

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT**  
**FRIDAY**  
**2 DECEMBER 2012**  
**10.51 AM**  
*Second Sitting*

**The Speaker:** I will ask the First Elected Member from George Town to say Prayers.

### PRAYERS

**Mr. D. Kurt Tibbetts, First Elected Member for George 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 Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Official Members and Ministers of Cabinet 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:** Proceedings are resumed. Please be seated.

### READING BY THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER OF MESSAGES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**The Speaker:** I have no messages this morning.

I would remind the House that the Minister of Education will continue to be absent, probably for the remainder of this Meeting. I do not have any excuses from anyone else who is absent this morning.

### STATEMENTS BY HONOURABLE MEMBERS AND MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

**The Speaker:** I have no statements from Honourable Members and Ministers of the Cabinet.

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

#### MOTIONS

#### Government Motion No. 4/2011-12—The Strategic Policy Statement for the 2012/13 Financial Year

*[Continuation of debate thereon]*

**The Speaker:** The Honourable Premier concluded his presentation yesterday and the floor is now open for anyone else who wishes to debate on this matter.

Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to offer a contribution on the Motion to recommend that the 2011/12 Strategic Policy Statement (SPS) of the Cayman Islands Government to this honourable Legislative Assembly.

Before I start my contribution, Madam Speaker, I want to do a number of things. I would like to, on behalf of the Opposition and indeed, Madam Speaker, I believe I can safely say on behalf of all Members of this House, to extend sympathies to the family of the late Pastor Al Ebanks who was buried on Saturday last week, and to the families of Mr. Derek Wight and Mr. Dennie Warren, Sr.; both of whom will be buried this Saturday. And, Madam Speaker, to join with the Honourable Premier in extending formally and publicly our sympathies to the Clerk of this House, Mrs. Zena Merren-Chin, on the sad loss of her mother. Our prayers and sympathies and thoughts are with the families of the bereaved.

<sup>1</sup>Madam Speaker, I would also like to note with continued and growing concern the absence of any member of the media from these Chambers. I believe, Madam Speaker, that we need to address whatever the issue is that is preventing the media

<sup>1</sup> See [Speaker's comments](#) at page 734

from effectively covering the proceedings in this honourable House.

I noted, Madam Speaker, that the television station was here when the Premier delivered the Strategic Policy Statement. No other member of the media was here and there is no one here covering the contributions of other Members. This is a deplorable state of affairs, Madam Speaker. It impacts on the business of this House and it impacts on the country. And I do not believe that this House should remain stuck in the middle ages because we are preventing the media from covering the proceedings of this House on the basis that digital equipment will not be allowed in this House.

Madam Speaker, I call respectfully on you, publicly as I have done privately, to address this situation. I call on the Chairman of the House Committee to deal with this issue, if the rules of that Committee are the obstacle or hurdle that has to be overcome to ensure that the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of this House consisting of the elected representatives of the people of this country are to be properly covered and broadcast.

This, Madam Speaker, is an affront to democracy and we must, in my respectful view, address it as a matter of urgency. Letters have been written, statements have been made, I have spoken to you, Madam Speaker, I have mentioned it to the Premier, and nothing it seems is being done. And, Madam Speaker, it must be addressed.

Madam Speaker, with those preliminary remarks which do not relate to the matter at hand, I want to now turn to address the Strategic Policy Statement delivered by the Honourable Premier yesterday.

Madam Speaker, we learned from the Premier that the world is filled with doom and gloom. We learned from the Premier that the world is still in the grip of the worst recession it has experienced since the great depression of the 1930s. We learned from the Premier, Madam Speaker, that the global economic scene is fraught with uncertainty. We learned, Madam Speaker, from the Premier that we are living in austere times, both globally and locally. And we learned from the Premier that bad times are about to get worse.

I want, Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition and indeed on behalf of the country, to thank the Premier for bringing this to our attention and letting us know in what I can only describe as clear and unambiguous terms, how really bad things are.

I want to thank him also, Madam Speaker, for letting us know how serious a problem unemployment is in this country, although I believe it is quite clear that the Government has clearly, plainly, obviously understated the true figure, which I believe they are claiming is something like 6.7 per cent.

Madam Speaker, there is a reason why I say that. I just need to retrieve something on my phone here. I did some research earlier this morning in relation to this.

Madam Speaker, the Government says that the unemployment is 6.7 per cent. According to the ESO [Economic and Statistics Office] reports and the census, Cayman's population is now 54,397 persons. There are 33,463 employed, and of that overall figure there are some 7,996 not in the labour force and there are some 2,396 persons unemployed.

But, Madam Speaker, the ESO reports also indicate that there are some 20,000 work permits. I would hope that we can presume that everybody on a work permit is employed, and, that we do not have people on work permits being counted as unemployed in the employment statistics. So, Madam Speaker, by my calculations that leaves just over 13,000 Caymanians employed. So, Madam Speaker, I calculate the unemployment rate to be somewhere around 18 per cent for Caymanians.

But, Madam Speaker, I thank the Premier nonetheless for acknowledging that we have a serious problem with unemployment. I also thank him, Madam Speaker, this time around for acknowledging that we have a serious issue with crime. And I note, Madam Speaker, and acknowledge that considerable work and effort has been made by the Government, albeit at the prodding of the Opposition—but nonetheless, that is our job.

[laughter]

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Leader of the Opposition:** A Significant amount of effort has been made and resources devoted now to dealing with crime and policing.

However, Madam Speaker—and I hope the Premier does not find this surprising—but none of these revelations he made, none of these matters that he gave such emphasis to in his speech on the SPS Motion are surprising. This is not news to anyone in Cayman, Madam Speaker. Everyone knows things are bad. Everybody knows times are hard. And as the old people will say, *And sufferation is plentiful*.

We all know that these are austere times. We have been living in these times since 2009, and every year since then things have been gotten worse. So, Madam Speaker, that part of the Premier's contribution comes as no real surprise to anyone.

Yes, Madam Speaker, having the analysis of the global financial situation, the world situation done, is useful, is helpful. Analysing the Cayman situation is perhaps even more helpful. But what all of us in Cayman was hoping for, what all of us have been praying for, what all of us have been waiting for now more than two and a half long years was not a detailed analysis of how bad things are and the reasons for

that, but rather some indication, some pronouncements by the Premier, of what the Government is doing and what it intends to do to improve the lot of all of us who live here, work here, invest here, shop in Cayman for the various international financial services that we provide.

But, Madam Speaker, sadly, there was little said by the Premier which would engender any confidence, any hope or that would provide any inspiration to the people of these Islands. In a speech that went on for some time, Madam Speaker, I think the Premier devoted maybe five minutes—to be charitable I will say ten—to his so-called vision of the common good.

At the conclusion of his speech, Madam Speaker, the Premier claimed to have presented his vision for the future; one that is filled with hope and promise. But, Madam Speaker, I spent most of last night and a good part of the early hours of this morning, searching through that nine-page document to see if I could find anything in there which gave rise to either hope or promise. And, Madam Speaker, I am sad to say my search was in vain.

This was a very curious presentation, Madam Speaker, for one who has been here for some time now, and certainly from the start of this practice of presenting the Strategic Policy Statement and Government Motion which has been followed by a statement by the responsible Minister, and before the new Constitution, by the Leader of Government Business.

Last year's SPS presentation by the Premier and Minister of Finance ran to a full 70 typewritten pages. This year it is 9 pages long. This is the last SPS that the Premier and Minister of Finance will present before the last budget of this term. The 2012/13 Budget will be the last budget of this term.

The Government is significantly beyond the half-way point in their term of office. I would have expected and I believe the country would have expected, particularly in these difficult times, a comprehensive presentation by the Premier and Minister of Finance about where the country is going, what is hoped that we will achieve over the next little while. And particularly, Madam Speaker, when things are as grave economically as they are, everyone is reaching out for some hope, some inspiration, some promise that things are going to get better, things are tough but the Government is making effort, the Government is doing things. But there was none, Madam Speaker. None!

There is, Madam Speaker, a brief reference at the very end of the address to projects which the Government, as the Premier said, signaled almost from their first day in office. But, Madam Speaker, one would have expected, particularly in light of the controversies which have existed and are seemingly growing with each passing week about a number of these projects, that there would have been some explanation, the opportunity would have been seized to

say, *This is what has happened; we have made these adjustments, we have changed the stewardship, this one is in charge, that one is no longer in favour, this is the way we are going, we have gotten rid of this contractor but we are just about to sign with this contractor, these are the plans, this is how we are going.* Nothing, Madam Speaker. Nothing!

Now, Madam Speaker, I know that the Premier and Minister of Finance must by now be somewhat gun shy because in the past he has promised much and to this point has delivered very little in respect of any of these projects that have been promoted as the saviours of Cayman's economic fortunes and prospects. But, Madam Speaker, I do not believe that the Premier and Minister of Finance can properly come to this House on an occasion such as this, delivering the Strategic Policy Statement (which is required by the Public Management and Finance Law) halfway through the fiscal year and not say to the country, *This is where we are going, this is how we are going, this is what you can look forward to.*

Madam Speaker, to simply come to the House and say, *This is a Government that is committed to responsibility in times of austerity and here is how well we have done,* as far as the stewardship of the country's finances is concerned, is not enough. And even that, Madam Speaker, bears some careful analysis which I will come. But assuming that that is the case, it is not enough.

Madam Speaker, when businesses are closing, when people are losing their homes, when you are running a real unemployment rate of 18 per cent, those words are cold comfort to the people of this country, to the businesses in this country. It is, Madam Speaker, dereliction of duty to have delivered an SPS in those terms offering nothing, Madam Speaker, to inspire confidence in the economic fortunes of this country.

Madam Speaker, the SPS, and, indeed, the Premier's speech, refer to the FFR, the Framework for Financial Responsibility. And that is put forward, as one would expect it would be, by the Government as the UK's response to the financial difficulties that this country has encountered since 2009. Of course, Madam Speaker, as all the children all over the world in the deepest recesses of the Continent of Africa well know by now, all of that is the fault of the previous Administration. But, Madam Speaker, what the Premier did not address in that regard, is the impact of the FFR on the major projects which his Government has promoted over the years since they have been in office.

For instance, Madam Speaker, what is the impact of the FFR on the ForCayman Investment Alliance (FCIA)? Is the reason why nothing has been said of consequence in the SPS, or, indeed, in the Premier's speech about the ForCayman Investment Alliance is because the Government now has to go

back and revisit the arrangement of that agreement? That, in fact, they have to do various things as far as cost benefit analysis, as far as environmental studies, as far as economic studies, as far as accounting studies, as far as legal studies in relation to what has been agreed with the Dart group of companies?

Is the absence of any substantial reference to the ForCayman Alliance deal in the Premier's speech, and in the SPS, an indication that that is at risk, and that that whole deal is at risk? If that is the case, Madam Speaker, I believe the Premier should be frank and forthright with the House and with the country about that. Because, Madam Speaker, if that deal and the China Harbour Engineering port project are supposed to be the economic saviours of this country, and both are either at risk or substantially delayed, then, I would strongly suggest that there needs to be a Plan B.

If the Government is hanging the country's economic fortunes on those two pegs and neither is likely to happen anytime soon, I fear for what is going to happen to this economy over the next little while.

*[inaudible interjection and laughter]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, we have been urging from the onset of all of this, that the Government follow accepted process and procedure when dealing with the award of contracts, when dealing with developers and major projects.

