



**CAYMAN ISLANDS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
ELECTRONIC VERSION**

2015/16 SESSION

21 May 2015

Third Sitting of the First Meeting
Throne Speech and Budget Address
(pages 71-108)

**Hon Juliana O'Connor-Connolly, JP, MLA
Speaker**

Disclaimer: The electronic version of the *Official Hansard Report* is for informational purposes only. The printed version remains the official record.

PRESENT WERE:

SPEAKER

Hon Juliana Y O'Connor- Connolly, JP, MLA
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

Hon Alden McLaughlin, MBE, JP, MLA	<i>The Premier</i> , Minister of Home Affairs, Health and Culture
Hon Moses I Kirkconnell, JP, MLA	<i>Deputy Premier</i> , Minister of District Administration, Tourism and Transport
Hon D Kurt Tibbetts, OBE, JP, MLA	Minister of Planning, Lands, Agriculture, Housing and Infrastructure
Hon Marco S Archer, MLA	Minister of Finance and Economic Development
Hon Osbourne V Bodden, MLA	Minister of Community Affairs, Youth and Sports
Hon G Wayne Panton, MLA	Financial Services, Commerce and Environment
Hon Tara A Rivers, MLA	Minister of Education, Employment and Gender Affairs

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

Hon Franz I Manderson Cert. Hon., JP	Deputy Governor, ex officio Member responsible for the Civil Service
Hon Samuel Bulgin, QC, JP	Attorney General, ex officio Member responsible for Legal Affairs

ELECTED MEMBERS

GOVERNMENT BACKBENCHERS

Mr Anthony S Eden, OBE, JP, MLA	<i>Deputy Speaker</i> , First Elected Member for Bodden Town
Mr Roy McTaggart, MLA	Second Elected Member for George Town
Mr Winston C Connolly, Jr, MLA	Fifth Elected Member for George Town
Mr Alva H Suckoo, MLA	Fourth Elected Member for Bodden Town

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Mr Bernie A Bush, MLA	<i>Deputy Leader of the Opposition</i> , Third Elected Member for West Bay
Capt A Eugene Ebanks, JP, MLA	Fourth Elected Member for West Bay

INDEPENDENT MEMBERS

Mr D Ezzard Miller, MLA	Elected Member for North Side
Mr V Arden McLean, JP, MLA	Elected Member for East End

APOLOGIES

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, OBE, JP, MLA	<i>Leader of the Opposition</i> , First Elected Member for West Bay
Mr Joseph X Hew, MLA	Sixth Elected Member for George Town

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
STATE OPENING AND BUDGET
2015/16 SESSION
THURSDAY
21 MAY 2015
10:20 AM
Third Sitting**

[Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Connolly, Speaker, presiding]

The Speaker: Good morning. I will ask the Honourable Deputy Speaker to grace us with prayers today.

PRAYERS

Hon. Anthony S. Eden, Deputy Speaker, First Elected Member for Bodden Town: Let us pray:

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

Bless our Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth II; Philip, Duke of Edinburgh; Charles, Prince 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 Premier, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Leader of the Opposition, Ministers of the Cabinet, Ex-officio Members, and Members of the Legislative Assembly, that we may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of our high office. All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake.

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. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.*

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

The Speaker: Please be seated.

READING BY THE SPEAKER OF MESSAGES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

APOLOGIES

The Speaker: I have received apologies from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who is away attending a graduation, and from the Sixth Elected Member for George Town who will also not be here today.

QUESTIONS TO HONOURABLE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

The Speaker: The Elected Member for North Side, to ask the Honourable Minister of Planning question number 1.

QUESTION NO. 1: DART HOTEL, COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller, Member for North Side: Madam Speaker, I will take my time to give the Honourable Minister time to attend to the Chambers.

The Speaker: That is most considerate, Member. The Honourable Minister is here.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to ask the Honourable Minister of Planning, Lands, Agriculture, Housing and Infrastructure: Can the Honourable Minister state if the hotel being built by Dart conforms to the Planning requirements for height and the number of floors allowed?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts, Minister of Planning, Lands, Agriculture, Housing and Infrastructure: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The answer is as follows: The Central Planning Authority (CPA) reviewed the application for planning permission for the hotel and determined that it complied with the Development and Planning Regulations in terms of building height.

The CPA recognises that the maximum permitted height of a building in the Hotel/Tourism 1 zone is 130 feet, or 10 storeys, whichever is the less, as per regulation 8(2)(e) of the Development and Planning Regulations. The regulations define "height of a build-

ing” as the vertical distance measured from the highest point of the building to the proposed finished grade. In the case of the Dart hotel, the applicant’s proposal was to fill and grade the site such that there would be two covered basement floors below the finished grade. As a result, the height of the building is measured from the new finished grade and the CPA, at the time, determined that the hotel complied with the permissible building height of 130’ and 10 storeys.

The Speaker: Are there any supplementaries?
Member for North Side.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
Can the Minister confirm that based on his answer this hotel is likely to be 12 storeys and not 10, with 2 being supposedly underground?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister of Planning.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Madam Speaker, I understand very well the way the question has been asked, and I refer to the answer that I gave which is to do with the definition in the regulations. If I were to answer in layman’s terms, I would say that if you went and inspected the building you would find 2 floors which are under the finished grade, and 10 floors that are above.

The Speaker: Elected Member for North Side.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, can the Minister confirm that the finished grade from which the measurement will be taken to allow these two additional floors is how many feet above the original grade of the land? In other words, the contours that are recorded in Lands and Survey as to the natural contours of the land, how many feet above that has the land been filled in order to accommodate two and how wide is that? Was it just the hotel footprint, or does it cover the whole property?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister of Planning.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
That information I do not have with me, but I will certainly commit to the Member to get that information, and I will get it today, and let the Member know.

Just to advise, and I know that I am responsible, and I know that whatever information I need I have access to get it, but this part is not something that I, as Minister, am very familiar with because it was well underway when I became the Minister.

[Hon. Minister of PLAH&I undertook to provide at a later date, the information on how wide the built up of the ground to cover two floors of the hotel is]

The Speaker: Elected Member for North Side.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, would the Minister confirm that this is, in fact, setting a dangerous precedent? And pardon me, Madam Speaker, but I need to give the Minister a little background of why I put this question, if you would permit me.

The Speaker: Permitted.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Because this has now transferred to Rum Point where we have an individual who, because he wanted his house 10 feet above everybody else’s, has filled his land 10 feet at the boundaries to the adjoining lots, vertical, and the risk we run here is that anybody who comes here in the future and wants to exceed the number of floors in a building, simply has to raise the grade of the property to whatever height of floors that they want to get extra and Planning will give them permission.

Madam Speaker, if that the likely scenario, as I see it, then I would propose that the Minister bring an amendment to 8(2)(e) immediately that says, *Measurements must be taken from above sea level plus whatever the registered contour of that property is in Lands and Registry under the original survey.*

The Speaker: Honourable Minister of Planning.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Madam Speaker, let me take the questions and comments one step at a time.

First of all, I myself have observed the location just past the Kaibo that the Member for North Side is speaking about, and I have inquired about it. What I did not know, and still do not know yet, is whether that was done to have floors down below that, or whether it was simply done for height. But if it were only done for height, I do not think that that is actually because there was a difficulty with how high the building was going to be. I suspect that that land owner simply wanted to get that height. I do not whether he was looking to protect from storm surge or what. But that does not change your point; I know that. All I am trying to say is that the comparison is not necessarily for the same reasons to have the finished grade be that. But I have inquired about that so that I could get a clear understanding.

Not to try to pre-empt anything, but when this question came in, that was the first time I had personal knowledge of how the construction down there was being done. I already have said to my staff that as soon as we get a minute we need to sit down and look at this to see whether this is something that we want to allow the regulations to continue to allow and to give me a broad view of exactly what any ramifications may be.

So, the question that the Member has asked, if I can confirm that it is setting a dangerous precedent, I cannot answer that question the way he would

like me to. But what I can say, Madam Speaker, is that I have already asked the question and when we make a clear determination as to the benefits and the drawbacks and all the other things, then, certainly, if it requires an amendment we will certainly do that. But I do not want to commit right away, flying off the handle, because as the Member well knows, I would much rather be from a very informed position to be able to know what to promote in that regard. But I understand exactly what the Member for North Side is saying, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: I recognise the Member for North Side.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Just to let the Minister know that I am aware of the one at the Kaibo. But the one I was actually talking about is the condo development by Rum Point where they are attempting to mound right to the boundary in order to create parking to expand the building they have there, because they basically . . . but I think that developer did it at another development along Seven Mile Beach where he raised the same thing to get the additional storeys. So he got away with it on Seven Mile Beach, and now he is simply transferring the application and doing the same thing in Rum Point.

I am also very concerned about the property that you mentioned, because it is seriously infringing on the adjoining landowners where the fill is just falling into the land. My understanding is that the Planning permission they have does not allow that. It was only supposed to be three feet at the boundaries and it was stepped in to get up to the feet gradually, which I understand was intended for the storm surge. But as you know, everybody else in Rum Point only raised the foundation of the building, not the whole lot.

The Speaker: Honourable Minister of Planning.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Madam Speaker, just to follow up on what the Member has said, and I thank you for the latitude you have allowed, what you have mentioned, I will make part and parcel of the entire look-see and investigation to see exactly what is the best way to move forward, whether we need to make amendments and, if so, we will ensure that is done in a speedy fashion. Thank you.

The Speaker: I recognise the Member for East End.

Mr. V. Arden McLean, Member for East End: Madam Speaker, just to ask the Minister: We heard some time ago that there wasn't any total Planning approval given for the Kimpton in the initial stages. The red card was not issued until much later in the development. Can the Minister tell us if these plans were not reviewed, and if this was not pointed out to the Ministry at the time?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister of Planning.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Madam Speaker, my understanding is that all plans were reviewed. But I hope I explain this in the correct fashion . . . I have spoken to the Director of Planning about the issue to ensure there are no anomalies with regard to the process itself. What has been explained is that the Department itself, and this is not to accommodate developers, but this is just process through the Department itself, that they give various permission at various stages, and it is nothing to do with any lack of examination of the plans in the initial stages, but they give various permissions. And the reason why they have adopted that principle is so as not to cause undue delays in developments which wish to take place. But the process itself, and I was very careful in my deliberations with the Director of Planning, and I have been assured that the process itself does not negate, nor does it neglect, the actual inspections or examinations, rather, that need to be done to ensure that plans conform with the Planning laws and regulations.

If the Member wants to be specific about this one, I will make determination by getting a response from the Director of Planning, and perhaps get it in writing if the Member so desires. But when that came up initially, what I just explained is what the Director of Planning explained to me by way of a process that is taking place.

The Speaker: Elected Member for East End.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Now that the Minister said he can go further and ask further questions or discuss it further—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Yes.

I understand that they give different stages of approval for these buildings to prevent holdup, which I support, however, in this instance I believe that the foundation approval was given, but MEP [mechanical, electrical, plumbing] approval was not given until the fourth or fifth floor. Can the Minister in his research find out if that is the case?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister of Planning.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Madam Speaker, I certainly will do so and advise the Member accordingly. I will.

The Speaker: If there are no further supplementaries, we will move on to the next question.

QUESTION NO. 2: SEAMEN'S BENEFITS

[Deferred]

The Speaker: I recognise the Member for North Side.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I beg to ask the Honourable Minister of Community Affairs, Youth and Sports Question No. 2: Can the Honourable Minister say how many persons are receiving seaman's benefits from Government as of April 30, 2015, and what benefits do they receive?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister of Community Affairs.

Hon. Osbourne V. Bodden, Minister of Community Affairs, Youth and Sports: Madam Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 23(5), may I ask that the question be deferred?

The Speaker: The question is that Question No. 2 be deferred by virtue of Standing Order 23(5).

All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Can I just check, before I finish this question if the Honourable Minister wishes to do the same for Question No. 3?

Hon. Osbourne V. Bodden: Yes, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

The Speaker: Okay.

If you would just request, then I will put the question on both, rather than doing it separately.

Hon. Osbourne V. Bodden: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In relation to Questions 2 and 3, standing in my name, according to Standing Order 23(5) can those Questions be deferred? Thank you.

The Speaker: The question is that the Questions 2 and 3 as they appear on the Order Paper for Thursday, 21 May 2015, be deferred in accordance with Standing Order 23(5).

All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: Questions No. 2 and No. 3 deferred.

STATEMENTS BY HONOURABLE MEMBERS AND MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

The Speaker: There are no statements for this morning.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILL

SECOND READING

APPROPRIATION (JULY 2015 TO JUNE 2016)
BILL, 2015

DEBATE ON THE BUDGET ADDRESS AND THRONE SPEECH

~ Together with ~

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY STATEMENT

[Continuation of debate thereon]

The Speaker: I recognise the honourable Member for the district of East End on the continuation of his debate. There are 30 minutes remaining sir.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Madam Speaker, thank you.

Madam Speaker, with the limited time that I have left, I wish to touch on some other matters that are extremely relevant to our people. One of those matters happens to be crime. I note that the Premier in his delivery merely brushed over it on page 41 when he said: "**As we take measures to reduce the crime rate, the Royal Cayman Islands Police Service continues its efforts to identify and confront the security threats faced by the Cayman Islands.**" Madam Speaker, I believe that the country deserves a little more than that. I understand the quandary that the Premier finds himself in, in being responsible for the financial aspect of the police department and nothing else.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Well, yes, we talk about the Governor speaking about it but I really need something from us.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: I understand old boy.

Madam Speaker, I know the Governor has constitutional responsibility for it, but we continue to use that as a prop. The people of this country could not care less about who has responsibility for it. All they know is that we are responsible for them. That's all they know, and as such, they are right. And we must put pressure wherever to ensure that people are

safe. There is very little that is of more importance to any citizen, besides eating, other than their safety. And people are not feeling safe, Madam Speaker. I am going to let the Premier off of the constitutional responsibility, but certainly the responsibility to the people, we hold that. And there is too much. People are not feeling safe. And every time we deploy police officers in particular areas, my constituency in particular, they move and redeploy them and crime spikes.

Madam Speaker, I do not wish to speak on a matter that would make it sub-judice, but the press this morning reporting . . . I don't know what it means about how nearly squandering a case of whatever the case may be. So, I will leave it at that. But, Madam Speaker, people feel like they are empowered by the lack of police presence. And, Madam Speaker, I ain't blaming the Commissioner of Police. If the resources are not made available to them we need to make sure they are available. And if the job is not done, once he has the resources, we need to fire him. Get rid of him now. If we can—we—the 18 of us, can stand and say we provided the resources for him and there are no better results, we need to fire him, whatever that process is.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Madam Speaker, yesterday I spoke about having written to the Premier . . . and for the benefit of all of those who would think that I was fabricating stories because it appears like the government email is not working, I should really give him one copy of this to give to the Premier because it appears like he did not receive it.

The Speaker: Member, are you endeavouring to lay the document or just sharing personally with the Premier?

Mr. V. Arden McLean: No, just sharing it personally with him but I am going to read it.

The Speaker: If you read it, I need a copy as well.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Well, he will have to get one off of that because I only have one, Madam Speaker.

So, Madam Speaker, maybe I should not read it. I want to give him the benefit of the doubt that those emails in the government are not working. But in that same vein then, maybe I need to give the Minister of Works a copy of the one that I sent to him and he responded to and has lost my email, I guess. And my email is on this one, so maybe I will just share it as well. But, Madam Speaker, that means there is no need for him to do copies then, if I am just going to share it with them.

Madam Speaker, let me go on to a couple of other issues that certainly the Government has said that they are going to be addressing in this year. One

is the one man one vote. Now, Madam Speaker, I don't know what the outcome was of the big meeting last night. I understand it was not so big. Usually, in West Bay those meetings are big. Madam Speaker, I know yesterday the Leader of the Opposition invited the Premier to join him in opposition to the single member constituencies, one person one vote. Madam Speaker, I want to warn the Premier that if the Premier did not learn in 2000 from his unforgivable lapse of better judgement, this time he will if he now lapses into that again.

Madam Speaker, in 30 years of leadership from the Leader of the Opposition, he attempted to be in Cabinet five times and only served one full one. Madam Speaker, the Members in this Hallowed Hall entrusted him with leadership in this country, not the people out there; it was the Members in here. And every time they rescind that trust—now that speaks volumes. But every time every person the Leader of the Opposition has come in here with, is no longer. I merely say it to say that his opposition to the one man one vote may very well cause him, or those who come with him, their demise too. I say no more.

Madam Speaker, that was for the Premier. You know what happened in 2000, and that was short-lived on the anniversary date of the election in 2001.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Don't follow him. Bad will be your end.

Madam Speaker, another issue I want to talk about is this liquor licence that the Minister of Financial Services, and I am sure he will speak to it at length, or I hope so, upon his rising to debate these matters.

Madam Speaker, one of two things or both have to happen with the liquor licence: the chairman has to go or the law has to be changed or both have to happen soon.

An Hon. Member: Both.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Both? Thank God.

Madam Speaker, I had the occasion to meet with the chairman recently on a complaint made by my—

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Constituent.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: No, my family, to the board. And when I said that the board has no authority to do certain things, his response was that the law does not say you can't do it. Now if that is how we are operating the laws in this country . . . and, Madam Speaker, to the Attorney General, my response to that was: but the board is a creature of statutes and if that statute does not say it, you cannot do it in your capacity as

members of the board, but more so, as chairman! And if you are exercising a particular function on behalf of the board as chairman, show me the instruments. There are none! We need to stop people leasing licences without it being on the premises. The law is very specific in it, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, let me say that I have no interest in this. I don't sell any liquor but I have a vested interest in when my family rights are being encroached upon and they feel aggrieved by it and they make a complaint to the relevant authorities in this country. So, I go as a family member to see them righted, not as a Member of Parliament; it just so happens that I am.

I said everyone was going to get their little piece. The last one is the Minister of Finance. And I am going to maybe be a little kind to him and the others may get a bit jealous, but so be it, that's their own pet peeve, they will have to deal with that.

