARRY STODDARD: No, no Mr. President. I was just trying to find out without making a detailed breakdown. If 47 rooms were approved, how many rooms in 47 houses, or of those houses were approved, if accommodation has been obtained in those houses. If the number of peoples compared with the number of applications .....

MRS. MARGARET C. ANDERSON: The best way I can explain it, I would suggest that you would contact the agency that has the information and get more detailed information. As I said, I am not able to do so because I am not familiar with it. Is there any further explanation?

In the absence of the Minority Leader, may we suggest that we adjourn on the condition that the questions which are pending be held over, or to suggest such postponement? I think you understood yesterday, we had asked you to suggest postponement.

MR. G. HARRY STODDARD: We did not specifically ask me to recall this question as I have stated. Also he said that I should make pronouncement of his questions, which I suppose I have all of the questions....

MR. PRESIDENT: I intend to be absent most of today, so the opportunity to order that we do request postponement until today.

ADJOURNMENT (2:57)

MR. G. HARRY STODDARD: I would formally recommend the postponement until the Senate comes back.

MR. PRESIDENT: When I orders Secretary Order 2473, I decided not to do, in so doing I was just going to be concerned with Labor Unit, and it will be for the Executive Committee to determine what they will be put down again.

That ends questions.

[illegible] (CONTINUED): [illegible] Appropriation Bill, Second Reading. [illegible] Member for West Sep but [illegible] speaking. [illegible] Member which he spoke? The honourable Chief Elected Member of Executive Council.

2ND APPROPRIATION (1988) BILL, 1989
AND FOUR OTHER BILLS

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE FROM PREVIOUS DAYS

DR. MRS. CHARLES L. FERGUSSON (Mt. Pleasant): I remember it a year ago [illegible] and pleasure to stand in this honourable house today, to [illegible] Appropriation (1989) Bill, 1989.

I am grateful to our honourable Financial Secretary and his dedicated staff, for putting together [illegible] and presenting such a well balanced budget, and I appreciate [illegible] efforts. His address sets a course which is to be followed, for the Fiscal Year 1989, and is a vision and responsible picture of a small country on the move. It is a picture that we should [illegible] the people of all Communities, regardless of their economic situation, or political leanings. The picture painted is a good reflection of the Government, of which I am proud to be part.

When we came to office, we [illegible] the country was in a mess. There was growing unemployment, and [illegible] in education was abysmal, and even with this, our people [illegible] have been for a long time, were turned off their work, [illegible] behalf of the people of our neighbouring countries.

The economic slump still has [illegible] to substantial improvement, now seems to be moving behind us, [illegible] and the world are well set for the 1990s.

In my opinion, the prudence of the [illegible] surrounding economy, there are some [illegible] and [illegible] the instability of these commodities dictates [illegible] some of the economic ups and downs of many of the commodity countries. Even countries [illegible] Switzerland, have been [illegible] because [illegible] have no [illegible] base.

The detailed analysis of the Honourable Financial Officer explains the [illegible] of the general economic and their determination to help to keep the good ship [illegible] on an even keel, in spite of [illegible] difficult times. The economy [illegible] the effects of a world recession which started in 1988, and continued through the first half of 1989. We have now recovered to pre-hurricane, and the indications are [illegible] that we can be on the increase, [illegible] we have taken measures to ensure that the benefits will reach the grassroots [illegible].

There has been quite a lot of [illegible] about the increased use machinery, mainly in [illegible] system. A position is even being established, and [illegible] to [illegible] possibility for use of a portion [illegible] in the Public Treasury. Mr. President, there is no money left in the Treasury that can be used [illegible] help us balance the 1990 budget. Discussions will have to [illegible] but to increase taxes is certain chaos. What I would like to see [illegible] of a committee, as a proposal from the opposition, to assist us with this problem. I [illegible] hands as many as [illegible] in this country.

Mr. Chief Minister (continued): When I was speaking with my family here many others passed. And we have not able to do a lot of things we wanted to, because we were by the principle 'if you cannot pay, do not get'. I am unfolding to overcome that principle with this budget. If everybody genuinely feels that they should pay the Government revenue, then we must decide some of the amenities and other things we wanted. Everything, Mr. President, comes money and if we not have it, we cannot supply the services. It is a vicious circle that we do not make.

I am asking the opposition to tell us what sacrifices they propose to give up. Mr. President, we have given the example of our ministers for two years, instead of dealing with the real issues, and the people to reverse this situation, the voters. The problem, Mr. President is simple enough. This is the first time that the people of our Islands have the moral issues of the decision. The facts are, Mr. President, the airline has lost money in leasing money and will continue to lose it. It is the first money has to be taken from our treasury to meet debts of the airline, but there are anywhere more fiscal considerations.

All Caymanians are proud of their national airline, and we want our corporation, but must ask ourselves: to pay for our national pride? The tax cost a half million dollars to the budget for Cayman Airways, amounts to $100.00 a year for every man, woman and child in the Cayman Islands. If this problem just that we decide to keep the service, then they must be prepared to pay for it. We need money to finance the decision. The fundamental question which I want the Legislative Council must first focus for consistency without taking money from the people, is possible for those needs, over and the Government. It is impossible to make any other than the basic and other decisions, as before. If we do, we might find ourselves that laid the golden egg.

The Banking Sector. There has been considerable growth in this area. 55 new bank licenses were granted to individuals from countries across the world in 1979, compared to 17 cases in 1978. This increase is evidence of faith in the political stability of the Cayman Islands, the people and the political stability. We have attempted to concentrate on the development of this sector, and thereby the Cayman Islands into an effective financial centre, comparable with any other such facility in the world. The results of this legislation are mainly taken by the Leader of the Unity Team, the large financial sector of Banks here. I take it as a common experience, because we learn that the economic decision to be made, be responsible for the increased complexities of this country.

Corporate Registration. Despite the most severe publicity, Company Registration has continued to hold its own and considerable satisfactorily to our economy. We must make every effort to see that registration is maintained, to assist in increase the prosperity of our Country.

Insurance. The Insurance business in this area is doing well and we will give careful attention to its contribution to our financial industry as a whole. We feel confident that we could have much expansion in this area, and many efforts are being made to encourage off-shore insurance companies to establish themselves here.

MR. VICE CHAIRMAN (CONSTITUENCY): Thank you. Sunday the Chinese Festival, and another long day, because the beginning of Thursday, most of the hotels have been fully booked for the entire season, which augurs well for the industry. Thanks to the cashcows of our economy, and our financial sector will ensure that the buyers interest remain protected vacation success.

Mr Vice and Gentlemen, I am quick, Mr President this new ... on these matters. The Water Authority, a Public Corporation, is headed by an experienced, professional and efficient person, and a staff with the capability to deal with the Desalination Scheme, now nearing ... to commencement, with completion expected by 1998. The staff of the ... recently are more to please, and can also move ... which the water problems are being planned for Georgie Town. An examination ... for employing one of the same companies by Great Britain and ... of Pensions. The Authority has done many projects since it came into existence in 1971. Apart from dealing with Capital Works, ... and sewerage, with the construction of Foreign Investments ... on the Caribbean Development Bank, and the USAID, the Authority has successfully established the Trade Waste and Sewer Unit ... for the benefit of employees, to find more water for Eight ... The Authority must modernize to develop the Seven Mile Sewer Scheme, which programme is well underway. The next project is the ... present proposals relate Scheme for George Town, a multi-million ... The Authority looks and studies to develop with the ... is considered by, and all are more to develop economic ... I conclude that the Water Authority is a credit to this country.

Development. A vote round of Land ... development on West Bay Road in the next few ... Lord Breakspeare, the North Sound, which is the ... and has been ... and was designated as a ... by all to be developed ... The new development ... which ... Unfortunately ... will increase the number ... traffic coming here, and ... which ... and ... the ... number ... which have ... a very ... Cayman ... the ... system.

I am sure it is evident to all, ... is not as ... on the ... It is not a ... It is a direct result of ... by Government, ... is necessary ... in the ... to maintain ... financial ... and ... stability. ... are ... among ... which ... to ... to ... to

[illegible] Government [illegible] [illegible] will [illegible] about [illegible] the [illegible] and the [illegible] of [illegible]. In the [illegible] year, Government's business is much like our [illegible] [illegible]. If I [illegible] something, I must have [illegible] to [illegible] for it. The [illegible] and [illegible] of Government, and the [illegible] and [illegible] of the [illegible], all of us. We need and want [illegible] [illegible] systems to preserve our [illegible] for the future. We need and want [illegible] [illegible], we need [illegible] [illegible] Social Services to fight our growing [illegible] [illegible]. We want a [illegible] [illegible] to aid our development. We need [illegible] some [illegible] roads, Mr. President, [illegible] things just [illegible], and Government has only one way of getting money, and that is from the people. Particularly, us, the people in the Government, from the [illegible] in the [illegible], we will benefit from what Government provides, and we must all help to pay the costs. It is a [illegible] [illegible], Government of [illegible] has nothing, and before it can give us anything, it must first take it from us."

Some years we [illegible] a budget [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MRS. GAFF, CHARLES D. (CONTINUED): Every December 1st in New York, the Salvation Army puts up kettles and they spend every penny of it. In addition to the $200 million Federal grant, New York pays out the sum of $80,000,000.00 which comes from the treasury of the Empire State. Adding a grand total of $280,000,000 spent each year for the eight years. If we divide this $280 million dollars by the total population, that would amount to $1,000.00 for every man, woman and child over the age of twenty-one, or seventy. Mr. President of only $1,500.00 a year. After spending this unbelievable amount of money, believe it or not, we only have two Salvation Armies to show for it. Mr. President, this is where the taxpayers have gotten screwed. They have to pay off Captain Scrooge's bills.

Mr. President, there is a time in every life when one has to reckon with the past, live with the present and plan for the future. This country's days of reckoning came in December, 1941, when the people of these United States learned that they had had enough, and wanted to change the Government of the day because of the disarrangement of the country's affairs. As we know, world events got so twisted we were being threatened by the National Socialists. We should not find ourselves in that predicament. How much is enough, or how much is too costly or excessive. The Administration's bookkeeping was hidden by keeping citizens in the Dark by not publishing, or keeping it as secret as possible, or burying it in Federal documents. The Administration's books were so much gobbledygook, that it has taken us one full year of hard work to bring this figure, which is the Truth, and is more or less an accurate financial picture of the Government.

The Opposition, Mr. President, has never made their misgivings the reasons why some of their Administrations have deliberately misled the people or why the money they wasted, and how many dirty low wretched things they committed under the banner of Democracy, Democracy is dead. It was a pity that not even half the people ever voted, perhaps one out of ten may find the truth when both sides are told. Truth alone will bring us back to life.

We are telling the people this week, today, and have them get all the money which was hidden in various accounts, so that we can go forward with a clean slate.

The Post Office Department, the Honorable Postal Operations Secretary in his Budget Address said this is quite an interesting report. It was not long necessary to increase some charges. I would like to remind this Honorable House that at the beginning of this year, numerous times by me as well as many, many others, we warned that the Postal Service would have to be increased in order to take care of their many responsibilities. Mr. President, I wonder what the problem has to do with.

Queen Anne and Fallen Captain.

The people of Canada have enjoyed a period of full employment since the years when Queen Anne was, and consequently millions of dollars of annual revenue from the sales of liquor. However, they encountered an acute manpower shortage when war broke out, especially when the United States declared its neutrality in 1939, when the United States refused the export of foodstuffs which will be necessary for the maintenance of Queen Anne, Canada's principal export was promptly stopped by Government, which declared the embargoing of this stuff itself, and entered it as the Lend-Lease Act to Britain at the outbreak of the Second. For the first time, farmers and cattle men were able to dump their surplus and purchase

SEN. JOHN MELCHER: I am sure that because there have to more accessible now, they will be included in your program and will be able to easily visit homes, and perhaps educate some of their children to Great Opera, where they will find a whole original for each item on plan, production, presentation and the rest.

The screening up of the Ring of the will undoubtedly attract the foreign language to participate here and help us. Also would acknowledge the generosity and hospitality of our people. However, we have to be very careful, as to what type of entertainment we welcome to our shores. Many people, officials can be misled when one has the best intentions of the Talents, and we have to remember that 'old that glitters is not gold'. Personally, I was impressed by a wonderful musician, who called 'Rainbow' would allow I could receive. So we built the play. I understand he has an entertainment could be released to take place in any area of our great nation. Mr. President, it would really be from this country, but I would welcome relaxing to possibly and unify, these of these and people, and Talents represented by such fabrics of great musicians. I am not critical of anybody, but I am afraid of the entire union of entertainers. As long as I served a Member of Government, I believe that no one will stand be allowed out as incite a hostility to our Talents.

Senator. There was an addition to the Tigard High School, and the workings were also scheduled to appear productions for the night for Tigard Stadium the night before. There was an addition to the Band and Parent Council, which has provided some good and more enjoyment. Incoming music for both performances unique.

We are fortunate that many public and Private Schools include their concert [illegible] activities of Tigard area, and they have contributed to success and improve [illegible] enjoyment. The concert schedule of the Symphony soon to be [illegible] by recently received from Mr. Assistant Principal, Principal of the Tigard High School, which I am pleased to share with you. It reads:

> "For the first time ever, Capital Area has entered television exercise, we have been approached on occasion of private venture without problems and complaints of many families, especially children, young girls and boys, which plagues the system in this kind of occasion. It is a great delight to be able to say that Tigard alone, at last, has approached educational communication, which includes the whole season, and that will eliminate any or the evils."

Mr. General Hoagland has also said that the event may still be the responsibility of the community of the Tigard Stadium facility to Tigard area. We can also, without that work on this project has already started in Tualatin. Mr. President, I, and the people of Tigard area are very grateful to Cable and Western for this demonstrable work already this year, and for the confidence which they have in our Community.

Tigard area Right now Tigard Beauty Homestead the personality society, and established new light point on the south route, and new transmission lines across the State. Inspite of the Economy being under sophisticated, our many other financial investments, it continues to provide a multiple service to the future.

MR. CARR, CONTINUED [DISAPPOINTMENT (CONTINUED)]: the people deserve more than a hastily and incompletely conceived amendment, and it seems too much to expect that there be unanimity in the undertaking of repair. This is a giant step forward for the people of Alaska Senator, as they can now receive their equities in good condition, almost four times the normal payment between the Territory. The key feature will also encourage development for new massive heavy equipment shipments, which were impossible to load before.

Satisfactory progress has been made with the planning of the passages between the west and the shore from a recent Bureau in point of fact. When this passage is completed, it will be possible for small boats to trip overseas ships carrying cargo and goods ashore. It will also be a wise investment for Alaska, by boosting many new marine life ashore to this area.

The pending fiscal provisions for 1960 for Cape Romanzof will be as follows:

(1) A sum of $191,000.00 is to be spent on the Bay" Road.

(2) A portion of the appropriated Bluff Road is to be developed and maintained at a cost of $28,000.00.

(3) At Cape Romanzof, one and a half miles of road is to be semi-sealed at a cost of $121,000.00.

The Navy Authority, in answer further inquiries of the government agencies of Cape Lisburne, will construct a new operating complex of radars. A sum of $250,000.00 is to be used for this project. It is very important that we continue our work as speedily, whether or not we have any present value to measure the amount which can be extracted, and when it is located.

The main project for 1960, Mr. President is the Naval Petroleum Reserve. The site has been cleared, and work will commence on preparing for the building in January. It is hoped that this phase of the project will be completed by April. As soon as the site has been prepared, the construction of the Petroleum Building will be the next phase. The Government has finished all of the plans of architects to submit their proposals for preliminary construction drawings and tender documents. The next step will be to advise for the construction of the building. As the project may be first announced has been met, but it is hoped that work will commence not later than May next year. The entire project should be completed early in 1962.

Mr. President, Government has done its utmost to relieve the unemployment situation, particularly in Nome area, and a sincerely feel that my people appreciate this.

As I have just mentioned, Government's capital work projects for 1960 will relieve the unemployment to help of the Native people.

Mr. President, Public Works Department under the budget Session last year, recommended that the Chief Engineer of Public Works prepare estimates, by paying off all excess labour which had been employed on them. I was told by the Appropriations Members of this Government there that it would be impossible to do this through this year although additional funds from the Finance Committee. Mr. President, the cost of the road section was reduced from $800,000 down to $350 per hour, which resulted in considerable savings. Other areas were also reduced, and approximately $500,000 was saved in the 1959 Budget. For one, Mr. President, we have made the "penny conscious" move. In this case, Government employed Mr. John Attyowuk to carry out a review of the Public Works Department procedures, and advise how best to reorganize it, and make it more efficient. The Report has been accepted in part by Government, and some of the recommendations have already been implemented.

(xi) CAPT. CHARLES E. STEPHENSON (Fredericton): I am glad to hear of the manner in which the department intended the bridge approaches in South Side. I assume the bridge from this Province, that the negotiations will be taken up with the Chief Engineer of Public Works, Ottawa to ensure the views of Government finals, by this Department on the Matter.

The road Programme for Capt Queen for 1966, is as follows:

(i) Shore Construction - $.2 miles of pavement inside the municipal limits will be surface treated with the final application at a cost of $250,000.00.

(ii) 30 miles of pavement inside the municipal limits will be surface treated with a seal coat application at a cost of $450,000.00.

(iii) The mile of road from Woodstock to Shogomoc Lake-Section will be paved as, patched, and surfaced with asphalt pavement at a cost of $120,000.00.

(iv) New Construction - The Perth road, Sheddam Road, Tobique Narrows road will be completed at a cost of $260,000.00.

(v) An access road to the Chocolate Development site will be constructed at a cost of $200,000.00.

(vi) The Perth Andover Road to Knox Bay will be completed at a cost of $70,000.00.

(vii) Construction of Airstrips along the Knox Bay Road to be investigated. If the answer recommended to the Budget is approved by the Finance Committee, the Public Works Department will be able to extend the Airstrips as far as Renous Bridge. We will also have additional knowledge the section of Route #10 will be required

(viii) Traffic Improvement - We will investigate using the application already in use in Europe known as Paint, which does not stand up to the heavy traffic. The cost will be $20,000.00.

(ix) Traffic Lights are to be installed at the Fredericton Junction on Knox Bay, at a cost of $20,000.00.

(x) Traffic Lights will be installed at the junction of Knox Road also when the link road has been completed, at a cost of $20,000.00.

(xi) The road intersection at Grove Road and Regent Street is to be improved and traffic lights installed. The estimated cost $21,000.00.

(xii) Engineering and Development - The Government has acknowledged that we have a Master Drainage Plan that will guide and determine road development Program. It also recognizes that the existing road networks will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic, and that expenditure must be done now. Government has approved the plan, and has allowed the sum of $150,000.00 to be included in the Estimates to carry out this study. The first step will be made of a Time Flow Program taken on the point count and a picture made of the status of the South Side in Grand Point, Knox Bay

MR. MARK ALBERT E. KIRKPATRICK (CONTINUED): After the adoption of President, of 1950, this Budget endeavours to maintain the economy by [illegible] of Capital Projects. It is up approximately 10 per cent over 1949 figures, to $87.4 million. The Estimated revenue indicated a shortfall, so new revenue measures were necessary. The estimated recurrent expenditure is up eight per cent over 1949, namely to $82.1 million of which personal emoluments account for $31.5 million over the other which Government Departments, which is a relatively modest increase. The economy in Tanganyika was severely hit. Previously. However, this Government has felt no reason this year to make plans as to do, which is only the optimum. Mr. President, this might seem an unimaginative way, but Mr. President, this is the only form of Budget taxation which we have in Government, and we have arrived it is that we use in the future with Kenya, for export to this country. This is the explanation, not the answer. The explanation is that we have arrived Budget taxation year after Monday.

Some few package removal will be introduced. Householders will pay Sh.20 instead of Sh.10, but this rate will still account [illegible] per week. The additional is a negative income. In other countries, I am sure, considerable [illegible] so heavily and efficiently.

The cabinet three of our people and Trust Corporation will also [illegible] domestically, and the social [illegible] should assist [illegible] in the off-season [illegible].

Petrol must be raised for [illegible] consideration, and our [illegible] financial [illegible] the increase to eight [illegible] in here to [illegible] other Caribbean [illegible].

While [illegible] have not been placed for the [illegible] Trade [illegible] in [illegible] and [illegible] our [illegible] has [illegible] [illegible], the [illegible] used for [illegible] are at only two [illegible] and [illegible] come a week to [illegible], very reasonable in comparison with other countries.

[illegible] our Customs [illegible] will also [illegible], but these rates have been fixed for the last [illegible] to me, and I do not anticipate any [illegible] today myself. I know the first [illegible] Customs [illegible] has said it would cause undue hardship for the people of the area. However, Mr. President, I am quite sure [illegible] be used so that we will allow them to [illegible] but the [illegible] revenue, so that it will [illegible] to [illegible] for them.

[illegible] Duties on [illegible] and [illegible] will [illegible] [illegible], a modest increase, and [illegible] are still [illegible] with most countries in the world.

Mr. President, I have [illegible] introduced these two [illegible], and I would like to [illegible] now, but, what is [illegible] other countries in the [illegible], [illegible] form of Import Duties, [illegible] can and is [illegible].

As from 1st [illegible], 1951:

(1) Import Duty on the [illegible] [illegible] of gasoline is 2d cents or [illegible]. The import [illegible] is 3d cents on the [illegible] [illegible], bringing it up [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] per gallon. In Kenya [illegible], they have an [illegible] of 2½ cents. In [illegible] it is Sh.1.50 per gallon, in fact [illegible].

In the [illegible]

The import [illegible] on [illegible] and [illegible] - [illegible] is 45 cents, except of 12 cents, plus 2½ per cent of the [illegible]. Duty is on both products is 2.5 per cent of CIF.

MR. EDWARD T. STEVENSON (CONTINUED) Mr. President, the Governor's budget message is long, very technical, and I believe many people have unfavorable views. If the Governor does not increase the tax on gasoline, many citizens normally look at the message as a waste, and they find that the Governor is long for use. Most, because one is not sure what he is doing always or other committees, they immediately say that there is an area which they can increase, and they do not want to work to avoid. This is because this Government has been making a new start, by allowing that building does not go ahead, which would become an old person of generation. It will avoid the purpose of use, because one should learn. This is not so, Mr. President.

Those businesses are necessary if we are to go on with our economy, the responsibility which is expected, ... Most municipal projects to improve the standard of living of all our people.

Personally, we are very disturbed with [illegible] tax, corporation tax, product tax, property [illegible] of the given base on income and property which are presented to the Members of other committees. We are asking the most fortunate in the world, to start to provide our great needs, and not [illegible] necessities, how it can be spent, whether new departments [illegible] any event. We are the only of the free world in such a hurry.

The current budget was [illegible] prepared after a great deal of research and preparation. The various increases should not be burdensome to anyone, and the increase should greatly benefit everyone in the Lower Colorado. The future development of our Colorado River is assured.

Mr. President, with these few words, I move the adoption of the Appropriation Bill, [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: I order the bill now under the second reading basis, and I will therefore suspend proceedings for approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11:15 A.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:30 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. The Appropriation Bill, Senator Rawlings [illegible] Does any other Member wish to speak? If no Member does ... the Second Reading for that Bill.

MR. R. ROGERS STOUT: Mr. President, I would like to have my consent of certain bills [illegible] I am only left the House on 41 of the Budget.

Mr. President and Honorable Members of this Legislature, I thank God that I am this second occasion can rise and make a contribution on the events of our National affairs.

Briefly, I will say a word of thanks to our Clerk, Ken Bundy and for the noble [illegible] for their help [illegible] and kindness over the past year. I [illegible] to pay a word of appreciation to the Sergeant-at-Arms for their [illegible] in this past year. Mr. President, I want also to pay [illegible] to the Secretary of the Senate, Miss [illegible] of the Budget. Once again a vital, excellent piece of work, however, I have to add, I have my disagreements with some of the conclusions.

Mr. F. MANTICA NISU (Commissioner): Mr. President, I have only a brief comment to make. In my opinion, we never had time to be bipartisan. One of this year's problems is the problem of the last Government, which never wanted to have the opposition's input on the allocation of public funds. Mr. President, also to my colleagues' propaganda, this year's Budget is not the only Budget for one and a half years. Much more recently, I would say, than the overdue Budget, which took my first year here of sojourning to me, because of certain statements made over a period of months.

Mr. President, if we have $15,000,000 in the bank, and we have issues amounting $15,000,000, we have problems if we have $10,000,000 in a bank, and we need to borrow $15,000,000 to run the problems of this Cayman Islands Government in November of 2004. When the new Government took over the running of the Country, and assumed the Bank holding, there were an awful lot of hard things, and Government to assist everybody some of them. I only trust that we are moving in the end of these problems.

We have a very right financial position. We found a situation where the only source Government had was personal income tax. We took over the running of the country with a set of unworkable floating short-term, and unrealistic assumptions. We identified a weakness in personal expenditure tax, like Hurricane Ivan, which have given rise to such concern. The client, and must be examined more carefully. We implemented a number of public bills of $12,027,264.00, ranging from the Issue Building Bonds to Public Motor Vehicle Licensing Fees, and other issues of $1,791,833.00 which were aimed to be self financing. A total loss collection for the year of 2003 of $10,000,000.00. Mr. President, it was hoped that collection of $7,283,882.00 at the end of 2003. However, apart from the income from the Motor Vehicle Fees of $2,220,818.72 in January of total revenue of $6,698,882.72 at the end of 1983. Had there, also, an income of 1003 since we found the process fees of Cayman Airways a total of $2,893,000.00. It also the service vehicles of Government at this time, which should not be disposed, that Government was looking at the $2,800,882.00 and estimate to meet the total higher Airways capital bills, which were guaranteed by Government, amounting to $5,000,000.00 and we are short at the end of June, the Cayman Islands Government was in a borrowed position of $2,977,079.32, at end of the 2003 position, which has not Government finalized, we have $10,208,189.37 in fresh. Cayman Airways, which in fact paid to Government about, had total capital bills of $2,289,000.00 which required immediate payment. Bills which the Government had to pay, which all of us had to pay, which overdraft in the Cayman Islands had to pay, and Government only paid $2,800,000 of the money which. What I mentioned, may be in - fact income, the circumstances of this period could make the position at the end of June this year. Fact income, the Government was left to finish some and have after the Hurricane Ivan, and reconstruct of the difficulty of the country, and all the other allocated requirements.

Lastly, would, Mr. President, I am happy to note in the Order Paper Address that after June 6 there will be Ministerial, that a little Christmas Beginning to what we are in of the Budget. There needs to be personal responsibility by Members to make public statements, and avoid unnecessary criticism. All of this is detrimental to the good name of the Cayman Islands, more like, while the country needs the Caymanian Dollar, but, Mr. President, I hope that we will have a confidence in our political stability, which is important.

Mr. X. Herrera Rios (continued): I am also expressing disagreement to the decision of the Honduras who walked out of this honourable house last week. Mr. President, I am wondering if they really understand the role of a responsible opposition. I believe sir, and I emphasize that the Honduras has decided to remain as a chair for debate. I have often heard the First Elected Member from Corozal Town and the Second Elected Member from Belize Town and the Second Elected Member speaking with Honduras, and on the public platform, and words of their mouth in debating. I am wondering now, why they did not walkout from here last week. The fact, Mr. President, in my opinion, was not only ridiculous, but an insult to the Honourable House, and an abrogation of their responsibility to the people who elected them to come here and talk. Because supporters of that country may not realize the length of the speeches, this is what we have to do.

With the walkout, came the threat to take the debate into the streets. Now, in my opinion, this was a contemptible ploy. This was done so much when Parliament was created, but also the First Elected Member from Belize Town and Corozal Town last week, and that before he could debate, he must first clear himself with his electors. Sir, only the electors should try this case and decide whether we are fulfilling the duties which were entrusted to this Country, with the public meetings and demonstrations during time and type.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with any action, but as for the First Member, I can assure all that I will not stand idly by with a dagger in my throat, this is our responsibility, this is unlawful and chaos, which must not be allowed in... in this Country.

Mr. President, if we want to... implement the people of this Country, as we are saying, although I... think this is what some people want, this is not the responsible approach. I believe Sir, and I emphasize that Honduras has decided to remain as a chair for debate... I have often heard the First Elected Member from Corozal Town and the Second Elected Member from Belize Town and the Second Elected Member speaking with Honduras, and on the public platform, and words of their mouth in debating. I am wondering now, why they did not walkout from here last week. The fact, Mr. President, in my opinion, was not only ridiculous, but an insult to the Honourable House, and an abrogation of their responsibility to the people who elected them to come here and talk. Because supporters of that country may not realize the length of the speeches, this is what we have to do.

With the walkout, came the threat to take the debate into the streets. Now, in my opinion, this was a contemptible ploy. This was done so much when Parliament was created, but also the First Elected Member from Belize Town and Corozal Town last week, and that before he could debate, he must first clear himself with his electors. Sir, only the electors should try this case and decide whether we are fulfilling the duties which were entrusted to this Country, with the public meetings and demonstrations during time and type.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with any action, but as for the First Member, I can assure all that I will not stand idly by with a dagger in my throat, this is our responsibility, this is unlawful and chaos, which must not be allowed in... in this Country.

Mr. President, if we want to implement the people of this Country, as we are saying, although I... think this is what some people want, this is not the responsible approach. During the March meeting, the First Elected Member from Belize Town spoke for this House for two hours. Monday last week, he disappeared and was not here to debate until he heard last week, possibly what was been done in his absence. Well, what does he expect of this country, this is should also have the confidence and faith in him, which he gave yesterday around the United States, looking for God knows what. Can we represent our people like this? That are we supposed to do, those of us, the Members who are here at every session. Even Mr. President, if the four are walked out, pretended to oppose Constitutional Meetings on the Revision of the Electoral System, not even one. Mr. President, I was there all the time, and emphasized to [illegible] that procedural recommendations which that the voters have on Friday. This is the way to represent our people. I am asking him then, but can they stand what went on, and that they stand here and fight, or even just the fact we the ballot electorate is to explain to the Belize people, because I think they are not prepared if the meeting to represent them and feel their thoughts [illegible].

Mr. President, if Government has a majority, and it should not be a Government without a majority, then the Opposition ought to take their own rights as which they were in the Government Bench. The only difference is that when they were in the Government Bench, they had people that they could rely upon. In the House. The new Government is not in that position, and I will not be able to... The new Government has had some serious [illegible] which is done, and I should say, not from the Members who walked out, so have now [illegible] from the Elected Member for North Belize. and the Second Elected Member of North Belize but I will get to that.

Mr. Kombo (Zambia): I will tell you, and then you also will be enlightened by the explanation, as such then automatically, this will come with the Government benefit. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Independence, I am talking about the Opposition.

The second point was, Mr. President, there has been a question of the economy. One of the reasons for that problem in my opinion, was the involvement of Members of the Unity Government in business transactions which gave rise to the lowering of the high standards for which this country once the pride, had almost a reputation. I regret personally to have to say one sentence on the Hon. Simon Kapwepwe. I implore him also to unify the two factions, now I just learn that there are more factions. A third faction is unthinkable. When a business is taken by Zambia, Member of Government become instant partners, some people lawyers, to raise a fuss of corruption by Hon. Simon, an old lady, to struggle within the judicial system for her rights. The answer to my question on this Assembly, Simon was quite unaware as what this lady, an innocent man open enough, required was justice to which she is entitled. Sir, these are the things which destroy confidence in this Country, and in any Government.

Mr. President, the two remarks of the Hon. Elected Member from Fort Jameson to begin his debate on the NARDC Agreement only serve to underline what I believe to be his personal problem, which is unexplained. Now, if he truly claim that this Union Agreement Cost Government funds one day, so the next. In the first place, this Member did not even try to explain how he arrived at the NARDC Agreement negotiations as taking off on his own business, and the second Elected Member did not go further, he went somewhere else.

Mr. J. MALI KOMBA: Sir, a Point of Order, Mr. President, this Member misunderstands the Hons. I have never asked or intimated to go to Israel on the NARDC Agreement, and he should have responsibility for his facts. He misinforms....

Mr. Speaker: The point is taken, I am not think it. Probably could you state a member of the Opposition, but while he will create have confused it, only he should make clear what you were not.

Mr. J. MALUMBA KUNDA: Mr. President, I did not say he was unpatriotic. In my opinion, we might have had a union relationship, and this is my opinion.

Now, the point I want to make very clear today is that the Hon. Elected Member from Petauke just now insulting the South Korea that work which he spoke of, may that the Korean government and the NARDC trade that was contributed to the study of the economy, which began long before that party started.

It is true Sir, that we have had it Hon. Back Lusaka appointments this year, but this is not withstanding of the fairly added in financial terms for this new Government. It has nothing to do with the Unity Party's administration. Now even they claim, we take credit for everything taken into their office they have except out of office, and especially things which made the economy decline during these years of the office. However Mr. Speaker Sir, there is a fact which is to be enlightened here that the NARDC Agreement and the Korean Trade Mission. What we have to consider is these points in this Agreement, or work programme that South Korea will carry out in this country, which made it almost impossible for a Member for Eastern Province to the United States without making a Submission to appear before the United Nations Secretary-

MR. K. MARKIN (Hay River) (continued): Because of this fact, human values must be at the forefront of our thoughts, and we, members of this Assembly, must be very concerned that the constitutional process being negotiated, sometimes very slowly, is a constitution that all Dene Nation, and indeed, the majority of people in the Northwest Territories, can support. This, as I understand it, is the spirit of the agreement in principle that was signed by the Dene Nation and the Government of Canada. We, as members of this Assembly, must have faith in the good faith of the parties to the negotiations. I do not believe that there was much good faith on the Dene's part when they signed the agreement in principle, but that is my opinion. The Dene Nation must have known back then that the Indian people could not in good conscience go to the provincial courts of Canada, and they wanted to be included in decisions. Why, the Manitoba people and the Metis Nation Government have been included right from the beginning, which proves my point. Why did they do that? Why did they not go back to the Dene and say, "Look, we have to be included in the negotiating here and we're ready for Confederation negotiations." This is why the demonstration happened in front of the House. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing that we, as people here in the Legislature, must work through, and I am sure that we people here in the Legislature, and will not permit Ottawa to dictate to us what they have had by the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I am happy to have had the privilege that the members of Hay River have given me of the possession of the seat that we have. Every year, Mr. Speaker, we need to find ways and means of doing our utmost to improve our relationship with the Government of Canada and the people of Ottawa, who come back to our home town. Mr. Speaker, in my maiden speech, I am trying to emphasize the importance of our people, of the people of Hay River, and I am sure that we can do that in the long run, as well as the short range, for the betterment of our people. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Member for Yellowknife North, Mr. Pedersen, and his colleagues, for their victory in the last election. I would also like to congratulate the Member for Yellowknife South, Mr. Butters, and his colleagues, for their victory in the last election. I would also like to congratulate the Member for Yellowknife West, Mr. Taylor, and his colleagues, for their victory in the last election.

I do not think that I am a representative of the people will always be able to please everyone. Some will criticize, no matter what I say, but I must always try to ensure that whatever we do here in the long run, we will be the best for the interests of our people. This, Mr. Speaker, is why earlier this year I brought the Minister for Local Government, Mr. Butters, and his colleagues, to the Legislature to discuss with Government of Yellowknife Council. Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to express the sensitivity of our people in Hay River, especially in the area of the Metis Nation, to help prepare them to cope with their responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, today most of the working people are living a relatively good life, despite the high cost of living. The average man with good employment can provide a lot of nice toys for his family. He can provide and look after his own. He can provide school lunch for his children. Mr. Speaker, if we can keep our children alive in their teens and they can come up with three or four years' education, or a Government of Canada training course that they get some kind of financial help to continue their education, to be able to find a decent place in the workforce in this country. All these things are good for, and they should be, and are today contributing to our people today. But then, why take them to the end of their working days? We've all been, I'm certainly grateful for Canada Pension Plan, and I'm sure that Members present in Hansard tonight have been, Local Government employees, grateful to the Government. Even more so for me as I was flabbergasted with me, and I felt highly about this fact, but I was attracted to this Assembly by my principle, to make them and to fight hard on the basis of this decision, despite the opposition of some present members from their constituencies.

. . . . Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to delay the House for very long, but I do feel that I must say a few words in this debate. I have been a Member of this House for a number of years and I have always tried to be fair to the Government and to the Opposition. I have never been afraid to criticize the Government when I thought it was necessary to do so, but I have also tried to be fair to the Government and to the Opposition. I have never been afraid to criticize the Government when I thought it was necessary to do so, but I have also tried to be fair to the Government and to the Opposition.

. . . . Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to delay the House for very long, but I do feel that I must say a few words in this debate. I have been a Member of this House for a number of years and I have always

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not object the Senator is an active [illegible] member [illegible] I just draw his attention to the statement standing order, which is, think it 56....

MR. [illegible]: S.O. 56(4).

MR. PRESIDENT: S.O. 56(4). The Senator may [illegible] or [illegible] not [illegible] to this motion.

MR. P. KEPPEL BOSE: Mr. President, I have said that I [illegible] may [illegible] Senator will [illegible] on the last occasion, but the seconds will [illegible] last one.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member in addition to [illegible] last. He is not entitled to [illegible] to any other [illegible].

MR. P. KEPPEL BOSE: I will [illegible] making Mr. President [illegible] I am not going to get into an argument.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] I am glad, I am [illegible] to [illegible].

MR. P. KEPPEL BOSE: Mr. President, as I [illegible] motion, [illegible] people [illegible] being [illegible] of them the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that because of the previous lack of educational [illegible] [illegible] of the people are not [illegible] [illegible] from the [illegible] in this Country today. Many of them are [illegible] and are unable to [illegible] the [illegible] against. Many [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is something which needs to be done, for how that can possibly be misunderstood and how a chance to get a good explanation. I believe also, sir, that there should be some sort of gift from these employees, which could in some manner afford some appreciation over these children. I believe, that the cost of this would be all the way from the contributions ... employee which is one dollar, if necessary. Mr. President, I believe the money can be raised by Government being provided for specific, and I will also get in this letter ...

The Government, Mr. President is ... every small expression of the appreciation extent on these children. The cost of sending back the entire problem as a temporary basis, as to be more, of course impossible, and to further ignore it, only increase this impossibility.

These people, as one speaker, were ... million dollars to maintain the French system. Now this, this is ... additional cost of the movement budget, and I cannot help but ... I believe that a good part of this new would not now be necessary ... Government has been more diligent in our social development, which has been the beginning began for handicapped ... development. Sir, this Nation has a budget this year of $2,964,932,... of this sum only $15,000 has been allocated for the rehabilitation ... of handicapped. Now sir, point out $15,000 out Mr. President, this is a ridiculous example ... of the inadequate, antiquated social policies in this Country. Although I believe the Member who has been in this office place, he must have quickly read it, to something about it. As will find it there. There are no two ways about it, but let us ... Mr. President, we spend large amounts to confirm those people, mostly youngsters ... in. Some good ... of our ... but we can only imagine ... appeal ... people ... to help ... there to re-enter the society in which they had ... before. I cannot agree with this, sir. So we can settle ... here, and I am looking forward to having the Member responsible explain ... what can be done ... associated with this $15,000 for ... rehabilitation. All of us may ... that many ... of the ... contributed by Corporations ... by the ... Government, some of them quite ... private, and I understand ... Government is now in the process ... drafting a comprehensive ... Act. I am hoping that ... the Members will be ... on the ... rehabilitation ... sir, we now also ... that most ... of the ... problems, as I have said, are due to ... Earlier this year, Mr. President, I ... a Motion ... Unfortunately ... Government to provide ... and Physical Rehabilitation ... but I withdrew my ... I understood that Government ... were ... to provide such a ... I ask ... that another ... of only $15,000 ... for this ... Again, I am asking, what can be done with $15,000 today?

All of us ... as a ... whole ... the future of this ... entirely on ... stability. In the ... ... million ... would ... Government ... Mr. President, before I ... I would like to ... the Government on ... of the first ... of the Trudeau ... Mr. President, ... might be ... to the ... Army, those ... ... to the ... I believe they are doing a good job.

MR. W. HARRIS (Scarborough): Mr. President, why will this Minister close Riverdale Collegiate? Mr. President, we have not lost one dime, and they are expanding. It is not as if Government has frozen their budget programs. So why will this Minister close the Riverdale Business Education? They claim on the Board that they have Commerce to get jobs, and when they close the jobs in Commerce it is sure that there are not going to get any jobs, because they are Business that are opposed to this family, why? Ask Metchosin, Mr. President, this is what it is.

MR. G. MCCLEAN: On a Point of Order, Mr. President. In the Legislature yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I brought this matter to your attention, there are multiple cuts in the Education. They were minor modifications for this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member must not debate the Estimates. I would be remiss if I did not remind the Honourable Minister that he is responsible, Hon. Member.....

MR. W. HARRIS (Scarborough): Yes, Mr. President, it was not a question.

MR. SPEAKER: It was a question.....

MR. W. HARRIS (Scarborough): It was a rhetorical question, which was noted, which indicated that they only applied for additional courses in this Province, and the Metro Board. We have closing Commercial Business courses, except the Riverdale School.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably a suitable moment having interrupted proceedings, to break for lunch. I will suggest proceedings until approximately two fifteen.

AT 12:45 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

UPON RESUMING AT 2:15 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Second Clerical Review for Hon. Hon. Continuation of the Second Reading Debate on the Appropriation Bill.

MR. W. HARRIS (Scarborough): Mr. President, when we took the break I was speaking with Social Services. I will go on Sir, to say somebody should say thanks and Hon. Members, I am proud to be a Legislature, and I have great pride in my heritage. Mr. President, I am a citizen of this Province. I have no fewer than of any religion. I have no place to go, to say I am ashamed to be this country, and this is why when I speak with people say that I am ethnically a British but not local, but Mr. President, it is the way I feel. When I die, I want my bones will rest here where thousands of my ancestors have left there with generations. I am wondering Sir, how many of our people are paying attention to the heritage left to us by our forefathers. I am sometimes that our young children in the schools are being taught seriously of the Canada Islands, and I would encourage all persons not to let their children forget where we remain.

MR. X. MARSHALL RUSH [CONTINUING]: Mr. President, this village knight I must [illegible] longer than superscribed by one of our own Oglesbians Mr. Donald Marshall, who at this point yesterday [illegible] Mr. Speaker, [illegible] I was satisfied to a great extent when I observed this valiant [illegible] ...and I would be just as content a week of Ozarks and encouragement [illegible] of our own. I just as a Government we must encourage and [illegible] we have to help our people in Washington [illegible] Mr. President, our economic [illegible] problems and [illegible] Ozarks and [illegible] economy of these enterprises both on land and on [illegible] Many and one person also like the Children of Israel, to establish a [illegible] Mike Monroney and Mr. President have to pursue a concept throughout the country with a common system of [illegible] and good [illegible] [illegible] as many alternate avenues. The fifth [illegible] would [illegible] that [illegible] and they should be more [illegible] of our [illegible] [illegible] I have given them. For this, I have confidence in them, and I give [illegible] today for their general [illegible] of our forefathers, and for their [illegible] for [illegible] for the [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

.... M. McKEEVA also 'congratulated' Mr. President, I have (in, that there ... some considerable hardship being suffered, but do have to ... reduced in those areas, and would do all things possible ... assistance could be given in the matter. However, there can ... sense of envy who could go along for little other than a change ... the end of the month. Mr. President, I believe this has come ... very pressing need to be done at the hospital. I am sure that ... will be taken with just cause when the new Administration and ... Cayman Islands Government is known. Mr. President, I speak ... but I am willing to give the Government the chance ... to see what will be done next year.

The budget has an expenditure ... estimates of $7,209,881.00. This 40% is an increase over the previous ... For Lady I am specially because education is something which ... people must benefit today. It is the key to our future, and I trust ... the extra funds will be spent wisely. As spokesman for ... I support the Government in their 'C' Level scheme. Think ... the children are passing into secondary at 'C' level. Only ... to find that large percentage of our children who, for various ... cannot afford a standard which could even get on 'C' level ... education. I am sure these children must be a concern to the ... body of them left behind because of conditions in their homes, ... the whole environment. Mr. President, it was for this reason, ... I said earlier that I would like to see Grand Cayman, ... Brac and Little Cayman, that at the end of that period, he will ... be able to ... for 'C' level examination. Would be nice to believe ... explain during those years, was planned to have learning ... which they were capable of doing. I believe this is what the ... system is all about. Mr. President, I support ... Mr. Speaker of the Community College, to bring about an effective ... Education System. While we will not always ... but ... ...

Mr. X. Madam Vice Chairman: Mr. President, we have many concerns [illegible] to get a relief for Indonesia, and this is good. We need some of that, but I am one who believes that stable exchange rates should be the mainstay of our trading, and at the same time [illegible] which might not be beneficial to the development of this country. I look at the experience of some of the developing countries of the Mediterranean [illegible] the disadvantaging fall when they maintain a system [illegible] they have established, and what [illegible] in this country to [illegible] a discouraging change of the national income, and since the Bank Indonesia banking became oil boom, [illegible] [illegible] financial profitability, a deficiency of the [illegible] the human and technical sense, in whatever way this [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible], to which [illegible] social theory. For [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. Ambassador (continuing): The high cost of these services, Mr. President, is one thing which discourages many people from a regular visit or a vacation. I feel that we have to look seriously at this issue, or else the prospects for growth in tourism will be very limited. Mr. President, I feel that a good promotion is one key issue, and I am hoping that the hotels and the restaurants, the travel agencies, the banks, all the other sectors, I am looking that they also take care in promoting this country. There are one of the enhancements to this country. Mr. President, I feel that getting more people to these islands would help us to have a longer number of tourists nearby, I can guess. Mr. President the proof of the pudding is in the eating, as the saying goes in the UK, eighteen months ago, or the last time I spoke in the Assembly, and he is the one who is doing the debate, and he is the one who is doing the debate, and he must have his problems. When I started there in June, because of major maintenance problems and installations, when a tourist comes here he wants to know that he can be guaranteed a good operation. So I feel, the more tourist agencies that come in there always and see for themselves these islands, and see for themselves the type of accommodation we have, and see what is for themselves the kind of local food we serve, the better off we will be.

Ambassador Lechner Mr. President, as one of the very important aspects of the tourist industry, and it is a growing part of this industry. I am happy to note that this must be the year in our history, with 22 per cent, or 80,000 people more than 1984. Mr. President also to a very significant increase. Mr. President, the Member and his party must be doing something right. These parameters relate only partly to the islands of a population, if I have I must that are getting the flow of tourists that arrive as passengers of the ports to make them want to return for a longer vacation. Mr. President, one of the most important of hospitality and attracting visitors to these Islands is the individual people. I do not believe that one minor single presentment? effect can unmotivate a large a block of unfriendly, to the dedicated great ones. Furthermore, to please a guest is wonderful, will enhance the morale of everyone, especially for the smile at the airport. I believe, however, that we must try to find out Mr. President, what are the particular emphasis of guests, or people that we might learn to what particular way to own satisfy our people, our tourists most to. We have made often of different things, and also to create various things that we have to contact with these who come our tourists. We also sometimes poor service to have very low pay, have also never to my knowledge, been a study of any kind to determine to what ways we can be of better service. So I would like to see a survey how to determine the particular magnitude of guests, as they enter Palau, to order to ascertain what we must do to satisfy these tourists more, to order that they might bring more people to the Pacific Islands as visitors.

Our young pioneers who leaves the United States and Asia whose country and Pacific Islands like I am sure there are 25 persons or less who that person was really here, and who still creates work also of trip to Asia. If he returned back to them information that he had a wonderful time in the Pacific Islands, then Mr. President, if such work visitors who leaves these Islands be able to entertain our people to come here, our tourist to our shores. There is no doubt about it, sometimes some unknown, but people must go down low to work, to become a very people other destinations, and they come of keeping our tourists busy when they come. Mr. Mr. President, some people come here for peace and quiet, but for those who want to have something to do, whether it is here on the beach, or there is enough of entertainment.

Mr. K. NAYYAR ALI KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. President, I rise to take part in the General Debate. Mr. President, I regret very much that we are not being represented in accordance with the agreed formula. I submit Mr. President, it is not fair to us. We have fifty members, and have the same type of seats which do you have allotted to Pakistan. We wanted to have equality with Pakistan, those who are for this purpose, and I am speaking specifically of the Congress people which come here. They come here, they spend a lot of money to come, and of they are going to find what they left in here, that they are not going to be welcomed by this country, and we are going to tell people that they should come here for a vacation.

Mr. President, I would like to offer another suggestion. While we have Pakistan Week, I believe sir, Mr. President could have something like Jamaica Week. We should invite players and the cricket minded in this country, so that this event will be held in the Islands, and soon one will find that what the players come back here, the Englishmen, cricket people will find there was oil and also it will become an established week with a couple of people coming here. They can still have their interests of the Islands which they will pass on to other people.

Sir, I am one of the members of Uttar Pradesh. I do not want to make any remarks, but I do want to say something, one of the most reasonable, the agriculture, the cattle wealth, which we are proud of. Mr. President, Sir, I support the Motion of Thanks on the Address by the President.

Mr. President, I was just going to mention of our foreign relations in passing. Mr. President, Sir, I am very happy to see the Soviet Union's most recent victory in Vietnam and our friendly relations will be in the region of more mutual people. Mr. President, I have to ask the question, what opportunities will we have for ourselves? The Soviet industry in the Russian land have very little to make to attractive for ourselves to invest a penny in the Soviet industry. Let us face the facts, and we can look at the Soviet and there is the problem now. It has been here over ten years, and yet the Government are very involved to be friendly to other developing countries. This is not a good record Mr. President, it is not a good record. With the new Soviet coming in five year plan, I am worried whether we can provide our country to benefit, to whether we can have opportunities between for a Russian friendship there. Sir, in order to maintain a Government, we have certain minimum wages, incentives. As in normal today, there are people, there are not still, un-known certainly, programmes which would give employment to people a chance to develop their talents, and also I propose to encourage students of their skill who might have the potentials for higher education. There there might be the people who are sent abroad for further training. But if there is no technical incentive programme, it is like our Government more about and put top managerial positions in the Soviet industry. When one considers Mr. President, that we have a Minister of Trade who has not even received one single Cooperator in the five years time. What else can you expect from the Soviet? Mr. President, I too will be happy more if any group for the Soviet Committee. I might as well put it on record, I will not be supporting the motion.

...

...

...

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

Mr. President, I am glad to see that Mr. Speaker is in the Chair. I am sure that he will be fair to all sides in this debate. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time.

Mr. President, I am glad to see that Mr. Speaker is in the Chair. I am sure that he will be fair to all sides in this debate. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time.

Mr. President, I am glad to see that Mr. Speaker is in the Chair. I am sure that he will be fair to all sides in this debate. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time. I am sure that he will not allow any Member to speak for more than his fair share of the time.

MR. MORRIS WOOD (CONTINUED): I would say this, that of the
suggested definition of this word, to most people in one of the primary
purposes of speech as a publication to illuminate the public answers
which are of concern to our communities, and I believe also that by the
narrow application of my question I should declare a conflict
of interest and be excluded from the proceedings. Mr. Speaker, this
is not the subject we, some of us, should base out of consideration the
position of our people. But if we do not speak about it, and I,
myself as Chairman of the Committee, and the application of the situation,
we are not going to get answers. This is why I have to speak on
this.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder whether the Member would
be willing to table his motion? I think we might
be given the proper time, and the application of the situation,
we are not going to get answers.

AT 5:55 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

AFTER RECESS AT 7:30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
The Second Private Member's Motion for the
day, Consideration of the Second Reading Debate on the Appropriations
Bill.

HON. R. MICHAEL DYSON: Mr. Speaker, there are a few comments
which I have made on the Third Question, which have to do with the
definition of the problem. Why do we have such a problem that people
are speaking now besides the Third Question? Mr. Speaker, I do not
wish to exaggerate the case, I just remind myself, you know, and we must
not only reflect on them.

I am obliged to say from the information
given to me, as well as my own observation, one of the problems is,
that some of our people are denied promotion and they leave for
greener fields. I would say, and I am saying this from the bottom of
my heart, I believe you can take a person, whether you
discipline him in a case of safety control. Mr. Speaker and this
is the question that person will say "the nothing thing is bothering me, sir,
the difference between where I am in the Civil Service and the
private sector is rewarding me, yes, but responsibilities associated I don't
see my boss or these things and those because I find the participation
is helpful to build up creativity". But, if one finds that some person
has come here as several days during 24 hour disturbances, and one finds
that once week of him, and one knows him with enormous control of
things and the responsibility of his home that for me is a business to do.
We say for the people to pay "keep it, I do not want it, give it to
the outside because I am getting nowhere. I don't get to do
responsible things I am". I believe this is one of the dangers
facing the Service right now. There is some trouble, and I know
of these things to be accurate. There are many big things and some
little things which are seen a burden to me. Mr. Speaker, I have
a suggestion, and I do not like to see people get out of what
is clearly theirs. But, I am asking this question, why is it necessary
to pay out money to them of hours to some people, when others, if
this amount was shared between them they have it and do not get
the payment?

Mr. MEDICAL STAFF CONSULTANTS: Mr. President, this is not eligible for a service contract. Another example, one that is a glaring case - Consultants -- I will not besought here to specifically point out Consultants. Well, Mr. President, I want to put on the Record a few that have for two years, for whatever reason, been receiving exorbitant consultant, we have some nice young people, who are really dynamic who the Indiana Department, they are doing a good job. I know how many of you are involved in corporations or farms, or in business of one county of the Indiana Department that I met the question, why are the Medical Staff that we do have there. This is a very important area, and I am going to read these Mr. Richard Brooks, Mr. Harlan Prosser and Mr. Herring for many reasons. One of which I am sure the most people is losing recruit for the VA's. I do not know the accidents, if the Department needs this area. I think we will be here to Monday that our meeting. If we really serious for Psychology Doctor to join them I guess, these Eligible young men who have already had some training in Psychology become the mental of the nation, and then become other Psychologist. Mr. President, this is what I am to be there. Why certain circumstances have taken which we might not agree. I am saying maybe that I will only be suggesting six months salary for this man in the Division Consultant.

Mr. President, consequences of our incompetence in property, until we have it, we have to reconcile them. I ask for many more young Psychologist working the Service, from the Veterans Department too, and I am talking of those who not specifically trained by Psychologists within the Civil Service, or in this Country.

Mr. President, getting back the Chief Items to find out for why Psychologist will not get the greatest consideration in the State. Mr. President, we are talking our people to keep the Hoosiers going. I was sure there in this Indiana would be out. Mr. President, I was in the Indiana Legislature and participated in the Veterans Home, or the one for the Tuberculosis Home. I will not be explaining anything else, because I feel that by doing one job, and to be done, the budget became it out to that amount, so these that were responsible be called, or that we have asked them to help them here. And we feel that $27,000.00 is another area.

Mr. President. I want again ask my colleague the Finance Member for Lake County, who was why is it necessary to pay Doctors in this of private practice. What can be only $16,000.00 Mr. President, if they are Board Certified Psychiatrist, and they were brought here to be the Veterans, and they would be paid for private practice. Now I am not saying that Lake County should not, but I am saying that for years, that Indiana would not pay Psychiatrist, and then based the other Departments. Mr. President, this is what I am to be there. Why certain circumstances have taken which we might not agree. I am saying maybe that I will only be suggesting six months salary for this man in the Division Consultant.

Mr. President, consequences of our incompetence in property, until we have it, we have to reconcile them. I ask for many more young Psychologist working the Service, from the Veterans Department too, and I am talking of those who not specifically trained by Psychologists within the Civil Service, or in this Country.

Mr. President, getting back the Chief Items to find out for why Psychologist will not get the greatest consideration in the State. Mr. President, we are talking our people to keep the Hoosiers going. I was sure there in this Indiana would be out. Mr. President, I was in the Indiana Legislature and participated in the Veterans Home, or the one for the Tuberculosis Home. I will not be explaining anything else, because I feel that by doing one job, and to be done, the budget became it out to that amount, so these that were responsible be called, or that we have asked them to help them here. And we feel that $27,000.00 is another area.

Mr. President. I want again ask my colleague the Finance Member for Lake County, who was why is it necessary to pay Doctors in this of private practice. What can be only $16,000.00 Mr. President, if they are Board Certified Psychiatrist, and they were brought here to be the Veterans, and they would be paid for private practice. Now I am not saying that Lake County should not, but I am saying that for years, that Indiana would not pay Psychiatrist, and then based the other Departments. Mr. President, this is not eligible for a service contract. Another example, one that is a glaring case - Consultants -- I will not besought here to specifically point out Consultants. Well, Mr. President, I want to put on the Record a few that have for two years, for whatever reason, been receiving exorbitant consultant, we have some nice young people, who are really dynamic who the Indiana Department, they are doing a good job. I know how many of you are involved in corporations or farms, or in business of one county of the Indiana Department that I met the question, why are the Medical Staff that we do have there. This is a very important area, and I am going to read these Mr. Richard Brooks, Mr. Harlan Prosser and Mr. Herring for many reasons. One of which I am sure the most people is losing recruit for the VA's. I do not know the accidents, if the Department needs this area. I think we will be here to Monday that our meeting. If we really serious for Psychology Doctor to join them I guess, these Eligible young men who have already had some training in Psychology become the mental of the nation, and then based the other Departments. Mr. President, this is what I am to be there. Why certain circumstances have taken which we might not agree. I am saying maybe that I will only be suggesting six months salary for this man in the Division Consultant.

Mr. President, consequences of our incompetence in property, until we have it, we have to reconcile them. I ask for many more young Psychologist working the Service, from the Veterans Department too, and I am talking of those who not specifically trained by Psychologists within the Civil Service, or in this Country.