I know, Madam Speaker, that we will have a substantive motion to debate in relation to the FFR. Therefore, even though it has been referenced in the SPS and in the address by the Premier, I do not intend to spend a great deal of time going into the details of the FFR in my contribution on this Motion. But, Madam Speaker I wish to say this much: It is our view, it is our considered position that had the Government followed proper process and procedure as it relates to Central Tenders Committee, as it relates to the provisions of the financial regulations in the Public Management and Finance Law, and the operations of statutory authorities and so forth, we would not be facing this prospect now with an agreement which the Premier has signed on behalf of the Cayman Islands Government with the UK Government relating to financial responsibility which so severely limits and constrains what can be done and mandates what must be done before you deal with developers, before you make deals with developers, before you commit government to major expenditure, before you commit government to participation in major public/private partnerships.

It is, Madam Speaker, the bad experiences that we've had in the last two and a half plus years which have brought this about. It is things like the condemnation in the Auditor General's recent reports

about procurement that's caused the UK to take such a grave view about what is transpiring in Cayman. It is because of all of these allegations of corrupt practices and conflicts of interest that have come to bear on us and on the Government that has resulted in things like the Framework for Fiscal Responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I hope that sometime before we leave this House and this Meeting that the Premier or somebody else in the know is going to explain to us when it is that the Framework for Fiscal Responsibility has come into effect, or will come into effect because there is no date in it that I see as to the date that it comes into operation, other than the date below the signature of the two Ministers (the Minister for the Overseas Territories in the UK and the Premier and Minister of Finance in the Cayman Islands).

There is a reference, Madam Speaker, in the fourth paragraph of the Agreement to the provisions in the Agreement being encapsulated in the origins to the Public Management and Finance Law by the 1<sup>st</sup> July next year. But to the best of my understanding and interpretation, that does not relate at all to the effective date of the Agreement. And, Madam Speaker, if the Agreement is in effect, then I think the Government is bound, the Premier is bound to explain to the House and to the country what impact that has, not just on things like the ministerial MOU with China Harbour Engineering company, but also the impact it has on things like the ForCayman Investment Alliance Agreement, which, as far as any of us know, has never even been to Cabinet.

Madam Speaker, as I was thinking this morning, I likened the Premier to Father Noah. Madam Speaker, Father Noah built the Ark and the rains came down and the Ark floated off. And Father Noah never had a plan. The only distinction, Madam Speaker, I was able to make in this case, is that while Father Noah did not have a plan, God did. And as long as Father Noah followed the instructions of God—which he did—the Ark and those within were safe. In the fullness of time the Ark came to rest on Mount Ararat with all on board safe and sound.

Madam Speaker, we are afloat in an ark captained by the Premier with no plan. And I am not at all sure that we are going to arrive safe and sound anywhere.

We have an SPS being delivered which, Madam Speaker, has lots of detail in it, lots of technical detail, lots of financial detail; but no indication of any plan. Two and a half plus years at sea being buffeted by some of the strongest winds and the roughest seas the world has ever known. We have no float plan. We have no idea where we are going. We are, Madam Speaker, following what is called by the Premier, "a vision of the common good," one that is filled with hope and promise.

Madam Speaker, hope and promise are good. Faith also is important. But we have got to have some

sort of plan. Where is the plan? And, Madam Speaker, in my respectful submission it must go beyond simply saying we can help our employment state and move towards full employment if the projects that Government signaled almost from our first day in office are not unduly hampered; projects such as the Cruise Port, Cayman Enterprise City, Narayana Health University and the ForCayman Investment Alliance.

Madam Speaker, as the Premier has acknowledged—give him that much credit—these are projects that the Government signaled almost from their first day in Office. But the time for signaling is long past. It is time for some evidence that something is actually going to happen.

Madam Speaker, the Premier in some of his adlibs towards the end of his speech said, that we can't do it on talk and complaining. We can't do it on accusing people. No, no, no. The things that people blame me for. If you want, accuse me, accuse me, but one of these days things will be made clear. Curse me today, try to unseat me today, talk about my family today, but things will be made clearer, that I know. Well, Madam Speaker, the Premier should not leave it to us to divine what it is that he is proposing to do.

We cannot simply accept that because he says things are going to get better that they are going to get better—certainly from the experiences of the last two and a half years. And he said that many times. It does not give us the confidence to believe that simply because he says things are going to get better, that they are going to get better.

Madam Speaker, it is not enough for him to say that things will be made clear one day, that things will be made clearer, that he knows. We do not have that much faith, Madam Speaker. We need something concrete to hold on to. Give us a reason to believe that things are going to get better. Devoting nine typewritten pages to the fiscal issues, Madam Speaker, is not what people need, is not what the country needs.

Yes, Madam Speaker, we do need to get the country's finances back on track; no one doubts that. Things were bad; no one doubts any of that, Madam Speaker. But you cannot, in my respectful view, come to the country and say, *Well, you know, we think we are doing a good job in terms of stewardship of government finances. Hang on people, these are austere times and things are going to be rough but you just hang on, things are going to get better.* The country needs, the country desperately needs, and investors need, people locally need, everybody needs to believe that there is some basis that things are going to get better.

Madam Speaker, I want to turn now and have a look at the SPS document itself, and to talk about why even this claim by the Government about the restoration of the fiscal position is less than (I am search-

ing for the word) . . . is less than certain. (Let me be charitable, is less than certain.)

Madam Speaker, projections, projections, projections. Lord knows that we on this side know all about projections. If we are the victims of anything, we are the victims of projections that went wrong, and so we will be forgiven if we are a bit reserved in our endorsement of projections for the sake of projections. And I will come to that. But let's look at (not at this moment) the projections that we had to deal with. Let's look at the recent projections, the ones that were made back in June of this year when the Premier and Minister of Finance presented the 2011/12 Budget.

Madam Speaker, in June the Premier said that the operating revenue for this fiscal year was estimated to be \$535.8 million; operating expenses, \$489.9 million; and that there would be a \$12.1 million surplus. That was June. Today is the 2<sup>nd</sup> December; yesterday was the 1<sup>st</sup> [December] when he presented this. The revised Budget estimates are now operating revenue of \$548,382 for the 2011/12 year; operating expenditure is \$511 [million]. And they are now projecting a deficit of \$4.5 million for this financial year. And we are only at the halfway point.

Yet, Madam Speaker, in the SPS there are projections for 2012/13 of a \$23.5 million surplus; for 2013/14 of \$31.5 million and for 2014 of \$42.5 million.

Revenue is projected to climb each year from \$548 million this fiscal year (on the basis of the current revision) to \$561 [million] in 2012/13, to \$573 million in 2013/14, and to \$587 million in 2014/15. But the Premier has not told us how those projections have been arrived at.

There is a provision called Strategy 3 on page 20 of the SPS, which says: "**Revenue Enhancement. The third element of the Government's fiscal strategy relates to the development and implementation of a more stable and sustainable revenue base for the Government. Continuing the efforts which commenced with the 2009/10 Budget, the Government will continue to explore suitable options for new revenue streams, carefully considering the greater economic and financial impact on the people of the Cayman Islands.**"

What does that mean, Madam Speaker? There are these opaque references to revenue enhancement all over the place.

There is a reference, Madam Speaker, in the FFR. One of the Government's fiscal strategies is the Realignment of the Revenue Base. What does that mean? I know it fills me with fear because the Premier has now committed the country by virtue of an agreement with the UK Government, to the realignment of a revenue base. What does that mean?

There's a reference to it, Madam Speaker, and I'm searching here trying to find the three year plan . . . "Three Year Budget Forecast" it is called, which was presented to the Foreign and Common-

wealth Office on 24<sup>th</sup> May last year, in which the Premier committed again to the realignment of the existing revenue base. Madam Speaker, it talks about the Cayman Islands Government being cognisant of the narrow nature of the current revenue base.

**“The Government has considered the introduction of direct taxes, such as payroll and property tax, and aided by the analysis contained within the Miller Commission report, has concluded that introducing these forms of taxes could be very damaging for the Cayman Islands economy.”** Good, Madam Speaker; relief!

**“However, the Government feels that any consideration of consumption based taxes is an area that requires further examination because this form of tax can assist in spreading the burden of taxation across the wider community while minimising the impact on businesses. The Government will therefore be examining the full list of tariffs under the Cayman Islands Customs Law with a view to adjusting some of these fees. The Government feels that introducing a VAT would require significant administrative costs and therefore the alternative of restructuring the current import duties taxes would be a more efficient way to achieve the result of broadening the revenue base.”**

**“The Government is therefore committed to carrying out a comprehensive review of consumption based tax options with a view to identifying ways to broaden the base.”**

So, that is what they were saying, Madam Speaker, eighteen, nineteen months ago. And we see this line or a version of it creeping in increasingly into public utterances, speeches and documents that are promulgated by the Government. But no one tells us what that means.

The Premier said that the SPS this year does not contemplate any new tax measures. Well, this would be the first year since the Government took office that it has not implemented new tax measures. But how are they going to ensure revenue enhancement in the present depressed economic conditions? On what basis are we projecting that revenue is going to increase every year over the course of the next three years?

We know what has happened and is happening with operating expenses. Operating expenses were projected at \$489.9 million just in June. Already that has been revised upwards to \$511 million for this financial year. On what basis are we concluding that we are going to get those expenses down?

Madam Speaker, the Premier has said that one of the fiscal strategies is controlling government expenditure. And the Premier makes quite a boast about that. But the figures tell a very different story. On the basis of their own figures—requiring no analy-

sis by any of us—in the 2012/13 year . . . well, let me go back to this year.

In the current Budget, as I said, there were projected at \$489.9 million. That has been revised upwards to \$511. In the 2012/13 year they projected at \$498 million. In the 2013/14 year they projected at \$503 million. And in the 2014/15 year they projected at \$508 million. So how is that curtailing or controlling government's expenditure? The expenditure is growing. If that is Government's fiscal strategy, controlling government expenditure—even on their own case they are failing. And they have not told us how they are going to enhance revenue. And so, Madam Speaker, given recent experiences—which can only be described as bitter—we can place little faith in these projections.

Madam Speaker, for those who might think that the Opposition is being uncharitable, that the Opposition is being unduly pessimistic, that the Opposition is simply seeking to score points, I believe it would be helpful if I were to show what has transpired over the last year that we were in office.

Madam Speaker, just so that no one believes I am making this up, I am relying on nothing else but the *Hansards* of this honourable House. Madam Speaker, in preparation I have made a copy for your good self. Sometimes it takes me a while to learn a lesson, but once learned I never forget it.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, I think the place to start would be the Budget Address for the 2008/09 Financial Year, which was delivered on the 30<sup>th</sup> April 2008. I will ask the Serjeant if he would hand-up this copy of the *Hansards* to you so that you may follow as I read.

Madam Speaker, I am going to try to limit as much as possible what I have to read so that I do not wind up reading the whole—

#### Point of Order

**The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Connolly:** Madam Speaker, on a point or order, please.

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Point of order?

**The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Connolly:** As far as procedure, I was writing but I just wanted to make sure the Member sought your permission to lay the document on the Table for a specific reason because it then enables other Members, including myself, to get a copy, and you have one yourself.

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** [Inaudible]. You don't lay *Hansards* on the Table of the House.

[inaudible interjection]

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, I am referring to the transcripts of the speeches in this House. That is not a document that I have ever known to be laid on the Table of the House. That is a part of the *record* of the proceedings of this House. Every Member is entitled to it. If the Minister wishes me to stop while we get copies, I am quite happy to do that.

**The Speaker:** We will have the Serjeant have them copied, but you may proceed with what your presentation is.

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, because I wanted it to be complete I have copied the whole of speeches but I am not going to read every word of the speeches.