Madam Speaker, the Minister got up here and boasted of no increase in taxes on the country and his ability to get the government's finances back in order. And I talked about that yesterday and how I believe we should have done that, which was to stretch it out a little more. But, be that as it may, the country must recognise that even in 2016, 2017, we still will not be able to borrow money. It will be a long while before we do that until we get back in our senses or get it straight, so that our 10 per cent will not be used up.

Madam Speaker, what I want to say to the Minister is that in the interest of assisting small businesses, the time has come to increase taxes. As much as he claims he did not have to, or the government that he is a part of did not have to and followed his direction and his abilities to get revenue and don't spend anything, Madam Speaker, there are many small businesses in this country that can stimulate the economy. And I want to talk about just two in particular but there is a myriad of them. But in the interest of time I see that I will soon be done.

Madam Speaker: (1) as I understand it we have about five bakeries in Cayman that bakes bread—the stand alone bakeries. And then we have the supermarkets with their bakeries. Madam Speaker, here is an opportunity for government to assist that industry. Increase the cost of finished bread coming into this country by 500 per cent. I believe it may even be duty free now, I don't know. And if flour is not duty-free, remove the duties on flour.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: It is already duty-free. Flour and wheat is duty-free. And give them a prescribed time that is going to come into place. What that will do is to assist those people to get new equipment and beat the demand. Some of them are struggling.

I have eaten the Cayman made bread, the Cayman Brac and the ones here. I've had all of them

and I don't see any difference in the bread. Bread is bread. And bun is bun. You think we had them in our days that could be imported? Unna remember the old gold medal sacks that were used to make sales out of? That is what that was for, you know, Madam Speaker. Remember I told them: "You see our glory, you don't know our story"; that's bread. Know the bread story. And the reused . . . where is the Minister's garbage? Oh, that's the Premier. Reused? Everything we reused! Even the condensed milk can was used for cups! And telephone across the classroom as well. Reuse—only nowadays we are talking about that.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: The only thing burnt in our backyards, were the leaves that we raked up, not garbage collection. Even those pieces of brown paper torn off the old guillotine machines were reused because my mother used to write on it with charcoal so that I could go to the shop. And bandage for sprain. So, Madam Speaker, I invite the Government to consider that.

The other thing is, Madam Speaker, and the Premier will know this, maybe the rest do not know too much about it in the current time; no fault of theirs. But, Madam Speaker, the mangoes are in this country unbelievable, but they are seasonal. So, let's put provisions in law that mangoes during that season cannot be imported. That will help our farmers. It will help our little small businesses. Every day a number of us pass the stands on the road with the farmers with their little small businesses. Mangoes in abundance and they are competing with those imported from Costa Rica. Those are things that I would like us to do. I recommend that we do.

Madam Speaker, there are other areas that we can do that as well.

Now, Madam Speaker, one of the other areas that I wanted to move on to was that of the National Conservation in this country by the Minister of Environment. He thought he was not going to get his little piece either. Madam Speaker, I am hopeful. I wait with bated breath that the new enforcement has come of age and we have new enforcement officers who have had experience before. Because, Madam Speaker, Finance Committee we shall discuss that a bit further. But we see too many times personal grievances in those areas being played out on the wrong floor. Madam Speaker, I have always supported the conservation, especially of our marine environment. I am no tree hugger. I've said that many times, because I understand extinction is forever. But after many years of complaining I went straight to the Minister whom I should not have to go to, but it appears like that is the place to go. And I should say that I can't even blame the Ministers for not responding directly when they

say they are passing it over to their technical people. At the very least you should get some response.

Madam Speaker, I have complained bitterly for additional marine enforcement to be in my constituency. The response was that they did not have the power to arrest. Now, the Minister recently gave that to them, three weeks ago, or six weeks ago under the law. And I want to hear what the results have been since then. But I also want to hear how they can infer that Members of this honourable Chamber is encroaching on the law. And that has to be trashed out in front of the people of this country, and, in particular, my constituency. I'm not using privilege here, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Member, can you just repeat that last sentence for me please?

Mr. V. Arden McLean: I said that has to be trashed out in front of the public, and, in particular, my constituency through these hallowed Chambers.

Madam Speaker, the mere fact that I am in the same location as you are, does not mean I am there for the same reason you are.

Madam Speaker, one thing I do is that I save things I believe are of very great importance and sometimes it has to be divine intervention that makes me save those. And that is a good thing you know. Sometimes God knows best. You think He does not know how to direct you? He knows exactly how to direct you.

The Speaker: Sometimes?

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Well, all of the time. I guess some of God's greatest gifts are unanswered prayers nah?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Y-e-a-h, because if He answered all of those that I asked him, you can believe, Madam Speaker, we would have had some cleansing ya long time. I don't know what kind of cleansing but it would have been cleansing.

Madam Speaker,—how much time do I have left, Madam Clerk? One minute?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Twenty minutes?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Madam Speaker, thank you, because I thought you were saying 20. I thought I had heard the zero on the back, you see.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Madam Speaker, I would lighten that up by saying that my dad told me one time that he was in New York and he and another guy got a taxi and this was when my dad was young, 19, 20 [years], and the taxi driver said \$2 sir and the man pulled out \$20 and gave him and walked away, and daddy said, *But wait, we got to wait for our change.* He said, *Lester, don't embarrass me here now, you know zero don't mean anything where we come from.*

Anyway, Madam Speaker, let me close by saying to my colleagues what I see that is afoot in this country. I wonder if we are that blind that we can't see that the little squabbles on the small issues that we engage in, that they are engineered to have us fight each other while ignoring the bigger issues. We see one just played itself out here this morning with the number of floors and how we get away with that. That is what they are doing, Madam Speaker—properly engineered to keep us blind to the bigger issues. But you know, what we need to do is to listen to some of the recommendations such as I gave to the Minister of Finance in increasing those taxes, so that we can help our little people. Because if we increase the cost on mangoes or ban mangoes during the season, people will start planting them in their backyards you know. Okay?

The other thing, I have always said to the Minister of Planning, Madam Speaker, is that one of the things I want to see in this country is to allow Caymanians who are building their homes, to be able to build on a little efficiency onto that house. Madam Speaker, I am not talking about an apartment. I am talking about a little room with one bed or two bedrooms, and the trickle-down effect of doing that by allowing them to put that under one roof is cheaper for them to do. And secondly, you will get some young Caymanians who do the internet thing and there are 50 people who subscribed to him or her and people from overseas book these things on short term rental. And the wife and family is right there, the whole family.

We say our greatest assets happen to be our people. That's how we can get them interacting with our people. Seventy-five dollars a day to stay there; Madam Speaker, do you know what that means for a family? They don't even have to pay for their mortgage. They may even be able to pay for their children school fees. It takes that burden off of us. But because it is a single family home and *oh you can only have one driveway up to it and one carport and we have five people in there driving cars and five cars on the driveway.* Just make these people drive up too. Or they rent it out long term, \$1,500 a month can nearly pay their mortgage or pay their mortgage in many instances. That is the kind of stuff we need to do, Madam Speaker. You know, you have been to BVI. They do it there all the time. And rent it out short term to tourists. That's the kind of stuff we need to do to help our people.

Madam Speaker, if we continue to fight each other and ignore the big issues that need to be addressed to help our people, we deserve to lose our country. We deserve to lose it. We need to stop complaining that others are taking it over. It is us who have the responsibility to deal with it. There is not one of us in here, with the exception of the Attorney General, that was not born of Caymanian parents! Not one. Remember where we are coming from because we need to make provision for those who are going into the future. And you know what, they come from us too. The same way we came from Caymanian parents, those who will be the future of this country will come from us. They are going to be our direct descendants, the same way we are directly from other Caymanians. Let's keep it going. Let's provide that which we believe is in the best interest of these people. Let's watch out for those engineered things that will keep us apart.

Madam Speaker, I thank you and I thank Members for their attendance, even though sometimes they did not want me to say what I had to say, or they thought so anyhow. But, Madam Speaker, I do appreciate the ability to debate, even though the Premier dropped it on me in the middle of the night. But I have reminded him on more than one occasion, since last night, of the error of his ways.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Does any other Member wish to speak?

I recognise the Fifth Elected Member for George Town.

Mr. Winston C. Connolly, Jr., Fifth Elected Member for George Town: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise to add my contribution to the Throne Speech, Strategic Policy Statement and Budget Address that were given by the Governor, the Premier and the Minister of Finance last Friday.

Madam Speaker, I stand here proud to be a part of this Government that can bring economic growth, and can focus on jobs and prosperity for these Islands, and one that has the recovery of the Cayman Islands' insight.

Madam Speaker, we have heard that the economy is on the way to recovery. We are expecting a 2 per cent growth. We have also heard that unemployment is down as of December 2014 to 4.7 per cent from the 6.3 per cent we inherited when we took office. My congratulations go to the entire Government and the civil service for sound planning and discipline implementation that has occurred over the last two years.

Madam Speaker, in 2013, when we were invited to be a part of this coalition Government, we were promised that we could be productive members with a voice. And so far, the Premier has kept his promise, even when, at times, we do not always agree

on how to get there. What I am most proud of from what was highlighted in those three documents and addresses is that this Government is taking on some of the legislation that previous Governments ran away from, or were incapable of bringing to the fore. I think that says a lot about the current leadership that we have, and by that, I mean all Ministers and backbenchers working in tandem because two years ago we could have been in a very precarious position had we not chosen to come together. I think the country is better off for it.

Like I said, Madam Speaker, whilst I have my own personal goals that I would like to achieve while I am here, and whilst I do not always subscribe to everything that is the priority of the Progressives, we have chosen to operate as a true democracy within our ranks and we all have the right to voice any concerns and bring our opinions. And I guarantee you, Madam Speaker, and the people of the Cayman Islands that it is not an all one-way street.

Madam Speaker, some of my concerns over some of the topics that we brought forward, although I can live with them, will come out, no doubt, in some of the debates as they come online. I think it is prudent on my part to talk about some of the reasons why I do not wholly agree with some of the laws and policies we are bringing. But that, by no means, detracts from the fact that I agree that we should bring them, that I am proud that we are bringing them and that Cayman, in my view, will be better off for them.

I think that I can speak for the other Independents, but I will put a caveat in there that they have every right to disagree with me and add their own two cents. But I think we have all contributed to this Government because we believe it is the right Government for this period of time that we find ourselves in. I remind myself and my colleagues that we believed this was the best choice for the country, given the players that emerged from the last election.

Madam Speaker, one person, one vote; National Conservation Law; the discussion on Sunday Trading; cruise ship berthing; waste management system; education; pensions; all these things have been passed over by past Governments, including the UDP. I think the fact that we are bringing them to this honourable House, we are having the sometimes unpopular discussions, is a testament to where we think the Government and the country need to go. But, Madam Speaker, there is still a lot left to do. And at this moment in time, we are looking at the big picture and trying to prioritise. But by no means can anyone afford to rest on any laurels because we have lots of work to do. And if history is any indicator, we have about a year, really, to do some of the hard work and to take the licks that come with that to get some of these things achieved because in the past, electioneering and campaigning starts about a year out.

Madam Speaker, I believe that some of the ills we now face are a direct result of bad decisions by the

last administration, and also at a time when that administration was in power before. Everyone talks about unemployment and crime. But nobody looks at some of the root causes. Bad political decisions made only for political gain end up being tragic decisions for countries. And I am talking in particular, Madam Speaker, about rapidly introducing citizens to this country in one fell swoop. Nobody in this room, nobody in this country can tell me that some of the ills that we face today are because of those decisions, both at the top end and the bottom end.

Madam Speaker, we are committed to bringing jobs to this country. We are talking the hits because we cannot deliver them fast enough. But I would like people to pause for a minute and think how the injection of people into these Islands has taxed everything, including infrastructure, including social services, including the ability for young Caymanian professionals to rise up. So, Madam Speaker, the drain on our resources is a direct result, in my mind, of bad political decisions and I would encourage my colleagues to continue to fight and come up with a plan to counter this.

Madam Speaker, the civil servants' cost of living adjustment and the reduction of import duties to 20 per cent, privatization, whistle blowing legislation, standards in public life legislation, reduction in fuel duty that will be 50 cents down from where we started in a few months, are all things that we hope will provide some relief to our fellow Caymanians. This is also something that in previous years we were told we could not do because the Government's coffers needed the cash. But, Madam Speaker, we have come up with inventive ways for cost savings in order to do this. So, again, I applaud the Minister of Finance, his team, and all the other government members and civil servants who have contributed to workable solutions that end up as benefits for our people.

Madam Speaker, you heard the Premier in his delivery of the Strategic Policy Statement talk about the Legal Practitioners Bill. This is something that when I was on the other end of the table as a practitioner, for as long as I can remember, has been passed down the road by Governments because of a myriad of reasons. I cannot stand here and try to determine what some of those reasons were, but I know that partially it was because people did not understand what the Bill was about, so they just chose to ignore it. Partially it was because as a country we felt that our people were not being given fair shakes, and I subscribe to that, having been in the profession. But, I do not think that it is everybody doing it at the same pace and trying to keep Caymanians down. And the only way we can get to the bottom of who is doing it and who is not, is to have dialogue, and, like our old people say, straight talk, because if we chose to ignore a situation, we are not helping anyone.

What has happened in those 15 years since this legal practitioners legislation was being bounced

around by Government after Government, is that a generation of Caymanian lawyers have paid the price. So, Madam Speaker, forgive me. This is something very personal to me, even though I do not practice law anymore, and I do not intend to ever practice law in these Islands again, at least not in any major capacity. But it is time that we had that dialogue. I just basically laid the cards out, even the unpalatable bits that people do not want to talk about in open settings.

Having been very involved in this process over the last year, that all parties now realise that the dialogue needs to happen, that there are shortcomings in our system, and that people are prepared, for whatever reason (maybe not all altruistic), to have conversations and to now put in place the necessary steps to ensure that Caymanians get access to the profession, get properly trained when they enter the profession, but most importantly, Madam Speaker, that they get the opportunity to advance not just to the first round of what people call partnership (which is salaried partnership), but all the way to equity partnership where they share in the spoils that has become the Cayman dream that has almost demolished the Caymanian dream. Lest we forget, Caymanian parents sometimes squeezed blood from stones, begged, borrowed and stole to ensure that their children had better opportunities than they had. They had and continue to have aspirations. And most, if not all of us here, are Caymanian parents of Caymanian children. I certainly do not want to ever tell my children that their elevation is only halfway up the ladder and the top rung is for somebody else.

So, Madam Speaker, whilst I point out the legal profession, because that is the legislation we are looking at, let's not lose sight that every other professional sector has to do their part. We have to start looking at our school leavers, our college graduates, and start planning well ahead of them actually graduating and showing up at our doorstep looking for a job. The professions have to absorb our Caymanians. And the Members of this House have to ensure that they are doing so, be that with a stick or with a carrot, but, again, having the straight talk and the dialogue that causes no fall out, because lest we forget we are all in this together. We need a certain amount of imported labour, and they need a certain amount of our Caymanian professionals.

Not only is it good, corporate social responsibility, it is the law, Madam Speaker. This is what you are supposed to be doing when you show up here. Again, Madam Speaker, I am not one to ever advocate for putting Caymanians in a position that they have not earned, that they are not capable of doing, but likewise, I strongly detest when people would say that Caymanians do not have the exposure and the training to be able to get to those lofty heights, because when they say that, they are the ones failing, because they have not done what the law says. And if that is ever an excuse, whoever is the recipient of that

should stop the conversation, get up and leave and say, *Come back when you start following the law.*

Madam Speaker, that piece of legislation has the ability to change lives, not just the lives of the people that would be in law, but also the lives of Caymanians, because if you want to talk about trickle-down economics, that is where that disposable income would come from; that and other professions like it. And unless Caymanians are at the top, at some point in time those economics go somewhere else, and those economics go to others than Caymanian children.

Madam Speaker, I do not have to lay out a plan or a map that shows that if year on year Caymanian children are not getting the same opportunities and level of education that soon new Caymanian children who do have that, will be at the top of the food chain. It is not fair that everyone does not have proper access to the same room at the top. So, I am glad that the dialogue has started. I am glad that both the legal associations, the Caymanian Bar Association and the Cayman Islands Law Society have come to the table willing to embrace the changes that this Government has suggested, and I am glad that we can further this discussion. I am very glad that the Premier, the Minister of Financial Services, the Minister of Education, and all the others working on that legislation have been steely in their approach and have not taken any excuses. That is something that I am very proud of, Madam Speaker, as part of this Government.

We need to look at a plan for the future. We need to preserve wealth amongst Caymanians, because if the bottom drops out tomorrow and all the monies leave, we are going to be in dire straits, Madam Speaker.

This Government is also looking at, and we had the discussion as recently as two weeks ago, of the upskilling fund and the Immigration Accreditation which was not mentioned in those documents because of certain budgetary constraints. But I will not let my colleagues forget those things because things like the upskilling fund will fuel some of the policies I have been working on along with the Minister in Education and Employment.

Madam Speaker, TVET [Technical and Vocational Education and Training] is another topic area that has been bounced around and put on the backburner and everything else for as long as I can remember. But I am proud that the Minister of Education, along with our colleagues in Cabinet has seen fit to put together a council on TVET to recognise that giving skills to our young Caymanians who may not be as academic as others, is a great equaliser because those skills will make them employable, promotable, and business owners.

Madam Speaker, for too long we have looked at—

The Speaker: Honourable Councillor, is this an appropriate time to take a 15 minute morning break?

Mr. Winston C. Connolly, Jr.: Yes, Ma'am, I am at your indulgence. Thank you.

The Speaker: We will reconvene at noon.

Proceedings suspended at 11:45 am

Proceedings resumed at 12:17 pm

The Speaker: Please be seated.

REMINDER OF SPEAKER'S RULE FROM THE CHAIR

The Speaker: Before taking the morning break, the Fifth Elected Member for George Town was continuing his debate. Before I call on him to continue thereon, I would just like to remind Members of the Speaker's Rule, particularly paragraph 19:

“Permission is granted to any representative of the press who is approved under the Register of Interests Law 1996 (Declaration of Press Interests), to prepare transcripts of the Legislative Assembly proceedings through the use of laptop computers, iPads or any other silent touch-typing device so long as it does not interrupt the business of the House. However, other electronic recording device, photography or television is forbidden, without the express permission of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.”