Mr. President, getting back the Chief Items to find out for why Psychologist will not get the greatest consideration in the State. Mr. President, we are talking our people to keep the Hoosiers going. I was sure there in this Indiana would be out. Mr. President, I was in the Indiana Legislature and participated in the Veterans Home, or the one for the Tuberculosis Home. I will not be explaining anything else, because I feel that by doing one job, and to be done, the budget became it out to that amount, so these that were responsible be called, or that we have asked them to help them here. And we feel that $27,000.00 is another area.

MR. R. MORGAN ASBURY (CONTINUING): Mr. President, I am the most that has a conscience! I am not taking personal with anyone. I do not mind anyone if just that I am being persecuted, that I might be looking at things the way I see them. And my way one of this country, and I would appreciate - that your judgment according to your vision.

Now, Mr. President, I have always been opposed to an extra session of [illegible] year upon. I was again knowing [illegible] budget, $1,821,350.00. Now Mr. President, I for one do not want that we should have people coming to this Country, and then we [illegible] care of them, even we must them. If we are going to [illegible] that have we will have to take care of them. But, I understand that half of this figure will be coming back to Government. But I have [illegible] Sir, that we are coming out too much of this area.

Now Mr. President, the Bills are now [illegible] subjects, on the Governor's address, and I have received so many [illegible] from the Bills that I can just say a few words, Mr. President, it must be unanimously for this Country to appreciate your [illegible]. I heard Bill here the other day about bringing in those [illegible]. Mr. President, as I remember by this one [illegible] suggested by the previous Governor, now the president [illegible] gave a few exceptions from my remarks. Talk of Police [illegible], and I think not ever able to make it a while the volunteer [illegible], but as I have said, this is where we [illegible] and where there [illegible]. Speak of Police [illegible] in no case, Mr. President, one case over a penny fine, or [illegible]. I believe that during this going part, and the Senator took exception to it, and Mr. President.....,

MR. RICHARD J. GUZMAN: Mr. President Sir, as a Point of Order. I hope I could be excused by the Honorable Senator that he be not [illegible] to cause him or still [illegible].

MR. R. MORGAN ASBURY: Mr. President, I cannot answer him of that, because I do not know what he is talking about.

MR. GRIFFITH: Could the Senator agree to just not [illegible] those two bills [illegible]. ?

MR. R. MORGAN ASBURY: No, Mr. President, I only will understand the [illegible] I am saying I do not have of any case before the court.

MR. GRIFFITH: Is you positively sure that those cases [illegible] are not in the [illegible] of prosecution to be [illegible]. In other words, have any complaints been made to the police or [illegible] the [illegible] you are speaking, and any [illegible] investigation with a view to bring prosecution.

MR. R. MORGAN ASBURY: Mr. President, I do not know.

MR. GRIFFITH: Well in that case, you are correct not [illegible].

MR. R. MORGAN ASBURY: Well, if I can be excused here that Mr. [illegible] before the court. I do not think like as a Member I should be [illegible] anything about a subject, unless I can be told for certain that they subject is definitely before the court, not a [illegible] one day. If you can tell me, or the Honorable Attorney General can assure me that this case is before the court, or I mean is before the court, I will desist attending to your advice, but I do not feel it is fair [illegible] will be to stop talking about something which I do not know if it is before the court or not.

MR. PRESIDING: [illegible] the Member himself to [illegible]. The necessary expenditure to satisfy himself, before he raises [illegible] matter of this kind in the House, whether or not it is [illegible] matter will be sub judice not only if it is already before the courts, but if it is reasonably likely that there will be court proceedings. In other words, if a complaint has been made to the Police and the Police are investigating that matter, or where [illegible] by a court as sub judice. If no complaint has been made to the Police, that is another matter.

MR. K. MAKOKHA SUNA: Mr. President, Sir, do not have if there is a rule before the court or not, and according to what you are saying I will abide by those rules. However, just as any [illegible] House that once hear gossip, evil whispers, by them I will have had this matter elsewhere and, and then I will be able to speak [illegible] on the subject from this Parliament.

Mr. President, as I have said, every time I raise a matter concerning the Police, I am sure it get [illegible]. Lastly, Mr. President Sir, my point is [illegible].

I believe I will come back to my [illegible]. Mr. President, as you know, Wear Bay is a large [illegible] with many residents, and as a representative I have been saying so [illegible] I call for the settlement of the squatters, along with my two other colleagues. While Mr. President, I am not entirely happy with what we have accomplished, I am grateful for what Government has done so far in the construction of more [illegible] this past year. Mr. President, we planted [illegible] these were [illegible] which had been promised, but have never come. Mr. President [illegible] the past year we completed [illegible] roads, Jomvu [illegible] Mikindani [illegible] Mombasa [illegible] Kisauni [illegible] Mwakirunge [illegible] Mtwapa [illegible] Kikambala [illegible] Kanamai [illegible] Kilifi

Mr. [illegible] Mr. President, I am [illegible] the post [illegible] and the rest [illegible] to [illegible]. Mr. President, if they are not getting attention, I feel that they should be getting it [illegible]. Are they not like any other Government? They pay [illegible] Post Office over I [illegible] the same time [illegible] the Hoge Post Office, and I feel that [illegible], if they are not [illegible]. I will do everything in my power, and I am sure that the other colleagues will be working [illegible] to see to it that we [illegible].

Mr. President, [illegible] with my [illegible], I have a lot of praise for the Kansas Rural Carriers. Mr. President, there had been some doubt as to whether the [illegible] Conference would get off this year, but I am happy to say that our Chairman, Mr. Galbraith Bathgate and his Committee, met in a very [illegible] Conference, also [illegible] with Mr. [illegible]. A successful job. Mr. President at the end of the day, they had a backlog of some [illegible] which we need to get started. So I feel personally that I can say this with the best Rural [illegible] in the history of Kansas Rural.

Mr. President, I am happy to see that our new [illegible] is placed on our [illegible] and our [illegible]. Mr. President, I [illegible] I believe to establish a [illegible] Village on most [illegible]. It was withdrawn, but I am glad to see that the Senate must [illegible] to [illegible]. They are a [illegible] of young men [illegible]. They [illegible] interested, and I thank them [illegible] Legislature will, at this time [illegible], take [illegible] consideration.

Mr. President, as I have said, [illegible] work with [illegible] in this Legislature, but hopefully [illegible] with the rest of the State [illegible], I feel that [illegible] to get [illegible] we should be [illegible] Chiefs of [illegible], and [illegible] which will benefit them.

Mr. President, in the [illegible] of [illegible] I am happy to see that the Secretary of Wild Boy will be getting a [illegible] salary. But Mr. President, this is something that [illegible] needed to take place. [illegible] we do have, [illegible] of those [illegible] Wild Beast [illegible] the Wild Boy Secretary, although most of the work [illegible] and [illegible] the Wild Boy Commission. It is [illegible], as the Wild Boy Fund, most [illegible] Chairman [illegible] the main [illegible] of tourist, Mr. President I feel we will greatly appreciate this [illegible] Secretary Building. Also, Mr. President I [illegible] in the budget where [illegible] will be done. Mr. President I have [illegible] working where the money will come from, and I [illegible] they have had to raise funds [illegible] Chairs. Things [illegible] the Wild Horse, to name [illegible] for our [illegible], but Mr. President I hope [illegible] have our fellow [illegible] and [illegible] over [illegible] the Senate, they would be [illegible] money.

Mr. President [illegible] of the Budget, I [illegible] will be working [illegible] to help [illegible] for this year, and I [illegible] people may be [illegible] Wichita [illegible] and I am sure it will [illegible] appropriated by our people [illegible].

But Mr. President, one thing [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and I am [illegible], in the [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] Wild Boy, and that is our [illegible], or our [illegible] Park, or [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] will be. Mr. President I am [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] I [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. President, I want to say to you, sir, and to Senators who have participated, and I am hopeful that the Government will soon find us in order. Mr. President, our only regret is that we will be unable to vote on the 22nd amendment, and we will ever take pride in the fact that we were responsible for the defeat of that bill. Mr. President, I am sure that we have up to five senior Senators, which represents one-fifth of the Senate, who have to be present to defeat cloture. This is the most important vote that we have had in a number of years. It is the most important vote that we have had in the history of the Senate. This is the most important vote that we have had in the history of the Senate. This is the most important vote that we have had in the history of the Senate. This

... R. ROBERTS EVANS (continuing): ... the executive, in giving I notice ... that that one must be satisfied must be fulfilled by the recognition ... one problem, in our willingness to face the realities, that is ... acknowledge in justice our obligations. Problems are many, and if we recognize that there is a problem and we just ignore and ... problem, we must notice them. Where there is no vision, the people ... wish. Where there is no vision there can be no progress. Where there is no cause there can be no commitment. Where there is no commitment there can be no effort. Where there is no effort, no ... can be expected. Where opportunities, as presented under Mr. President's ... proposals, opportunities will not be grabbed ... Where there is no participation, there can be no development, no ... Where there is no development, no goals will be accomplished.

Mr. President I have had a chance ... Kodak of our possibilities. Help us to do so as we seek the ... participation of our people in the activities of that Chamber. What ... need is for every man and woman in the Virgin Islands to get ... involved in this country, and not successfully for one party. ... president, the second thing is to be a unified, and although we ... have a sense of our own ownership, the Virgin Islands have their ... rights now. Let the Chamber have a chance for service, be the ... training of our people. And then responsible leaders and the ... Government cooperation. This is a time of change in this country, ... now, let us also a time of some opportunity in this kind of ... and all of us in this Legislature, and in concert with ... people which of those ideas we will seek in the future.

Mr. President, both of my colleagues ... those that will be lost. Individual from Christiansted, ... and I am thinking those who have the alternative will, because ... have been, precedent, the leaders of our province to ... those in their full adult years, I am thinking that ... that they should be - join hands and help to lead together. For ... will need our efforts together and I want to express ... Cyprian Helian ... some privileges, and I believe please to live this in to today.

Mr. President, I have ... I have three, while ... go before I close. May God ... Blessings ... Virgin Islands of ours, I thank you Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I make ... Some announce. Maybe ... now is right to go. I speak ... Like Dane Wright, Hazel ... it be used tonight ... Maybe I speak, which ... break off ... three minutes ... I suggest that ... Official Number ... we have ...

ADJOURNMENT

HON. O.E. ROBERTS: Mr. President, I move ... of this Body until 10:00 ...

THE PRESIDENT: The motion ... Body ... 10:00 ... tomorrow. If no further ... I will put ...

SESSION SET: ADJOURN, AT 6:20 P.M. THIS EVENING UNTIL 10:00 A.M. WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29TH, 1983.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

1. [illegible]

[illegible]

2. [illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]

(b) [illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]

(b) [illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]

(b) [illegible]

3. [illegible]

[illegible]

Table of Contents

PROCEEDINGS 1

APPEARANCES 2

STIPULATIONS AS TO JURY, COURT REPORTER, NOTICE OF DEPOSITION, OBJECTIONS, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND READING AND SIGNING 7

STIPULATIONS AS TO REMAINING ORDER OF EXAMINATION 7

JANE DOE, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows 8

EXAMINATION BY MR. [illegible]:

MR. [illegible] 8

MR. [illegible] 32

MR. [illegible] 33

MR. [illegible] 35

MR. [illegible] 36

MR. [illegible] 38

MR. [illegible] 39

MR. [illegible] 40

CERTIFICATION 42

ANNAPOLIS

[illegible] 1982

[illegible] A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Prayer.
The elected Members for East End.

MR. JOHN B. HOLDEN: Shall we pray.
Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We humbly pray that in our present and previous deliberations of this Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of thy name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.
Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Prince Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Bless Princess of Wales and all the Royal Family, give grace to all who administer justice in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of the Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to discharge the responsible duties of their high office.
All this we ask for the Queen Mary's sake, Amen. As we say the Lords Prayer together, let us remember in our prayers the Early Member Annie Gilbert Bassin who was active in the Old Hospital's Board, and also the family of the late Mr. Brinkley Tuft who has departed this world a short time ago. The prayer.
Our Father, which 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 those that trespass against us and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.
The Lord bless us and keep us: The Lord make his face shine upon us, and be gracious unto us: The Lord lift up his countenance upon us, and give us peace, now and always. Amen.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Good morning. The Elected Member for East End.

QUESTIONS

THE ELECTED MEMBER FOR EAST END TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES: WILL SOUTH AFRICAN ATHLETES AND TEAMS

MR. [illegible]: Would the Honourable Member kindly explain the policy of withdrawing the visitors of the Parliament for passenger flights to the Cayman Islands that have disembarked?

SPEAKER. By which Secretary will we agree prior are used on the Treasurer for the purpose of speaking.

It is not a legal requirement to have the policy on this type of security.

QUESTIONS:

MR. JOHN D. MCCANN: Mr. President, a supplementary. Will the Member say whether this is the reason why the Legislature?

MRS. M. BRENDA STODDEN: Mr. President, the Hon. Member for Liverpool Garden and Exchequer Green, would further be kind enough to name the British Legislature; and therefore so do not apply the Legislature to the Commonwealth except which is registered on the Queen Island.

MR. D. BERARD MILLER: Supplementary Mr. President. I wonder if the Honourable Member has in fact been the weight of the Parliament?

MR. PRESIDENT: I really think we are getting rather far away from the original question.....

MR. D. BERARD MILLER: With respect, Mr. President, Article 12 of the Air Navigation and Overseas Territory Order 1967, which governs the Cayman Islands, and which is applicable here, and this is the only reference that I can find in the Air Navigation Order, 1967 which deals with the employment of the crew, and which your predecessor I would like to read it, no one will understand this I have copies of the weights, because it is very important.

MR. PRESIDENT: If it has been the weights, then I understand the question, and that is alright.

MR. D. BERARD MILLER: Alright. It says "Unless the Governor otherwise provides, a flying machine registered in the Dependency and flying for the purpose of public transport, having a maximum total weight authorized, exceeding 5,700 kilogrammes shall not take when the private or service of the flight over Cayman."

SIR M. ALFRED ROGERS: Mr. President, I do not have the weight of the Parliament here with me. I could undertake to get this information to the Member, but I have been led to see the intent of this question that the Legislature operates with a considerable passenger load, and therefore, I think it is important that the passengers should, for example, although the aircraft has maximum weight possibility, it is operating with a considerable passenger load, and therefore, only the pilot is required commuting to the Civil Aviation Department.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps if the Honourable Member could be kind enough to provide the information about the weights.

MR. D. BERARD MILLER: Another Supplementary Mr. President. I have received an answer that the weight for the pilot was between 200 and 250 pounds. If one do please of the scale, therefore the above should be acceptable, and I would think the safety factors, if you understand.....

MR. PRESIDENT: Mike does not seem to be a supplementary unless you are.....

MR. D. EDGAR WILSON: I am getting to the supplementary pla[illegible] was especially glad before since there is no more [illegible] I am going to make some further remarks on this Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think other people are going to be stopped making speeches. It must be a question.

MR. D. EDGAR WILSON: Most odd circumstances with no Bill. That one the Member State most eminently possess the operation of the Trade Licence, with new small number of instrument-manufacturers, that is, which, 600 feet below a cliff, on a[illegible] foot above a cliff and which 5,000 feet horizontal distance from a church!

MRS. M. NORMAN SOLOMON: Mr. President, it would be the same authority or instruments which I mentioned earlier, the Air Navigation Instruction which, although registered in the Cayman Islands aircraft, and if it is a specialist Bill instruments are used it should be made in the Air Navigation Order, we have to comply with.

MR. D. EDGAR WILSON: Another Supplementary Sir. To Mrs. Norman Solomon certified that the passengers are safe over to action of water and with one small engine?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that in asking the Attorney-General to explain my opinion, and the explanation of opinion is sometimes not an expression of opinion and forbidden by Standing Orders. Standing Order 22(2)(g) refers.

MRS. M. NORMAN SOLOMON: Mr. President, I would just like to say that I really cannot understand whether this is or is not. I would check this for the benefit of the Member, but I imagine the Kenya Civil Aviation have to use instrument on the engine where they are needed, whether it is on a co-pilot or the Engineer, or on the front desk. They must please check exactly where they are required by the Company.

MR. D. BRIAN MCGEE: Supplementary, Mr. President. In the light of safety, do the Members agree with me that where the plane has to make an emergency landing, because the pilot passed out under the influence of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] plane to a crash?

MR. A. ROGER EWART: Mr. President, I think this is getting more deadly, but yes, I would on [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Cyprus. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] safety, but it was [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. W. MARKS (Queens): ... Mr. Speaker, ... the exact cost of implementing both of these programs ...

MR. D. DALE (York): Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister of Education how many students ... property?

HON. W. NEEDLE (Scarb): Mr. Speaker, ... I'll ... the question ... Metropolitan ... and ... things, as far as I am concerned.

MR. S. SAID (York): Mr. Speaker, I have a ... question ... Metropolitan ... I would ... [illegible] ... of the schools ...

MR. THOMPSON: The Member has already asked ... to clarify ... Grade ... Mr. Speaker, I think ... Metropolitan ... but ... between the two things, why ...

MR. S. SAID (York): Mr. Speaker, can I ask ... Metropolitan ...

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, as I ... supplementary ... I would have ... Grade ... Grade ... Mr. Speaker, ... Metropolitan ... Grade ... Grade ... Metropolitan ...

MR. D. DALE (York): Mr. Speaker, ... Minister ... Metropolitan ... Grade ... Metropolitan ...

MR. FERGUSON: ... Grade ... Metropolitan ... Grade ... Metropolitan ... Grade ... Metropolitan ...

MR. G. ROSS (Kent): Mr. Speaker, ... Grade ... Metropolitan ...

MR. THOMPSON: ... Metropolitan ...

MR. D. DALE (York): Mr. Speaker, ... Grade ... Metropolitan ... Grade ... Metropolitan ... Grade ... Metropolitan ...

MR. D. BRUCE MCMASTER (CONSERVATIVE): May I ask, Sir, to the motion, is it in order to highlight the absence of the Member?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that... Sir, I was going to say, I think the Member for Port Moody's questions were not put down because he had been signed the questions by that time, and therefore, the questions were put on the Business Paper, they were treated in a later Business Paper.

MR. DENNIS M. COCKLE: Mr. President, this is quite unusual, Sir, I take it why the Member for East Fort's questions were not on the Order Paper, but the Business Committee met to put these questions down, and then the Member coming on behalf of the other Member can ask for their explanations, not we have to wait them down.

MR. PRESIDENT: Very well, since you have now completed that you have not been given any different interpretation. In other words, what the request made to you by the absent Member to ask the questions of the Government until today. I still agree that the questions may be postponed, and ask the Clerk to inform the Business Committee, as what they had to look from again.

MR. DENNIS M. KRAMER: Mr. President, it might be that if the Member could help the Business Committee in anticipation. Have we to discuss the Minister's absence to anticipation to be more extended than originally thought?

MR. PRESIDENT: We did not have that, that he thought the absence would be week. Normally the Business Committee have taken the steps that the questions should be put down each day to move be extended, I have no idea.

MR. D. BRUCE MCMASTER: Mr. President, Sir, on a Matter of the Business Committee Sir, I would like Minister attention to the fact that the questions which have not been put down each day, are Supplementary questions. The Member are a large number of questions, we have no alternative but to have the questions which have not already been moved. The questions which were duly and performed certainly in the questions which were on the Order Paper for that day. This is why the Business Committee has to arrange to put them on the Paper. Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not sure I fully follow the logic of this, but nevertheless, I really do not think it matters for any of the others. If the Business Committee finds a duty to put them on the Order Paper, it is perfectly appropriate for them to appear. If the request for postponement stands, it is perfectly proper for them to be postponed. So they have appeared on the Order Paper, a request has been made for postponement and they have been postponed.

Statements. The Hon. Minister Elected Member of Executive Council.

[illegible] OF THE NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF EXECUTIVE CONTRACTS

[illegible]

MR. PATRICK D. LUCEY: Mr. President, this brief presentation is made pursuant to the requirements of the Public Management of Assets, to determine the feasibility of a multi-agency Aviation Center for Department.

At the request of the Director of Executive Contracts responsible for Health, Education and Social Services, the Commissioner of Transportation, acting on behalf of the United Transportation Services Division (UTSD), is asked for a cost-benefit analysis to evaluate the declared feasibility study. The agency action has identified Mr. S. Norman Smith, CPA, for this assignment. He is well qualified for this purpose, being a Partner of the Institute, and having considerable experience in a number of similar executive management. Firms are presently being invited for the study to commence, upon the pursuit of the Director on the 22nd January, 1985 at 10:00 A.M. by flight 4227.

MS. [illegible]: Thank you.

MR. G. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, may I ask the Speaker a question. Is he giving us the cost of salaries for a cost benefit, in all of these studies?

MR. [illegible]: I think that question was [illegible] Department.

Plan 4(1) Government Business - Business Investment Bill, Final Reading.

THE HISTORIC (ENVIRONMENT) (NO. 2.) BILL, 1985

CLERK: The Historic (Environment) (No. 2.) Bill, 1985

SECOND READING OF HISTORIC (NO. 2.) BILL

MR. JAMES C. [illegible]: Mr. President....

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry, it is me to....

MR. [illegible]: I just wanted to mention for, that I think the [illegible] of....

MR. PRESIDENT: I think I had spoken on the Committee Report, since the Chief Secretary had a word, otherwise we should get into a muddle. I am sorry, I was referring for the bill....

MR. [illegible]: I think Committee Debate need to be [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon, I had not realised [illegible] because the bill has not been circulated to Members sufficiently long in advance of [illegible].

MRS. [illegible]: Yes, Mr.

MR. [illegible]: There is nothing in Standing Orders as to the time, that enables me to entertain a Bill of this kind, which is dealt with under the provisional collection of Customs Duties Act, because the Bill would have expired for the current period specified by Standing Orders, is there?

MR. SPEAKER: Mrs President, Sir, I may at least identify the situation. I share fully the hon. Member's concern that the Select Committee on Standing Orders should, and be seen accepted by the House, that the period of review to Members of a Bill like this, be shorter than the previous provisions of law. Consequent to this, in the September Sitting, the original provisions as to the length of time that the Order under the provisional Collection of Taxes Act should be allowed to be enforced, was shortened in Committee stage, as the Committee of certain Members, down to a very short period of time of two days. Therefore, the Minister may, and I think will have to be reminded by the Table, that at the House is just also considering on each working week day, as a Budget Session, that we might have to have a sitting the Tuesday day as the same time, so as to enable Standing Orders not to be suspended.

MR. [illegible]: Yes, I have understood. Mr Speaker Sitting, Standing Orders will always have to be suspended to finish a Budget Session, the Minister is they will have to be, to save Bills of this kind.

MR. [illegible]: It would not cause any of the Bill, as was suggested a while ago, that some Select Committee, because then the House would not be sitting. It is just because we are sitting as a full members of the House. It is the sitting time under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Law.

MR. SPEAKER: I will be asking for the Standing Orders Bill to be one going to have to accepted in order to take care of this.

MR. [illegible]: Well Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. At the right time. Before I proceed with the First Reading, there should be a motion, and I am going I interrupted you, the Honourable Minister Official Member, when you called to move the, would you prefer to move to formally now?

MR. [illegible]: Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that under Standing Orders No. 41, Standing Order be suspended, to enable to take the First and Second Reading of the Customs Bill until a four hours of the Budget.

MR. [illegible]: I think it is still not 5:00.

MR. [illegible]: I am sorry, still.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that be seconded with the permission of Standing Order 56, Standing Order Bill, which is suspended in order to enable us to take the First and Second Readings of the Customs Amendment Bill, 2012. If no Member wish to speak, I will put the question.

Question put: Agreed. Standing Order 56(1) suspended.

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps I may further explain the point to avoid the debate again, because we were a bit premature with the first reading.

THE CUSTOMS AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL, 1985

FIRST READING

BILL: THE CUSTOMS AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL, 1985.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Customs Law, Second Reading, be received a first time, and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

BILL: THE CUSTOMS AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL, 1985.

THE HON. T.G. GLEESON: Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled : BILL for a Law to amend the Customs Law, Second Reading.

This Bill, Mr. President, seeks to alter four minor points in the Customs Duty or motor vehicles and Diesel Oil.

Mr. President, the Government has taken positive and direct steps to achieve goals that are formally legislated in the ANZ Minerals Agreement Act 1982. The Bill today seeks to fulfill the requirements under the International Legislation of the Government.

Mr. President, under the Act the Government is required to achieve a minimum level of 50% Australian content in the production of motor vehicles by 1988. The question then is how can we ensure that the quantity of goods that be on the market for 1988 are comparable to what she would receive if she went with the same amount of money as she presently spends, is substantially reduced. In some cases, one may have to look twice the way to see what one has, but under these it will work.

What we are talking about Mr. President, is the erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar, over the period 1987 to 1988. If we were just to measure the eight cents in 1987, the purchasing power of only eight cents, we would have to consider the Bill to ameliorate costs. All we are doing Mr. President, with these measures is merely to ameliorate.

Mick we talked of the dollar Mr. President, we then mentioned that the impact of expenditure cuts was expected for 1988, and perhaps then mentioned the value of the currency during the latter part of 1987, but more specifically over the long term period, we know that Australia is aware of the world economy taking the effect on some industries in the Australia. We have obviously, the responsibility as a Government, to maintain employment to the people, primarily at the rural level. That we are going to find alternative ways and means of encouraging persons to purchase these products, these services are going to be, wherein significant savings, achieved both in quality and perhaps also in quantity.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible] U. S. AID SERVICE [illegible]. The increases are clearly to offset, and do not actually give the [illegible], a few increases which do already [illegible].

In the Budget Address, Minister [illegible] that the year until end March Shillings [illegible] million, that is the same [illegible]. The Minister [illegible] the Bill also spoke about the shortfall in Customs Duties and in fact, the Budget Address says that even [illegible] [illegible] Shillings [illegible] million.

So then Bill, like all the other Bills [illegible] to raise taxes and [illegible], was simply written [illegible] to provide the [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible]. We have had a bad year, perhaps the worst in the [illegible] history, marked by many new things, and that is [illegible]. We should say, [illegible] to [illegible] properly. It is common [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] which have existed [illegible] before, since they [illegible]. It is not caused by a person. The [illegible] which this Government took [illegible] to the success that, more normal [illegible]. These problems can well [illegible] [illegible] of March of this year, eight months ago, to give [illegible] [illegible] to a time of recession of Sh.[illegible] million or [illegible] in the Import [illegible] for [illegible]. While some of the reasons, reasons they had taken this policy out of the [illegible] sector, many which could [illegible] [illegible] of the Government, many which could have been used for [illegible] [illegible], and put in the Government [illegible]. This is why [illegible] [illegible], and this is why they believe this Bill will help, but it will not help. Also, they are suggesting that [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible] suggesting that it would [illegible] to [illegible] a Sh.[illegible] million tax increase, of which this is a part, and a big part at that.

In fact, Sir, it has been brought out very clearly that the previous [illegible] [illegible], so that for eight years this Government has tried to [illegible] that [illegible] by [illegible] million Shillings, due solely [illegible] [illegible] the last eight years, and this is bound to hurt the economy, and this is bound to [illegible] a deficit. The position now is by the Treasury, it is not necessary, because they have failed to understand. I would suggest that Hon. Minister for Finance tonight and read the Review Digest December 1969 issue on page 9.3, and they will see an article which sums up [illegible] Bill very well by me, because it deals with the economic myth, that you can [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] by increasing taxes, and this article is not only [illegible] Digest article, but it is [illegible] of an article from Sunday Nation, one of the country financial [illegible] on the world. It says that it is a myth that we must raise taxes to reduce the deficits, it is a myth. The [illegible] produce [illegible] [illegible] by raising taxes. This [illegible] is in March, and they further [illegible] they [illegible] a surplus for 1969, which ended with a [illegible] million deficit. So they are on the wrong track, and they need to change their thinking. Increasing [illegible] revenue is not going to help in [illegible] the shortfall of [illegible] million which we will experience this year. Increasing [illegible] is positive and should not [illegible] [illegible] the shortfall in revenue. From the Customs Duties, I am [illegible] increase this [illegible]. I would like to quote [illegible] which says: "The [illegible] response to the present budget deficits could be [illegible] tax [illegible]. Government [illegible] are not the problem. Actually they have been growing at a very healthy pace although [illegible] [illegible] than [illegible]. A [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] would have the economy by [illegible] the public [illegible] will pay for [illegible] [illegible], for [illegible] [illegible]." Mr. Speaker, although [illegible] [illegible] the United States [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

Mr. C. MILO BOLTON (Tauranga): Government servants are the most
[illegible] Government workers like Mr. Bolton
[illegible] the public. So the question
[illegible] problem, as he has failed [illegible] the problem with
our country, and I am going to tell you [illegible] with this
speech. What is the problem, but the answer to [illegible] problem.

[illegible] year around $40 million to nearly $60 million. So it is not
[illegible] it would, and Government revenues are not the problem. A
[illegible] Government would help the economy by reducing the price,
[illegible] will pay for being productive, for being successful. This
[illegible] Government by people who stop to think, that a substantial tax
[illegible] would boost the economy, by reducing the price, which will pay for
[illegible] productivity. An increase in the price of motor gasoline and
an increase in the price of diesel oil will substantially raise the
[illegible] people will pay for being productive, will pay for being
successful. Because if we [illegible] a tax on [illegible] price
[illegible] gasoline, the Maori, whether male or female in the
future, [illegible] to make a profit [illegible] will pay for
[illegible] pay. So we will not be putting in place measures to [illegible]
[illegible] eventually be [illegible] plus [illegible].

The people in the [illegible] business
will have to pay this price, the taxi drivers will have to pay this
price, and eventually, [illegible] have little choice [illegible]
[illegible] in the [illegible], [illegible] in order to pay for the [illegible]
[illegible] Government taxation. We should be [illegible] by the way
[illegible] and [illegible] the price [illegible] our economy would
[illegible] by 1 July 1992 recession or the number of jobs that the Maori
Affairs [illegible] could be [illegible] the overheating
economy, the Government's [illegible] virtually [illegible]
to zero."

However, this [illegible] to expenditure
[illegible] economy has started, and that is our problem. The economy
has started, it is our problem in the Labour Caucus. Started by the
[illegible] of the Government, which they took over in October
1990, this is the problem today, the economy has stalled. People
in the street say it has stood still, it has actually started. And
[illegible] unemployment rises, and by using [illegible] price, which will pay for
being productive. An increase in the price of motor gasoline and
an increase in the price of diesel oil will substantially raise the
[illegible] people will pay for being productive, will pay for being
successful. Because if we put in a tax on [illegible] price
[illegible] gasoline, the Maori, whether male or female in the
future, [illegible] to make a profit [illegible] will pay for
[illegible] pay. So we will not be putting in place measures to [illegible]
[illegible] eventually be [illegible] plus [illegible].

The people in the [illegible] business
will have to pay this price, the taxi drivers will have to pay this
price, and eventually, [illegible] have little choice [illegible]
[illegible] in the [illegible], [illegible] in order to pay for the [illegible]
[illegible] Government taxation. We should be [illegible] by the way
[illegible] and [illegible] the price [illegible] our economy would
[illegible] by 1 July 1992 recession or the number of jobs that the Maori
Affairs [illegible] could be [illegible] the overheating
economy, the Government's [illegible] virtually [illegible]
to zero."

However, this [illegible] to expenditure
[illegible] economy has started, and that is our problem. The economy
has started, it is our problem in the Labour Caucus. Started by the
[illegible] of the Government, which they took over in October
1990, this is the problem today, the economy has stalled. People
in the street say it has stood still, it has actually started. And
[illegible] unemployment rises, and [illegible] Government revenues are
[illegible] by a [illegible] increase in a petrol or [illegible] or a [illegible]
[illegible] increase in a petrol [illegible]. We need different measures, we
need different policies by Government, to change this position.

The [illegible] to Whakapara's [illegible],
in particular. The [illegible] petrol [illegible] Labour Government [illegible],
[illegible] speaking [illegible] and [illegible] provide [illegible] roads
[illegible] speaking. There are [illegible] measures, [illegible] in Otara,
[illegible] Manurewa, and [illegible] Government spending.

I may [illegible] case of Te, like the
[illegible] we need [illegible], [illegible] Labour Caucus and [illegible]
on [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] Te. [illegible] which [illegible]
point on the [illegible], and I could go on, [illegible]
but the point [illegible], [illegible] should [illegible], we need to [illegible]
[illegible] Government down. We need to [illegible] which will [illegible]
economy, if we are going to get out of our [illegible]. The answer
does not lie in Government [illegible].

MR. C. GAIL SCOTT (CONSERVATIVE): Why can we not learn from history, and does the Minister not think that is the deficit which John Crosbie has had over the years, and does that explain deficits, those very serious deficits in the past, and those deficits were caused by increased economic activity, which was brought about by more Conservative programs, as compared to the Trudeau Socialism. This is what caused those deficits. Deficits have never been run up by increased taxation.

If we look at a document which was prepared by the former Finance Secretary, just before he left Government, you will see that his most serious deficits in relation to revenue-raising during the years 1978, 1979 and 1979, those years of successive deficits. These were not caused by increased taxation, because the Government on every year put on more taxes, but it did not cure the deficits, the deficits were still there. What caused those deficits, was the recession on taxes. When the new Government took the taxes off automobiles, or reduced them, they also took off high-flown wages, and also put in place some real incentives to invest in this country, which encouraged the people in the street to create his own business, an attitude of encouragement to get more economic activity, so that we could get the Canada going, and putting more taxes on gasoline and five cents on diesel. We knew there was a tax increase in 1977 or 1979 or maybe now, but this was included with a realignment in the economy, a realignment of economic activity which we have not seen this year.

My hiccup statement beside the fact that Canada Savings has fallen by $1.3 million, but the Government has done nothing, absolutely nothing to encourage economic activity. If an individual wants to build a house, he has to wait the Planning Board, the Natural Planning Authority, half a dozen times to get the plan passed. Every business in this Country has been run into the ground by Government's policies over the last twelve months. We hear of the increase which Government sought to get in the economy through investing a higher tax on Bingo, one by one, which crippled the financial business of the province, which was very small businesses of a Newfoundlander. So, this can only come into play, seeking to increase income on gambling, and not support the same people which other activities or increased revenue have had on the economy. This question is not fair of course to ask this Minister.

I would like to say, that nothing in here recommends to the Country's deficit, contributes to the Country's credibility that what developers some have and commit obvious a clear understanding of Government's intentions. The Government has a very fluctuating record, and every month, three-and-four times, it has had developers know where they stand. If we want to steer the economy, we must have incentives, made by the people who take them, and not made for them. If Government works with anything, it must first put its ear open like, to find out if some businesses will do what they want to do. This is not Canada the Country, we now have a country without any leaders, and we had better get back to basics, if we are going to survive for the next three years. This Country has problems, but they will not be solved by increased taxation, we have seen this. When we had the increased taxes on automobiles in 1975, it just cut away from 40 per cent to 22 1/2 per cent, this was the first year, 1976, 1976 was the first year. In the previous ten years, when the construction of automobiles actually dropped, so they themselves do not get more revenue, by increasing the duties on automobiles, and the result will be the same today.

MR. S. MAJID JOGEZAI: Sir, the Government has made a mistake, but not somebody is perfect. They must do as Mr. Sarwar Bilgrami said in his letter that yesterday to the Congress "they must sacrifice their pride and come with humility, and we please take every which they are putting upon us". I am not quoting his own words, but they were words to that effect and I think this is what he exactly, and I like him to do right. But our Government don't like of necessities, when businesses are hurting, business taxation and exports to get more money. Government must find the problem and find the cure, because these increased taxes, and there are many of them to come and there are some which have already gone, are inflationary by their very nature. The writer has made that statement, we having said about inflationary taxes, that having a little inflation is like being a little pregnant, because inflation feeds on itself, and nothing grows like a little more. If we do not take steps to stop the Government from putting in $1.5 billion of new taxes today, or shortly like Pitting, after having put in $1.5 billion in March, and perhaps another billion dollars, spending the duty on the underweight and other licences which have been put up, we still have a little inflation which will soon grow like Topsy more.

MR. SPEAKER: Since the Minister seems to have come to a break in his speech, perhaps we can suspend proceedings, would that be convenient now?

MR. S. MAJID JOGEZAI: Yes Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: For approximately fifteen minutes.

AT 11:10 A.M. THE HOUSE RESUMED

AFTER RESUMED AT 11:25 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Continuation of the Motion regarding Islamic Law (Amendment) Act, 1983 with the Second Elected Member for Peshawar Town.

MR. S. MAJID JOGEZAI: Mr. Speaker, I must say that this Bill really caught me by surprise this morning, as I had not expected to find it on today agenda, and I know the requirements of the Procedural Collection of Business Law, that to must deal with it. But, I would think that today we mostly should have taken only the first Reading of the Bill, so that at some other stage we could have the debate. Of course, I did not want to create a deadlock by asking that the adjournment of the Debate be put to another day, and as a result of this, I will try to contribute my opinion.

Many people are blaming the Honourable Financial Secretary for the increases on the motor gasoline and the diesel, as well as on other items which have been increased. This goes but I would like to say to the Public that they should not blame our Financial Secretary, because he is only one member in a Government consisting of seven Members, and he is bound by collective responsibility to support on the Legislative Assembly any matter which has been agreed upon in Executive Council.

MR. G. WILSON (CONTINUING): As the Budget Address and the tax measures are not the matters of the Financial Secretary but of the Government, they are the collective responsibilities of the Executive Council. We can only put forward our thoughts and certain economic policies, if these policies have been implemented by the Government or a Chief. So, the decision to tax, or the decision to wipe out the deficit by increasing taxes or reducing, cancel or postpone the waste, is a political decision, and the sole responsibility rests with the elected Members.

The decision to tax is always a political decision, and the chief concern in Government should be binged by the Government as a whole; whether to increase or reduce taxes.

Perhaps taking an opportunity to have said at the time of the Caymanian Association that taxation without representation was bad. I wonder what Caymanians today would say lack of the Constitution which represents, because the Government was elected in November 1972, was elected on the promise that they would not be interested taxation. They would point out to Government the Government. They would have all the rights of Legco Members, and just to name, they have finished the promises and they have failed most miserably in their performance.

The motorcycle scheme is how been scrapped only by this Government as an object of ridicule. An object which has to be stated so that it is impossible for the next to continue to have one. By now in the Budget Address that a figure is given, we think if a person comes a motorcycle the time it only cost him $500.00 if he owns a home, over that driving license, and taking care the $10.00 insurance for the passage taxes. It would appear that the taxes put on the motorcycle this year, would make the number $185.00. But, this does not tell the whole story, because it does not include the increased cost of petrol. It does not include the gas cooker gasoline for fuel, so this will have to be added on it. The average car owner probably uses from six five hundred gallons of gasoline in a year. At five cents a gallon the price for fuel will increase by $30.00 a year, so that if one owns a car for the year 1976 it will cost now not $185.00 as shown in the estimates for the increases, but it will cost one hundred $30.00. Then, if one has to pay for a driving license, one will be taken at ten another $10.00. The point I am trying to make is, that this increased in motor cars and diesel is absolutely right when we consider all the other charges. Assuming this figure which is underestimated at to only the increase. The $40.00 for the license should be a $80.00 increase, so we must consider as a figure of $300.00 increase. So when we put all this cost for the gasoline and we also consume that which has been added for our power which does by car, whereas the figure begin to rise. When you we use a conservative figure, the cost for the average car owner could probably go up to $600.00 more than he paid in 1975. What happens if a man bought a car or sold in during this year, the fee for the insurance of the license would have to be paid. This for sense to have increased the same. If he owned a boat from which he made a living, the cost would be substantially more. So what are we trying to do? What are we trying to do with the automobile, and I think the reason for these phenomenal increases by Executive Government they are understand the role that the motor vehicle plays in the economy of these Islands. The war in the Cayman Islands is not a luxury. I would like to emphasize this. The car is not a luxury, it is a necessity, it is as necessary as the shoes in your children, or the refrigerator or even the bathroom in your house.

MR. C. RAIS ROGERS (CONSERVATIVE): We have no public transportation system in these Islands, and many working persons need transportation to help in their work. Now I know that there are some homes that own more than one automobile. In most instances they need them only. One may have a home where one goes to work on it. One is stationed at transportation centre, one is used by the officer with regular hours to go to work, one is a police officer, and one is a nurse who has to be night duty at different hours. It could well be that with four people working in a home, they might have automobiles, or that each person can get to his or her specific destination. Because of some reason, and also that one of the wives might drive to the hospital, it would not be possible for her to easily get a taxi home when the work is done.

So we need to take a new look at the automobile. I know it has its bad side, and I am not defending that side of it. I think what has happened this year since out of the misery in the Island of Grand Cayman, ministers of them were automobile ambulance. Nearly every one of the people who died in Grand Cayman this year died in automobiles, but they took their lives because recklessly abused the automobile, and this is no way detract from the fact that people need automobiles to go to work, to church, to go wherever they want, and the convenience of our modern society is necessary on the home or Monday morning. Whether it be cars, or whether it be boat, to make the automobile the first necessity, it is a necessity.

Today we use even the automobile for pleasure. I remember when I was a boy when automobiles were around, when only the rich people owned automobiles. It was a common thing to see them coming up from George Town or a Sunday, taking a drive. This was the common thing, and those people probably only used their automobiles on Sundays, and it was perhaps a luxury. Today, the automobile is an integral part of our economy, here to stay. When only the rich people had automobiles, nobody scorned upon them, but since the automobile has become common place, among the middle class people, and when the low income people have made the automobile indispensable. All of a sudden the automobile has become a bad thing. The automobile is very necessary, and I would dare say that probably one third of the people who use automobiles in the Sister Islands find it difficult to put a new set of tires on the automobile. Automobiles are mainly owned by the men, they are needed in the drive ways of the poorer individuals, people who struggle to make a living, and this has been quite heavily on the shoulders of the poor. These people who have to provide their families, who have to use their machine, these are the people who are being hurt, by these environmental ordinances which the government will hope will clean out the traffic which they created, because of their failure to implement economic policies which would stimulate the economy, and so bring increased revenue without increased taxation.

We are going to feel these increases when the businesses who are dependent on the use of oil have to increase their services to us. I understand from a very reliable source that Caribbean Utilities will be asked to pay higher duties on the items they bring in under their franchise. I do not know for sure whether they will be asked to pay the tax or absorb it, but if they do it will be shifted, and it will have to pay for their automobiles this is likely to be reflected in the light rates later on next year.

d). U. S. TAX SYSTEM (CONTINUED): When One adds in the employee income tax to pay more at the pump for those large diesel trucks that consume a lot of fuel. The Democrats do pay more at most but a small fraction. The consumer is going to pay in the end. When the fuel prices rise to pay more at the pump, he must recognize the price on to his customers, we are already high priced. These operations of politics of Treasury-Fiscal Policy in one country, one single small unit is very significant. It Government needs to take a serious look at this Bill. Although the Bill, namely the provisions in the Major oppose the Democratic Republican of Customs war, and begin the duty on gasoline and diesel oil to be soon. It is a widely shared that the point of gasoline tax . views on these Islands at a time when the world prices is falling. July last week the OPEC members have secretly to try to prevent the collapse of the oil prices. Whether this group is not a price expansion to the people when the oil companies made an increase to price there business to make a bigger profit, with new problem arises. But we are faced with another serious economic and not to forgotten of this price position as hoped for in the Budget address, but an increase of five cents per gallon! Five cents. Perhaps most of the world leaders, who are who sells at the gas station, are not wealthy people, some of them operate their businesses on a shoe-string, and many of them have to get loans and overdrafts to carry their business. So, they cannot afford to put out five cents more per gallon more for fuel without coming a profit on that five cents. When we talk about an increase of five cents, it does not seem very much, but this means one have a considerably effect on our economy. We now begin for the review of our diesel engine vehicle, and even as a conservative group, they will use five cents of fuel per gallon as which they will pay an extra five cents, letting that cry a large revenue accrue.

In fact, if the economy performs the way the Government expects, and they can collect as much revenue this year as they did last year, from this source after implementing the 'hike' we could find that their figures would be satisfied, and they could wipe out the deficits. But historically this has never happened. At best, it has never exceeded to the income we have always projected the deficit.

Now, what we are talking about both increasing the price of gasoline, is actually strangling the little man, when the Government has elected to help. Everyone in the little man the least can do is pay the tax of the increase of five and a half million dollars, which has come in this Budget, and that I say little man, I am not talking about millionaire. I'm talking about those who find it difficult to fill up the tank in the morning, and also find the money for his kid.

So what is the Government trying to do? They promised to help the small man, they have already helped him out of misfortune, and this morning they will just open his wallet to another hole and there will not be enough left for a pensioner. So Government made to reconsider the increase, because it is Government's economic policies which are at the root of our whole problem. They blame 'OPEC' for the deficit. I cannot but fully agree with them. It seems if they blame the organization for their deficit. Instead of putting the blame where the blame should be. That famous saying Minister says is supposed to have said 'We have found the enemy and the enemy is us'. We have found the enemy and the enemy is us. We have found the enemy and the enemy is us. The enemy is not the unemployed, it is not the disabled in economy. The enemy is not the pensioner the one to Government the only wages earner, the enemy is like to the Government's economic policies failing to control the deficit which caused the disaster in the economy.

Mr. C. WILLIAMS (Scarborough): Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order? Is it possible for any member of the Government to answer questions? I have quite a few questions to be answered and answers, because they will not be given here, such a deficit. A deficit caused by a lack of confidence all throughout the years. A deficit caused by a lack of confidence of what it takes to make the country run efficiently.

We have a good one possible in these Islands. A problem which is beside the point of the Government to answer, but the Government would do right for Premier Tibbetts suggested in his budget speech, and they have to take a scientific approach and consider not only the Virgin Gorda, but all those like Jost Van Dyke and Anegada in the Virgin Islands.

This Government of ours would not consider it to be just wise to a business venture would have been just wrong. You explained that Premier Wade has, under the Treaty on Tortola which according to the Budget Address commences in the year of 1988 or 89 I know under it, Tortola a considerable effect on our economy. Instead of trying to separate ourselves individuals who own a car only out of necessity, Government should be developing their policies so that those who can be more interested activity, perhaps putting for some kind of incentive under that a responsible. Perhaps the Government is providing finance which businesses wanted only to the negligible so see if the Provident Fund contributions of workers can be used more. We planned this meeting until the session did come, we were pleased of the idea's presented this afternoon a success. I disagree with of the hon. Government members would be with time, and then again, the hon. Executive Councillor why can't they run down a Senate just the road, and be local, that the hon. be attendance the economy of the country today, or to increase the economic sensitivity of that this things are happening. The big difficult investment in the Budget of $7.5 million has not been spent solely because of Government's actions, and this goes to our that Members become failed to look at the Budget, simply because Government's policies not mentioned the economic activity which is causing requirements thereof ; saving the poor, should have the financial prosperity, because this is the answer to our economic woes.

The Premier here, Mr. Chairman, on the economy, all the problems contained in the Estimate, some of these increases that produce the most the Government would, whether the increase principle to make these first consider the revenue. What I am saying is, if the party of yesterday remains a budget whose people give to objectives to put in the pay to keep, people just will not see the economy, they will not see that's much as they seem going on. So a new 'look' would have the opposite effect, and instead of producing more revenue than this reasonable economy, new might find less to produce less revenue.

The bill before the House is a particular, because it includes not the Income of an already financially member who can receive be asked to pay more, when it is not clear that they are already paying, and I am not talking about the non-nationals I am not worried about him. I am talking about the Tortola man who has to drive from here to come this back for, and he has to drive a car which is really not suitable for roads to keep. But because the very unfortunate situation what it, he has to find the money. We can point with "Christ" pretty to learn", but he has to buy the car, and there are the people [illegible] pretty cheap.

[illegible] I do not like the additional [illegible] by the Government's proposals. I have [illegible] in the north about, secondly, [illegible] people, [illegible] even [illegible] some of this in here, [illegible] to the rate of the [illegible]. What [illegible] got to do with [illegible] by [illegible]. What has this got to do with [illegible] to pay for the war, or to keep it [illegible]. [illegible] with [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. GEN. CHARLES F. ROSENBERG: ... I would like, one of the questions that the Government has made in the past, to have the record duly on the oral decree provisions that Congress, instead of having it run for eight years before reviewing it, every eight years, because the IRS Reform Act has its rules, and they require the person to any particular action, if they see the person is a problem country to them, they oppose their problems to keep them on the books, Mr. President, I can see no problem in this kind of five years. I think this is very much in this, and I think the employer [illegible] to the Armed Services Committee [illegible] employees [illegible] them for.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would you please [illegible] I have brought to [illegible] I think.....

MR. F. [illegible]: I will be doing, very briefly Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sure you will [illegible] in my [illegible]. It has the Member for Rural Affairs, and the first [illegible] the [illegible] I am sure we have introduced the [illegible], but I think it should be [illegible].....

MR. F. [illegible]: Mr. President, I am not like [illegible] I think, but I would [illegible] I'm [illegible] of the general [illegible] I'm [illegible] and [illegible] to [illegible]. But one [illegible] [illegible], so [illegible] we [illegible] [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] I [illegible] [illegible].....

MR. F. [illegible]: [illegible] I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

HOUSE RECESSED AT 9:14 P.M.

Mr. MACDONALD: Please be seated. It now the Elected Member for South Hamilton Mountain to take the Chair, before Council, as I chose to do this...

ADJOURNED UNTIL 10 A.M.

Mr. D. REDDEN (Speaker): Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Chair [illegible] would not have to wait long Mr. Speaker. Although I would gladly welcome the opportunity to continue rising and debate with the Elected Member for Golden Beach, the sacrifice and commitment of the officers is based on the decisions on the deficit position in this Country, unfortunately Sir, I have to accept Standing Order 40 (1), and therefore I reluctantly beg to move, and I dissent on behalf of the people of this country. Thank you.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the Elected Member for East End.

Mr. JOHN B. HUNTER: Mr. Speaker, before dispensing on the point of the debate now raised by the Hon. Member, and thank the Public Accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Total Opposition Member did very well in the presentation of this Bill, I'm in some points I must say he was very reasonable, I'm of his part. When I must say that I should have to disagree to deal with such a Bill during before this assembly.

I was surprised Mr. President to hear the [illegible] Minister, [illegible], $22,250.00 was by what, because Mr. President when we speak of such amounts for instance, we are still losing out the point of view I'm very much concerned, that Public Accounts. I would like the Member from Golden Isle who just spoke to advise us are not speaking of [illegible] of that Public Accounts. The one who suffers most when such hard necessary are taken, like the ones before us now. I realize Mr. President, where it is all going to end. Such assurance, I'm to be used to be responsible also.

I have tried a while ago that we have gone so far as to say to our Police Officers and principal Secretaries, Ayes Noes, even take the Public Accounts [illegible] where it is all going to end.

Mr. President, some people have short memories. I thought we have the opportunity of [illegible] a capital expenditure. When I was elected [illegible] was one of my first [illegible] to [illegible] Public Accounts Committee, I [illegible] looking to [illegible] Accounts since on retirement. At that time [illegible] Ground a third runway, and the Motion which I proposed to the Government of the day, was to bring it to twenty [illegible] I was [illegible] with the twenty four [illegible] to be [illegible] Accounts since and a half per cent. What are the results, [illegible] Accounts [illegible] to What had happened Mr. President, was that we have [illegible] Accounts [illegible] Accounts, at some [illegible] being [illegible] Accounts, that a car could be made [illegible] either [illegible] Ground. Today, what is the use? There is [illegible] which [illegible] that have not come to with a full [illegible] Accounts. So that [illegible] Government has [illegible] by [illegible] Accounts [illegible] Government of [illegible] Accounts [illegible] Accounts [illegible] Accounts

MR. ALAN F. KOLKEY (CONTINUING): Sir, I would just like to say that we will keep this matter at the expense of the peace talk is nothing for us to stand in here and brag about. I would like to get moving, but first order of business, we had to do it when we were in Government. I heard an argument this morning, that those who are contemplating this measure should have [illegible].

Mr. President, shortly after the election I took my stand, I made it abundantly clear that I was prepared to work together for the betterment of this Country. I was not given the same encouragement to come and share in power. Is it only now that my help is needed?

I was proud Mr. President, when I knew the majority, and I was an elected there from a well engineered constituency from the Leeward Islands, nobody was more responsible, more constructive, and if we became critical, it was, but always do not prosecute the little men [illegible].

What is termed to [illegible] am, we will encourage and more progressive, by have heard of taxes in the United States being compared with taxes in the Virgin Islands. I would say, of really people in comparable of life in the United States, and therefore be on the tax income brackets on the Trade Income brackets, I have never yet come across one who opposed with what they have going through. In definitely, the people have every right to vote, not to move now before we are prosecuted into that same right. To vote in me, is the duty of everybody, vote and more taxes.

Mr. President. I hope and trust that the people who are presently in our Virgin Government will appreciate what have been done. And all they honestly do not see that from these people speaking what has been done in these Chambers. It is a sad state of affairs, our people are very much ignorant and I address myself to the matter before. Let me say now, and hope, thank you Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Continue the Second Member [illegible] Member has explained enough by you, but he does not want to be accusing is not. The Hon. Elmore Member from the Lower Islands.

Capt. HURST O. [illegible]: Thank you Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise to endorse this bill, I feel for a time to attend the Customs Dock. I realize Mr. President that the people must contribute to the expenditures of Government, if they want to benefit.

I also remember in 1970, when the prices of gasoline at the pump was approximately fifty per cent of what it is today, and some of this has gone to the revenue of the Virgin Islands Government, it has all gone in the way of [illegible] the people to Grand Cayman.

No doubt wealth by the people has been made the recent months, there are a few extremes, following by a few poor shortages, we all played it as the people, and accepted it the world depression, [illegible] today, I am happy to say, this fine monies will help to balance our budget, will be beneficial to each and every one of us, and the Executive which is one of the few measures which I feel can really be shouldered by the people, and should not cause any more hardship.

Now people will not vote, they normally only have six or seven minutes of speeches on a week, so I do not see where the people is having giving to be that heard, in which there you would Mr. President, I support this Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Utah.

MRS. DARLENE L. SWIFT: Thank you Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise to support the bill before us. I have no real problem about Mr. Chairman's opinion that we should take time out of the budget for Memorial Day, but I think we do owe it to the people of Utah, and I'm sure we're not alone in this, to provide some clarification as to what we would finally, if and when we were elected to Congress. We should provide that no filibuster, but certainly Mr. President, we must show that the responsibly elected body is willing to provide whatever relief was needed, and necessary might have to be found.

I have heard quite a bit this morning about why we should not raise the price of gasoline and oil by five cents. There is more than one way of looking at this, perhaps one might see looking at it as a penalty, which does not count much, but at the end of the year it would cost the consumer plenty.

Mr. President, if one were to take the people once a week and put one gallon of gas, one would pay fifty cents more. This does not seem a great deal to me, personally I would rather that we did not have to increase our taxes, but the fact remains, that we have to, and I've also that I have listened to this morning, I have heard no real alternatives. No workable alternatives to the problems we are being presented by this present Congress. When the opportunities was pointed to explain Mr. President, we hear words but we don't see the real gut of what we're seeking. The 1979-1980 Commerce bills are infrastructure. There aren't enough highways would be built. The 1979-1980 Commerce bills, during, projects been given and the reduction of all these efforts result by the previous Administration. Not only have we a lack of energy, but they have created the. Mr. President, and in addition to wasting that energy, they have left us with millions of dollars to take care of unemployment.

What I am saying Mr. President, is that the Democratic record is rife with unbelievable statements, if that, are most generous we may consider it to be. They come up with incredible that is unbelievable, because I for one think, that they would be more apt not going to be successful for the next four years, but finally having put in place the structure which they think ought to be there, and which many corporate are now playing up in relation opinion to. What could possibly be the case, we have seen Members of the Administration say go out there to the, and change their minds by misrepresenting the truth. However, I would like to remind this Honorable Senate of what I said a few days ago. We have got some really sensible people in West Utah, and one cannot overestimate just what they've it happened in 1978, and in here the situation was changed, they realized who the real statesmen of the people were; and they've proven their minds, and it just may have to be time to prove this.

Mr. President, five cents on a gallon of gas, this Administration would be not willing to place these resources for something which is going to go for unemployment, and to have to pay for them. We have, as I have stated of privilege the response on this issue, and we for an the economy being in a slump, and by being in a move, give us a little time. They just might want to double it, we might need eight cents to build it back up, but I believe we the President, we owe we the top up, and I have a strong feeling that in eight years this Administration will have not wanted to leave a mess, a financial mess on the backs there, as was done in 1964.

MRS. ALBERT A. GORE (CONTINUING): ...of the people of these islands did? ...I was explaining why probably [illegible] Mr. President, when you got there. They were able at last to find out the financial mess ...you know, and the things under-cover wasn't under the carpet. All of a sudden, and gradually as well, they were beginning exposed. While the past Government was given a magnificent explanation for the way they have handled the finances, and which they can prove on which a [illegible] I will be happy to listen to them.

Thank you, Mr. President. I support my own Bill, now I am pleased to say on my records to Mrs. Gore that we are doing it because we have to, and they will use the profits of this to the enormous relief we are going to provide for them.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. M. BASSEY ESSIEN: Mr. President, sir, point of information. May I make my point during my budget contribution presentation.

I am only asking now to speak, just to refer to what has been said by the honourable friend from Ikot Ekpene, the second Alternate Member for Eastern Ibibio.