[inaudible interjection]

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Yeah. Otherwise we would be here forever.

**The Speaker:** [Addressing the Serjeant]. Just go ahead and copy. Just please hurry.

You can proceed, Leader of the Opposition.

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, so that Members may make a note and check that I am not making it up as I go along, it is the *Hansards* of Wednesday, April 30 2008. The page is page 11.

I am reading from the section entitled "Forecast to Operating Expenses". This is a speech delivered by the then Honourable G. Kenneth Jefferson, Financial Secretary.

#### "Forecast Operating Expenses

"The 2008/9 Operating Expenses are forecast to be \$501.3 million. This amount represents some \$28.2 million more than was forecast in the SPS and a \$12 million increase over the expected 2007/8 outturn."

Moving, Madam Speaker, down the page to the section headed up "Compliance with the PMFL".

"Madam Speaker, the PMFL is very specific in terms of how it defines the fiscal guidelines within which the Government must operate its financial affairs.

"The Principles of Responsible Financial Management are set out in section 14 of the PMFL

and I will now explain how this 2008/9 Budget complies with these Principles.

"The first principle relates to the operating results of the Government and requires that Core Government's Revenue less Core Government Expenses be positive. This has been fully satisfied with a forecast operating surplus of \$13.5 million."

So, Madam Speaker, pausing there: When the budget for 2008/09 financial year was produced in this House, the projections were that we were looking at a \$13.5 million surplus for that financial year.

"The second principle requires that Government maintains a positive Net Worth. Full compliance has been met as the Government's Net Worth is forecast to be \$532.6 million at 30 June 2009.

"The third principle relates to the maximum allowable Debt Service costs and requires that these costs be no more than 10% of Core Government Revenue. This ratio is ultra prudent, and holds the Government to a very strict limit. It is the international norm for this type of ratio to be calculated using only the principal repayments; however, the PMFL goes a step further by including interest payments in the calculation, making the ratio more onerous to comply with. For 2008/9, the Government is forecasting its Debt Service Ratio to be 7.9%—which is below the 10% limit.

"The fourth principle also relates to borrowing but it sets the limit for the total amount of Net Debt that can be carried by the Government to be no more than 80% of Core Government Revenue.

"The Net Debt is calculated as being the outstanding balance of Core Government Debt plus the outstanding balance of self-financing loans, plus the weighted outstanding balance of SAGCs' debt guaranteed by the Government, less Core Government liquid assets.

"For 2008/9 the Government is forecasting its Net Debt Ratio to be 73% of Core Government Revenue—which is well below the maximum of 80%.

"The fifth principle requires that Government maintains cash reserves that are no less than 90 days of estimated executive expenses at 30 June 2009. The 2008/9 Budget complies with this requirement because it has cash reserves forecast at 91 days."

So, Madam Speaker, much maligned though we have been—and still are—about having run the country into the ground, having spent like drunken sailors (I think was the expression the Premier used in here), let it be remembered that when the Budget was presented to this House in April of 2008, the final Budget for the years of stewardship of the

PPM Government, there was a \$13.5 million surplus projected. And full compliance with all the principles of responsible financial management; a speech delivered, a budget presented not by an elected minister, but by the Financial Secretary under the old Constitution.

Now, Madam Speaker, the process plays out as it does every year. We get to December and the Government is required to produce a Strategic Policy Statement, as was done here yesterday.

Madam Speaker, in the *Hansard* of 10 December 2008, page 648, starting at the bottom of the page, the section entitled “Economic Forecast for the Next Three Fiscal Years” . . . I’ll hand-up a copy of this so you may follow me, Madam Speaker.

Again, Madam Speaker, the Financial Secretary speaking: **“Madam Speaker, the Economic forecast: Section 3 of the SPS provides the forecast economic position of the Cayman Islands for the 2009/10 to 2011/12 financial years. These forecasts were prepared by the Economics and Statistics Office (the ESO) within the Portfolio of Finance and Economics.**

**“The ESO forecasts that the Cayman Islands economy, measured by changes in real GDP will grow by 1.7 per cent in the coming 2009/10 financial year and should accelerate to 2.5 per cent in 2010/11 and 2.4 per cent in 2011/12. These growth prospects assume that the world economy and in particular the economy of the USA will recover from its current difficulties.”**

That was one huge assumption to make!

**“Employment levels, measured by the numbers of persons employed, are expected to be 35,729 in 2009/10; 36,161 in 2010/11 and 36,523 in 2011/12. Conversely, the unemployment rate is forecasted at 3.9 per cent in 2009/10, and 3.7 per cent in both 2010/11 and 2011/12.**

**“The local inflation rate, which is highly influenced by inflation rates in the United States of America, is forecasted at 2.7 per cent in 2009/10 and 3.0 per cent in both 2010/11 and 2011/12.”**

Those are the relevant bits, Madam Speaker. From there, moving to the next section—“Financial Forecasts”:

**“Core Government operating revenue is forecast to be \$535 million in 2009/10, \$555.4 million in 2010/11 and \$571.8 million in 2011/12.**

**“Core Government operating expenses are forecasted at \$488.6 million in 2009/10, \$502.2 million in 2010/11 and \$514.7 million in 2011/12.**

**“Financing expenses are forecasted to be \$18.2 million in 2009/10, \$23.7 million in 2010/11 and \$25.1 million in 2011/12.”**

“Surpluses”—the magic word: **“Surpluses are forecasted to be \$28.1 million in 2009/10, \$29.6 million in 2010/11 and \$32.0 million in 2011/12.”**

And then, the very last paragraph, Madam Speaker. Or I should say this before . . . the next paragraph: **“On the balance sheet, Government’s net worth (which is the difference between its total assets and its total liabilities) is expected to increase steadily over the forecasted period.**

**“The anticipated borrowings in the 2009/10 to 2011/12 period result in Debt Servicing ratios that remain under the maximum 10 per cent level prescribed by the Principles of Responsible Financial Management in the PMFL.”**

The final paragraph: **“Overall, the financial targets indicate an affordable fiscal position over the three-year forecast horizon.”**

So, Madam Speaker, this is the Financial Secretary saying to the House, saying to Finance Committee, saying to the country on the 10<sup>th</sup> of December 2008: **“Overall, the financial targets indicate an affordable fiscal position over the three-year forecast horizon.”**—a projection of substantial surpluses for the 2009/10 year; \$28.1 million and \$29.6 [million] in 2010/11 and \$32 million in 2011/12. The 10<sup>th</sup> of December 2008.

Those are the projections on which the Government of which I was a part relied.

Madam Speaker, we get to March 2009, a meeting of Finance Committee—20<sup>th</sup> March 2009.

**The Speaker:** Honourable Leader of the Opposition, this is going to tie into this debate on this Strategic Policy at some point?

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, it is crucially relevant because what we are talking about are *projections*.

The Government, the Premier, has come to the country and said the financial targets for the period 2012/13 to 2014/15 are these, and, therefore, we are in good shape. The Budget for the next financial year is going to be crafted and is going to be molded around these projections. The point I am making, Madam Speaker, at some length, is about the reliability of these projections.

You need not worry, Madam Speaker, there is not much more I have to say, or can say, on this particular point, but this is the final *Hansard* relating to this particular period.

Madam Speaker, by the time we got to March, we were now very, very sure that we were running into significant financial problems. The Government revenues were down; government expenditure was up; the bottom had begun to fall out of the global economy. The Government was facing an election in May and the House would be prorogued at the end of March. We were required to make plain, to make an honest assessment of what the financial position of the country was before we demitted office. So, we went to Finance Committee, Madam Speaker, and the

Financial Secretary then gave estimates of our projections about where we were, financially speaking.

And this, Madam Speaker (what I have just handed to you), is the record of what he said on that day. I will not read all of it, by any means, Madam Speaker. But if I pick up the second full paragraph on what is marked page 3, it is actually the first page of this excerpt.

**“Honourable Members, if we turn to page 13 in the Annual Plan and Estimates document we see where it speaks to compliance with the principles of responsible financial management. We see the very first item referring to the operating deficit being \$13.76 million. Obviously, that is the deficit expected before Extraordinary Items, which we previously considered on page 180. So, we expect a forecast deficit of \$13.76 million before Extraordinary Items.**

**“The net worth, that is the assets of the Government less its liabilities, is a net positive figure of \$521.93 million.**

**“The debt-servicing ratio, which, as all Members will know, has a legal limit of 10 per cent of Government revenue, that is the interest expense and the principal repayments during the course of a year cannot exceed together more than 10 per cent of Government’s revenue. We see in table 2 where the debt-service ratio is expected to be 8.1 per cent at June 2009. So it is under the 10 per cent legal limit.**

**“Our net debt ratio, which would be no more than 80 per cent of core Government revenue, we expect that to be 74 per cent at the end of June.”**

I’ll skip the rest of that. Go down to the last paragraph.

**“The cash reserves at the end of June, the \$126 million that I spoke about earlier, that translates into 91.1 days, approximately, of expenditure coverage. The Public Management and Finance Law requires that for the year 2008/9 and all subsequent years that we have at the end of each financial year cash balances that are sufficient to cover 90 days of Government’s expenditures. Our \$126 million expected at the end of June 2009 is equivalent to 91.1 days of expenditure coverage.”**

And then, Madam Speaker, the documents go on to acknowledge that at this stage we were looking at . . . oh yes, over on the very first page in the corner he says, **“In grand total terms, the forecast deficit for the year is of the magnitude of \$28.9 million.”**

That was the 20<sup>th</sup> March.

Madam Speaker, I can say from my own knowledge on the 5<sup>th</sup> of May, the Financial Secretary delivered a Cabinet note which outlined and had attached to it, the financial report of the Government for the first three-quarters of the financial year 2008/09, to March 30, 2009. And then the estimate of the deficit

was placed at \$18.8 million for that nine-month period, (that was the estimate; that was supposed to be the actual), and the projections to the end of June at \$28.9 million.

The Elections came, a new Government was elected and, almost immediately, the projected deficit tripled, settling in the end some months later at an \$81 million figure.

So, Madam Speaker, my question to the Government, the question which is being asked everywhere, in board rooms and bar rooms: On what basis do we rely on these projections? What has changed? What has Government done to improve its system of economic forecasting?

What aspects of the Miller/Shaw Report—which was commissioned at great cost and written with a great deal of effort, expertise—have been implemented? What has Government done that can make anybody feel that its ability to forecast is better now than what it was in 2008/09?

I suspect, Madam Speaker, that although the Government will never publicly concede that these are issues which have driven the UK’s desire for the Framework for Fiscal Responsibility, that, in fact, this is a major factor in that overall scheme of things.

Madam Speaker, how do we have confidence in these projections? Where is the evidence that Government is controlling expenditure? What are the systems that have been implemented to give greater control and to give better insight into what is being spent? What is the Government doing about the Public Management and Finance Law? For there is no doubt, Madam Speaker, that that Law in its present form is largely responsible for the significant increase in human resources required to run the cold government machine.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** And a number of us in here bear responsibility for that. And I do not just mean elected Members; I mean those of us who have been around the system—including senior civil servants, including the UK Government! I am not for a minute, Madam Speaker, saying that we should throw the law out. There are many aspects of it that are very, very good, very, very useful. But it is plain, Madam Speaker—it is plain—that structurally it is not what this country needs.