So, limited provision is provided for the press and no other member of the public. It has been brought to my attention that there were in fact, two breaches that occurred here yesterday in the precincts of the Legislative Assembly; one with a Government Minister's photograph being taken, and one with the Leader of the Opposition's picture being taken, and I would like to say categorically that this Chair will not tolerate it. We have a duty to protect every single Member in this House, whether ex-officio or elected, whether during break time or whether they are on their feet. So, I would ask all interested parties hearing my voice today, in or out of the Chamber, to please desist. I thank you.

Fifth Elected Member for George Town.

APPROPRIATION (JULY 2015 TO JUNE, 2016) BILL, 2015— BUDGET ADDRESS AND THE THRONE SPEECH TOGETHER WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY STATEMENT

[Continuation of Second Reading debate thereon]

Mr. Winston C. Connolly, Jr.: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, when we took over in 2013, this country was in crisis. We had an interim Government that tried to keep it together, but everyone spoke volumes at the polls as to how disgusted they were with the situation that existed.

Madam Speaker, I think that in the last two years we have restored some of that confidence and definitely the stability in Government. And, as we continue this plan for positive economic growth, and keeping in mind transparency and good governance, I think the Cayman Islands will be a much better place by the time the next election rolls around.

Madam Speaker, we are looking at the plight of all of our people. We realise that we have to put policies, procedures, laws in place that give them the best chance to provide for their families, for their loved ones, and, at the end of the day, Madam Speaker, we want a healthy, functioning middle class, because that shows not only in statistics, but it shows in our supermarkets, it shows at all the vendors around the Island that things are happening.

The other thing I want to touch on is the commitment to one person, one vote. Whilst it is one of those topics that can be polarizing and there are so many sides to that coin in terms of how people want it to turn out, how people would like to see it happen, et cetera, this Government listened to the people of the Cayman Islands and is committed to bringing it to fruition as promised well before the next election. Again, I will take my hat off to the Premier for sticking to the promises that a number of people in his party made during the campaign, and although I did not necessarily campaign on one person, one vote, it is what the people want, and it is something that they shall get.

Madam Speaker, I will not take the topics of the Minister of Education, but I just wanted to touch on the Education Law, 2015, because she has allowed me to work with her on that piece of legislation, something that will finally be enacted this year, something that has barely changed over 30 years. Madam Speaker, it is time. Our children are our future. They are the people that we have all of our dreams, hopes and aspirations in. And this law will cover them, not quite from cradle to grave, but it will put emphasis on early childhood care where we know we get the most benefit from the dollar and time spent in our youngest. It will also put in place objective inspections of schools which are sorely needed. And, like I touched on before, it will bring TVET and governance models to a system that will provide greater opportunities for public/private partnerships in the governance of education. It will allow the village to raise the child.

I believe by getting the business community involved in the process it will be better informed, but also, they will be part of the education process and people suddenly will not be able to point fingers because we will all be in this together. Madam Speaker, it also looks at additional educational needs, including

the gifted and talented, and including special education.

Like I said, I will not steal the Minister's thunder, but I applaud her for bringing this to the forefront. It is high time. And again, it shows that this Government is committed to making necessary legislation that has been long overlooked or avoided, bringing it to the forefront, bringing it, passing it into law so that the country can be better for it.

Madam Speaker, the other thing I am very passionate about is cost for our people. I am encouraged again by the dialogue the Minister of Planning is having with the fuel importers. We need to protect our people. We need to ensure they are being treated fairly, and we need to ensure that they are not bearing the burden for people's greed. That is why we are elected.

Madam Speaker, we are also looking at George Town redevelopment. As a Member for George Town I watch this very closely. I would love to see our capital take its rightful place in a setting in Cayman. But I also like to see where we look at other things that will help the middle class and the man on the street, including looking at energy and how that all plays out.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would just like to again say to those people who might be watching and listening, that this Government is not about yes people. Especially I know, speaking for myself, we have healthy debate on a number of topics and we do not always start out in the same place. But we can agree to disagree sometimes. We can agree to compromise a lot of times, and we can always put the country first. So, Madam Speaker, I am very proud, again, that we can come in as Members of this Government, in spite of our differences and push for the good of these Cayman Islands. Thank you, Madam Speaker, for your time and indulgence.

[Applause]

The Speaker: Does any other Member wish to speak?

I recognise the Fourth Elected Member for Bodden Town.

Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr., Fourth Elected Member for Bodden Town: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also wish to rise to add my contribution to the debate on the Throne Speech, Budget Address and Policy Statement. I would like to begin by thanking the Honourable Premier, Her Excellency the Governor and the Honourable Minister of Finance for their contributions.

I would like to particularly single out the Minister of Finance and his team for what I consider their continued diligence and hard work in presenting yet another well-thought out, not easily achievable budget that actually continues to meet the requirements of the

FFR, but also manages to address many of the issues facing these Islands.

Madam Speaker, we are midway into our term. This is my first term as a legislator. I believe we are moving into what I consider an exciting and progressive phase of the history of the Cayman Islands. This market for the first two years gives us an opportunity to pause and reflect on the successes that we have achieved. And it gives us a chance to benchmark our progress against our manifestos and our plans for the country. It also gives us an opportunity to regroup and make additional plans to move forward and continue with these successes.

It has not been an easy two years, Madam Speaker. We have faced many, many obstacles as a Government and a country and a people. We have worked (I can say this on behalf of every Member of this Government) extremely hard to overcome a number of threats, a number of difficulties that have faced the Cayman Islands. Confidence in this Government I believe continues to be high, and we continue to demonstrate how capable we are at managing the affairs of this country. And that confidence continues to grow.

The requirements of the FFR alone have made it extremely difficult in certain circumstances for us to be able to do the things we promised. We hopefully will continue to maintain compliance with the FFR and next year, be able to reap the benefit of that compliance.

We have also continued to weather the global recession without increasing taxes on the people, and that was a promise we made. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, we have looked to reduce the tax burden on our people and we have successfully done that in a number of areas and we will continue that trend. I think it is a testament to the dedication this Government has to the people of the Cayman Islands that we continue to look for ways to reduce the cost of living and to make life less burdensome for our people.

Madam Speaker, we were faced with the threat of Ebola in the last year, and even closer to home Chikungunya. I am amazed at the response and the swiftness and the ability that we moved with to prepare for those threats. Thank God we did not have to deal with those threats to any significant level. But I am eternally grateful to those civil servants who worked so hard to put things in place so quickly to mitigate whatever risks we faced.

Of course, my colleague from Bodden Town, the former Minister, was at the lead with that, and I have to give him credit. And I continue to be proud to be the Councillor for his Ministry.

We have experienced economic growth during a time when other countries are still suffering and still experiencing shrinkage in their economies and their people continue to flounder and suffer. We have put things in place and it does not happen overnight. I

know that. I know that sometimes patience wears a bit thin, and people who are suffering and hurting want things to happen quicker. But bearing in mind our limitations, we have been, I think, successful at continuing to support our people. And I think this is due in large part to the tenacity of the Minister of Finance and his team, and their dedication to properly managing this country's resources and economy. That goes for the entire government team, Madam Speaker.

I want to especially acknowledge our Honourable Premier and our Honourable Deputy Premier. They have provided a significant level of leadership for us, especially the Members of the Government who are new to this. They act not just as leaders, but as mentors, especially to us councillors. They have demonstrated extreme patience when we do make mistakes or missteps, and they are appreciative as my colleague from George Town mentioned, of the differences in philosophy we may have amongst our own team and amongst the Coalition team. I am grateful that I work with a Government that appreciates we are not all robots programmed to think the same way. And we are able to work together in the best interests of the country, and respect each other's differences of opinion and philosophy.

Both the Honourable Premier and Deputy Premier are able to understand the key differences in approach that we all may have and still manage to keep the team effective and functioning, and I take my hat off to them for doing that. They have done a superb job in leadership.

Madam Speaker, we know that while we can pause and acknowledge our achievements, we are not yet out of the woods. There is still a lot of work left to be done. One of the main significant concerns that I have, of course, is the continuing unemployment amongst Caymanians.

That, in conjunction with the cost of living, is also still a major concern of mine. Of course, we need to ensure that we continue to provide key services in education and continue to expand and improve what we already have in place. Madam Speaker, we are not a Government in denial. We recognise that what remains to be done is significant. And we are by no means starting to celebrate early.

This Budget addresses the concerns that we have and we will continue to put our heads down and work to address the issues. The high cost of health insurance is another major concern. I will be encouraging the Government to continue exploring how we can address this. I have been approached by a number of young Caymanians who have expressed to me their concern with the high level of health insurance and their inability to manage to continue to support their families and pay their bills with such a burden on them, which is mandatory and mandated by law. So, we have to look for ways to address this. And we need to explore whether or not there are too many providers for this small jurisdiction. And we need to

look at the role that CINICO can play in sorting this out. We recognise it is something that is not sustainable and not helping our people. So, this is something that was raised recently in caucus and one which I will continue to advocate for change.

Madam Speaker, the Premier and the Minister of Finance presented the Progressives-led Government's plans for the next financial year. As I mentioned earlier, this has not been an easy budget to achieve, and we continue to be bound by the terms of the FFR. It is hard to be conservative and still deliver what has been promised to our people, but we have found a way to balance that. And again, I congratulate the Government team for an excellent job in preparing this Budget.

It is no secret how I feel about the FFR. I have spoken on it previously. It is quite clear that our inability to spend on our own behalf and to stimulate the economic activity needed to keep this economy moving and growing is a concern. We also have great difficulty in providing meaningful tax breaks to consumers, businesses and individuals, and to seek to increase their disposable income so that they are able to spend more and fuel the economy because we are under such tight restrictions. And a number of the ratios we must comply with, Madam Speaker, are really insignificant in terms of real life scenarios, however, they are there, and this Government has taken the path of least resistance in trying to comply on schedule and ensure that we are able to ease up on some of these restrictions in the near future and allow us to continue to increase what we are doing for our people. So, we have to be patient.

We understand that people are hurting, Madam Speaker. That is no secret to any of us. We recognise that. But we are working as hard and as diligently as we can to put this country back on track, both in terms of compliance with the FCO requirements and in terms of encouraging investment and development. As quickly and as expeditiously as possible we will meet with the terms of the FFR and we will be able to help our people.

Obviously, Madam Speaker, there has been some concern with the lack of capital spending in the eastern districts, as mentioned by some Members of the House already. And we recognise that. I recognise that. I am a representative from an eastern district; but again, everything in its time because we have to prioritise and put things in place. Have no fear, Madam Speaker. We, the eastern district representatives are fighting to get things in place for our districts, because I don't just look at Bodden Town, I look at all the eastern districts and try to help as much as I can.

One significant development coming down (and I will speak to it later on) is hopefully the Beach Bay development which will have a huge impact on the economy of the eastern districts. But one thing that this Government cannot be accused of—and I keep hearing references to previous years and previ-

ous administrations, of over spending. This administration has not over spent, Madam Speaker. We have flourished under very significantly restrictive conditions.

I sometimes wonder what we will be accused of in two years, because in every which way we can, we have complied with the rules that we must operate by. The negative impact of the FFR, I think is most significantly demonstrated when one compares the capital needs of the districts with what we are able to actually spend. I do not want anyone to make the mistake of thinking that we are oblivious to this. But, Madam Speaker, when I think back to two years ago when the Premier laid out the plans for the country and he set us on that course, and two years later we are able to pause for a second and look back and realise that without some of us even realising it we have been sailing on that course and accomplishing a lot. And we can continue to do so if we stay the course.

Madam Speaker, this Government has demonstrated that we are more than capable of managing our local economy and the country's money. Confidence has been restored, Madam Speaker. And I do not say that tongue in cheek, because I hear it every day. People come to me every day and congratulate me on the positions I take, the positions we take and what we are doing for the country. I am proud to be part of this Administration.

Unfortunately, we must continue to seek non-traditional ways to address some of these key concerns, Madam Speaker. We know that there is a need for a long-term mental health facility. We know there is a lack of hurricane shelters in the eastern districts. We know that education facilities need improvements in the eastern districts, and that we need to introduce a higher level of trade and vocational education. We know there is much needed infrastructural development. And of course, health care and emergency services always have to be improving. Our population continues to grow and expand and, of course, we have to keep pace with that. So, we have paid close attention to these requirements. And while we are keeping a focus on the capital needs, we understand that we have severe restrictions but we are making plans to deal with those and we are finding non-traditional ways of providing these services and capital needs for our people.

I do believe that we could have accelerated the country's climb out of the recession, Madam Speaker, had we not been so severely limited. We are left in a position where we have to move forward with managing the economy void of the ability to directly stimulate the economy ourselves by spending. What we have to do is continue to work with investors and developers and have them basically spend on our behalf. This is not easy when one considers that it is the same policies that make it hard to offer concessions. And we would like to be in a position where we no longer have to offer concessions, but for the time be-

ing it is the way we can manage this and move forward.

This Budget is a strong budget which I think the country can afford. We owe our thanks to those who worked so hard to prepare this. I still have every confidence in the Minister of Finance and his team, and his ability to do the job he was elected to do. I will continue to be guided by him, because I do believe that part of the confidence that has been restored is due largely to his efforts.

This is a budget that the country can afford, Madam Speaker. And it demonstrates a fresh, creative and effective approach that this Government has adopted, and that is why I think we are being successful, because we are thinking outside of the box and doing things that might necessarily challenge us to a certain extent, but they are effective and we are finding ways to put this all together. For too long this country has lived outside of its means. I think we now have a sensible lean and effective budget that will allow us to get things done without sacrificing any of those much-needed services. I do not think that we can be accused of over-extending ourselves or the people of this country.

I also think we are now seeing a heightened sense of teamwork amongst the Government team, amongst the Ministers especially, and I think everyone has come together in a way we have not seen in a long time, to agree on the key spending areas and those areas that will have the most impact and benefit to the Caymanian people. We have come together not only to agree on these key areas, but perhaps for the first time in a long time we are seeing a much higher level of cross-ministerial cooperation and communication ensuring that we are all on the same page and we are all in sync and our efforts are working together. This, Madam Speaker, is the way we have been able to avoid making costly mistakes, reduce the silo and empire building, and encourage the various ministries to work together in the best interests of the country.

The Government continues to reform and streamline our operations and ensure that our maximum impact is achieved and the best value for money is guaranteed. We know that the tasks ahead are costly and demanding and we will not be able to achieve every single thing that we need to in one single budget. But I know we have exhausted the possibilities with this Budget and put as much in there as we possibly could. It will take years for this country to pull out of the recession we are just coming through. We still have recovery to do. We still have a little ways to go. But working together, I think we have already proven that we can do all of this without one ounce of recklessness, irresponsibility and loss of confidence.

The Government continues to be disciplined and honest in the budgetary process. We have not been afraid to say no in the areas where it was required. Even in the face of all the criticism and those who say we are not going anything, we have still

managed to reduce some of the taxes laid on the backs of the people by the last administration. The next two years will see our final push towards restoring financial prosperity across these three Islands, and this Government has the right plan to do this.

The clock is ticking, we know. And we are working against a tight schedule. But all of us are up to the job. We know we are not yet out of the water and there are many individuals who still rely on the Government to ensure they are able to find work, earn a decent living, have access to opportunities and be considered part of the Caymanian dream. But I am encouraged by the consistency in our surplus budgets meeting the prescribed ratios of the FFR, the continued cutting of expenditure, and being able to give cost of living increases to the civil service. All of these in combination are things we are doing for the country and for our people.

I am still concerned that our social services run such an expensive budget and that they are still low on resources. That is an indicator to me, Madam Speaker, that there are people still suffering and need help. For me, the ideal scenario would be that we do not need social services any more. But it is an indicator that we continue to work hard to take care of our people. We cannot continue the welfare policies of the past, because those were not based on any policy or, I should say, discretion. We have to be responsible about how we offer social services to our people. However, in conjunction with offering the assistance needed, we need to make sure that we offer the formal education required to allow Caymanians to take their place in society; we offer the trade and vocational training that our young people need to step into roles that are now currently being occupied by, what I consider, cheap labour; we continue to toughen up the immigration and labour regimes to ensure that our people do not become victims anymore and are able to find work in their own country, especially when they are qualified.

Madam Speaker, many people may have taken note of comments I recently made in the press about the inability of Caymanians to get work in the tourism sector. I did have a bit of a scuffle with CITA [Cayman Islands Tourism Association] over that. But I am pleased to say that I have learned a great lesson in that experience, because when we did finally get all parties to come together and sit down and close the door, we came up with solutions and we are now able to much more easily find work for our Caymanians in the tourism field. And as we continue to train through the tourism school, that will become even more available to our people. But we now have the full cooperation of CITA.

An Hon. Member: Good job.

Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr.: And that is something that I initially wanted. That was the objective, not to beat up

on anyone, but to make sure that our Caymanians were getting employment.

And I would like to thank the Honourable Deputy Premier and his Councillor, Mr. Hew, for their assistance in helping me achieve that, as well as the Minister of Labour and her team.

Madam Speaker, we are aware that the rate of foreclosures in this country is still alarming. The number of people without electricity and water at times is still alarming. We are working to the best of our ability to reduce the cost of living. We heard fuel regulation mentioned, and our being able to monitor what is going on with fuel prices. We know how widespread the effects of that are, and how it affects every single aspect of life in these Islands. We are taking that seriously and I know that the Minister has produced a plan that I wholeheartedly agree with and that I know we will, in the very near future (not even the medium term, but in the near term) be able to come back to the country and tell them exactly what we are able to do about influencing the cost of fuel.

Madam Speaker, at the risk of being accused of repeating what the Premier mentioned in his address, I think it is important that certain elements of his address be emphasised. I note that the Member for East End is not here, so I will take the chance of quickly running through some of those.

These are a recurring theme in our caucus, our Government. But the Premier did mention that we have a budget which inspires and encourages economic growth, that we have a budget for job creation, that we have a budget for cutting taxes, and that we have a budget that will secure government finances and reduce debt. That is a mouthful when you think about what those things actually mean. Again, I know that it is easy to sit on one side of this House and criticise the efforts this Government has made. But I think it is a disservice to the hard work and thought that has gone into preparing this Budget as we continue to take the country forward. Anyone who feels that any of this was easy to accomplish, clearly does not understand the magnitude and awesome responsibility that we are faced with as representatives. Not one of us shies away from that responsibility.