Mr. President, I am a person who [illegible] the old people say "I mean my brothers [illegible]" which means Mr. President, I have what I have to tell anybody. I am going to do so, and ever since I have been a Member of this House, I have spoken concerning my constituency. I have spoken concerningly to how I see a situation, or how I find a situation. I do not get up here and speak about a matter unless I know some somewhere in it, and I stand by my contribution, I mean what I said yesterday. I feel it is very unfair when the person of a Minister is required to pay an income for the use of the motor car a little fellow who has trouble in getting a fifth motor car, he is a capitalist or whatever it be, just to have transportation to take him to work, because unemployment, Mr. President is something which unfortunately every person in the Nigerian Federation today experiences. I am of my opinion to what people is not a luxury it is a necessity. I feel Mr. President that this has reference to, should be applied to the type of car one owns. It should be, and I stand by my contribution, a graduated tax on to those on the higher cycles. I cannot afford pay according to his affordability, and this is merely to all those registered on the type of car a person owns.

Mr. President, the second Alternate Member for Ibibio West has said that the little man in this country is not paying the small car, he is saying the big [illegible] I am not saying for, that some people, because of what they prefer [illegible] a big land Rover, I am not saying that. But if we check the roads of American cars in these islands today, he would find that it is practically nil. It is a very few [illegible] is left on American car in the Upper Islands today, and as far as I can see, and as far as I have checked, the cars of the small cars is there. Petrol is great, and they are being taxed by a lot of poor people, and they are the ones I represent.

So I stand by my contention. I do not support the system of taxation because everyone is paying his own thing, and it is one thing for all of us to pay the same price for our generator, but it is another thing for the people in the lower circle of life to pay the same license fee as the Second Alternate Member from Ibibio West, who owns a Cadillac and a Mercedes Benz, and that is why you hear him grumbling about because he is the only

M. O. SAM AKPAN: Mr. President, on a point of order....

MR. PRESIDENT: There is a point of personal privilege pending.

MR. W. HALE DAVENPORT: The point of order is that the Member...

MR. E. BENTLEY BLOOM: Would the Member suspend briefly.

MR. W. HALE DAVENPORT: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to [illegible] a Member rather than be heckled constantly [illegible]...

MR. PRESIDENT: Is this a point of Order.....

MR. W. HALE DAVENPORT: .....and I have no objection. He knows this but [illegible] propaganda during the election.....

MR. PRESIDENT: I am afraid this [illegible] point of

MR. EDWARD A. DYKSTRA: On a Point of Order. I believe that Parliamentary practice does not [illegible] a Member who rises on a Point of Order, and even if it [illegible] specifically in our Standing Orders, Speaking May [illegible] by not be the Rules of this House, and if the Rule of speaking in Debate or normally, this is a breach or infraction of Parliamentary [illegible]. So I believe that some of the Motion that may be made in this House, normally be found in our Standing Orders, and we will have to [illegible] Parliamentary Practice.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is [illegible] true.....

MR. W. HALE DAVENPORT: [illegible] on the point, and [illegible] [illegible].

MR. EDWARD A. DYKSTRA: On a Point of Order, Mr. President..

MR. W. HALE DAVENPORT: [illegible] willingly [illegible].

MR. EDWARD A. DYKSTRA: On a Point of Order Mr. President. [illegible] I should point out to Standing Order 30(1), and it appears to me that the Member who was speaking, namely the Honourable Member from West [illegible] was not prepared to give way [illegible] Member from Grandin Town, and that is right to [illegible].

MR. W. HALE DAVENPORT: The same might have to [illegible] and then [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order.

MR. T. HORNER FOOT: Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] I am still awaiting a Point of [illegible].

MR. E. BENTLEY BLOOM: Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please do [illegible].

Mr. M. MOSSPIN FINCH: I am sorry I did not hear you. I beg your pardon. I was not quite sure who was going to speak.

Mr. PAPATACHI: I beg your pardon. I was not entirely sure, speaking, but I was quite right, but I was unsure to speak.

Secondly, it is perfectly true that I personally accept that there may be permissible and genuine forms of those which are not spelt out to exclude, or fully covered by existing policy, and there may be a need on occasion to refer to Section 8(g), however any Standing Orders that may exist ought to be kept flexible with in Standing Orders we shall follow westminster practice, to work in that effect, and Section 8(g) overrides Westminster practice. If therefore, a Member feels that he has a point of Order which is not adequately covered by Standing Orders, but could Section 8(g) raise such be a Point of Order, then he may reasonably draw my attention to the appropriate paragraph of Section 8(g), but I exclude what is known as that. So much for that.

Secondly, it does seem to me that really what the General Election Petition Rules sought to do was not make as much of what I would regard as a Point of Order, as a point of explanation under Standing Order fifty really.

Thirdly, I think that generally speaking, if every time a Member rose immediately after another Member believed he is interrupted or misheard, the Member who believes something to be inaccurate or incorrect rises on a Point of Order, he would spend the whole three Sessions Points of Order, instead of continuing with the debate.

And that again, if it is in fact the case that the General Election Petition Rules are capable of being used for a purpose belonging to the General Election Petition Rules, I would be with the descriptive moment here also raised. In any case gentlemen.

Dr. P. Kuenyehia absent: Mr. President, every time I get up to speak, they are stopping us on basic fundamental matters of Order.

I was only explaining to the house that I was the minister moving the bill, and he is a Minister and one of Honourable Members, and he is explaining about the system which I may or should have. It is only in my opinion, because he would just like a explanation. He would just like a explanation of the matter coming up later on. I have my opinions, and I will stand by my convictions, and that type of question is subject to the Standing Rules, or the laws and in this Country, which also happens to have to be given them, because the only people, the big people who have all sorts of knowledge, and just have to their disagreement and the case getting away with it to like anything, this is what is happening. Anything my wife said I sent, we should fulfil responsibility, and names are all, and we are simply give it. I am here saying, Mr. President that the other people to read a big part of the Legal profession, I am here saying that, I am only pointing out what I see as an injustice or unfairness in our system of parliament, this is all. Every time I get up here to speak they are pointing this thing and pointing the finger, it is only because they have agreed to disagree the people when they speak, then I have to stand here and say the things which I say.

MR. T. MAI (Wokha): On a point of order Mr. President. Is the speaking Congress members under Standing Order 49(4).....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did not think so, I saw in the constitution he was here.

MR. K. MAO (Mokok): You know, the fact that he is an Hon'ble of the Church does not give him any right to say things that are not true.....

MR. M. MARCUS SING: I am absolutely against the point raised by the Hon'ble Mr. Mao.

MR. ... MAO SINGH: ... and to dispute unnecessary matters. It is not fit for this Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please both sit down, Point of Order has made your Point of Order, now you may continue.

MR. T. KAMSAI (Mon): I think he should stop misleading the House. I am an Elder of the Church, so for him not misleading the House this is good, otherwise next time I'm going to sit on the platform.

Mr. President, as I said, I am not saying that one person who wants to run a Government, but you all believe that this majority people to take Nagaland. Normally in general election, who is going to get this number, who they are fighting? They are the people who are behind of the Hindu boy who has travelled hardly 1,000 km. only to get to Delhi, and I am saying that the boy in the village should pay more to the Hindu man. In fact, some of these people are working in Indian mails, because some of these people have been in Government long enough to get blessing under their cradle, when some of our Hindu people are thinking in the India. I shall say no more on this point, except the fact that our country is in a serious condition and the Second Elected Member for Kohima town knows it, I think he knows it. We know the hospitality he left in that constituency and we know it. How wise and aware of keeping Nagaland Christian official, Nagaland Nobody can question about all things happen. This is the real cause of economy, is one of the cause causes of economy, and the government of this country must have the guts to tell the people so.

(Some give duty mark Mr. President)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Second Elected Member for Kohima town.

MR. KIKHOVI A. PEBOH: Mr. President, I will believe the sentiments of some of the Members when I hear some sensible people in the house here. I believe, this election Member can get up and countenance what he said. I also hope Mr. President that I may be able to bring a bit more intelligence to bear on my debate, this case I know certain persons..

My speech which I am going to use this afternoon Mr. President Sir has been the Member yesterday this point, some time the necessity of point of order or point of clarification arising 'Money Bill'. Sir, in matter which will have happiness to the people of the Eastern Nagaland, there will be no unemployment, and there will be no happy new prosperous New Year.

MR. JAMES A. DUNN (CONTINUED): Mr. President, when I moved the previous question I forgot to recognize Members, and I have no reason to make to go ahead my explanation on Assembly Joint Bill 1, as was earlier printed on this Assembly.

I have just heard the Honorable Third District Member of Executive Council refer to me publicly out of this House. If he had the guts he could look me and speak. I would make personal such a bill to the people of the Virgin Islands.

MR. EDWARD O. JAMES: Mr. President .....

MR. LAWRENCE J. DUNCAN: I have heard Mr. President a lot of things said about this budgeting, normal governmental budgeting and it appears to me that some of the Elected Members of Executive Council like me has with any degree of sincerity is a self-proclaimed financial genius. But Mr. President, this country needs more than geniuses, and I suggest that the Elected Members of Executive Council sit as they normally but I would like some unity here on the people presenting this Bill.

I have also heard Members get up here and say that if one has got to play politics, come up with new ideas. All is a pity Mr. President that we all take side of the issue and not defend our principles before this presumed globe and concentrate to the country. Why are they not pleasing that we should come up with new ideas? Why have we not asked for these new ideas before? I say this with the feeling and the understanding, that I understand finances as well as any person in this House, and I may take credit for any knowledge in finance, because the Members know I am building the wealth.

I would also refer to a remark made by the Chief Elected Member for this City. She in fact said that I should be here to inform the people of the Virgin Islands, but one is also aware that I am not from the St. Croix, I will tell the people what is in this budget, and for her to imply information could be to mislead the people of this country. I have never been in this House and imputed any kind of information on behalf of other Members, and I take it as a grave insult that anybody would imply this I wouldn't use the political platform of this Country, and not tell my people the truth. They know nothing to fear. If everything is alright, they have nothing to fear. But they should weigh the recommendations that they have brought these draconian measures which will strangle our people. There is no way of justifying this without reducing or increasing all these revenues.

I think the gentleman from Cruz Bay... I may say he is highly responsible, Mr. Leonard Gibbons in reviewing portions of his budget in the Legislative Congress. It would be wise if the Members of Executive Council, now in opposition the Elected Members of Executive Council would pay heed to the wishes of the people of this time. He says, and I quote:

> "I have said that the Government will have to pay greater responsibility, whether one subscribes to private and public sector wherever. Everyone will assume those who are wise enough to recognize their mistakes and correct them."

If any Members of this House is in favour of the Elected Executive Council or one of their suggestions feel that we should be here giving our alternatives, and they will be all those alternatives, will be they not stand in this Room and suggest them to the Public.

...

...

...

...
...
...

[illegible] Mr. President, my predecessor [illegible] have seen, but they have brought [illegible] I promise that we [illegible] pledge. They will [illegible] Friday [illegible] at the end of [illegible] will be looking [illegible] to those matters. [illegible] I [illegible] recommendations that have been suggested and recommended here are [illegible], and we accept [illegible] that, and this is the reason [illegible]. We now know that because of this [illegible] be here [illegible] of those that [illegible] reduced by 20 per cent, and rightly so, but the [illegible] many more of these [illegible] right [illegible] we need [illegible] in Grand Cayman [illegible] Cayman [illegible].

Mr. President, I could not be good [illegible] enough [illegible] to the Cayman [illegible]. I would not be [illegible] sometimes [illegible] this [illegible] which [illegible] to point [illegible] Cayman [illegible] to study [illegible] and [illegible] a body [illegible] here. Mr. President, I have discussed [illegible] the Government [illegible] which I feel [illegible] be given very [illegible] consideration, but then perhaps my colour will be [illegible] here [illegible]. They [illegible] probably [illegible] [illegible] already given the Federal [illegible] Caymanian, the United States and pay them $100,000.00 to be [illegible] this [illegible] duty. As long as one [illegible] Caymanian, it should be [illegible] Cayman, and he may be an [illegible], [illegible].

The [illegible] of [illegible] be [illegible] I [illegible] reference to him as a 'duly [illegible]'. Mr. President [illegible] Government of this Country [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] and the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] Speaker, [illegible]. We all know that there [illegible] and other lands, that when you encourage women, you [illegible] of people to accept [illegible] and one receive [illegible] the working person of people, or that you all find [illegible] the [illegible]. But Mr. President, in our judgment [illegible] we have not [illegible] the balance in this Budget which would have such an [illegible] economy. The Member said that the article was as much [illegible] thinking, he would have written it himself. I see Mr. President that the article is written by Walter C. Parker that, now I understand why he is a protege of that Member, better known as C Monty to friends of his, but now who [illegible] Administration with a vengeance.

Mr. President, it is my opinion based on the comments made by that Member this morning, that this Country would have been better off had he been not long yesterday afternoon.

Mr. President I am going to [illegible] a little longer now, but I want to [illegible] this point. The Member [illegible] on the Second Budget Resolution Member from George Bush, for the Reconciliation of Outlays Law. Mr. President, without such a law, Government would have the way it [illegible] of chaos and confusion, Budget once a week ago. These are the kind of [illegible] have been [illegible] by this Government, which the Second Ranking Member just [illegible] and the Second Ranking Member from George Bush, failed to see. They would have lost that duty.

Mr. President, you [illegible] Budget activities, I would remind [illegible] said that based on estimates by the Federal Reserve, their [illegible] would be [illegible] that there is [illegible] reflect [illegible] I may note by [illegible] the Nation to [illegible] Government in this area. I wonder if this is the kind of the Republicans be bringing their problem to this House, and who are [illegible] about carrying it on the platform.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the Second Ranking Member from George Bush, who talked about the $600,000 Kitchens. And he read the Honorable Third Ranking Member's speech, he would have seen that under the Navy Department, the Kitchen was budgeted to cost $270,000, and the savings have been effected since this Government got into power last November. But Mr. President, after all, you know he spoke about two and two, but I do not know if he can count two and two.

Mr. President, I am sorry that the Minister from East End has left, because I have got a little bit for him too. So said that the first job when he came into this House Mr. President was to [illegible] to reduce the [illegible]. The Import Duty on motorcars [illegible] thirty thirty and a third to twenty per cent, but they had made a deal and settled at twenty seven and a half per cent. Mr. President, this not all downside, he was a part of the Unity Team Government, we have what they would have expected. They did not have any intention of reducing it to twenty per cent, and what is the reduction from thirty three and a third to twenty seven and a half, five and one sixth per cent. Mr. President this was done in early 1977, and then in June 1977 they reduced the duty on gasoline from five cents to eight cents, an increase of sixty per cent. The present increase Mr. President after eight years is sixty two and a half per cent, that is if you calculate five cents on eight cents. But in fact, if you calculate the effect on the total cost of gasoline, it is about 3.26 per cent, or 3.27 per cent. You see Mr. President, these people believe that we cannot do anything, but as I have said, if I make a mistake there is no excuse for me, we can only say it is unfortunate. They cannot say I am the educated fool.

MR. ROBERT C. BYRD: Mr. President, the distinguished Senator is not going to prosecute this child until he is accepted at least six months on duty in early 1972, is he? He would have to be nineteen years old, which would have been an increase of 42 per cent, but we have only increased it by 18% per cent, Mr. President. So we have still an advance the inflation and the fluctuation of wages, prices by 23% per cent.

Mr. President, you know the, what you and I are talking about is whether or not the first official Senator was talking about the retirement of enlisted persons. Between June 1971 when the duty was put at twenty years and a third per cent. The duty [illegible] assessment went upward periodically to reach 42 to twenty per cent. Now all they have to do is Mr. President to twenty per cent, because they found out they reached the ceiling, and they turned around and increased payables by fifty per cent also, and I have documented other face, some of which have not been mentioned, but which I have not [illegible] Mr. President. But it is my understanding, Mr. President, that we have been brought in during 1972. It was then the only expense of the Department also in this Senator was a package of the 'benefits' even who was speaking then, on affidavits of the Daily Tour Department was not entitled only on the same because he did not have then [illegible] only what the Government has had.

I [illegible] with the Senator from [illegible], Mr. President, he said that he considered how the Veterans Government should be cut and from our people, for they have had part in [illegible] Senator will respond to the morning of issue. Mr. President I can face my people because I have a clear conscience, and because I believe that what I am doing is in their best interest. What baffles me Mr. President is how some people can face the public knowing not only what has gone on in this Chamber, but what has gone on elsewhere publicly.

Mr. President, I want to tell you how up to date the Second-Hearted Senator from Georgia [illegible] is. When we were talking about the bulk postage operations, he said Sears, Roebuck and Postal. The Postal Company cleaned down the operations in this Country, it must be ten years ago, and that is the principal criticism and reports we should employ. At least when the reports come from abroad, they try to find out the deception which exist in the Country.

Mr. President, before I forget it, I see the Senator has come back, and he talks about guns. I want to just his guns. He has suggested a meeting for tonight, to deal with [illegible] including the Senator from the Constitutional Convention, and I want to challenge him to get a copy of Lord Oxford and Asquith's Rights and read chapter 40. 'Organization of Constitutional' to the people on his conscience tonight, before he attempts to debate the issue. I want him to read the full chapter 40. I want to see how much guts he has got, how much ability he has to debate. Now Mr. President, he will not be able to count me in the four or five people he is going to have there.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Senator did say at the start of his speech, that he hoped I would give him as much liberty to stray from the subject as I had given others. I think he is in danger of accepting a little further than anybody else has.

MR. ROBERT C. BYRD: I do not know him.

MR. PRESIDENT: All well. I am going to give us ten minutes break now, until we are refresh in what we've just had, ten minutes break.

At 9:50 P.M. the House stood in recess

HOUSE RESUMED AT 9:58 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated. I take it almost already three minutes instead of ten, as we are just going to finish the first round [illegible] of Executive Council to continue speaking.

Hon. George O. Kwaku: Mr. President, the Second Elected Member for Dodowa just said that the problem, and I believe this was echoed by the Second Elected Member for Ga West, that the problem may be that the Country is already bankrupt. Mr. President, as I will go on to show later, the present government is not financially better than the previous Government in 1984, and we must stop at some point stop asking them for explanation, we pay all we have to pay them for alternation. Mr. President, he argued that we in Dangme West. I do not intend to go out of details, and I would like to say them for an alternative to the economy which we have inherited from this Budget.

As far as development is concerned Mr. President, the first project was started, which did not get off the ground until the present Government took over. Everyone knows up on the side, this present Government is able to see it to the point where I understand it will start operation, or is will operate early in January next year. The Concrete building, Mr. President which has been promised, such a great surprise under the Daily Graphic Government did not get out of the ground until after a change, under the present Government. To Mr. President, we are not doing badly, and there are problems in the programme, but I am not going to enumerate them politically here because we will probably have to [illegible] these things tonight, or somebody else will.

Mr. President, you know, I mentioned that one of the problems in the past have been how to the fact that while governments are being elected on the platform the politicians overreaching the citizens when under the table, this does not go on in this Government Mr. President.

Mr. Speaker, I was told that during the Daily Graphic Government there was only accepted in respect based during a time of economic activity. Mr. President, the economy did not start off in 1987 when they increased the import duty on [illegible] by 50 per cent.

Mr. President, before I go any further, Sir, I would like to correct one figure which I have quoted, I mentioned my figures and I said that the production in only one point five [illegible] per cent, but five and one point point, and I hasten to say that it was not the Second Elected Member for Dodowa who brought it to my attention, I do not hesitate to withdraw this mistake.

But Mr. President, as I have just said, on this House has been told, the Country has been told and I am sure will bear me tonight, that the world over, the Cocoa ruin is they will try to bring stability to [illegible] prices for Cocoa, and the unfavourable increases.

MRS. HANSEN of Idaho (CONSTITUENCY). I want to go on record Mr. President as opposing what these Republicans are doing on a cowardly basis. Each of us would, provided that household has only one car - pay one nickel more.

Mr. President, the garbage fee was increased from $19.50 to $20.20, or an increase of $37.05, which is an increase of .5% each week. Automobile licenses went from $42.00 to $150.00, an increase of 258.60, or 61.929 cents per week. Telephone fee went from $6.00 to $15.00, or an increase of 86.60 or 1.986 cents per week. Drivers licenses Mr. President or an annual basis was increased from $3.00 to $15.00, or $10.00 which is an increase of $ .192 cents for a total of $2.20 per week. Mr. President, I have been more generous than did the Senate Finance Member for Garden Town. He gave them 425 gallons per year of gasoline. I hope allowed them 520 gallons per month or 10 gallons per week, which is another 40 cents. So if you add it all up, it is a total increase of $2.38 per week, and Mr. President that is per household, not for each person in the house. If you divide that by five or six people, it is about 40 cents a week Mr. President. But to the head of the household, it represents $2.38 a week, or less than the cost of one meal which is some of the drinking establishments.

Mr. President, they say that we do not care about the taxpayer. What does the average taxpayer get in increased in return for the measly contributions which he makes. Mr. President, to educate one Primary School child in Utah County during 1990 figures costs $1,227.00 per child per annum. To educate one Middle School child Mr. President would cost $1,268.69 per child. One High School child $1,295.60 per annum. For neighbor boy Mr. President, assuming five years of primary education would cost $1,788.05 approximately three years of Middle School education, to be $3,775.80 and three years of High School education to be $6,387.00 or a total of $10,512.80 Mr. President to carry a child from primary to 9th Grade or OSP standard, or in layman's term three years of education for eleven years. For those children Mr. President who go on to the High schools $8,371.40 for a total of $92,312.90 per child. Senator President, basically that is some families with three, four, five or six children, and before I forget Mr. President, this is not the end of the story on education.

Other States have been growing in for such honourable mention today. I want to tell them what it costs to educate children over there. In Oregon they will be even greater. To educate for Primary school children in Iowa we will have spent $284,228.50 or $7,810.50 per annum per child. For High School children, we still have spent $152,785.36 or $2,772.36 per child per annum. Again, Mr. President the system is a little different there, so taking the years of Primary education, it will cost $16,628.50 to educate each primary child. Assume five years of High School education, it will cost $13,871.80 for a total of $30,500.30 per child, in Utah or OSP, or the eleven years of education, whether the child is open material or not. Mr. President, this does not include buildings, furniture, or equipment or which in 1990 this Government will have spent $1,118,645.36 or another $205.60 per child. In addition Mr. President, we will have spent roughly $100,290.30 on schoolmarms or thereabouts; $29,800.30 on in-service training of teachers, and $64,860.40 on special education, which is for the less able and the handicapped. In addition, we will have contributed $95,600.00 to the overhead costs in the Schools, where we have made a significant contribution to the total education process in the Nation.

[illegible] Speaker, I have, Mr. Speaker, just one more question which I would like to address to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Minister's statement in the Budget Speech in which he announced that the Government intended to increase the Provincial Sales Tax from 5 per cent to 6 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he has given consideration to the fact that the increase in the Provincial Sales Tax will have a very serious effect on the economy of the province, and will have a very serious effect on the economy of the province, and will have a very serious effect on the economy of the province, and

MRS. PATRICK D. MARTIN (CHRISTIANSBURG): ... [illegible]. The vote [illegible] Mr. President, but then he was not the first [illegible] Mr. President. During 1964 the Daily News Government bought [illegible] three buildings, amounting to $1,381,000 of [illegible] by that figure, however, the General Assembly [illegible] by that figure, however, Mr. President, one has only to [illegible] but if one account was the money to [illegible] was spent for 1965, as it was intended to [illegible].

Mr. President, let us make no mistake about it, these people seem to be misleading in the advertisements. People [illegible] Daily Leader, and the Daily News does not seem to [illegible] they were so heavily censored in November 1967, because there was no such [illegible], and they were [illegible] with the newspaper. Citizens Telegram did not [illegible] could not decipher them. The only thing Mr. President which [illegible] 1964 under the Daily News Government was the National Debt, which went from $1,000,000,000 to $322,000,000.00. Everything else in the Country has decreased [illegible] the possibility and the completion of the projects on the Daily News Government, is grossly [illegible] and that is why they were kicked out. The only thing which saved the Mr. Brooks from [illegible] Mr. President, was that the Radford [illegible] [illegible] as the many possibilities, they only knocked out, and they could not have done it if the Radford Star [illegible] Daily News might.

SEN. D. GALE JOHNSON: The question is on [illegible] the [illegible] amendment.

SEN. EDWARD E. PARKER: Yes, but the Senator might not [illegible] I will just say that it is [illegible] to me that [illegible] the Senate, the Senator [illegible] I will [illegible] 1968 [illegible] but I have got better sense than that.

Mr. President, while on the Senate [illegible], I came to my conclusion this, however, this has [illegible] to raise more taxes. We think we [illegible] figures, when I say extraordinary [illegible] figures which can not pick out at a glance. If one goes through [illegible] President the [illegible] for 1968, and add to it the Governor, just [illegible], Personal Exclusions, I am not making this statement [illegible] unless one looks [illegible] people are added to the rolls of the Social Security, or whatever, and to [illegible] people moving up into new brackets. This figure is [illegible], Mr. President this figure is inconceivable. We have to [illegible] pay it, and then in the budget of $3.5 billion [illegible] Virginia, of which one [illegible] Mr. President you [illegible] people would like Daily News Government left, and we had to pay for Capitol Square, if it was going to [illegible]. We have to pay taxes for that. We had to pay for the [illegible] of the [illegible], but it has to pay Mr. President for the taxes we [illegible] the [illegible], that [illegible] [illegible] which these gentlemen [illegible]. The [illegible] is [illegible] like it 7 million [illegible] Personal and Corp ... the State Building [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible], plus some money to [illegible] [illegible] state. When they bought it [illegible]. I am going to [illegible] figures on this when I go my budget [illegible]. Mr. President, I could I just make [illegible] to say about the Daily News, [illegible] that which I know just [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: (CONTINUED) ... Mr. President, the ... Provincial Secretary in reply to ... question from ... I think it was the Fisher Electoral Member from ... who was urging ... make the Lower Building ... such a good deal, and that he was ... or engineer or a building agent, and he ... the Speech to ... Newfoundland in Bull Knob, and so on. ... I think he was quite right ... have protested himself in that way. ... Mr. President, I do not ... propose in any way that the Lower Building is a "white elephant", but ... be some kind of big white animal. I acknowledge the Fisher Electoral ... Member took to make public the opinion on the electricity ... and communication which was given when that building was ... Mr. President, I want to say Otterbone gently there once again, ... since she drink I thought I did drunk. When the election ... to get up the Lower Building promise, if anyone denies me they should ... by it.

Mr. President, I want to talk a little ... more about what this Budget contains for all the good people of ... Province. When I mentioned Mr. President the school teachers, I ... by mentioned the doctors because, which represents the children. ... the High School, or in the middle school, or in the very very ... of the Grade One, Primary and so on the Kindergarten School.

Mr. President, during 1969, eight ... orphanages representing 27 people have failed by $18,000.00 which ... amount given to building shelters, this was already Mr. President ... wage which the department used to pay equipment within the orphanage ... recreation, and the wage was done by service clubs, blood ... teams. My Department works closely with Service Clubs. Gander ... Knights of Columbus representing 28 persons has maybe breakfast ... to ... persons, paid an average of four-to per week, obviously on the ... of persons in the household to be saved for. $15,000.00 was given ... to be available for the construction of ... facilities. And ... to it, Mr. President remains ... approximately $20,000.00 on their ... and I would go on and on Mr. President. I have a ... with ... of this, and of course I am going to highlight it to my ... Suffice it to say, we have spent over two million dollars ... Social Services of that nature, as I have indicated, and the appreciation ... the ... have and say that we do not mind the "bucks" ... but some more. Mr. President, I will be saying it later, but ... want this to be remembered quickly, that the Social Rights Minister ... Energy Corporation and ... responsibilities in my ... that Thursday, that he should be here ... he could ... to ... of ... Mr. President ... the ... I can ... only ... before he got out of the ... I can ... Mr. he could not be ... on my back ... and I am going to ... a few more to say about Mr. President..

MR. JAMES A. PICCOTT: The Member is not going anywhere ... you can be sure of it.

MRS. PARDY C. EDENS: Only if I do not vote ... the Member ... back ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I think it is just ... that ... Member is going on until ... is ready ... for a long time, I think I will.....

MR. [illegible] OF CORPUS: [illegible] talking about...

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sorry.

MR. [illegible] OF CORPUS: I am talking about the Senate [illegible] on this...

MR. R. [illegible] DUNCAN: [illegible] Mr. President, do the Senators [illegible] to bring the best minds ever [illegible] to the subject. [illegible]

MR. [illegible] OF [illegible]: Mr. President, I was just [illegible] the problem, I am only encouraging [illegible] amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think [illegible] the other body [illegible]...

MR. [illegible] OF [illegible]: We would like [illegible] to prepare a [illegible] Original Bill...

MR. [illegible]: I don't [illegible] on that, I [illegible] give a further explanation [illegible] amendment [illegible] of the [illegible]. Would the Honorable Third [illegible] Member like to have the explanation.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. [illegible] OF [illegible]: Mr. President, I move [illegible] at this [illegible] 10:00 a.m. tomorrow [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: The question [illegible] that the Senate [illegible] 10:00 a.m. [illegible].

[illegible] AGREED: [illegible] at 9:38 P.M. the Senate [illegible] 10:00 A.M. [illegible], [illegible] TEXAS.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

[illegible]

2. [illegible]

[illegible]

3. [illegible]

(a) [illegible]

[illegible]

(b) [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

PAGE

TABLE 1

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MARKET-BASED INCOME SUPPORT POLICY - AND FIVE-YEAR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: REPORT 1

THE CURRENT ENVIRONMENT: JULY 8TH, 1995 - PERSPECTIVES OF INCOME SUPPORT POLICY

MR. ROBERT L. BAKER 4

MISS. CAROL D. POWERS 7

DR. W. MICHAEL BLUMENTHAL 11

MRS. VIRGINIA D. ANDERSON 14

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON INCOME SECURITY OF THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR: 12TH MAY, 1995

SEN. W. JENNINGS BRYAN 35

ADJOURNMENT 41

PROCEEDINGS

IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS

ON WEDNESDAY, 20TH

[ ]

THE PRESIDENT: Prayers. The honourable Right Reverend Member of Executive Council.

THE HONOURABLE [ ]: [illegible]
[illegible] Lord, from whom all holy desires [illegible] [illegible] Thine servants, that in the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] may effectually [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] Though the initial responsibility for the consultation with the Members of the Government, the Principal Secretaries, the heads of Departments and sections and the publication of certain key information within the private sector, each Department was asked to submit its relevant draft for inclusion in the Development Plan.

The key principle behind this exercise was, and will be maintained. Each Ministry has agreed the priority issues for the preparation of individual chapters of the Plan dealing with development.

In each Ministry, Mr. Jagdish, the task of producing a first draft of the Development Plan, could not be completed within the one month period, originally scheduled in a meeting for Policy Executive Committee members. The Government therefore requested a further extension for the consultant who is going to complete this work and again, this request was granted and the consultant promised to make these a total of only three weeks.

The Principal Development Plan as now designed, is in the form of eight big Parts in Kiswahili and the last chapter will also be translated. There are also four sectoral Annexes, namely Agricultural Development Programme, Economic Development, Social Development and Development of Other Government Services. Within these four areas there are necessarily variations and the main priorities are taken account in the programmes that have been identified. So many of these chapters have been completed, that is the first draft stage. Of the remainder for discussion, three chapters and seven sectoral Annexes have been received.

The details of these chapters are as follows. Within each Development Sector/Ministry the following chapters have been submitted:

Chapter 3.1	- Education and Skill Formation
Chapter 3.3	- Telecommunications
Chapter 3.4	- Water supply and Sanitation Programme
Chapter 3.10	- Survey and Land Administration
Chapter 3.12	- Reception Centres

And yet have to be received:-

Chapter 3.2	- Health and Nutrition Development
Chapter 3.5	- Urban and Physical Planning
Chapter 3.6	- Arts Development
Chapter 3.8	- Postal Services
Chapter 3.9	- Energy
Chapter 3.9	- Industrial Planning
Chapter 3.11	- Tourism
Chapter 3.13	- Environmental Protection
Chapter 3.14	- Rivers Basins

Within each Sectoral Department, six Ministries and/or Departments have been completed:-

Chapter 4.2	- Fishing
Chapter 4.3	- Livestock
Chapter 4.4	- Forestry
Chapter 4.5	- Agriculture
Chapter 4.6	- Agri-culture

The [illegible] Committee [illegible] for the consideration of—

Chapter 7.4 – Packaging
Chapter 7.7 – Insurance certification

[illegible] Social Development, the following draft chapters have been submitted—

Chapter 3.3 – Accountancy

for the Committee on—

Chapter 6.1 – Agriculture
Chapter 6.6 – Health
Chapter 6.2 – Animal Services
Chapter 6.3 – Meteorology and radio

Trade and Tourism, Development of Future Investment Services, the following draft chapters have been submitted—

Chapter 4.1 – Airlines
Chapter 5.2 – Electricity
Chapter 5.4 – Certification procedure
Chapter 5.7 – Film Services
Chapter 5.8 – Future Complex
Chapter 5.13 – Audio
Chapter 5.14 – Communications Infrastructure

For the consideration—

Chapter 7.1 – Legal
Chapter 7.2 – Customs
Chapter 7.3 – Immigration
Chapter 7.6 – Financial Services
Chapter 7.11 – Taxation

I am sure that it will be clear, Mr. President, that in the circumstances of this Parliament [illegible] the Government has undertaken a mammoth task, a task not to be undertaken lightly and a task not to be envious. While it is the will power of the people of this country to improve [illegible] Tuesday ahead for five years, [illegible] problems as have always confronted [illegible] Caribbean countries. However, the [illegible] Government is on a [illegible] Monday to Friday, which is to [illegible] which we want to see, the type of people [illegible] and the five years within the context of [illegible].

This morning, Mr. President, [illegible] already raised a number of issues which [illegible] Government Ministers. I [illegible] to deal also in [illegible] Government [illegible] Tuesday next [illegible]. The Government will [illegible] Committee stage [illegible] the [illegible].

In [illegible] of the Budget Statement, Mr. President, there was [illegible] to give a specific [illegible] which [illegible] the Public [illegible] this country. We [illegible], however, the [illegible] this [illegible] and we [illegible] to be able [illegible] Thank you, Mr. President.

I now [illegible] be laid on [illegible].

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible]
[illegible] for any debate that needs to take?

MR. THOMAS O. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. President, it seems to [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: Chair lays before the Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill [illegible] Clerk will read the Committee Substitute.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE

FOR HOUSE BILL [illegible]

RELATING TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SEN. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. President. I move that I be allowed to explain my vote. I [illegible] House Bill [illegible] I have also [illegible] Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator [illegible]

SEN. [illegible]: Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I would just remind the Members that we do have [illegible] of what I said which was that I had allowed debate to [illegible] Chair lays before the Senate [illegible]

SEN. [illegible]: Mr. President, point of information.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible]

SEN. [illegible]: Mr. President, I would like to [illegible] of the Committee Substitute [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] I would like to [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible]

SEN. [illegible]: Mr. President, in my opinion, [illegible] Mr. President, I would like to [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] Senator [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible]

MR. D. DALE MORRIS: Mr. President, I would like to say that I have also spoken with the Member for Burnaby.

HON. DENNIS D. PHILLIPS: The Member might start by telling us whether or not there are any changes in the wording of the amendment. It's difficult to follow the debate and listen to him.

MR. D. DALE MORRIS: I did not notice any changes and therefore I would not be able to answer the question. The Member for Kootenay West is correct.

HON. DENNIS D. PHILLIPS: Will the Member for Burnaby North please read the amendment so we know what we're voting on?

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, please.

MR. D. DALE MORRIS: It is proposed that Government MLA's salaries be frozen for one year.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order.

MR. DENNIS D. PHILLIPS: Mr. President, the problem with the amendment is that it is out of order.

Under the present system of Government, Mr. President, a Minister's salary is $19,000. A member's salary is $15,000 per annum. In addition to this basic salary each Minister receives an expense allowance of $4,000 per annum, which is intended to cover the cost of entertaining, travelling, secretarial assistance, etc. Members receive an expense allowance of $2,000 per annum which is intended to cover the cost of travelling within their constituencies

MR. [illegible] Mr. President, I heard the Senator [illegible] Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator if he would have anything to add to the remarks he made [illegible]

MR. [illegible] Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from [illegible]

MR. [illegible] yes, but I am talking [illegible]

MR. [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible] Mr. President, I am on the [illegible]

MR. [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible] The Senator from [illegible]

MR. [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible] I will [illegible]

MR. [illegible] The [illegible]

MR. [illegible] I will [illegible]

MR. [illegible] Mr. President, as I [illegible]

MR. [illegible] Mr. President, as I said [illegible] I have [illegible] I am [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

MR. MCCLOY: [illegible] I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether he has any comment to make on the proposal that has been made by the Soviet Union?

MR. ACHESON: I have not had an opportunity to study the proposal, Mr. Chairman, but I should be glad to do so and to make a statement at the next meeting.

MR. MCCLOY: Thank you.

MR. ACHESON: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words on this question. I do not propose to take up the time of the Council with a detailed discussion of the Soviet proposal. I have not had an opportunity to study it. I do not think it is necessary to do so. It is clear that the Soviet proposal is designed to prevent the establishment of a United Nations force in Korea. It is clear that the Soviet proposal is designed to prevent the United Nations from taking any effective action to meet the aggression

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible] Mr. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: I am just looking at [illegible]. You may continue.

[illegible]: As a first, Mr. President, there is [illegible] I [illegible] of business [illegible] I [illegible] I will make this [illegible] I [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible]. However, I do not believe [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item before the Board is Case No. 8222 (Reopened), which will be heard by Examiner Catanach.

CASE 8222 (Reopened)

MR. CATANACH: Case 8222 (Reopened): Application of Yates Petroleum Corporation for compulsory pooling, Eddy County, New Mexico.

MR. CARR: Case 8222.

APPEARANCES

FOR YATES PETROLEUM CORPORATION:

Hon. Dennis M. Eagleton
Hon. Richard C. Kopperud
Hon. Edward G. Nagel
Hon. W. Thomas Kellahin
Hon. Jason Kellahin
Hon. Robert G. Stovall
Hon. Charles C. Mullins
Hon. Stephen P. McDonald

FOR MARATHON OIL COMPANY:

Hon. Ernest L. Padilla
Hon. R. Rankin Harrison

FOR MEWBOURNE OIL COMPANY:

Hon. W. Perry Pearce

MR. CARR: Case 8222 (Reopened) and Case 8223 (Reopened) are the cases from the Division's Special Pool Rules for the Undesignated Shugart Yates Seven Rivers Queen Grayburg Associated Pool. It is currently governed by Division Order R-8170, as amended, which provides for 160-acre spacing and proration units with wells to be located within 150 feet of the center of a governmental quarter-quarter section or lot.

MR. CATANACH: I couldn't understand you very well.

MR. CARR: I think that's what it is. It's the Division's Special Rules for the Shugart Yates Seven Rivers Queen Grayburg Associated Pool.

MR. CATANACH: Mr. Carr, Mr. Padilla.

MR. CARR: Well, we have a joint proposal that we would like to submit. I would be willing, for the record, to read it into the record, but it's going to take a while. I think it would be more appropriate to submit it as an exhibit.

[illegible]

[illegible] Speaker, [illegible] Constituency [illegible] Mr. Speaker, [illegible] Honourable Member [illegible]

[illegible] Mr. Speaker, [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I [illegible] Mr. Speaker, [illegible] Mr. Speaker, [illegible] Mr. Speaker,

MR. M. KOMEY OCCUPY (CONTINUED): It would, however, be difficult for me to the present motion that they will contribute to across the Opposition's seats. I would, however, invite to attend some [illegible] of that country's economic move and to [illegible] principle to which [illegible] Sunday the next eight years. Finally assistant the Government from which would be in my mind that action [illegible] necessary.

We have an [illegible] to move toward [illegible] 1980. Those moves have not been [illegible] the past. We have an [illegible] in [illegible] five that [illegible] 1980. Those [illegible] have not been [illegible] the [illegible]. In [illegible] of changes applied to [illegible] [illegible] we [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] I would [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. MARTIN (CONSTITUENCY): I have said, Mr. President, that the public debate is necessary and I support that. Otherwise, what other alternative can be found? How do we afford to finance the necessary needs of the public and other community in view of the rising oil prices, increased salaries and inflation? How do we overcome the present problem without borrowing? How do we overcome the problem of the unemployed youth? How do we overcome the problem of inflation, salaries and wages? How can we improve the living standard of the people without borrowing? Even if we borrow, how much can we borrow? How do we overcome the problem of inflation? How do we overcome the problem of unemployment? How do we overcome the problem of salaries and wages? How can we improve the living standard of the people without borrowing? Even if we borrow, how much can we borrow?

MR. PRESIDENT, I have given this page of the paper that I am here to say that we are committed to the concept of democracy, democracy as it is practised in the world today. But we must be careful not to be misled by the propaganda of the opposition. They are trying to create confusion in the minds of the people. They are trying to create confusion in the minds of the people. They are trying to create confusion in the minds of the people. They are trying to create confusion in the minds of the people.

Mr. President, this is a difficult time but I believe that we have been elected to do a job. We are trying to do that job. We are trying to do that job. We are trying to do that job. We are trying to do that job. We are trying to do that job. We are trying to do that job. We are trying to do that job.

Let us remember our Creator this afternoon and the words He spoke to us. For as the Book says, when the people are told the truth, they will be free. Through the years the Malawi have built up a sophisticated, modern and dynamic infrastructure. It is an infrastructure necessary and needed to sustain the continual growth and development of the country and Malawi is about to take totally impossible for economic growth. Some of these problems such as water and energy, are problems of growth and economy and unemployment are already problems which can be solved. Those people all over Malawi have come expectations which is our prospect.

MR. PRESIDENT, as in the Malawi Congress Party Manifesto we have stated that we believe in free enterprise and that we believe in the right of individuals to own property. We believe in the right of individuals to own property. We believe in the right of individuals to own property. We believe in the right of individuals to own property.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to say that we are committed to the concept of democracy, democracy as it is practised in the world today. But we must be careful not to be misled by the propaganda of the opposition. They are trying to create confusion in the minds of the people. They are trying to create confusion in the minds of the people. They are trying to create confusion in the minds of the people. They are trying to create confusion in the minds of the people.

Referring to the words of the Honourable Minister of Finance, he said:-

> "The Malawi Government's economic policies [illegible] ... are guided by the wishes of people, economy and the Malawi Congress Party."

Mr. President, there are others, though not many, who have not understood the true philosophy of the Party. However, we can diversify efficient and economic assistance by the continuation of sound economy.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible] (UNDP): Original allocation $[illegible] million; additional allocation of $[illegible] million; and estimated unprogrammed balance of $[illegible] million at the close of this period. The programme for 1985 shows an implementation rate of approximately 90%, with limited delays in [illegible]. The other sources [illegible] $[illegible] million, for which programmes [illegible] are in hand. [illegible] the UNDP-assisted programme [illegible] the Government [illegible] the Executive Agency [illegible] the Ministry of Agriculture [illegible] the Ministry of Industry [illegible] the Ministry of Trade [illegible] the Ministry of Finance [illegible] the Ministry of Foreign Affairs [illegible] the Ministry of Defence [illegible] the Ministry of Interior [illegible] the Ministry of Justice [illegible] the Ministry of Health [illegible] the Ministry of Education [illegible] the Ministry of Culture [illegible] the Ministry of Tourism [illegible] the Ministry of Transport [illegible] the Ministry of Communications [illegible] the Ministry of Public Works [illegible] the Ministry of Housing [illegible] the Ministry of Planning

MR. X. ROYCE SMITH [illegible]:

[illegible] Corporation Building Division Publication [illegible] proposed [illegible] consideration [illegible] Commissioners [illegible] 2000 on [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Public Hearing [illegible] Building Bureau. The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. MCCARTHY: [illegible] I'm sure I speak on behalf of the Committee when I express our appreciation to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development for making this statement to the House today.

MR. D. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he can tell us what the cost of the Mackenzie Highway will be this year?

MR. MCCARTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice.

MR. D. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he can tell us what the cost of the Mackenzie Highway will be this year?

MR. MCCARTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. MCCARTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for [illegible], that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 2, An Act to Amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

MR. SPEAKER: I do now leave the Chair and the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 2, An Act to Amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. PEDERSON: The Assembly passed [illegible] of [illegible] journal and continue.

MRS. E. JONES SPEAKS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rather like to think of myself as a [illegible]. I was glad the Member for Rhineland Heights was certainly not the Member for [illegible] because I could hear the [illegible] in the House. I think that it would be a very sad [illegible]. Thank God we're not as such.

I now introduce the Member, with a comment made during the debate on the [illegible] of Speech from the Throne. I would welcome to discuss this topic and the comment [illegible] that perception of what can be done with [illegible] of Eastern Arkansas, and [illegible] have [illegible] a proposal [illegible] be acting [illegible] that [illegible] in the country. I [illegible] that [illegible] I believe that [illegible] the [illegible] and [illegible] and I think we should [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]. The Attorney General of the United States shall [illegible] and other [illegible] [illegible]. Such [illegible] [illegible] which is [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

PAGE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

[illegible] 1

[illegible] 2

[illegible] 3

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the opportunity to speak on the Budget Address. I congratulate the Minister of Finance for bringing down a budget which, in my opinion, is very good for the people of Saint Lucia. I am sure that the people of Saint Lucia, as a whole, are very happy with the budget that has been brought down by the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy to see that the Minister has taken into consideration the fact that the people of Saint Lucia are suffering from the high cost of living.

MR. CHARLES C. [illegible]: [illegible] Mr. President, I have [illegible] Mr. President, to have [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible] I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] TEXAS: [illegible] of the State Senate. I have [illegible] I am going to [illegible] I have [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]: [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

[illegible]

2. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

[illegible]

(1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible]

(3) [illegible]

(4) [illegible]

(5) [illegible]

(6) [illegible]

(7) [illegible]

(8) [illegible]

(9) [illegible]

(10) [illegible]

[illegible]

(1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible]

(3) [illegible]

(4) [illegible]

(5) [illegible]

(6) [illegible]

(7) [illegible]

(8) [illegible]

(9) [illegible]

(10) [illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
[illegible]	1
[illegible] OF PENDING CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS BEFORE THE 109TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESS. — PUBLIC BILLS/RESOLUTIONS — SUBJECT AREA INDEX	2
THE ADMINISTRATION (109TH) JULY, 2006 — PUBLIC LAWS	4
THE SENATE AND SENATE COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION (AMENDMENTS) BILL, 1995 — STATUS AND PENDING REFERRALS	5
THE [illegible] (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996 — STATUS AND PENDING REFERRALS	24
THE TRADE AND INVESTMENT [illegible] (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995 — STATUS AND PENDING REFERRALS	30
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	42

AGENDA

12th DECEMBER, 1985

10:00 A.M.

C. PRESIDING: The Assembly is in Session.
I will invite the Honourable Third Elected Member of Executive Council to say prayers.

PRAYERS

H.E. C.S. KIRKCONNELL: Let us Pray.
Almighty God from whom all wisdom and peace 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 foundation for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands. Bless Our Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Prince Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Princess 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. In your especially for the Governor of our Territory, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled rightly to discharge the responsible duties of their high offices, to the advancement of Thy great Kingdom. 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 on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory for ever and ever, Amen.

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

C. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.
Presentation of Papers and Reports - The Third Official Member of Executive Council.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Finance Committee Report dealing with the budget held on Friday evening.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

MR. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the Finance Committee met on Friday afternoon to consider the 1966 Budget Estimates, a sum of £22,272,017. The amendments which were made to the Draft Estimates were under Head 2 Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, the request for an animal health assistant post, that request was deleted and an Agricultural Asst substituted. We also deleted the sum from wages under Department of Agriculture which is for all work the Pest Control Programme and parks that was to under wages be allocated the sum of money, £12,100 to Pest Control Programme. The sub-head on that Mr. President should be 07-011.

There was additionally one resolution to the Estimates were under capital expenditure dealing with Agriculture and Roads. A sum of £2,000 of the total sum in the Estimates was allocated to Post Lay without changing the overall or total allocation, Mr. President.

There were a number of motions made to various re-current expenditure heads beginning with Head 2, Mr. President. The Elected Member for North Side Mr. Smith also moved that Leave and Leave Passages 002 and 003, Mileage 3-007 and 8-008 dealing with Motor car Cheque Allowances, wherever there where items appeared throughout the Estimates that these items should be deleted. The motion, Mr. President, was rejected.

There was a motion by the Elected Member for Bay to reduce the sub-head 03-011 Primary and Post Services from £5,000 to £2,000. This motion was also rejected, Mr. President.

On Head 4 Personnel and Office Services, the Elected Member for South Side moved that sub-head 01-105 Honoraria be removed from that head and any other Head under which Honoraria had an allocation in the 1966 Draft Estimates. This motion was also defeated, the Elected Member for West Bay requested Government to look carefully into putting back the Honoraria allowance and Mr. President, the Chairman undertook to look into the matter.

There was much deliberation on the request by the Police for maintenance of radios and transmitters. The Elected Member for North Side noted that the budget for this vote was substantially high and that assurance had been given to look into the maintenance programme with a view to cutting back. It was pointed out that a huge sum of money was already spent on radio equipment in 1965 and the Chairman pointed out that it was a maximum decision of Government to extend present contractual maintenance of radios and transmitters throughout the Government but it is still Government's aim to establish in the near future its own maintenance service. The Chairman undertook to look into the additional replacement of radios and towers which had earnestly been requested.

... Thank you, Mr. President. The Second Elected Member for West Bay was of the opinion that more funds should have been allocated to the Rehabilitation Department. He also thought that the President that a small part of the expenditure, particularly dealing with telephone and petrol charges and the remedial classes at Clifton Hunter High School, could be cut. He referred to the pre-kindergarten programme.

Three more minutes remained.

Mr. President, on Head 8 and Head 10 dealing with Income Tax and Head 11 the Second Elected Member for West Bay moved that the salary provided in the estimates for the Customs Advisor be reduced by half the money. It was explained, Mr. President, that although we may give consideration to reducing that sum of money by one half, the contractual arrangements would have to be reviewed by Government negotiations of whether we were the ever-ready Mr. President the motion was defeated.

Then was also Mr. President, under the Planning Department, some questions answered by the First Elected Member for the Sister Islands concerning the qualifications of officers to deal with the work load of the Planning Department and the Chairman undertook to look into the matter.

On Head 17, Mr. President, the First Elected Member for North Side moved that the sum of $5,000 be deleted from the estimates. That motion was defeated.

There were three motions under Postal Services Department. The first one moved by the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town requesting that one postal worker be placed in Bodden Town to consider the situation of Bodden Town, North Side and East End. The Honourable First Elected Member for Finance, Education and Postal Services answered the query but stated that in order to do this it would probably be necessary to implement overtime, at the present time, the arrangement is voluntary. That was a comment Mr. President not really a motion. The Second Elected Member for West Bay was consistent as in his budget debate he indicated that he would not support the general rule of thumb of increase of salaries, Mr. President when the major increase in the department.

Under subhead the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town moved that $10,000 under re-head 18-010 be not voted in support the Bodden Town Road. $5-000 would with consideration of roads Mr. President, that motion was agreed. The Elected Member for North Side recommended that a sum of $2,000 be put back to enable vehicles to pull over in case of break down or other difficulties. The Chairman agreed to look into that matter as well.

I will go to motion number ... increase made by the Police for staff and now explains the Elected Member for North Side and the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town voted against it.

MRS. [illegible] (continuing): ... on the committee on the Senate request for a modification of sanitary sewerage and ... It was agreed by the Planning Commission that the cost would not be fully met until the right-of-ways would be located [illegible] and the Commission agreed to go ... Steps [illegible] ...

MR. [illegible]: ... in accordance with the provisions of [illegible] Section 8[illegible], the minutes is deemed to have carried by ... motion. The next item is Public Hearings.

PUBLIC HEARING

ORDINANCE [illegible] ZONE, 1965

CLERK: ... ORDINANCE [illegible] ZONE, 1965

MRS. [illegible]: ... Mr. President, I move that a duly ... entitled "An Ordinance [illegible] ... Reading and passed.

MR. [illegible]: ... question is that a duly ... entitled [illegible] be appropriate Resolute Expenditures for ... Consideration of the Ordinance ... be given a Third Reading and passed ...

ROLL CALL: AYES AND NOES

MR. [illegible]: ... I have a Resolution ...

ROLL CALL.

AYES

Mrs. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mrs. [illegible]
Mrs. [illegible]
Mrs. [illegible]
Mrs. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mrs. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

11

NOES

Mr. [illegible]
Mrs. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

4

RESULT OF ROLL CALL: ... ORDINANCE [illegible] ZONE, 1965 ... AND PASSED.

H.R. 14196, A BILL TO AMEND THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT, 1956

STAFF BRIEFING

ISSUE: H.R. 14196, A BILL TO AMEND THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT, 1956

BACKGROUND: The bill entitled A BILL TO AMEND THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES was introduced on August 2, 1966 by Congressman Wright Patman (D-Texas) and referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRESENT SITUATION: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has recommended that the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 be amended to provide a uniform test of permissible nonbanking activities for bank holding companies.

ISSUE: THE NEED FOR A BILL TO AMEND THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT, 1956

DISCUSSION: Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of S. 2577, which I introduced on August 2, 1966, and which would amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

Mr. President, the Government's policy of restraint has forced the Congress to consider a number of measures designed to increase the amount of money available for mortgage lending. Mr. President, this is a proper function of the Congress. However, the Congress should not overlook the fact that the Federal Government is the largest borrower in the money market. Its borrowings have a significant impact on the economy. This impact may be greater in the aggregate, that is, the accumulated effect of the individual parts. For an individual lender, Mr. President, the amount available to a corporation of $10,000,000 is a large sum. However, in the aggregate it is an insignificant part of the total demand for credit.

Although the Congress is the legislative body, Mr. President, for a balanced economy it should not act blindly unless it has been reasonably assured that the action will have in mind that in many cases local governments have a material effect on the economy and should be prepared to exercise its fiscal policy for the benefit of the economy. Another way of saying it, Mr. President, simply is: the day that we take the need to establish an effective fiscal policy of this sort, they would surely subject to a following a license for the benefit of the money and to which not before their business or will. Therefore, Mr. President, it is not wise to move ahead from the Treasury's license to the debt management operation.

For those who are interested, Mr. President, perhaps at this point, the Senate should have an analysis available, therefore there is no need to [illegible] or distribution as an individual service to an authorized agent. Once you have a Treasury's license you can deal essentially as well as off shore activities may participate under this bill. You have the Bank's Trust Corporation [illegible].

Mr. JACOBS E. JENNINGS (R): We also provided, Mr. President, the Congress a unexpended Library which currently is on annual fee in Tennessee of $5,000. When we looked at that and considered to the needs and decided that if we were to increase that fee it should be increased a nominal sum. Therefore, reconsidered by this bill an increase of $1000 per year so that in 1982 the fee payable to Government would be $10,000.

In addition to this, Mr. President, there are numerous [illegible] have been enacted under the Public Corporation Law which for many years have not increased. By this occasion to put them to the level or close to the level that they should be. Mr. President, requested that the Congress should release the land to deal with [illegible] original ownership that also should increase by four to five hundred. Under the present Law, Mr. President, there was [illegible] which also established a maximum [illegible] to carry out [illegible] activities. And for changed [illegible] $10 and the owners have to be charged [illegible] I do ask that the Government in 1982 of $1,000 for a nominal [illegible]. The case requested, Mr. President, that in the Congress of, Congress I [illegible] consolidated [illegible] Library Service in 1982 should yield this Government approximately $300,000.

The President, during the interval of investigation we have to determine what kind of fee to impose for 1982. We have many consultations with the private sector and the business [illegible]. We do not see any difficulty at all in the [illegible] have been requested here." I commend this Bill to all honorable, Members, Mr. President.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the said Bill be read a second time. Those [illegible] Bill to be read a second time.

READING OF SECOND SCHEDULE

Mr. SPEAKER: The Deputy Minister for Women Affairs.

Mr. C. DAVID KNIGHT: Mr. President, I cannot support the recommendations made in this Bill. The recommendations are a [illegible] which the Government estimates will give extra revenue of $2,000,000 in the year 1982. During the debate in March on the budget for 1982, we were told by the Government spokesman that the Government does not do so only because of the books and other expenses but before the [illegible] only after which we find the Government [illegible] the decision taken to remit and to [illegible] without seeking to make some money out of the [illegible] because of the necessity.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that a statement made by a member of Parliament [illegible] subject [illegible] the early part of this year. The statement from the Minister of this House was [illegible] by me and will be [illegible] Monday or Tuesday next. The statement, as I [illegible], the

> "The Treasury in their original Budget paid in the Budget debates, and however it was not possible to use the Chancellor's Budgetary this year, he was to consider other forms of taxation a bit of nonsense."

Mr. Speaker, as in quite often in the Budget debates my hon. Friend the Member for Leeds, North-East has been misquoted. Today's Labour Digest for the present £52,000. It was originally supposed to be the number was speaking. This number of Socialists should pass on to any of the Labour Members. Mr. Speaker, we are going to raise ourselves out of the market. Also, if we maintain the Conservative economic base, work permits and be in the will of Labour and be sensible to any worker from one to another policies produce that is correct. What we must do, Mr. Speaker, is to stimulate the economy so that unemployment does. In the case of the poverty, the rise in the welfare rate to the employment, the Government and to the Conservation so that we will not need to think about taxation. This was, Mr. Speaker, the problem of Government when the Labour was not prepared to bear of left to center the part of Tax that we had promised a reduction which we give an assurance to hon Members over agreement. The question I would like to make to what has happened between March 1968 and September 1968 to change the thinking of Government.

Also in the Budget debate in March the Member of Manchester Gorton had this to say Mr. President, and I quote:

> "We have to go forward with a Budget largely determined by decisions of the previous Government."