Madam Speaker, the Government is fond of saying that the PPM significantly increased the size of the Civil Service. Madam Speaker, we have to acknowledge that there was a significant increase in the numbers under our watch. But, Madam Speaker, you think it was the ministers who were going out and saying, *We want more people, we want more people?* Madam Speaker, as the provisions of that Law came

to be better understood and implemented, you would hear, *This department has to get a chief HR and a deputy HR and we have to get a chief financial officer and a deputy chief financial officer, and we need an assistant to them.*

Madam Speaker, as at odds as we are, Government and Opposition (because that is the nature of the system), there are things on which we can and should unify. And one of the things that we should unify on is an acceptance that the present Public Management and Finance Law needs major, major revision.

**An Hon. Member:** And thrown out!

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Urgently!

Because unless we start to centralise again, these two functions, or most of the aspects of these two functions; the HR function and the accounting function, we are going to have to continue the proliferation of resources to man all of these little distinct agencies within each department, ministry/portfolio as the case may be.

So, Madam Speaker, when my friend, the Fourth Elected Member for George Town, will say (as he did recently when he and I were engaged in a debate about this), that—*It is the PPM who ran up the size of the Civil Service, and we have cut it back* (I forgot how many hundreds he said he cut it back by)—I smile. When I talk to the people in government they smile too. It really is not anything that the elected Government has done or certainly not the Fourth Elected Member for George Town has done that has resulted in this reduction in the size of the Civil Service. It is in part, a function of the economy that we are living in now. And those of us—

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** The Minister of Health says it is a function of leadership. Well, I hope he helps, Madam Speaker, with the leader—

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** He's doing more with less?

I hope, Madam Speaker, that that actually translates to reality, because we do need to do more with less. I agree with him entirely; we do need to do more with less. While I certainly do not advocate and do not want any Caymanian civil servant not to have their job, there is the process of attrition for those who are not Caymanian, who have contracts which will come up for renewal.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Members are saying across the floor, Madam Speaker, very helpfully, that that is what they have been doing.

But, Madam Speaker, for those of us who have been around a while, we can believe that unless we change the structure, as soon as there is a perception that there is more money available, more people are going to get hired.

We have to change the structure, and we have to redesign the way that we deal with financial accounting and human resource management. And, unless we fix those two things, the numbers within the public service are going to slowly rebound. Mark my words! We saw it happen before.

This is not the first time that Cayman has faced austerity. This is not the first time that we have had to deal with budget cuts, and there have been mandates about reducing the size of the public service. Not the first time. It is worse, because it is the worse recession that the world has known in 80 years. But there are things that we can fix, and the Public Management and Finance Law is one area that we need to be addressing urgently.

I see, Madam Speaker, from the FFR that the Premier has agreed that substantial changes have to be made to the Public Management and Finance Law by the 1<sup>st</sup> July next year. But I do not see anywhere in there addressing these particular concerns which I am trying to articulate. I hope, Madam Speaker, that that is going to be part of the overall exercise; that it is not just going to be about amending the Public Management and Finance Law to give effect to what the FFR says. I hope we are going to take it further than that. And I hope this is not going to be one of those issues that will be hived off to some committee which sits and sits and sits until the House is dissolved.

Madam Speaker, I am just checking my notes to make sure I have covered all of the points I wanted to.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** *[Addressing inaudible interjection]* What is it the Minister of Health would like me to address on his behalf?

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, I think I better leave the Minister of Health to make his own contribution. I might not put it quite the way he wishes.

Madam Speaker, I want to conclude by registering the concern, the disappointment and indeed the

shock of the Opposition that in these times of austerity (using his own words), the Premier and Minister of Finance did not use this important occasion, this opportunity to outline to the country what indeed his vision is. What is it that the Government is going to do to get us out of the mire that we are presently in? As a government they are running out of time—really out of time—to do anything of consequence.

Now, Madam Speaker, all of us are unified in the view—all in this House, and I believe probably right across the country—that the country desperately needs a cruise ship pier. I hear arguments growing, it seems, these days, about where it ought to be put. But I do not hear anyone saying, as I once did, that we do not need it. Why is that, Madam Speaker? That is so because the numbers have demonstrated that our share of the cruise ship market is decreasing almost on a monthly basis.

Now in part, Madam Speaker, no question that that is a function of the global economy and the fact that our target market by and large does not have the disposal income that they did a few years ago. But even those that are sailing, the ships are going increasingly to other ports where there is more convenient ways for people to disembark, safer ways.

Madam Speaker, we have let this drag for far too long. Far too long! The Government's handling of this can only be regarded as disastrous since they took office. We are now two and a half years down the track and we still have no indication as to when we will even have an agreement, let alone when we will actually have any start of construction of any cruise ship piers.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Government has changed horses, midstream. I, for one, had considerable confidence in the abilities of the Third Elected Member for West Bay and the councilor (I think they are called) to manage this particular situation.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, I was invited to two presentations by him in the early stages of his stewardship of this.

*[Inaudible interjection]*

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** Madam Speaker, I have listened, I have read what has been said about all of this. The fact that DECCO [Dart Enterprises Constructing Company] came on board, DECCO left.

If DECCO left, as has been reported, because they would not accept anything less than a 99 year lease of the properties, then I agree entirely with the decision of the Government, as far as the negotiations were concerned, by the Third Elected Member

for West Bay, in not agreeing to that—if that was the basis for it. I only know what I read.

Madam Speaker, GLF were then taken on board in December of 2010. I have seen various documents, I have heard much. I have read what has been attributed in the report to be the position of the Third Elected Member for West Bay. Madam Speaker, it seems the advice given by the Third Elected Member for West Bay was to let GLF proceed with construction of the Port. I have seen a report that the Premier says he was not aware of that advice. He never knew. I struggle, Madam Speaker, to understand how that could be the case.

We have all been in this business, the Third Elected Member for West Bay, the Premier, myself, those on this side, and some on the other side, for a while. We know how the business of government works. Certainly, when any of my colleagues were in Cabinet making major decisions, I would not have needed an email from any of them to know what their view was on a matter of this importance. And so, Madam Speaker, it may be otherwise, but I am driven to the inescapable conclusion that the change in horses at this stage does not have so much to do with the ability of the horse to finish the race, but indeed, more to do with the unwillingness of the horse to run down a certain road. And perhaps, Madam Speaker, it is believed that the new horse will be more amenable to direction and instruction.

But, Madam Speaker, whatever all of the internal issues are there, the sad result for the country is that there is not a chance, in my view—not a chance on earth—that we will have anything approaching a pier before the end of this term. And, Madam Speaker, I am not (although I could in the context of this debate) going to go into all of the concerns and considerations and issues about the party with whom the Government is proposing to contract; or indeed how they came about getting that favoured position. That is for another time because that will out. That will out, of that I am certain.

But the result, Madam Speaker, is that again, just yesterday, we had public utterances by the Cayman Islands Tourism Association (CITA) of major concern and despair over the fact that cruise visitors are down hugely again this month—down more than 43 per cent over last December. And there is no indication that things are likely to improve. The Tourism Association has become so desperate for some action by the Government that they are calling on Government now to find some way, at least, to do something, even if it is only building one pier at this stage and then moving forward to a second over a longer term. That is how dire, how desperate, things have become.

Madam Speaker, I do believe that just as the decision taken way back in late 2009 to do away with any dealings with Atlantic Star proved to be a major delaying factor, just as the decision to dump GLF and

go with China Harbour Engineering has proven to be a hugely delaying factor. This decision by the Premier and Minister of Finance to change horses midstream, as to the management of this port project from the Government end is concerned, is going to increase the delay much further.

If there was any doubt in my mind about that, Madam Speaker . . . I had the benefit of listening to the Fourth Elected Member for George Town attempt to respond to questions from the host on *Crosstalk* this morning, and listeners' calls. And there was so little that he appeared to know about any of this that I said to myself (nothing to do with the man's ability, quite capable of learning), *he has got a lot of work to do!*

So, Madam Speaker, here we are the victim, again, of whatever internal issues it is that the Government is laboring under and the country continues to suffer.

Madam Speaker, I have been reminded of the cost factor as well in potential lawsuits or suits which are pending as a result of some of the decisions which have been taken in this regard. And, Madam Speaker, it seems that every few months we have to get a new Port Authority Board—again, in my view, searching to find a board that is more compliant, more amenable to instruction and direction from the top.

**Mr. V. Arden McLean, Member for East End:** Even civil servants sometimes.

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** But, Madam Speaker, all of these things in the context of the SPS and the speech made by the Premier yesterday serve to further undermine confidence in the Government's ability to deliver on its promises and to deliver on its responsibility to effectively manage the affairs of this country, and, in particular, to deal with the economic issues which this country faces and which every country in the present climate is struggling with.

So, Madam Speaker, we on this side find it very difficult—*very difficult*—to support this SPS.

#### **Speaker's Comments Regarding the Press**

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Leader of the Opposition.

I need to say something here before I suspend for the lunch break.

Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I do not usually respond from this Chair but I think I need to on this occasion, lest we give the public the wrong impression. Listeners to his speech on the radio tonight might get the wrong impression as to what really happened with regard to the press.

We are very fond in this House of quoting Standing Orders, and I will quote from them now: Standing Order 84(1) and (2): "**The Presiding Officer**

**may grant a general permission to the representatives of any journal or newspaper to attend the meetings of the House, and such permission may be granted under such rules as he may make, from time to time, for that purpose. If such rules are contravened, such permission may be revoked.**

**"(2) Any representatives of any journal or newspaper when attending meetings of the House SHALL [Speaker's emphasis added] sit in the area allotted for the press and shall under no conditions engage any Member in conversation during such sittings."**

Those are the rules of the House. And, as he is, I am sure, well aware, the press is here. They have chosen to sit in the comfortably padded seats in the lounge of the Legislative Assembly. That is their choice. Perhaps he would like to follow his Scriptural injunctions and invite friends to come up higher.

We are now suspended for lunch until two o'clock.

**Proceedings suspended at 12.31 pm**

**Proceedings resumed at 2.25 pm**

**The Speaker:** Proceedings are resumed, Please be seated.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**The Speaker:** I'm glad the Christmas spirit is prevailing.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**The Speaker:** Yes, it is. Okay.

*[inaudible interjections and laughter]*

**The Speaker:** All right, it is time to begin the sitting.

We have had the Premier's presentation, we have had the Leader of the Opposition's reply and the floor is now open for anyone else who would like to contribute to this debate.

*[inaudible interjections and laughter]*

**The Speaker:** Does any other Member wish to speak?

Member for North Side.

**Mr. D. Ezzard Miller, Member for North Side:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, it is not often, when something is up for debate in this Parliament, that I am reluctant to take part. But I am not sure what the position is on this SPS we are debating.

Madam Speaker, bear with me for a little while—I am not trying to anticipate the debate on the FFR, but the copy of the FFR that I have is not signed or dated so I am not sure when it comes into effect.

The reason I am reluctant to debate the SPS is because if the FFR is in effect from the date it was signed, then, Madam Speaker, the SPS before us (in my view at least) does not meet the requirements which are laid down in Appendix A 15, as to what the Strategic Policy Statement should look like under the new financial agreement.

I do not want to be any part of assisting the Government to contravene that agreement in any way at all. Having said that, Madam Speaker, I will make a small contribution to the debate but will be abstaining on the vote.

**The Speaker:** Can I have that number again if you do not mind. I'm trying to find where you referred to.

**Mr. D. Ezzard Miller:** It is in the FFR Agreement-Appendix A- section 15. It lays out a number of things that are supposed to be contained in the Strategic Policy Statement which I have not found into the Policy Statement which is before us.