In my experience in working closely with caucus and the Ministers is that this Government is determined, in some cases maybe even to our own detriment, to make the lives of Caymanians better when we leave office or at the end of this term. And I join them in that. We Councillors are an intricate part of the decision-making process and the decisions that the Government makes and we have been criticised as not being legitimate. However, from my experience, and from where I sit, being able to influence what goes to Cabinet and what ultimately happens for our people makes me an even better representative and I am able to influence to a much higher extent. Again, this is something new that was introduced by this Government, and I am pleased that I am able to

influence at that level. I am not just relegated to being a district MLA. I actually have the opportunity to act as Minister from time to time, and that actually gives me the opportunity and a taste and experience of what it might be like to be a minister in the future. And that is something that I aspire to be. So, again, we are looking forward; we are looking to grow and develop ourselves so that we can all together become better representatives for the country.

The Speaker: Councillor, is this a convenient time for the luncheon break?

Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr.: Yes, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: We will now take a luncheon break and reconvene at 2:15 pm.

Proceedings suspended at 1:00 am

Proceedings resumed at 2:39 pm

The Speaker: please be seated.

Before we took the lunch break the Fourth Elected Member for George Town was debating. I will . . .

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: Oh, sorry, I thought I said Bodden Town, I beg your pardon. I will call upon the Fourth Elected Member for Bodden Town to continue his debate.

**APPROPRIATION (JULY 2015 TO JUNE, 2016)
BILL, 2015— BUDGET ADDRESS AND THE
THRONE SPEECH TOGETHER WITH THE
GOVERNMENT'S POLICY STATEMENT**

[Continuation of Second Reading Debate thereon]

Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr.: Thank you, Madam Speaker; that is an understandable mistake, because I grew up in George Town.

The Speaker: You have one hour and 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr.: Thank you.

Madam Speaker, before we broke for the lunch break, I was going over some of the items in the Premier's address that I thought warranted emphasis. I was also about to make the point that despite the limitations on this Government and the restrictions we have to work with, we are able to still go ahead and lighten the load for our people and give them some tax breaks. We are looking to do even more. So, we are working for the people and trying to improve the

lives of the Caymanian people and all of the people who live here.

Madam Speaker, we have made, I think, tremendous progress in improving our tourism product. We have already heard about the various projects that are underway, namely, the Kimpton, the Hyatt redevelopment, Beach Bay, and the Beach Bay project in particular, Madam Speaker, is something that I have taken a personal interest in because I want it to happen in my district. In fact, all of the Bodden Town representatives have had a keen interest in making sure that the project happens. We are working hard with the developers to make sure that it happens because Bodden Town does need that tourism product. Currently, the district does not have a very strong tourism showing and it can be improved. That is what we are working to achieve. I know there are some who say that it will not happen, but if that is the case, it will not be from a lack of trying.

Madam Speaker, as we have heard earlier, unemployment is down and continues to fall. I am still not enthused by the level of employment that we currently experience, but I am feeling that we are—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr.: —encouraged (thank you). I will continue to do what I can to play a part in reducing unemployment. I still meet with my constituents regularly to work with them to find employment.

Madam Speaker, that leads me on to more district-focused discussion. Before I begin that, I really want to take a moment to thank the First Elected Member for Bodden Town for his continued leadership. He has been a mentor for me at the district and caucus levels and he provides invaluable support and advice. I thoroughly enjoy working with him and feel honoured to be counted as one of the representatives in Bodden Town under his watch. So, I just wish to acknowledge his effort, as well as that of my other two colleagues. I don't want to leave them out. They do work very hard with me. And we have a very dynamic and successful team in Bodden Town and I am looking forward to the next two years of working with my colleagues.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr.: And beyond! (My mistake)

Madam Speaker, my district work continues and I continue to enjoy what I am doing. I love being a district representative. I continue to work with the various community groups in Bodden Town and enjoy being in close contact with the people in Bodden Town, especially those who come to visit us and those who we encounter as we are out doing our rounds throughout the district.

We continue to meet with the constituents on a regular basis and we continue to support district ini-

tiatives on different projects that are taking place in the district. The most notable one recently was the Cox grand opening, which we all attended and were proud to attend, because, I think each and every one of us played a role in some way, shape or form in making that a reality for the district. It was encouraging for us to be acknowledged as having played a major role in assisting Cox in hiring Bodden Towners and hiring Caymanians. I cannot remember off hand the percentage of Caymanians they have employed, but it was significantly high. And they acknowledged the efforts of the Bodden Town MLA office in making that a reality.

We have also increased our level of presence at the Bodden Town MLA office and we have added an office manager by the name of Ms. Heather Bodden, who now works closely with us and is helping us to have even more contact with our constituents and be more involved in the community. She is a welcomed addition to the Bodden Town family.

As I mentioned earlier, the Beach Bay project continues to reach a point where I think we will soon see a lot of activity. I worked closely with those developers in the initial stages in providing temporary jobs for some unemployed Bodden Towners. The plan for that facility, that development, is to continue on that vein. The developers understand that this Government wants to see Caymanians employed, Caymanians trained, and that is the focus of this development and it will be as this Government continues to work with them.

We also heavily support the primary schools in the district. I know the First Elected Member for Bodden Town is a regular visitor to the primary schools. He is a solid supporter of the young people in the district and I follow his lead. The Minister of Sports is also working hard to improve the sporting facilities and the success of the Bodden Town football team is, I think, a testament to his efforts now because he has taken that on and pushed very hard to make sure that our team has the . . . and not just the team, but the young people in the district have the right sporting facilities and access to those facilities at all times. And we are still working now to introduce a boxing facility. Again, we have had interest from developers who are planning to work with us to make that a reality.

Just touching on my work in the Ministry of Culture, I have worked closely with the Deputy Chief Officer to begin changes around the Cayman National Cultural Foundation Board, to make that board more focused and more a representative of our local culture and entertainment needs. Those changes are now . . . I think they have progressed now through Cabinet and are being implemented. I was pleased to have played a significant role in that.

The Minister of Culture continues to play his part in supporting our young up-and-coming, talented Caymanians. Just yesterday we were able to get some assistance for Cottrell who is a local artist who

has been invited to Miami to perform at Best of the Best, which is a significant achievement for a Caymanian. He is going over there this week to represent his country. That was made possible through efforts by the Premier's Ministry and me, in working with the chief officers. I am extremely proud of him and what he is about to accomplish for himself. But that is the culture that we have created in the Ministry. We want to help young Caymanians and we want to give them the opportunities and we want to teach them how to fish. We do not want to keep giving them the fish; we are teaching them to take care of themselves and make something of themselves and to craft their own lives and move forward.

Last year through the Ministry we were also able to assist Mr. Stuart Wilson. He actually went on a world tour and has been spreading Caymanian music, his own style of reggae music as well, throughout the world. He went as far as Thailand. Again, that is a young Cayman blazing his own trail, but with our assistance. And I am proud to say that we were able to assist him as well. He has recently returned home and I actually was able to chat with him. He is so appreciative of the efforts and is so encouraged and has progressed so far with his music, just through that experience, that I can only expect even better from him in the near future.

Madam Speaker, I am now, with the Minister's permission, researching ways that the Ministry of Sports can formalise and create a professional boxing commission. We do have a commission of sorts, but in my opinion it has been a bit stagnant, in my opinion, for quite some time. As boxing is one of my favourite sports, I want to spend some time exploring the possibility that we can actually create a professional boxing commission that will allow our young local boxers to look forward to the future with the hopes of becoming professionals and developing their careers and without having to do what individuals, like Charles Whittaker had to do, which is travel overseas all the time to get some exposure and get the fights. Cayman can become, as part of our tourism package and sports tourism, a hub for professional boxing if we get this right. It is a huge opportunity for our young athletes and it is also a development that can actually create new jobs, specialised jobs that did not exist before that Caymanians may be interested in.

Again, I will complete the research and discuss with the Minister and bring those proposals forward to caucus. But the Minister has already given me his blessing to proceed with that research.

Developments like the ice palace would complement that, Madam Speaker, and as we move to bigger and better developments we will look for ways to leverage off of them and develop other areas using them. I know some people are skeptical about the ice palace concept, but if they look at the design and the plan they will see that it is well thought out.

I have also discussed the need to create an advisory committee within the Ministry of Culture, made up of some of the major players in the local music and entertainment industry that would provide suggestions on what Government needs and can do to pave the way to create a self-sustaining and vibrant entertainment industry. Again, with the new changes coming with copyright laws and so forth and intellectual property, we can leverage on that and actually encourage that sort of development and encourage our young artists to become entrepreneurs and, again, Madam Speaker, create jobs that did not exist here before, create new opportunities and break through barriers that our young people who have been involved in the music and entertainment industry have faced.

I have seen so many Caymanians who have come up with tremendous talent under their belts and never get the exposure, never be able to become known, famous, or even wealthy from their talents. What I want to do through the Ministry is encourage and enable Caymanians to actually break away from the traditional go-and-get-a-job, you know, work in a bank. There are other areas we can expand into. And I have seen so much talent, especially in our young people recently. I have seen young people who have mastered video production, sound production, sound engineering, with no formal training. Just imagine if we create the environment that encourages that and fosters that and grows that what we can achieve.

The potentials are limitless and the jobs, the careers that would be created, it really is a tremendous opportunity for young Caymanians and people who are involved in music and entertainment.

Madam Speaker, my primary assignment has been e-Government. On May 22, 2014, Cabinet actually approved a framework that creates the Cayman Islands e-Government initiative. I have discussed this before, so I will not go into a huge amount of detail, but I really do want to highlight that this initiative helps to create and foster a joined-up Government approach. It helps to break down the silos that have existed previously where ministries operated sort of independent of each other. There was not a whole lot of cross-ministry communication. That has actually been addressed, and is continued to be addressed, and e-Government was actually going to assist in that.

We will also develop a uniformed platform so that we can present our e-Government services to the world, really, as a seamless and transparent interface, so that end users of the e-Government platform are able to use any aspect of it, depending on what security access they have, and so forth. But it has to be seamless and joined up and we have to eliminate the bottlenecks and issues that are created when you cannot access data seamlessly.

I am pushing for more of a renewed focus on local users now. There have been a number of accomplishments, Madam Speaker, that we have not

advertised that a lot of people are not aware exist. Just to name a few of those, I will go through some of the services that are already available online via the Cayman Islands Government portal:

- Birth certificates
- Death certificates
- Marriage certificates
- Vehicle licensing
- Drivers licensing
- Aircraft registration and licensing
- Vessel name reservation
- Education scholarship application
- NWDA assistance
- Planning inspections
- Company registration
- Cayman Land Info
- Access to laws and judgments
- Library cataloging and book borrowing
- Immigration online
- DOT cruise visitor conversion tracking
- Internal applications
- Trade and Business Licensing
- Tax exempt certificates

All of those services, Madam Speaker, are currently available online. It is a bit of a shame that we have not advertised it to the extent we should have, but I can understand why, because we were building these things piecemeal and the focus was not really on marketing, it was on getting the work done. I must commend the Deputy Governor for his commitment to getting these things done.

Earlier this year, when the steering committee was created, that supports the e-Government framework, we actually selected a number of individuals who I consider to be experts in their field. The e-Government steering committee now consists of two chair persons, myself and the Deputy Governor; Mr. Samuel Rose, Cabinet Secretary; Mr. Ian Tibbetts, who is the Director of e-Government; Mr. Alee Fa'amoe, who is the Managing Director of ICTA; Mr. Wesley Howell, Deputy Chief Officer; Nicola McCoy, who works at Civil Aviation and has implemented a number of e-services. We have also involved an external stakeholder, the Chamber of Commerce. And the representative from there is Mr. Wil Pineau.

We have already had a meeting to establish the guidelines to move forward and I am pleased to say that we are making tremendous progress. And again, I wish to thank the Deputy Governor and his team for working so diligently to get this done so quickly. I think we will achieve a tremendous amount in the next upcoming months.

Madam Speaker, I was not planning to spend too much time discussing comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech, but he did make one comment that I listened to carefully. I think it is a comment that bears some discussion because I

think it is the root of some of the issues that we face as Caymanians today.

He said that we must embrace and welcome wealth among us. And I agree with him. That is correct. We do need outside investment. But I think that these Islands have now arrived at a point where we need to shift the focus a bit on ourselves. We have built financial services and tourism and in the past we did it in the quickest way possible because the country was growing, there was a boom. We did not really spend the time to see how Caymanians factored into this, and how we ensured that Caymanians always played a role in this. I think that is where this Government has now turned their focus a bit, on how do we develop our own, our home-grown talent to take their places in leadership positions within these industries.

I disagree with the Leader of the Opposition that we should always turn to the outside when it is time to bring in the experts and bring in the wealth. We need to create our own local wealth. If we continue to rely on outside wealth, it is fleeting; it is not permanent. Our own homegrown people being instrumental in growing these industries and if we invest in our own people, Madam Speaker, I think that is the ultimate investment that will pay off for this country.

Not to criticise too much, but I did note a quote from Mr. Tony Travers who is representing the financial services, and has represented it well over time. But I think his quote which was made to the *Royal Gazette* on April 1, 2015, demonstrates what I am concerned about. He said: **“The recent statistics have indicated that as the expatriate workforce increases, Caymanian unemployment reduces, which shows that the better understanding is that a viable local economy can support the integration of Caymanians who have developed sufficient skill sets.”**

Madam Speaker, we should not be “integrating” Caymanians into our industries. We have to build from the bottom up with Caymanians. We have to shift this mindset that if it is imported it is better than local. We have to prepare our people to become the leaders in our economic miracle. And we have to stop thinking that if it comes from elsewhere it is better.

I spent 10 years working as head of technology for one of our major law firms. And I have yet to come across an IT professional who could better any of my team, any one of them. We have to believe in ourselves and we have to stop falling into that trap that if it comes from elsewhere it could be better than us. We have to start believing in ourselves and in our people.

The Leader of the Opposition also spent a lot of time talking about what he calls “previous PPM Government mistakes.” He did not spend a lot of time talking about the current issues that this country faces. He was talking about an administration that was two administrations ago. He talks about over spending on schools, but, Madam Speaker, I have paid close

attention to the results that we are achieving in education and I just want to encourage everyone in this House and those on the other side to put down the beating stick for a while. Education is something that we are all supposed to support together; we are all supposed to help develop together. It is critical to the future of our children. Let's not make that a political football.

My own daughter is graduating from Clifton Hunter in a few weeks. She is currently at UCCI pursuing her associates and achieving grades that make me proud, and thinking about a career in medicine. She is not the exception. Many of her friends are in the same category as her. I am just using her because she's my daughter. But we are achieving a lot for our young people. Let's continue working together to do that. Let's not make education something that we use to fight against and castigate each other for. If mistakes were made, they were made; but let's move forward trying to build the best for our young people.

My concern, Madam Speaker, is for the young people in this country. I almost said young voters, but I cannot say that, because there are not many young voters. And that is the concern I have. I heard a talk show this morning discussing that same problem of young people are not voting; they are not getting registered to vote. The politics of personality are causing our young people to become disillusioned. They do not feel as if they are part of our plan. And some of them feel like this is a big game when we get in here and we spend so much time going at each other, fighting, nit-picking. The young people are watching. There's one right now—a member of the Youth Parliament is watching.

We have to set better examples for our young people. We have to make them understand that they are part of the plan and this is why we are actually in here. We are in here for them.

One thing I wanted to correct was that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that the Beach Bay project was his idea. He was involved in that to some extent, in discussions, but when we took office there was no plan on the table. I don't like to wave my own flag, Madam Speaker, but fair is fair. We have worked extremely hard to get that project underway. I really do not want to step back and say, *Oh well, yes, it was his plan*. He was involved in the early stages. We have brought it to the table and are pushing it forward. And I am doing this for my Bodden Towners.

The Leader of the Opposition also accuses us of not reducing the high taxes that were put in place by his administration. I find that a bit ironic, Madam Speaker. I am not going to spend too much time pointing out why I find that ironic, but we are reducing taxes. It is a bit facetious because in stating that he full well knows that it is not easy to just reduce government revenue, because once you create the appetite for that revenue it is hard to just cut it off. So, to accuse us of not wanting to reduce taxes when he him-

self increased the taxes, that is being a bit disingenuous. But I will leave it at that. But I really do not want to walk around with that on my shoulder, Madam Speaker, because I know that we are doing all we can to ease the cost of living for our people. And it really is unfair to make those sorts of accusations.

As I said earlier, I will not digress into accusations and finger pointing. I made that clear when I was first elected, that I planned to stand at a higher level than that. I am here to do a job, and I am here to do what I can for my country. I am willing to work with any Member of this House if it means at the end of the day this country is better off for it.

I hope that the message I am trying to make is clear. We have people who are hurting. We have people who are suffering. It is hard to focus on their issues if we are going to spend all of our time in here squabbling and fighting each other. The election is two years away, and I am fully prepared to campaign and defend my seat when the time comes. But for now, I say let's all work together for the benefit of the young people of this country. This budget is ambitious, it is reasonable, it is effective, and I think we should all get behind what the Government is trying to do. I do not see anything in that budget that makes me worry. I do not have any sleepless nights over it. And I hope that other Members of this House, when they have the opportunity to ask questions and delve into it, will feel the same way.

Our Government remains ready to help our people. Until the current situation with unemployment and poverty is addressed, we are going to have to step that up and continue the high level of assistance to people. I know that we get criticised for giving out too much for social services and so forth, but we are representatives of the people and the people, many times, come to us for assistance because we are their last resort. I have seen this time and time again. We have to be our brother's keeper.

So, until the people are in a position to help themselves, we have to be there for them. I hear the criticisms about social services and what we are doling out. But, honestly, I have seen this Government become meticulous and very careful about what we do and about what sort of assistance we give. To hear the accusations that we cut scholarships, yet no acknowledgement that we are giving \$10 million in scholarships really bothers me, Madam Speaker.