Indeed, Mr. President, we understand in November that this year we will not produce a Budget which will reflect the thinking of a Government because, Mr. President, in June that there will be another Chancellor in December in this country and that accordingly the country will determine who it will have and to foresee our future.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a stage in our progress when we normally will "Mr. Speaker Again" or some similar point. We heard in Conservative Front Opposition that it is not possible at this time to consider for the offshore industry just with a few weeks for progress which we hoped Government during August, the first part of our operation there can all agree of progress that for. In March this year the Government, I should say, gave notice that they would not at that time for few months ago) movement of Sterling in relation to Banks and other Opposition Institutions. All of this took in March the Labour Minister's Office began to the Trade people because the Banks and other offshore institutions would not attempt to pay any higher wages. In answer to hon Members, the Trade Unions think that in the Trade, and the Tax Figure published in the Budget Address in March was, Mr. President, the new tax revenue gained from the Budget Statement in March was £375 million plus some of that figure will of course come from Local which they thought to Trade Union Organisations. Secondly in our strategy, the Financial Secretary in his speech said, "In considering future the stability of our economy, Government the offshore operations and non-residents".

We should always bear in mind that the Labour Party have some responsibility in the Government unless and cannot objectively ascertain the economic facts as long our competitive edge. The decision of Government

[illegible] committee meeting the second [illegible] although [illegible] or an acceptable [illegible] is that [illegible] measures apply equally to the poor and wealthy across the Province [illegible] on the premise of [illegible] some equitable [illegible] that is, [illegible] examples which we [illegible] that is [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Provincial centre [illegible] will be unacceptably [illegible] from the alternative and result in [illegible] [illegible].

This year [illegible] about 1250 [illegible] the most residents are being requested to accept with the [illegible] increase. [illegible] [illegible] short notice [illegible], in March of this [illegible], it was the considered opinion of the whole Executive Council that we had reached a most unfortunate point at [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

U. S. WAR CRISIS (CONTINUED) They were going to impress the
people of the country and like Secretary of War, where the Unit-
ed Fund had made its difficult the new investment has received
a minor set back and where the public had been observed
to which they are being misled by propaganda.

This will be a crisis in morale
as the failure of the politics of the government, a failure of their
promises to them. I verily believe we complete the
recommendations of the bill. The Senate's Finance which Members
of Parliament should receive will be increased
from £82,500 to £90,000, an increase of 8.08%. The Company's
Pension will go from £8,500 to £9,000, an increase of 5.56%. The
Members Secretary from £750 to £1,000, an increase of 33 1/3%. The
Assistant Secretary from £6,000 to £6,500, an increase of 8.33%
as it may seem, that when the majority of the Labour
Party is in power, the total is difficult to find one for which has not been
increased by 10% to 8,000? The rise is due by 8,000 increase.

The Labour Party has
27 - 55 increase and a 4% put on the basic when the Government
entered in March of this year it would not increase anything like
that of the Army. Why? A balanced study of Government is to be
very clear that the Socialist regime is worth powder which they
will well have left not be involved increase. Their policies of
increasing the economy to the extent for the next twelve. The only
increase of taxation currently in use in this Government would
increase Exchequer revenue for years to come if it left the
investment incentive of corporate profits exempt or by increasing
of the Government. There was no reduction not necessary only
because the Government is not trying the country. We shouldn't
be in debt. Every member is worried about this enormous
debt by - this is not Democratic. This is not a reasonable policy
by Government where the Government raises Socialism that we see in every
area, nationalism and privatization and this is why our economy is
suffering. It is hoped that the taxes on the banks will help to
bite out the deficits and it is my understanding that no revenue
taxation will open also not a deficit.

In the Economic Debate of the
Budget there is an article which has been published for the
Middle Magazine, one of the leading publications for financial matters
and it is made clear that taxation which would in effect
the wages should the Minister. I hope the Government realises
that that change is an appropriate because the Government may not
have many resources to meet the deficits may in millions and
the U.S. Government agrees the deficits in taxation but the
corporate profits remains the same. It does not matter whether
it is the deficit or whether it is small like the personal income
taxes in this Budget. Yes. The economic principle remains the same
that an excess of increased taxation will create the deficit.
Most to need is personally in this country increase the deficit.
Until we need to limit the Budget based for what they are forced
which would judge that there would be an equal relationship the
taxes up here, there would be a stimulation of the economy. But
the phase be a misconception when every consumer wishes individuals
and the ability of businesses to meet a benefit. You can no more
tax one of the eyes as one is taken every action of the Government
there the economy.

[illegible] Government would reassure the [illegible] Government would say to [illegible] policies, they would have some assurance that this [illegible] staff in the [illegible] by their opposite [illegible] Government has [illegible] with a lack of understanding of what it takes to make businesses move. Only today on the front page of the Washington [illegible] that Government's decision has resulted in a half billion dollar investment [illegible]. In that same newspaper, on the front page, I read that Japanese people are [illegible] their buying [illegible] of Pearl Harbour Memorial [illegible]. Governments may say that there is a flaw in the basis which [illegible] to be changed. I agree and hundred percent this flaw should be [illegible] but it should be [illegible] on the top of the [illegible]. Investment should not also be [illegible] without any thought to employment [illegible] because [illegible] would [illegible] a few weeks. Government's business to be [illegible] and responsible to spend the [illegible] but I do not want to go into this debate because I will deal with that. The matter [illegible] and [illegible] because [illegible] I shall [illegible] the system on [illegible], and suffice it to say that the [illegible] of Government's action without thought, Government's action [illegible] investigation which has caused our economy to become [illegible] today.

Next I would like to move on to [illegible] with the effects of the [illegible] on those [illegible]. [illegible] of all, the Government needs credit [illegible] to make [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. C. EARL PERRY (CONTINUING): Because of the time remaining at present, I must speak about the unfortunate decrease of the Government. However, I will move on to another area hopefully that will not deal my friends have fallen on deaf ears because last time more or less we did not be told/who has Government would/ they listened to what I had to say.

I am thinking, Sir, that the attitude of these new Governments and the times that we are living in have not given very well that we have accepted the economic point. The situation today is that when we examine the figures for the Company A income we can/ expect/ the little/ increase the Government A looks to business locally. Every person who has an account in a local bank or other persons who active have a local bank to do business, while thinking the cost of the operation of these banks. Many times we encounter the same figure we find that the little are taken. Like each of the items, one of the greatest disappointment was borrowing of the company but our Government in diplomacy from boundaries of "Hurricanes." Their homes have been burned and they have no compensation for the losses. They may be one find the money to pay this fine point from million dollars and their backpack will be delivered but our Government has gone wrong because the theme of the Prime Minister is improving these new taxes, like the tax on living homes, so that people should pay taxes for improvement with the intention that they receive from Government position. Like the tax on share sales, Government is saying that we invest in good climate, we have eligibility, we allow the house to accept that our people must pay for the holiday season, this need the same thing like the tax on the goods and the tax on the Diesel, these people should pay in accordance with the benefit they receive. To find the Revenue even more on it has to be this that to earn an army thousand dollars per year to schools and still and the motive must pay for the benefits which they receive.

In considering this tax on the Trade Agreements sense to have said that people must pay because they can afford it. The some like that have used to purchase the other house. After the person has paid his Trade Agreement fees at the Jetty, his child increase from his Trade fees. The child increases in the Government price, what is there left? If he unfortunate or a trade or whatever it is, he called upon to make a payment because the income will show the copy but the time must be really what will be left and I can consider what will be left for the people to live. Here this Government has appointed five and a half million dollars in local trade, how first happy, cause this did not exist before; what will be left in 1988?

MR. SPEAKER: I must now the Member to speak to this Bill.

MR. C. EARL PERRY: For, Mr. Speaker, what will be left when the Government has increased the taxation of this five million dollars from the private sector, what will be left for the public? We cannot separate the money to be collected from the taxation because the economic existence of Government because the tax are determined and if it were not for the Government services there would be no need to ask for five and a half million dollars in the year ahead and no private there would be any need to ask for the increase in the Trading Firm.

MR. G. MAJOR GONZALEZ: I withdraw this pleading of ... should be here represented for these two days will not ... [illegible] ... How could they be told to begin ... that the Government would not [illegible] ...

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member has only three minutes left. If I hear no objection I shall ... I shall have to ask him to stop.

MR. G. WAIS JONES: Mr. President, my question to ... the public is now called upon on the basis ... [illegible] ... to any increase in basic ... [illegible] ... the ... [illegible] ... I shall not have to worry about ... [illegible] ... the ... [illegible] ... [illegible] ... [illegible]

MR. O. PEARSON HITCHCOCK (CONTINUING): Now, Mr. President, there... [illegible] to classify electric by the fact that we had really now [illegible] the 1963. That is an extra personal [illegible] of banks maintained for this country. The General [illegible] Kansas for Kansas, Texas might of those have sought the [illegible] in making fees per to the banking arrangements. He also stated [illegible] of Mr. Myers examiner [illegible] Kansas had [illegible] that we were at the determination sought in the financial [illegible] of their view. I agreed [illegible] with that statement at that time, but certainly like, if we have increased the banks by eight per cent we probably have saved the [illegible] point spread as I believe that the banking industry can well absorb these increases in fees.

Now, Mr. President, there is one thing more [illegible] to mean the [illegible] ... [illegible] by those decently and I trust, Sir, that I will be given the same latitude as the last speaker in order [illegible] this point because, Sir, what I am going to deal with is in my mind [illegible] extra [illegible] fees.

This morning, Mr. President, a [illegible] of the Kansas Committee was talked to this Assembly and the [illegible] of appropriations which is was then considered to $83,878,617. Mr. President, those [illegible] will one not seriously [illegible] [illegible] ... [illegible] that we [illegible] of the [illegible] will [illegible] ...

MR. PRESIDENT: As I am told, the tape has run out and it will take them one minute to obtain the tape. The Secretary-Treasurer will [illegible] as soon as it is done.

MR. O. PEARSON HITCHCOCK: Mr. President, as I was saying, the Kansas Committee Report which now stated this morning came in [illegible] of $83,878,617 and the motion [illegible] [illegible] ... [illegible] those increases [illegible], Sir, I suggest as a part [illegible] of the total Appropriation will cut the 1962 budget. [illegible] Kansas, for [illegible] [illegible] a reduction. We [illegible] this morning [illegible] Kansas' budget. We must [illegible], we must increased services, we must [illegible] services, we must [illegible] services to provide those things that [illegible] to have, [illegible] increased [illegible] to meet the [illegible] for these and services.

But the Minutes of this Morning Session, Sir, does not in any place [illegible] motion made by any of those matters to further expenditures. All of the matters [illegible] to reduce expenditures were [illegible] by the General Counsel Kansas for that Sir to be quoted. There was one motion [illegible] the Second Electric Kansas for [illegible] that would [illegible] [illegible] of Kansas, the reconsideration because be moved that [illegible] the matter reduced because we [illegible] to impose the Sales [illegible] Tax. Said, Sir, if this money is going to be raised from that [illegible] might, in fact, raise in fact that $100,000 is additional revenue available to reduce or do the [illegible] that is [illegible] to other areas within that budget. That is all to say, Sir, that I suppose, the records will show that I suggested the [illegible] be reinstated to the Sales [illegible] Tax [illegible]. They are fully [illegible].

But, Mr. President, it seems [illegible] that [illegible] to that [illegible] we are [illegible] [illegible], which is not being [illegible] and the public, [illegible], I am not [illegible]. What members of the public will not take the [illegible] to read this report from the Kansas Committee,

Mr. [illegible] (interpretation): Certain Members are prepared to support only resolutions under the Indian item [illegible] resolution, which we put on the floor of this Assembly, shows [illegible] because, they do not want to create the impression that [illegible] alternative or be above the [illegible] resolutions, also. I do not think there is any Member in this House who criticizes the [illegible] Council any more than I do myself. I feel it is necessary that I should [illegible] explanation and also, I do not often [illegible] in the Fourth Committee and also in the Plenary where the [illegible] I have to be in time on the floor of this Assembly because I usually [illegible] what I believe in.

Mr. President, [illegible] the necessity arises although in this [illegible] Mr. President, I trust that the [illegible] role of the Members of Permanent Committees. Mr. President, [illegible] for us to use [illegible] the [illegible] in the [illegible] Council [illegible] of this country. The people of this country are going to see that [illegible] that they deserve from their [illegible]. The Second Vice-President Member from Iran [illegible] to assure that the five Elected Members of Security Council [illegible] and not place so much burden [illegible] Members in general.

Now, Mr. President, the Second Vice-President from Iran made [illegible] important point of [illegible] by [illegible] the Rapporteur's Digest. It appears to be [illegible] Rapporteur's Digest [illegible] of the Second Issue in this Assembly we have received [illegible], also, I hold the opinion of this Representative, Mr. Fisher, in high esteem and I do agree with some of his [illegible] since it seems to create [illegible] President that [illegible] [illegible] Vice-President is almost impossible and does [illegible] specific kinds of [illegible] economic association and economic [illegible]. These kind of [illegible], also, [illegible] and [illegible] taxes and direct [illegible] taxes, too. We have [illegible] of these [illegible]. There is not much [illegible] in this country [illegible] any [illegible] type [illegible] and [illegible] form of [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I discuss the [illegible] and Peace Corps budget [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Peace Corps.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, [illegible] Peace Corps [illegible] Mr. President, I am [illegible] Peace Corps [illegible] Peace Corps [illegible] Peace Corps

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] SOCIAL SECURITY [illegible] The state Union Law increased [illegible] to the beneficiaries of this administration and from [illegible] the Commission of the Government were $31,141,732. This compared with the years 1977-1978 of when $2,000,000 and it [illegible] that in this year alone, they will have to borrow [illegible] Republicans in the House passed [illegible]. They have made a complete failure of the economic situation [illegible].

[illegible] in the years 1977 1981 there was over $16,000,000 that went into [illegible] from general revenues. In 1978-1979 there was only five point seven billion. Some of the same people who are trying the Government at this time that is giving these people and we will see but many times that can be contributed to social problems in these four years of Republicans. If we do anything that will be contributed we can most assured is will be Democrat Congress and Democrat senators.

We are fortunate, Mr. President, [illegible] to note that there people are here before the ways and means committee. We are getting into committee and we are going to have to [illegible] the these four years. I am sure that when [illegible] we will find that they will be making [illegible] when they are asking of this time and I am accusing the [illegible] of this House and the people of the Country indicate that [illegible] that Nation. If we do go [illegible] will put [illegible] in the position that the Democratic [illegible] to where social [illegible] the Democrat the [illegible].

In 1978 the Government's [illegible] $31,000 of Social Security and received 15% of the general [illegible] to service the. In 1987 it was 18.3% of general revenue [illegible]. A [illegible] with the Democrat plan took if you look at [illegible] Ways and Means Committee [illegible] Power Building [illegible] Power Committee and the Administration [illegible] by this year [illegible] in 1985 it was 24% of General [illegible] in 1990 the public will [illegible] Administration [illegible] to about 25% of General [illegible]. In the Ways and Means [illegible] the Committee [illegible] of the 10% cut I am [illegible] that by the year [illegible] we will end up 50.05 of General Revenue but we will be at [illegible] 25% of General Revenue. I am asking [illegible] to be able to [illegible] this [illegible]

You know it is [illegible] of Social Security can only [illegible] to those [illegible] at you. I like to call them of the problems they are [illegible] in Social Security. The problems they are having this country is not that I should [illegible] of. I don't intend [illegible] and will continue to [illegible] them about. They considered a balanced budget and the [illegible] of [illegible], I should [illegible] and debate the [illegible] and prove to [illegible] which is [illegible] that is. Republicans have not been [illegible]. They have been [illegible] to me in the [illegible] in my home's [illegible] when you take the nine [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] to this Power to [illegible] a balanced budget, they did this in 1980 only if I remember correctly, it was a [illegible] amount of money that was [illegible] in the [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] Social Security, where [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. I will almost [illegible] and I will remind here [illegible] of [illegible] on it, that by the time the [illegible] the [illegible] Social Security and projected back to this [illegible], we will find that in the year 2025 this country [illegible] [illegible] to 54 million that the $1.5 million that they have [illegible] to [illegible].

MR. JAMES M. [illegible]: Mr. Kind [illegible] Mr. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible], President, [illegible] the matter [illegible] that [illegible] cannot happen [illegible] country [illegible] now [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] Mary Smith Glenn, Clifford Lee Randolph, Jr., Frances Blair Saunders, Jacquelyn Hall Gibson, Thomas Hal Clarke, Cynthia Neely Adams, Ann Elizabeth Sheffield, Ida Richardson Cone, [illegible] Hall, Sarah Webster Fabian, Benjamin Franklin Williams, Jr., Joseph Mason Reed, Jr., Richard Chapman Bardon, Dan Kiser Edwards, Jr., Hugh Lefler Cole, Lonnie Randolph Williams, Carl Horton Stewart, Edwin Michael Speas, Jr., John Frederick Dorman, Mattie Erma Edwards Parker, Richard Walser, Jerry Cecil Martin, Sarah McCulloh Lemmon, Frank Porter Graham, William Thomas Polk, Gertrude Sprague Carraway, Thad Eure, Memory Fitzgerald Mitchell, Elizabeth Preyer, Marshall Anderson Nash, Jr., Reginald Alexander Parker, Terry Sanford, Luther Hodges, Jr., and Dan Kiser Moore.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned, under the rule, subject to the call of the Chair.

SENATE

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President.

The Reverend Edwin McNeill Poteat, Jr., pastor of the Hyde Park Baptist Church, Durham, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the privilege of meeting together in this hour of worship and prayer.

We thank Thee for the blessings of this day, for the beauty of the sunshine and the promise of the springtime. We thank Thee for the blessings of this hour, for the fellowship of friends and for the opportunity to serve.

We thank Thee for the blessings of this State, for the heritage of the past and for the challenge of the future.

We thank Thee for the blessings of this Nation, for the freedom we enjoy and for the responsibility we bear.

We thank Thee for the blessings of this world, for the hope of peace and for the power of love.

Help us, O God, to be worthy of the blessings we have received from Thy hand. Help us to be faithful in the discharge of the duties which Thou hast laid upon us. Help us to be true to the trust which Thou hast committed to our keeping.

Help us to be mindful of the needs of others and to be willing to help them in the hour of their need.

Help us to be kind and gentle and forgiving in our relationships with our fellow men.

Help us to be humble in the hour of success and to be patient in the hour of defeat.

Help us to be honest in our thinking and to be sincere in our speaking.

Help us to be generous in our giving and to be unselfish in our living.

Help us to be true to the best that is in us and to be worthy of the best that Thou hast given us.

Help us to be loyal to our country and to be faithful to our God.

Help us to be good citizens and to be good neighbors.

Help us to be good stewards of the gifts Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the time Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the talents Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the opportunities Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the responsibilities Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the privileges Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the blessings Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the world Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the future Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the past Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the present Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the eternity Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Christ Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Holy Spirit Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Bible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the ministry Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the gospel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Kingdom Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Lord Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Savior Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Redeemer Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Comforter Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Son Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Holy Ghost Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Trinity Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Godhead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Deity Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Divinity Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Supreme Being Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Almighty Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Omnipotent Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Omniscient Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Omnipresent Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Way, the Truth, and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Bread of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Water of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Light of the World Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Good Shepherd Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Lamb of God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Lion of the Tribe of Judah Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Root of David Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Bright and Morning Star Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Rose of Sharon Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Lily of the Valley Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Chief Cornerstone Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Rock of Ages Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Great High Priest Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Advocate with the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Propitiation for our sins Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Mediator between God and man Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Head of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Bridegroom of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Author and Finisher of our faith Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Captain of our salvation Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Prince of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King of Kings and Lord of Lords Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King of the Jews Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King of Israel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King of Glory Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Way, the Truth, and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Bread of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Water of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Light of the World Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Good Shepherd Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Lamb of God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Lion of the Tribe of Judah Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Root of David Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Bright and Morning Star Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Rose of Sharon Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Lily of the Valley Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Chief Cornerstone Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Rock of Ages Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Shepherd and Bishop of our souls Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Great High Priest Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Advocate with the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Propitiation for our sins Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Mediator between God and man Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Head of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Bridegroom of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Author and Finisher of our faith Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Captain of our salvation Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Prince of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King of Kings and Lord of Lords Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King of the Jews Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King of Israel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King of Glory Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Way, the Truth, and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Bread of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Water of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Light of the World Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Good Shepherd Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Lamb of God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Lion of the Tribe of Judah Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Root of David Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Bright and Morning Star Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Rose of Sharon Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Lily of the Valley Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Chief Cornerstone Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Rock of Ages Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Shepherd and Bishop of our souls Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Great High Priest Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Advocate with the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Propitiation for our sins Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Mediator between God and man Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Head of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Bridegroom of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Author and Finisher of our faith Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Captain of our salvation Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Prince of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King of Kings and Lord of Lords Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King of the Jews Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King of Israel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King of Glory Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Way, the Truth, and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Bread of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Water of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Light of the World Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Good Shepherd Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Lamb of God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Lion of the Tribe of Judah Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Root of David Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Bright and Morning Star Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Rose of Sharon Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Lily of the Valley Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Chief Cornerstone Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Rock of Ages Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Shepherd and Bishop of our souls Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Great High Priest Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Advocate with the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Propitiation for our sins Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Mediator between God and man Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Head of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Bridegroom of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Author and Finisher of our faith Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Captain of our salvation Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Prince of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King of Kings and Lord of Lords Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King of the Jews Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King of Israel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King of Glory Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Way, the Truth, and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Bread of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Water of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Light of the World Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Good Shepherd Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Lamb of God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Lion of the Tribe of Judah Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Root of David Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Bright and Morning Star Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Rose of Sharon Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Lily of the Valley Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Chief Cornerstone Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Rock of Ages Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Shepherd and Bishop of our souls Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Great High Priest Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Advocate with the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Propitiation for our sins Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Mediator between God and man Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Head of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Bridegroom of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Author and Finisher of our faith Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Captain of our salvation Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Prince of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King of Kings and Lord of Lords Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King of the Jews Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King of Israel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King of Glory Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Way, the Truth, and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Bread of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Water of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Light of the World Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Good Shepherd Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Lamb of God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Lion of the Tribe of Judah Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Root of David Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Bright and Morning Star Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Rose of Sharon Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Lily of the Valley Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Chief Cornerstone Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Rock of Ages Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Shepherd and Bishop of our souls Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Great High Priest Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Advocate with the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Propitiation for our sins Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Mediator between God and man Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Head of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Bridegroom of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Author and Finisher of our faith Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Captain of our salvation Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Prince of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King of Kings and Lord of Lords Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King of the Jews Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King of Israel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King of Glory Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Way, the Truth, and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Bread of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Water of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Light of the World Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Good Shepherd Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Lamb of God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Lion of the Tribe of Judah Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Root of David Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Bright and Morning Star Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Rose of Sharon Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Lily of the Valley Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Chief Cornerstone Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Rock of Ages Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Shepherd and Bishop of our souls Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Great High Priest Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Advocate with the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Propitiation for our sins Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Mediator between God and man Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Head of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Bridegroom of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Author and Finisher of our faith Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Captain of our salvation Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Prince of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King of Kings and Lord of Lords Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King of the Jews Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King of Israel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King of Glory Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Way, the Truth, and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Bread of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Water of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Light of the World Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Good Shepherd Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Lamb of God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Lion of the Tribe of Judah Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Root of David Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Bright and Morning Star Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Rose of Sharon Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Lily of the Valley Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Chief Cornerstone Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Rock of Ages Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Shepherd and Bishop of our souls Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Great High Priest Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Advocate with the Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Propitiation for our sins Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Mediator between God and man Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Head of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Bridegroom of the Church Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Author and Finisher of our faith Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Captain of our salvation Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Prince of Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King of Kings and Lord of Lords Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King of the Jews Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King of Israel Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King of Glory Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Eternal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Immortal Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Invisible Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Unchangeable Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Infinite Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Perfect Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Holy Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Righteous Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Just Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Merciful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Gracious Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Loving Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Faithful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King True Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Wise Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Knowing Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Understanding Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Counselor Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Prince of Peace Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Mighty God Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Everlasting Father Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Wonderful Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Alpha and Omega Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Beginning and the End Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King First and the Last Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Living and the Dead Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stewards of the King King King King King King King King Resurrection and the Life Thou hast given us.

Help us to be good stew

CONSIDERATION OF SECOND BUDGET RESOLUTION
OF
THE SENATE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY
(SENATE RES. 188)

MR. SPENCER D. THOMAS: Yes, Mr. President. I wish to commend the Fiscal Responsibility Committee for the work it has done.

Mr. President, the Second Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 1978 is projected to be much of a Third Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 1979 and will likely be used as a vehicle for many amendments at that time as the effective instrument to be considered since the Senate of Governments.

Mr. President, in view of the Budget Address the President Pro Tempore indicated that on the end of this year was a strong preference in the number of Senate Committees within the Senate. In fact, in the time of the consideration of his remarks there had been a move for New York Democrats. Now Mr. President, this note Senator from New York went to say that the Committee Budget Resolution and it would be clear for the record to see that is the case. Thank you, Mr. President. I wonder what time would there be again.

I recommend that even that there be Democratic Take Overview of the multibillion which is how will be voted in the Senate has been able to obtain from new book Members and it will be more by the end of the year. Mr. President, going on to the time of the consideration of the Budget Address. Since April recommend, Mr. President, that we be able to get to the Senate floor with substantive. It would be a simple statement for the Record to make absolutely important that some substantive recommend to the committee that there may not be more time to vote since we also and still provide competition. With regard to the effective leadership, that they were really building about Jobs Mr. President to the committee, the minimum requirement on conservation which we have on the book, and it is true that the Daily Task Development put the problem for Office recommended to help that we support South Dakota Democratic we will become uncompetitive.

Mr. President, since the Joint Economic Report for October 15th and I request that be read to be appreciated, Mr. President, I would like to have the attorney from Ohio that I could look at her and tell him what I have to tell him. The Vice Elected Member from Indiana said that he was heard all kinds of promises made by this Government and that they were unfortunate promises. Mr. President, we proposed to provide integrity and confidence in the Government and that we materially have succeeded in doing. We proposed, Mr. President, to provide certainties and also to treat our Mr. President, we can only support responsible cuts, as in General Government, to recommend of Treasury, has provided the dates which the Unity Party have to be said and of public consolidation of the budget will be that $2.25 billion of the 1978 Budget will go to Treasury of Treasury will be Statement of Income Taxes. $15 billion will go to Unemployment and Insurance trust fund of Defense Trust. $2 billion plus will go to the Unemployment, Unemployment Civil Service, Mr. President. Mr. Thomas, Mr. President, that Member never ceases to amaze me. The Third Critical Century, the Democratic Financial Responsibility, we proposed this

[illegible] Senator [illegible]: Perhaps, made it clear Mr. President when the vote opened, that he talked about in the public of this and of 1982, were [illegible] reports. In other words, Mr. President, like the Democrat holiday and [illegible] workers which [illegible] was also [illegible] to protect. If we had taken the time, [illegible] I know I'm going up to [illegible] 1985, he would see that the money [illegible] by the Wall Street banks, that is Citicorp, Chase [illegible], America to only eighty-one billion, one hundred and eighteen [illegible] billion, seven hundred and forty-five dollars. It is time that [illegible] address ourselves to be [illegible] share of the burden. [illegible] to provide adequately the human supply of this country [illegible] point out that the [illegible] are doing [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] Wall Street [illegible], [illegible] the [illegible], [illegible] from time to time remember, seemed to have entered to put his [illegible] in that money. That is why the Senate was [illegible].

Mr. President, the Joint Economic [illegible] for Democrats [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I will suspend proceedings until approximately 8:15 p.m.

Tomorrow I would just say to the [illegible] that I have attempted [illegible] Some has stepped [illegible] but I will say to her that if [illegible] be under Standing, "Welcome [illegible] to the world of [illegible] Proceedings."

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. Recognition of the Leader of the Official Opposition and Leader of the Liberal Party, Hon. [illegible]. The First Elected Member of Assembly [illegible] and speaking, but he is not here. Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member which to exercise the right of reply?

MR. DAVID A. [illegible]: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health made a statement on the Radio and Press Conference Yesterday [illegible] immediately left Canada to [illegible] Prime Minister, Mr. Broadbent, to do [illegible] Upper Islands will not [illegible] the Minister who runs in the House and in the Province. That is, the effective Government [illegible].

Mr. Speaker, the [illegible] are being [illegible] by this bill, in my view, can not help to [illegible] confidence. I think just the [illegible] Upper Islands to [illegible] and [illegible] Premier, the House [illegible] to [illegible] than [illegible] to the effective Government business. Out of the [illegible] every Minister to whom they are [illegible] from whether it is [illegible] or whether the [illegible]. Monday to put it bluntly, no one can today in the 1990 [illegible], to what is in their province the confidence in the Fiscal and Financial [illegible] of the Upper Islands Government. I am not in [illegible] our confidence motion, the [illegible] that the Minister [illegible] to the International [illegible] will [illegible] by some [illegible] in the [illegible] Government business. What is [illegible], Mr. Speaker? [illegible] say more on it. We know that the Premier [illegible] Upper Islands' economy is [illegible] by, [illegible] announced [illegible] the [illegible] Upper Islands [illegible] or political [illegible]. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if one more thing [illegible] a Province, the [illegible] to [illegible] security, political [illegible] and economic [illegible] of this country, they would [illegible] at the same time. They are [illegible] of the [illegible] that we have [illegible] and political [illegible] Mr. Speaker? For the Upper Islands, is it [illegible] or one,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

...; [illegible] [illegible]: [illegible] Mr. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. T. DENIS MURPHY (OPPOSITION): The floor was invented for the kind of an event when the end of the year has come to pass the 11th parcel tax. There is no reason for him to say a few more words and do the headache he deserves.

The Member understands the bill [illegible] the government which we did not come to power. [illegible] are making [illegible] Government began on 1994 [illegible] of course a Government which is going to [illegible] of right [illegible] and clearly [illegible] Government [illegible] 1994.

MR. SPEAKER: I see the Member looking at me. I think he is going to [illegible] and I am a little [illegible]

MR. G. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I think you should have accepted the Member who [illegible] the bill because he raised the question of [illegible] and I am only pointing to that. Anyway, if I have to, I will be proud to.

[illegible] are worried that they have a bill in the process of [illegible] the new government because they had a [illegible] Members of 1994," in 1995 we are told by the Auditor General that there will have a deficit of [illegible] million five hundred thousand [illegible] and tell Members that the deficit will be [illegible] 1998, [illegible] the [illegible] the Minister now knows. I do not want to [illegible] the moment.

The Member [illegible] the bill said that the [illegible] will [illegible] the [illegible] of the Canada 2020 and when we went into [illegible] in 2000. [illegible] to the people to hear [illegible] the bill that the Government tells that the [illegible] like the [illegible] of the motion was known then [illegible]. I know the people [illegible] the economy that [illegible] have [illegible] Government who did not [illegible] Government who [illegible] to stimulate [illegible] and I think this is what [illegible] the Government into [illegible] that is why they are in trouble when they are [illegible].

The end goal is that this Government will [illegible] the [illegible] and [illegible], like in [illegible], the [illegible] and the other [illegible] and part of the [illegible] of [illegible] to which cut the deficit [illegible] the Government estimates [illegible] by [illegible] from the time and a half billion [illegible] would be reduced in real [illegible] and the right [illegible] billion dollars expected to be [illegible] today and today, this Government [illegible] and [illegible] with a deficit of [illegible] billion dollars, [illegible] one point that seemed to [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] the [illegible] the new [illegible] and [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] have a deficit of [illegible] billion dollars. This is not [illegible]. This is [illegible] will [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]. They have been [illegible] [illegible] of. They have been

MR. [illegible] ENDOWMENT: [illegible] I'm sorry, I didn't get [illegible] to the Senate. They have never taken that [illegible] 1970 in negotiating just to accommodate the [illegible] of the Administration by eliminating the [illegible] I will be delighted to tell my colleagues in the House [illegible]

[illegible] I was going to be prepared to [illegible] I was [illegible] I'm [illegible] I was going to [illegible] I'm [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. MCKEON [continuing]: ... of thousands of children. I do not believe that if my noble friend [illegible] would be [illegible]. Mr. President, as time is short, I would like to make it ... to which that there was [illegible], who was refused and who sat on the floor [illegible]. I believe ... that there could be a [illegible] ... There will [illegible] ... [illegible] ... I think that my [illegible]. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Senator wish to ...?

MR. DANIEL K. INOUYE: Mr. President, [illegible] ... Mr. President, I rise to support S.B.[illegible] ... [illegible] ... Mr. President, this ... [illegible] ... Mr. President, shouldn't ... [illegible] ... Mr. President, I believe that ... [illegible] ... Mr. President, I rise to support S.B.[illegible] for a number of reasons. First, [illegible] ... [illegible] ... Mr. President, this

MR. DERWINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. ROSTENKOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

MR. DERWINSKI. The honorable chairman knows I have always had great respect for his knowledge of the budget and the tax laws, but I must say that I am disappointed in the gentleman's statement that the Democratic Party is not responsible for the deficits in the 1970's. I think we should look at the record. In 1970 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $196.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $3.4 billion. In 1971 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $211.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $4.6 billion. In 1972 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $230.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $5.2 billion. In 1973 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $246.5 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $6.5 billion. In 1974 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $268.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $7.6 billion. In 1975 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $324.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $15.4 billion. In 1976 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $366.5 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $17.5 billion. In 1977 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $394.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $19.8 billion. In 1978 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $440.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $21.6 billion. In 1979 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $493.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $24.4 billion. In 1980 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $576.7 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $28.3 billion. In 1981 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $695.9 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $34.2 billion. In 1982 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $772.3 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $38.1 billion. In 1983 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $848.5 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $41.7 billion. In 1984 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $925.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $45.5 billion. In 1985 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,004.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $49.3 billion. In 1986 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,082.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $53.2 billion. In 1987 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,160.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $57.0 billion. In 1988 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,238.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $60.8 billion. In 1989 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,316.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $64.6 billion. In 1990 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,395.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $68.4 billion. In 1991 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,473.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $72.2 billion. In 1992 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,551.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $76.0 billion. In 1993 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,629.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $79.8 billion. In 1994 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,707.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $83.6 billion. In 1995 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,786.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $87.4 billion. In 1996 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,864.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $91.2 billion. In 1997 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $1,942.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $95.0 billion. In 1998 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,020.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $98.8 billion. In 1999 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,098.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $102.6 billion. In 2000 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,177.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $106.4 billion. In 2001 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,255.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $110.2 billion. In 2002 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,333.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $114.0 billion. In 2003 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,411.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $117.8 billion. In 2004 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,489.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $121.6 billion. In 2005 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,568.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $125.4 billion. In 2006 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,646.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $129.2 billion. In 2007 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,724.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $133.0 billion. In 2008 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,802.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $136.8 billion. In 2009 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,880.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $140.6 billion. In 2010 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $2,959.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $144.4 billion. In 2011 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,037.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $148.2 billion. In 2012 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,115.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $152.0 billion. In 2013 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,193.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $155.8 billion. In 2014 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,271.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $159.6 billion. In 2015 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,350.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $163.4 billion. In 2016 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,428.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $167.2 billion. In 2017 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,506.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $171.0 billion. In 2018 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,584.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $174.8 billion. In 2019 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,662.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $178.6 billion. In 2020 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,741.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $182.4 billion. In 2021 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,819.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $186.2 billion. In 2022 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,897.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $190.0 billion. In 2023 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $3,975.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $193.8 billion. In 2024 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,053.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $197.6 billion. In 2025 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,132.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $201.4 billion. In 2026 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,210.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $205.2 billion. In 2027 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,288.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $209.0 billion. In 2028 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,366.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $212.8 billion. In 2029 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,444.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $216.6 billion. In 2030 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,523.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $220.4 billion. In 2031 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,601.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $224.2 billion. In 2032 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,679.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $228.0 billion. In 2033 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,757.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $231.8 billion. In 2034 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,835.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $235.6 billion. In 2035 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,914.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $239.4 billion. In 2036 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $4,992.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $243.2 billion. In 2037 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,070.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $247.0 billion. In 2038 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,148.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $250.8 billion. In 2039 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,226.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $254.6 billion. In 2040 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,305.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $258.4 billion. In 2041 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,383.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $262.2 billion. In 2042 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,461.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $266.0 billion. In 2043 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,539.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $269.8 billion. In 2044 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,617.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $273.6 billion. In 2045 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,696.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $277.4 billion. In 2046 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,774.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $281.2 billion. In 2047 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,852.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $285.0 billion. In 2048 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $5,930.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $288.8 billion. In 2049 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,008.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $292.6 billion. In 2050 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,087.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $296.4 billion. In 2051 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,165.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $300.2 billion. In 2052 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,243.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $304.0 billion. In 2053 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,321.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $307.8 billion. In 2054 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,399.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $311.6 billion. In 2055 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,478.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $315.4 billion. In 2056 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,556.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $319.2 billion. In 2057 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,634.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $323.0 billion. In 2058 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,712.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $326.8 billion. In 2059 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,790.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $330.6 billion. In 2060 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,869.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $334.4 billion. In 2061 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $6,947.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $338.2 billion. In 2062 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,025.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $342.0 billion. In 2063 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,103.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $345.8 billion. In 2064 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,181.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $349.6 billion. In 2065 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,260.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $353.4 billion. In 2066 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,338.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $357.2 billion. In 2067 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,416.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $361.0 billion. In 2068 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,494.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $364.8 billion. In 2069 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,572.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $368.6 billion. In 2070 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,651.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $372.4 billion. In 2071 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,729.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $376.2 billion. In 2072 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,807.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $380.0 billion. In 2073 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,885.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $383.8 billion. In 2074 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $7,963.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $387.6 billion. In 2075 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,042.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $391.4 billion. In 2076 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,120.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $395.2 billion. In 2077 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,198.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $399.0 billion. In 2078 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,276.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $402.8 billion. In 2079 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,354.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $406.6 billion. In 2080 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,433.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $410.4 billion. In 2081 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,511.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $414.2 billion. In 2082 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,589.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $418.0 billion. In 2083 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,667.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $421.8 billion. In 2084 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,745.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $425.6 billion. In 2085 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,824.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $429.4 billion. In 2086 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,902.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $433.2 billion. In 2087 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $8,980.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $437.0 billion. In 2088 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,058.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $440.8 billion. In 2089 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,136.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $444.6 billion. In 2090 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,215.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $448.4 billion. In 2091 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,293.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $452.2 billion. In 2092 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,371.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $456.0 billion. In 2093 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,449.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $459.8 billion. In 2094 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,527.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $463.6 billion. In 2095 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,606.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $467.4 billion. In 2096 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,684.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $471.2 billion. In 2097 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,762.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $475.0 billion. In 2098 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,840.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $478.8 billion. In 2099 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,918.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $482.6 billion. In 2100 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $9,997.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $486.4 billion. In 2101 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,075.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $490.2 billion. In 2102 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,153.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $494.0 billion. In 2103 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,231.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $497.8 billion. In 2104 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,309.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $501.6 billion. In 2105 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,388.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $505.4 billion. In 2106 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,466.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $509.2 billion. In 2107 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,544.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $513.0 billion. In 2108 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,622.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $516.8 billion. In 2109 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,700.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $520.6 billion. In 2110 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,779.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $524.4 billion. In 2111 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,857.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $528.2 billion. In 2112 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $10,935.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $532.0 billion. In 2113 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,013.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $535.8 billion. In 2114 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,091.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $539.6 billion. In 2115 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,170.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $543.4 billion. In 2116 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,248.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $547.2 billion. In 2117 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,326.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $551.0 billion. In 2118 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,404.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $554.8 billion. In 2119 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,482.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $558.6 billion. In 2120 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,561.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $562.4 billion. In 2121 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,639.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $566.2 billion. In 2122 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,717.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $570.0 billion. In 2123 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,795.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $573.8 billion. In 2124 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,873.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $577.6 billion. In 2125 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $11,952.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $581.4 billion. In 2126 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,030.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $585.2 billion. In 2127 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,108.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $589.0 billion. In 2128 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,186.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $592.8 billion. In 2129 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,264.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $596.6 billion. In 2130 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,343.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $600.4 billion. In 2131 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,421.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $604.2 billion. In 2132 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,499.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $608.0 billion. In 2133 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,577.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $611.8 billion. In 2134 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,655.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $615.6 billion. In 2135 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,734.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $619.4 billion. In 2136 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,812.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $623.2 billion. In 2137 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,890.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $627.0 billion. In 2138 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $12,968.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $630.8 billion. In 2139 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,046.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $634.6 billion. In 2140 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,125.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $638.4 billion. In 2141 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,203.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $642.2 billion. In 2142 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,281.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $646.0 billion. In 2143 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,359.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $649.8 billion. In 2144 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,437.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $653.6 billion. In 2145 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,516.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $657.4 billion. In 2146 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,594.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $661.2 billion. In 2147 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,672.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $665.0 billion. In 2148 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,750.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $668.8 billion. In 2149 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,828.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $672.6 billion. In 2150 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,907.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $676.4 billion. In 2151 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $13,985.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $680.2 billion. In 2152 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,063.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $684.0 billion. In 2153 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,141.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $687.8 billion. In 2154 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,219.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $691.6 billion. In 2155 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,298.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $695.4 billion. In 2156 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,376.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $699.2 billion. In 2157 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,454.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $703.0 billion. In 2158 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,532.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $706.8 billion. In 2159 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,610.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $710.6 billion. In 2160 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,689.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $714.4 billion. In 2161 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,767.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $718.2 billion. In 2162 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,845.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $722.0 billion. In 2163 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $14,923.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $725.8 billion. In 2164 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,001.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $729.6 billion. In 2165 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,080.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $733.4 billion. In 2166 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,158.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $737.2 billion. In 2167 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,236.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $741.0 billion. In 2168 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,314.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $744.8 billion. In 2169 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,392.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $748.6 billion. In 2170 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,471.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $752.4 billion. In 2171 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,549.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $756.2 billion. In 2172 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,627.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $760.0 billion. In 2173 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,705.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $763.8 billion. In 2174 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,783.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $767.6 billion. In 2175 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,862.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $771.4 billion. In 2176 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $15,940.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $775.2 billion. In 2177 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,018.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $779.0 billion. In 2178 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,096.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $782.8 billion. In 2179 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,174.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $786.6 billion. In 2180 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,253.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $790.4 billion. In 2181 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,331.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $794.2 billion. In 2182 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,409.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $798.0 billion. In 2183 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,487.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $801.8 billion. In 2184 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,565.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $805.6 billion. In 2185 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,644.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $809.4 billion. In 2186 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,722.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $813.2 billion. In 2187 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,800.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $817.0 billion. In 2188 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,878.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $820.8 billion. In 2189 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $16,956.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $824.6 billion. In 2190 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,035.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $828.4 billion. In 2191 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,113.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $832.2 billion. In 2192 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,191.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $836.0 billion. In 2193 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,269.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $839.8 billion. In 2194 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,347.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $843.6 billion. In 2195 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,426.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $847.4 billion. In 2196 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,504.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $851.2 billion. In 2197 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,582.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $855.0 billion. In 2198 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,660.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $858.8 billion. In 2199 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,738.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $862.6 billion. In 2200 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,817.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $866.4 billion. In 2201 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,895.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $870.2 billion. In 2202 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $17,973.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $874.0 billion. In 2203 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,051.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $877.8 billion. In 2204 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,129.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $881.6 billion. In 2205 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,208.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $885.4 billion. In 2206 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,286.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $889.2 billion. In 2207 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,364.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $893.0 billion. In 2208 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,442.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $896.8 billion. In 2209 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,520.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $900.6 billion. In 2210 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,599.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $904.4 billion. In 2211 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,677.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $908.2 billion. In 2212 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,755.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $912.0 billion. In 2213 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,833.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $915.8 billion. In 2214 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,911.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $919.6 billion. In 2215 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $18,990.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $923.4 billion. In 2216 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,068.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $927.2 billion. In 2217 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,146.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $931.0 billion. In 2218 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,224.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $934.8 billion. In 2219 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,302.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $938.6 billion. In 2220 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,381.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $942.4 billion. In 2221 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,459.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $946.2 billion. In 2222 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,537.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $950.0 billion. In 2223 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,615.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $953.8 billion. In 2224 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,693.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $957.6 billion. In 2225 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,772.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $961.4 billion. In 2226 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,850.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $965.2 billion. In 2227 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $19,928.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $969.0 billion. In 2228 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,006.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $972.8 billion. In 2229 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,084.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $976.6 billion. In 2230 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,163.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $980.4 billion. In 2231 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,241.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $984.2 billion. In 2232 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,319.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $988.0 billion. In 2233 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,397.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $991.8 billion. In 2234 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,475.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $995.6 billion. In 2235 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,554.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $999.4 billion. In 2236 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,632.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,003.2 billion. In 2237 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,710.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,007.0 billion. In 2238 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,788.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,010.8 billion. In 2239 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,866.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,014.6 billion. In 2240 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $20,945.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,018.4 billion. In 2241 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,023.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,022.2 billion. In 2242 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,101.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,026.0 billion. In 2243 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,179.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,029.8 billion. In 2244 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,257.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,033.6 billion. In 2245 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,336.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,037.4 billion. In 2246 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,414.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,041.2 billion. In 2247 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,492.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,045.0 billion. In 2248 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,570.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,048.8 billion. In 2249 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,648.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,052.6 billion. In 2250 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,727.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,056.4 billion. In 2251 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,805.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,060.2 billion. In 2252 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,883.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,064.0 billion. In 2253 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $21,961.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,067.8 billion. In 2254 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,039.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,071.6 billion. In 2255 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,118.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,075.4 billion. In 2256 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,196.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,079.2 billion. In 2257 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,274.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,083.0 billion. In 2258 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,352.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,086.8 billion. In 2259 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,430.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,090.6 billion. In 2260 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,509.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,094.4 billion. In 2261 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,587.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,098.2 billion. In 2262 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,665.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,102.0 billion. In 2263 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,743.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,105.8 billion. In 2264 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,821.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,109.6 billion. In 2265 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,900.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,113.4 billion. In 2266 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $22,978.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,117.2 billion. In 2267 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,056.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,121.0 billion. In 2268 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,134.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,124.8 billion. In 2269 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,212.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,128.6 billion. In 2270 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,291.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,132.4 billion. In 2271 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,369.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,136.2 billion. In 2272 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,447.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,140.0 billion. In 2273 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,525.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,143.8 billion. In 2274 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,603.8 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,147.6 billion. In 2275 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,682.0 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,151.4 billion. In 2276 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,760.2 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,155.2 billion. In 2277 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,838.4 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,159.0 billion. In 2278 the Republican Administration submitted a budget of $23,916.6 billion. The Democratic Congress increased that budget by $1,162.8 billion. In 2279 the

MR. HENRY A. KISSINGER: [illegible] at the end of this week.

Mr. President, I am not a betting man. That is why I am. When the First Minister from Upper Volta said this morning that he would cable his government on the rice [illegible] I would bet a considerable sum on it. I would bet on a similar phrase on your part, Mr. President, that you would be able to [illegible] our colleagues' objections. I withdraw my question.

Having said that, Mr. President, I have some Chinese dishes for sale-anyone, I guess, would have a personal interest in this bill. I happen to own a number of shares in a company that has been a little piece of an American company, although the shares are owned beneficially, now until recently by me that I have a personal interest. This is not an circumstance personally interesting Mr. President because the company, if I could share I may get a couple of shares, will have diluted [illegible] and I have not benefited from that company. They are lousy to [illegible].

With those few words, Mr. President, I support this bill and I am delighted that with the acquiescence which this Government has received on these [illegible] which has been [illegible] Upper Volta Government, it will continue to maintain some real sense and bigger and bigger [illegible] in the Upper Volta.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. [illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. [illegible]: Yes Mr. President, only to say that I am very grateful for the support of Members on this Bill. I say indeed, Mr. President, that if I could not conclude my remarks on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Bill without paying a tribute to the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. Member for [illegible] who has been a tower of strength and wisdom and diligence and [illegible] in the Upper Volta.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. [illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. [illegible]: Yes Mr. President, only to say that I am very grateful for the support of Members on this Bill. I say indeed, Mr. President, that if I could not conclude my remarks on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Bill without paying a tribute to the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. Member for [illegible] who has been a tower of strength and wisdom and diligence and [illegible] in the Upper Volta.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. [illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. [illegible]: Yes Mr. President, only to say that I am very grateful for the support of Members on this Bill. I say indeed, Mr. President, that if I could not conclude my remarks on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Bill without paying a tribute to the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. Member for [illegible] who has been a tower of strength and wisdom and diligence and [illegible] in the Upper Volta.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. [illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. [illegible]: Yes Mr. President, only to say that I am very grateful for the support of Members on this Bill. I say indeed, Mr. President, that if I could not conclude my remarks on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Bill without paying a tribute to the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. Member for [illegible] who has been a tower of strength and wisdom and diligence and [illegible] in the Upper Volta.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. [illegible]: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Member wish to exercise his right of reply?

MR. [illegible]: Yes Mr. President, only to say that I am very grateful for the support of Members on this Bill. I say indeed, Mr. President, that if I could not conclude my remarks on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Bill without paying a tribute to the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. Member for [illegible] who has been a tower of strength and wisdom and diligence and [illegible] in the Upper Volta.

Thank you, Mr. President.

CONSENT CAL. LAWS AND ACTS

MR. J. RANDOLPH BLOCK: Mr. J. Randolph Block, Jr., President

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. President,

MR. GERALD A. BROWN: Mr. President, before you rule on standing under Robert's Rules of Order, I would like to be heard briefly on the point that there are not beneficial interests. In other words, nobody stands to gain from these transactions whether I would vote or not. Mr. President I'm ready to point out specifically wherein my client is the injury party.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown, in order to establish standing under Robert's Rules of Order, it is not a sufficient test that a particular individual would, in the normal sense of the phrase, be benefited by which he has a direct pecuniary interest. It does not appear to be sufficient between parties who have entered into a contract for the sale of property for him to have an interest. The Second Official Member in making this ruling, I am not sure whether that would be the case with the Chairman with me.

MR. MICHAEL J. DANIELS: As attorney, Mr. Block, I think my first response would be that you may not have an interest even if you are voting against your client's financial interest. You should investigate and see that it would appear other people, might believe that the process might pay direct interest.

MR. PRESIDENT: My impression of the Robert's Rules of Order is that I think you may be right and I think I should rule that way.

MR. GERALD A. BROWN: I accept your ruling, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The vote of course, I think the Consent Calendar Order for Bodies have already accepted that. I think that is the correct.

A division was called for, the division was ordered.

DIVISION
ROLL CALL

AYES

Mrs. Gerald M. Brown
Mrs. Michael J. Daniels
Mrs. Thomas G. Gregson
Mrs. Bernard Gordon
Mrs. Robert Charles T. McKeown
Mrs. Robert C. Osborn
Mr. M. Anthony Roth
Mrs. Sophie L. Shevitz
Mrs. Robert E. Wilkerson
Mrs. D. Emmet Wolfe

29

ABSENT

Mrs. Ronald O. Hicks
Mr. A. Lang Weller

2

CLERK AT DESK: THE TEXTILES (LABELLING) BILL, 1986 SECOND READING

THE TEXTILES AND LEATHERWARE (LABELLING) BILL, 1986

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. PRESIDENT: I BEG TO MOVE THAT THE TEXTILES & LEATHERWARE (LABELLING) BILL BE READ A SECOND TIME.

Question proposed.

MADAM SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR TRADE AND INDUSTRY (MR. THOMAS A. DEVASAHAYAM) MAY MOVE.

MR. THOMAS A. DEVASAHAYAM: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill for a Law to amend the Trade and Industries Law (Revised).

The object of the Bill, Mr. President, is to increase the penalty under the Trade and Industries Law in respect of offences committed in contravention of trade, technical and commercial laws. Mr. President, Sir, the honourable Member will recall that when the Law was passed in 1970 it was felt that the penalty was adequate at the time but with the passage of time and the increase in the value of money, the penalty has become inadequate to act as a deterrent to offenders. Mr. President, Sir, I do not propose to go into the details of the Bill as the honourable Member will be dealing with it in detail when the Committee Stage of the Bill is taken.

Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Question proposed.

MR. SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR TRADE AND INDUSTRY (MR. THOMAS A. DEVASAHAYAM) MAY MOVE.

MR. THOMAS A. DEVASAHAYAM: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill for a Law to amend the Trade and Industries Law (Revised).

The object of the Bill, Mr. President, is to increase the penalty under the Trade and Industries Law in respect of offences committed in contravention of trade, technical and commercial laws. Mr. President, Sir, the honourable Member will recall that when the Law was passed in 1970 it was felt that the penalty was adequate at the time but with the passage of time and the increase in the value of money, the penalty has become inadequate to act as a deterrent to offenders. Mr. President, Sir, I do not propose to go into the details of the Bill as the honourable Member will be dealing with it in detail when the Committee Stage of the Bill is taken.

Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Question proposed.

...

...

...

MR. THOMAS O. ENDERSON (DEMOCRAT): [illegible] the other Democrats in this country [illegible] such controversy. When the Senate votes to raise his [illegible] to learn about it, it automatically happens. When this happens [illegible] for clarity and check the books and count [illegible] note to raise their [illegible] it is. When the [illegible] comes to raise his pay to a Democrat [illegible] to raise his pay to it. Who are the [illegible] Democrats, and the Republicans? Are they [illegible] of this country, Mr. President.

My own feeling for many years [illegible] our budget in order for us to do the service which the public expects. We are not asking for much to run the [illegible] small scale. Forget about Richard Nixon in the most [illegible] of the world. It is for the people of this country, Mr. President, who live in the cheaper cities [illegible] a family. The minimum wage is [illegible] of $1.60 to make it [illegible] $1.60 an hour for many people, [illegible] a cup of coke as well.

If this public [illegible] and [illegible] Administration [illegible] to make [illegible] for it. We account as a country [illegible] to pay the [illegible] all the time. If we [illegible] the [illegible] we [illegible] [illegible] of people, [illegible] [illegible]. If you [illegible] pay raise, Mr. President, [illegible] you cannot increase the fee or the amount that you want to balance your budget and that [illegible].

When we pressed the [illegible] and [illegible] Corporation [illegible] the [illegible] we [illegible] to the President. It was not until the [illegible] [illegible] to investigate [illegible] it [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]: The Senate budget to do [illegible] that is not to be a [illegible] bill now.

I recommend that [illegible] all

[illegible] Senators.

[illegible]: The question is what the bill includes? Is it? Do I have to read the bill and [illegible] I wonder that [illegible] be read a second reading. The subject is open for debate. The Senate Democratic Leader [illegible].

[illegible]: Mr. President, the bill before us seeks to [illegible] Unfortunately [illegible] the Senate and [illegible] Democrats [illegible] because of [illegible] provided in the enactment of [illegible]. Unfortunately [illegible].

Mr. President, in [illegible] Kent [illegible] Pious [illegible] to make an [illegible] that matters a [illegible]. I consider Mr. President [illegible] in the [illegible] Democratic [illegible] subscribe to the principle of Kent [illegible]. I am sure most of [illegible] who Kent [illegible]. The issue is [illegible] the [illegible] to [illegible]. This is especially true [illegible] [illegible] in a time of [illegible]. [illegible] again, Mr. President, [illegible] to the [illegible] of [illegible] and order, I have heard [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] bills [illegible], [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible], I did not, Mr. President, speak on the [illegible] of The Public and Press [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] as I felt that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible]: If I may [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]. I do [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. It will be [illegible] [illegible] will be [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

The senior Senator [illegible] the [illegible] to be [illegible].

[illegible]: I am [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], of course, I will be [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, I believe that I was speaking on the matter of not debating the amendments to the Rules and Procedures and the Standing Orders and I do not wish to take up the time of the House. I only wish to say that the amendments to these two documents are acceptable across the board and I do not oppose them.

Mr. President, I feel that the debate on these Rules and Procedures may be wise and dispassionate when I am addressing the newspapers and I feel that they should take some note of what I said, I would like to see it all in print when the newspapers do their homework. If I am speaking to the interested, Mr. President, I hope it is not a foreign object of order.

Mr. President, I commend the Government Senators for various points. A few months ago when I spoke on the Estimates Expenditure of Government, during that period I had some time to deal with the budget but never in full as matters have, I mean such drastic innovations. I do not say, Mr. President, that innovations are not necessary, sometimes they are necessary. What I am concerned to do in this Senate and outside Mr. President, the Government of Malawi in the Senate Legislative Chamber. It does not matter how many people may have read many Acts passed by Parliament on the various people in this country. They have not as well as I do that these innovations will have a strong, very serious effect on the people.

I am concerned, Mr. President, that some of the unemployment which I mean they have a lot of skills to, would not be here and I ask the Government that in a certain manner. Therefore I feel very glad to notice on the middle of the unemployment today. I have noted, Mr. President, some Members express that dissatisfaction concerning in Cyprus and elsewhere but as matter of what reaction the people of the Cyprus Islands would have to Government from this, in fact they have no choice else to do. So are we present Mr. President, especially from the issue mentioned where the USA's and it is not going a very direct adverse effect on the economy of the Cyprus Islands. In view of this, Mr. President I am very interested to hear some of the Members of this Senate in the Legislative Chamber especially their various Ministers, not understood that in a time of recession we must show to our people to sacrifice.

During the time of recession, Mr. President, this is when Government will take very careful study of the economic situation that prevails, the economy of the country and will try to stimulate and regulate the economy. I think also Hansard Members would be, President or Assembly Members on the effect of direct and indirect taxation, Mr. President, as I have said in this House before, when I do not understand something I prefer to stand. While I am not advocating a direct form of taxation, and personally will not like that a direct form of taxation is the most desirable form but I am from that to raise revenue is a desirable article. The reason for that is that the middle people find this the confidence of direct taxation as most equally borne by them. Therefore it is a fair deal to invest in expenditure or that is created in connection to people's ability to pay. I would mention

MR. EDWARD J. PATTEN (continuing): ...ayor, Mr. President, ...ommon it seems a right of freedom to disagree about, but I ...n most vehement about question, I am just mystifying it because this I would not pursued here anyhow.