Madam Speaker, I would like to raise a few concerns on the Strategic Policy Statement which is before us. While I heard the Premier in his presentation speak quite a lot to "Controlling Government Expenditure", Strategy 1 in the [SPS] on page 20, when I look across on the next page at the actual numbers which are projected in the SPS, I have some concerns that that is not what is happening with expenses in the Government.

Let me deal with the revenue side of it first, Madam Speaker.

The Premier quite rightly talked about the international and worldwide economic state and the financial meltdown, and that these are times for austerity, which I agree with. But, Madam Speaker, in only five months, according to the numbers on page 21, under the Table entitled "The Aggregate Financial Targets for Core Government", states that the Government is making a projection to increase the revenue by some \$20 million from what was budgeted only five months ago. At the same time we hear that some sources of revenue such as work permits, are down by, I think, the Premier said 7 per cent. Now, Madam Speaker, projected revenue for work permits was increased by some 25 per cent in the last Budget, if I recall correctly, and they were hoping to get an additional \$10 million this year from work permits.

So, in light of those two statements, Madam Speaker, I wonder where the additional revenue is coming from. The projections on revenue increase year after year. And it is interesting, Madam Speaker, that it is almost the same amount each year. And, when I see that put into tables I get a little concerned

that numbers are just put in for the sake of putting in numbers, because it is 12 million, 12 million, 12 million. And one would believe that with proper economic analysis there should be a greater variance in the additional revenue that was projected year on year.

Madam Speaker, if we look at the next line on the Table "Government Expenses", that has increased and this financial year it is projected to increase by approximately \$21 million. The first Strategy of the SPS, Strategy-1 "Government's Fiscal Strategy" reads: **"Strategy 1—Controlling Government Expenditure: The UDP Government is taking definitive steps to control expenditure in a sensible and logical manner. The Government has commenced an extensive review of the public sector entities aimed at reducing the cost of the delivering services to the public. This SPS has established clear targets for the reduction of operating expenditure over the three financial years."**

Now, Madam Speaker, an increase in \$21 million is not really a reduction at all. And the more serious aspect of that is that the Budget which was passed here in June projected a—I think it was around a \$12 million surplus. That is already being revised into the negative for this fiscal year. Only five months into the Budget we are now projecting a \$4.5 million deficit. And, Madam Speaker, I would suggest to the Government that maybe the elected arm of Government needs to get greater control or put stronger reins on the administration that is increasing expenditure in face of a Government stated fact that it wants to reduce expenditure. Because, Madam Speaker, a \$21 million increase can in no way be interpreted to be a reduction.

Then we find, Madam Speaker, that there is a reduction for the target for the 2012/13 year by approximately 14 million. Now, is that realistic in the face of what is happening this year? Is the \$21 million some extraordinary expenditure that is only occurring this year? Well, I don't know. And then we find that in the years following, expenditure increases again. And curiously enough, Madam Speaker, we get a recurring figure again of \$5 million. And it gives me cause for concern, Madam Speaker.

Like I said, when I see these recurring numbers I hope that it is not a situation where we have just decided to add a percentage to the figure and type the figure in and there is no real analysis of the expenditure in government and what it entails. Because, Madam Speaker, I probably have a little advantage over a couple of other Members here. I have been all three sides of this budget. I have been there as a civil servant trying to prepare one; I have been there as a Member of Executive Council trying to control one; and I have been on this side of the bench trying to review what the Government is proposing and try to follow them around.

Madam Speaker, we say things are bad; we know things are bad. But if we look in today's [*Caymanian*] *Compass* (Friday's *Compass*), there are some eleven pages of advertising mostly for professional people. And, Madam Speaker, we hear that we have 18 per cent Caymanians unemployed. I know from experience that most of those 11 pages are most likely to be for work permits. And, Madam Speaker, the greatest threat to the stability of the Cayman Islands today is the young educated Caymanians.

When you talk with them they go into another culture, they go to another man's country, they work hard, they study hard, they get their academic qualifications, they get their professional qualifications and they come back to the Cayman Islands and cannot get an interview for a job. When you talk with them they repeatedly tell you that they do not understand why it is this way in Cayman because all of their friends are being head-hunted by corporations a year, six months, three months before they graduate, especially those who perform the best academically. They are wined and dined by corporations trying to employ these people. They come back to Cayman and take their qualifications to these law firms and accounting firms and banks, and they are treated as though they are performing some criminal act. *Why come here and bother us?* But they have hundreds and hundreds of people on work permits.

Madam Speaker, when you talk with the parents of these people who have invested heavily, made investments, borrowed money that they would not normally borrow at that age, to send their children to school to get them an education, and they come back here one, two, three years later and they cannot get any jobs. Madam Speaker, we need to address this situation. It is a powder keg waiting to explode. And I would caution the Government that revolutions in other countries are not started by the poor and uneducated. They use them, of course; but they are started and engineered by the young educated people who no longer believe that they have an opportunity to participate in the economy of their own country.

We have the situation in Cayman where the young professionals are feeling that way, their parents are feeling that way. It has to be addressed.

Madam Speaker, the Premier and the Government continue to depend on these mega projects that they have been trying to get started for 18 months, a better part of two years on some of them. Some of them, every time you pick up the newspaper they are being downsized in terms of what is their investment going to be. But the benefits that they have been granted is not being adjusted.

Madam Speaker, we have the situation with the Port and China Harbour. I have here, Madam Speaker, a fact-finding-trip-to-Jamaica report by what I would now call "The China Harbour Chamber of Commerce.", Madam Speaker, this is unadulterated

advocacy for the company. And they talk about politicians accepting gifts and anything we accept makes us corrupt, but they can take an all-expense paid trip to Jamaica, be wined and dined and come back and write these kinds of reports.

That does not have anything to do with that big 'C' word, they are just gathering information. Madam Speaker, I see it differently. We have to be careful how we let in these kinds of companies that are prepared before they even get here to purchase, pay for, and buy that kind of support for their projects.

We all know, Madam Speaker, and we can deny it as much as we want. We all read the newspapers and we all see on the Internet the problems that this particular company is having in all the Caribbean countries that they are in, and in most of the other continents that they are as well. Madam Speaker, my concern is that we are dealing with the wrong people. And my dilemma is that we all know that the Port issued a "Request For Proposal" and a number of companies answered that proposal. I do not recall that China Harbour Engineering was one of those. So how they got to the table and how they have now become the premier company, I don't know.

I am hoping that the FFR came into effect on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of November when it was signed, because, Madam Speaker, if it is in effect, then, I think the country has some hope because that whole project would have to go through a deeper, greater, and more specific analysis, and, in my view, would have to be retendered in order to qualify and meet the requirements of the FFR.

Madam Speaker, I noticed that they even have in this document a picture of what the dock is going to look like. It is very close to what DECCO had proposed. One of the questions that the mariners to whom I showed it . . . while I do not know if it would be an impossible engineering feat, it is going to be kind of hard to put dolphins down in 8,000 feet of water. And there is where they are located if you look at this picture, Madam Speaker. You can see the drop-off.

We all know that the first shelf there with the *Kirk Pride* is 1,500 feet and that is fairly narrow and it drops off to 8,000 feet. I am not saying it is impossible. The Chinese are great engineers, and they might have a way of getting concrete down 8,000 feet, but it is going to cost us a lot of money. I do not think [\$]300 million is going to do it. But, of course, maybe they are going to dredge in one place and fill in another, I don't know.

Another concern of people in the know, when it comes to shipping, is that the piers are too close together. No captain worth his salt is going to put the ship's propellers in gear unless he has his stern lines on board. And the direction in which these ships are docked are going to make them broadside to a day like today when you have 15 to 20 knots northeast winds. It will not take the ship very long with the

amount of windage it has above water, to drift that couple of feet and hit the other ship.

But, of course, we have not asked the mariners about anything like this. We have left it to, first of all, DECCO who built one dock down by Camana Bay and the Chinese, to tell us how it is going to work.

Madam Speaker, the Dr. Shetty hospital that we heard so much about and how many billion dollars they were going to spend in the country and how much revenue they were going to bring to the Government and how many new aircrafts Cayman Airways would have to buy to bring the passengers in, has not started. And that is shrinking faster than a block of ice in the July sun in North Side. Again, every time I see the newspaper this is being downsized and something else is being done.

Madam Speaker, my concerns with the SPS that has been presented is, that the numbers in the document do not support the written sections of the document and what the Premier has told us is going to happen, and we need to reconcile those two positions one way or another. Either we have to say that expenditures are increasing, and tell us the reason why. Might be a good reason, I don't know. But we cannot say that expenditure is reducing when the numbers clearly say that they are increasing.

So, Madam Speaker, with those few comments I shall abstain on the vote.

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Member for North Side.

Does any other Member wish to speak?  
[pause] Does any other Member wish to speak?  
[pause]

Minister of Health.

**Hon. J. Mark P. Scotland, Minister of Health, Environment, Youth, Sports and Culture:** Madam Speaker, my contribution to the debate on the Strategic Policy Statement will be brief.

Madam Speaker, I just want to begin by saying (and I do not have to repeat it) that we know we exist in a difficult worldwide economic situation at present. This has been a challenge for not just this Government, but others—but more so for this Government given the position that we found ourselves in when we first took office.

Madam Speaker, with a limited revenue base—and we know [there is] no direct taxation and no intention to have direct taxation on our residents—there are several few sectors that maintain our economy: the financial sector, tourism and the development and construction that comes from those two key industries. And, Madam Speaker, over the last few years these key sectors have come under tremendous pressure—the financial sector, from competition of other jurisdictions trying to do the same, emulate the

model that the Cayman Islands built over many years to be one of the top jurisdictions in the world.

We know that jurisdictions like BVI . . . when we look at the Company Register alone, Cayman used to be one of the top company registers or jurisdictions for company registry. And in a short time BVI emulated our model and now has many, many more companies on their register than here in Cayman. So, other jurisdictions are competing for the business that we have. We know that jurisdictions like Halifax and Ireland and others are growing tremendously in terms of their financial services.

The same thing with tourism, Madam Speaker: The sun, sea and sand are not the only things that people search for anymore when they are taking a vacation. You can almost have sun, sea and sand in your backyard if you want to, and so we have to be very competitive now to attract here. So, we see what has been happening in the tourism sector for many years as well. We are now starting to see in the past two years, growth back in the stay-over area of tourism. Some stay-over tourism is now higher than, or just getting back to, pre-Ivan numbers just in 2010/2011.

We are seeing the turmoil from the cruise sector and primarily that is because of us not having the cruise port which, again, we hear how we are working towards achieving that.

Madam Speaker, I have been saying for many years that the only way, or one main way, for us to strengthen or grow our economy for the economy to rebound is to diversify. And, Madam Speaker, that is to find sustainable ways that the economy can grow and maintain that growth. Areas like medical tourism, we all know that we are supporting one large project and see where that is now starting to break ground where the developers just recently closed on the property and hope to submit a Planning application soon.

And, yes, Madam Speaker, we all acknowledge that 2000 beds are not going to be . . . or the whole big project planned is not going to happen next year. We know that. But if we start to see the growth of a small medical tourism facility which grows bit by bit over the next five-to-eight years, that is something that can be sustained in our economy, provide jobs and economic stimulus. As we all know, medical tourism is not cyclical; medical tourism would happen all year round. So, that is going to be something that is sustainable growth for our economy. Sustained growth, I should say, not just sustainable growth; sustained growth in the economy.