But on to more positive development, I am looking forward to a number of things that we will do in the next two years. Of course, first and foremost on that list is the one person, one vote, and single member constituencies. I have not wavered in my support for that, and I am pleased that we are moving forward with the change. I really do not see how anyone can look at the system we have now, compared to what we are proposing and say that what we are proposing is bad for the country. The enhanced accountability of representatives, the increased representation, the in-

creased responsibility, the increased level of democracy that is involved, I cannot see any negatives in what we are about to do for this country and for our electoral system. The electoral reform was needed a long time ago, Madam Speaker. We have fallen behind other democratic countries in terms of representation and equality.

When an individual can have six times more voting power than another individual, it is wrong. It is not democratic and it has to be changed. It has to be addressed. I do not care how many public meetings are held, or how many petitions are signed, I will not change my position that this is the best way forward for this country.

Madam Speaker, I am also looking forward to supporting the Minister of Labour when she implements the minimum wage legislative changes. Again, this is something that is long overdue. I campaigned about it before I was even thinking about going into politics. It is something that addresses a growing concern that I have and I think we have all seen it to some extent now where we actually have young people in this country being disenfranchised and unable to gain employment because they are competing with imported labour that will work for less than minimum wage and our young people are becoming frustrated with that situation. If it is allowed to continue, we will continue to see the removal of our middle class, the degradation of our middle class, and we will end up in a situation where we have rich and poor, and nothing in between. We need to put the necessary framework in place to protect our people who are working.

Madam Speaker, without the protection . . . remember, we have no labour unions here. So, the Labour Law and the laws have to protect the people and they have to be a bit on the side of the employee, because they really have no representation. The employers have a lot of representation. There are many organisations out there, many associations that the employers belong to. But there are not many that the employees belong to. So, the Government has a responsibility to protect the average worker. And this I fully support.

I also look forward to supporting the introduction of the Legal Practitioners Bill. This is something that, again, has been festering for so long and is becoming an issue where we are losing our competitiveness to other jurisdictions because we do not have it in place. We need that as soon as possible. And I am looking forward to supporting that. Obviously, there are some concerns that we all have, that we have to continue discussing. But I am looking forward to supporting the implementation of that Bill.

I am also looking forward to the strengthening of the Labour Law. I know that Minister Rivers is working diligently to get those proposed changes in place. I think she will be bringing those to the House in very short order. Again, those changes are long overdue

and something that I have been looking forward to and plan to support.

We are also looking at the fuel industry and making proposals to deal with the concerns about high fuel prices and being able to determine what we should be paying for fuel and so forth. Again, I support the Minister and what he is proposing to do. I am sure he is going to talk about that when he gets up, so I won't go into any detail. But I am fully supporting his efforts and I look forward to this Government implementing that.

Madam Speaker, I am looking forward to the Government implementing our complete agenda. I find it hard to believe that anyone, after listening to this, could accuse us of not doing anything. We are working hard. Sometimes it is to our own detriment. But we work nonetheless. And for anyone to say that we do not have this country's best interests at heart is dishonest.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I just want to thank you and the staff here at the Legislative Assembly for continuing to do their jobs so well and for supporting this parliament. I think I have said to you personally how much I appreciate what you do. And that feeling continues. Thank you very much.

I also want to thank the constituents in Bodden Town who continue to believe in me and support me. I think on a daily basis I get some form of appreciation from my constituents. And that is really and truly the only thanks I need. It says a lot for the job we are doing, but it is a feeling that I cannot describe. But it is what makes me continue to do my job.

Again, I want to thank Minister Bodden and the Premier for continuing to have me as their Councillor and working me, giving me the various tasks and duties and responsibilities to prepare me for one day, hopefully, to be not just a representative but a minister in our Government. That is my ambition, and I make no secret of it.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr.: I do not think I would want to sit in that first seat there any time soon, because I have seen the stress that comes with that. But I aspire to move a bit higher next time around, if I am given the opportunity. And I look forward to working with this entire parliament for the rest of this financial year.

Again, I just want to repeat: Let's work together. The election is two years away. Let's give it one more year and let's do what we can to the best of our ability for this country. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Does any other Member wish to speak? [pause] Does any other Member wish to speak? [pause]

I recognise the Elected Member for the district of North Side.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Let me begin by offering the Progressive Government and their coalition partners congratulations on their achievements outlined in the Throne Speech, the Policy Statement and the Budget Address. Madam Speaker, the fact that they have stabilised the financial position of the country and that they have improved the image of how government functions, speaks well of the country.

Madam Speaker, since all Members will spend most of their time debating what is in those three speeches, that is the Throne Speech, which is very little, the Policy Statement, most of which, in my view, should have been in the Throne Speech, and the Budget Address, I am going to spend the majority of my time talking about what is not in any of those three speeches which I believe the Government needs to pay some attention to, because the things that are there they are doing a good job with, so I don't need to talk to them about that. They are quite capable of getting up and singing their own praises and demonstrating what they have done over the last two years and what they plan to do for the next two years. But I believe there are some significant things that the country needs to address which are not included in any of those three speeches.

Of course, Madam Speaker, at the forefront and central to what is not included in any of those three speeches are the needs and requests from my constituency, which I have submitted both verbally and in writing.

Madam Speaker, I listened yesterday afternoon on the radio because, as you know, Madam Speaker, I had something to do with the primary school children in North Side and I like to spend time with them as well. But I listened with awe, admiration, respect, envy and, yes, a good amount of jealousy to the Deputy Premier as he outlined and boasted about all the provisions in the Budget for his constituency in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. And I congratulate him.

But, Madam Speaker, I could only lament, cry, (you can still hear it in my voice, Ma'am, my throat is sore) and be ashamed that as a representative for North Side I cannot do the same here today for my constituency because search as I may in those 2,000-plus pages of documents, it's hard to find much about North Side.

But I have done my part, Madam Speaker. And all I can do now is assure the North Siders that I have made the request both verbally and in writing, and that I intend to carry those requests to Finance Committee and continue to advocate particularly for the two classrooms and the staff room for the Edna Moyle Primary School in North Side. That primary school is the only school in the Island that does not have a staff room. It is the only primary school to which nothing has been done for a decade, if not decades.

We are not asking for much, Madam Speaker. The two classrooms and the staff room, as designed by Public works, approved by the teachers, approved by the PTA, I estimate to cost about \$350,000, which represents 0.0005 per cent of the Government's projected revenue, or 0.0028 per cent of the \$5 million assigned to the Education Ministry for capital development in the budget.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Okay.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Or 1.75 per cent . . . no, I'm sorry. You're right. The 0.028 per cent is of the projected surplus of \$121 million.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: No, no. I agree. I agree.

Or 1.75 per cent of the \$5 million for capital, which is in the Education budget.

Madam Speaker, I intend to advance that the Government can afford to build the much needed two classrooms and staff room onto the Edna Moyle Primary School in North Side.

For a long time the school was small. But the school is growing now and is busting at the seams. I think we are also the only school on the Island that is still left with a temporary classroom. As I said, Madam Speaker, I don't think we're asking for a great deal.

Now, I know that some people around the Public Works Department have suggested that we are talking millions of dollars to build two classrooms and one staff room. But, Madam Speaker, I am going to guess, giving what they just spent on a bus pickup for the children, then, that would probably be where they would go. We asked them to build a shelter, not a bus shelter . . . that's not what we asked for. We asked for a shelter so the bus could drive under it and pick up the children when it was raining. The bus has been outside in the weather for years; that wasn't going to change. They insisted on building a bus shelter.

The problem is that they put a sidewalk in the middle of the parking lot and now when it rains the children have to step in six inches of water to get onto the bus. They still get wet from the design. I told them so when they showed me the design. When they were getting ready to pour the sidewalk I went there. I had them call the Public Works Department and I said, *This does not make any sense. You are putting the sidewalk between the drain and the rest of the parking lot; it's going to settle water.*

[They said] Oh no, we'll cut pipes.

They went and cut and put the pipe but the water is still there. So, we have the unfortunate situation where the children have to step off a six inch

sidewalk down onto a parking lot in six inches of water and then step up 8, 12, 15 inches into the bus.

The classrooms, in my view, and I have spoken to at least three construction companies that I've shown the plan to, and they have told me that \$300,000 to \$250,000 was adequate. So, I am publicly asking and pleading with the Government. We have the plans ready. To the best of my knowledge they are supposed to be either in Planning or approval. It would be nice, particularly if the Deputy Premier, with all of his influence, authority on the Government, would help me get that construction started 1st of July, so that it would be available for the opening of school in September. We can build them in two months because it is just one, two walls.

Madam Speaker, the PPM put the name, deservedly so, of Ms. Edna on the school. She was one of their founding members. I think it was the honourable thing to do. The least we can do now is to make it worthy of her name and not have the children have to take turns to go for lunch because the canteen is too small, because a piece of that is taken off as a classroom.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Government expects, and I believe that they will, to get us compliant with the Public Management and Finance Law [PMFL] in this coming financial year. That is no small achievement, Madam Speaker. They deserve the kudos for that. I don't believe that building a classroom in North Side would prevent them from getting there though. Okay?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Oh, you'll hear plenty about that classroom today until somebody gets up and says, *We are going to give it to you.*

But the question I have, Madam Speaker, is . . . yes, it is good to become compliant in all stuff in this financial year, but what then? What are we going to do for budget year 2016/17 in order to address some of the needs the country has? Become non-compliant again?

Madam Speaker, I have always said, and I have always believed that those ratios are far too narrow and limit Government's ability to function. None of us in this House can operate our homes the way we are expected to run the country. If none of us could borrow more than 80 per cent of our annual income, we wouldn't have houses to live in. But it is an accepted thing that you can go beyond that, stretch it over a few at a time, because you will enjoy the comforts of the house while you are paying it back. None of us could build a house if we were limited to 10 per cent of our income to service the mortgage.

So, Madam Speaker, what I think the Government needs to do, now that they have achieved that, is go to the UK and say, *Listen, we need to make some changes here.* And I think they have to do one

or two things. They have to make the ratio as a percentage of revenue higher, or, which is what I would recommend they do, is link it to gross domestic product [GDP], which is what most countries do. When you link it to revenue, any drop in any of government's revenue heads could lead to you becoming non-compliant. But if it is based on the gross domestic product, it is more general, and it is also a much larger amount. But I don't think that that is too generous a limit to say the 10 per cent and the 80 per cent are of the gross domestic product as opposed to government's annual revenue.

Madam Speaker, the country has some needs which need to be addressed, which are not in this budget or the Throne Speech, or the short speech from Her Excellency the Governor. One of those is the needs of our elderly. We have an obligation, we have a responsibility, and we have the capacity to provide for our elderly better than we are doing. The numbers and the needs of our elderly are going to increase dramatically over the next several years, because we didn't have the baby boomers from the war, but we have the baby boomers from the seamen who came back in the 60s. They are now approaching retirement age.

And because of the way we allowed the health insurance industry to migrate and develop and allow the health insurance companies to continue to take up the profit from everybody from age 18 to 60 and then deny everybody after 60, the Government finds itself in this position today.

Madam Speaker, I brought the first health insurance bill to this Parliament. And it was intended then that your health insurance . . . as I also brought the first pension bill. That National Team Government, led by the Leader of the Opposition destroyed a lot of things in this country when they came into office in 1993. They were elected in 1992. They unraveled a lot of good things that were in place for this country. And the country is paying the price for it today. Had we left in place the pension plan that was there, first thing, you would have had eight more years' of contribution than what they have today when they retire, and you would have had a pension. That pension plan was more like a social security. Don't care who you work for, you got a number and that's what you paid into. So it was easy for the individual to manage it.

What is happening to Caymanians today is over their lifetime they are working for three, four different companies paying pensions into four or five different companies and at the end of the day they have nothing because each one has eroded and the quantum sum in each pension plan is so small that they get no benefit from their investment, it only gets eroded with the cost. And just like the pension should have been, your health insurance should be part of your retirement plan so that you get the benefit of the young people working because your premium is spread over the young people and everybody.

One of the big problems with health insurance in this country is we do not sell and we do not force the insurance companies to sell group health insurance. They sell individual plans discounted on numbers. There's a big difference between those two things.

And the whole idea of health insurance is that we spread some of the cost of the elderly. Nine times out of ten, particularly in this country because it's compulsory, you start work at age 18 and as you look at the disease indices based on age in Cayman, there are not a lot of people getting sick between age 18 and 60. And a lot of people, unless they get in an accident or something, or they have the odd case of juvenile diabetes or some inherited function that develops . . . so most of those people pay those health insurance premiums every month, have very few claims for 35-plus years, and when they get to 60 and they need it, they tell them 1) they're not covering them; or 2) the premium is four times what it should be because they are separating them into one group.

It is the same thing the Government is trying to do. We cannot address the needs of the elderly piecemeal. We cannot take the cost of the healthcare, which is going to be high, and isolate that and address that in isolation from everything else. This country needs to have a national debate on the needs of our elderly. We need to decide what benefits we are going to provide for our elderly, we need to decide how we are going to fund those benefits for our elderly, and we need to decide what the criteria is. And the criteria must not be who you know or who knows you.

Madam Speaker, don't tell me that's not how it works, because I know. I send people to get assessed and they say no. I tell them to get somebody else to send them, and they get everything.

Again, Madam Speaker—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Yes, that could be the only difference because nothing was changed about the person.

An Hon. Member: What did you do?

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: I don't know.

I did what I'm doing now, probably, criticising the people who put the programme in place because it didn't make any sense.

Whatever we decide has to be fair, Madam Speaker, and it has to be transparent. It has to be simple. It has to be understood by the citizens of the country so that you understand when you are young, you pay in and you are putting something aside for when you get old and that the young people are making a contribution to the elderly people who built the country for them to enjoy. That's how most countries do it.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Government made mention in their Throne Speech, as did the Deputy Premier and the Premier, about the hospitality school, which is a good thing. I am a little concerned that it's an entry level and that we have to be careful that we are not creating another piece of paper that a Caymanian must get in order to get a job cleaning a room or stacking liquor in a bar, because the only people required to have qualifications around here are Caymanians.

And don't you wave your hand, Mr. Deputy Premier, too early, because the Government board—that you all appointed—called the Business Staffing Plan Board and the Immigration Department, approved the permit for top management in the tourism industry, zero qualifications in tourism, zero experience in tourism, and allowed him to replace Caymanians—not one, not two, not three up until this week—who are qualified, who have experience and who were doing a good job. So it's okay to have people and to prepare our people to enter the industry. It's time to do something about those already there with 20, 30 years' experience, master degrees in hotel management, bachelor degrees in hotel management.

And every hotel on Seven Mile Beach is managed by a foreigner. It's difficult from where I sit, Madam Speaker, to practice CaymanKind if you can't speak English.

Madam Speaker, don't tell me now—I see some shaking their heads—that they can speak English. I am going to table this. I gave it to him to photocopy (I don't know where he is). This is an ad in the Cayman Reporter, issue 71, Friday the 8th, Thursday, 14 May 2015, under the picture of a lion or a lioness and a crown called the Ritz Carlton. First ad: English as a second language [ESL] Instructor.

Now, Madam Speaker, explain to me how people in this hotel who cannot speak English can get a work permit in this country. It is so bad that they are advertising for English, as a second language, instructor. Madam Speaker, I am going to read the ad for the public just in case they didn't see it.

“Part-time (average 3 hours per week) specialist required for a short term contract to help employees improve their professional and service English language skills.”

The Speaker: Member for North Side, it's your intention to table it, as you referred to?

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Yes, Ma'am, I gave the Serjeant copies.

The Speaker: You need to request it, then, I can order it.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Okay, Madam Speaker. I would like to table this ad by the Ritz Carlton.

The Speaker: So ordered.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: I got it here, I don't need it.
You didn't alter this while you were outside now . . .

[Laughter]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Those photocopiers today can do all kinds of things. I didn't do that, Madam Speaker.

And it says, “. . . **Responsible for designing and implementing ESL lessons; evaluating, coaching and correcting employees to cater to a wide range of abilities and professional criteria including, but not limited to: accent reduction, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, speaking and listening skills, business English and functions, professional writing and presentation skills. Classes will reflect professional values and standards of the Ritz-Carlton Grand Cayman.**” (They are not talking about one in China).

“**Qualified candidates must have:**

- **Master's degree in ESL or related field.**
- **Minimum 10 years' experience teaching English as a second language.”** (so you know that's no Caymanian, because we teach English because we speak English, not as a second language).
- **“Advanced knowledge of the structure and rhetoric of English.**
- **Strong leader and great communication and interpersonal skills.**
- **Ability to lead and motivate a multicultural team.”** (but we're talking about CaymanKind now, you know)
- **“Strong computer skills in MS Office applications.**
- **Must be able to work flexible shifts including evenings, weekends and Public Holidays.**
- **Knowledge and experience of hospitality and service operations a distinct bonus.**
- **Fluency in other languages desirable.**

Weekly rate, US\$100-US\$150.”

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Now, Madam Speaker, when Caymanians go here and apply for jobs, they have to get all kinds of qualifications. They have to go through all kinds of interviews.

I know somebody who is on, I believe, their 15th or 16th interview now. I better say no more about

that because they will punish him for that by . . . well, I think they have already eliminated him because they only . . . what they do, Madam Speaker, is encourage Caymanians, *Oh, we're going to do this, we're going to this, we're going to do this.* And tell the Business Staffing Plan give them that stamp, approved. Then all of a sudden they find a reason why they can't hire them.

Madam Speaker, not this hotel, but we were told by the PPM Government when we did the TLEP [Term Limit Exemption Permits] amendments to the Immigration Law, that they were bringing in a \$20,000 fine—remember that?—for people if they didn't tell them Caymanians had applied for the job. I think I had at least one complaint that was borderline. I don't think anything was done about it. But again, I can't unveil my source because they would be completely blacklisted if they knew that.

Madam Speaker, the point I want to make to the Government is this: Yes, we need to train Caymanians for the industry. But you know, Madam Speaker, when it comes to the tourism industry and that related field, Caymanians don't need too much training, you know. It comes natural. We built our tourism on the relationships that Caymanians built with people and got them to return. Those people don't have a certificate in anything.