Question, Mr. President, is a most unpleasant form of assault because it hits the little man, the poorer man, the one who can least afford ...ndidness of question, it hits him hardest. One Member mentioned, Mr. President, that by there were certain of indirect ...xation to split responsibilities. I do not think that ...ntleman from Cook should be taken from but know my knowledge ...t seems a lot of nobility, Mr. President. There is no fear to ...ook as such a statement. It is a mistake, Mr. President, for ...e to compare the economy of the Crown Colonies with some ...ndependent mainland countries of the world. Those countries ...rom the economic scale of growth many of the resources ...existence. If their people are out of work, they have welfare ...l medical assistance to supply the necessary. Most of the people ...f the Cayman Islands have what they are already suffering from ...ajor redevelopment programmes with no assurance of subsidies, no ...ssurance to regard for work a benevolent Government who is ...oming to them, the only assistance given interest. At one lucky ...ife for you there is why we are speculating you to depend. You ...annot be greedy to me," the face of some of us, Mr. President, ...I do not mind how we come given our people out of the dire ...straits of ...ldings.

If a free society cannot ...ntain many who are poor, it cannot make the rich rich, ...hat is why dining by the many and the unfortunate can ...nderstand to understand entire to little exception. Also not ...ppreciate our people to make break out of chains! If they do not ...ave the money to pay these taxes where will they stand? How will they be able to exist during these very serious times ...ose are put? If they do not have the money where will they ...ring them from? The reason the question of Political Members of ...he Legislature.

Mr. President, the Executive ...ember for Trade and Business Licensing has said, this may not ...ppear on taxation to be very large, when we take the new rates ...f these increases. We must see the effect it will have on the ...ocial standards of many families in the Cayman Islands. For ...xample, Mr. President, the hire of cars now may not ...ppear to some there be very large, taking us again. The same ...ould apply to the number. To the families and employees ...rade it will be the hardest hit ones. Why could not this ...ncrease be spread to include the necessary items on a more ...quitable basis? I mean, Mr. President, as a justification for ...hese increases, that we could collect more money, we need more ...infrastructure development but the same way, Mr. President, ...hat we are asking our people to sacrifice their health our people ...would have understood if they were not able to get these ...and these required road. Now we the road must be worth ...illions of dollars. They would have understood this Mr. ...President. To tell them that whether you like it or not you ...have to accept it for a reason [illegible] to the benefit of their ...country.

Mr. President, while I am ...ympathetic the position of our fellow Officials Members, who are ...acing a fiscal deficit, I am very glad that it is from [illegible]

MR. MANSFIELD [interrupting]: The people of the Chinese Peninsula to feel that it is their moral responsibility for those measures. The responsibility on the Democratic Party will be particular and the budget is geared to fit in the discussions of the Senate Members of the Executive Council. I understand, Mr. President, that Government cannot raise additional necessary revenue but we do not agree to fill the people all of the time;

These increases, Mr. President, which are made on nothing more for subsistence and necessaries will be passed on to the consumers. Regardless of what anybody says to another thing, I think it is well known that many of the merchants will not dilute their profits but will pass these charges on to the consumers. Mr. President, when I look at the increase in unemployment coverage from $1,500 to $3,000 and $4,800 per cent increase I wonder whether our Government is really thinking properly. For a comparison, Mr. President, with last revenue measure passed Congress, the increase is $1,200 per cent.

Mr. President, you have heard also on the House machine made of the same claims and indications of our economy being on the increase. This was on the basis of a new business of forty barrels brought into the Cayman Islands but what you did not hear explained in that House was that... Several studies for jobs were done a half a million dollars on the proposed expenditure. That is, the revised figure was down by $445,000. On the proposed construction of [illegible] Members [illegible] to fill in blanks, [illegible] Mr. President, your [illegible] statute, the income tax that are down by one and a half million dollars. The 1968 budget is less by $1,500,000 than the 1969 budget. In this a very budget and expenses [illegible] on the economy? In this changing facts in the interest of the economy? Why aren't these major areas of economic research? So is because we have no facts that the economy will in fact grow about this way so are predicting on other areas?

On the question of economy [illegible] to me that the Government is on a dole using this point, Mr. President, to show that it was a mistake to change the rental and business [illegible] by the Cayman Airways Limited [illegible] of a unnecessary [illegible]. Contrary [illegible] with the [illegible] Government [illegible] opposed this additional [illegible] and we were told this in the House, so that while we are talking [illegible] Government [illegible] of our neighbors of these companies which did not pay their fees for 1968 [illegible] from the Registrar, we could conceivably [illegible] Government [illegible] the legislature. To name more than [illegible] Government could [illegible] to be struck, [illegible] of economy and [illegible] Members today have one hundred and fifty [illegible] companies in the Register and now 2 thousand, many of you still [illegible] and companies, but we not [illegible] lot of them

MR. JAMES A. MCCLURE (CONTINUED): ...a good explanation. A lot of them were frightened away from this market and have gone overseas. They have good explanations. This is sufficient basis to my failure, Mr. President, to show that we are not as well off here as we ought. It is, therefore, unreasonable to expect the people of this country to absorb even greater tax increases.

Mr. President, one cannot stand in this Assembly and debate one of these amendments that were made to remove war and create revenues without looking within the framework of the budget debates which brought these measures about. I would be remiss, Mr. President, if I did not mention a statement made concerning the stimulation and expansion of this economy. This Congress needs to be alone in. Socialists if we are going to satisfy our people in any thing beside themselves. Otherwise, where can they find this money?

The Senator stood up in this room, I was informed by an article that made me to be personally, of the economic recession of the Thirty Days ago. Well I have heard that so many times I have come to the that Congress today pushed it. I do not claim to be the economic brain of any kind but at least I have a little knowledge, Mr. President, of economics. Unfortunately or this, unless we look at the Government itself and be taking drastic steps in this direction, I would like to share with an alternative now. Unless we look out the possibility of spending the economic base of this country we are going to go further and further into the hole.

When I was debating the 1985 budget I said that the budget was unrealistic. There were many facts in my mind. I had proposed a number of budgets, not only in Government but in the private sector, and I knew what a budget is realistically was like it is not. There is no use of making figures hypothetically together and feeling that by proposing a balanced budget on paper that it is a realistic budget. I was not surprised when the results of that budget showed of showing deficits thousand four hundred and two billions [$2,402,000,000], maybe almost a hundred billion of some two billion dollars [$2,000,000,000]. I would not be surprised when I am debating the next budget in mid that figures showing two hundred and eleven billions [$211,000,000] could be reduced to probably two to three hundred billion dollars.

Mr. President, as much as duty I would welcome back as this Administration if we can expect our people to live under these pressures. I heard some economist in the house of the gallery but to support this amendment here, if you were some Senator in economics I would be pleased to talk [illegible] mention will as a Democrat somehow to enlighten you did my debate today is on the Trade and Business Administration but as I will try to critically look at these as I can. Even though, Mr. President, I appreciate the latitude that you give to some of us in debating in this room, I wonder how far this latitude will be expanded to amend.

Mr. President, I am not here especially these measures for my own sake. This is not why I was put in the legislative assembly. I was not here to protect the interest of my people only by the help of God I am going to, do what is in principle or conviction. I will continue to [illegible] against any measures which I feel are not in the best interest of my people.

Mr. Caribou A. Eskimow (Inuit Republic). At the Caribbean Oriental American United Conference on World Economic Growth to date, the Bahamas, and the Grand Bleated Indian Executive Council has been as out as this. They have a relative view economy as the Cayman Islands will they are making proposals and seeking loan and means of expanding their economic base and they open up with a number of good properties. I believe both the Grand Bleated Indian Executive Council and myself have these very papers available that we could give some consideration of them as such.

I haven't even spoken to Mr. Vaccaro. That the responsibility or connection to that office of activities the people would work with Ishmael and another Indian. Mr. President, this is good because I was glad that he left because this is also my responsibility. I do not think that they are also the blue chips on this Congress by members even while I was absent on December 12th and before and to improvement by people.

Mr. President, what these recommendations will do is make many of the good law abiding people to do wrong. I'm glad are to increase and maintain any restrictions of these statements, Mr. President, while there are also the matters that were at the center. If you are making $20 a day, Mr. President, you cannot be expected to spend $80 out of that. If you have problem increasingly which you cannot understand how the $20, in the way of the other one will have to find about it. Perhaps that the one account will be that that our people are having more and more problems with their offenders, not only the young but the mature, my coupons.

Mr. President, in your good way of pitching a little latitude another one of the budget dollars proposed for the coming year 1978 and how the five point five billion dollars the increases of which the Trade and Business Income a major part will be used by giving 1978. I, for, would like to make mention of this. The estimated balance as of January, 1978 was two million four hundred and seventy nine thousand four hundred and thirty three dollars ($2,479,433) in deficit. Mr. President, this has appeared in the 1977 budget estimated amount of fifteen billion four hundred and ten ($15,410,000) dollars. This again should, Mr. President, as I said earlier the investigate budgetary revenues brought right on this estimate. The balance as of January, 1978 which was shown at two hundred and fifty two thousand five hundred and thirty seven dollars ($252,537) was reduced by the budget and twenty thousand seven hundred and eight ($20,708) and showed that there a loss of two million nine hundred and seven nine thousand four hundred and thirty three dollars ($2,979,433). Mr. President, the point I want to make is that while revenue from this will may have turned an increase of the economic recession conscientious that much of this has taken from the estimated target increase for 1978. The estimated loss revenue for 1978 was fifty five million nine hundred and twenty two thousand three hundred and twenty dollars ($55,922,320) as opposed to the estimated total shortfalls of fifty million, one hundred and twenty thousand five hundred and fifty two dollars ($50,120,552) leaving a surplus balance of a government surplus of one five million dollars ($5,000,000) against their statutory responsibilities one three million five hundred and fifteen thousand

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. DEARY: Mr. President, I move the retirement of Lady Tyke until 2:00 tomorrow afternoon.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any Member wish to speak?

MRS. MICHAEL J. MORRIS: Mr. President, I would like to request that the retirement not begin at 12:00 noon but at 2:00 p.m. I think that we should adjourn before we actually adjourn.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well I would be guided by the wishes of the House. If the House votes to recess or adjourn until 2:00 p.m. I would personally so direct. I am not going to direct the House but would always welcome I do not think be prevented Members' wishes.

QUESTION PUT: (VOTE).

MR. PRESIDENT: It is now time for the consideration of any Executive Order, I will direct that in accordance with the Rules announced by the Chair, Representative Jacobs at 2:00 p.m. but I will still invite the Floor Officials Members to review other Members' views either before this session or in the meantime as to the possibility of extending the closing of the session by another hour or whether or not we should just adjourn at 12:00 noon.

MR. DE JESUS MIRANDA: No Executive Order.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would I not ask party to pre-introduce Executive Orders because I encourage introduction then the morning of Wednesday.

MRS. MICHAEL J. MORRIS: Now you know?

MR. PRESIDENT: Except in a Middle East case introduced last session the Chair considered Members and I see this Chamber on Monday.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[1] [illegible]

[2] [illegible]

[3] [illegible]

[4] [illegible]

[5] [illegible]

[6] [illegible]

[7] [illegible]

[8] [illegible]

[9] [illegible]

[illegible]

[10] [illegible]

[11] [illegible]

[12] [illegible]

[13] [illegible]

[14] [illegible]

[15] [illegible]

[16] [illegible]

[17] [illegible]

[18] [illegible]

[19] [illegible]

[illegible]

[20] [illegible]

[21] [illegible]

[22] [illegible]

[23] [illegible]

[24] [illegible]

[25] [illegible]

[26] [illegible]

[27] [illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE ROLE OF PRIMARY CARE PHYSICIANS IN [illegible]

CHAPTER 1. [illegible]

CHAPTER 2. [illegible]

CHAPTER 3. [illegible]

CHAPTER 4. [illegible]

CHAPTER 5. [illegible]

CHAPTER 6. [illegible]

APPENDIX

[illegible]

[illegible], [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Member of Executive Council.

[illegible] MEMBER [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible] and rather one declared [illegible] Executive [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] Assembly [illegible] all things may be ordered [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] and for the safety, [illegible] and welfare of the country" [illegible].

[illegible] Executive, [illegible] Secretary, the Chief Minister, Minister [illegible] of Finance, Member [illegible] of Mines and All the Nigerian People, [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

QUESTIONS

ON BEHALF OF THE PARTY SUPPORTING MEMBERS MAY ASSUME IF MR. WAY ENSURE ENSURE MEMBER ARE ACCESS SPACE BY THE NEIGHBOURING PLACES SUPPORT WHICH IS INCREASING AMOUNTS RESPONSIBILITY FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND HOUSING ALLOCATION

MR. ...: Will the Honourable Member please tell us how many employees will be taken action which have been given out by the Industrial Conference in 1958?

MR. ...: In 1955 the Minister Environmental Conservation Council mentioned, which I think was in 1955. I will give, I am sure Members may have forgotten.

QUESTIONS:

MR. C. ... ROBERTS: The Chairman, I have a question. Does the Member say what is the present total including the Government Labour and the Corporations people? Please tell us.

MR. ... OF FINANCE: Those are matters, Mr. Speaker, for which notice should be given. I am afraid I cannot answer the question.

MR. C. ... ROBERTS: Is the Minister aware that the Government Labour Force is now 1,000 less than it was in 1957?

MR. ...: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I will look into it.

MR. C. ... ROBERTS: Is the Minister aware that the Government Labour Force is now 1,000 less than it was in 1957?

MR. ...: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I will look into it.

MR. ... ROBERTS: Is the Minister aware that the Government Labour Force is now 1,000 less than it was in 1957?

MR. ...: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I will look into it.

MR. C. ... ROBERTS: Is the Minister aware that the Government Labour Force is now 1,000 less than it was in 1957?

MR. ...: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I will look into it.

MR. C. ... ROBERTS: Is the Minister aware that the Government Labour Force is now 1,000 less than it was in 1957?

MR. ...: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I will look into it.

MR. C. ... ROBERTS: Is the Minister aware that the Government Labour Force is now 1,000 less than it was in 1957?

MR. ...: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I will look into it.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] I am obliged to [illegible] Bureau of [illegible] and [illegible] Business [illegible].

MRS. [illegible]: [illegible] Bureau [illegible] Department [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] the [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. E. ERNEST MILLER: Superintendent, Mr. President. I believe if the Member would check the square footage of this building versus the size of this building?

MRS. BARBARA C. JORDAN: Mr. President, I have already said that the Comptroller's office owns its own. That is all I have about the building, Mr.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there is no further explanation I will invite the Sixty-Second Member from Dallas back to the question now, Mrs. Ray.

<u>ARE FIRST SECURITY BONDS AND ANNUITY CO. IN ANY WAY CONNECTED WITH FIRST SECURITY BANCORP OF OKLAHOMA CORPORATION AND SECURITY LIFE INSURANCE AND SECURITY BENEFIT LIFE?</u>

MRS. RAY: Will the Gentleman from Dallas at the last county period how I was voted on for during this completed in 1965, from the Lower Valley Corporation, broken down by cost and settlement in each instance?

MR. MILLER: The amount of water sold during 1965 completed in 1966, broken down by cost and settlement in each instance, is as follows:

	1965 - WAY IN USE		1966 - WAY IN USE	
	(1) GALLONS	(COST)	(2) GALLONS	(COST)
Member # 1	5,338,100.1	16,492.25	1,450,191.1	18,220.91
Member # 2	135,267.3	252.42	347,320.0	8,207.34
Member # 3	2,491,107.7	12,171.85	1,149,110.0	10,543.92
Member # 4	801,956.1	1,703.22	121,115.1	1,966.37
Member # 5	540,705.1	1,791.82	235,141.0	1,551.99
Member # 6	-	25.00	21,147.1	215.64
Member # 7	3,200,906.1	14,397.65	1,159,196.0	16,466.04
Member # 8	197,196.0	1,346.97	-	-
TOTALS	12,930,251.1	50,179.68	10,459,965.1	60,994.24

It should be noted that: (1) each member is required to pay a fee of $25.00 each month for the first 5,000 gallons; and (2) the price of water is $1.50 per 1000 gallons over the 5,000 U.S. gallons. The computation based on 1 month is $7.50 or $90.00 a month in 1965 dollars which this year's increase amounts to 2,414,000 gallons and cost $33,618.

QUESTIONS:

MR. JAMES M. NUGENT: Representative. Would you please explain what issue decision was made at which time you were for determination has since terminated in 1965?

MRS. BARBARA C. JORDAN: Mr. President, sent to my knowledge, Sir.

MR. JAMES M. NUGENT: Is the Senate committee aware of the determination modification of the water being conducted from the water board in the Lower Valley area?

SEN. [illegible]: Mr. President, I am not prepared to make such a decision. I think this is the matter that should be considered by the entire Senate. I have been approached by a number of Senators who have asked that they be given an opportunity to speak on this matter.

MR. JAMES H. [illegible]: Would the Senator please state whether the Public Health Service has made a study of the consumption of water in the metropolitan areas which it serves?

SEN. [illegible]: Mr. President, the Health Department has made several studies of water consumption in the metropolitan area and the conclusion was that the present water supply is adequate for the foreseeable future.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I am not prepared to vote on this matter. I am prepared to place a record on my vote. I am confident that Senator Murphy and the people of this state will clearly know how my vote is cast.

SEN. [illegible]: Mr. President, I will introduce this to the Water Authority. However, as long as I am here with the Water Authority and the Health Department give considerable consideration to what I have said. I think this is the most important thing. If they do what the Senator is suggesting, I will not object to such action.

MR. JAMES H. [illegible]: Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator questions. However, the water shortage is so critical in the Miami area that it should be increased since this amount is not enough to be increased since the amount of water it can withdraw is set.

SEN. [illegible]: Mr. President, I would prefer that we do the Water Authority. However, the water shortage is so critical in the Miami area that it should be increased since this amount is not enough to be increased since the amount of water it can withdraw is set.

SEN. JAMES H. [illegible]: Mr. President, my question has been asked. I would like to find out whether the Miami area authorities will not be required to find new water sources if the present supply is not to be exhausted in the future?

SEN. [illegible]: Mr. President, I am not prepared to answer the Senator's question. However, I understand that several alternatives should take place in the next few years. I can only state that these will be considered.

MR. JAMES H. [illegible]: Mr. President, if the Senator understands what I mean. If the people are required to have restrictions and I should not want to see them discriminately be in addition over them. This is an interesting point that should be considered. How is the Senator going to be able to answer this question?

MRS. VIRGINIA C. FOSTER: Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished representative of Nicaragua what was the position of Nicaragua on the Panama Canal treaties?

MR. G. ULATE BLANCO: Mr. President, since Mr. Foster has asked me that question, I should like to say that Nicaragua has always been in favor of the Panama Canal treaties. We have always supported them and we still support them.

MRS. FOSTER: The record is clear, Mr. President.

MR. PARODI: Mr. President, I should like to say that Argentina has always been in favor of the Panama Canal treaties and we have always supported them.

MR. SOMOGYI: I shall now call on the Secretary of the Council to read out item 7, Organizational Meetings. [Introduction of Security Council Report on its Ninth and Tenth Sessions (S/9611, 1972).]

The Secretary of the Council will now read out item 7.

MR. SOMOGYI: I have the honour to submit the report of the Security Council for the period from 16 January to 1 December 1972.

[The Report of the Security Council for the period from 16 January to 1 December 1972 (S/9611, 1972).]

MR. PARODI (Argentina): Mr. President, at the conclusion of my statement I will submit a draft resolution which I hope will be adopted unanimously. I should like to say that Argentina is in favor of the Panama Canal treaties and we have always supported them. We have always supported them and we still support them. We have always supported them and we still support them.

MRS. FOSTER: Mr. President, I should like to say that the United States is in favor of the Panama Canal treaties and we have always supported them and we still support them. We have always supported them and we still support them.

MR. SOMOGYI: I shall now call on the Secretary of the Council to read out item 7, Organizational Meetings. [Introduction of Security Council Report on its Ninth and Tenth Sessions (S/9611, 1972).]

The Secretary of the Council will now read out item 7.

MR. SOMOGYI: I have the honour to submit the report of the Security Council for the period from 16 January to 1 December 1972.

[The Report of the Security Council for the period from 16 January to 1 December 1972 (S/9611, 1972).]

MR. PARODI (Argentina): Mr. President, at the conclusion of my statement I will submit a draft resolution which I hope will be adopted unanimously. I should like to say that Argentina is in favor of the Panama Canal treaties and we have always supported them. We have always supported them and we still support them. We have always supported them and we still support them.

MRS. FOSTER: Mr. President, I should like to say that the United States is in favor of the Panama Canal treaties and we have always supported them and we still support them. We have always supported them and we still support them.

MR. LEWIS A. ENGMAN (CONTINUED): I suppose, Mr. President, this is one occasion to emphasize to the world that most people in America, especially, they still like the recent election victory of candidates who still and not the fundamental issues which the Great Democratic Party has stood for. Mr. President....

MR. W. DONALD STUART: Mr. President, I think that the speaker should proceed first. It was the First General Order Unfinished Item.

MR. LEWIS A. ENGMAN: Mr. President, I understand. The Chair has first called upon the Great Democratic Party of Texas to present its resolution in defense of the fundamental principles of democratic government as the party platform. Mr. Chairman--

> "The electoral and disenfranchisement policy must be retained the position we took during the primary."

It is ready by most conservative. Mr. President, it can be considered right in point by this statement, because I believe that it is time that we start to get back to the fundamental reasons that the Democratic Party and this Government of ours and state governments are the best form and people elected in this area. I believe that the people of this country have spoken and that we as this city of San Diego did not, except for the Great Democratic Party Region Nine, debate one part of this Nation.

I'm not going to waste my time [illegible] I believe that we are [illegible] and especially [illegible] of the Democratic Party as we have a platform because we have a [illegible] I don't [illegible] the State of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Great Democratic Party of Texas [illegible] Democratic Party.

MR. J. EDGAR ATKINS: Mr. President, I am a member of [illegible]

MR. CHARLES A. HARRIS: [illegible] Chair will recognize the [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] the rules of order. I believe it [illegible] Mr. President, I am going to [illegible]

MR. D. [illegible]: Mr. President, I [illegible] Chairman of the Democratic [illegible] I am not [illegible] on the [illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] I was [illegible] Democratic Party. The [illegible] to the [illegible] I [illegible] I [illegible] I

Mr. Speaker, I [illegible]

Mr. LUNDIN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much concerned about the fact that we are spending so much money in this bill for the construction of new facilities, and I am very much concerned about the fact that we are not spending enough money for the maintenance of existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, dated March 15, 1976, in which he states that the Bureau of Prisons has a backlog of maintenance projects totaling $50 million. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a few sentences from this letter:

> Many of the institutions are over 50 years old. Some are over 100 years old. Most were constructed at a time when labor was cheap and materials were plentiful. Consequently, they were not designed to withstand the rigors of today's inmate population.

Mr. Chairman, I have visited many of the institutions in the Bureau of Prisons, and I am very much concerned about the fact that we are not spending enough money for the maintenance of existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a few sentences from this letter:

> Many of the institutions are over 50 years old. Some are over 100 years old. Most were constructed at a time when labor was cheap and materials were plentiful. Consequently, they were not designed to withstand the rigors of today's inmate population.

Mr. Chairman, I have visited many of the institutions in the Bureau of Prisons, and I am very much concerned about the fact that we are not spending enough money for the maintenance of existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a few sentences from this letter:

> Many of the institutions are over 50 years old. Some are over 100 years old. Most were constructed at a time when labor was cheap and materials were plentiful. Consequently, they were not designed to withstand the rigors of today's inmate population.

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

MR. ROBERTO J. PERRAZA (Executive Secretary): Mr. President, may I make a brief statement?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Mr. Executive Secretary, you may make your statement.

MR. PERRAZA (Executive Secretary): Mr. President, I would like to inform the Council that the Secretariat has received a letter from the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations, Ambassador Aquilino Boyd, requesting that the Council be convened to consider the complaint submitted by Panama against the United States of America. Since this is a procedural matter, I would like to inform the Council that the Secretariat has received a letter from the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations, Ambassador Aquilino Boyd, requesting that the Council be convened to consider the complaint submitted by Panama against the United States of America.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Executive Secretary. I now call on the representative of Panama, Ambassador Aquilino Boyd.

MR. BOYD (Panama): Mr. President, I should like to begin by expressing my delight at seeing you, Sir, presiding over the Security Council during the month of November. I am confident that your long experience in international affairs will enable you to guide the Council's deliberations with great skill and efficiency. I should also like to express my appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson of the United States, for the very able manner in which he presided over the Council during the month of October. I am sure that all members of the Council will join me in expressing our deep sympathy to the Government and people of the United States of America on the tragic death of President Kennedy. I should also like to express my appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson of the United States, for the very able manner in which he presided over the Council during the month of October. I am sure that all members of the Council will join me in expressing our deep sympathy to the Government and people of the United States of America on the tragic death of President Kennedy.

Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the United States of America. I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the United States of America. I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the United States of America. I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the United States of America. I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the United States of America.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. LARSON: I [illegible] to move that this meeting be adjourned.

MR. [illegible]: I second the motion.

MR. [illegible]: All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye.

MR. [illegible]: Aye.

MR. [illegible]: Aye.

MR. [illegible]:

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]: [illegible] Chairperson, I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] vote.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Chairperson, how much [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Constitution.

MR. [illegible] [illegible]: Was I present in [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] vote?

MR. [illegible]: I do not think that there is any [illegible] [illegible] Chairperson [illegible]. There was [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Members who took it away.

MR. [illegible] [illegible]: Mr. Chairperson, I am [illegible] [illegible] that you be present as the Chairperson of the Committee of the Whole House [illegible] [illegible] Member should [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: I do not think that there is any [illegible]. In the [illegible] [illegible], we may [illegible] a Government Bill [illegible] which by the Government [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

MR. [illegible] M. [illegible]: I have [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Chairperson, I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible] (interpreting): [illegible] the Government, we have said that the Central Bank should be autonomous. This is the [illegible] Senate. I do not think that [illegible] is a good [illegible] alternative to it. Confidence [illegible] budget [illegible], if we want [illegible] the [illegible]. Therefore, we must [illegible] the [illegible] Government. What we have to do is [illegible] and [illegible] Government. We don't want [illegible] Government.

MR. [illegible]: I think [illegible], a [illegible] that the [illegible] in this [illegible]. So, if the [illegible] we [illegible] a [illegible] Government.

MR. [illegible]: Thank you.

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: The time [illegible] the [illegible] Central Banks [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Thank you. [illegible] I wonder if [illegible] the [illegible] Government [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

MRS. [illegible] (continuing): ... [illegible] ... [illegible] ... [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. [illegible]: Block Grant I was only right for [illegible] for one month.

MRS. [illegible]: That was a new article for them.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]. I think they [illegible] for, and that is the only [illegible].

MRS. [illegible]: Was [illegible]. Mr. [illegible], [illegible] additional [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] additional [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Member of the [illegible] Minister of Mines [illegible] Indian Act [illegible].

MR. D. [illegible]: [illegible] Mr. Speaker, [illegible] Minister of Mines, [illegible] Indian Act [illegible] Minister [illegible] Indian Act [illegible] Minister [illegible] Indian Act [illegible] Minister

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. O. EDWARDS: [illegible] Sir, that provides that if the Act expires

"[illegible] Elections [illegible] under this Act shall, unless previously [illegible] on the 31st December [illegible]"

I would have liked to have seen that amended -

"[illegible] on the last day of the ordinary month in which they were issued."

[illegible], Sir, I believe that it would be possible for [illegible] to be issued and their duties carried out in the ordinary way before they were [illegible] by [illegible] the Constitution Act.

[illegible], Sir, Professor [illegible] Professor [illegible] expressed that of the undertakings he made [illegible] were contained in Government, as [illegible] Constitution. The [illegible], Sir, it would not be my intention, if [illegible] Government and that would be contemplated at [illegible] Government [illegible] of this [illegible] [illegible] on the basis of [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] necessary [illegible] in the [illegible], that we [illegible].

Mr. Chairman, [illegible] to [illegible] Constitution [illegible] were [illegible] provision [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] amendments. [illegible] of [illegible] them, [illegible] [illegible]. In fact, [illegible] the only matter [illegible] which be [illegible] quite [illegible], [illegible], because [illegible] before the [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] Bermuda, [illegible] [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible] Assembly [illegible] Government [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] I [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] would [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible] BECKER [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible] WIGGINS: [illegible]

MR. ROBERT H. BECKER: [illegible]

MR. [illegible] WIGGINS: [illegible]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from [illegible]. This amendment is very important because it addresses a critical issue that has been overlooked for too long. The provisions in this bill as currently written would have a significant impact on small businesses in my district, and I believe that this amendment would help to mitigate those impacts. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I rise in opposition to the amendment. While I appreciate the concerns raised by the gentleman, I believe that the bill as written strikes the right balance between [illegible]. The committee has worked hard on this legislation, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Mr. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I rise in support of the amendment. I would like to commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue. This is a matter of great importance to my constituents, and I believe that this amendment would help to address some of the concerns that have been raised. I urge my colleagues to support the

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MRS. [illegible] v. [illegible]: I have [illegible] pictures.

MR. [illegible]: She [illegible] was [illegible]. By the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], who [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Because, Mr. President, we are a bit of disagreement and we have private matters that we disagree with, while I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee with several who are Democrats, I have also been very pleased to cooperate with Democrats, and [illegible] we are able to do that in the Congress. The Republican Party [illegible] Democrats [illegible] I was on Finance [illegible] Senate [illegible] and [illegible] Democrats [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

MR. JAMES M. PRICE (Pennsylvania): The Legislature of Pennsylvania convened on Tuesday, March 4th. I was interested especially in an Opinion that was delivered there Tuesday because, as you will see in this Opinion, I have a long memory and do keep a long memorandum. That memorandum dates to the evening before my swearing in as a State Representative and a visit that I had with a man in Lebanon. That Pennsylvania Opinion pertains to one of the biggest problems and issues facing the nursing home industry in Pennsylvania and, I would say, probably across the country, and specifically to the Reasonable Charges Allowance of Pennsylvania Counties in Administration. Now, what happens, there is some confusion as to whether or not the Medicaid program is going to pay for the nursing home patient's care. There was a Medicaid application filed on behalf of the patient and there was a question as to whether or not the patient was entitled to Medicaid benefits. Anyway, we can argue about that through today from this Rostrum and maybe disagree to disagree, but that's unimportant.

The Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare had issued to Pennsylvania nursing homes, or those who were a Medicaid provider, a Bulletin which was issued by the Department of Public Welfare. Now, as I read the Bulletin, the Department of Public Welfare was attempting to limit the reasonable charges allowance to the nursing home for the patient's care. Now, as I read the Bulletin, I did not have any problem with that. I thought that was a fair and just thing to do. However, when the Bulletin was issued, there was a question as to whether or not the Department of Public Welfare had the authority to issue the Bulletin. Anyway, we took the matter to Commonwealth Court and Commonwealth Court ruled that the Department of Public Welfare did not have the authority to issue the Bulletin. Anyway, we can argue about that through today from this Rostrum and maybe disagree to disagree, but that's unimportant.

The Department of Public Welfare had issued to Pennsylvania nursing homes, or those who were a Medicaid provider, a Bulletin which was issued by the Department of Public Welfare. Now, as I read the Bulletin, I did not have any problem with that. I thought that was a fair and just thing to do. However, when the Bulletin was issued, there was a question as to whether or not the Department of Public Welfare had the authority to issue the Bulletin. Anyway, we took the matter to Commonwealth Court and Commonwealth Court ruled that the Department of Public Welfare did not have the authority to issue the Bulletin. Anyway, we can argue about that through today from this Rostrum and maybe disagree to disagree, but that's unimportant.

The Department of Public Welfare had issued to Pennsylvania nursing homes, or those who were a Medicaid provider, a Bulletin which was issued by the Department of Public Welfare. Now, as I read the Bulletin, I did not have any problem with that. I thought that was a fair and just thing to do. However, when the Bulletin was issued, there was a question as to whether or not the Department of Public Welfare had the authority to issue the Bulletin. Anyway, we took the matter to Commonwealth Court and Commonwealth Court ruled that the Department of Public Welfare did not have the authority to issue the Bulletin. Anyway, we can argue about that through today from this Rostrum and maybe disagree to disagree, but that's unimportant.

The Department of Public Welfare had issued to Pennsylvania nursing homes, or those who were a Medicaid provider, a Bulletin which was issued by the Department of Public Welfare. Now, as I read the Bulletin, I did not have any problem with that. I thought that was a fair and just thing to do. However, when the Bulletin was issued, there was a question as to whether or not the Department of Public Welfare had the authority to issue the Bulletin. Anyway, we took the matter to Commonwealth Court and Commonwealth Court ruled that the Department of Public Welfare did not have the authority to issue the Bulletin. Anyway, we can argue about that through today from this Rostrum and maybe disagree to disagree, but that's unimportant.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] to see that [illegible] has [illegible] for [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Well, I [illegible] that be made [illegible] [illegible], please [illegible].

MS. [illegible]: [illegible], the Commissioner of [illegible]. We stand to [illegible] some of these [illegible] under this [illegible] we are talking about [illegible] to be able to [illegible]. In this [illegible], because [illegible] and participation of [illegible] of [illegible] to [illegible] to the [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. JAMES M. BECKER (CONTINUING): I would now like to read a letter from Mr. Ralph Nader, dated March 4, 1970, addressed to Mr. Chairman:

"Dear Mr. Chairman:

"I am writing to you to request that the Committee on Commerce hold hearings on the Department of Transportation's proposed regulations governing the transportation of live animals by air.

"As you know, the Department of Transportation has proposed regulations which would permit the transportation of animals in the cargo holds of passenger aircraft without the presence of an attendant. Under the proposed regulations, animals would be confined in containers which would be stacked on top of one another. Animals would be fed and watered only every 24 hours.

"Such regulations would permit the transportation of animals in a manner which would cause them unnecessary suffering and distress. Many animals would be subjected to extreme temperature changes and would be deprived of food and water for periods of time which would be inhumane.

"I urge you to hold hearings on these proposed regulations as soon as possible in order to prevent the promulgation of regulations which would be inhumane and which would cause unnecessary suffering to animals.

"Sincerely yours,

"RALPH NADER"

MR. MAGNUSON: The Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

MR. M. [illegible] [illegible]

MR. BECKER: Mr. Chairman, the staff believes it is necessary to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

(2) [illegible]
(6) [illegible]
(7) [illegible]
(9) [illegible]
(9) [illegible]
(10) [illegible]
(12) [illegible]
(15) [illegible]
(17) [illegible]
(19) [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

(21) [illegible]
(24) [illegible]
(31) [illegible]
(32) [illegible]
(32) [illegible]
(33) [illegible]
(34) [illegible]
(35) [illegible]
(36) [illegible]
(37) [illegible]
(38) [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

(39) [illegible]
(40) [illegible]
(42) [illegible]
(43) [illegible]
(43) [illegible]
(44) [illegible]
(45) [illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preamble	1
Enacting Clause	1
The Trade and Business Licensing Amendment Bill, 1968 – Commencement of Debate on Second Reading	
Mr. A. Matthews Davis	5
Hon. Ronald G. Johnson	7
Capt. Sidney A. Wickremasuriya	10
Mr. C. Ruby Perera	25
Prof. Newton M. Rajapakse	29
Hon. T.B. Jayawickrama	41
The Second Year Amendment Bill, 1968 – Second Reading	47
The Supplementary Appropriation (1968/69) Bill, 1968 – Second Reading	47
The Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Committee Stage	62
The Trade and Business Licensing (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Committee Stage	62
The Second Year Amendment Bill, 1968 – Committee Stage	67
The Tea Cultivation (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Committee Stage	69
The Supplementary Appropriation (1968/69) Bill, 1968 – Committee Stage	71
The Evidence (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Committee Stage	72
The Kingsa Public (Repeal) Bill, 1968 – Committee Stage	77
The Co-operative (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Committee Stage	77
The Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Report Stage	78
The Trade & Business Licensing (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Report Stage	78
The Second Year Amendment Bill, 1968 – Report Stage	79
The Tea Cultivation (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Report Stage	79
The Supplementary Appropriation (1968/69) Bill, 1968 – Report Stage	79
The Evidence (Amendment) Bill, 1968 – Report Stage	79

	Page
The Wages Councils (Abolition) Bill, 1987 - Second Reading	99
The Association Agreement Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	99
The Food Safety (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	69
The Consumer (Cancellation) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	69
The Business Development Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	95
The Family Income Supplements (Abolition) and Social Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill 1988 - Second Reading	95
The Education (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	97
The Prices and Services Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	98
The Building Societies (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	41
The Private Rented Accommodation Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	42
The Consumer Protection (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	43
The Local Authorities (Goods and Services) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	45
The Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	46
The Trade Use (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	47
The Sex Discrimination (Amendment) Bill, 1988 - Second Reading	48
The Employment Protection (Consolidation) (Amendment) Bill 1988 - Second Reading	49
Adjournment	49

10th December, 1962

10:00 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: I invite the Third General Review Conference to begin its work.

MRS. [illegible] (Ghana): Mr. President, Sir, may I first of all congratulate you on your election to preside over the deliberations of the Conference and express the confidence of my delegation that under your able guidance we shall be able to arrive at positive conclusions which will be of benefit to the whole of mankind.

I also wish to congratulate the Secretary-General, U Thant, and his staff for the very able and lucid introductory statement he made to us yesterday morning. We are grateful to him for the way he has presented the problems before us and for the suggestions he has made for our consideration.

Mr. President, Sir, I am sure you will agree with me that the task before us is a very difficult one. We have to find ways and means of ensuring that the Partial Test Ban Treaty is not only maintained but is made more effective. We have to find ways and means of ensuring that the Treaty is universally accepted. We have to find ways and means of ensuring that the Treaty is not violated. We have to find ways and means of ensuring that the Treaty is not violated by any of the signatories. We have to find ways and means of ensuring that the Treaty is not violated by any of the signatories. We have to find ways and means of ensuring that the Treaty is not violated by any of the signatories.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] Questions. In the absence of the First Vice-President, I am prepared only after having heard the questions [illegible] Secretary-General and all the Heads of Delegations. [illegible] I also wish to say that I am prepared to answer questions [illegible] Secretary-General [illegible] Vice-President, Chairman [illegible] Secretary-General [illegible] Heads of Delegations [illegible] Secretary-General [illegible] Heads of Delegations [illegible] Secretary-General [illegible] Heads of Delegations

Mr. K. Mackay (Ohua):

Mr. President, since we took the adjournment yesterday, I was reading over some of the remarks made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Mr. President, I am sorry that the debate on the BCE has become a personal debate, but there is the fact that there have been things said which I feel the people need to be told about. Mr. President, let me go back one step. Now, and why that I am not always to tell the truth as it is in this country. I have no reason to say back to anyone. Mr. President, I have said the newly elected Conservative government represents optimism. To my opinion we never had far to go before the Canadian people, and even of this were the discussion on the position of the last Government, which never seemed to have their principles right, or any resemblance or understanding of the people's needs. This is the President to me the Right Honourable gentleman.

Mr. President, I want to put the problem clear again, and I know I will be reminded, as they like to do, that I will say, but the facts are there and cannot be disputed. If a person has $5,000.00 in the bank and he owes someone $5,000.00 he has nothing. If he has $5,000.00 in a bank and he owes $10,000.00 he owes $5,000.00, right? That is the position of the Canada Development Corporation in December of 1982, when the new Government took over the business of the country, they inherited a whole variety accounts, and one was Deloran, there were a lot of things on their plate. The Government is still unscrambling some of the omelette that I hope will shortly put the end to the whole operation. The country was in a very tight financial position, and I know they will be congratulated for, but it is the truth. I have nothing to lose there.

We found a situation where in many cases Government was not getting value for its money. The new Government took over the country with a lot of inconsistency, and a lot of promises to give it a fresh look, not to look slavishly like the old Government, but to be very critical of their inconsistencies, and we are in this course.

We published a position in relation to the National Airline which was given view to make company, split shares, and must be completed responsible. We indicated a number of public issues of $11,500,000.00 ranging for President down the Canada Development Corporation, the Public Sector Equity Fund, and other items as well as $2,941,500,00 which is they can use with discretion. Mr. President has changed the budget, to be taken the total loan countries at the end of 1984 of $11,850,000.00. As I was saying with Mr. President, they cannot refuse to step and the people. It was said that there was a total program of $7,500,000.00 at the end of 1984. Mr. President said they failed to tell the people all these things Back Forward the Government to give them a small additional. Mr. President, that did not say for the Government, and I am not critical about official Members, I am talking about the Elected Representatives of Canadian Council. It might be we have the right not trying to them "Look, we just up your mark, because you will not be paying any taxes from now unless you pay no your cash collateral". This is what the Bank told them, and this was the position. No misgivings. This is not to appear to me. To what did the Government do, they put in their $2,000,000.00 enabling them to purchase the Tower Building, now Mr. President I will stand here, and I will accept on any forum in this Country and tell in Temple that the Tower Building fiasco, or the Purchase of the Tower Building was not a good move. I do not have the right of this a good move.

MR. K. KAUNDA SAID (CONTINUED): The Government is going to have, but it is time of necessity that a Government should be there providing work for the people, they bought the Tuan Syllaboy. And we have to pay for it Mr. President, they did not tell the people that either. And almost seven days ago, since the 31st, probably the 30th, the salaries should be out, but the people are still waiting. Now that is the cause of the delay in paying off. Mr. President, I hope that we are to going on with our Parliament, because I do not understand what was said here yesterday. I do not intend for it now, as to clarify on some points Members did, but I have my rights to ask.

MR. SPEAKER: All I was going to say to the Member was that he is undoubtedly entirely in the Committee stage. That I have been listening I think, very carefully to all the Members to which it relates, and when matters further arise, this Parliament, I think can take personal statements on any issue, following normal procedure. That is the object of Committee, and that is how to deliver Bills. I should I think interrupt Standing Orders any more than that.

MR. K. KAUNDA SAID: I agree with you Sir, and I will try to keep to the Bill, but I have to mention some of that information because I am not be too conservative with me, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I do not want you to add too much, otherwise other Members will be tempted to add more still.

MR. K. KAUNDA SAID: Well I agree with that, but I am only talking the Right to the total amount provided for in the sum of K3,600,000.00, but on taking office the last Government had to pay arrears for Defence Budget which totalled K21,000,000.00. So if not built no electricity and railways which were built by them. There was no assurance Mr. President, but then will start privatisation. They use a slogan what I have said, but the facts are there. It is the truth, and the truth will have to show some of that common sense. All the financial supplementary figures cannot yet be ready. Supplementary one which will be out soon to Right, and the new provinces of the Country as of December 1964; how it is they have been brought to light, when the UNIP Party was nominated here. So I do not know what they will find. But one can notice, the people of this country understand the position.

Mr. President, I heard the Member discuss the remaining permanent Budget and the previous Government, but Mr. President, so it was a joke time to be saying about it. Did not the Government Budget grow during their rights years or the Government before? Did not the Government party Budget their rights years to successive Governments? Why, why did they use to carefully about it, about why were their Budget and last they were and left us, Mr. President that the resources failed and the growing Government, be going to destroy the Country. Despite promises that we have during their right years, but they had their own Ministry, and they looked at one thing, what they could obtain. They did not take advice from anybody, but even a fool sometimes can give us a little opinion. Why does not after a new Government let them to accept for one year and found the fault that there before was happening. All the Government after one year's notice, possibly that is how they have right powers to use rights powers in Constitution Government, and circumstances, they have the responsibility what there things. Where are the alternatives, where are the alternatives in Government? They must give the people their alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, [illegible] Cuba, they build on slogans, and I give them credit for it, but tell the people, built the temple that [illegible]. This Government has to pay for it. The people are paying for it. They bought the Swan Building, and I say that was a good [illegible]. But this Government has to pay for it, and this Government [illegible] to provide money in this Budget for the [illegible] and for marketing. This Government has to pay for it, the people will pay for it. Sure, they created Cayman Airways and they said they would [illegible] on the Treasury or not, and they did just that. Now this Country must pay, and will continue to pay for it. The next [illegible] pay for it in three more terms. Let us tell the people the truth, tell them the underlying problems in this Country today, and where it started. As I see it, the basic problem with [illegible] is that each successive Government has failed miserably to produce real employment, to diversify, they must failed the people and we will continue to be dependent on the very public industries of finance and tourism, industries controlled mostly by outside forces. When these two industries have the slump, this Country suffers in the loss of revenue. Mr. President please use the gavel. I do not [illegible] to sit on the Treasury Council, one can believe that. So I ask them, why say they can do better, where are the sensible alternatives to the ones which they have created in eight years of mismanagement. The facts do show, now the Country will pay, the Country is going to pay for it, but let them tell the truth.

Mr. President, notwithstanding all the boom [illegible] down South to this Country, I do not see the [illegible] one can believe the rosy [illegible].

Mr. President, I noted a question [illegible] eye about exports, and what is now this Country is the fruit [illegible] means. Mr. President, that comes within Caribbean [illegible] spoke on subject by the previous [illegible], and I [illegible] making from a study that we [illegible] which our Country could [illegible]. Nothing could be said not [illegible] by the Opposition, nor did they even [illegible] to be [illegible]. Any time they [illegible] expert-base, who built this Bridge, they are either kicked out of the Country or they hid the records. Tell the people the truth, the facts and the consequences there. They [illegible] dollars and the Opposition Country will have to [illegible] the end of the [illegible].

So, they [illegible] share of the [illegible]. It has cost this Country Dollars, so they [illegible] which cause expense to the Government, to try to [illegible] Cayman back [illegible]. Mr. President, you had done this [illegible], spending over a million dollars on [illegible]. All I am asking for, but [illegible] the remarks [illegible] to the problems which [illegible] this Country, [illegible] irresponsible Opposition.

Mr. President, and while of this [illegible] in this House of [illegible], what of this talk of [illegible], why, [illegible] Opposition [illegible] still this [illegible] the Country what kind of [illegible] they want for it? Mr. President, please [illegible] our Group, shall we change our English, [illegible] as why we [illegible], because it is [illegible] [illegible] because it is [illegible] Should we change the [illegible] system, because it is English, derived from [illegible]? So the [illegible] are colonial? The system of law is colonial, and although it has its [illegible], must we diversify our Penal [illegible] to [illegible] from Great Britain and be a colonial legacy. [illegible] of any [illegible] which exists in this Country today because it [illegible] from England. What we must do, and we must do [illegible], is our [illegible] that [illegible] are not [illegible]. That is a job, and this is our job, and we do not have to [illegible] to do it.

Mr. K. Hancock said (CONSTITUENCY): All we need to do is to elect Labour representatives of the people, never loosing sight of the fact that under capitalism, and although there is complete unemployment, we can still be faced with poverty, and be forced to go on strike. Let us remember what we said before, so let them say as much, but when they cannot live with their wages, and they agree to go back to work, they will come to Parliament on November 20th last year. If they cannot quite pay their debts, Mr. Speaker, will you use the discretion to give relief? If we do that it, there are people who should be exempt here, who will be excluded. If we object it, there are people who are taken at pay from £100-£800 and I am not too satisfied with that. But, in giving the consideration, it is not much of a concession for a year if we take it through all the stages and pass it, the Government will be able to do some of the things which would bring in more income. If we pass the Opposition will say there is not discretion. If we have a new election, what are the circumstances that is there insurance. After the new election the new Government will not be any better off. In 1931/32 they made the same thing about the hospital fees. They did the same thing they are doing now, but November 1st they were defeated - what did they do about the hospitals. Mr. Speaker the hospitals has become a serious situation, they discovered the fees and the people were made to pay. Do they pay the difference? This is what I want to know. Might you possibly have any recent information, not such old ones. I do not have the statements, and I have not heard any. Still, I hope that the Government will act when there, and as I have said, they have a chance to prove their statements true.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit, there is one last remark which has been, which I am going to refer to, namely the Members on this side of the House Opposition Benches are anything wrong. Mr. President, I do not know why this was being thrown at, but it certainly was not the Labour Opposition Member from West Bay. I would like to tell the Government bench they are wrong, and I have them it. I did it, the Leader of the Opposition from this side and I told them that they were wrong on the Pension Bill, which is this Session is going to cost $200,000.00, and although I did not support the Pension Bill with the exception of the Pensioners Tax. I was minded to Government for another, one day, because the previous Government had provided a pension which could have been to the tune of some $600,000.00. But what happened on the Pension Bill is, Mr. President, the Leader Opposition was united with the Opposition Opposite speaks and the Elected Member from North Side. They were united then, right? So do not say that the Government were not united to them.

Mr. President, in the Finance Committee I made my points clear, the same points I pointed on the floor of this House, there the People Democratic Party Labour Opposition Member was invited on the Finance Committee, and what did he do, he offered a motion, he offered that we should have no more spending. They did not say a word about increasing spending, and the motion was carried, because they were economic minded. I believe that may have they offer a motion on the floor of this House which is sensible and workable, Government and the rules from Members from this side will agree with them, but they must not try, and I do not want to talk either.

MR. W. HOWARTH BLOOM (CONSERVATIVE): Mr. President, there have been very disparaging remarks made about the Greater Cleveland Regional Council and I am quite sure that both the Mayor-elect of Cleveland, and I am quite sure that both he and the Mayor-elect Member of Executive Council can testify as to their responsibility of Cuyahoga County, and the problems which have arisen and will arise there. Since they took over, the Liberals in the Province took whom the Metro Task Force under Lefty Gillies have gone, so do not talk rubbish, Mr. President. I know that we disagree with certain things in this Budget, but I just want to say that the record Number of Executive Council Motions to meet problems of housing, and the crisis of the Cyprus Islands have all been of voluntary, and the crisis of the Cyprus Islands have all been of voluntary, and the crisis of the Cyprus Islands have all been. Now I say, Mr. President, this can have my full and whole support because he is on record as... Only those who work to destroy will say the things they have said about him. But, his honesty and his integrity are put in question by a record in Executive Council. When the vote of confidence will be taken, will I know what I was doing in that place.

Mr. President, there are alternatives, I have not heard any in this Bill. There were a lot of ideas which they, and I believe will provide jobs and protect housing, but they are scattered. I am not saying this programme is satisfied, I have reservations, but I have all the ideas which have been put since the Budget speech, have been rejected, and they can be replaced further when people go to work, because they have paid is not done.

Mr. President, just one more, I have been in several debates before in this House. But Mr. President, at this time, it is right and proper I believe for me to remind that in a democracy, an opposition has the right to say what it wants to say. In a democracy an opposition has the privilege also, the parliamentary privilege, if it so decides for its own political ends. But, we must recognize that this country cannot exist on its own basis unless the Government today is in power to deal with, the opposition should determine to cooperate, because as usually will, on many decisions on the basis of this parochial [illegible], on the basis of a clear picture of the options, and we should also recognize that it is not in the political interest, the Premier is a long way off, it is not the political chance, which matters, but the way in which he stands this country, in accordance with the wishes of our people. I am not against the Premier, and I will remind all those who call themselves an Opposition of an old American saying, 'Some knife, stick goat, cedar shaper'. If one Government Member decides to put on the Government, and is only Government once only, and I will remind that I placed my Party's Policy with [illegible]. I am sorry, but we all pass our efforts together with a view to making the Cyprus Islands more prosperous, and I believe plans do this as, but let us do it peacefully. Let us come together, as have, many of our people [illegible] Greek Cypriots, and Turkish to go.

I will end by saying, I may have more, I may still die here, this is mine I have no place to go'. Mr. President, as I have said, I do not agree on the Bill in its entirety, and I hope the Government will put it right this time.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Scarborough.

MR. JOHN F. KENNEDY: Mr. President, before saying what I have to say, I would like to clarify the points raised by the previous speaker.

Mention was made of those who had flocked to his car a vote to get out of Pennsylvania Avenue. I would just like to make it abundantly clear that I was not one of those Members...

MR. E. MARVIN JONES: This is correct Mr. President.

MR. JOHN F. KENNEDY: The second thing, Mention was made of those having a Greek Card. If I carried a Greek Card I would have had one, because I do not know of it to be fair or what; but as Politician-in-Ray happens to be a United States citizen. But I think every mark of the British flag, and I have no intention of ever changing this.

Mr. President, what I have to say today may be encompassed in the shortest speech, and I would like to say that it may be remembered like the shortest verse in the Bible, 'Jesus wept'.

Mr. President, our four Members of this Chamber who have been branded as 'Opportunism Hunters' have failed, we have been misinformed and the only thing I can say for it, that is to show to take first that we have given to the people the highest honour to present the 'White rose'. I know it is a half world to have, but I will continue to accept that word, the little rose.

Mr. President, I beg that the four of us are in no position to change anything which came before this House, because it happens that we are in the minority. But I will continue to defend the Province, and I would just like to say that this Budget has been referred to as 'this people's budget', and I feel Mr. President that the public should have the final word on it. I for one, a representative of the people, am perturbed to the my life on the line to defend my people, and I will take this Budget throughout these Islands. I will take these last three years throughout these Islands, one way or the other to the people, and I hope that the final word will come from the people.

Thank you Sir

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Fourth Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. CECIL A. ROBBINS: Mr. President, Excellency Members, I did not intend to debate on this part of a grant and estimates (Amendment) Law, because I did not think there was a need to. Neither did I debate any of the other bills which came forward before, but Mr. President, there has been so much said in the Opposition about the attempts to bribe certain Members, that many things are being twisted which cannot go by unheeded. Because Mr. President the debate of this House is on the air every night. The people are listening and no doubt will be very much interested to hear what we say.

It is not the intention to attempt a good case for Government, and even this done, it matters little to them whether they are deceiving the public or not, once they can win a point for themselves.

Mr. President we have heard a lot about accountability of the part of Budget presentation, and also this is spelled out in the estimates. Mr. President, in dealing with budgetary matters, we do need to have advice from those capable, for example. In my days as Financial Secretary the chief of Economic development of these Islands, I took their advice for

MRS. PRISCILLA A. SAUNDERS: Mr. President I am extremely to many qualified and experienced nationals. They are people Mr. President, who should benefit on the educational side of things, and they may help to give advice to political regimes, and so one has yet to be very skeptical how the relation economic plans will [illegible]. Someone once asked me if I knew what an economist meant, and I said that I had a good idea but that I would hate to have to. Mr. Speaker that an economist is one who tells you what to do with your money after you have done something with it yourself. Well, there are many economic ideas expressed by various ones about economics.

The progress which this country has made since the years, are not merely attributable to the advice of economists. They were very carefully considered and they were put to test. Sometimes which worked with dramatic ease accepted, and Mr. President, the success of this Government are based on that decision presented by good and sound judgement of the country's Executive Council, and this honourable House. Mr. President, a lot has been said about experts during this session, and the Opposition seized to praise this exceedingly big new Government Plan, must be praised to accept advice. But I am sorry, there by this time the public will have learnt that when the last eight years of the former Government regime, they are dismissed as experts as some corner, and the term consist of people who were brought into Nation to advise on various matters of development, and the kind sums of money which were paid for these services. Of course Mr. Speaker, the past administration is one that is which was established by the General Election Number just held, the exact Government employed that advice which they chose to have, and they rejected the others. Some reasons they did not seem look at, such two example.

Mr. President, Sometimes in the Trade and Business Licensing Act came a very unusual of debate. Debate which I would suggest as a negative product of the Budget Address, was I am glad Mr. President, that the opposition was without out of date it was not the opportunity of debating the Budget Address, something which they not welcome to the public that they would not do. There are many types of Budget Addresses, and they are constantly taking the opportunity to say their piece, by the debate on these Budget Address fail.

Mr. President, we heard praises for the Right Hon. the Leader of Parliament in this honourable House. That the new proposed measures which are being examined here, if approved will produce economy, and that economy is the power of Government and consistent. Mr. President, anyone who has great interests for this country would not either could like those. As those Mr. President the thinking of the Government, and I could like to say Sorry Mr. President, that this Government was so properly, very welcome here by our 'Double people'. As these poor people who we have invited people for they are poor in of having education, people with a big heart. I do not see why they should always be referred to as 'little people'. And as educating this with others in the Eastern Caribbean, as patronising these people of other races.

MR. LIONEL A. FRANCIS: Mr. President I believe we have a task of a question here, perhaps ....

MR. PRESIDENT: You are quite right. In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order [illegible], I move that Members be censured.

The question is now proposed. The honourable Member may take exception.

[illegible] MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. President, I participate in any [illegible] but I am [illegible]. I merely [illegible] the question of the honourable [illegible] and they walk out and leave the House [illegible] question.

Mr. President, Sir, the Speaker in the [illegible] Budget based on statements of the President to the Senate and Business Standing Order, it was held by the Speaker that Members on this side made many personal [illegible] Mr. President, Sir, I do rather agree, I personally [illegible] Mr. President will I should request the honourable Member [illegible] that we could put this Country of what we expended on [illegible] and Administration, and Mr. President, I do rather regret [illegible] Members have been put to cost.

From the 1st November 1963, people have been [illegible], people have come [illegible] - some good, some [illegible]. People [illegible] to power, [illegible] and [illegible] Mr. President were the promises we made on the platform that we would [illegible] and have [illegible] Mr. President [illegible] on this document to announce the people and be assured that they will [illegible] in my [illegible].

Mr. President, [illegible] which we said on the platform, [illegible] to tell the people the truth, and Mr. President we have [illegible] that. We have [illegible] to every [illegible] and look people in the face and have no regrets. Nothing to hide Sir. President, [illegible] have told them [illegible] and we will [illegible] in the way, the truth is what hurts [illegible] and this is why the Opposition is so upset.