Madam Speaker, the other areas that we have talked about to diversify the economy include the Enterprise City which is underway. We have also been working toward the ForCayman Investment Alliance. And, Madam Speaker, one of the points I want to make is that the Leader of the Opposition spoke

about the Premier not giving a vision for turning around and growing the economy. Regardless whether or not the Premier has talked about it in this specific SPS or not, we have been talking about what we want to do to turn around this economy for the past two years. And one of the big problems with starting this, Madam Speaker, is that every time the Government announces a project or announces an initiative to improve the economy to give us economic stimulus, there is some person, some group objecting to that.

Madam Speaker, I am not saying that people should not voice their say on a project that is going to be done and eventually that input is taken. We have seen in some cases where, after public input, projects were not put on the table again, such as the East End Seaport and the North Sound dredging and so on.

Madam Speaker, every time a project comes out, whether it is very good or not for the economy, someone has some objection to it. A case in point is what I am talking about now, Madam Speaker, the ForCayman Investment. The ForCayman Investment Alliance is a project where the Government sees the opportunity to incentivise a developer, namely the Dart Group, to continue developing. The Dart Group has already put a lot of money into this country, close to a billion dollars, as I understand from the project done already (the main project), plus some other smaller projects. They have done some good developments in the Island; I think we would all agree.

As we all know, unlike many of the other developers doing projects that we are working with now, this developer has the funds ready to go. We know that because it is a very wealthy developer who has very lucrative businesses elsewhere, and they have shown that already with what they have done.

So, we are working on a project with them which will incentivise them to continue to redevelop a hotel property that was recently acquired, and to do some other projects, such as to extend the Esterely Highway to West Bay, and very key projects to remediate the existing dump in George Town and to provide a new site and develop the first phase of a waste management facility. After much searching, after reviewing a lot of criteria, technical criteria and so on, eliminating other sites, the chosen site was not arbitrarily picked out of the blue, Madam Speaker. But the chosen site based on technical criteria and otherwise, happens to be in the district of Bodden Town.

Madam Speaker, I think everyone agrees that the most serious environmental disaster that currently exists in our country is the George Town dump or, as my good friend from East End has called it over the years, "Mount Trashmore." And here we have come up with a method or a way to address that problem by using a developer who is here and will cap or remediate that site and will then provide an alternate site which will give us 25 to 40 years of waste management facility if managed properly.

Madam Speaker, there are now groups again objecting to that and we hear about petitions being started about that project as well.

Madam Speaker, if that is going to be the approach for every project we are going to undertake we will never get the economy turned around. We would never see the environmental issues addressed like the waste management facility, like the existing dump in George Town. And if that is the approach going to be taken, then I would ask the Members of the Opposition or the country: What are the alternatives to be able to address the issues we have, and also to turn the economy around to get an economic stimulus, to get people back to work?

Madam Speaker, you know I think all of us agree that people are hurting. Every day people will call and say, *My electricity is turned off and I don't have any lights in my house now for the past week; for the past month I don't have water in my house.* Madam Speaker, the only way to turn this around is for economic stimulus for job creation. We are not going to see that if we do not do things which give people incentive to do some development. Everywhere else in the world, Madam Speaker, countries are giving developers incentives to start projects. I know some states in the US are saying to companies, *Come here now, work and start your business, develop your company and you will get no taxation for X number of years. Zero taxation.*

I know the same thing is happening in Ireland, for instance, with the financial industry, Halifax with the financial industry as well. And so, Madam Speaker, the incentive that we are offering to some of these developers and companies is to give them that encouragement and the incentive for them to come here and do a development which will create employment.

In the initial stages, for instance, Enterprise City, the first stages of that would be through construction. After that it will be through job creation which is sustained over a longer period.

Madam Speaker, the important point is that incentives that would be offered to the developer, unlike what has been said numerous times, are not direct investment on the part of government, and are not funds that government takes out of its treasury or bank account and pays a developer. If a developer does not do the development, if he does not start the work, he does not actually see any incentive at all and does not receive any incentive.

So, if a project that was supposed to be 2,000 beds before and was to receive X amount of incentives and it becomes 200 beds, then, the incentives are commensurate with the size of the project. For instance, the Shetty Hospital, the total incentive package (I think if I recall) is around \$160 million worth of incentives over a two billion dollar investment. If the investment is only \$200 million, then proportionately the incentives would only probably be around \$16 mil-

lion. So, it would only be incentives based on what the developer actually does.

Madam Speaker, this is being done everywhere in the world. It is the way that governments are now giving people the incentives to start their projects, give that economic stimulus which the country needs to get turned around, to get people back to work, to be able to put food on the table again, feed their families, to have steady jobs again for long periods. Those are the issues that we are facing now—not having jobs for people who have been out of work for many months, some people for years at a time at present.

The Government itself, with limited revenue resources also has to provide the services that government normally provides. Yes, we are doing that. We have trimmed some costs, Madam Speaker. We have trimmed it to where we know the services that are required in this country are now being provided by the Government. And it is very difficult to continued trimming, especially given the current economic situation again where if government were to start having mass layoffs putting people out of work, that again would also have serious effects throughout the economy, Madam Speaker, because the economy is in such a position now that it would not be able to absorb a mass number of people without jobs at present.

So, Madam Speaker, it is a balancing act that the Government has to play at present to be able to deal with this situation and the fact that there is always some objection, some petition, someone saying that this project is not good. Why is it not good? And then people are asking: Why don't we work together? Well let's work together to see some of the projects done, to get some of these initiatives on the table, get them rolling, get them moving so that we can get people back to work instead of at all times just objecting, starting petitions and the likes.

As I said, the FCIA agreement is the prime example where we have tried to do projects which are beneficial to the country at present, [such as] the Esterley Tibbetts extension, the dump in George Town, the new waste management facility in Bodden Town, and yet there is objection coming to some of those projects already.

Madam Speaker, I can only encourage the Opposition to support the initiatives that the Government is taking to try to reinvigorate the economy. With those brief words, Madam Speaker, I will take my seat now.

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Minister of Health.

Does any other Member wish to speak?  
Member for East End.

**Mr. V. Arden McLean, Elected Member for East End:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I really did not have too much intention of speaking because I thought the Leader of the Opposition had done a fairly good job of presenting our side of this debate. And then the Member for North Side made his contribution. But, Madam Speaker, since I have heard the Minister of Health jump to his feet, I certainly have to get up.

Now, Madam Speaker—

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Madam Speaker, the Premier said it looks as though we will have to work until late. I will be finished by 4.30. I can leave then.

Madam Speaker, I know the SPS delivered by the Premier really does not give us any hope. It does not give the people on the street a lot of hope.

I recall (I believe it was in the 80s) when there were two little old ladies doing an advertisement about hamburgers and one asked the other one, "Where's the beef?" Madam Speaker, there is no beef to look forward to.

Madam Speaker, I hear the Minister of Health over there crying and begging people to stop opposing them and every project that they do! Madam Speaker, let me explain, whilst I have a lot of respect for the Minister of Health—long time—he needs to know when and who is on the other side. Somebody told me today that they are going to buy me the Country and Western song by Kenny Rogers for Christmas—"The Gambler"—"You've got to know when to hold 'em, Know when to fold 'em."

Madam Speaker, the Minister of Health needs to look into the past and look into the last two years that he has been a Member of the ruling party. He needs to think before he gets on his feet. Madam Speaker, because he does not think, it does not mean that I do not have respect for it. You know, every now and again he may go out of his head, maybe he did not take his memory medication.

Madam Speaker, the Minister says that every project that the Government proposes is opposed by us and others outside. Madam Speaker, I beg to differ because he is crying out there for assistance. What more assistance can this Opposition give this Government? What more? Because they need it, he says, to stimulate the economy and to stimulate the economy projects are needed. Madam Speaker, let us take a look at it.

If he has no memory, as short as the time is—1) the passenger liner dock. We have never one day opposed it. The Leader of the Opposition went so far this morning that he was giving the Third Elected Member for West Bay glowing remarks on his ability.

**An hon. Member:** Commendation.

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Commendation. And to some extent I support his view in that regard. Sometimes!

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Because he has his technical capabilities which I believe he is pretty good under so you know I am not going to say too much more. He is a decent person to do those kinds of things, compared with other people.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Madam Speaker, we have never one day opposed it. To the contrary! I suggested to the Third Elected Member for West Bay why we would not put the mega yacht [dock] as a component of the dock when DECCO was the preferred contractor to develop it. Thus, I think they may have taken that on board and incorporated that right there by Red Spot. We never one day objected to it. The Minister must stop crying. He must stop crying.

Let us take a look, Madam Speaker, at the schools—the two High Schools! Never one day did we object to them finishing the high school; to the contrary, we wanted it finished. We urged them to do it, and we implored them to do it.

Let us go a bit further: The Shetty Hospital. There may have been some questions we asked about it. We never opposed it. Now, Madam Speaker, I am going to get back to the Shetty Hospital because that ties in with something else which was a pet project of mine. The Economic Zone: Some of us had some questions about the laws the Minister was changing and how it was going to work and what effect it was going to have on our country and the likes. But we did not oppose it. We did not oppose it.

Madam Speaker, we are yet to oppose the expansion of the airport. We have never opposed it.

Madam Speaker, I just named four major projects that are two, three billion dollars' worth of work and not one has started! He must stop crying!

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** He must stop crying and manage the country and get the job done!

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Now, the dock in East End was not going there!

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* All talk? You should have come up there and put it there!

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** All politics they are saying, Madam Speaker. So, what was the support we gave those four that I just said? Was that all politics too? Madam Speaker, they must stop crying—

**An hon. Member:** Do something.

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** —and do the job!

Now the Shetty Hospital is scheduled to go to East End. Not one day did I oppose it; I welcome it for the people of East End.

It is rubbish! They are making excuses for not managing the country. Rubbish!

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* Yeah, you better believe it is going to squeal, to show all you where you were wrong.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* Well, you do not have any objection one way or the other.

**The Speaker:** Order. Let's get back to the subject.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* Better legacy? You have big shoes to fill ya buddy!

Madam Speaker, the people opposed the Dart deal. And, Madam Speaker, the Premier came to this honourable House asking us to say what the position of the Opposition was on the Dragon Bay Crown land that we gave permission for in increasing the lease time to 99 years. He wanted us to take a position on where we were with freehold. Madam Speaker, when we were in the majority we did what we had to do. They must now do what they have to do.

What Michael Ryan needs to do is to pay the \$6 million he owes into the coffers of this country. That is what he needs to do! Because we told him he had to pay what was owed up to when we left there. That is what he needs to do. That is what the UDP Government needs to do! They need to manage the country. They need to stop crying.

The Premier got up here yesterday and talked about the difficult decisions that had to be made. We made difficult decisions. Yes, Madam Speaker, each day this same Government crucifies me for building the roads in this country—but they have not built any. The Premier has been in here 28 years and his people could not get out of West Bay. I am taking my

licks. I made the decision. But they are not making the decision.

They are on the third [company] trying to get the dock built. Third [company]! Third contractor! And it will still not be built. The media is reporting that the Premier is saying that it is going to be built by the first quarter of 2013. *Nah BoBo!* That can't happen! He could start today, it cannot get finished. I can assure him of that. And he has now extended it until March of next year for the agreement to be signed. Madam Speaker, that is twelve months he is talking about. Impossible to do it!

But this is what the Government has been doing. They just spout these things out anytime the . . . It is obvious, Madam Speaker, when the Government proposes something good for this country, we support it. When it is not good, we oppose it, and then they say we oppose everything. That is not right. That is not right! We must stop crucifying the citizens of this country because they do not like the proposals by the Government. And then come here with an SPS that has no meat in it. Has no hope.