The greatest growth in the tourism industry in this country occurred when every single hotel on Seven Mile Beach was managed by a Caymanian. And we have plenty Caymanians who have degrees in hotel management today. And not a single one of them can get to the top.

The Fourth Elected Member for Bodden Town made the point in his speech that we have to start recognising our own. We have to start protecting our own. We have to stop allowing these people to come here and give us these excuses why Caymanians cannot fill these top positions, because it's no good of putting them at the bottom.

Madam Speaker, we are allowing them to hire people from anywhere with no qualifications. But a Caymanian shows up and fills out a form, first thing they have to do is pay \$25 for a police record and then, they have to have all sorts of certificates to clean hotel rooms or to work as a bartender. Most Caymanians have no problem bartending. They watch their aunts, uncles, and everybody else drink all their lives. They know how to mix drinks! Mixing drinks in Cayman is like cooking Cayman food.

Some of the best bartenders this country has ever seen, had no formal training, but can mix anything. One of my constituents, and I can use his name today because he said I could, Andy McCoy, the person that invented the mudslide that these bartenders cannot make unless they take it out of a machine. Go to these same places and apply for a job, and they will tell you they have no openings.

You know that thing that the court house—I have to be careful here now too—[that] those lawyers are trying to suppress through the court house (I see the attorneys looking at me) about that information FOI. That has some good information in it. I was shocked to see the amount of permits that institutions in my district have, because every time I send somebody they say they don't need anybody—including Andy McCoy. He went to everyone. Not a one would hire him. Don't need anybody, but if you go there they have Filipinos; all nationalities.

I sent four people (and I am not going to call their names because there's no cause to call the children's names) to one of the institutions to apply for a job. I heard that they wanted some F&B people. My office spent the time to prepare them. The first child—this is the report that the person who interviewed them sent back to me: “Young, very shy, but very charming and pleasant. She is interested in a possible position as a greeter in a restaurant or retail sales in the gift shop. No positions available at this time.” [UNVERIFIED] But they have sulky people there walking around doing the same job, you know.

Second one: “Most experienced of all four interviewed candidates; sees himself as a senior tech for an IT company in five years; would be willing to work as a server, as it would allow him meet people and network. Intelligent, carries himself well, and seems very organised but has no actual hands-on F&B service experience; possible consideration for employment as an F&B server.” [UNVERIFIED] They never gave him a job.

Third one: “Also very experienced in employment history, but with no actual F&B service experience; clearly a very intelligent lady, quick thinking and pleasant; possible consideration for employment as an F&B server.” [UNVERIFIED] No jobs.

Fourth one: “Very pleasant young lady but with no F&B service experience; would recommend that she look for employment in daycare area as she seems to enjoy working with young children. No position available at this time.” [UNVERIFIED]

Madam Speaker, these young people spent a week in my office putting up with me and other people telling them the things they needed to do for this interview. You see the reports. But yet, they get somebody from California who goes to licence a tricycle (those little bicycles that has a motor attached to it, I call them tricycles), and the person licensing it says, “You sure you want to be riding this around Cayman?”

He says, “Oh, that's all I can afford now. But don't worry I'll soon have a car.”

They said, “Oh? Well, you're working here on a work permit?”

“Oh yeah.”

“Where is your work permit?”

“Working at the Ritz Carlton.”

“Mm-hmm. What are you working there for?”

“As a bartender.”

“Oh? Well you must have lots of qualifications and experience in bartending to get a job at the Ritz Carlton.”

“No. Me? I never worked a day in my life as a bartender. My friend got me the job there.”

Did you hear what he said? His friend got him the job there. Now, that's true, you know, because he never had any reason to . . . he didn't know who he was talking to or anything else. But for these young people . . . there are no openings. And you wonder why the young people are getting frustrated about what's going on in this country, Madam Speaker. They have good reason to be.

I know the *Compass* will be writing me up next week about my revolutionary stuff, but those are the things we have to do something about.

Madam Speaker, the Government . . . and I just heard the Fourth Elected Member for Bodden Town talking about the shift to e-Government; it's a good thing. But you know, Madam Speaker, I was around when Government established Computer Services. Remember that one? Government was going to be paperless in three years, remember? We were going to reduce staff. We were going to have everything in order. Every year, not only did the civil service increase and they used more paper, but Computer Services itself increased. I think it was started in 1988 or 1989, somewhere around there, if I remember correctly.

The list just read out by the Fourth Elected Member for George Town is impressive. But, Madam Speaker, what I think the Government needs to do more of, is have internal communications by email. For instance, if I need to get my guns licensed or renewed, I have to take my passport, go up to Walker's Road, get in line, stand up, pay \$25 for a police record, go back the next day to pick up the police record, and then the next day hand the application in for my gun licence to the same person, you know, in the same office.

Madam Speaker, charge me the \$25, charge me \$45 if you want, but do that work internally. You still have to check; at least I would hope that they check it when it's presented to them. [It's the] same thing with licensing vehicles. You go to the vehicle licensing, if your vehicle is licensed in a company name you have to come back to George Town or get it before you go, a certificate in good standing. People there should be able to go online. Yes, *it's in good standing*.

Mr. Miller since this is in a company registration it's going to cost you an extra \$30.

No problem! Pay it.

I trust that it is going to reduce cost. I don't believe so, because all that data has to be entered by somebody. And my experience with it is that it has never reduced costs anywhere, not even in the private sector.

Madam Speaker, I noticed that the only person who mentioned the E&Y Report was the Premier (and that was just in passing), and that they are going to produce their own report of the things that they want to do. And, Madam Speaker, this is my position. And the Deputy Governor is sitting right there. When I was invited to a meeting by him, I told him, in front of E&Y, that this is an exercise in futility; this is a waste of money. The Government has to make the decision before they bring in E&Y. What are you going to privatise? Once the Governor has made that policy decision, then, you hire someone like E&Y to tell you how to privatise it and get the maximum return from it, because we didn't tell E&Y we weren't going to sell Radio Cayman. They recommended that you sell Radio Cayman. We didn't tell them we weren't going to sell the Water Authority, because they recommended we sell it.

So, I said from the beginning, and I still say so, the Government itself must make the policy decisions. There are some things in government that I believe could be privatised. But don't fool yourself. It is not possible, or it's going to be a very rare and in few instances that you are going to be able to privatise a service that government currently provides and provide the service cheaper by the private sector. Very few, if any!

I tried to privatise garbage collection in 1989. At that time we were charging \$25 a year, if I remember that. And if I remember, the lowest bid I got back was \$50 a month. So, while the Chamber of Commerce and the media like to badmouth the civil service about how their inefficient and ineffective and they waste all this money, all that is not true, you know; ignore that. There are many services in the civil service that are being delivered efficiently and effectively, and I am telling you here today, without fear of successful contradiction, that the private sector cannot do it cheaper or more effectively, or more efficiently. But it's a good beating stick.

We have to be careful how we subscribe to these things that are being pushed, just like the pension plan. It was the Chamber of Commerce that hijacked that, you know, and made it into the rubbish that we have today. And the only people who have made money out of it are the fund managers and themselves.

Madam Speaker, again, I am only talking what I know. I worked with them for one year. They had 32 changes that they wanted made to the plan that Mr. Benson put there. I agreed with them to change 30 to make the plan better. I couldn't do two because they wanted me to legislate against future parliaments. We all know that's impossible, right? And they wanted me to prohibit forever government being able to borrow the money through a legitimate financial arrangement with a bank into which the money was deposited. And they saw an opportunity for them to make money and they hijacked it, and that's what we have today.

And the people in this country who we were trying the most to protect are the ones that are going to suffer the most, unless we find an alternative through government to look after them in their twilight years. And that's the disgrace in the whole thing. And that was solely done by the private sector. It was a deliberate act on their part to make money. I was there.

Now, Madam Speaker, I am a little bit worried about the announcement of work permits being handled online because these employers are such nice people. Right? I know some . . . and I just told you some of the things they are doing. Qualified Caymanians now, Madam Speaker, I am not talking about people who are not qualified. And we have to be very careful how the Government is acquiescing to their demands to be able to do this electronically.

They have more schemes . . . I was also chairman of the Immigration Board. The Deputy Governor was there with me. He knows some of the schemes we uncovered. And some of them that, Oh, doing a good job, just a sheep in lion's clothes, because if you give them an inch, they're like a termite, they take the whole yard.

Another thing mentioned in the Budget Address and the Policy Statement more so, is the idea of creating this super ombudsman by combining FOI, Complaints Commissioner and a few other agencies. Madam Speaker, I don't support that. If you are going to interfere with their roles and their functions as it exists in the Constitution and the legislation, I am not supporting it. If you are talking about them being able to have access and use the same reception staff, et cetera, I can support that. That is a sensible thing to do; which is why I don't support the Government knocking down the Glass House to give it to somebody to make a park.

I think the Glass House would make a wonderful regulatory facility. Cayman Monetary Authority at the two top floors, these agencies down below, space for the Auditor General, space for the DPP and all those others who are paying rent now. If the Glass House was in such bad shape that it was condemned, my question is: how could it possibly have survived Ivan? And it did pretty-good in Ivan. Some of those buildings that Planning certified as being hurricane proof went down.

It has to make more long-term economic sense, in my view, to repair that building. It still has plenty green around it to make a park if you want. If Uncle Dart wants to donate a park to put around it, we can still do that. It would look pretty. Right? As long as it does not look like the one in North Side because that looks like a desert. But they can put some colourful plants and whatnot on it.

That is too big an asset to destroy it. And it has historical value. That was the first, as I recall, when Mr. Berkeley Bush opened that, he said then that it was the first all-aluminum and glass building in

the Caribbean. And we have to stop destroying our heritage just by knocking down. The Public Works Department condemned it in order to get the new building next door. We got the new building next door. We needed that anyhow. We couldn't get out of that. So let's find out what needs to be done and fix it. And we don't have to fix it all in one day, or one year. We can do it in phases.

A big complaint was there was no external stairwell. Madam Speaker, I don't see an external stairwell on the one they built now, the new one.

Madam Speaker, one of the things glaring and one that concerns me the most of being omitted, other than the elderly, from any of those three speeches, is any relief for Caymanians losing their houses. Madam Speaker, we have to do something about what the banks are doing to Caymanians on their mortgages. In the last three months I had three different people come to see me. In one case they had a house that the court had set the minimum on 10 acres of land, \$750,000. Signed a private deal for \$500,000 and put the rest on to another piece of property.

Another one came to see me. They bought a duplex on an evaluation of \$575,000. For various reasons in this economy, and because we have too many work permits and Caymanians can't get access to some of the jobs that they need, although they are qualified for them, people got in trouble with the bank. Now the bank has gotten an evaluation for that house for 370-something thousand dollars which just happens to be equal to what they owe the bank; kind of convenient, eh? And they have the house up for sale for that. So they remove that \$200,000 equity that the Caymanian has in the property.

The third scenario, the guy bought two lots of land, built the first house out of his pocket, never went to any bank. Had \$180,000 in cash, decided he wasn't getting any interest at the bank so he built a house to sell. He borrowed \$200,000 more from the bank, built a house valued at over \$600,000 by his evaluator. The bank foreclosed on his \$200,000 because he was in the construction industry and couldn't get any work. He had to sell the house for \$250,000 just to pay the bank off, because they were threatening to take both lots.

Madam Speaker, no bank in this country will give you more than 80 per cent of the equity. So we don't have the situation they had in America where they are borrowing more than the house is worth. The bank secures itself a 20 per cent cushion in the value to start with. They will not lend you more than 80 per cent of the asset. They take every asset that you have too, and then they want personal guarantee on top of that, so, that if they sell it from below the amount you're still stuck with the balance. Most Caymanians believe that if they owe the bank \$200,000 and the bank sells the house for \$150,000 they, don't owe the bank anything. Oh no ol' boy. You still owe them the \$50,000. That's your personal guarantee. And they

can put that on any property that they find in Lands and Survey, and you wouldn't know about it. They might be courteous and write you a letter and tell you after the fact.

Government needs to put some regulation on this. At a minimum the regulation should require that if I borrowed money at 80 per cent on a house that you agreed was valued at \$500,000 and you are going to foreclose; that's where it's going to start, \$500,000. You can't start at \$300,000 because you have some evaluator that gives you an evaluation now at \$300,000, because you want to sell it to your friend.

Madam Speaker, I would go so far as to say that what we have now developing in Cayman is a foreclosure business rather than a real estate business. And there are certain chosen law firms. There are certain chosen land evaluators. There are certain chosen real estate agencies that do all of this.

One of the people who complained to me heard the lawyer for the bank telling the client, *You don't need to be in any hurry, you know, because we are going to put the prices down next week. If you think this price is too high, just hold on until next week, we're going to lower it some more.* In the meantime now, it is depriving Caymanians of their equity. And we know who it is out there buying houses to qualify for PR. It isn't Caymanians. It ain't Caymanians.

I don't subscribe to all these conspiracy theories they throw up in here you know. But sometimes you have to wonder. If you look in the *Gazette* (the Clerk and I went in the back there and pulled out two), same law firm on every foreclosure notice in those gazettes. But that might just be coincidence, because that might be a big portfolio of their business. I don't know. But it's the same . . . that is the person and his attitude that these people complain about.

Madam Speaker, the Government needs to find a way to address this. I understand that people must pay their mortgage, but we must insist that the banks do some other things as well; take equity in the building if the person is just temporarily out of a job and they can't pay their mortgage, or because the economy is down and they can't pay their mortgage. Okay. Let the thing go up and the bank take equity as an alternative to foreclosure than selling it out from under them so that the Caymanians having nothing left.

This person who had the \$500,000 value duplex, had he gotten it sold at that level, he had \$150,000 in his pocket to start over with. The bank sells it at \$300,000 and he isn't getting anything.

Madam Speaker, they are blaming us, you know. I can't find any change to the Land Registry Law, but the lawyers and the bankers are telling the clients that they no longer need to go to court for the court to arbitrate on the value of the property, they just go list it on the MLS, multiple listing system, with the real estate people. They go directly there.

Now, if you look at the Land Registry Law you will see that the law allows the bank to do two things: Sell the property or take it for arbitration. I don't remember the exact legal terminology. But they are saying that we changed the law to allow that. I can't find where we made any changes. Now maybe there has been a position and the banks are now representing in the mortgages that they don't need to go to court for the court to fix . . . because there has to be some independent arbitrator in this process.

You can't have the bank who I owe the money to, selecting the law firm to prosecute me. That's normal. But they shouldn't be allowed to select their realtor to undervalue my property, and then select their own real estate company to sell it. I believe we need to bring in some system that says that whoever is valuing the property should not be chosen by the bank.

In one of these cases the person could show me the bank's evaluation, which they had to unveil in court, and show me an evaluation from the same company that valued it when he purchased it and their evaluation was still up above the \$500,000. He got another separate evaluation which valued the property close to \$500,000, \$480-plus thousand. But the bank has its chosen evaluator, \$370,000, and that's what they insisted it be sold at.

Now, I am not a lawyer. I am not a banker. But I know my people are hurting. And I know it's my responsibility to do something about it.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, the banks again: The Government says it wants to do things to help small businesses. In any small business in Cayman the most expensive thing is banking. It cannot be reasonable for me as a small business owner to deposit a cheque in the bank and the bank takes four days to clear it. That is absolutely unconscionable because the bank is making money on the cheque before they clear it.

I saw one small business person a couple of weeks ago deposit over \$30,000 in cheques, some from government, you know. Right? And the bank would not honour . . . she deposited on Wednesday and the bank will not honour payroll for that person on Friday because the cheques have not cleared. Four days.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: If you look, you will see it. But it should be hours, it should be automatic now in this day and age.

You can go to the US and put a cheque into the machine, a photo of it, and get instant credit in your account. Why do we need four days?

It's the same thing with your credit card. You go and pay cash. Right? But you have to wait 24 hours to get credit. It's worse than that, Madam Speaker. My bank told me the other day when I went in to pay my credit card with cash, the clerk looked at

me and said, *Well, Mr. Miller, you understand that we can't do this anymore. You can't pay a credit card with cash.*

I said, *What?* I said, *You can tell your manager that any time Ezzard Miller walks in here with legal Cayman currency to pay my card, he is going to accept it.*

They want you to deposit into your account so they can charge you to transfer it. You get a cheque. . . if Mr. Arden gives me a cheque for \$100, I take it to his bank, I don't have an account there, they will only give me \$95. That's highway robbery!

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Because I don't have an account there at the bank the small businessman is only getting . . . that's probably the profit. The \$5 from that \$100 cheque is probably the profit. They are now starting, I understand, to charge the small business people for depositing cash. There is a fee for them to count the cash.

Madam Speaker, I am not suggesting that we must hogtie the banks to the point where they can't make any money, because we know that interest rates are down and everything else now. But this is exorbitant. This is what is killing small businesses in the country. Can you imagine a person on a fixed income from government and they go with a government cheque written on Royal Bank to some other bank and they can't get the full amount of the cheque? Well, I tell them, Listen, when they tell you that, tell um *No, no, no, no, no. You call Mr. Arden because he coming ya and give me that \$5. I am not leaving this window until I get my \$100.* And every time you say \$100 you say it louder and louder and louder, they will eventually give you the \$100 just to get you out of the bank.

So, Madam Speaker, these are the things that I believe the Government needs to do.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Oh, let's not go down that road. Right?

This is the kind of thing that is making it difficult for small businesses.

Madam Speaker, I tried to get the UDP Government to do it and they wouldn't do it. I recommended it to the PPM two years in a row now. Every bank in this town, if I walk in with a US dollar, will give me eighty cents. If before I get out of the bank I decide I need the dollar back to sell to Mr. Arden and I go back, it's going to cost me eighty-four cents.

Now, Madam Speaker, as far as I know, Cayman currency is fixed to the US dollar. Now, any other currency transaction I don't have a problem with. The Government needs to take that four cents and fund CIDB with it. The best estimate I can get in the

financial industry is somewhere between \$25 million and \$35 million a year. If you put that over there in the Cayman Islands Development Bank; it doesn't cost you any money to get it. They can lend it to small businesses for 2 per cent, 3, per cent, 4 per cent on proper things and we can help people, because the banks are not supposed to be in that business.