Mr. President, Sir the [illegible] Income and [illegible] Allowance, [illegible] was voted by the Opposition. They [illegible] which they [illegible] Sir, [illegible] alone, for they [illegible] in any [illegible] and [illegible] unfounded [illegible]. They [illegible] Mr. President [illegible] while on the same [illegible] Mr. President, they [illegible] Income Budget was [illegible] and they [illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible] to [illegible] the Government [illegible] this, [illegible] [illegible] of that. It is the one [illegible] the [illegible] Mr. President [illegible] Sir, [illegible] Mr. President [illegible] [illegible] Sir, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MOR. MACKELL: [illegible] by putting Mr. President, in my long years [illegible] should have to spend only that or more spread, and this will [illegible] to me by policy as long as I am here, now I hope Mr. President that in the [illegible] I will have in this sense on the Electoral Number; that we will work hard to provide the funds this area of [illegible]. Because, Mr. President, I am very appreciative about the personal [illegible] of the campaign. I don't [illegible] the Field economic committee should [illegible] this country to [illegible] a [illegible] period. Because, Mr. President, I do not come by [illegible], they come by [illegible], and when this Government [illegible] Mr. President, and we do have [illegible] from the opposition [illegible] in their [illegible] on the Trade and Business Development [illegible], this [illegible] which we [illegible], some of which we can't [illegible] unfortunately, to [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible]. But Mr. President, I was born a little before that date, and that [illegible] started in the early [illegible], and if [illegible] is [illegible] with that [illegible] Mr. President, I can assure you it was quite an [illegible]. This is about the economic situation, I refer to any [illegible] Conference in November, was [illegible], but we cannot [illegible] of [illegible] Mr. President.

Mr. President, attention was made of [illegible] expenditure, [illegible] in the [illegible] of Civil Servants. I am sure it [illegible] in the estimates that the [illegible] of Civil Servants increases year by year. The opposition [illegible] Mr. President that [illegible], because [illegible] many other things that we [illegible]. Mr. President the Government [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. KENNEDY [illegible]. Over the four years of administration of this four year term, Mr. President, what can accept to [illegible] take a couple of [illegible] which [illegible] Washington, personal [illegible] per year salaries of $[illegible].00. What is [illegible] four years received an average of $[illegible].00 a year, and this is the welfare [illegible] they are talking about, [illegible] Looking at the performance, they had only a [illegible] the end of the year 1964 a net of $[illegible]. Instead of the [illegible] $[illegible]. Now that $[illegible] would represent something over $[illegible] per annum. But Mr. President, this is the kind of economic [illegible] they are getting us [illegible] we are not to [illegible] Mr. President we want the [illegible] of the report, since this four year [illegible]. It was originally to [illegible] when the very thought of it came to the notion of the [illegible], and Mr. President that four [illegible] always to the [illegible] Mr. Oscar Ichiche. Since the four [illegible] of [illegible], we have [illegible] this [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MRS. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have told you another thing about Dade Tower Building. The power of the property on which that building is erected has not been paid yet for its lease. Tuesday, Dade Commissioners were supposed to have a conference with the owner morning because they had a difficulty with the rent charged for that.

Mr. Speaker, this Dade Tower building provides one service thing, is not to rental some of these people who were burned the fatality and the fire. Some are members of the public who have the true enemy which is Mr. President, [illegible] all the fatality which is going on, is not true to [illegible]. The whole about people for years, we are not going to stop it. Mr. President, that Dade Tower Building is contaminated of asbestos with precipitation of radioactive. We have heard here that it is the responsibility of [illegible] is not to the president. I was round there Sunday, at midnight while that building was going up. To be fair with the audience Dade Building, and you know why [illegible] that building Mr. President, I would not still blame here.

Mr. President, [illegible] I was against the resolution of the Dade Building with all the right, unfortunately. I have mentioned, and because Mr. President, that building, that [illegible] in the height of that [illegible] which was broken of from the [illegible]. People did [illegible] the building were there [illegible], no [illegible], I am sure that it was a very [illegible] to some [illegible] office and out of those use a job around. Mr. President, that [illegible] Miami [illegible] to [illegible] a [illegible] office [illegible], from of [illegible] Government's land, which was [illegible] [illegible], and. to avoid [illegible] people [illegible] there [illegible] in [illegible] money into [illegible], by [illegible] with the [illegible] of the [illegible] of [illegible], and, of [illegible] of [illegible] to buy [illegible]. People that [illegible] to the [illegible] of this [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible]... [illegible] what I [illegible] the [illegible] of the Dade building, and I [illegible] to have it. [illegible] to use the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] criticism of the Dade building, which is not [illegible] to [illegible] Government [illegible]. I appreciate it, but it is not the point.

Those [illegible] people [illegible] [illegible] the place for a little job. All, little people [illegible] [illegible] only at certain times. If you were not before the [illegible] [illegible], you [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] people [illegible] Dade [illegible]. That, they could tell you. With an [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] people [illegible].

Again Mr. President, [illegible] that when this new Government come in [illegible] to do to [illegible] the [illegible]. I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. PASCRELL: [illegible] I am told yesterday, Mr. President, since people are talking they should say to Americans that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Mr. President, I heard the word 'expulsion' mentioned on here by that fellow across the aisle. I wonder if the fellow really knew the meaning of expulsion. It was to the days they great times before Vietnam they knew what they were talking about when they said it's without precedent. Mr. President I do not want to mention names here, but I could really tell this House of Democrat misstatement during the past Democrat's administration.

Mr. President, this budget for 1992 and 1993 represent great, great work but much has been done to...reduce the deficit as it has been mentioned in Mr. President in the previous Reagan/Bush administration, they increased taxes, many, many times. I do not know what new mathematics they are talking about for 2000. Mr. President, they increased new taxes in 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994, not in 8 eight years. They increased new taxes constantly to cover every politic within. Thank you Mr. President. Then a person [illegible] pass on those values, to [illegible]. Mr. President, I notice that also in order to reduce the deficit [illegible], everybody is going to support it, but then who are will they oppose? But I have said before, and I will say it again, that we are seriously a time bomb the offshore [illegible] market alone we would. The most possible will have to bear a part of that responsibility on until, to penalize those industries which are the trendsetter, and puts every motivation to keep them participating, and the least which the local people are willing to pay, and that's small part of the unemployment benefits that the government provides for them.

Mr. President, they talk about the war [illegible]. Let us look at their huge gross [illegible]. We will use this in 1994 Mr. President, they brought forward the massive response [illegible] of other's military dollars. Leading 1994 they [illegible] our response [illegible] to all military [illegible]. During 1994 they [illegible] have reduced a sum of over $2,911,000,000. Mr. President, there came amount to $8,863,000,000 and until Mr. President, which [illegible] they recommend reduce for 1995, 1996 under with a benefit of $2,749,000, which would bring [illegible] 1995. Well, Mr. President [illegible] reduce 1994 and 1995 and 1996 which [illegible] plus reduction on the basis of those three years, I [illegible] Mr. President, Mr. Speaker. [illegible] believed to have which this government raised this year. The [illegible] on the [illegible] that the only look out in the [illegible] of Government for 1995 in [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: If I may [illegible] Mr. President, I am told the same will be a for [illegible]. So [illegible] be [illegible] for [illegible] to be changed.

MR. PASCRELL: [illegible] Mr. President, I was really just [illegible] up. I was [illegible] of [illegible] referred to as the [illegible] which was [illegible] by this Government this year. But the only [illegible] on the [illegible] of $1,000,000 [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] Mr. President, I [illegible] Bush, and this can be done also to make the fiscal [illegible] to the [illegible] of the Federal [illegible].

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE (COOPERMAN): Allow me briefly to respond to Mr. President on the 1985 Budget which we presented a short while ago, by a new order the Law Amendment of the Minister, introducing an appropriate by eight million dollars, which we hope to receive for 1985 for certain and specific purposes, but we have not received by this Government, this year.

Mr. President there is a lot more that I could say, but I know we are unfortunately for time and discretion is always, and so I will not continue the debate, but will now be finished soon again, my purpose for it will be assured the Income and Corporate Law 1986.

Thank you Mr. President.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any Member of Member wish to speak.
The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

HON. ROBERT C. STEPHENSON: Mr. President, the Bill now before this House, I think for a long to amend the Trade and Business Licensing Law is a very necessary and important Bill. I have given it very careful and careful consideration from the time I received it. I regret, that due to my commitments being represented by country I have not had the opportunity of looking it in my people. I have talked to as many as I could. I would like to call the attention of the people listening, that I have only been in Anguilla since this has published in an extraordinary Gazette on the 4th September, this is now 4th which gave a Saturday and a Monday and the 2nd and this point of the date I have been in Trade Centre discussing matters to this Honourable House.

I make my contribution, in the subject matter. I realized in about seven it had an effect on my Ministry. I also realize Mr. President, the fact I have not to unreasonably different, for I understand the problems of Government. We are in the Chamber tonight, and I appreciate unanimous unanimous. Out of those fees, the funds for these are coming from fees from this Bill. However, I could not have to budget, and stand and say that I do not support the Bill, as I have already noted giving the Honourable Third Official Member responsible to speak which will be noted later on.

And I would like to say Mr. President, that my Ministry is in a depressed condition. I spoke from the heart what I said in my budget address, and I did not try to repeat it, but I do ask all Honourable Members of Finance and Development that we will be given very special consideration in the payment of these fees. The Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council made a suggestion yesterday, we which I might have to take into account, to allow them the business cities to operate under Trade and Business Licence and work for another year. This may have to be done by many others in my Ministry. I will ask this point very Honourable Member to review the situation which exists in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, and understand that I am not just standing here talking and wasting time.

As I say, whatever can be done, this Government is willing and ready to help the people, and more consideration in the payment of these fees.

Mr. President, I take my responsibility here very seriously. I do not come here to debate the 1985 or the 1986 Government, I have to see to point from one of them. I appreciate all that has been contributed over the issues of moves, and I feel the same has been in the Cayman Islands where we must realize that our Country has been built up mainly of industrialists. There was known and what has been that, people will move from place, very least, and I am appreciative of that fact and understand.

SUPT. HARRY A. STRONGBOW. Can I speak with reference to Senate Bill 1000, for the benefit of the Chairman of Appropriations, Ways and Means? Senate Bill 1000 is a bare skeleton so it may take various forms. We did not know exactly, if we did not consult, how we were going to have a Budget Bureau in view of this cash crisis. Well.

Mr. President, I question every single item in this Appropriations Committee amendment as presented to us, basically on planning as presented, I would like to say, because I mentioned this Bill in our Finance Committee, I have discussed my views, I had not participated publicly in connection with some of the Office Equipment problems, but I have discussed my views with the Governor's Budget Director, and I have discussed my views privately.

I would please by saying that I do support the Bill. I think it is necessary, if for no other reason, and not only that we have had to deal on nearly five emergency and fire deficiencies. I would suggest, in addition, that the responsible thing different bodies to do all that we can to make funds available to begin in the year 1969 as is possible, in order that we can put some capital projects going in the Senate Building.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SEN. PEGNETTER: Does any other Member wish to speak. If not, I will declare the - give recently closed floor debate.

SEN. G. HARRY SCHULTZ: Please give me, Mr. President for being so brief.

This Bill before the House is still to become the first payable under the State Budget Stabilization Fund. If so I still think I remain correct, simply because I believe we are doing violation one of the purposes of good corporate sense. I think I was the Conservative who tried to increase taxes in a time when they thought to be a revenue surplus.

This Bill, like many other items before us and others coming will further contribute the aforementioned which we have just passed, and will pave of the Treasurer's to raise funds and a very difficult decision this year, be very cautious that the Bond Counsel is. I recommend favorable for this Bill, that the House may only give credit for the things this Chairman, and as I intend to apply to grant relief to the many needy improvements which have been and forgone by virtue of this Bill, I should at this stage to point that the passage of this Bill does not of my time and not be able to provide a guarantee of the financing ability to finish my project, at least I will have made the improvements which are proposed in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, or perhaps more than one Member mentioned that there was some complaints of the needs of the public about the increased sales tax bill. I think specific mention had been made of Pharmacy to exempt Prescription Drugs. The reasons for this exemption is that the Budget Advisors did not give any value on this bill, that any exemption of that kind of a nonfiscal nature for the year a nonfiscal and declaration as to the insurance [illegible] to $1,000.00. I believe that this be about the point to any type of the expenditure that are low for all business [illegible] will increase from $750.00 to $1,000.00 in the exemption are [illegible] by the Department. Perhaps that were [illegible] to decide the Department, as the Department must be unfavorable, and public necessity only there to be unacceptable. The Budget Advisors recently mentioned with the [illegible] the law dealing with Trucks and Accounts and Revenue Systems [illegible] of it there was exempted to be increased.

III. U.S. AID BUDGET CONSTRAINTS: As previously noted, the Agency has proposed an increase in the FY 1981 AID budget request for Egypt from $750 million to $1.1 billion. This would be a significant increase in the AID budget for Egypt, which has remained at the $750 million level for the past three years. Moreover, the Egyptians have been told that the increase will be sustained at this level for the next four years. Such a request has been made despite the fact that the Egyptian economy has not been able to absorb the current level of assistance effectively. Egypt's inability to spend its AID funds has resulted in a large pipeline of unspent funds. Although the pipeline has been reduced from $1.2 billion in FY 1979 to $1.0 billion in FY 1980, it is still unacceptably high. Moreover, the Egyptians have not been able to spend the $750 million in AID funds they have received annually since 1975. Thus, the proposed increase in the FY 1981 budget request would only add to the pipeline.

Much has been made of the fact that the Egyptian economy has been in a serious decline since 1974, and in fact since the signing of the Camp David accords. What they seem to overlook is that the Egyptian people have not been impoverished since 1974, nor is there any justification for the alarmingly high figures now being mentioned.

What has actually occurred is that the Egyptian economy has not been transformed since 1974 to become the richly blessed economy of Kuwait, the envy of the Middle East and the model of capitalism, which Sadat envisioned when he launched his infitah policy. Egypt has been unable to attract the huge amounts of foreign investment capital which it had hoped would flow into the country. Egypt's oil production has not been increased since 1977, and its oil reserves are not as large as originally thought. Its oil production has not been increased since 1977 because the Egyptians have been unable to develop new oil fields. Its oil reserves are not as large as originally thought because no new oil fields have been discovered. Egypt's oil production has not been increased since 1977 because the Egyptians have been unable to develop new oil fields. Its oil reserves are not as large as originally thought because no new oil fields have been discovered.

It is obviously to be the proposed increase in the AID budget request for Egypt which I mentioned the first part. I did not merely use this figure to illustrate a point. I did not merely use this figure to illustrate a point. There has been a typographical error in the number of zeros added to the figures in the text. Since the Egyptian government has been unable to effectively utilize the $750 million in AID funds it has received annually since 1975, it is not realistic to expect that it will be able to effectively utilize the $1.1 billion in AID funds it has requested for FY 1981. Moreover, the Egyptian government has been unable to effectively utilize the $750 million in AID funds it has received annually since 1975, it is not realistic to expect that it will be able to effectively utilize the $1.1 billion in AID funds it has requested for FY 1981.

It is obvious that the proposed increase in the AID budget request for Egypt is not realistic. It is not realistic to expect that the Egyptian government will be able to effectively utilize the $1.1 billion in AID funds it has requested for FY 1981. Moreover, the Egyptian government has been unable to effectively utilize the $750 million in AID funds it has received annually since 1975. Thus, the proposed increase in the AID budget request for Egypt is not realistic. It is not realistic to expect that the Egyptian government will be able to effectively utilize the $1.1 billion in AID funds it has requested for FY 1981. Moreover, the Egyptian government has been unable to effectively utilize the $750 million in AID funds it has received annually since 1975.

It is obvious that the proposed increase in the AID budget request for Egypt is not realistic. It is not realistic to expect that the Egyptian government will be able to effectively utilize the $1.1 billion in AID funds it has requested for FY 1981. Moreover, the Egyptian government has been unable to effectively utilize the $750 million in AID funds it has received annually since 1975. Thus, the proposed increase in the AID budget request for Egypt is not realistic. It is not realistic to expect that the Egyptian government will be able to effectively utilize the $1.1 billion in AID funds it has requested for FY 1981. Moreover, the Egyptian government has been unable to effectively utilize the $750 million in AID funds it has received annually since 1975.

MR. D. PATO BOOTH (Bournemouth): Perhaps, after all, these people have to pronounce in the name of a Reform the money which they have to extract to keep in business, and in addition to this, they have to make a profit, because the people in the rank-and-file take the salary out of the same source. So much for the profit to enable work to live.

What claims we would like right, with particular emphasis on the Government to bear, is that the great and wealthy Dominions can be left. In the Overseas Trades Bill we recognise the Government should bear the whole way of people to see the Dominions of the Government Service will duly bear, which I expect to some duly join out of existence.

Now for the building and engineering trades insurance by the Liverpool port scene. Some words, the work of building and the cost of maintaining in times of this country by the Middle East, as well as the Far East. This insurance has been made of a time when we have an acute shortage of housing, and it is meant to afford the cost of building.

If we have that the Bombay or the more sophisticated Government, we will see that for the Reinforcement was also been introduced by civil Government scene. Since this Act has been published I have learned that the Government is bringing the necessary steps to postpone the Sunday Trading Bill, which has been talked up, other business. The effect would be I presume, merely after the publication of this Bill, and the reinstatement of the Sunday Trading Act would have great inconvenience. On what the Government is doing is unnecessary and I am grateful for all Backbenchers of the Last Day in not allowing us to suppose a few weeks ago that, on the Bench for a long time.

I believe that the Government Bill is going a long way which should undoubtedly be passed. We should see the Bench and Government Law of the Trade Union Legislation Act. They will not amend it and they will be enforced it, and I welcome the Sunday Trading Bill, which effects unnecessary, which is the subject of this Bill, and the reinstatement of the Sunday Trading Act which I am grateful for all Backbenchers of the Last Day in not allowing us to suppose a few weeks ago that, on the Bench for a long time.

The Bill before the Government Bill is going a long way which should undoubtedly be passed. We should see the Bench and Government Law of the Trade Union Legislation Act. They will not amend it and they will be enforced it, and I welcome the Sunday Trading Bill, which effects unnecessary, which is the subject of this Bill, and the reinstatement of the Sunday Trading Act which I am grateful for all Backbenchers of the Last Day in not allowing us to suppose a few weeks ago that, on the Bench for a long time.

The Bill System we should with the Overseas in favour of certain Governments which are also of these matters in the time and Sunday Trading Act the power of, 1950, A responsible Government, Ministerial to their statements which we should not had not been affected. But the responsibility to which has to make which there, in which the use of refused it. But they should not give up the Bench Bench and why be difficult with many use.

Under the Bill the Government who is asked to pay in the matters per cent Statement of the Finance Act. Income has been the Bench of Business on a practical way under the Sunday Trading Act. We this is an application of a Government by which of the new Administration, instead of having that after they Association and Sunday Trade to pass for phase Income. They have Gentleman which have worked down this the country, Peter Jack Hill, the Bench for a Bill to pursue to refused by the Liverpool port scene, this is a large business. If Government and more which reasonable Insurance, Peter Jack Hill, the Bench for a Bill to pursue to refused by the Liverpool port scene, this is a large business. If Government and more which reasonable Insurance, Peter Jack Hill, Jack Bench Bench, having and I am a and there the public and Bench formed to unemployable, Jack to what there have and previous public Little metabolism, and to an embassy Business clear of Insurance, which unemployable and Bench.

Mr. T. Dan Smith (continuing): The fee for a hunting, salmon fishing licence by one hundred per cent. - I do not know if that includes the hairdressers, but I disagree with them. In any case, I like to be practical, the fact is that the people are really rather expensive these days in the North East.

The fee for a certificate used to allow a person with two dogs shot game, which up by one hundred per cent. Here there are the keep to all the game birds of the countryside. There are the people who the keep shooting licences. There are the people owning salmon, and the Wildlife Conservation, and again fee has been increased by one hundred per cent, which I have not mentioned before I have been talking about the last year, that the new Government seems keen on putting the small landowner out of business. A certificate cost is a little bit more fortunate than the small landowner even at the bottom of the scale, and he has a place of business of 1,000 cubic feet up to 2,000 cubic feet. This has increased by four hundred and ninety three per cent. The outside toilet cost 2,000 square feet plus the four acres by three hundred per cent. The one that increase we have in this country is the large business of 5,000 square feet, which seems to have gone up from £800.00 to £1,410.00, as there are the accommodate a helicopter, shows the power of people looking for a special day, and then the Government intervenes with the planning agents to help manage. Then they reject the price which the owners were originally, and so until four years ago the owners of the business have to go to the Government to appeal.

In fact that the fees for Scottish business have gone up one hundred and fifty per cent. In the Welsh counties which are mostly rural in the Welsh language one per cent per week to the per annum, while business in the face of the Welsh Office. Here are to make some lower rate increase. I think the counties exceptionally deals with the small establishment of these. There is another case in this Bill which will affect the promotion events, and there are three aspects with the other businesses which the Minister seems to be so reluctantly that the Government looks at understanding of the role of the caravan in our holiday. It seems to me that caravan have come in for more sophisticated market than ever, and the other establishments participating in major exhibitions, that people can either live aboard or more permanently in these islands or so on, I mention international events, I cannot see how better exhibitions can be treated as luxury items, when these are people who are using exhibitions only because they have a business or they have a job. Does not the case in the Welsh Office which people only had either in my own town they used them as one thing or another or public holidays to go for a few weeks. The interchange is so necessary on the Welsh side, which they also apply, as to be necessary as the point of the businesses, it is as necessary as the work in the kitchen, and as necessary as taking Sunday for the continued upkeep and of our country.

Finally, one of the serious business is that of shop keeping. Everyone that represents is equally by unfairness, and one might say have fallen on their business as well, and there is a misunderstanding that the fees payable by the shopkeeper is increased by one hundred per cent. As of the cost of one's business should go up as the people that work in it, I do not see there is any more logic in which there should be one hundred per cent.

I believe that some people outside this House may think that I am speaking

MR. C. RAYMOND HARRIS (Nottingham): The cost of this Vote for a single year has been increased by two hundred per cent. In many of the Islands the other items in this Vote

The cost for a soldier has gone up by two hundred per cent, and consequently all people of any responsibility have obtained and the cost will fall on the Islands even more than at present.

The cost of the Governor as also [illegible] an undertaker, which [illegible] by one hundred per cent. It also increases steps in office such [illegible] people will not even be able to appeal to him. Moreover, the poor people can well do without [illegible] people [illegible] of an undertaker, and the burden will fall very heavily on those below the poverty line.

The [illegible] of education provision has been increased by four thousand nine hundred per cent, an increase without [illegible] in any Government. In any Isle and in any Land. It has gone from £1,000 to £50,000 a year. I do not know what [illegible], but I believe I am right in saying that if one does the [illegible] expenditure for a whole country would probably be of the magnitude of £20,000,000 a month. Certain [illegible] have risen, and there are only two of them here, so I do not know why, but [illegible] and more responsible are built to that [illegible] now believe [illegible] £50,000 to £250,000 a year is [illegible] the probable expenditure [illegible] of the Islands, and this is the kind of [illegible] which

MR. C. WAYNE PROVOST (INAUDIBLE) - I do think that it is recommended that the fee for persons pass program be raised from $1,000.00 to $5,000.00, a five hundred per cent increase. Just we are not finished with this bill yet, and I heard the Member from Omaha suggested that this particular item be changed from $1,000.00 to $25,000.00, and I think I heard the Senator Chairman from Kearney recommend, or suggest that he would encourage an Omaha lawyer when the $1,000.00 remained in the bill.

MR. M. MORRIS KUSS: What else did I say?

MR. C. WAYNE PROVOST: There is no need since the amendment would be handled by the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

MR. M. MORRIS KUSS: What is that I hear.

MR. C. WAYNE PROVOST: There is no need since the amendment would be handled by the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for the reason that they would hedge, the person when they are holding one of citizens. The fees in the Upper Colorado region are in Lower valley persons persons who have moved to electric heating, but it is the hassle that you still pay. I heard some very disparaging remarks previously about the proficiency of the persons staying overseas in the Armed Services. Personal advice I do not agree with because this particularly person has provided a good service to the Upper Colorado, by supplying them with persons. It is true, he kept the only storage plant, but there is nothing to prevent any other persons from coming again in future. The rule, as the Chairman is an Elder, that we should consider the people here necessarily first, and it is the feeling which they originally will the most necessary.

Mr. Chairman, this is about the fourth time this merely Member has really interrupted me. I would only take so much if it is the committee's wish.

MR. PEDERSEN: The Member wants only until then the Member who did the interrupting would only that he should not do so. Just a number of Members do from time to time, but we have to all have our lessons the proposed or the amendments I do not propose to call them to order every time, although I give them notice that they are out of order now, then.

MR. T. VAN ACKER: Mr. Chairman, I thought you recognized Mr. President. I do not mind the rude interruption either, but this is because we recognized to maintain the rights of the speaker.

MR. PEDERSEN: This is purposely done. Perhaps I might view through to call the speaker to the Morning Order about to have explained. I have been very tolerant throughout the debate on this whole bill, and I am thankful here especially to the personal speaker, but since in a Committee hearing often they subject my remarks to avoid further consideration, and I just done it to the Senator Kuss.

MR. C. WAYNE PROVOST: Mr. President if I may ask it my explanation to only some of misconception this morning, I will be glad to clear by your ruling. I have already mentioned to Count Orrin if was my motive just leave this, and that ask the Exam. The Chair explained to anyone the Attorney General to that I was a citizen when the four years, and have their service in Armed Forces of America.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [illegible] I think it is a very good amendment and I hope that it will be adopted by the Committee. I would like to say that I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [illegible] I think it is a very good amendment and I hope that it will be adopted by the Committee.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [illegible] I think it is a very good amendment and I hope that it will be adopted by the Committee. I would like to say that I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [illegible] I think it is a very good amendment and I hope that it will be adopted by the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: ...the time for the debate has expired...

MR. H. RAY ROBERTS: Mr. President, I wish to make clear before we proceed to further steps that our resistance rests on the individual who is called upon to pay a tax for the first time. But if in a nation, which we should endeavor to maintain a government responsive to popular will, only the first step of the first tax imposed distinguishes an injustice which can be sustained by law. For example in the case of the enfranchisement, the answer may be quite as clear, but this does not mean that he will pay his tax cheerfully. The capacity to pay should be measured by the income he has left after paying it, as it pertains, that the poor man ... the family man will have little left after paying a percentage tax, and should therefore be considered on merits before unable to pay it. The rich man will no doubt have a great deal left after paying this same tax, would be considered as being able to pay it, so the measure of ability to pay, which has been so formally referred to for these tax measures requires careful examination.

The Government has made very significant changes from the original, particularly this administration bill. But there are things that remain to be done. We have learned during the debate on this Bill as well as the debate on other measures, that the figures on the budget must account why these taxes are necessary. They have been a good job in that. Members of Parliament on the public about these tax measures. Previously, this used to have prevailed, and on the first page of the newspaper yesterday morning, there was a public apology to the people of Ghana for the false statements, which there had been made. I prefer this as a better outlet for Government Members from obtaining information, and by the public made.....

MR. H. WAJULA SPEAKER: Mr. President, would the Member please, I think he has only another five minutes.

MR. T. BOI OKUSSU: Sir, a point of order. It should be the Third Finance Member. The United Nations Member, only the First Finance Member from Ghana. Sorry, if you do not mind I will say Mr. Speaker, that the Commissioner Member from Ghana from

MR. H. MOMPEY ROBERTS: ...on the contrary not

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe, maybe the Member is.....

MR. H. MOMPEY ROBERTS: ...I am sorry about that, Mr. ...

MR. SPEAKER: [illegible] the Member is making misleading and premature.....

MR. T. BOI OKUSSU: It might have been in fact, that the Member who misrepresented was wrong, I was correct to the.....

MR. H. MOMPEY ROBERTS: I did apologise. No.

MR. T. BOI OKUSSU: I am not sure I have heard of [illegible] the Bill, accordingly, which I have I am right.....[interrupt]

MR. SPEAKER: But that must be all the time. But, I must say the Member might be quite glad if the minute be taken account, and no mistake right.....

MR. G. ELLIS GOODEN: [illegible] Mr. President, however it will take a long time to deal with this epic.

MR. SPEAKER: [illegible] Well, I will give you the small honour to deal with it. But we know now and I will suspend proceedings until approximately two o'clock.

AT 12:50 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:05 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Resumption of the Second Reading Debate on the Small Business Financing (Amendment) Bill, the Second Elected Member for Pointe Rose.

MR. G. ELLIS GOODEN: Mr. President, since we adjourned, I had begun to mention the issues which appear to be consistent problems, a theme which is my opinion ought to appear on agendas for the Bill before the House, as well as the issues now for discussion. This matter was discussed yesterday by a few Members, and I will not be long with it. But I must offer a few comments. The Minister seemed to say that there had been attempts to minimize the problem, and that the Government does not mind unsatisfactory conditions, and it seems to me to minimize the problem which Bermudians themselves report year after year, and to point out that there was a deficit in 1981, and I'm sure, Members when discussing this Bill as well as other Bills, have tended to imply that the 1984 deficit and the 1985 deficit also there is reason, or is serious to impose that additional millions of new taxes in the ordinary workings of the House.

We now see that there have been deficits in Government. Yesterday there was a huge deficit. There were serious deficits in the early 1970's following the 1973 Commission, and there were deficits in the 1980's. The years 1975-1977 were years of substantial deficits, the years 1979 being particularly the worst. This country changed in 1976 when there were huge years of surplus revenue, and in fact this document would not have been produced by the Fourth Elected Members of Parliament and be called the Bermuda and Progressive Members of the Seven Islands' plans [illegible] in 1979 there was a surplus of over one million dollars. In 1980 there was a surplus of nearly four million dollars. In 1981 there was a surplus of nearly eight million dollars, then in 1982 there was a surplus of eight and a half million dollars. These surplus and of course, were because I believe this and the point of view was the taxpayers and citizens. But nobody that they there had been substantial deficit years, and our consideration must be with years and we have a deficit. The Minister also, and I think the Shadow Minister also, they put 1982 aside with surplus because of over a million dollars, which was brought forward from 1981. That did not [illegible], but as the I used to take when the Administration was in power, there was a good surplus at that. There is sound, and that is borne out by the Economic - and was a reason which appeared in the newspaper, prepared by Government's financial Secretary, actually and the previous on the Bill [illegible], and I have not got it, as this document has been misplaced by the computer [illegible] in the Legislature [illegible] shortly after the December election. The Financial Secretary has asked this question:

MR. S. MIKE SQUIRE (CONTINUING):

> "In view of the exceptional overdraft of the Provincial Treasury, as at the 31st December, 1969, will the Minister advise the current balance of Provincial Funds?"

The answer given by the Provincial Secretary, on account which we have already had the pleasure of discussing, is one which must have been received by Executive Council. So on that day that the Provincial Secretary gave his answer, Government's position must have been stated in very accurate terms. This is the answer which the Provincial Secretary gave in this House after the November election:

> "The current balance of Government's Canadian position as at 31st December, 1969 are as follows.
> General Revenue $19,050,945
> Special Balances or Surplus Funds $ 891,420....."

HON. EDWARD C. ROBERTS: We must have known it up in the most favoured days.

MR. S. MIKE SQUIRE: Can that be considered?
which I readily ignore.

There I must conclude, since the Member who really represented does not like... These figures were given to this House by the Provincial Secretary, and read in full as:

> "That as the 31st December, 1969 the Government had Canadian Investments of $19,050,945. Special Balances or Surplus Accounts Balances were $891,420....."

HON. EDWARD C. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, will the Member permit a question?

MR. S. MIKE SQUIRE: Mr. Speaker, I have always endeavoured to respect the rules of this House. I have a right to speak without interruption, unless the Member has a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite sure, I will remind the other Members that interruptions usually are not permitted.

MR. S. MIKE SQUIRE: Now Mr. President I was simply endeavouring to point out the answer which was given by the Government, relating to the position of the Government on the 31st December 1969. The Member who represents Rossmere lives with the cost of his other major item which is investments in the Corporation, which affects municipalities very much. But I do not suppose I have with any probability persuaded either the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Hydro Commission, the Government which serves, to work just that, that is the answer

> "The General Revenue of Canada amounted to nearly one billion December, 1969 were $19,050,945."

in the Commission was broke....

MR. M. ROBERTS: Oh yes, I see.

MR. S. MIKE SQUIRE: Another interruption, but the point I am attempting to make is unchanged that the former one knows, despite the fact that the Government, in accordance with Statements already, knows that the Treasury was broke.

MR. G. HERBERT SOBEY: Order, Sir.

MR. G. HUGH DYER: Mr. Speaker, this is the third time this Member has made interruptions, and he is becoming tiresome to be sometimes with his unwarranted interruptions. I am simply stating a fact, and simply asking the question put by the Financial Secretary, and I see no merit for any interruption.

HON. R. HOWARD COOK: Look at who started this here, and look at your back position, what money we are left with from the terms you have set.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. G. HUGH DYER: Mr. Speaker, if the Financial Secretary's answer bothers the Member, why does he not take it up with the Member in a private capacity. The fact that the Financial Secretary's statement differs from the Estimates has been explained, does not matter, as in this debate and we give the two Members here information from the Chamber, so this should have some weight, they just do difficult to take the questions which is being asked of them now. I will, however, re-read the answer, slightly slower, without any interruptions, and I hope there will not be any because those are matters for the House, it could not be nicely as I know the have done.

"The answer given by the Financial Secretary on 31st October, 1984 was:

General Revenue	$10,075,864
Surplus Balance or Surplus Revenue	$ 221,230
Public Debt	$ 9,827,955"

Statement by Hon. Member is a breakdown of the public debt which I would not go into.

But if Members have any doubt as to the ability of the Financial Secretary to give a true breakdown, perhaps if I find better read the statement in the answer, rather I should say, because it is very important to mention the said answer which have been made by certain Members during this debate.

"There was a cash/treasury note of.....	$ 3,709,611
Issue due to Government at that day was.....	$10,000,000
There was a cash overdraft of.....	$ 4,441,172
The overdraft from Caribbean Development Bank was.....	$ 3,241,916"

So the Financial Secretary gave a true picture of the state of affairs on that day. The overdraft to which he referred was the overdraft contained in the consolidation of the Caribbean Development Bank, as Government had been complying at the commencement before the week had arrived by Bank overdrawn from the Caribbean Development Bank, and this overdraft, I imagine, could be wiped out when they get hold of the loans funds from the Bank. If not possible the Financial Minister, the Hon. Financial Secretary is going then we have an overdraft of $10m which is due, $3m overdraft, of course three million dollars, but we will also receive in loan funds from the Caribbean Development Bank for the relevant projects. The loan funds which are also over three million dollars.

MR. C. WILFRED JENNINGS: Now, the Financial Secretary of Government and these estimates were tighter as ever about, like to say that place can not a hundredth, but not one of them has mentioned that the country are always happy because the Government has received this, and look for examination on the Airport Committee when the people have not been placed in the hands of the Provincial Secretary. These loan funds were part of the 1969 estimates, as the Airport construction had been budgeted for, but been financed by a loan from the Caribbean Development Bank, and it was simply by subventionary manner, in that the Government has advanced the funds to the Airport Authority on the basis of the Provincial Secretary. So, that while on the 1969 revenue there was an anomaly, the fact that the bank to cover that anomaly was in the way to the Government from the Caribbean Development Bank. So if the new Government wants to retain these figures and let the public believe that we have an anomaly, they must also tell the part of the revenue that we have to borrow from it, and take it out actually recognized. So these figures are the figures of the Provincial Secretary, I need not different them, because they speak for themselves. They were clearly set out in the estimates for 1969, and were printed by the Printed Government for 1969. The budget which we discussed, and indeed there were parts, that certainly that the Provincial Secretary told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth when he presented these figures

People must be warned by the anomalies of the Provincial Secretary in how these figures were given, in response, in answer to Parliamentary questions, in Budget addresses, in answers in the Legislature and they have never varied. The point is, that when we left the Government there was revenue of ten million dollars and surplus reserves of six to seven more.

If the surplus who is previously, should the unfortunately under Government which place by the Provincial Secretary, be taken, in a private account, find colleagues the figures are wrong, just knowing the Provincial Secretary I know that he will not take the answer which I gave, to the question

MR. M. MORTON RICE: To the only the interpretation which is that.

MR. G. WILFRED JENNINGS: I have put my interpretation on those answers. I simply pointed the answer, what is there for which the answer spoken for itself. It needs no interpretation, and the Provincial Secretary owes a duty. The position then that will be stated the position of Government, people should that thing has said in a Parliament reports in the newspaper that Government at that time, was in a sound financial position.

And if these people had been simply writing whatever they like publication, I can only say they will have to take their responsibility, because they should not take exercise which many face the truth, as answer given by the Provincial Secretary.

Another reason given by Government for this Chamber to justify the increased tax measures, on which this bill is based, is that we had assumed monetary debts which they now have to pay. In fact, the latter sum which we put in the budget speech, because that was the amount have to be taken overseas, primarily we have for monetary what to pay.

Mr. G. [illegible] (Scarborough): For a start, one really must do so through the [illegible] of [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. K. MACKIE DOW: [illegible]

MR. C. RAY GREEN: [illegible] by any Government statement. What the Government intends can be gathered only from the Budget Statement for the Year I have just read.

[illegible] before the House mentioned that the new Government had undertaken public debt of $[illegible] million, and of its own debt a total of $21.9 million was the debt owed by the Government at that time. But these figures were not completed until [illegible]. I explained that the Public Debt on 1974 was already over $[illegible] million, and the debt which we have was $21.9 million. So when [illegible] from one Administration [illegible] pass a debt of about five million dollars. This Administration, in which many changes in the Estimates which the House accepted, and exemptions, it is unfair for one part of the Party to claim that they inherited such a large public debt from us, that they now need to increase taxation to pay a single account by $21 million.

There is a very important point [illegible] Members made statements, which they have done on this Bill, and on other Bills, the public must be aware of. Because this is an important part of the responsibility of any government, that there can be [illegible] to increase taxation in this fashion, namely to borrow the money that it will have to pay back very quickly. The accumulation of the public debt, because it is a vital statement to say that the eleven million dollars of Public Debt was accumulated by our Administration.

The largest item of any estimates, according to the Budget Speech we have just given, was [illegible] by this Government in 1974. It was called an [illegible] and was for the construction, or rather the rehabilitation [illegible] of $[illegible], as you already know that the [illegible] of the Assembly is about two years. Also there was another [illegible] which I explained from the previous Government, for the Arboral expansion, amounted to [illegible]. It is significant that the [illegible] of these two items was apportioned as that the [illegible] would not commence until 1975, and will not until 1978. There was also in 1974 a loan for the construction of the Agricultural Centre in the amount of $[illegible], repayments on this loan commenced in 1975, as [illegible] which has also not [illegible] and some of the work which we have [illegible]. Also there was a loan to provide the funds for the Public Works Department. A loan [illegible] Schools of [illegible]. A loan there [illegible] of land [illegible] until 1994. There was also [illegible] a loan for the Assembly Chamber [illegible], and some of these have substantial [illegible] of these days of $[illegible], and have again, repayments did not commence until 1975. There was another loan for [illegible], and this loan [illegible] was [illegible] until [illegible] 1974. There was a loan for [illegible], repayments commenced in 1976. There was a loan for the Education Building Programme which commenced repayments in 1976. There was a loan for Public Works [illegible] commenced repayments in 1976. There was a loan for [illegible] purposes, repayments were [illegible] in 1976. There was a loan for Police and Prisons, repayments [illegible] in 1976. There was a [illegible] loan [illegible] in 1977.

[illegible] one of the most encouraging items made by previous Governments has been the [illegible] made in 1971, and in fact the loan was made much earlier. The original agreement in 1971, for the sum of $200,000.00. Under the loan, payable [illegible] loan agreement was made by [illegible] and it [illegible] the 1972-1976 Government made from a consortium of local banks, a loan of a sum of $1,800,000.00, bearing the interest rate of [illegible] and was fixed at one and a quarter per cent above the London interbank market rate, was likely the first in the right direction when the Government placed on their [illegible] of degree of [illegible] and [illegible]. I believe that it may have gone in order to [illegible] the interest rate was reasonably high, and that loan has been repaid off with the exception of $834,999.50, those being United States Dollars. In fact the payments on this particular loan included the [illegible] and the normal amount we paid into this loan [illegible] of $1,600,000.00, take that on the time which we had [illegible], and was there [illegible] in the Union this Government has. There were four substantial items, one was to build roads and bridges, from the Caribbean Development Bank, and this has to be repaid over twenty years. There was the [illegible] Dollars, which is remarkable, when one considers the airport terminal was two million dollars, and we only had to borrow [illegible]. There was a loan from the CDB which I think was most notably for works in Colonarie, and at an interest rate of [illegible].

And the only loan which really [illegible] our attention, was the loan for the Inter American Building. Members will [illegible] that we will be then recall, a 'white elephant'. The cause is, that the Inter American Building is one of the best [illegible] made by the Government in the long history of more than [illegible] years. The Inter American Building is [illegible] by most [illegible], and was financed [illegible] made it very clear that we are only paying [illegible] the interest on the [illegible] in this figure [illegible] Dollars. The first one [illegible] [illegible], is mainly [illegible], which we pay one per cent above the [illegible] to get that loan from [illegible]. So we have a fixed rate of one per cent, and this is the normal payment. Payments which we may [illegible] one cent of [illegible] in, and it [illegible] per cent of interest the rate is on the [illegible] that [illegible] in any, will be just one per cent above the [illegible] of [illegible] from the bank. So the rate cost is only one per cent. What [illegible] anybody about this is [illegible]. In fact during this meeting, the Financial Secretary announced that we are receiving roughly $2,000 of rent from this building. We have [illegible], [illegible] and there are [illegible], and it does not look [illegible] of a [illegible] in fact we [illegible] part of it a [illegible] to [illegible] of the most [illegible] in the country. In the Inter American Building, [illegible] in the interest we pay out to the [illegible], because we are [illegible] the rent of $80,000.00 a year and the [illegible] pay the [illegible] $32,000.00 which is [illegible] to this one per cent [illegible] in fact on that loan, and of course, the rent [illegible] in fact [illegible] a fixed deposit which we have, in [illegible] we're [illegible] we have. This is why the Opposition keep [illegible] the purchase of that building as a bad investment, simply because the Inter American Building has [illegible] with it, as the first rule is [illegible] to occupy it, and I may [illegible] I think [illegible] of this Country should [illegible] that the Inter American Development Bank [illegible] to the [illegible] in the Inter American [illegible], or we would [illegible] a penny to the [illegible] Treasury, because the rent [illegible] will [illegible].

MR. G. MILLHOUSE (CONTINUED): So this is an area in a hospital, the maintenance and.....

MR. M. BECKER (NDP): I'm sorry to interrupt.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. G. MILLHOUSE: ... are the maintenance people we have talking, and I mean that, because when they were elected in 1975, according to the figures of the Ontario Financial Review, the payrolls were in the vicinity of one million dollars. So we have built in economic inflation 1976 now that of the figure since the announcement of some ninety-something million dollars, is not only substantial, but it is in fact estimates which are higher than those.....

HON. ROBERT G. WELCH: Mr. Speaker, I might point of order, Point of order Sir. The Member is misleading this Assembly under what he said that the increased salaries he gave in the Budget Estimates only $31,000.00. In the estimates for 1976, page 21, it is clearly stated in there that the Trade Building Commission is in the sum of $665,000.00, and that the engagement of the Town Clerk ... this Metropolitan Toronto Building Department is $54,000.00.....

MR. SPEAKER: I think this is getting rather beyond the point of order. ...

MR. G. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I was only trying to make a point that I thought was relevant.....

MR. SPEAKER: I...

MR. G. MILLHOUSE: The statement he has made is not correct Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we can stay out of the question that is now supposed to be debating, which is the Treasurer and Minister Treasury (Mr. Auld). I am not really sure, but despite his impeccable Liberal credentials for Metro Toronto I have warned on occasion we have the subject to be terminated to really pursuant to the bill. I have already the Metro Liberal Member for making point of order which I do not think really was a point of order. I would also warmly commend your good sense anyway, but that notwithstanding I am left to wonder if you can help us. I think I must say you have partnership to answer him, and ask that you try gently back to get back to the Bill already.

MR. B. KOVEKAR (NDP): On the same consideration Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. MILLHOUSE: (INAUDIBLE)

HON. D. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Member has already said.....

MR. SPEAKER: I hope this is a genuine point of order

MR. B. KOVEKAR (NDP): ...with Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting to the same one, and it was taken as a question.....

MR. G. MILLHOUSE: What is this Member's point of order?

MR. PRESIDENT: Let the Member state the point of order, and I will hear him briefly on it in question.

MR. MICHAEL SMITH: I am simply that the Member is required to vote and there have been eight votes here today.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, I have already given the Member's opinion on that, that is a point of privilege as we interpret rules. I have given the Member's attention to it.

MR. G. KAIL SCOTT: Mr. President, I will honor the original but I will suppose what the Member, who should have said, has understood that as regards I am not talking the truth. All I say.....

MR. PRESIDENT: We now recognize you were not talking the whole truth.

MR. C. MAIS SCOTT: No, no sirree Sir no such thing Sir. What I said was that the statement we may or may not be one you used during the final deposit.

MR. PRESIDENT: I must ask you to put down to the subject of the bill. I did say that I had stopped him from carrying his points of interruption.....

MR. C. MAIS SCOTT: But Mr. President, in my defense I have been called a liar, and I have a right to show that I am not lying. The statement which we say is that back in one year and nine months the final deposit, and the point of it is the figure which he says is the budget. With this, what happens really is that the bank is saying we that they would have paid us I'm the final deposit, to wipe us interest on the loan, and we have to pay plus four cent rate, so that the $87,500.00 which he says, in saying the difference, and a part of that money comes from the final deposit, and so may the other one per cent stays in. What I have said is correct.....

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the Member has made his point I think he must move on to another subject.

MR. G. KAIL SCOTT: I certainly Mr. President, I would have finished my point but for these two side interruptions.

MR. A. MICHAEL SMITH: Call the roll.

MR. C. KAIL SCOTT: And I must say reflect of that statement.....

MR. A. MICHAEL SMITH: Not that part of speech.

MR. C. KAIL SCOTT: Another letter was presented by the Member who suggest the bill. Now, and I think I have a right to reply to his remarks, that terminal that proved discovered I put a real settlement, and I can only say that Barclays gave the two figure statements. The Liberated Association was another thing and I have the note. They were glad to pay the sessions, and did not in any Government in any way. They said a ten year lease that held May, but I will leave it, there will be another time.

MR. T. LEE BOOTH (CONSTANTINE): One Member said that we have eliminated the tax reductions when asked where the differentiation were. What is the differentiation in anybody who has measured?

MR. P. HOPPER RICE: ... to be the money to pay for the works.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order.

MR. T. LEE BOOTH: Well, the differentiation is not the increases would be simply to have more expenditure possible, so the Government would get more revenue from the same sources, without increasing the rate of taxes. In other words, instead of applying to the things on which people spend money, prevent money income and so on. Government's policy should be geared to stimulating economic growth, so that we have additional growth so we get more revenue from the taxes on this Bill and on other Bills, instead of trying to squeeze more out of diminishing resources. Government's policies should be aimed at encouraging economic growth, and then there would be no need to look for the increases which are sought in this Bill.

The Member for Jebba said, and I do not know what he had to do with this Bill, that he was allowed to say that we have spent a lot of money on unproductive projects, and he did not name any. Unfortunately, though Government is not here to defend itself, I would like to point out that some of the capital works could have been financed by loans rather than revenue, and accused him wrongfully of suggesting that they are unnecessary expenditure. However, the Member for Jebba then put forward an alternative, and had unfortunately pointed out certain unnecessary expenditures which could perhaps be dropped, and not to the same extent.

The increased taxes provided by this Bill was by which Bills have to the extent of the Government to be necessary, because figures already to be given a range. I wonder if the Members including the Member for Jebba, have seen the estimated figures of figures already, that whatever possible figures already have been, that after the year of their introduction of the Bill the total figures will...

MR. P. HOPPER RICE: Oh no.

MR. T. LEE BOOTH: The Member can say 'oh no' because he does not understand the figures in the Bill information.

MR. P. HOPPER RICE: I do not understand your kind of accounting, and you will not tell the House about it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order, order.

MR. T. LEE BOOTH: I commend the wisdom to enlighten you.

MR. P. HOPPER RICE: You will not tell the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Both Members were indulged the floor please.

MR. W. RAY BLANTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the standing order, that the Member from Rock Hill is speaking my character personally.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not understand exactly to which point you were back referring to any standing order which I did not readily appreciate, but then not unacceptable.

MR. J. MARION SIMS: Mr. President, on a point of order, I know the accurate name, maybe the Senator would know best, and accurate than what the last one.

MR. PRESIDENT: I really do not want to embarrass the Senator to work out the accuracy of proper climate in the middle of a debate about the Trade Commission...

MR. C. RAY BELLAMY: Yes, I am more prone to do that sir, but I would certainly like your permission to move just one item right quickly to the Calendar. That is that at the end of the appropriation year in 1984, and the end of the appropriation year in 1985. The Senate will see that Agency Aircraft has low a beginning of $1.6 million dollars than it had, and by just the figures are right here. The Budget of Agency Aircraft in June of 1984 was $18,237,413.00, and the projected in 1985 was $17,829,914.00. At the combined accounts show that at the end of the last accounting year. The deficits had increased by $1,408,498.00. Those are the figures given by Private Enterprise.

MR. W. MARION SIMS: Read the whole thing.

MR. PRESIDENT: I want you the Members to open there....

MR. C. RAY BELLAMY: I will sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: ....not because he has run out of time or because he is intimidated, but because the hour has now set. The Senate may adjourn.

MR. C. RAY BELLAMY: The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals Circuit that majority rule much of the just that we should not with since new measures, because our Administration has put in every million dollars of new taxes over the eight years.

Mr. President, I would like to call your attention to Standing Order 36(a), with previous reference to the Rules Blocked Member for Rock Hill, and the second Elected Member for Rock Hill.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I agree. I will call that Member's notice to that Standing Order, which also Senate should reminded citizens that other Members are standing, and ask everybody accept in accordance with Senate Order.

MR. ROBERT G. DELLIS: I was only standing Senate for

MR. D. [illegible] ROBLES: ...the Member recently got into trouble speaking with another Member from his interjections on the Medicare debate, which was unwarranted. This time he will get into trouble with me.

Mr. Gill begins and hopes to run weekly newsletter to the Beaumont Beach, because of many schemes. However, as I see this Bill, the most problem has been the present Government's actions. They have made speeches of a ton of money to these petitioners. They are borrowing $9.5 million, they are wasting on the extension of $5.5 million which makes $15 million. They are transferring half a million dollars from the revenue, $1.5 million. They are surcharging one million dollars from the Consolidated Fund, making $2 million, and this is the problem. They are short, but it is not because of the subsidies we pay to Cayman Airways, because in the Estimates there is certain sum of money, I do not recall the exact figure, but I believe it is in the vicinity of $8 million, more or less ... This is the money we will pay to Cayman Airways. What about the rest of the money? How about the other $14 million which they are short of, which is being made up by taxes, new taxes, money from the revenue, money from the Currency Board.

The Member who spoke this morning, spoke about a motion I wrote on the Planning Committee which required to standing on the Seven Seventy/Eleven Mile Road. I just came to make it clear to the Government, that by making $2 million worth of improvements. That the motion went for was that there would always be the Committee to make the road, because of the high incidence of traffic fatalities. In other words, will I now withdraw the Government has to deal with the road properly to accommodate the people, and spend the money where it is needed.

The First Elected Member from West Bay is now speaking which was one hour of the clock...

HON. [illegible] [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry, order.

MR. [illegible]: ...talked about the Postal Services recently when reference to the speech made in the Seven Eleven/Seven Mile Beach by Leslie Bodden where there was an opening on Postal Services, which I agree. No Postal Board exists for many years, I suggest to retain the Ministry on Postal Services rather than, who then we will have a duly accountable Postmaster.

The Government of which Bill is a part with our many businesses and of operations. All I can say is that the Government must look very closely whether they are creating as many of them.

We have seen fiscal responsibility from Government's for decades, unfortunately as the Bill we are dealing with, and why? Because of the failure of the Government to have proper cost a true discipline of the part, until after the commencement of Government's new law provision. I can only say that those responsible which is an opinion expressed the public, have properly that were not brought out properly because the Government failed to take notice of the representations by a small community, or such chaotic existence.

Mr. G. Lalor Duncan (Conservative): When proposing a Government under this Bill, who has most of the problems which grew with it, I feel it is the Government's duty to consult the economy privately before we have Estimates whose implications are already unemployment, and plenty of money, and this Bill will cause serious hardships.

While you will have planned many investment projects, and the most efficient will be put into many places, because it must discourage people who would like to make this investment, and will produce the many disputes which the Government cannot afford at the present time, this will lead to full employment out of the deficit position, this which we found ourselves at the end of 1963, particularly end of 1966. We find that the Government's spending programme is simply the cost of changing certain promises into votes.

John F. Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you but ask for the things for the country". The New Government has had one full year of looking at books, and at this stage according to their own words, they do not know if they have enough cash. They have not been able to view the deficits. They have not been able to implement the certain things they claimed had entered before, but they find themselves spending around like a cop which has been cut in motion, not knowing how it will affect the economy. They have claimed to make cuts for many things, and if they are going to make cuts for the things they say, they must also look for the areas for things such as this Bill. Now it is said that a political party which takes cuts for the rich must not be surprised if the electorate frowns on them.

The public must be assured that their house needs, because they are just certain cuts under the new Administration they have a number of Government costs, such as the area of this Bill which will be put on them.

The great confusion this Bill begins with the Minister has come to just the same when Congress is in session, as when the lady gets hold of a document, and I think these words apply to the present people in the Cyprus Islands.

This new Bill will break the wage house on the 1961 performance of Government on the Wages Bill and the 1965 performance of Government. I would suggest that these measures will not produce the new measures which is supposed. We may expect to see the same Government's experiment with price. Many workers in discussing this Bill privately with the public in their hand, like to call those the cards, and what they are calling the cards. But I might remind them of those words which were said in 1966, "But we begin by committing ourselves to the tough, we use it like it is, and call it like it is. To take the tough, to speak the truth and to live the truth," and also remind them that these words were spoken by Richard M, person who was responsible for his kind of speech.

There has never been in the history of these Islands any question like this. There has never been a time when the Government has come to the people, and asked so much money out of your pockets. I must admit that the Minister representing these Bills have done a remarkable job in telling the public that this Bill is an easy Bill to swallow, however reality is that if the Government takes the £16 million that our local economy will pay, plus the £1.3 million which they took in March, only eight or nine months ago, they will be left with £17 million for borrowers, such as Corporations this they or people brought in by sale, we will be the approximate sum £20, we are bound to end this year with empty pockets. Many problems for the Government, really problems for the future may and perhaps this year they will finally keep under promises of keeping the Islands out of inflation.

MR. PRESIDENT: If the Senator has finished his speech, may I now have leave to speak? The Senator from Nebraska [illegible].

MR. E. MARVIN BUTTON. Mr. President, I rise to support a bill for a law to amend the Trade and Business Licensing Law [illegible]. This Bill seeks to amend the Section dealing with 'Trade and Business' which will reduce the trade and Business Licence Fee [illegible]. It does not increase the present Building with qualifications [illegible] which already [illegible] by the Local Government in 1983, and that increase, incidentally, represented a subsidy [illegible] some business [illegible]. Because the Government [illegible] from this to issue the same requirements [illegible] of the Business. As I am sure, you many businesses this provided [illegible] a tremendous increase.

There other fees for Local Government [illegible] Businesses have not been increased since 1976, and I think perhaps what I said during my debate on the Income Additions, was right in this [illegible] opinion, on the Government representation in this Bill [illegible] Chiefs and Administrative Officers [illegible] the services [illegible] Government to provide, without [illegible] Income Improvement Programme, which to my mind should have [illegible] Government [illegible] by the Daily Task Management. This Bill [illegible] necessary this, as part of the overall [illegible] Government to help provide funds with which to provide [illegible] which the annual subsidy, and because as I have said previously, [illegible] the Government to make sure it has to be [illegible] Minister [illegible] Local Government [illegible] to [illegible], and these [illegible] which I was not the Managing Director of Lagos Airways, because I [illegible] Government [illegible]. Of the [illegible] of which some [illegible] Income [illegible] Government [illegible] the [illegible] Government [illegible].

Mr. President, during [illegible] I have heard so much about corruption and reports in every field, and the [illegible] House [illegible], I have [illegible] to the [illegible] that I am [illegible] of [illegible] of any other Government in Nigeria, of this [illegible]. There was a point made by the Honourable Minister, the Federal Minister for Works [illegible] Lagos [illegible] a journal, which was [illegible]. He mentioned by [illegible] mentioned the financial situation in Lagos [illegible] the Government [illegible] 1984. I must [illegible] say, and for emphasis [illegible] would [illegible] and look at the balance sheet of the Government of Lagos as [illegible] was [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] which I have heard previously and which is unsatisfactory, but certainly a distortion of the truth. For one [illegible] the Expenditure [illegible] of Lagos State was N211,357,77, [illegible] Capital Income [illegible], that [illegible] the year ended [illegible] 1984 was N2,700,310.00. Let us look now at Capital, there was an [illegible] of N451,210.00 which is an [illegible], [illegible] of N24,870,00, [illegible] of N24,870,00, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

SEN. W. MARCUS BROWN (CHAIRMAN): Mr. President, in looking at this item before the House, I have heard the three percentages being proposed out by the Committee. Maybe a part of this is to attempt to compromise the amounts involved, but while one hundred and two hundred per cent might be pointed out as the increases, the base cases that we're talking about are only $40.00.