The Premier talked about his aspirations (let me just get what he said, Madam Speaker). He said he was concluding with his vision for hope and promise. Madam Speaker, I cannot say that that is not true. The question I am asking is: For whom? Because I know that my people in East End have no hope and the people in George Town, West Bay, Cayman Brac, Little Cayman, Bodden Town, North Side, have no hope! There is no hope or future for them. They got plenty promises—

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** —under this Government.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** But I must support things that I do not believe are in the best interest of this country to stop them from crying?

My father told me two things don't kill people; hard work and crying. Stop their crying and get the job done! That's what they must do.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Thought that is what they are trying to do and haven't done anything yet.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Madam Speaker, in two and a half years the UDP Government, the only project they got off of the ground is the housing—and they nearly have that messed up now again.

**An hon. Member:** Yeah.

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** That's it! If they can show me one other project that is going to bring my little—the three words that I coin as defining politics—tangibility, measurability, and visibility for the people. Tell them to show it to me. We see a lot of plans. I just saw one there about the dock again.

Plans for dock—interactive plan on computer for the one in East End. Plan for the Enterprise City; plan for the airport; and plan to move the West Bay road. Nothing has been done! Because the projects that are no good for this country I am going to oppose. They have to get use to that. They can cry as much as they want. They will stop crying. They will soon find out that tears can stop too. They must work. Tie that right around their heads and get the job done!

*[laughter]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** And then they complain of contracting revenues. Every year they have had increased revenues and increased expenditures. You think it is any wonder that England had to step in and make them sign this. And the Premier is talking about how it was with a bitter pill to swallow. I hope it was one of them simpawirie pills, Madam Speaker.

*[inaudible interjections and laughter]*

**An hon. Member:** Keep going; keep going.

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Madam Speaker, you think I don't know it is going to come; I know I got to bring some people out. You think we are getting out of here tonight? No, no.

*[laughter]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** No, we ain't coming out of here tonight, Madam Speaker. I can assure you of that.

Madam Speaker, I see where . . .

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Madam Speaker, I have always supported those projects. Always! And no one on that side can say that I went out against those projects I listed. Madam Speaker, I went out with a vengeance against that dock in East End. Oh yeah! That was not coming up there. The people said they did not want it. Okay?

Now they say they would prefer the Shetty Hospital. Madam Speaker, you do not hear me saying anything about that. That is what the people want. I will back off from that. It is not my job to go there now and tell them that that is not in their best interest. They

say that is what they want. I am going to support it. Madam Speaker, when I did my polling in East End with my petition against the dock I asked them what would they prefer to see there 90 per cent of them said, *Well, let's put the Shetty Hospital there.* That's fine by me. That is on their own initiative.

The Opposition to the dock was my initiative. But I did not oppose the dock up here. They said that is \$300 to \$400 million. They say the Shetty Hospital is \$2 billion. The airport must be \$100 million. The Economic Zone must be another couple of hundred million. That is nearly \$2 billion . . . it must be \$3 billion dollars. Madam Speaker, the truth must be told when it comes to what we support and what we do not. I can admit what I do not support.

Madam Speaker, one of the things I proposed in here to help us with our budget was to give away Boatswain Beach. Even if we had to assume the debt on it, the repayment on that would be less than \$10 million a year that we are subsidising this thing to. Had to be less! You know how much that could save us even if the repayment on it were \$5 million? And we are looking money?

Here we are on page 22 of the SPS where it says, "**The Government is planning to raise \$59.0 million from the divestment of certain assets in 2011/12 and the receipt of funds received from Dart re ForCayman Alliance Initiative; . . .**" Madam Speaker, where is the beef?

People need to know what it is they are divesting. Nothing! The Premier said a lot and did not say anything. He has not made the people know. Has this been approved by Cabinet? Has it been approved in accordance with the Vesting of Land Law and, more so now, the FFR? Nobody is saying that. The people need to know. All we hear is a lot of fluff. And they like to talk about substance over process. Where is the substance now? I do not see any substance to this. There is nothing in it that can give hope. There are a lot of promises.

We heard the Leader of the Opposition saying, and I agree with him, that you cannot calculate unemployment on the basis of your workforce. Fifty per cent of our workforce is made up of people on work permits. It has to be Caymanians who live here. That is what it has to be [based] on; the Caymanians who live and work here. It cannot be 6.5 per cent, whether or not other governments were doing it that way.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** If you take it to its right conclusion it is around 18 per cent.

**An Hon. Member:** More than that.

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Madam Speaker, we talk about, and the Government is talking about that there is hope for the future. Hope? Not in terms of anything that is tangible, measurable and even visible in the future. We can't see it. We can't feel it. We can't measure it. They must get up and get the job done. Propose things which are good and carry them through to their full conclusion. Let's see what becomes of them. You think I want to sit here, Madam Speaker, and watch the country go down? No! I am not going to do that. I will not do that.

But all the UDP ever talks about is what they inherited, the financial position. I bet you they understand now. And we are going to discuss that later in that FFR when it is debated too. I bet you they are now understanding about those projections. I bet you they understand it now, and the lack of proper credible projections. And they are acting on the same advice that we were.

Madam Speaker, it is hypocritical to say that the Opposition Members have opposed everything the Government is doing. That is not true. I want to see Cayman survive. I want to see it come out of these doldrums as well. The sooner it gets out the better it is going to be for the people I represent.

But they say that we like to play politics—we love to play politics, that is what we do—and get up here talking about opposing every project. They need to stop that because people know different. I am not going to sit here and allow them to do that. It is wrong! And that is the politics that we play in these hallowed Halls. That's the politics we play! If they think they can play any more politics than me, tell them to come on down. I have been here long enough too. And long before I was here. Let them talk their rubbish!

Madam Speaker, I think I have gotten in what I had to say. And, Madam Speaker, one thing I think I have learned in politics in all of these years is that it is about debate and counter debate. Everybody else has the same right I have to say what they want to say. The same right that I have to stand in here, everybody in here has. If they want to say something they have to get up. When it is time for me to say something I am going to get up, because a couple of things are not going to happen.

No one out there or on this side is going to run me out of this seat. Okay? And as long as I represent the people of East End, no one—*no one*—is going to stitch my tongue to the roof of my mouth. Okay? They are not shutting me up. I am also an individual.

The Members on that side may have to get up and explain why they don't sleep much. Now I don't know why that is. I do not know if the Premier has truncated them; but I know the Leader of the Opposition is not truncating me. I can assure him of that. That is not me. I say it when I have to.

So now, the Fourth Elected Member for George Town—

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* No, no, I ain't talking to you Captain, the Fourth Elected Member. Nor the Third Elected Member for West Bay. The Fourth Elected Member for West Bay can get up and say as he pleases.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Madam Speaker, he said that he is going to get up. I must say a little more so he can have more say. He don't need me man.

*[laughter]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** This is a free world, say as you please because you know the Premier is going to beat me so that will be two.

*[laughter]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** You think I never had thatch rope across my back before? Yeah, plenty times! It did not kill me then and it ain't going to kill me now. And I ain't dodging to go home either. I did enough of that.

*[inaudible interjections and laughter]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** John, John, I got plenty marks on my back. You want me to show you them?

*[inaudible interjection]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* Razors.

*[laughter]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** But he sharpened 'em! He had no business to sharpen 'em.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**Mr. V. Arden McLean:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I shall now leave it to the Members of the ruling Government to conclude and, as promised, I would not be until 4.30. We still have time to close at 4.30, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Member for East End.

Does any other Member wish to speak?  
[pause] Does any other Member wish to speak?  
[pause] Does any other member wish to speak?  
[pause].

If not, I call on the Honourable Premier to conclude his debate.

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** Madam Speaker, I have listened to many debates in this House before I became a Member, as I sat in the audience a lot. And I have listened to many debates, heard noise; some good sense, others just noise.

I consider the Member for East End nothing but a noise box. And so, Madam Speaker, he and his colleagues who spoke, including the Leader of the Opposition, could find much to criticise because they have criticised everything. And they have gone from criticising, and on a serious campaign that they promised would start last year and be the worst that we have ever seen. That is what they said; that is, the Leader of the Opposition. So—

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* Oh well, anything the Leader of the Opposition does, Madam Speaker, the parrot is bound to follow him.

I don't know why, though, they have not made him yet the deputy. And he has the audacity to challenge people over here who have not spoken. He has to speak every time his leader speaks, but he would not choose him to be his deputy.

*[inaudible interjections and laughter]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* I don't know. It has nothing to do with me; that is all I can tell you.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** Madam Speaker, I have listened a bit here and there to what they both had to say. The first thing is that the Leader of the Opposition said that I could only claim that we were fixing the finances. But that was not good enough, he said.

Well, Madam Speaker, as I said, that is a promise that I have made with myself because "to thy own self be true." Our Government is going to put this country back in the shape it should be financially. Not good enough, though, he says. So, Madam Speaker, it shows why these Islands got into trouble under his management. Because he does not seem to recognise what it takes to fix it financially. And that, without fixing it financially, everything else goes awry and you cannot do anything.

I explained that in the debate earlier in opening this debate, and I explained that when I was dealing a bit with the FFR as to the reasons why we have the FFR.

So, Madam Speaker, he really did not have a lot to say that I should even grace with some sort of

comment. But because he is the Leader of the Opposition, I will, in a few areas.

On this thing that he talked about “the Ark”—

*[inaudible interjections]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** I've been called many things but I have never been called “Noah.” And, at that, “Father Noah.”

Madam Speaker, Noah had a plan. He had a plan. They did not listen to him. Noah knew what was coming. He had the vision. He had the spiritual insight from God Almighty. He had it. He warned them, he begged them; they did not listen. He had a plan and he built the Ark and he saved some things and made a new world.

So, if the Ark is on a rock, then that is where the good ship Cayman was between 2005 and 2009. On the rocks! On the rocks with increased debt, \$600 million in those four years compared to May 2009, \$189 million that we left. On the rocks! In debt! On the rocks of a deficit in May 2009—\$80 something million. Never mind the \$200 million plus of capital works. On the rocks! We were on the rocks. On the rocks with the OECD black list.

**An Hon. Member:** Grey list.

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** Grey, black, you can believe it was black.

On the rocks! On the rocks for loss of business into the financial services. On the rocks for Cayman businesses losing. And, on the rocks with unemployment. They cannot sit there and say that this just happened since 2009. Who do they think they are talking to? Have they forgotten that I was in that seat and asked them over and over to do something about the situation and they told me, *Not on the kindest of mornings, would they listen.* Oh, they told me more than that. They took time to investigate me too. And that is being done again. I ain't worried about it. When your hands are clean and your heart is pure you do not worry. Let them do what they want to do and say what they want to say.

On the rocks, yes, Madam Speaker. We had a plan and have a plan to take us off the rocks—the rocks that they put us on! Because you know what is true, Madam Speaker, as one good gentleman told me? Anybody can captain a ship when it is by the dock tied up. But when you put it in stormy waters it takes a good man to navigate it and keep it afloat. And so, yes, I do have a plan. You must have a plan. Noah had one and I have one. And our Government has that plan. It is not my plan by itself. It is the Government's plan. The plan is to put this country in a better position than what we found it.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** The truth is we have a plan, we now need the house. As my good friend the late Ronald Martin told the Planning man who came down and told him: *You can't do this, you need a plan.* He said, *A plan? I need a house.* We have our plan; we are trying to build the house! They did not object?

Who do they think they are talking to? That one who was screaming so loud just now that you could not hear your ears up in here? Huh? Where were he and the Leader of the Opposition? Based on their Wednesday show and the Member for North Side [based] on his Tuesday show?. Where were they? Objecting to everything under the sun! And now they come trying to twist his opposition to our projects into some kind of laughable support.