Now, when they introduced it in 1968 the argument then was because Cayman currency was new and they needed to have a cushion to make sure it worked. Cayman currency has been around a long time now and is one of the most stable currencies in the world.

Madam Speaker, in some of these instances we have to be brave. We have to do what is right by our people. We can't go and borrow money to fund CIDB at 10 per cent and expect them to lend it on for 6 per cent or 8 per cent. I mean, that is what ran poor old Patterson out of business. He used to buy from Dr. Roy and carry it up there and help the people and sell it to them cheaper. Right?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Right?

I think that's a good . . . if you want it to be generous, split it with um, two and two. You're still looking at \$15-plus million a year to put into CIDB and you can use that then for education scholarships and put a proper scholarship fund there and all those kinds of things we can fund it with, because they are making a lot of money on it.

Now, Madam Speaker, again, I think we need to be a little more specific, or we need to do something more direct about the cost of fuel, which we all agree affects everybody. And it affects the cost of living. I believe the Government needs to whatever it needs to do to be able to do two things. They need to be able to determine what the landed cost of fuel is here. And that has to be through some process, whether it is cost, insurance and freight, as the duty, as opposed to per gallon, or we simply say that they are allowed X percentage of markup on the landed cost and have to demonstrate the landed cost to the ERA [Electricity Regulatory Authority] or whatever. But the Government needs to get a handle on what fuel is being landed here for. And whatever system is put in place needs to have an incentive for the fuel companies to get cheaper fuel.

It is no good doing it if it is simply a pass-through to the customer. It has to affect their bottom line, otherwise, they are not going to go to a cheaper source. But we have plenty of bright people over there. They can figure this out.

The second thing we need to do is to control the markup between the wholesaler and the retailer. And there are countries around us. The Member for East End gave the Bahamas as an example in the last sitting; perfectly reasonable graduation.

The third and most important thing is that we have got to take the wholesale owners out of the retail business. They should never have been allowed to get into it in the first place. And there is far too much . . . first of all, we have too many gas stations for what we have to service it. And the oil companies own far too many of them. They are double dipping us. And they are going to encourage the retailer to keep the price up, because the higher the retailer keeps the price, the more money they make. So, we need to tell them that they have six months to get rid of the stations. Get them out of the system.

Sometime ago I think it was the . . . what board was she chairman of? She shook them up a little bit by threatening that. But they backed off because . . . I will tell you in a sidebar, I don't want to do it over the room.

Those are the three things that I believe we need to find a way to do. At least we can then justify to the public that we have done something and that this is what it costs, and this is what the markup is and it's not unreasonable. We could be accusing them wrongly. I don't know, because I don't know what they are paying for it, other than what you see on the Internet and stuff like that.

I know one thing; they don't take long to adjust it upwards. But boy they will take a long (Ms. Annie's thing), long, long, long time to bring it down. Right?

I must add, Madam Speaker, that I don't think the Navasota proposal will help the price of fuel, because that equation doesn't make any sense to me. I don't see how a company is going to come in here and invest \$140 million in a tank farm in East End, another \$10 million in a dock, \$350 million total, right, bring the pipes to George Town, have to have another tank farm in George Town to receive it, because you can't pipe to the gas station. I don't think so. I wouldn't recommend that they do. I guess they can, but I don't think the Government should allow them to do that. And somehow they are going to be able to sell fuel to Caymanians cheaper than two companies who have already paid for their infrastructure? Something is not right there. I think we need to find a way to legislate, if necessary, that these two existing ones address it, and anybody else coming in will be equally affected.

Madam Speaker, again, not a lot said in any of the three speeches about the crime problem. In North Side and East End we keep being told we have no resources. We provide additional resources, they start something, it is working, and they take it back because they need the resource somewhere else. We need to get a handle on this crime thing.

What was it? Two years ago we sat with the Chief of Police and the Governor in a closed session and everybody told them come back, I think it was two days later, tell us what you need in resources. As far as I remember, we gave them basically everything

they asked for. But we still didn't get any help in North Side and East End.

Now, at some point in time, Madam Speaker, we have to deal with the administration of the resources you're provided with. If you can come here and tell me that you need this resource to do this, I will agree with you. But when I give you the resource, I expect this to be done. Having given you the resource now, if you don't do what you said you could do, then, you need to be sent home. It's simple. Obviously, you have that capacity to manage the resource I gave you.

Madam Speaker, we cannot affect crime in East End and North Side by having one car drive through it twice or three times a day with the windows locked up and the policeman on the cell phone. They're likely to have music going inside the car too, and we're going to get to that in Finance Committee about those fancy vehicles they are still buying. They told us last year we were going to fleet vehicles. I see people driving around dogs on leather seats. And I see some fancy trucks. When I was looking a truck to buy, the kind of trucks I see them driving, they are \$60,000 \$70,000 trucks.

Madam Speaker, I am not a policeman. But I know that when there is a police presence in my community crime is down. If you doubt that, Madam Speaker, go to Rum Point any Sunday afternoon. When the police are there, in amongst the boats, whether on their wave runners or their big boat, everything is nice and calm. You can enjoy the evening with your children. As soon as the police go, they come right to the bow of your boat and roll a splif and light it up right in front of you, you know. And then you almost have to duck your children underwater so they don't get high off the ganja!

Why can't the police stay? Where are they going? We had a team in East End that was working good; disbanded because they needed help in Bodden Town.

Madam Speaker, we talked about unemployment, and the Government says it has gone down. Well, the figure that I get doesn't say it's gone down, but in the latest report we have from the Minimum Wage Committee, employment in Cayman is at 9-point-something per cent.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Hmm?

That's 2013 figure. Okay. It's probably worse now then.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, I am concerned. And I support anything the Government wants to do to help people get into employment situations. But we have to do something about Caymanian professionals already in employment.

We can't have a situation where we have 14 Caymanian doctors, all of whom want to specialise and some have been waiting 10 years to get some assistance. And they don't want any freebies, Madam Speaker. They will pay back what it costs. They will pay for it. But they cannot get anything from the Education Ministry, HSA can't tell them, the Health Ministry won't do anything about them. And, by the way, Madam Speaker, I am hoping that when we get to Finance Committee, because every Member in Cabinet knows I brought it to you all, I asked you, I begged you not to support it. This idea of the board and the CEO of the HSA applying for the HSA to hire institutional licensed doctors, nurses, pharmacists, lab technicians, everybody. Now, Madam Speaker, I hope that that is dead, because if that happens, Madam Speaker, every Caymanian in the healthcare field can pack up their shingle and go home. There's only one reason for that—cheap labour. That's why it was done.

Remember, Madam Speaker, I stood here on the Floor of this Assembly in your presence. You were in Government. I told them the worst piece of legislation I ever saw come to this Parliament was that piece of legislation that created those institutional doctors for this country when people like me and others have fought so hard to raise the level of professional healthcare coverage in this country.

Madam Speaker, it is just wrong to tell Caymanians they have to rise to a certain standard, but we provide alternatives to people to do the same thing that Caymanians do at a lower standard, without having to do the exam. Madam Speaker, as I said, I trust and hope that all of those doctors that work there will pass the exams. My position is that they must take the exam, just like I say about the lawyers. And I heard various Government Members say they are bringing this Legal Practitioners Law.

Now, Madam Speaker, they only need to do two things for my support, you know. One, stop outsourcing; and two, every person coming here must sit the Cayman Bar exam. I don't care where you come from. I don't care how long you've been practicing. It should be real easy for you to pass an exam if you come from one of those high powered countries and have been practicing 20 years. You should not have any problem. You should be able to go down to that court house and sit down in one day and pass it with distinction. But you must sit the exam.

Every Caymanian has to do it. We need to do the same thing with accountants. We need to have the local CPA. If you come in here on a work permit, sit the local exam. That's how it is anywhere else in the world you go. You think the Caymanians who get called to the Bar here by passing the Bar exam can go anywhere else and practice law without doing the exam? Why are we afraid to do things for Caymanians?

Mr. V. Arden McLean: But you can't even go from one state to another in America and do it.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Oh, I know that.

But we are afraid to say that this is our standard and you must meet it. Why? Because the accounting firms, the law firms want to bring them from everywhere that they can find them and they don't have to do anything.

Madam Speaker, I have been told, and I hope it's not true, that it is possible that you can get registered as a lawyer, called to the Bar here now on the Internet. Some kind of electronic submission or something without ever coming to the Cayman Islands you can get registered as a lawyer to practice law in Cayman.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Okay.

Well, you know what I want, they have to come here. By the way, I think you should have to work, just like my Caymanians, two years before you can do the exam. But if you have 10 years, I will give you a chance to take the exam. But if you fail you have to go back home.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: So, Madam Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that Cayman is so advanced in the financial industry, both in banking and in legal and everything else. We need to start creating our own local qualifications.

My friend Eddington Powell has been trying for 25 years to create the Cayman Islands Institute of Finance. If you want to be a banker we can do it under the Monetary Authority; it's not difficult to do. You do your academic qualifications wherever, you come here and you take the Cayman banking licence.

You want to be an accountant? You go and you do your academic anywhere. You come here, you sit the Cayman CPA.

If you are a Canadian with a CA, or whatever, you come here and sit the exam. If you're so bright, because that's what they tell us, that Caymanians are not bright enough to hold these top jobs, these people shouldn't have any problem passing the exams.

It's the same thing with the healthcare professionals.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Oh, no, no, no. They are getting all the summer jobs I hear. That's another thing.

I hear that particularly the Canadians in the law school are taking up all the summer placements and the Caymanians are not getting any. But I am going to watch it and see.

Madam Speaker, I met with the Deputy Governor last week? Week before last. Nice presentation, Madam Speaker. They are doing a lot of good stuff.

There's a lot more they can do. But they are lining up. But, Madam Speaker—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Sorry. Okay.

The point is this, Madam Speaker: When I finished high school the Government had a list of scholarships. You applied for what the Government was offering scholarships for. At some point in time they've got to stop offering scholarships for \$20,000 a year for psychology.

Moment of interruption—4:30 pm

The Speaker: Member for North Side, we have reached the point of interruption. I invite the Honourable Deputy Premier to move the motion for the adjournment.

Hon. Moses I. Kirkconnell: Madam Speaker, I move a motion for the suspension of Standing Order 10(2) so that we may work past the hour of interruption.

The Speaker: Do you have an indication whether it is going to be to 6:00 pm, or what time?

Hon. Moses I. Kirkconnell: Yes, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: The question is that Standing Order 10(2) be suspended to enable the House to continue to work until 6:00 pm this afternoon.

All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes and Noes.

The Speaker: I believe the Ayes have it.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Can we have a division please?

The Speaker: Madam Clerk, please call a division.

The Clerk:

Division No. 2

Ayes: 9

Hon. Moses I. Kirkconnell
Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts
Hon. Osbourne V. Bodden
Hon. G. Wayne Panton
Hon. Marco S. Archer
Hon. Tara A. Rivers
Hon. Anthony S. Eden
Mr. Roy M. McTaggart
Mr. Alva H. Suckoo, Jr.

Noes: 3

Capt. A. E. Ebanks
Mr. D. Ezzard Miller
Mr. V. Arden McLean

Absent: 5

Hon. Alden McLaughlin
 Mr. Joseph X. Hew
 Mr. Winston C. Connolly, Jr.
 Hon. W. McKeeva Bush
 Mr. Bernie A. Bush

The Speaker: The result of the division is 9 Ayes, 3 Noes, and 5 absent. The motion is carried. We will work until 6:00 pm.

Agreed by majority on division Standing Order 10(2) suspended.

The Speaker: This time is a convenient time for the afternoon break. We will reconvene at quarter to five.

Proceedings suspended at 4.32 pm

Proceedings resumed at 5.05 pm

The Speaker: Please be seated.

Member for North Side, the Clerk has advised that you have one hour and 15 minutes remaining. Sorry, I beg your pardon. You have spoken for one hour and 15 minutes. You have 45 minutes remaining. I recognise the Member for North Side.

**APPROPRIATION (JULY 2015 TO JUNE, 2016)
 BILL, 2015— BUDGET ADDRESS AND THE
 THRONE SPEECH TOGETHER WITH THE
 GOVERNMENT'S POLICY STATEMENT**

[Continuation of Second Reading debate thereon]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, I found it . . . you know, we started late today. We came back late off the lunch break. We suspended Standing Orders at 4:30 to take a break for 35 minutes, and that is why I voted against suspending Standing Orders to go on after 4:30, because I believe that suspension of Standing Orders should be a rare thing. And it shouldn't just happen just to facilitate the Government.

Some of us make plans to leave here at 4:30 and have other things going on in our constituencies. And to not be shown the courtesy to be told that we're going to work until six o'clock . . . now am I to assume, Madam Speaker, and I know you can't answer that, but maybe the Deputy Premier can, and I will give way for it; do we plan to work until six o'clock every evening for the budget debate?

[No audible reply]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Okay.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, that little thing about Standing Orders leads me nicely into the next topic of the Premier's speech. I notice the Premier said he would be setting up a committee to review the

Standing Orders to produce a modern set of Standing Orders. But again, Madam Speaker, I am concerned about what is missing.

Madam Speaker, I think the time has come to separate the Parliament from the Executive. While I support a review of the Standing Orders, I believe it would be better to have an act of parliament that establishes parliament on its own, separates it from the control of the Executive and as regulations to that, we have proper Standing Orders. And the other thing we need to add to that is a Code of Ethics for Members.

Those of us who take the time to read the *Parliamentarian*, the last issue of the *Parliamentarian* has a very good article in it about ethics and why they are necessary in parliament and how to do it, and what's good about it. So, I support a review of the Standing Orders. But I would be happier and I would encourage the Government to let's do . . . we talked about this separation of Parliament from the Executive and taking it away from under the Deputy Governor or wherever it sits now and put the Speaker in charge as the chief officer as the Public Management and Finance Law would require. We have been talking about this for years.

Mr. McLean presented a very good paper in Trinidad about how it could be done. And again, we don't have to reinvent the wheel. There are existing parliaments in the Commonwealth that have already done this. And it shouldn't take six months to do. We should be able to do this, get the legislation in place, get the Standing Orders done, the Code of Ethics, all done to be passed into law in September.

We certainly have been discussing this. I wasn't here, but I understand that I think it was the 2005 or 2009 we had people who went all about, did all this research, and there are files amongst files in the records of the House that do all this, Madam Speaker. So let's set up a committee of one or two people under the chairmanship of the Speaker to bring back a report to us before this budget's Finance Committee is over, of what we are going to do. Let's get it done.

Madam Speaker, I am old fashioned. I work with timeframes. If you tell me to get it done by the end of the month, I am going to try my best. If I don't get it, I may go past two or three days, but if I don't have any timeframe to work with, nothing happens. That is why I cannot understand why we cannot say we are going to meet four dates of the year and stick to it.

How do you plan legislation if you don't know when you are going to bring it to parliament? We should know that the parliament is meeting on the 15th of September, so if the Minister of Labour wants to bring the new Labour Law, she knows that she has to have it approved by Cabinet at least a month before, 21 days before, 30 days before. So, she has to have it done by the end of August. We can't call parliament when it's convenient to the Government because we

finished a law. We need to be organised. We should be able to say we're going to meet in February, June, or because of the Budget Address it would have to be May, should be April actually. That's what the original law called for. We know who changed that and made it whenever we got it done as long it was before 30 June, right? They couldn't find time to correct the things in the Public Management and Finance Law that needed to be corrected, but they found the time to make the changes that suited them, because they didn't want to do the work and get it done on time.

So, Madam Speaker, in this legislation we should . . . the Speaker should decide when we are going to meet, she and her staff. And the rest of us fall in line. That's how it was. And I know, Madam Speaker, they don't like me to compare 1984 to 1992 to now. But we knew when parliament was going to meet. We knew that the Throne Speech was in February. We knew that the Budget was in November. We knew that the June session of parliament was reserved for the financial industry to tweak and amend any laws that they needed. We understood that September was the time for us to have our legislation for other programmes that we wanted in the Government.

So, we need to have a timeframe and we work backward until we get things done. I don't understand how they can work otherwise.

Madam Speaker, another thing is that I keep hearing the Government announce they are going to put legislation out for public consultation. And they are going to circulate it, according to the Constitution; 21 days before. Madam Speaker, we need to manage the public consultation better. The Government needs to make more effort to take these things to the districts, to take these things to forums, town hall meetings, explain it to the public. Putting it into the *Gazette*, which nobody in my constituency subscribes to, is not going to get public consultation. The only people you are going to get involved in it are those who have a vested interest enough to promote it or oppose it.

If the Government is going to draft good legislation they need to get a balanced view. They need to take the programmes . . . and, Madam Speaker, I know it can be done. I did it with every single programme that I did when I was a minister and took it to every town hall in this Island and had public meetings about it. Some places you go, you get 50, 60 people. Some places you get 4 or 5. But you have the meeting the same way—right?

And the Minister should be out there on the front line putting up the programmes, not the civil servants. Civil servants are there to technically advise him, but he should know enough about the programme to protect the civil servants and defend it in public.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: He or she.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Either one. Now, I speak English and the English we speak in North Side is not gender sensitive. He means she, and she means he—right? This is not Spanish. We don't have an "o" after the male, and an "a" after the female in every word.

So, the point I am making, Madam Speaker, is that the Government needs to do a better job, in my view, of managing public consultation and of getting out there to the public. In North Side it's easy, they can bring it to the district council meeting, we meet the last Thursday of every month. The average attendance is 45, 50 people. If I stirred up a little controversy about something in the Government there will be 90 people there. And well, that's another thing, Madam Speaker. While we're over here a lot of us talked about setting up district councils, and we had to change the law and we had to . . . They've been over two years and I haven't heard a word about it. I don't hear the District Council mentioning any of these three documents.

I as a representative, Madam Speaker, find my district council very useful. It is a great opportunity for me to get input. It's a great opportunity to discuss stuff with the community. The community gets more involved in the governance of the community and, therefore, the governance of the country in its entirety. And I would recommend to all the Ministers that we need to take the District Council Law and wipe out that dictatorial thing that we have there, where the Premier and the Opposition Leader appoint everybody and then the Premier can decide how much money he can give somebody if they want to run against me to work in the district. In North Side we have open elections for our officers and it works well. I would encourage . . .