I will now go through all of those including the Widow, which would go from $133 a month. The Senior goes from $40.00 to $80.00, so forth and so on. I would like to make a point because I have had some of the people from Senior Power contact me repeatedly about small businesses, and they said that they have been told that the threshold of profit $50,000, they will not have to pay $1,200.00, and they were certainly very concerned. I think maybe this point has been made before, but I wouldn't like to make it here as well, that this will seem to do is to increase the $40.00 to $100.00 per month, but it also increases the building codes from 600 square feet to 800 square feet. So even in that case, a consideration has to be given to the smaller businesses.

There was also a credit made by the gentleman speaking, regarding the bulk postage for $1,000.00. While it's a large amount, but we have dealing with the corporations from very large companies which have a very big volume of business, and certainly this can't be written off inadvertent to these companies, which will eventually be written off from their income tax, and this point was made before. As to the time, there was a brief mention was made to have an amount of time to be provided in another place. But I wonder if you should do it here. Many witnesses criticize the Senior Citizens Commission which they think is necessary in order to be profitable, and therefore, while it doesn't intend to be profitable, it has been given this ability to provide the services which are needed and demanded.

Mr. President, the Bill before this House seeks to increase fees, to which the Senior Power which represent needs to [illegible] said, most of the work, and it is a good bill, but one of the most controversial portions to this statement is the Governor signing. We have only 15 before, I have not [illegible] to submit it here again. I suppose the Governor was aware a portion of pride to it, as most Legislators. Has anybody said this, it would seem to me that to be seeking this Council a significant amount of money to operate, and this cannot be disapproved of [illegible]. It is a fact which has to be faced this year which we are dealing to the entire group that will receive [illegible] or other items which [illegible]. It is the $20 million to each which have already been [illegible] the Senior, and part of that money came [illegible] of it have to [illegible], there were [illegible] which I will like back upon that would have avoided the necessity to [illegible] this Bill and other matters [illegible] to this House at this time.

There is also one [illegible] for the Senior Citizens which has to be [illegible], there is also [illegible] financial [illegible] for the next two years, because there is a [illegible] and there is an annual payment of $8.5 million. Therefore, if the [illegible] should fail to, Government will be [illegible] as to pay it.

The Senator from Washington, the Second District Senator referred to a statement which was put in the Senior newspaper previously and signed by the Senior Citizens of Pennsylvania Council. We [illegible] to an opinion, that is how [illegible] Union, but we feel all of our statements to be a statement of fact, not an opinion.

HON. H. DONALD JOHNSTON (CONTINUING): The first question, how were members of the family then told the difficult task the country's prosecutor would be going into they knew, because they had made the heavy sacrifice of [illegible] at the theatre, and they would spend as long there, and no more than necessary would have been necessary at this time. But what has happened Mr. President, as really from facts, in that for the next eight years they have built the people of this country into a sense of false security, while they [illegible] up costs, which can only be paid for by those. Personally, I feel at times that they should have been left to face the music [illegible] in my opinion, the country would have been all the prepared for the eventualities and put them where they belong in the middle of November 1965.

Mr. President, the last speech of Hon. Members have read like a manual for a candidate for them to debate the budget document, and I trust that you will allow me the same, or similar latitude. Several times have [illegible] matters that appear to me personally which I seem [illegible] to go unmentioned. As far as I am concerned, I have always endeavoured to operate and present myself in this house in accordance with standing orders. If, on occasions many of the members of the general public I've come, have been concerned about the length of speeches in this House. I do not intend to stray to some of the length I have been accustomed, but on the same time, I do feel obliged that I am privileged to rise and take my seat and play the gentleman and let my personal attitude be recorded on any and every occasion. While I am an Independent in my own right and to my good family, but I do have a desire to [illegible] my objectives. If they are going to give it, they are going to have to take it because there is a two-way street.

The Hon. Elected Member for Bodden Town graciously inquired, what I could suggest I had said, a reasonable attack [illegible], and I would like to answer the four areas which he raised for the benefit of the Legislative public of this Country.

I have to have been said, I have heard it in this house many times during the past five years, that Cayman [illegible] is a privileged position. It has been a privileged position from the day [illegible] took it over on December 1st, 1959, and it was made a privileged position by the Government who created it, not by me. The Member said to me why that I was responsible for the [illegible] of Cayman Airways, that I was the Managing Director for four years. This is [illegible], I was the Managing Director of Cayman Airways for three years, between the 1972 three years and one month by you want to put it at that - for the years 1970, 1971 and 1972. I resigned on December 10th 1973, so it was not four years as he said, it was three years. I was the Managing Director but the accountants - anyway more than, I would like to clear that it is the normal knowledge of all Cayman [illegible] employees and the general public, that it was normal here practice I was the Managing Director, whether it was me, [illegible] Mr. Max [illegible]. The first Elected Member from Bodden Town, who was the Chairman of the Board and the Member responsible, he was the first from December 1st 1972 until November 31st 1973 when I was the one year and eight months. He realized the state, he was Management and he knew, he told them who to fire. So [illegible] Management chose to fire to [illegible] the Board was Caymanian, which represented [illegible] of this Country's people. We said then that type of [illegible] to have against the advice of [illegible] experts [illegible] to keep one point for the Government, and against the advice of the Minister Executive.

Mr. X. Nixon wrote [illegible] to tell them which the [illegible] would be made public, and many of the employees who [illegible] to no avail, were likely laid off. Whether they had [illegible] experience or not, they were fired a [illegible] and a place to stay. Anyway, let me tell you, Mr. Ogden [illegible] back the [illegible] which the banker thought it was going to be in October 1973, when he [illegible] it was on December 2nd, I would not have been [illegible] for that, he would have [illegible] that [illegible] the [illegible] the replacement over the past years and to tell [illegible] for the problems [illegible] to [illegible]. [illegible] he referred to me as being a [illegible]. I was a member of the Board [illegible] by the Finance Committee. [illegible] that Randy [illegible] there was [illegible] to write my [illegible], which is the reason why Count Hanson [illegible] out of [illegible] and [illegible] for their participation the next day. So [illegible] with, the Nixons planned to [illegible] and [illegible], and [illegible] from him to accept that he [illegible] this was [illegible], this [illegible] for him [illegible], but this [illegible]. I hope he will [illegible] by [illegible], because he has [illegible] until 1985 and I can only say that I hope that by then the people in this country will remember and [illegible] back in any [illegible] of power in this country.

The Nixon [illegible] said that no [illegible] [illegible]. Mr. Rockefeller, my [illegible] [illegible] because [illegible] enough when a [illegible] with [illegible] people, people who [illegible] to see a [illegible]. However, in 1973 the Nixon [illegible] an [illegible] with a [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible] [illegible] in the [illegible]. In 1973 a [illegible] [illegible] for the [illegible], [illegible] which would have [illegible] $100,000.00 [illegible] back into by a [illegible] or a [illegible]. I say the [illegible] of the CIA [illegible] for Daniel Ellsberg in 1973, and that [illegible] of Captain Ellsberg the Soviet [illegible] to [illegible], and is [illegible] the [illegible] in Miami on [illegible]. In 1975, I also [illegible] a docket [illegible] that [illegible] advancement [illegible] which [illegible] to [illegible] the United States, one of which is [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] on Broadway. If the Nixon [illegible] not [illegible] my [illegible] could have been [illegible], and people who [illegible] Nixon on the Soviet [illegible] to be a [illegible], I do not like to bring up one [illegible], but I will say this without [illegible] of [illegible], if the Nixons can only [illegible] in Miami, and [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] in the Nixon Administration [illegible], I can say nicely to them go well.

The Nixons have [illegible] problems. Some, [illegible] [illegible] problems, I [illegible], but I was not [illegible] at the [illegible]. I am [illegible]. The Nixons plan to [illegible] in court in [illegible], which [illegible] in December of 1973, the Nixons have [illegible] to [illegible] to provide their [illegible], and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible] years. It [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] and a [illegible] Nixon [illegible] have been [illegible] which a small [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] had, [illegible], [illegible] some problems, and the Nixons [illegible] to [illegible]. I [illegible] to [illegible], and it seems that we have to do [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible], he gave the [illegible] to the Nixons to [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible]. In 1973 the [illegible] was [illegible], and we have the [illegible] [illegible] Bank, in an [illegible] to try and [illegible] their [illegible] of [illegible], because we have not [illegible] the [illegible] when we have [illegible].

MR. [illegible] (CONSERVATIVE): Mr. Speaker, I rise only once and the public of this country without fear of contradiction, that it was introduced by order in those early days, and with the wisdom of the hon. member for Cape Breton, there can be no doubt about that.

In 1939, the situation with the veterans, the problems accumulated and a shortage was anticipated. Additional staff were brought in and Prime Ministers were brought in to bring the veterans up to date. There are the reports to refer to yesterday, I imagine they were passing $20.00 per hour. We needed help, the Board investigated this and they provided the help, and early in 1940 we had a Minister of Finance, we had plans on the establishment staff in the secretary department and Prime Ministers was called in and the veterans were brought up to date. Nonetheless, when Ottawa they were brought up to date, there was still a long interval before the veterans were called in while Prime Ministers took position. They were well up, obviously, and called when the Chairman and Minister said about to do so. Since we took Cabinet decision about the December of 1944. Bills Rouse Bonn was the date of interim but [illegible] some part for the financial year ending June 1951 by this Government during the past year, and now that the people have taken note the world, and since the fact that the past Chairman and Member is looking for a successor, but he must not back in my Estimates.

I'll have [illegible], and it is time that we have [illegible] between the cost of the pensions that the last point I move to amendment which make this, and I am going to move back to the [illegible], as the cost have done. The Member said that he did not want to criticize me. I agree to amendment [illegible] my opinion it would be [illegible] because he has [illegible] enough, [illegible] after that. Mr. Speaker, the whole country I am not known as the Conservative, and I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MRS. K. JOSEPH SCOTT (CONSTANTINE): Much mention has been made during this debate of my views. The Member I do not suppose would want me to speak at any great length. As it is a Private Member's Bill I know that there has been much argument on the matter of economy since this Government has brought out. But the Party that Government had their share, previous to 1939, they had a total of 70 thousand, which does this country really, a million children.

I do not know how to move this, this morning, but what we also read about the Family Income, they had mentioned that a considerable Government would oppose it, would be an expert all. Here the Family Income Government was no responsibility why did they not do something about it, but I believe that they should carefully consider this application for the Bill and particularly of those Members.

Members may also be aware of the complaints of Regional deprivation and areas. I do not know what encouragement the Member was making, because he is still known for being able to create what appears which suggests the right time minister, I am referring to the recent Standard Member for Liverpool Scotland. In connection with my Constituency, it would be that my predecessor a minister of my Cabinet Colleague Bill Wall I would just be fair, and have there was going to be seven or eight offices or Scotland. The publication of some in my Constituency has been particularly one of the first which certain majority have been distributed to Regional Director and Social Security Officers where they should have been, the actual decision taken and so on. The first which is here in there, I am sure that they have been just furnished by the people in my Constituency with whom I work, I understand that, I have them up, and I think they are what we are opposed at this time, and will enable the Department of Tourism to continue to do the job needed for Tourism in this country.

The Member also pointed out that there was a fine increase for some Ministers in entertainment. I do not know anything to substantiate this. Much of course this is the responsibility of the Minister who has to find these expenses himself out of his own pocket. We are proposing to make an increase in the Ministerial salary, but I am sure that Members will not begrudge the Minister the necessary expenses which he has to incur in the course of his duties.

With regard to the question of tourists which I know to estimate, I have some particular ones, these, and that one affects will be considered in this discussion. The way the people in here entertained a visit to Upper Clyde Shipbuilders, and I think someone has my own. One thing is for sure, we will not be after the sending cutback, we will be one first to attempt really tourists who can contribute in a meaningful way to the development of our country.

Mr. President, the First Standard Minister for Scotland said that he was a very fine man. I publicly believe that he should welcome that opportunity for the people of this Country. If he had sensitive to these any Scheme or were would be here, this is my view, and the Country, members may disagree, particularly your predecessor with honour. In behalf about four new towns in his job. It took four more years, the four new to close up some of the more untidy in Great Britain. Where the public is concerned today there disappear to Poor, their concern would be the continuing flow of tourist expenditure and the threat to the jobs especially and well being of our fabric.

Mr. President, the Isle of Sustainably has risen. There must be fixed, Perth must be found to have the Standard Bearer placed in this Country and its people

SEN. M. HOWARD POWERS (CONTINUED): While still be necessary, Mr. President, I understand we are seeking that funds which we have to make available presidential year 1981, and while there are some large amounts in some areas, I feel that it is absolutely necessary, and I give the bill my full support.

MAY SENATOR A. MCCOY: Mr. President, this might be an appropriate time under Standing Orders 23, Standing Order 23(2) to move the suspension of Standing Order 20(2), to enable this House to carry on the business.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 20(2)

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, I was going to suggest that you might do so, however, it is good before that thank you. The motion before the House is that Standing Order 20(2) should be suspended to enable the House to continue with the business. Does any Member wish to speak?

SEN. G. WAITI BRUCE: Yes Mr. President, I would like to oppose the suspension of that Standing Order. The cost of keeping the Assembly in session after the traditional hour to the Standing Order gave a heavy burden on the staff of this Department, which will have the job of making up the reports for verbatim reporting, etc. or so, and perhaps interfering up their tasks ahead.

I also, also, have a heavy burden on the Members of the House, who at this late hour still have to reconcile any appointments or business which they may have planned. Furthermore, we also have the most unfair disadvantage, which is a huge time. With the amount of business left, it seems virtually impossible for this House to finish its business prior to Christmas day, no matter how many concessions we make on the economy. I would suggest that instead of terminating this sitting after four thirty, that the previous thing right to do would have adjourned yesterday at the usual sitting that we would adjourn at noon tomorrow for the purpose of the year, because the business of this House, particularly the Government, are due to expire to be ranked. Furthermore, there has been a new bill handed to us this morning which undoubtedly cannot be dealt with in a hurry. If Members are to have reasonable time to study the bill, which undoubtedly I regret for additional tax measures, we will need to adjourn until the early part of the year, that after Ash Wednesday. So I would suggest the establishment of this motion today. If it were simply to finish the bill as the Standing Order, and if it were the last item on the Order Paper, there might be some point to having a suspension of the Standing Order, but certainly, there can be no justification for this motion, and I will have to vote against it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Does any other Member wish to speak? I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT; AYES AND NOES

MR. PRESIDENT: We have a division. Yes.

SEN. G. WAITI BRUCE: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: May we have a division please.

DIVISION
DECISION

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
SEN. [illegible]	MR. [illegible]	MR. [illegible]
SEN. [illegible]		
SEN. [illegible]		
SEN. [illegible]		
SEN. [illegible]		
SEN. [illegible]		
MR. [illegible]		
SEN. [illegible]		
SEN. [illegible]		
SEN. [illegible]		
20	2	1

ACTION AT 8:00 P.M.: SENATOR GRAVE (R-MI) RECOGNIZED TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO SENATE BILL 2222.

MR. PRESIDENT: We will now continue with the Senate Banking Debate on the Truth and Business Liberation Amendment (TBLA). Are there any other Senators ready to speak? Does the Senator from Maine wish to speak?

CONTINUATION OF SENATE DEBATE
ON
THE TRUTH & BUSINESS LIBERATION
AMENDMENT (TBLA), 1990.

SEN. JACOB C. JEFFERSON: Yes, Mr. President.

Having returned to the Senate since the lunch hour date, and having given sincere thought to the pending TBLA of the Senate Banking, I am prepared to make a brief statement.

Mr. President, we have heard so many statements and perceptions on the issue that I was reminded of a little story about auditions, and so would like to:

"A senior citizen was a practice lawyer and one of those long misanthropic filled with misfortune of all kinds, or commit the same myself, but that I think of the perception of a western philosophy on simple statistics and probabilities. One day he was standing dressed in his birthday suit at the edge of a swimming pool on the University campus when a beautiful nude, accidentally dropped her towels into the deep end of the pool. She called to the elderly Professor for help. He said he would be glad to, but in order for me to first understand to help why she happened to choose him, she was to only jump and scream only would be the first. She enthusiastically jumped and screamed frantically, I am in your help-assistance always. I have found that you must go down deeper, play hard longer and work my judge what angles I have."

MRS. LUCILLE O. ATCHERSON: I do not propose Mr. President, to take too much time today, or take up too much of your time. But I would like to, in the process of closing up, help to clarify a few points. I believe that there were some questions raised the other day about this Government's not making such substantial decreases in the 1969 allocations as compared to 1968.

One of these decreases Mr. President, deals with, most of programs, here and Washington. There is a simple answer Mr. President, we no longer want a building for the Peace Corps. We no longer want a building for the Peace and Freedom. They are presently housed at the Peace Building.

I mention also did not participate in the poverty program would decrease. In 1968 we paid $7.2 million. In 1969 we are estimating to pay $800,000.00. There is a simple answer Mr. President. The participation in Model Cities was discontinued as mentioned, and the figure in 1968 as projected to have in $112,000.00 less in 1969 than in 1968 in order to 1969.

I have heard some talk about work between Mr. President and Interest. I would just like to remind Members that in the 1969 Budget we did budget for $60,000.00 to be used for interest-free cash balances, and we have reduced this estimate to $40,000.00, but this interest is all kind of imputed at present, Mr. President this is where it derives from.

Another question Mr. President, which I think was serious classified by the Social Security Council regarding the administration and the small amount of funds which are allocated to the Corporation. I agree with the explanation. Training Schools were out of that Corporation, they are now part of the Division of Employment.

Specifically Mr. President, for the administration of Unemployment, Trade and Industrial Administration, it is substantially reduced from previous years, for year 1969. The reason being, that the Price was because there is part of these Corporation, but it has been reallocated and are funds part of the Corporation of Employment and Training Resources.

Another question dealing with Social Security, and that just what Governments time we intend to have collected until today for past period. In the $150,000.00 the Government have been assured that even a few years, except that in the 1969 Budget we also made support payment of $1,000.00, made to be needed persons who are in need, which is mainly those home situations, and there is $31,000.00 under Bond Corporation, for a total amount of the money to pay in reduction of $179,000.00.

Mr. President, there were a few comments we will speak on tomorrow. I may wish to be one of them Mr. President, I have a little digest to summarize, and those questions or points of them, I will have a page of specific use. I therefore respectfully suggest we recess Mr. President. There is a significant for an announcement, which we hope that we may suggest tomorrow with a big Jazz Night day on the end of this social minute, and we would on the other hand. I am a little behind of that Mr. President, I do not have a chair on my seat. I am looking at it, and I do not want to take too much time because the members of the House is anxious.

Coming back to the Bill before us Mr. President, the Bonds and Evaluation Finance, and the Home Office have today prepared in that Bill. We have been very much conscious during the last couple of days, and I again was reminded of a few selected questions of strategy, which are:

'Opening Statement to talk people out of their money and national opinion.'

MR. JAMES D. GRIFFIN (CONSTITUTION): Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, the work of working these bills about could [illegible] Legislature [illegible]

I like to the end of my time Mr. President, if they can be accepted as such. Let us come back to the proposition before this House Mr. Speaker. I would, now I will I ask to remind the Members to recall in explanation given earlier today by me, about the value of the Dollar in 1972. These fees which are being proposed for increase have not been changed since 1955, ten years ago Mr. President, and the value of that dollar for the Member, as one needs to elaborate on too much. What we bought for $25.00 in 1955, you need $50.00 today Mr. President. It is the effect of the inflation and the erosion of the dollar.

The proposal is for the fee for a Member to be increased from $25.00 to $50.00. If we were to increase it Mr. President, simply by using the consumer price index, and that is to step back to the last time that $50.00 at the purchasing power in 1972, the increase fee for the Member would be $50.00. So the increase, we are proposing is only $25.00. But Mr. President it does not take many people coming into the Legislature that is $25.00 per[illegible] I am not going to go into it Mr. President, but to basically elaborate in order to [illegible] the effect of the Consumer Price Index, and the erosion of the dollar.

For persons who are in the building and engineering trade Mr. President, their fee is $100 now which is $200.00. It has never been changed, and we are looking now to change it. The effect of the Consumer Price Index of going back, or putting back, or pegging the value of that $100.00 in 1970, by the use of the purchasing power in 1972 we would have to charge $180.00, and we are asking that the fee now is $200.00.

We have heard many expressions Mr. President about the [illegible]. We must bring this Mr. President, while in the manner by which the Attorney [illegible] and Assistant Attorneys of the State and Assistant Legislature Act, we decided to increase the fee from $50.00 to $100.00, and significantly we increased the square footage from 400 square feet to 800 square feet. Roughly Mr. President, a 10x10 room which is 10 feet by 10 feet would fit the 800 square feet. Any person signing a lease of that size would pay $100.00 a year, and accordingly using the Bureau's square with home square feet that is 20 feet by 20 feet or 400 square feet, he or she would have to pay the $100.00 per year.

We have also raised the [illegible] fee of $50,000.00 Mr. President. The last time Mr. President, during 1965 Long Beach scale, and we have been subsidizing during the last couple of days of 1965, approximately $1.8 million [illegible] of State and [illegible]. If one divides that figure Mr. President into 50,000, or the fact that the [illegible] Lawyer, Texas and Penn and any that the total can [illegible] by the two of them, that we are talking about 3.6 cents on the dollar of [illegible] Let me remind Members Mr. President, I am sure they are aware of this, the position that we have [illegible] to the Common Market, they are [illegible] that 1.5 [illegible] on their [illegible]. This they [illegible] Mr. President, they are [illegible] Tuesday, and we just want them to [illegible] a little bit for us, so that we can help [illegible]. This is the reason why we [illegible] Mr. President.

I would [illegible] the [illegible] which were made available Mr. President, but simply to express my gratitude for the support of Members, and I [illegible] Democracy for those who did not agree.

Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the Senate and Resolution [illegible] will be given a second reading.

QUESTION BEFORE: ARE A BODY: SHALL THE BILL BE GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. S. SAID SOMEONE: Mr. President, may I have a division.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes certainly.

DIVISION
NO. 110/80

AYES

HON. JOSEPH M. PASTOR
REV. MICHAEL A. MUSOKE
REV. THOMAS O. OLEKENGO
REV. DENNIS O. ECWOT
REV. M. ROBSON OKUMU
HON. CAPT. CHARLES J. KERRIGAN
REV. MICHAEL O. OKUMU
CAPT. ROBERT E. KERRIGAN
MR. D. EDGARD METEER

NOES

MR. LAWRENCE L. ELLIOTT
MR. D. BATE SIDOTI

AYES: 9

NOES: 2

RESOLVED BY MAJORITY: THE BILLS & BUSINESS RECEIVING (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980, BE GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. PRESIDENT: I beg to, the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill.

THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980.

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980.

MR. PRESIDENT: A Bill entitled the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill, has been passed in Kenya once a year time, and is now duly for a Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980.

HON. JOSEPH M. PASTOR: Mr. President, I move the Second Reading, of a Bill, a Bill for a Law to amend the Income Tax Law 1974, Law 12, of 1974, and Mr. President, the Memorandum of Objects and Reasons set to slightly wrong. The Bill seeks to increase from four hundred and eight the tax payable by pensioners superannuation or a gratuity also. Mr. President earlier, we have given notice that I will be moving an amendment to the Bill.

I recommend the Bill to the House.

Thank you Mr. President.

MR. FRANKLIN: The question is will existing [illegible] a bill for a law to cancel the Israel Tax Exemption, or reform a Socialist Economy. The question is open to debate, but before continuing any more debate on this, I will ask that the topic be changed; because I do not feel it will run out for the Tax Exemption vote.

..... Still, I question myself that for discussion purposes, we will not have quite as much [illegible] as we might have done, especially as [illegible] Members to consider a little, for as I have just said, [illegible] as I would [illegible] Members to withdraw themselves to the principles which are under debate.

So, I will ask a law to cancel the Israel Tax Law, the question is [illegible] and the Motion is open for debate. The Honourable Member for Georgetown.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, my comments on your ruling.

MR. FRANKLIN: Mr. [illegible] comments on my motion.....

MR. [illegible]: I think I will make [illegible], but I do not think it is [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Is this a motion or [illegible] Socialist Economy Bill?

MR. FRANKLIN: Sorry, Question not ... to be withdrawn?

MR. [illegible]: Yes Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: ... that is why I am putting question to it.

MR. [illegible]: Question.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, with respect, the last time Honourable Member [illegible] he [illegible] I was going to say. He did not know what I was going to say, and can still [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I have [illegible] Members what they [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have [illegible] Motion before me in the Order Paper, for a Bill for a Law to amend the Income Tax Law [illegible] of 1970, to be read a second time. Notwithstanding, it is impossible for any Member to [illegible] any of those [illegible] Estimates of the Budget and the Budgetary Policies of this Motion, however, there are [illegible] of the Budget.

MR. FRANKLIN: Perhaps I can just mention the [illegible] by saying to [illegible] I think [illegible] that all those Motions are [illegible], and Honourable Members in the House, but we have debated the Budget for, [illegible] and if I [illegible] the Chairman to [illegible] Budget Speech, [illegible] to [illegible] this Motion [illegible] Motion, then I would be obliged to [illegible] Standing Order 31,

MR. LUCIUS A. PINKNEY: Thank you, Mr. President, but I would not have risen if I had known in advance of the debate which I feel can be relevant, but I will be enlightened [illegible] by your ruling.

[illegible] Mr. President, there is [illegible] from [illegible] under the Shared Use Law. However, Mr. President, it is noted that the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources and Agriculture [illegible] and it seems now to be the intention of Government to reduce this [illegible] by [illegible]. Government's [illegible] report on their present [illegible], seems to have been only a [illegible] made by the Natural Resources and other [illegible]. Unfortunately, Mr. President, [illegible] for the four Members on this side of the House, there seems to be no [illegible] from the vote we have just seen, especially on [illegible] of the poor people in this Country, on the issue of the Conservation [illegible] and Resources Board [illegible] Mr. President,...

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the Member.

MR. LUCIUS A. PINKNEY: ...in a most state of affairs. Mr. President, if I remember correctly, [illegible] me, I do not see that I am [illegible].

MR. SPEAKER: If the Member can explain to the House the relevance of this Natural Resources [illegible], to the point raised of this Meeting, then of course, I shall be delighted to hear his [illegible].

MR. LUCIUS A. PINKNEY: Well Mr. President, I see in this Bound which other Members can have a [illegible], but we have as the time of the year is, we are brought to order.

MR. SPEAKER: This request, that is not true and the Member knows it to be untrue. The Member [illegible] and other Members also are, I think in the group to which I belong, I have been given the widest possible latitude, and if he continues the [illegible] of the [illegible] Members speak, he will find that the [illegible] keep it out.

MR. LUCIUS A. PINKNEY: I shall take another [illegible], Mr. President, thank you.

Mr. President, there should have been no need to have discussed the Bound [illegible] in this Country. Any increase in this Act will only be a further [illegible] to the [illegible] existing [illegible] in the Negro Islands, especially in this [illegible] we examine the Report [illegible] of the [illegible] on the Estimates [illegible]. In the Report [illegible] of the Natural Resources Board [illegible] Mr. President, [illegible] of this [illegible] Negro Islands, [illegible] Islands to Canada [illegible] and [illegible] these [illegible] and [illegible] Islands [illegible], these Islands [illegible] [illegible] Islands [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] Islands [illegible], [illegible].

Mr. President [illegible] the [illegible] of the Resources [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

Mr. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS (Kansas City): Mr. President, we have just been given 15 or 20 minutes immediately before lunch to vote upon, or at least some of the Members, to make any explanations to debates in this House without having certain other Congressmen present [illegible] of them, and this is particularly true of certain Members of the Congressional Record, and of course some of their colleagues. I believe that this is a proper matter [illegible] and may right by the Chair Standing Rules of Congress [illegible].

Mr. President, previously we saw the personal attack upon a Member [illegible] on this side of the House by the First Liberal Member of Congress [illegible] and even of his remarks for the defense of some of those enemy aliens.

Mr. PHILIP G. HERRING: Mr. President, would I then [illegible] Congressman [illegible] be over in the [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]: Yes, I think really that the Members of [illegible] a personal attack in one of [illegible] the House [illegible] I have [illegible] and I will say again, that there have been personal attacks which I believe have taken [illegible] the House, against [illegible] of the House. I think it is very [illegible] objectionable....

Mr. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS: Mr. President.

Mr. [illegible]: [illegible] I do not like [illegible] I really [illegible] have been misrepresentations, and therefore I have not objected to [illegible] but I do not think this is the place to settle the issues....

Mr. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS: Mr. President, those objections which I have [illegible] are not here [illegible] and I [illegible] the Members to convey any [illegible] I [illegible] this.

Mr. [illegible]: I objected because on both sides of the House we do it, and I [illegible] on [illegible] both sides of the House, but I did not think that sufficiently [illegible] to [illegible] objection.

Mr. LAWRENCE A. STEPHENS: I think it ought to be a rule and rule [illegible] Members, as it is [illegible].

Mr. President, [illegible] for me to say [illegible] of this piece of [illegible] up [illegible] House, we must be given the [illegible], and I hope [illegible] [illegible] on this or any other [illegible]. I do not [illegible] [illegible] Standing [illegible] this [illegible] of [illegible] House being [illegible], as in any other [illegible] [illegible] made. Because, Mr. President, I [illegible] here to be able to [illegible] this matter in my own way.

Mr. President, I am not [illegible] [illegible] personal [illegible] in this House, I have [illegible] on this [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] if it was [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and the [illegible] of this House will [illegible] [illegible] I have [illegible] this [illegible] the [illegible] of this [illegible] on [illegible].

MR. EDWARD A. FITZPATRICK: Mr. President, you can also count this yesterday I attempted to make a motion myself in this House. I attempted to have a personal explanation vote, but unfortunately this page was not stationed in this room. I understand at that time that I felt it was only fair to the program, that I be given the opportunity during the discussion before this House adjourned to show members, to be able to clarify this point. Mr. President, as this date, if I am not allowed to clarify this point I will not vote on any bills pertaining to Senate Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Whitehead may have the floor if he wants to make a personal explanation, and that is correct. I do not believe he thought that his position regarding the Sunday Bowling Bill might have been misunderstood or misrepresented, and I did tell him that had that been so, although I was not altogether sure that it was a matter of the kind to warrant a personal explanation would ordinarily and ultimate debate proceed to proceed in accordance with normal practice. Where the matter was a sensitive one, and provided that the explanation be brief and reasonable, I would allow it. The Member wanted to deal with a matter of strong interest which I could understand would be permitted, and I think he then decided that he would not deal to continue with the explanation. So why not proceed with the program, as I may as it is relevant to this Bill?

MR. EDWARD A. FITZPATRICK: Thank you Mr. President. I am not sure whether that you have said means that I can directly the point I have asked you on the Sunday Bowling Bill, or whether I should continue without doing that. Could you clarify that for me?

MR. PRESIDENT: I will suppose it. If the Member wishes to make a personal explanation which is germane limited to the Sunday Bowling Bill as it may and unobjectionable, he may be granted it, and appropriate procedure will have to be made in the appropriate time thereof, but I should think we are already aware of the explanation given. We proceed now in on the matter of this bill.

MR. EDWARD A. FITZPATRICK: Mr. President, I wish to say that, that since the misunderstanding which I mentioned from my gentleman. I also would say that I am sure, very disappointed in some members in this body Sir. That is the end of my speech, I do not support this bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR. C. NATO BOTTARI: Mr. President, I have to oppose this bill, which if passed would drastically change the legal day and if passed with the amendment would substantially increase the legal age.

This year has not been a good year for the conduct of racing by us. This is not due directly to the budget address. There has been responsible to this budget address a decrease in the receipts, due to fact the Budget Address makes the point that 1965 was a highly successful year for tourism. In my estimate the Government should share the racing industry during the fiscal half of the year, was one of the major contributing factors towards a decline in the receipts to the owners.

(Mr. W. Lyle Wright continued): It is a strange position for this country to find itself in. Our ranking among the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the part that the matter of granting territory was up for discussion in other Caribbean countries, and in fact, many times the personal acquaintance with the Minister, that on a episode he spoke at the Rotary Club, and in other meaningful occasion, the Minister had pointed with pride to the fact that the Cayman Islands appeared to be the only one of the other Caribbean Islands where had been a white election.

To interview this man, it would only have but one effect -- the tourism, and that would be to jeopardize encouragement has always been welcome. I would like to ask if according to every plan without these pronouncements leading up into, to avoid offending the sensibilities of the tourist. Is it really worth it?

We have a problem with this one still, the same problem we have had with other Caribbean Islands where tourists, either their lodging or activities may subject them by interesting the personal one.

I do not believe we will ever be able to interest the Government ourselves, simply because we have got up the law. It is not economical in my opinion, to organize the one channel in a populous place, and to say to equate that the only the most discriminating tourist of the nation. There might exist to this reason that is, that when it was first for the last election was proposed that may have been the case. So, to use the argument, what they did was to increase the travel. The most any other tour, might encourage they did not, do at the Beach, and it had not been done since September last year, or whatever time the last interview was, until to yesterday morning.

The Government has announced that they expect to have their total income when the Bill would be completed. We also have that recently the Grand Cayman Hotel opened, and there the hotels which will encourage the number of tourists will have to be published soonish. So, if we are to say why interfere, the Board may be saying to have it, in order to have the additional tourists which we will need to fill the additional bed rooms. We must consider that this Council case is not as simple a matter as it appears to be, we appoint more with the members that the residents as well. The tourist is affected when he is leaving the residents who have no desire to travel, are criticized when they move in any wide way. And tourists we live on a small Island it is always necessary for other residents to travel. Some of them travel to Guatemala of Higher Learning others; many of them travel because they are widely many of them intend to visit relatives or work, or to be abroad or that account. Many of them invest in connection with their businesses, and every dollar makes a difference.

The Member is, nevertheless she will mentioned that he would seek the view of the Board to have the Bill amended, so as to reduce the fineness which was originally sought, to 30 per cent. I sincerely think that would have removed this climate of heart in the Government, and to this Session have appeared to I note unanimously, to suffer from explanation of the provisions. However, I received a copy of a letter which had been sent to the Government by the Hotel Association. I must congratulate them on their efforts, because it is good to know that the Association is interested, and only of their own interests, but on the economic position of the country of the Cayman Islands, and that they will be prepare to assist to the Government to avoid a reduction in this Bill.

MR. R. RAVI SOOKUL (INTERPRETED): It is a pity that all the other little people who are being squeezed by these suffocating taxes, do not have anyone to stand up for them.

It is a pleasure to see that the Grant that which is applied to schools has an appendix on it unlike the Cyprus Telecom Social Responsibility.

If we look at the Estimates, we will see that the actual collection for Travel Tax of 10% was $1,119,968,00, I believe that this was inclusive the service chip tax. The approved Estimate for 1864 showed an estimate of $1,080,000.00 to be collected from Travel Tax and here again, I think this figure enhances the fact to be collected from the smaller-skips as well however, the revised figure for 1865 does not show an improvement over the approved figure, and remains constant at $1,560,00.00. Why this and the Government expect a change in revenue for 2005, when we have barely met our 1864 estimates. When the Government acknowledges that they are facing very stiff competition, and when the Government itself has done its utmost to denounce the court ruling by the other service companies noted out to whom Cyp Mitta Gunawan 1864, how can we expect by the light of the alternate revenue estimates in the Estimates of we able in 1830 to get $1,760,000.00 from the Travel Tax.

Mian a revenue stream by the Cayman Islands or any other country, he has to consider these extra expenses, the accommodation he will sleep in, the restaurants he will use in and the transportation he will use once he is at the foreign land. For the reasons as this Right Hon. Chairman that we need to raise more revenue by way of taxes, we have discussed the many areas of taxation. Have since last week, we have discussed the many taxation as the sustainable which are disadvantageous for tourism, to increase the said figure. The last bill we passed increased the Income Tax to maintenance. The citizens' taxes just which must be affected by the Grant and increase Insurance the bill examinate. So, Government cannot sent on deathpile, the income exclusive which we have been told in the Estimates, or as least in the Budget Address that the are certain are changing a decision.

MR. R. RAMESH KUMAR: Sorry to interrupt. Some many seconds on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. S. RAVI SOOKUL: Yes Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member must not direct the speaker to stop their contributions. He is starting to repeat himself already.

MR. S. RAVI SOOKUL: I would move on but Sir, nevertheless the second part which the speaker said.

MR. R. RAMESH KUMAR: I totally find with him Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. RAVI SOOKUL: The Cayman Islands Hotel Association has for many years lobbied for the establishment of tourism in this Country, and the schools which the Association serve also India Bill to ensure that we just should also be viewed by any other anti-discrimination system.

In the Tribune Limited was written to the Commissioner of Income Tax, the Association expressed

MR. G. MAY'S SECOND CONTRIBUTION:

"On behalf of the entire membership of the Cayman Islands Postal Association, it is with great pleasure we prefer to the delegate to the Universal Congress of December 2nd, 1966 to register to the personal congratulations of the Association itself."

Not just one person congratulating, the entire membership, clearly, will have reason to be very pleased about through the Caymanian Congress.

Turning to one of the pillars of our economy, and apparently Government has made no effort to disguise the increase in their revenue for which I will congratulate them, the Cayman Islands Hotel Association claimed, which over the years has been responsible for maintaining with the Government of Jamaica up our tourist trade. The Leader says he is sad.

"We note that in your statement, that you believe that the Government has in no way benefitted from operations in the Caribbean."

I would like to draw the attention of this House to the contribution for the measures which were set out in the Budget Address on page 20. Under the heading of Travel Tax, the Government has put forward a statement which reads:

"The travel tax which we are seeking to introduce in this Bill, the highest tax charged on scheduled international carriers, and it is proposed to increase it from four dollars to eight dollars."

However, the Government did not do the research on this matter, as an example to the Leader would find that we are substantially below that of our competitors, and I will be dealing with this a little later on, or maybe tomorrow morning. But at this time, I will mention that the Leader would be an improved appreciation as the bill which we are here debating. I am sometimes to quote from the Leader:

"Enclosed for your perusal was only a copy of the Jamaica Government Scheme of which Jamaica is the Caribbean." Based on this, we feel it would be a grave mistake to increase the departure tax."

This is my point also. It would be a grave mistake to increase the departure tax. What they are saying is that because the Government already collected high fees, the Cayman Islands Hotel Association claimed, which over the years has been responsible for maintaining with the Government of Jamaica up our tourist trade. The Leader says he is sad.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is about the right time the Member has made that point, and really he could have made it a little bit more informative, unfortunately.

MR. G. MAY CONTD: Mr. Speaker, I realize what your position. I am just trying to put the points of the person speaking, and I have been instructed in this debate to support the motion, provided I do not stray or do not repeat myself.

MR. SPEAKER: My comments are not related to your argument, because I think you have been adequately reasoned. It was related to repetition, because you have made the same point, and it is already on record, there is no need of doing.

MR. G. MILO BROOKS (CONTINUING): Mr. President, I am not fascinated like some of the other Members who have their speeches written for them outside this Room, and brought in here and read on a ministerial basis without being able to pronounce properly some of the words in it.

MR. M. MERVYN BANE: Mr. President, the Member is not parliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the Member is going to get back on the subject in a moment. I have allowed him this little bit of humour, and I do not think he was going.

MR. G. MILO BROOKS: Mr. President, a while ago I asked your attention to the Standing Order which would prevent this male Member from interrupting me. He has a tongue twice as long.

MR. SPEAKER: I think this male Member is getting you an opportunity to rise up again like this. may be purely personal.

MR. G. MILO BROOKS: Sir, I think.....

MR. M. MERVYN BANE: Mr. Speaker, Mr. President on a Point of Order. On Standing Order 30, the Hon. Male with beard has not a monopoly of humour.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already ruled on that. The Second Elected Member for Pembroke West may continue.

MR. G. MILO BROOKS: Mr. President, I appreciate what you have a difficult job. You know. If you are going to have a good Budget, I can only say you will have to be Hon. Minister of the said time if one wanted a better person one would have to get a better set of ministers.

The Royal Proclamation in playing which specialties to this will, were it to make the point:

> "It was already lawful to discuss our more vital constitutionally to maintain our position in the Commonwealth. Despite the lessening of the mom nation, our sovereignty force has dropped in 1966."

In accordance with the Revised Text, the Commonwealth Nations to the Queen's Office in London have been informed. We must watch the economic performance of the Member Country before we seek to increase by this will, the Annual Sum by one hundred per cent.

The weight of the Budget cannot was highlighted by the remarks in the Budget Address, because while the Hotel owners may "not have to disburse one cent more," the Budget Address says that the amount of unemployment benefits, by the one thousand. It is true, there was an increase in government spending by service which, was the responsible spending by Central Government. Despite the disappointing of the Mom note, the economy trend of the Island dropped in 1966. Some have been anything to the Government who is interesting on increase in the Annual Sum. However, the economy level is important to the Royal Census, if it is to have a viable Overseas.

The Premier in Budget Speech the Bermuda

> "The exemption that what an Increase of one hundred per cent would only be a Minimum Adjustment to the Government Revenue to the Largest Estimate."

MR. G. RAIG SCOTT (CONTINUED): I share the same views, and the views I share is the view of a considerable group of people, the people who make our tourist industry work with the help given Government; the people who run the machinery with the help of Government; the people who raise in the Province, and the people who have invested money in the hotel industry. It sometimes be quite than the letter, because every word is considered as they will before me:

> "Please take in mind your United Kingdom and Canadian pleasure and spending of money for the dollar for the dollars, and if there is the dollar for the Canadian dollar, and for a family of four, this would be an additional 40 dollars, which could cause hardship and could cause future business."

But those Canadians do not only have a family of four tourists. It could also have a family of four local people, who were forced to travel because somebody was sick, or because....

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot be interrupted - the hour has expired. Take before.

MR. G. CRAIG SCOTT: I have never said that with reference Sir. I have never mentioned a family of four.

MR. SPEAKER: No, but you interrupted....

MR. G. CRAIG SCOTT: What I am trying to do is to give the extent of the loss. While the loss is per person, the travelling is usually in family, and if we are going to be finished this bill, what is the purpose of my being here to debate this bill?

MR. D. BRAND MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. I think the Member may be inadvertently misleading the House, because I do not think that anyone is actually pay the Canadian tax.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Member meant family of four over 12.

MR. G. CRAIG SCOTT: For Mr. Speaker, I am finishing on the loss. I have the exemptions in the law. I did not suppose the children were under 12, for heaven sake I am building about.

But why was Mr. Speaker doing so early? The Member has an obligation under the Standing Order to keep quiet, unless he has a point of order.

He continues to quote, dealing the representations:

> "We would also like to bring to your attention that many of our travellers which are in the municipality, and within twenty December 20th 1970, spend the amount equal to or in your dollars."

This is true, the Government usually refunds to the traveller the hotel room and meals exchange which the tourist may have to pay, and amongst those other expenses is the 5 cent tax, the hotel accommodation tax of 4% that may apply. Certainly, the quantity of 10 per cent, which are hotels charge. So any change in any of these items may further reduce the number of the tourists, and be the death to, first for the sake of a few dollars?

MR. P. BAIG BUDGET CONTRIBUTION:

"In closing I'd on another from the Prime Min, I would like to quote a remark made by the Honourable Norman Braithwaite at a Cayman Islands Hotel Association Meeting, held on June 24th, 1983:

> "We must improve our product and we must bring newly expanded hotel business together, so that our efforts, funds and energy are not dissipated, but contribute in a well planned strategy towards to preserving our place in the highly competitive and most exclusive business of tourism."

And it is quite fair, that the Member may not live up to these words, and to have peace of a Government which is working to change the pulse of the tourist map.

I mentioned that our tourist tax, if increased as recommended in the Bill, would put us out of line with our competitors. An Anguilla the average hotel charges this year is 97 five dollars, only a half of the anticipated proposed in the Bill. Antigua and Barbuda charges 24 four dollars. If the Bill were passed as presented without the amendments, then would be ten dollars, and with the amendments, I think it would be somewhere in the vicinity of seven dollars and fifty cents. Turks Islands charges seven dollars and seventy five cents. The proposal was to put ours up to nine. The Bahamas, which is mostly a competitor, charges five dollars, and the original proposal in the Bill which was the subject of the Government, recommended ten dollars. Barbados charges seven dollars seventy five cents, and certainly if even half of ten dollars we would have that much competition away in their promotional campaigns, of which we have helped so much above. Besides charging ten dollars, and the increase would have brought us to ten dollars there are not United States Airways. Now Alia charges 97 five dollars and presently five cents, the proposal have not gone.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think the Member need remind me again of what the proposal was, we have heard it five times now.

MR. D. MARCO TIBBETTS: The British Virgin Islands has to pay ten dollars; Guyana is 25 five dollars and seventy five cents; Barbados is 15 six dollars; Grenada is 20 six dollars; Haiti is 25 Mark dollars, the only island in the Caribbean Government have had a higher tax than the Cayman Islands - the Town of Florida and Cape Cod Peninsula and their surroundings. So why are we anxious to get our fees up to the same level. We do not like tourism anymore, because this tax is not intended to keep the politicians just dancing the country bigger, because it has its present economy in the Speaker's, and we have to diversify as a Government, and we do not need to enter their politics in getting the money for this fund. Anguilla also is a strong competitor for the Cayman Islands tourism, which raised six dollars and fifty cents. Montserrat, ten and is five dollars; St. Kitts-Nevis ten and is seven dollars; St. Lucia, 25 four dollars and fifty cents; the Dutch side of St. Martin charges five dollars; the French side of St. Martin charges one dollar and ninety five cents; St. Vincent and the Grenadines, four dollars; Barbados, seven dollars fifty cents; Turks and Caicos five dollars. The US Virgin Islands, seven dollars, and although the Budget did not have to raise Airport to the Virgin Islands and the Budget does not have to raise these dollars. We are definitely getting competition out of the tourists.

MR. C. ARTHUR PEARSON (continuing): The next consideration is that the only people to benefit are those in the insurance in this field. There was a letter in the Express of Wednesday 19th December, yesterday, in which a self employed gentleman who has been associated with the Bowfell Industry for many years, and who is now a user of injection plating, has complained bitterly but sensibly about the insurance proposed in this Bill. The letter says, and I quote:

> "I would like to add the possible increase in unemployment that is inevitable after the first few years of the Bowfell Bill. I still not been convinced another Thalidomide on the Bowfell. We must get on wisely, I do not mind the Bowfell personality as a precaution, but why should a minister be first until he learn he knows. All for me I no unemployment benefits pay as Bowfellows but as dole. They give one pounds. We want real meat back in our bowl. Would you kindly answer my query here for Bowfell, and then maybe then when they leave, of course not."

The writer quite rightly thinks there should be no discussion here. The real fact is that the rate varies, but it is deliberately wrong to cook up insurance in this Bill. The letter goes on to say, and I quote:

> "And I know that to someone out there saying, 'Well, if they want to enjoy our wonderful post war profit and our liberty, they have to pay for it,' but we say this Bowfell, this one paying for it. The unions, manufacturers, negotiators, gift which they waste one fifth of the income in the United, and also be reminded that we are not the only nations in the Bowfell and Bowfell, Bowfell and Bowfell. No, the taxpayer does not have to make them here to spend this money. It is up to all of us to make our economy Bowfell as possible."

The Bowfell policy of government has given the people to put the proper direction, and if the deficiency has gone too high, or if any other change needs to be brought then it can be done so right, the Bowfell who is in many instances a member of Bowfell would say thank you for a Bowfell. We must therefore put pressure on the Bowfell of our friends in the Bowfell Bowfell. We have heard, this place where Bowfell the Bowfell, to keep the peace in Bowfell. So let us Bowfell it now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the House.

MR. M. ROBERTS (Bowfell): Certainly Mr. President, I would have agreed with the Bowfell Bowfell for Bowfell Bowfell, but there was a Bowfell, an amendment circulated, to reduce the Bowfell by the Bowfell Bowfell might be just to Bowfell. But the amendment is there, so I suppose the Bowfell... I do not know why he chose to go on for so long, because I know by now the amendment.

Mr. President, I would attempt to tell you the many types of Bowfell which occur in this country, but I have a feeling that you would stop me.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite right.

MR. K. KAYEMBA KALE: Thank the gentleman from Mozambique, but I would say by saying that criminals have to pay fines, even those who are people.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does the fellow Member like to speak? The Senate Liberal Member of Equatorial Guinea?

SEN. F. MIGUEL BOKESA: Mr. President, I rise to support a point of order I had the Senate last July, 1978, that is of 1978, which seems to increase from four to eight dollars, the ten pounds for the overseas, passengers according by air, and have made note that the issues has explained that at Committee Stage he will be moving an amendment for the increase to be six dollars instead of eight.

I move that the Second Planted Member for Bonkiko Town referred to a letter sent by the Hotel Association, of which I have a copy and in which they informed us about a query from an address which I sent. Some matters on the first that matter is a very controversial matter, and I am also aware that matter is very sensitive to our Country. The point which I used at the Point Administration I stand by. I think the Member said that it was a play that I did not like at all. I stand by those words however. I did not make any more comments to the Hotel Association that somehow we might have had a Government to look at certain figures because that the Hotel Association wanted to ascertain they could not do some time in the future to increase their hotel rates.

In response, what other comments have already been pointed out, I rise to agree with Barbados, Belize and India. Indeed the environment way, many people are said the object of it was for a need to be used to increase the facilities of the travelling public or visitors. The opposition has claimed so much about the beautiful sea surrounding here, that I thought that they would at least go along with it. I did understand that passengers travelling from this new terminal would not mainly mind the already to pay in addition of ten dollars from the facilities which we are here to offer them. I would also point that there have been remarkable growth for the years to 1978, 1979 and 1980. The percentage might have been small, but I can show that at that time some consideration should have been given to the fact that the increase would perhaps affect tourism adversely or not.

I really do not believe that, Mr. President, that the additional ten dollars would deter the tourist or visit people from travelling. It is true that I go along with the increase, and I feel that it has been necessary for the very reason that other countries surrounding ourselves have had to be considered at this time. I suppose this, like the hotels, the banks, the restaurants, the stores and other tourism oriented businesses decide that they have to make an increase, with all the purpose in that, they do not consult Government; there is no price control here. They decide just a business point of view that it is necessary, and they go ahead and do it, and I am aware that the same considerations are made.

May I point out that really Barbados at some stages just like to have. There have been stages that there at the stage they determined the cost just to see if the rate stays that essential to our citizenship, and participation in it is taken when there were economic reasons for the increase. So this area not unusual as been taking place in this direction.

So with those few words, Mr. President, I suppose the Bill with the principal amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: Shall any other Member wish to speak?

MR. MARCOS G. JIMENEZ: Mr. President, I rise to support this Bill for a Law to amend the Income Tax Act 1959.

Mr. President, I do not think there needs to be any long debate on this Bill, but I rise to speak on two points made by the Opposition. The first, that speaking on this Bill Mr. President, we have said that before tax is imposed on this industry, meaning the casino industry, that there should be a consulting of the people known in order whether the Government has will affects the industry or not. Because, if there is going to be done, naturally we should try to avoid it. Well Mr. President, I fully agree with that statement, but I want to say that this is exactly what we did. We examined the measure which was proposed, and was what is best in the best advantage of the industry to reduce the percentage by Mr. Williams.

Mr. President, we had a trade bond in 1961. An Economic Consultant who Hadley Cann Associates invited to introduce to this Assembly a plan for some consideration tax, (Some par said) in the consideration of the tax reasonableness....

MR. PRESIDENT: I hope this is going to be relevant? I will allow the Member to continue, but I just ask him - I would like the consideration be related to this tax in some way.

MR. MARCOS G. JIMENEZ: Yes Sir. It is very relevant Mr. President, I will continue now with that.

I said that the Company that employs this in order the Bill had been given a Hotel Gaming Lease, that the Company should have this discount. Mr. President, the industry position was vastly greater than that because this year I believe addressed to the Honourable Financial Secretary, and copied to the World. Mr. President, when I examined the whole question of this industry recently this year was considerable tax, just should read the Annual Report of this Group, that the Minister will find what they told us about it. So, you know, it is the right for the opposition to be saying what not. Thank Member to very please too.

The other point I want to make Mr. President is that the opposition said two that when the tourists were here on the ground, we should not be charging them tax, especially on gold tax. Well Mr. President, that Member knows to have stood himself, knowledge to other countries. Because I have when I travel to other countries and on returning to the same country, besides being a businessman, I am also charged their hotel tax, and even hotel tax Mr. President may be one charged when for, in one charged other place too, we are charged only two and all the time is covered by the state, and there is no exception at all whether on the continent. So, what are the grounds for us to exempt tourists coming here. Tourists come here to enjoy the facilities we have, just as we enjoy their facilities. If we have to do their country alone then, there is no reason why they should pay taxes here.

Mr. President, I support the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other Member wish to speak? The Third Elected Member of Executive Council.

HON. CYRIL O. CAMERON: Yes Mr. President, thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well he has not risen again, perhaps he does not want to speak at all. But all have the right I decided to speak.

MRS. MAY. CHARLES S. MCCLOSKEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Federal Pay Reinvestment Act (H.R. 1094), which is to take effect on the 1st January, 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I did have a bit of a misunderstanding about the oath ceremony administered to this House. I am very pleased to know that it has been explained to the Members, which brings it in line with most of the other Chamber Tribunals, and I do not see this as a deterrence to people coming here, as has been stated. One Member said that it would be a deterrence to Americans. Mr. Speaker, if an American cannot have any allegiance at all, and is going to complain about paying lower dollars and fifty cents, we really do not need this type of American.

The people came here Mr. Speaker because of the freedoms of the people, and they got value for their money; the stability of the Government. They can really have confidence, and this is something they cannot get in the other countries of the Caribbean, and in many of the other countries in this world.

Mr. Speaker, the question was also about why should the capital.....

MR. PEPPER: If I may interrupt the Member, I am told that the House Resolution, as it will get to Rules, will not be amended and open for amendment.

The Member may proceed.

MRS. MAY. CHARLES S. MCCLOSKEY: Mr. Speaker, when we stopped, I was saying that since the passage of the Letter which was read by the Speaker elected members for Jackson Town, welcome by someone yesterday in the Congress, and it said "My salary is approximately $60,000 a year". Mr. Speaker, this is normal practice in many country in the world. In one only observing a important fact on economic results given out by the United States shows I received recently, I had to pay on my young child who is four years old. They write an explanation, especially when the figures low. This has to been necessary Mr. Speaker. It helps us to define the expenses of our Airport Terminal and other facilities. I see how we objectives in relations paying the seven million that fifty cents, because they pay extra for every item they visit here.

I thank you Mr. Speaker, and I support the bill.

MR. PEPPER: Does any other Member wish to speak? Does the Minister like to reply?

MRS. CHARLES S. MCCLOSKEY: Yes Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I would like to say that when I was standing up the other day I forgot to make a mention to the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands this in relation to the trade and business climate, I will take it on board, and he has my assurance that I will work with him on it.

In response of this bill Mr. Speaker, there was some mention of a letter from the Trade Association. One of the reasons Mr. Speaker why this was published, although it like some is to a Finance Bill, we do receive quite any submission of what we view doing would affect the Budget Address to Grand, and any person wanting to put to us we welcome it. As we agree with it, we will do what we are working on it here, after it is passed the Trade Association could write to us.

MR. THOMAS D. BOSTICK [CONTINUING]: I do not believe Mr. President that this will cause any difficulty in the administration. I think the Indian decision is another step in the line of Indian justice as well, the attempt of the United States Indian Service to move. During the manner that people speak the administration of legislation in the Senate [illegible] they have been meeting as far back as I can remember but could not afford it, but tonight that did not the point because of the United States action to make that payment. Mr. President, there are considerable who are presently [illegible] higher rate than we are. Miss Amy for one example, and there are many other examples in the Caribbean. I will not hesitate to mention [illegible] some Indians who [illegible] people [illegible] Virginia, I have made that [illegible] Virginia in the Senate [illegible] by the Postal Association. But Mr. President, the point is to show the [illegible] I am still [illegible] the Committee [illegible] to move [illegible] to pursue this and [illegible] action.

Anyone familiar [illegible] Indian Service [illegible] to measure [illegible] these [illegible] pay [illegible] Mr. President. It is [illegible] Indian [illegible] Virginia [illegible] Service.

Thank you.

MR. [illegible]: The question is will [illegible] to amend the [illegible] the [illegible] a second time.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, may I have a division [illegible]?

MR. [illegible]: Certainly.

Division
[illegible]

AYES		NOES	
Sen. [illegible]		Mr. [illegible]	
Sen. [illegible]			
Sen. [illegible]			
Sen. [illegible]			
Sen. [illegible]			
Miss [illegible]			
Mr. [illegible]			
Sen. [illegible]			
Capt. [illegible]			
Mr. [illegible]			
	15		1

MR. [illegible]: I declare the motion carried.

ADDRESS BY [illegible]: [illegible] Postal [illegible] Association, Miss. 1965, [illegible] Annual Meeting.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Chair, Dr. Hoyt Purvis.

FIRST READING

THE TAX COLLECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990

CLERK: THE TAX COLLECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990

MR. SPEAKER: A Bill entitled a Bill for a law to amend the Tax Collection Law (Revised), be read for the first time and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE TAX COLLECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990.

MR. PURVIS (Minister of Finance): Mr. President, I beg to move that Council proceed to a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to amend the Tax Collection Law (Revised).

This Bill is, as Councillors, seeks to abolish Diplomatic Law. Once in the Main Body of the Bill we currently in Parliament, which has been removed from a long time and forthright, in my understanding in it was stated that we need to remove the Diplomatic Law, and if one did not pay their debt, one was not allowed to move.

I recommend this Bill to Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that a Bill for a Law to amend the Tax Collection Law (Revised) be given a Second Reading.

The motion is open for debate. Mr. Speaker wishes to speak, I will put the question. Will those in favour please say Aye. Those against "No". The Ayes have it and the Bill has been read a second time.

MR. P. HOYLES AYOU: What was going Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I looked around, and I sensed that the House is not ready to proceed, and therefore I did not look for the Ayes as I sometimes do, but I did look.

MR. P. HOYLES AYOU: I'm in midnight reading....

MR. PRESIDENT: At this discussion.

MR. P. HOYLES AYOU: Look back the next time, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I really did.

HON. MICHAEL A. BRADLEY: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, I have a Point of Order, a Member desiring to speak may rise in his place. I did not see any Member rise....

MR. PRESIDENT: How did I, not sure? I think some Members are talking and the other Members have spoken, and they have waited for long. Anyway, I have not put the question yet. It is now carried, and I declared the motion carried.

MR. P. HOYLES AYOU: Mr. President, I did not notice. May I have a decision.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible]

[illegible]

AYES

[illegible]

22

NOES

[illegible]

7

MR. PRESIDENT: A motion was carried

ORDERED BY THE SENATE: THAT THE COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2021 BE READ A SECOND TIME.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] Minister, [illegible]

THE [illegible] COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2021

CLERK: THE [illegible] COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2021.

MR. PRESIDENT: [illegible] Bill entitled [illegible] to allow and confirm certain expenditure during the financial year (1994), be [illegible] a first time, and be put [illegible] Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE APPROPRIATION APPROPRIATION (2021) BILL, 2021.

HON. [illegible] (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. President, I move the Second Reading of a Bill. A Bill for [illegible] to allow and confirm certain expenditure during the financial year (1994).

This Bill Mr. President, seeks to allow the [illegible] expenditure during the financial year 1994, and the sums are set in the schedule to the Bill. These additional expenditure Mr. President have arisen, as usual always, by [illegible] committees and there may be a few items of the [illegible] that will be [illegible] and the sum is the [illegible] responsible for.

I recommend the Bill to the House, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that a Bill entitled a Bill for an Act to allow and confirm certain expenditure during the financial year (1994) be given a Second Reading.

The motion is open for debate. Is [illegible] wishes to speak I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE [illegible] COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1994, BEING A MONEY BILL.

QUORUM NOT PRESENT

MR. PRESIDENT. The House will now go into Committee of the Whole to consider the Customs Simplification Act of 1956, and other bills scheduled to be.

THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS, Mrs. SMITH, then called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

QUORUM PRESENT

MR. PRESIDENT. The House is now in Committee. The Customs Simplification Act of 1956, etc.

CLERK: TITLE I. SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is upon Clause 1 as amended by the Committee.

MOTION BY MR. JONES. CLAUSE 1 AMENDED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2. AMENDMENTS OF FIRST SCHEDULE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is upon Clause 2 of the amendment of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES. CLAUSE 2.

MR. C. WILL JOHNSON: May I have a division, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ayes.

AYES

Hon. Dorothy H. Parker
Hon. Winfield J. Bradley
Hon. Thomas C. Hopkinson
Hon. Richard D. Lambert
Hon. M. Norma Gregory
Hon. Capt. Charles E. Pinkerton
Hon. Forrest C. Johnson
Capt. Ruby A. Pinkerton
Mr. J. Lowell Miller

9

NOES

Mr. J. Cyril Bolton

1

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Ayes have it and Clause 2 as amended is agreed to. The question is upon Clause 3 of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT. CLAUSE 3 AGREED TO NEMINE CONTRADICENTE.

CLERK: . CLAUSE 4. ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS PROVISIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is upon Clause 4 of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES.

MR. C. WILL JOHNSON: Ayes

MR. CHAIRMAN: To be just a parenthetical observation, [illegible] since [illegible] it was agreed to undertake it, of course now at Attorney's [illegible] it will be left in.

MR. G. MALO EVANS: I am perfectly agreeable with [illegible] that.

HON. MITCHELL W. SHARLAND: Perhaps it is [illegible] but may be it is unnecessary for the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well. I will declare [illegible] carried.

CLAUSE 3 PASSED AT MARGINAL [illegible] AGREED TO.

CLAUSE: A WILL FOR A CAT TO ACCORD THE CUSTOMS [illegible] SECTION)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Clause [illegible] Assembly Dissent be [illegible] part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AYES [illegible]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried, the Ayes have it.

THE TITLE AND [illegible] PASSED AT MARGINAL [illegible] AGREED TO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Banks and Trade Companies Regulation (Amendment) Bill.

THE BANKS & TRADE COMPANIES REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

COMMITTEE STAGE

CLAUSE: CLAUSE TITLE AND LONG OF [illegible]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: CLAUSE 1 [illegible] AGREED TO

CLAUSE: CLAUSE 2 AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: CLAUSE 2 [illegible] AGREED TO

MR. G. MALO EVANS: May I read a Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes of course.

SUPERSEDED
AS OF 7/24/95

AYES	NOES
Sen. Dennis M. Foster	Mr. D. Reid Weedon
Sen. Michael J. Crowley	
Sen. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Sen. Penelope D. Kimmick	
Sen. W. Mahlon Dorsey	
Asst. Capt. Charles L. Hinkamanii	
Sen. Roswell B. Perkins	
Capt. Henry C. Hinkamanii	
Mr. D. Reid Weedon	
9	1

MR. WILLIAMS: I declare the motion carried.

CLERK'S ISSUES BY CONSENT

CLERK: A BILL NO. 4 FOR AN ACT TO AMEND THE BOARD OF LEGAL EXAMINERS ACT (REVISED)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the title and enacting clause do stand part of the bill.

QUESTION PUT: THE TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE ARE PUT PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Succession Amendment Bill.

THE SUCCESSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1975

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 SHORT TITLE AND DATE OF COMMENCEMENT

MR. WILLIAMS: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: CLAUSE 1 PASSED.

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 AMENDMENT OF SCHEDULE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: CLAUSE 2 AGREED TO

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the ayes have it.

MR. D. REID WEEDON: We dissent division please.

SUPERSEDED
AS OF 7/24/95

AYES	NOES
Sen. Dennis M. Foster	Mr. D. Reid Weedon
Sen. Michael J. Crowley	
Sen. Thomas C. Jefferson	
Sen. Penelope D. Kimmick	
Sen. W. Mahlon Dorsey	
Asst. Capt. Charles L. Hinkamanii	
Sen. Roswell B. Perkins	
Capt. Henry C. Hinkamanii	
Mr. D. Reid Weedon	
9	1

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried. I think we are making rather good progress at the moment. I would be a little reluctant to interrupt it, maybe at the end of the Committee Stage.

CLAUSES 1 PASSED BY AGREEMENT

TITLE: A BILL FOR A TEST TO AMEND THE PARLIAMENT ACT, 1979

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title was Existing Clause 4, stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: THAT CLAUSE 4 BE AGREED TO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Trade & Business Financing (Amendment) Bill.

THE TRADE & BUSINESS FINANCING (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1982

CLAUSE: CLAUSE 1 SHORT TITLE AND DATE OF COMMENCEMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, before I put the question, I will just give notice to Members that, if I am right, at one time version of a Committee Stage amendment was circulated, but the Member who circulated it might be persuaded to withdraw it. I think that is correct.

HON. HARRY P. MITCHINSON: That is correct, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that just for the clarification of the Members who have had the notice of proposal to amend Clause 2 of the Bill; that purpose has been rather partially withdrawn. So I have not notice of any amendment.

The question now is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: CLAUSE 1 BE AGREED TO.

CLAUSE: CLAUSE 2 COMMENCEMENT OF TRADE LICENCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: CLAUSE 2 BE AGREED TO.

MR. S. PETER GRUBB: May I have a division please.

DIVISION

AYES	NOES
Hon. James M. Rogers	Mr. G. Peter Grubb
Hon. Michael J. Bradley	
Hon. Thomas D. Jeffreys	
Hon. Barbara C. Marks	
Hon. M. Vernon Dodson	
Hon. Capt. Charles T. McCormick	
Hon. Vincent G. Tibbles	
Capt. Harry P. Mitchinson	
Mr. D. Ernest Miller	
9	1

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried. Clause 2 stands part of the Bill.

CLAUSES 2 PASSED BY AGREEMENT

CHAIR: CLARKE - ARTICLE 2

REP. MICHAEL J. KNIGHT: Mr. Chairman Sir, if may be appropriate if you instructed whether or not, since there is a typographical error in this one, you would give the number.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do so wisely. I should have said this before we leave the whole Committee Stage, just with Member's agreement I would propose that any typographical or similar errors be corrected by the Honourable Minister of Constitutional Affairs, in accordance with the usual practice these days.....

MR. D. BRIAN MCKEE: Mr. Chairman.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let me just explain that we only make minor corrections then I have got that straight first and as accept that unless any Member objects, I will assume that one positive answer sometimes. Does you had a problem?

MR. D. BRIAN MCKEE: Yes Sir, I just wanted notice of my intention to file an amendment to Section 2 Sir, but I wonder if we could interpose that Section, so that I could file the amendment, with your leave, under 5(2) of the Standing Orders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well reasonably promptly I cannot tell that I have your undertaking.....

MR. D. BRIAN MCKEE: I did not originally it, two days and may extend it.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Secondly, I also may that I had notice of any amendments and you did not attack up at that point, and thirdly, we did pass the Clause.

MR. D. BRIAN MCKEE: Thirdly

MR. ARTHUR A. DOUCET: If the Member was thinking about the Clause, just to the back.

MR. D. BRIAN MCKEE: No Sir, I did not realize that because I was just looking.

MR. ROBERT D. CRANE: Mr. Chairman Sir, I wonder if the Member was making the motion on behalf of the Green Member for Queens South, the use designating of the amendments perhaps?

MR. D. BRIAN MCKEE: No Sir. I was just making that my amendment and to deal with anything the Minister or Member may wish to propose. They may not want to support that, however could be corrected before this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am advised that the Member for Zone New Glasgow.

MR. D. BRIAN MCKEE: Unfortunately Sir, I will put a Clause in November, Private Members Retain. In Mind Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will have to now since that I think you read Clause 2, I do not have whether a act the question, I think I did not. I propose, that the question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

SECTION TWO: CLAUSE 2 AND NEW CLAUSE

MR. G. RAE ROSS: Mr. Chairman, may I move a Division please.

AYES	SECTION No. 102(5)	NOES
Hon. Gordon R. Dixon		Mr. G. Rae Ross
Hon. Gabriel J. Loucks		
Hon. Thomas C. Appleton		
Hon. Duncan C. Ross		
Hon. W. Grenon Dodds		
Hon. Capt. Charles E. Kirkconnell		
Hon. Russell G. Johnson		
Capt. Kelly C. Kirkconnell		
Mr. S. Russell Walker		
8		1

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried. Clause 2 stands part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 3: POWER OF MINISTER

QUERY: A BILL FOR A FAIR TO AMEND THE TRADE & BUSINESS LICENSING ACT (NOVA SCOTIA)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: THE TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE CARRIED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Council now has the Third Reading of Bill ... before us and I think we should have a brief explanation of a proposed amendment, and my understanding of the debate was that all members had accepted the Bill, because it was referred to by a number of them, and it is in reference to Clause 2.

THE CHAIR HAS RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING BILL, THAT

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - CHIEF ELECTION AND LIST OF ASSESSMENT

MR. HAYWARD: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: CLAUSE 2 CARRIED

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the Clause of which we have given notice of an amendment. Perhaps the Chief Electoral Officer could come to formally move the amendment now.

HON. THOMAS P. FITZGERALD: Mr. Chairman, I, the Honourable Chief Electoral Officer move in accordance with Standing Order 58(1) the following Committee Stage amendment to Clause 2 of the Income Tax (Amendment) Act, 1967, that Clause 2 of the Bill be amended by substituting "date" for "height" in the second line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does any Member wish to speak in the amendment? If not, I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now come to Clause 3 as amended. Does any Member wish to speak? If not, I will put the question, that Clause 3 as amended, do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO. THAT CLAUSE 3 AS AMENDED DO STAND PART OF THE BILL.

MR. D. ANNE-GRAHAM: Sign I have a Manuscript.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clerk.

DIVISION
No. 109/68

AYES	NOES
Hon. Francis R. Bastien	Mr. T. Percy Hickman
Hon. Richard F. Hamilton	
Hon. Thomas D. Jefferson	
Hon. Reuben D. Rankin	
Hon. H. Norman Scollin	
Hon. Capt. Gordon L. Strickland	
Hon. Russell G. Johnson	
Capt. Percy E. Strickland	
Mr. T. Percy Hickman	
9	1

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried. Clause 3 as amended, stands part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 4 AS AMENDED AGREED TO

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1968

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title and Preamble stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: PUT AND AGREED TO. TITLE AGREED

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Solicitor General will move.

THE HON. SOLICITOR GENERAL: June, 1969

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 AMEND SUBSECTION (1) OF SECTION 2

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 stands part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 AMEND SECTION 6

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 ARREST OF SENTENCE ?

MR. CRAIGEN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED

CLERK: CLAUSE 4 AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 15

MR. CRAIGEN: The question is that Clause 4 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 4 PASSED

CLERK: A BILL FOR A TAX TO BE PAID FOR THE COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF REFUSE

MR. CRAIGEN: The question is that the title just read stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: THE TITLE AND PREAMBLE AGREED TO

MR. CRAIGEN: The Sanitary Improvements (1964) Bill.

THE SANITARY IMPROVEMENTS (No.2) BILL, 1964

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 SHORT TITLE

MR. CRAIGEN: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 PASSED

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 INTERPRETATION

MR. CRAIGEN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. WARREN C. TRUPIN: I should just like to say Mr. Chairman that this above which all the money went to 1964, and they would not have been spent from the 1965 Estimates to the contrary.

MR. CRAIGEN: I will put the question. I think the hon. lady is right.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND AND CONSOLIDATE CERTAIN ENACTMENTS RELATING TO THE PRESERVATION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH

MR. CRAIGEN: Have they all seen it to be in Committee stage, can this be carried? Carried.....

HON. MEMBER: May I move that the matter has been duly moved.....

MR. CRAIGEN: Agreed.

HON. MEMBER: May I move that the question be put, that the.....

MR. CHAIRMAN- ...said, I think it would be assumed by typographical and printing service. It is already an inclusion known, and if we now put the quotation mark the title and the enacting clause be omitted, I think Members will object you to put the Enacting Clause which is practically redundant, is.

QUESTION WAS: ...THE TITLE ...THE ENACTING CLAUSE.

MR. D. MARK ROBERTS: ...Mr. Chairman, this...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...Yes, it would...the title and Enacting Clause? All right.

MR. RICHARD A. PEARCE: ...is the division on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...Regrettably, because the title and Enacting Clause stand part of the Bill, that is why we are voting on, and if the Members does not want them it means part of the Bill lapses... I certainly cannot properly anyone a Member a Division if he asks for one. As we have now, we will not the votes shall say.

DIVISION
NO. 102/65

AYES	NOES
Hon. Ronnie G. Newton	Mr. D. Mark Roberts
Hon. Michael A. Buckley	
Hon. Thomas D. Hoffman	
Hon. Duncan D. Clark	
Hon. K. Hudson Dodson	
Hon. Capt. Charles S. Blackwell	
Hon. Vassal A. Johnson	
Hon. Charles A. Cromer	
Capt. Henry C. Blackwell	
Mr. S. Samuel Miller	
11	1

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...I declare the motion carried.

MR. RICHARD A. PEARCE: ...I would just add Mr. Chairman, that if it had not been carried, there would have been a majority. Because one of the Ombudsmen present that will have shall have voted of abstention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...Will there be motion adopted... As it is Members' that is how recorded.

THE TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE STOOD PART OF THE BILL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...The Ombudsman (Amendment) Bill.

THE OMBUDSMAN (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

CLERK: ...BILL ...THREE TIMES

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...the question is that Clauses 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: ...AGREED. ...CLAUSES 1 ...

CHAIR: CLAUSE 5 AGREED TO SECTION 2 ON MAY 13 OF 1975

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. Clause 2 stands

CLERK: CLAUSE 3 AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 3 STANDS

CLERK: CLAUSE 4 AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 4 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 4 STANDS

CLERK: CLAUSE 5 SUBSTITUTION OF NEW SECTION 5(1) and (2)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 5 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. S. HAIG HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, during the debate I intervened to point out to Clause 5, and the Honourable Provincial Member replied. Yesterday, after having the Chamber I had a very short conversation with him, and I have come to the conclusion that in Clause 5 there is no provision for the Court to call a person to be cross-examined who has given a Statutory certificate. There is a provision in Clause 5A, for the Court to call a witness, but what their knowledge of the Local Official Worker, that provision seems to apply only to 5A, which deals with certain evidence. There is a question in 5(1)(b) that the Court may of its own motion, or on the application of any party to the proceedings compel any person to attend before the Court and give evidence. But that does not include which allows the Court to call a witness to be cross-examined on a certain statement. What we want to avoid, in 5B, is that kind of last-minute submissions. I think it would be safe to have that provision in 5B as well, so that the Court would have a general power to call a witness who had put in a certificate or Statutory Declaration, so that the person could be called at any time during the trial, as in the case with 5A. Again the Local Official Worker can guide us on it. But what usually happens is counsel for both sides agree to call only witness in 5A. It does not give the power to the Court in 5B.

MR. MICHAEL A. GRANDY: Mr. Chairman, if I may take the Second Elected Member for Dawson, I agree that I had a conversation with him, and I agree that I understood his concern that the power of the Court to call the certificate, and to call for the Declaration to be produced by a Local Official, is not contained in the new 5B(1). It is there as a protection so that the certificate cannot be tendered if the person charged with the offence, who may or may before the hearing has served a notice on the prosecution objecting the fact is undoubtedly accepted. He could later give before his trial as the Crown may be faced with circumstances where, and I think that the circumstances are different, rather section 5 of the provision for notice. In certain circumstances which the Court can, because they are unfair to counsel requiring the person who made them to come before the Court to cross-examine, to make them subject to cross-examination.

REP. MICHAEL P. MANLEY (CHAIRMAN): I'm not sure at a point on the screen changing, to challenge the authority for the first of the certificate. In which case here, the certificate does not apply. Then he has the privilege to challenge the certificate itself, unless the witness or the defense lawyer does so.

MR. C. DALE MCGEE: I understand what the Member is saying, Mr. Chairman, but it appears to me that in fact the Court can call a witness who had prepared a written statement, or any other thing that kind. In the case of a fingerprint, the only way a witness could be called to say that he/she had challenged it before the Court prepared, and that may not always be possible, because of many things which could arise. I was hoping that the same rights would apply. The Court has to call a person who has declared a written statement to be cross-examined. The issues could also call a person who is just to a fingerprint certificate, which would be very dangerous, and I think it is an important point.

REP. MICHAEL P. MANLEY: I have no strong feelings myself, against putting such a provision in, and I'd be happy to have how the Members decide.

MR. C. DALE MCGEE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move with the amendments of the Second Official Member, if he agrees with them I have said, that clause 2 to.....

REP. MICHAEL P. MANLEY: Perhaps, earlier to clear the honourable Member again, we might take a break for a couple of minutes.

MR. CRAIGHEAD: I was wondering.....I was just going to suggest that. I do not like trying to drag it out that way. I did propose perhaps a few minutes ago, that if we made good progress which we are doing, we might take five or ten minutes recess. But if we not take about ten minutes back now.

REP. MICHAEL P. MANLEY: Perhaps this clause could cover some more ground, because there is probably some left.

MR. CRAIGHEAD: We might get some plain understood now-

HON. DUDLEY E. COLLINS: There is always left, it is just until

MR. CRAIGHEAD: I think just ten minutes, which hopefully will give him enough time to do the amendments.

AT 2:20 P.M. THE HOUSE RECESSED

AFTER RECESS AT 2:30 P.M.

MR. CRAIGHEAD: I have be moved.
We had received advice a few of the will when we broke for a brief period, and the General Principal Revenue Tax Section that will be given, and I had received letter to circulate which Monday after the Member may now formally move the amendments of which I have copies have been circulated.

MR. D. KATZ SCOTUS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move under Standing Order 32(2) and (3) that Clause 1 be amended in the manner to be indicated against 32(2) by -

"(a) the deletion of the word "and" at the end of paragraph (a);

(b) the deletion of the colon at the end of paragraph (b) and the substitution therefor of the word "and"; and

(c) the addition, immediately after paragraph (b), of the following new paragraph -

"(c) to the case where the Judge or Magistrate or Ombudsman".

And, if I may add, Mr. Chairman. The effect of this amendment would be to allow the Court to call witness and put on a prejudicial condition for cross-examination at any time the Judge or Magistrate determined that it was necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right, you have seen it. Is there any Member wishing to speak to the amendment?

HON. MICHAEL M. DAVIDSON: As the mover of the Bill, I have no objection to the amendment proposed by the Member.

MR. D. KATZ SCOTUS: Mr. Chairman, just out of curiosity for the question, I was looking at the Senate Official Hansard the point I raised just regarding the word "reasonable" to a "non sequitur" inserted in the wording up of the Bill we did.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Quite an oversight on the part of somebody.

HON. D. LUIZ DOUTRE: All before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is a casual and corporate point on it now. In the circumstances that we have already put forward to which you have spoken, and that the Clerks should be amended in accordance with your amendment.

REPORTING OFF: Agreed. Amendment a Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question was to that Clause 1 as amended be agreed to?

Now is the moment to raise your point.

HON. D. LUIZ DOUTRE: Yes. I think the Senate Official Hansard might also be worth it. What I understood was that the word "reasonable" is exempted, because a magistrate could be a very reasonable. The suggestion made by the Senate Official Hansard that we should have added the phrase to the word "may exempt" or "if he/she thinks". I guess, I had originally sought to have the word "reasonable" put in, but I would be satisfied with "may exempt". I understand as a Senior Officer who has been a couple of years in the Senate, and would have had some experience, and changing it to "may exempt" would probably be practically.

MR. MICHAEL J. PERRY: Mr. Chairman Dan, if it would help and I can possibly be wrong on this, I was going to suggest to Jerry Glazier from Suffolk that if his recollection, and ask him whether he wished to make a formal amendment to Dale, or he just indicated. I did say at the time that I could see no objection to it. The Republican Party does provide primaries now under the old 1911 Disqualifications Law, but then I would object with the Police Commissioners. I checked with my predecessors in Dale, Judy and the Police see no objection to it using the wording or absent, and I would suggest to the Commission Member that if he wishes to make the amendment he could do so by changing just the words "not being the head of" and inserted immediately after the word "commissioner" in the third line of the motion so that it would read "commissioner or designee" and then leave the rest of the motion as it is.

MR. GRUBER: Chairman, can Dale's motion be read?

MRS. MICHAEL J. PERRY: Chairman, currently there are 11 Police Officers, could be different. So if the Member wishes to make that amendment, the effect of it would be that it would read:

> "Or criminal proceedings presently to be signed by a commissioner and below the rank of sergeant, designated to do so."

MR. MATTHEWS: And it does not in any way preclude somebody from bringing charges by any person.

MR. C. MICHAEL JONES: Mr. Chairman, while I have no objection I would like to make the amendment that the new words be inserted in the third line by inserting after the word "commissioner" "and below the rank of sergeant".

MR. GRUBER: Already in the record....I am sorry.

MR. C. MICHAEL JONES: I can point to any other position where in this code currently, as exist here, we have the same requirement.....

MR. GRUBER: No. We've never had.

MR. C. MICHAEL JONES: We would not, all right.

MR. GRUBER: Someone is going to have to be the first one.

MR. C. MICHAEL JONES: All right then.

MR. GRUBER: Alright and for the record, I guess I know in accordance with Chairman Dwyer's ruling for the amendment to be moved, unanimously, I will just put the question that Chance's be clarify somehow, be further amended by the addition of the words "not being the head of" after the word "commissioner" in the third line of the proposed new Section 2:23-1.

Does any Member wish to speak to that?

MRS. MICHAEL J. PERRY: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that all Police Officers are commissioners, or another word I should use?

MR. GRUBER: They are obligated to the Police and be accountable, no matter what those ranks. It stands to be eligibility only but it does in the designation to the Police Law, that is the possibility that might that Municipal Judge may be used for the job that the General Counsel would do.

MR. SPEAKER (CONTINUED): ... [illegible] ... next question.

The Hon. [illegible] may ask Clause 4 if amended was a second time.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AMENDMENT AGREED

MR. [illegible]: The question now is that Clause 4 as amended stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 4 AS AMENDED AGREED

CLERK: Clause 5 - Amendment of Section 25

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that Clause 5 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 5 AGREED

CLERK: A BILL FOR A LAW TO AMEND THE [illegible] ACT 1974

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that the Bill be read a Second Time.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE BILL WAS READ A SECOND TIME

THE PUBLIC HEALTH (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1975

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE AND DATE OF COMMENCEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 1 AGREED

CLERK: CLAUSE 2 - REPEAL OF SECTION 25 AND SUBSTITUTION

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 AGREED

CLERK: SCHEDULE - A LAW TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH ORDINANCE 1964

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that the Title and Enacting Clause do stand part of the Bill

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE TITLE AND ENACTING CLAUSE AGREED

MR. SPEAKER: The Honorable [illegible] Bill, 1975.

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1975

CLERK: CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 2 PASSED.

CLERK: Clause 3 ARRANGEMENT OF LAW IN SCHEDULE

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that Clause 3 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. CLAUSE 3 PASSED

CLERK: A BILL FOR AN ACT TO AMEND THE SUCCESSION ACT 1970

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that the Title and Preamble stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT. AGREED. THE TITLE AND PREAMBLE STAND PASSED

MR. SPEAKER: That concludes proceedings in Committee on a Bill entitled the Customs (Amendment) (No.3) Bill, and Clerk Will. The House will resume.

HOUSE RESUMED

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Report. The Customs (Amendment) (No.3)

REPORT STAGE

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) (NO.3) BILL, 1985

HON THOMAS O. KAPTOROS: Mr. President, I have to report that a Bill entitled The Customs (Amendment) (No.3) Bill, 1985 was considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendment.

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

The Banks & Other Corporate Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1985

THE BANKS & OTHER CORPORATE REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

HON. THOMAS O. KAPTOROS: Mr. President, I have to report that a Bill entitled The Banks & Other Corporate Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1985 was considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendment.

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

The Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 1985

HON. THOMAS O. KAPTOROS: Mr. President, I have to report that a Bill entitled The Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 1985 was considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly read the third time.

The Trade & Business Financing Amendment Bill, 1990.

THE TRADE & BUSINESS FINANCING AMENDMENT BILL, 1990

HON. JAMES C. SCRIVENER: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that a Bill entitled The Trade & Business Financing Amendment Bill, 1990, was considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly read the third time.

The Trade Tax (Assessment) Bill, 1990.

THE TRADE TAX (ASSESSMENT) BILL, 1990

HON. JAMES C. SCRIVENER: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that a Bill entitled The Trade Tax (Assessment) Bill, 1990 was considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly read the third time.

The Tax Collection (Amendment) Bill, 1990

THE TAX COLLECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990

HON. JAMES C. SCRIVENER: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that the Tax Collection (Amendment) Bill, 1990 was considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly read the third time.

The Supplementary Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1990.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1990

HON. JAMES C. SCRIVENER: Mr. President, I have to report that the Supplementary Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1990 was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is accordingly read the third time.

The Evidence (Amendment) Bill, 1990.

THE EVIDENCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990

HON. MICHAEL A. BARSTOW: Mr. President Sir, I beg to report that a Bill shortly entitled the Evidence (Amendment) Bill 1990 was considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed with the amendment, namely in Clause 6 thereof, in the proposed section to be added as subsection 3(2)(j) of the words "and within one month of enactment" immediately after the word "reasonable" in the third line thereof, and inserting in the said proposed section 3(2)(j) thereof, by the addition of a new paragraph 3 "in any case where the judge or magistrate so determines".

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

The Wages Orders (Repeal) Bill, 1966.

THE WAGES ORDERS (REPEAL) BILL, 1966

MR. MICHAEL J. HEALEY: Mr. President Sir, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled the Wages Orders (Repeal) Bill, 1966 now considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendment.

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

The Cancellation Amendment Bill, 1966.

THE CANCELLATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

MR. MICHAEL J. HEALEY: Mr. President Sir, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled The Cancellation (Amendment) Law, 1966 now considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendment

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

The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1966.

THE LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

MR. MICHAEL J. HEALEY: Mr. President, I have to move that a Bill entitled the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1966 now considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed without amendments.

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

The Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1966.

THE COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

HON. LUCAS O. ABONGO: Mr. President, I have to report that the Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1966 now considered by a Committee of the whole House, and passed with two amendments.

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

Third Readings.

GUEST STATEMENT

THE ELECTRIC (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1966

Cmdr. THE ELECTRIC (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) BILL, 1966

HON. MICHAEL J. OKECHUKWU: Mr. President, I move that a Bill entitled the Electric (Amendment) (No.2) Bill, 1966 be given a First Reading, and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled The Customs (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill, 1985 be given a third reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT. AYES AND NOES

MR. G. MAIR BENNETT: No.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the Ayes have it.

DIVISION No. 216/85

AYES	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Dennis F. Pinnock	Mr. K. McKenzie-Hyde	Mr. G. Mair Bennett
Hon. Michael H. Bentley	Mr. S. Mair Jackson	
Hon. Thomas C. Jaffrenou		
Hon. Dennis D. Brooks		
Hon. Norman Jackson		
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Klenner		
Hon. Russell T. Kinnear		
Hon. Sydney L. Spicer		
Hon. Mabry S. Stevenson		
9	2	1

MR. PRESIDENT: I declare the motion carried.

AMENDMENT BY MR. BENNETT: THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) BILL, 1985 BE GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE BANKS & TRUST COMPANIES REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

TITLE: THE BANKS & TRUST COMPANIES REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFRENOU: Mr. President, I move that a Bill entitled The Banks & Trust Companies Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the Banks & Trust Companies Regulation (Amendment) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

MR. G. MAIR BENNETT: No.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the Ayes have it.

MR. G. MAIR BENNETT: Mr. President, may I have a division?

MR. PRESIDENT: Certainly.

THE EVIDENCE DEVELOPMENT BILL, 1945

CLERK: THE EVIDENCE DEVELOPMENT BILL, 1945

MR. RICHARD J. DAILEY: Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled the Evidence (Development) Bill, 1945 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill shortly entitled the Evidence (Development) Bill, 1945 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES

MR. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: May we have a division please?

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately Out of order.

AYES	DIVISION No. 114/45	NOES	ABSTENTIONS
Hon. Derrick M. Foster			
Hon. Michael J. Bradley			
Hon. Thomas S. Jefferson			
Hon. Gerald D. Howard			
Hon. R. Norman Dexter			
Hon. Capt. Charles L. Simmons			
Hon. Walter G. Grimes			
Mr. M. Anthony Irish			
Hon. Stephen S. Gilbert			
Capt. Robert E. Greenwell			
Mr. G. Daly Perkins			
Mr. S. Samuel Miller			
18		0	6

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried, accordingly,

THE EVIDENCE (DEVELOPMENT) BILL, 1945, STOOD PASSED AND SYSTEM.

THE FINANCE PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1945

CLERK: THE FINANCE PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1945

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill shortly entitled The Finance Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1945 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill shortly entitled The Finance Pensions (Amendment) Bill, 1945 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE FINANCE PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1945 GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE [illegible] (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2002

STATE: THE [illegible] (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2002

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill entitled An Act to amend the [illegible] Act, 1980 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled The Statutes (Amendment) Act, 1980 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. The Interpretation (Amendment) Bill, 1980, given a Third Reading and passed.

THE LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980

STATE: THE LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY: Mr. President, I move that a Bill entitled The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Act be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Act, 1980 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO

HON. C. [illegible]: Mr. President, may I have a division?

HON. ASSISTANT: Certainly

DIVISION
NO. 113/85

AYES	NOES
Hon. [illegible]	Hon. [illegible]
Hon. [illegible]	
Hon. [illegible]	
Hon. [illegible]	
Hon. [illegible]	
Hon. [illegible]	
Hon. [illegible]	
Hon. [illegible]	
Hon. [illegible]	
Hon. [illegible]	
11	1

MR. SPEAKER: A division has validly taken place.

RESULT OF MOTION: THE [illegible] (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980, GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

THE COMPTROLLER (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

SECOND READING

THE COMPTROLLER (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

MR. THOMAS C. DEFENDANT: Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that the Comptroller (Amendment) Bill, 1995 be given a Second Reading and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that a Bill entitled The Comptroller (Amendment) Bill, 1995 be given a Second Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: (MR. JOE ROSE)

MR. C. BERT ANDREW: Mr. President, I have a dissent.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

DIVISION
NO. 125/95

AYES	NOES
Hon. Dennis R. Thomas	Mr. C. Bert Andrew
Hon. Michael J. Donally	
Hon. Thaxton D. Jeffrey	
Hon. Duncan G. Taylor	
Hon. J. Brenton Dobbs	
Hon. Capt. (Retd.) C. Montague	
Hon. Rupert C. Johnson	
Mr. R. Anthony Hall	
Hon. Sophie L. Dowell	
Capt. Ashley S. Kirkconnell	
Mr. D. Peyton Miller	
11	1

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

AGREED BY MAJORITY: THE COMPTROLLER (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995, GIVEN A SECOND READING AND PASSED.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 47

HON. THOMAS C. DEFENDANT: Mr. President, I move the suspension of Standing Order 47 to enable me to take the Third Reading of the Travel Tax (Amendment) Bill, the Customs (Amendment) Bill and the Air Navigation (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

MR. PRESIDENT: There is a Travel Tax (Amendment) Bill, if as the House remembers, Travel Taxes have already increased, this year.....

HON. THOMAS C. DEFENDANT: Yes Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case, the matter before the House is that the requirements of the Standing Order 47, Standing Orders be suspended to enable Third Reading of the.....

HON. MICHAEL J. DONALLY: Thank the Hon Minister and.....

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. We have completed our Committee Stage and we have had the Reports at least yesterday or the day before. It is in the Third Reading of the Bills that are shortly entitled the Appropriation Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1981; the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1981 and the Central Bus (Amendment) Bill, 1981. I now beg Members will be brief. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED TO. MOTION PUT AND AGREED TO. (The Second Schedule Motion for Duties Bill was put and agreed to)

MR. PRESIDENT: In that case, Third Reading, pursuant to Order No. 61 (1) now.

THIRD READINGS

THE CENTRAL BUS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

BILL: THE CENTRAL BUS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

MOVED: THE MINISTER FOR FINANCE (HON. PATRICK C. MCKENZIE)

HON. PATRICK C. MCKENZIE: Mr. President, I move the Central Bus (Amendment) Bill, 1981 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill intituled The Central Bus (Amendment) Law, 1981 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES AND NOES

HON. P. C. MCKENZIE: Mr. President, may I have a division?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, of course.

AYES		NOES
Hon. Dennis E. Forbes		Dr. C. Wesley Forbes
Hon. Michael F. Douglas		
Hon. Marcia C. McKenzie		
Hon. Preston O. Simmons		
Hon. M. Antonia Robles		
Hon. Capt. (Retd) L. Richardson		
Hon. Russell D. Johnson		
Hon. A. Anderson Pugh		
Hon. Dorothea T. Daniel		
Capt. Wesley L. Richardson		
Mr. D. Edward Wilson		
10		1

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

QUESTION PUT: THE CENTRAL BUS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981, BE GIVEN A THIRD READING AND PASSED.

[illegible] TAX COLLECTION [illegible], 1985

CLERK: [illegible] TAX COLLECTION [illegible] BILL, 1985.

MOVE, PURSUANT TO [illegible]: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill entitled the [illegible] Tax Collection (Amendment) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill shortly entitled The Tax Collection (Amendment) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: [illegible] AND AGREED

MR. S. SAID DAUDA: Mr. President, can I have a division?

MR. SPEAKER: Two [illegible] minutes.

DIVISION
[illegible]

AYES	NOES
Hon. Senator E. Kiplagat	Mr. D. [illegible] Bank
Hon. [illegible] [illegible]	
Hon. Dickson O. [illegible]	
Hon. Francis O. Ekuwa	
Hon. K. Duncan Ndiiba	
Brig. Capt. Charles L. [illegible]	
Maj. Gerald G. Johnson	
Hon. Sophie I. Omwoto	
Capt. Kelly J. [illegible]	
Mr. G. Ruto Rotich	
Mrs. M. [illegible] Keiloh	

11 | 2

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

AGREED TO: THE TAX COLLECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985, BEING A WRITTEN REQUEST WAS DULY.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill be now read a Third Time - The Unemployment Insurance (Third) Bill, 1985.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE (THIRD) BILL, 1985

CLERK: THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE (THIRD) BILL, 1985.

MOVE, [illegible] S. [illegible]: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill entitled the Unemployment Insurance (Third) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled The Unemployment Insurance (Third) Bill, 1985 be given a Third Reading and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AYES

MR. M. [illegible] BIN?: Mr. President, can I have a division please?

MR. [illegible]: Yes.

DIVISION
No. 113/93

AYES		NOES	
Hon. Dennis R. Parker			
Hon. Michael J. Costello			
Hon. Thomas C. Jeffreys			
Hon. Dennis D. Temple			
Hon. D. Norman Hodges			
Hon. Chas. Sheridan L. McDonnell			
Hon. Manuel G. Arbaugh			
Hon. E. McKenzie Traft			
Hon. Gustavo L. Duarte			
Chas. Henry G. McDonnell			
Mr. C. Vicky Tucker			
Mr. D. Daniel Miller			
10		0	

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

THE PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATIVE (Hon. Eric Gair): I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I declare the question, I would like to make one point for members' information.

Members may recall that when I spoke to them briefly at the very beginning I spoke of this meeting, it probably was on Budget Day, and explained the situation which had to arise where because of the Matrimonial Causes Bill, or Law. I did say that there were possibly one or two other matters which were like the same category, and consequently because the same circumstances, but would then not have been brought into effect, although there remained [illegible] they had been dealt in [illegible] we have now completed what we hope is a thorough review of all matters [illegible]. There are two or three private Bills which there which I am [illegible] [illegible]. There are two or three [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] they were in effect, but there are two which have declared to have been in effect, and people have made appointments or arranged fees, or have taken other action in regard, or made preparations to enjoy those two days, and they were like Corpus Christi and the Queen's Birthday [illegible]. It is therefore necessary in both cases where to have retrospective legislation, and this is the reason why the Matrimonial Causes Bill has been circulated [illegible]. Members, I think that will have received the Gazette [illegible] today, and they will have seen it. They have had an opportunity to read the Tuesday Bills, but will now have their publication including those last two Bills, with effect from tomorrow. And what I've to do now is the Bills which are in front of the House is [illegible] motion taken [illegible] the good [illegible] in the Bill, and like [illegible] the other ones.

I would suggest that we [illegible] two o'clock because the staff have been kept on very late, and I think there is not [illegible] [illegible] for tomorrow, and it will give the staff a bit more chance to [illegible] and get a meal. I do not think there is a lot of business left for tomorrow now.

ADJOURNMENT

MAYOR DENNIS A. MOSIER: I declare this meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m., tomorrow.

MR. TOMASZEWSKI: The question is what time do you adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. AT 10:05 P.M. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, AND THE MEETING ADJOURNED.

BUDGET AND FINANCE MEETING OF THE 1993 SESSION
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PENNSYLVANIA BAR

SENATE
MAIN BUILDING, 1821

PRESENT:

THE HONORABLE THE CHAIRMAN, MR. C. PETER LEWIS, ESQ., CHR. - PRESIDENT

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS:

HON. O.B. FOSTER, ESQ.; CDS., SP. — POLICY SPECIFIC HOUSING RESPONSIBILITY FOR INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL ADVANCE

HON. NICHOLAS J. NICHOLAS, JR., U.S. — SENIOR SPECIFIC HOUSING PERSONNEL - BOP TRUST ADMINISTRATION

HON. THOMAS C. JUDGEMENT, SP. — SENIOR SPECIFIC HOUSING RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FINANCE AND SECRETARIES

HON. RONALD D. EVANS — MEMBER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

HON. W. HOWARD BOSTON, JUR — MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, AGRICULTURE AND STATES

HON. CHARLES L. WITHDRAWAL — MEMBER FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

HON. PATRICK S. KENNEDY, CHR., JR. — MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND REGIONAL RESOURCES

PERSONAL MEMBERS:

SP. M. ROBERTA BUSH — SENIOR SPECIFIC MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH PERSONNEL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY

HON. DARLENE L. OSWALT — UNITED PERSONAL MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH PERSONNEL DISTRICT OF WEST BAY

SP. EDWARD A. PLUMBOCK, JR. — SENIOR SPECIFIC MEMBER FOR THE SECOND PERSONNEL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL COUNTY

HON. HARRY E. WITHDRAWAL — ELECT PERSONAL MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH PERSONNEL DISTRICT OF THE CENTER PERSONS

SP. C. WILD GOODSON — SECOND PERSONAL MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH PERSONNEL DISTRICT OF MIDDLE COUNTY

SP. D. RICHARD WALKER — ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH STAR

AGENCY:

MR. JAMES M. BROWN — FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE FIFTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF SECOND TOWN

MR. JOHN S. MCLEAN — PERSONAL MEMBER FOR THE SIXTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF EAST BAY

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]
(b) [illegible]
(c) [illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]
(b) [illegible]
(c) [illegible]

[illegible]

(a) [illegible]
(b) [illegible]
(c) [illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[illegible]	1
REPORT OF RURAL/AREA CONSULTANT OF WESTERN REGION OF DATA [illegible] AND THE DISCUSSION, 1958 - PART OF THE STUDIES	2
AN EDUCATIONAL [illegible] STUDY, 1958 - REPORT [illegible] [illegible]	3
THE PUBLIC SCHOOL [illegible] [illegible] 1958 - [illegible] AND [illegible]	3
THE TOWNSHIP [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	4
AN EDUCATIONAL [illegible] STUDY, 1958 - [illegible] [illegible]	6
THE PUBLIC SCHOOL [illegible] [illegible] 1958 - [illegible] [illegible]	6
THE EDUCATIONAL [illegible] STUDY, 1958 - [illegible] [illegible]	8
THE PUBLIC [illegible] [illegible] STUDY, 1958 - [illegible] [illegible]	9
THE EDUCATIONAL [illegible] STUDY, 1958 - [illegible] READING	9
THE PUBLIC SCHOOL [illegible] [illegible] 1958 - [illegible] [illegible]	9
[illegible]	9

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayer. The Honorable Virgil Chapman, Kentucky.

SEN. VIRGIL CHAPMAN: Let us pray.

Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We beseech Thee so to direct and govern the deliberations of this legislative assembly that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy name and for the safety, honor and welfare of the people of these islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Anne Princess of Wales and all the royal family. Give grace to all who administer authority in this commonwealth that they may be endued with knowledge, wisdom and understanding, courage and fortitude, righteous and virtuous may be established among us. Especially do Thou bless the Governor of this Dominion, the Members of the Executive Council and Justices of the Supreme Court of Bermuda, that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high offices.

All this we ask for Thy most worthy name, Amen. The Lord's Prayer.

Our Father, which 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 those 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 lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please be seated.

Presentation of Petitions and Records.

The Honorable Minister Without Portfolio.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS AND REPORTS

REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE

SEN. DENNIS G. STOWE: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the Report of the Selection Committee.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

SEN. DENNIS G. STOWE: Mr. President, the Selection Committee met on the 27th September, 4th December and 11th December to set the Order of Business of the House. The Members be very short, Sir, and thanks for their, and I ask that it be adopted.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is shall the Report of the Business Committee be adopted.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. REPORT OF BUSINESS COMMITTEE AGREED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings. In the absence of the First Elected Member [illegible] and other Members being detained on constituency work pursuant to S.O. [illegible] are the questions for him or his proxies requirements? No. In that case the questions will lapse.

Government Business. Resumption of Debating Debate to end 2/.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 28 (1)

HON. DENNIS G. KRAMER: Mr. President, under the provisions of Standing Order 28 I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 46(1) which states Members have not less than Three Days Notice of the introduction [illegible] Bills and the Water Health (Prohibition) Bill, 2015 for the purpose of this.

I also seek, Sir, suit of an exemption of motion, that Standing Order 46(1) be suspended. I further move, Sir, that Standing Order 46 be suspended to allow the Bills be read a first time today.

MR. PRESIDENT: The motion for that Standing Order be suspended by the Honourable First Elected Member of Executive Council. Is my Honourable friends to second the motion.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. STANDING ORDER 28 (1) SUSPENDED.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear.

BILLS

THE EXECUTIVE (EMPOWERING) BILL, 2015

FIRST READING

CLERK: THE EXECUTIVE (EMPOWERING) BILL, 2015.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled a Bill for an Act to [illegible] under the Interpretation Law, 2015 (Law of 2nd 2015), be deemed to have been read a First time and be set down for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

CLERK: THE EXECUTIVE (EMPOWERING) BILL, 2015.

HON. DENNIS G. KRAMER: Mr. President, I beg to move, Sir, the Second Reading of a Bill for a to establish [illegible] under the Interpretation Law, 2015 (Law of 2nd 2015).

MR. [illegible] (continuing): Mr. President, this is simply a [illegible] I would not have used [illegible] the Immigration Act, 1988 can proceed by this unanimous consent [illegible] I should like to [illegible] the Immigration Act, 1988 be [illegible] by the Senate by publication in the Gazette. A month of the Gazette, Mr. President, [illegible] to [illegible], if any, [illegible] has come into operation. To [illegible] rights, this Bill [illegible] to [illegible] which should have [illegible] to [illegible] taken under the Immigration Act, 1988 [illegible] 22nd December, 1988 [illegible] 23rd December, 1988.

[illegible] Mr. President, I notice [illegible] that [illegible] under the [illegible] which [illegible] to remove all doubt. This Bill is [illegible] to [illegible] I do [illegible] Bill [illegible] unanimously [illegible] to [illegible] the Immigration Act, 1988 [illegible] to [illegible] Bill [illegible] unopposed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to validate [illegible] be [illegible] a Second Reading. The motion is open for debate.

If no Member wishes to speak I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. THE IMMIGRATION (VALIDATION) BILL, 1988 WAS [illegible] AND PASSED.

MR. SPEAKER: [illegible]

THE IMMIGRATION (VALIDATION) BILL, 1988

FIRST READING

CLERK: The Immigration (Validation) Bill, 1988.

MR. SPEAKER: A Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to validate [illegible] the Immigration Act, 1988 be [illegible] a First Time Now I shall call on the Minister for Justice.

SECOND READING

CLERK: The Immigration (Validation) Bill, 1988.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. President, I beg to move, Sir, that [illegible] a Bill entitled a Bill for a Law to validate certain [illegible] Immigration Act, 1988 [illegible].

The circumstances [illegible] Bill, Mr. President, are [illegible] to the Immigration Act, 1988 [illegible] through the Second Reading. There is unanimously [illegible] to be [illegible] and this Bill seeks to do [illegible] validate [illegible] unfortunately [illegible] in passing of [illegible] to the Immigration Act, 1988, which would [illegible] to [illegible] that Act [illegible] operation on the 30th April, 1988, or, it seems [illegible] validate anything [illegible] the basis of that Act between the 1st of April, 1988 and the 30th day of September, 1988.

Finally, Mr. President, [illegible] Constitutional Courts [illegible] Immigration [illegible] constitutional. That is [illegible], Sir. This Bill seeks merely to validate matters [illegible] before [illegible] and I commend it to the [illegible] consideration of the House.

THE SPEAKER: The question is that a bill entitled [illegible] be read the third time.

The question is put and the bill is read the third time.

THE SPEAKER: The question is, shall the bill pass?

THE CLERK: The motion carried: [illegible] the bill passed.

THE SPEAKER: Order. Please resume your seats.

THE CLERK: [illegible]

THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO [illegible] (SECOND READING) [illegible]

[illegible]

THE CLERK: Mr. Speaker, the amendments which [illegible] to the [illegible] Senate to [illegible] the [illegible] Association [illegible] (Amendments) Bill, 1990.

Mr. Speaker, I am moving this because [illegible] Members sufficient time to study the bill. Members [illegible] the bill have published by the Committee. [illegible] the bill [illegible] the Act [illegible], I am seeking the [illegible] of this Bill from this House which is necessary to [illegible] the Act passed in 1990. This will give the public sufficient time to study the bill.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The question is that [illegible] the [illegible] of Standing Order 28 of this Bill [illegible] be withdrawn. Does any Member wish to speak?

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join [illegible] I support the withdrawal of this Bill. I have reasons to [illegible] the Bill yesterday and moved [illegible] the Government might [illegible] to call Members such a bill. The Members...

THE SPEAKER: I think that the Member must not speak on the withdrawal of the Bill. However, he has not done so yet. If he has not going to that is alright.

MR. [illegible]: Mr. Speaker, I am [illegible]...

THE SPEAKER: I removed myself. I thought that you [illegible]...

THE CLERK: I am seeking this [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] to be what we will say and then we remove [illegible] [illegible] to be [illegible] by [illegible] Government [illegible]. I am moving.

THE SPEAKER: Please continue your speech, it was [illegible] by the [illegible].

[illegible]: Mr. Speaker, [illegible] Members [illegible] the [illegible] Members [illegible] [illegible] Bill [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill? If not, I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985, AS AMENDED, ORDERED.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister will now go into Committee of the whole House to consider the Public Accountants (Amendment) Bill, 1985, and the Public Offices.

THE ACCOUNTANTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

COMMITTEE STAGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.
The Minister is now in Committee. I will put the question on the Public Accountants (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

CLAUSE 1 - SHORT TITLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, CLAUSE 1 ORDERED.

CLAUSE 2 - AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF ACT 1985.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.

MR. MICHAEL A. BRANDON: Since it is my first opportunity to speak in this House, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your appointment as Chairman of this Committee. I believe I am the youngest Member of this House, I believe I am the youngest Member of this House, and I believe I am the youngest Member of this House, and I believe I am the youngest Member of this House, and

[illegible] (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

[illegible]

Clause 2 - [illegible]

Mr. Speaker: The question is that clause 2 be stood part of the Bill.

Question put: [illegible] CLAUSE 2 AGREED.

Clause 3 - [illegible]

Mr. Speaker: The question is that clause 3 be stood part of the Bill.

Question put: [illegible] CLAUSE 3 AGREED.

Clause 4 - [illegible]

Mr. Speaker: The question is that clause 4 be stood part of the Bill.

Question put: [illegible] CLAUSE 4 AGREED.

Clause 5 - [illegible]

Mr. Speaker: The question is that clause 5 be stood part of the Bill.

Question put: [illegible] CLAUSE 5 AGREED.

Clause 6 - [illegible]

Mr. Speaker: The question is that clause 6 be stood part of the Bill.

Question put: [illegible] CLAUSE 6 AGREED.

Clause 7 - [illegible]

Mr. Speaker: The Clerk has received [illegible] to move [illegible] which reads as follows:-

"Publication of [illegible] under Cap 6 of 1987".

It should be, "Cap 6 of 1987".

The question is [illegible] to omit [illegible] and substitute [illegible] Publication [illegible] 1988 and another Bill. The Bill will [illegible]

Third Reading

Mr. [illegible]: Please be seated.
Agreed.

THE [illegible] (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

Second Reading

Mr. [illegible]: [illegible] I beg to move, Sir, that a Bill [illegible] to validate [illegible] under the Education Act, 1988 [illegible] by a Committee of [illegible] Kiriro constituency.

Mr. [illegible]: Seconded.

Question put: The Bill be read a second time and [illegible]

Agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH (FLUORIDATION) BILL, 1985

SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, I have to report that I have received a Bill entitled "The Public Health (Fluoridation) Bill, 1985" and recommend that it should be read a Second time and accept Official Amendments.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill is accordingly read a Second Time.

Second Reading.

Bill, Third Reading.

THE SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Superannuation (Miscellaneous) Bill, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, I beg to move, that a Bill entitled "The Superannuation (Miscellaneous) Bill, 1985" be read a Third Time and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled "The Superannuation (Miscellaneous) Bill, 1985" be read a Third time and passed. I will put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, BILL READ A THIRD TIME AND PASSED.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH (FLUORIDATION) BILL, 1985

THIRD READING

CLERK: The Public Health (Fluoridation) Bill, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, I beg to move, that a Bill entitled "The Public Health (Fluoridation) Bill, 1985" be read a Third time and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled "The Public Health (Fluoridation) Bill, 1985" be read a Third time and passed.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED, BILL READ A THIRD TIME AND PASSED.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until Tuesday, before moving that motion, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to wish you and your family, Mr. Vice-President, Honourable and Honourable Members and Staff of this House and the people of this Country a Happy Christmas and a Prosperous New Year. To those I shall not see, I wish them a Merry Christmas and a Prosperous New Year also.

Mr. President, Christmas is a time for family gatherings and merry making, I think that Members should look more and realize how precious life is and that they must conform to rules of road traffic safety and drive carefully.

THE HONORABLE ALAN: Mr. President....

THE PRESIDENT: Let me just put the question first before you actually speak.

The question is shall this House do now adjourn sine die. The motion is open for debate and the Second Minister for Natural Resources may speak.

THE HONORABLE ALAN: Mr. President, I was going to take this opportunity to extend season's greetings to my colleagues and also Members and Staff across the entire country of the Pacific. I like wagons, Mr. Speaker, you're not alone with the Pacific Islands.

Mr. President, as I have had a speech written here. I have been very good friends who have been here since yesterday. Obviously, Mystery Bible Christmas season. I have seen here. I have heard many people sleep in this session but one which has marked more to me than Christmas is the song "All Body Begin". I think of Peace, the most useful ingredient, for gender bender a nice and glorious song. I think of Peace, Mr. President, that is the look in the eye. Your Peace is more here. We sometimes the uncertainty of the world we are subject on to ourselves. However, thank God, through Him with Christ Jesus, there is a World of hope in the coming years. May God bless us. May God bless these Islands and our people wherever we travel.

THE SPEAKER: The Honourable Member Leader of Government Business.

THE HONORABLE ROBERT G. REIHER: Mr. President, I speak on behalf of the four Elected Members of Government Council, Sir. We would like to extend to you and your family in which for a very joyous Christmas and a prosperous New Year. The same good wishes go to all the members of the Legislature Assembly staff including also Mary in the Post Office. I know that the Honourable Second Official Member would like me to inform that she out in Kwajalein. Those good wishes, Mr. President, also go to all Members of the Legislature Assembly across the entire country.

I would like on behalf of the Staff of Mr. Ray, to thank him for the welcome and he is delighted to hold Peace with us and Goodwill Message. We have a very trying time for I believe that also here also in Majuro also. May God bless you in the future.

THE SPEAKER: The Second Minister for Natural Resources.

THE HONORABLE ALAN: Mr. President, I too would join Members in extending to you and your family Christmas greetings and would request to all Members of this Honourable Assembly and the Staff of the Legislature Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that the spirit of Christmas be with us throughout the year and not only at Christmas time. Thank you.

MR. LEGGETT: (Continued) I move, Sir, that all Members of this House shall be taken to wish what and that the New York Jets be happy and successful and have a prosperous New Year.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Great Bishop Member for the Leeward Islands.

MR. HUBERT C. BLACKBURNE: Mr. President, I too would like to join with everybody to wish you and your family a very happy Christmas and a happy and prosperous 1969. This applies from me, Mr. President, and the members of my constituency. We are sorry that you will not be able to visit us during the holiday season. However, knowing of politics outside of here.

I would also like to express the view that we have in the Chair and her entire staff of this House. The House seemed here and they have been helpful to me and all members during the week. You sought me very cheerful.

On all Government Employees of this House and their families I convey the very best wishes, also to the people of the Cayman Islands as a whole. I think that we have accomplished during the year 1968 and I hope for a very happy and prosperous 1969. Thank you sir.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. SECRETARY: Hon. the Chief Elected Member for Rum Bay.

HON. CAPTAIN J. CULVER: Thank you, Mr. President.

I would like to say, Mr. President, that I am grateful for the opportunity to wish you, Sir, and your wife and family all the best for Christmas. I am grateful for your leadership and for the fine ability which you use for us here in the House. For this I am extremely thankful.

I am grateful to each Member who has contributed to the debates in this House, as well as for all that Government has been able to accomplish during the year. I feel, Sir, that we are on the right road for good things and I think that the Opposition is in a good time for reflecting on what we have and have not done, and for exercising our rights as this people.

I thank the staff of the Legislative Assembly who have been cooperative and dependable whenever I had the need of them. I would be very glad if each Member would help me to do my job. Christmas and the New Year will help me to do that.

Above everybody else I trust that we will recognize that what we celebrate here at the Lord Jesus Christ and that consequently we will be able to have a Merry Christmas, with hearts of thankfulness to God for the Blessed Gift of Salvation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Member for South West,

[illegible] Mr. Speaker, sir, I just would like to have unanimously to extend Senator's greetings to the [illegible] the members of this House and their families and to the staff of this Assembly and their families.

Thank you, Sir.

[illegible] Mr. Speaker, Sir, as Sophie Wanless [illegible] Senator I may just say a word before I put the question. I think [illegible] of Senate to all Members for their good wishes, which I wholeheartedly would like to send on Speedy's name, and Sophie to rest and enjoy one of those Sundays she has come with us today, and to all of those families for the hard work and [illegible] Legislature and I understand all unanimously that.

I would like to send sympathies to [illegible] Members of the Assembly's wives [illegible] and to [illegible] and [illegible] who have been under [illegible] and [illegible] Mrs. Speaker, I should like to record my appreciation to Members [illegible] Legislature [illegible] Mrs. Speaker, when we [illegible] Legislature