Too many times, Madam Speaker, I am approached by citizens who wish to be informed that ask me what's happening about this, and why is the Government doing this.

Madam Speaker, let me make it clear, I am not supporting Daylight Savings Time. I am going to tell you just how I feel about it. I am going to summarize it the way my sister did when somebody mentioned it to her. She said, *Yeah, that's like telling somebody to cut an inch off your skirt and add it to the shoulder so it will be longer.* All of these people believe that they are going to have more daylight and they are going to have more time with this, and more time with that. It's going to drive up the cost of living for people in my constituency.

They are going to have to get up in the dark of morning to dress by light, and turn on all the lights in the house to come to George Town at what is now 7 o'clock to start work, or 6 o'clock for those who start at 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock for those who start at 9 o'clock. And then they have to go home in the evening an hour earlier, so they will have to turn on the air-conditioning in their house an hour earlier for the children, and that will drive up electricity again.

Madam Speaker, I have a very good friend who manages a company here. He works under the London Office. He goes to work 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the morning. He is not asking the Government to change the time to suit him so he can be in time with London. He needs that for his job. These law firms, I told them already to hire more Caymanian staff and operate 24/7 if unna think that's necessary, but don't inconvenience and drive up the cost of living for my constituents just because you want to be on New York time so you come to work the same time they go to work.

It is beyond my comprehension why anybody believes that Daylight Savings Time is a good thing.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Exactly.

Getting back to tourism: The heyday of tourism in Cayman, Caymanians ran everything. Caymanians were the bar tenders, they were the maids, they were the waitresses. They were everything. Built wonderful relationships! People came back, time after time after time. And every time they came back they wanted to speak to Ms. Julie from North Side, because when they asked her where the best place to go and get fried fish and fritters, she said, *Don't worry about that, Johnny going fishing tonight I am going to bring you fish and fritters tomorrow morning.* And she brought them. And they were good too.

They built relationships. Having these sophisticated corporate people running our hotels and only servicing the corporate headquarters . . . we can create all the CaymanKind we want, they cannot be CaymanKind if they come from somewhere else.

I read the advertisement on speaking English. Now, if I had said here, Madam Speaker, that some of these people, when I go down there and try to order something off the menu and they can't understand me, and I can't understand them, they would say, *Well, Ezzard is just being a troublemaker.* But they themselves admit this, you know.

I repeat my question to the Minister of Tourism and to the Minister of Employment: How is it possible for people who need to learn to speak English properly to get a work permit in Cayman to work in an industry where you need to speak English? To the best of my knowledge, most of tourists speak English.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Don't get me started on the Business Staffing Plan Board, now, because you know that I know that that's not fit for purpose. I told them here in April they need to dis-appoint every member of that. But they haven't done anything about it, because they think they are doing a good job.

They endorsed them giving a work permit for chief operating office with zero qualifications and zero

experience to replace a Caymanian with 30 years of experience and master degree.

This week, you know, Mr. McLean, they have laid off the CFO. They have now decided they are taking the accounts to the States. So another Caymanian qualified person is out of a job.

When Mr. McLean and I went to everybody about it, it was wrong. Nobody can tell me that if you issue a permit for somebody who is not qualified for the job that that is not an illegal act! The law says the person must be qualified for the position.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, I FOI'd until I was blue in the face the man's qualifications. Of course, you know I already had them, right? Nobody would give them to me because he had none.

Putting up fences for Home Depot qualifies him to manage a hotel in Cayman. Oh, he had a law degree too, they said. But you have to wonder, if you have a law degree in the State of Florida and you are in the business of putting up fences, what kind of lawyer . . .

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: When the Government does that kind of thing and young people see this happening to people who are qualified, experienced, capable . . . three months before that the Government was there and heard the same owner congratulating the management he had and telling them that he couldn't have succeeded in doing what he did without the management. When the manager was up there at 4 o'clock in the morning rowing with the contractors to get the job done on time and on budget, and we just come in here with [one fell swoop] stamp his permit, put him in charge and turn him loose with nobody monitoring him.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Well, we wrote um a letter and they couldn't even . . . up until this point they have never acknowledged that they got a letter from us.

Madam Speaker, when people come to you and make this kind of representation they expect us as their representatives to do something about it. It is not good enough for me . . . they know what I did, you know, because I told them. I do it in front of them. And they see that I can't get anything done.

And the owner can go back now and tell the employees, *Unna don't have to worry about Ezzard and Arden. The Government just told me I can get any permit I want.*

Now, you don't bring those kinds of boasts unless you are sure of yourself. And the proof of the pudding is he not only got the permit, he's still getting

permits to replace qualified Caymanians. And you don't have to have a bachelor's degree in chemistry to clean a hotel room. You don't need it in hygiene. You just need to know how to handle a mop properly and a toilet scrubber and a couple of other things. I can teach them to clean that in one hour.

We solved all of that by creating a hotel school, the hospitality industry, and think that's going to solve the problem. Until this Government—and I am looking unna square in the eye—until you all are prepared to do what people like me did when I was in Government and issue directives to the boards, as the law allows you to do, that there will be no more permits for these categories of people. Until you all are prepared to take that action, these owners will be running unna around the mulberry bush until unna get giddy and they are going to laugh when unna fall down.

We have qualified, willing able and capable Caymanians to do this work. But they can't get their foot in the door. And the one or two they let in, they make sure they destroy them within months. And then they go running to the Government, *See? I hired a Caymanian and he wouldn't come to work.*

That's management 101. You are supposed to manage your human resources. Tell them tomorrow they can't get permits and see what they are going to do. I bet you they will manage what they got with the Caymanians. That's what they used to do before when they had to go to people like Mr. Ormond Panton. They managed what they had, because they weren't getting any more. But we, as long as they make the application and pay the fee, boom, they got it.

You all have to accept the responsibility that goes with an authority that the people elected all to govern. I see, Madam Speaker, that the Cayman Finance and the Ministry of Labour and Education are working together to get Caymanians entered into the financial industry. And they are going to spend, what is it? Three hundred thousand (\$300,000)? Thirty thousand (\$30,000)? Fifty thousand (\$50,000)? Anyway, forget the amount of money. But it's only 50 people. What happens to student number 51, 52 or 53?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: They already started. We let them all in that wanted to come in because they couldn't get permits.

Madam Speaker, we are always willing to accept quotas from them and us. But we can't put any quotas on them, because we used to have quotas. They lobbied various Governments to remove the quotas, both nationalities and individuals and for professions. Yes, they lobbied, the so-called people coming here only for our good.

When Mr. Benson Ebanks passed this Caymanian Protection Law in the West Bay Town Hall, said 12 people would get status for the year. And his argument was that that was a typographical mistake. It was supposed to be 1-2, one or two. Every amendment that every Government has made to this has weakened the Caymanian employment position in this country because there is nothing in here . . . our Immigration Law now is so far from this. I invite you all to read the debate on this. It's very enlightening.

The same things that we are being told now, we were told then. But they come to us, they lobby, they succeed. You give them one opportunity, that's not enough.

I followed it all through life. I have lived it. This was passed in 1972. The first amendment was by the Unity Team Government. Under this Law US citizens could not get Cayman status. You all are probably too young to remember those days. The first change to happen was that they had to allow US citizens to get Cayman status. You remember who that was done for, right? Those Texas boys!

The next amendment was towards the end of the 70s. We had those people who came here from the Bahamas and other places because they were trying to get things up here so the Bahamians would get something out of it. They run down here ready to retire. So, we had to create an opportunity for them to retire and stay in Cayman. So, we gave them their PRs or whatever they needed to accommodate that.

Three or four years later when they saw their friends in the law firms and things making more money than they ever dreamed could be made because the industry was growing, all of a sudden you had all of these retired experts that needed to come back into the industry. So, we had to change it to make special exemptions for them to get permits to work for their PR in the industry that they retired from. Right?

When they got enough of that and they retired again, then we had to allow them to go into business, or to work in any industry. Right? We all will remember some lawyers, accountants came out and we had the little Caymanians doing their swimming pool cleaning and stuff and they went and set up swimming pool companies and in a couple of months or a couple of years the Caymanians out of work, out of business. Right? And we can follow it right down, make it easier for them to get Caymanian status, make it easier for them to get permanent residence. Make it easier for this, make it easier to stay. Right?

Now, they can all stay 10 years and they will all have the right to apply for PR and Caymanian status. Because that's what it means, if they get PR they will get Caymanian status. And the majority of those who are going to get Caymanian status are the ones that are going to stop mine and your children and grandchildren from getting work because their children are going to those old school tie [SOUNDS LIKE], and they are coming back here from boarding school and

they are going to be better educated than mine and yours. Just like now.

And we accept all of that willingly. *Oh Ezzard, you don't understand. You can't disturb these people they are here for our good.*

Madam Speaker, Caymanians are beginning to get concerned. If you talk to the average young Caymanian professional now, they don't have the kind of hope that my age group had, to do well, to be able to go out and be an entrepreneur, to become wealthy. Right? They don't have those kinds of dreams any more. They don't have any heroes to look up to.

Getting back to the banks, look around town. You are telling me that after 30 years and Caymanians having a British Institute of Banking, Canadian Institute of Banking, with distinctions, master's in business administration, 20 years of experience in top management, we don't have a single Caymanian bank manager? How can you talk about young people wanting to go into banking? Where are they going? What are they going to do? Smile at people and be a pretty face at the counter?

What are they going to go into tourism for? The Caymanians who are now qualified, experienced, and should be at the top to give the Caymanian the assistance they need by bringing them in, can't get any jobs. We have people in this country who are qualified in hotel management for 20, 30 years, many of them on government scholarships. But we are giving permits to managers who can hardly speak English. And who, when they see a Caymanian sitting on the hotel beach, who just bought a drink from their bar, go and tell them they are not a guest, so they can't sit on their beach.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Mm-hmm.

But that's CaymanKind.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: We ga run one out ya, don't know which one it's going to be.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, I applaud the Government for what they are doing when talking about entry level, you know. But I want to impress on you that it is just as important to make sure that those people who have *EARNED* the right to be in charge as Caymanians are allowed to be in charge. And they are protected from somebody being able to apply for a work permit for a person who has no qualifications, no experience and get a permit to replace them.

Madam Speaker, I am not having too much to say about the Minister of Finance and his Budget Address because Finance Committee is coming up and I have lots of questions and I know he will give me the opportunity to ask those questions and drill down into this.

Madam Speaker, the Premier, in his [speech] dedicated almost two pages to Dart Reality. I make no bones about it. I said from day one Dart was too big a fish for this pond.

I see the Premier has told us that whenever the negotiations are finalised he will give us copies. I said that . . . and I see here where it says all the things that Dart is going to do, \$400 million, \$300 million, and I will reserve judgment on this group until I see the final document. But my experience in Governments dealing with these people, they got 100 times what Cayman has gotten.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: I can hear the excuses coming already, that their foot was tied to the original. Okay, I grant ya that.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Now, Madam Speaker, I want to use the Premier's own figures to demonstrate the point I was just talking about. He said on page 26, and I quote, "**Dart Realty started heavy construction on the Kimpton project in early 2014 with an annual average of 185 workers on site each month from local contractors who employed an average of 114 Caymanians, persons married to Caymanians as well as permanent residents. Work on the Kimpton project has escalated in 2015 with a year to date average of 395 workers on site each month with contractors employing an average of more than 200 Caymanians . . .**"

I notice the percentage of work permits gone up. I know plenty of Caymanians went to that site looking for work and can't get any work, including some from my constituency. And I am not talking here, Madam Speaker, about people who don't know what they are doing. I am talking about people who, in the 70s and 80s, were earning \$16.00, \$18.00, \$20.00 an hour as carpenters and finish carpenters and masons and master masons. Now they are being offered \$7.00, \$8.00 per hour.

While the unemployment of Caymanians, the Government says, has gone down, I don't think that was only in the contracting industry. And plenty of these that they have working there on work permit can be replaced by Caymanians.

Madam Speaker, what I don't understand is how the Government has the ability to enforce laws on people in my constituency, but they don't have the ability to enforce laws on these kinds of people. We proved through Question Time some time ago, that they had started the building without a red card. Nobody in my constituency is allowed to start a one-bedroom house without a red card, you know. This is a commercial building that's going to cater to our tour-

ists that we so badly need and are so proud. How do we know it is being done according to plans?

The Government told us that they had given them an approval and it didn't include MEP [mechanical, electrical, plumbing]. The very next day there was a picture on the front page of the *Compass* of the floor. And, Madam Speaker, again, I have been around construction a little while. I've done a few things in it, made a few dollars in it. That grey pipe I seen there, trust me, that's electrical pipe laid in that floor between that steel before they poured the floor. We had it all explained to us that they weren't putting in any MEP because they had corridors that they were going to rise it all up in. Right? I said well, I'm not an engineer but you have to get it from that corridor to that place over there. You are not requiring people to come and pour it down this pipe. And it was obvious that they were doing things that nobody else is allowed to do.

Now we heard today that somehow the Planning Board . . . and, Madam Speaker, let me talk a little bit about this Planning Board. Madam Speaker, I went there a couple of months ago with some constituents of mine as a project. The chairman was brave enough to suggest to me that he didn't think I should be there. Now I spent a couple of years down there, spent a couple of years in government service, and you don't think as chairman that Ezzard Miller has enough sense to know whether he can come into a board meeting or not? I guess he was sleeping then too, because it came out in the end that when he found out that it was actually him as chairman who had granted what his people objected to, he said he was just leaving to go to the bathroom. How can the Planning Board invent . . . because this is something that the Planning Board must invent, Madam Speaker.

The Planning Regulations, the Member read them this morning. It says so many feet, so many stories above grade. But the Planning Board which is supposed to be enforcing the law just allows the man to pile stuff up to get two more floors. What's the point of having a law passed by this Assembly and regulations approved by this Assembly—because one good thing the Government did since they have been there is bring those regulations back down here when those other people carried it up in Cabinet so they could change what they wanted to suit who they wanted. Right? Passed by this, and the Planning Board can imagine that that is what we intended. That, although we say you can only have 10 floors, you can build 20. Just pile up the sand around the building and keep going up. It doesn't matter if it's 10 or 20, it's the same principle. And when you raise it, you're a troublemaker.

I clearly understood when we passed the regulations here in 2014 that it meant existing grade, the natural grade of the land. Otherwise, it would have just been a height measurement and there would have been no . . . why do they think . . . how does the

Planning Board imagine that we put two restrictions, one height and one number of floors, if we intended you to pile up sand on the outside and build two floors and say they are underground?

Now, again, I am not a lawyer. But somebody needs to challenge that in court, that kind of interpretation of the law. But, you see, that's another problem we have in this country; the lawyers here only work in the financial industry. They just get their secretaries to clip papers together and charge them \$2,000. Right? They don't get out and test administrative law that we have happening in other Commonwealth countries. And they don't have to build a name for themselves out there at the court house because they get silk for making money down here.

Madam Speaker, again, I don't understand. We haven't had a single Caymanian lawyer that we could give silk to. Not one? We give it to plenty of foreigners. You tell me somebody of . . . I don't want to call any names, but I could name five right now that I think should get it, all of whom have been involved in; criminal prosecution, other sections of the industry. But no, somehow . . . and the Fourth Elected Member for Bodden Town did a good job talking about it. We have to start to recognise our own, and stop recognising other people above our own who are more capable than they are.

We have Caymanian lawyers who can stand up to them, Madam Speaker. They do it in the court house regular. But no Caymanian lawyer in the history of this country has deserved silk.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Health City on getting their ACI [Autologous Chondrocyte Implantation]. I am not one who believes that means as much as they think it means. But I wish them luck. You know my position on Health City has always been that it's not all good for Cayman. There is good and there is bad. I think it's good that we have it there, that Caymanians have access to it when they need it for the things that they do. But the other things that they are doing to the country in terms of registration and other things . . . and I still . . . and I see the Premier said they have done 4,000 patients. I would hazard a bet that over 3,000 of those are Caymanians, while their projection tabled in this House would be what the Government concessions would have been based around, and the Government concessions were many, and for a long, long time. Some of them are up to 100 years.

The number of patients to come in year 2012, which was the first year of their prediction, was 17,520. Everybody knows that I opposed exclusivity for them as I opposed exclusivity for Enterprise City. We can't grow a second and third line of this economy on exclusivity. Do we all believe that the financial industry would be what it is today if they gave W. S. Walker exclusivity on it? Or, if we had given the dive industry to Bob Soto? He certainly deserved to have

exclusivity in it, as much as these deserve to have exclusivity.

But I am happy that Caymanians are getting good treatment. I never doubted that the professions that they would bring from India could pass the exams, you know. I just said make them pass the exams.

The Speaker: Member for North Side, once you can wind up what you are saying, your time would have expires, if you would complete the thought you are on.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Yes Ma'am.

The point I want to make, Madam Speaker, is that I trust that they will continue to do well and that their business will grow. I have my concerns. I have my concerns that they are now getting into areas that they were never supposed to get in. And I can promise the Minister of Health that there is a huge fight coming from the local private practitioners because I understand now they are doing medicals and insurance and work permit medicals and all that sort of stuff as well, and it's supposed to be a tertiary hospital, and I have had representation from four doctors so far in the last month. So, I would just ask the Minister of Health . . . I have a question in about who is monitoring the terms of their agreement.

So, Madam Speaker, thank you very much.

The Speaker: I recognise the Honourable Premier for the motion for adjournment.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yes, one of them has to speak because we adjourn until six.

The Premier, Hon. Alden McLaughlin: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I think we are making very good progress in the debate and I thank all Members for their contributions and for the very reasonable way in which they have conducted themselves.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Premier, Hon. Alden McLaughlin: Madam Speaker, I move the adjournment of this honourable House until 10:00 am tomorrow, Friday, the 22nd of May.

The Speaker: The question is that this honourable House be adjourned until 10:00 am tomorrow morning.

All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes and one audible no.

The Speaker: I believe the Ayes have it.

At 5.47 pm the House stood adjourned until 10:00 am, Friday, 22 May 2015.