He does that now because, as I have been saying from 2008, and more so since 2009, that people are hurting. They cannot say that they were not told and that this just started. No! The records are replete with my begging them.

If the Member for North Side would hold true to his original position in the campaign he would be telling the truth today rather than molycoddling the Opposition. He would be telling the truth because that is what we campaigned on; that they had done so bad and they needed to be removed. He is saying something different today.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** They never objected to the dock. They didn't? *Humph!*

You mean when we got the Dart project going on the dock, they did not object to it? They went out and shouted from the roof top [that] they were not supporting anything that we were going to do with Dart. We were selling out to him, according to them.

The truth is we backed off because he wanted 100 years. And their capital cost was between 8 per cent and 10 per cent, and we said 'no.' We took the next best on the cruise. We said 'no.' We took the next project, and I will have some more to say . . . not just yet, Madam Speaker, but believe you me, when I am ready, as I have said to the newspapers, I am going to stand in this spot and I am going to lay it out on the Table of this House. I am not going anywhere else with it.

And some of them who are running around this country who used to import dope by the containers think that they are going to get away with slandering me and playing the mischief makers that they are playing this country and think that I can just sit down and take it . . . I will tell you all in this House one thing, I am taking my licks. I am taking my licks because I do not feel like fighting. But I am a fighter. And I am going to take my strength back (I have been weakened) and when I do, the country is going to know right here.

That is not too long away; a few more things left to be done. The country will know why I removed ourselves from GLF to the Chinese, or CHEC. And I am not laying any such claim about drugs on GLF. Okay? Get that straight.

They never objected? Oh, he says they never objected to the high school. They begged, they say, for it to go forward. Yes, they could not object; they started it. Under what cloud did they start it? Under what kind of management did they start it? What kind of financing plan did they have? How did they plan to raise the money? Those are the questions. Those are the reasons why we cannot say and do as much as we planned to do. And they ought to tell the country that they stood and said, *Look, build. This is going to be built*. And what did he say?

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** It is going to be built! Only if God came down and stopped him [otherwise] it was going to be built. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said.

So, they think that they could do that at \$100 million and this little country with declining revenue could just up and do anything now? Thank God, Madam Speaker, that there are people out there (not the few who call in on that radio show every day, either one). The silent majority are out there is saying something different though. The silent majority is saying something different. They know that if we build a \$100 million school we have to find the money to build it with. And we have to find the money to maintain it and staff it.

The Shetty Hospital, which one of them supported it in the beginning? Which one? Which one? If either one of the three most decent ones over there—they're there now—agreed, they did not say much about it. Look at the *Hansards*. They did not say anything about it. And certainly the Member for North Side objected to high heaven—and he still does—with impunity!

**An Hon. Member:** Oh yeah. Oh yeah.

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** He criticised the man. So, they separated themselves a little bit there.

*[inaudible interjections]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** They objected to the Shetty Hospital. That is if they are supporting today, because you do not know according to what the two of them say.

Madam Speaker, he says that all he sees are plans. Well, some plans must be done. They had plans. I had a plan when I was minister for the airport

in 2001. And we started on it, and I left it there and the person who took it over did not do anything either, except do some more planning. The next one came in, in 2005 and what did he do? He made such a mess, paid \$3 million for architects and got such things up there now that we do not know head from tail and they are trying to move things around. Put you from under the shelter to out into the rain. They had a plan.

Yes, we do have a plan for the airport. Yes, there are several, probably one dozen or more people who wanted to do it. Yes, the last one was the Canadians, and, yes, we are hoping to get underway. But I can tell you this: As I said a few days ago, or yesterday, if they get in tomorrow it is not going to be much difference because they are the ones who put the bureaucracy in place. Now, you have to do everything. The Governor wants you to have every "i" dotted, and the bureaucracy has built up tremendously much more because of the Constitution and this idea called "good governance." Now you have to do things that you did not have to do before. And we might as well tell the people of this country so. Or you will get investigated. Or you will get the Auditor General who will go and write you up and say that you are doing the wrong thing and embarrass you. And, all the headlines and editorials that they will create.

They think that they just created that Constitution and it was all just to say that we have a constitution? Oh no. There are things that we have to do, and that is what is happening at this point in time.

The cruise dock . . . well, I have just said, Madam Speaker. I think the positives of the cruise dock before us in that agreement are a whole lot more than the negatives. And the negatives are much greater under the GLF proposal.

On one, they have told us that there was no value for money process, although we had a committee doing some work. They said there was no independent business case. Now we have KPMG doing that from August. That is some of the delay. Now, since that, we have had the FFR, and the Minister says that these things must be done and it takes time! You think it is just going to be done by waving some magic wand? It takes time! And KPMG is doing that.

I said then, and I say now, that there was no evidence that GLF had or has the funds to do the project, but they wanted us to sign the contract for them to go out and get the funding. I understand that some of the wording that was in the agreement, that that is what they hang on to, to challenge us now. Also, what people did not know is that certain people here [who are] dealing with them had gone and talked to a local company for them (GLF and this local company, a local company, foreign owned) to own the upland development. As I said, the cost of their capital was anywhere between 7.5 and 8.5 per cent for GLF to 8.5, 10.5 or 10 percent for Dart.

Neither one had any dredging equipment that I know of to do the project. The Chinese have their own. That is going to be a lower capital cost.

*[Hon. Cline A. Glidden Jr., Deputy Speaker in the chair]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** Mr. Speaker, look at what we have obtained from the Chinese. We will build that one pier. And the Member for North Side who seems to be a contractor too, says, *no we cannot build it*. They are saying they can build one pier between now, or between March [2012] and March 2013 . . . I don't know who is saying so, but I know I heard you saying so.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* Well, whatever you said, you said they could not build the dock. Anyway, that is what they said. And that is what the contract will have to read.

Mr. Speaker, when they build it will cost this country 1.5 per cent to 3 per cent of capital cost. And you can try to figure out now, even if they went to 40 or 50 years and GLF was at 30 years, figure out the cost if you think the Chinese deal is not saving the country money.

Then, Mr. Speaker, they are going to build Spotts, which we have to do unless they go to South Sound or the North Sound—and it does not seem as though anyone has any appetite for either one of the two. So, where are we going to put the dock? Right where it is now. And where we are going to put the alternate? Right where it is now. But the Chinese are going to improve it, and it is a good plan being drawn by Mr. Danny Owens.

Then they have committed to a cruise facility for Cayman Brac. They will have to do the feasibilities. That is what anyone would do. But they have committed to it. They have committed to putting a cruise dock, pier/ jetty down to the Turtle Farm, which, when the Turtle Farm was built, we built it on that objective that it would have one. And if I can get that done within one year and a half time from now, we can save the country that \$9 million that we are spending. That is what the Chinese have committed to.

The Chinese have also committed (and the contract is reading that way) that we Caymanians can buy in shares into the upland development. We will own that, not just them alone or not just some foreign company, as was being planned. They will give us some scholarships for students also to study engineering or those sorts of things, mechanics, engineering, whatever, in China. These are some of the benefits that I negotiated.

You want to find out why I changed? Those are not the full reasons. There is more to come and this House will know about it and the country will know about it in due course.

I have been criticised, Mr. Speaker (to put it mildly), by the Opposition; both sides of the Opposition—the one for North Side and the official Opposition. One such criticism is that I am inconsistent. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that I said things and had to change my views later, or that I said something and some people never fully got what I said and took it out of whack. But no one can say that I am indecisive. And in the current climate if I have said something about a development and had to change for a better position, then so be it. If we were getting something six months ago and if I can change today and get something better, then should I not make that effort? I think I ought to. It is better for the country. That is what I am doing.

So, the fact that the Third Elected Member for West Bay and I had a difference of opinion . . . that is his opinion. Mine is different and they cannot criticise us on the one hand saying that people here are not doing anything because I want them to do it. That is what the Member for East End . . . and yet they say on the one hand that the Member for West Bay is a good Member because he seems to have challenged me (according to them), if that is what they were saying. Ha, ha, ha. We all have our own minds over here as well. We have our own minds. But some people who would not have any mind would not know that because they cannot see. They do not know any difference.

So, the Member for North Side likes to beat up on people sometimes. And his pet one is me now and the next one is China Harbour. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this Government will do well to get a partner and do it right in China Harbour.

Look at what was on the *Associated Press*. I want to take time to read what it says: **“China wants to convert some of its mountain U.S. government debt into investment in renovating American roads and subways, the commerce minister said Friday.**

**“Speaking to a business group, Chen Deming said China wants closer cooperation with the United States in infrastructure, clean energy and technology.**

**“Such investments would tie China more closely to Western economies and might help defuse fears Beijing will use its \$3.2 trillion in foreign reserves—some \$1.15 trillion of that in Treasury and other U.S. government debt—as a political weapon.**

**“‘We hope to achieve cooperation in the area of infrastructure,’ Chen told members of the American Chamber of Commerce in China.**

“Chen said he was amazed at the high quality of American subways and other infrastructure when he visited 20 years ago but many roads, railways and ports today need renovation.

“China is willing to turn some of our holdings of your debt into investment into the United States, hoping to create jobs for the United States’, he said.

“Also this week the chairman of China’s sovereign wealth fund said it wants to invest in projects to improve British roads and infrastructure. He said that would help to boost feeble global economic growth.

“Beijing is encouraging Chinese companies to investment more abroad to reduce the country’s reliance on exports and investment. It has sent trade and investment delegation to the United States, Europe and elsewhere to look for opportunities.

“Chen said Beijing wants to see Chinese and U.S. companies cooperate more closely on clean energy, environmental and energy-saving technology, information technology biotechnology, pharmaceuticals and medical devices.

“The minister acknowledged disagreements between Beijing and Washington over global talks, trade in environmental technology and other areas but said the two governments had more areas of common interest.

“Chen repeated Beijing’s longstanding appeal to Washington to relax restrictions and exports of ‘dual use’ technologies with possible weapons applications.

“We hope Chinese-U.S. trades will continue to grow and the imbalance will shrink. But that takes both of us to achieve’, he said.

“China’s economic growth should be above 9 percent next year despite “difficulties and obstacles” in the global economy that are battering consumer demand,’ Chen said. He noted that china also faces domestic problems, including inflation.

“Beijing eased lending curbs this week in an effort to spur business growth, reversing course after spending the past two years trying to cool an overheated economy with interest rates hikes and investment controls.

“I can assure you the Chinese economy will have a slight slowdown, but nonetheless, it will enjoy stable and sound development,’ Chen said.”

That’s in the *Associated Press*.

And so the Member for North side went about poking fun at the efforts of the Chamber of Commerce in going to see China Harbour’s work, and said that it is a Chinese Chamber of Commerce. I hope that they learned some lessons. I hope that they are prepared to look at new ways and means of getting business in

this country. China Harbour is one such company. And I believe that we are going to have a good dock facility.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, once again speaks out of both corners of their mouth. They lament the fact that we do not yet have a cruise berthing facility, yet they opposed the building of it in 2003/04. And when I signed for one such cruise facility to be built by a US firm in 2003, they objected to that. I am sure that the First Elected Member for George Town remembers. And then I made an agreement for one to be built by Misener and they scrapped that after May 2005. So, two chances that were signed got thrown out of the window by the Opposition at the time.

Then there was a big hullabaloo. I hear the criticism about the absence now of all the cruise visitors. Not enough now they say. *Humph!* Here, Mr. Tibbetts, The First [Elected] Member for George Town, said on the issue of sustainability, talking about a tourism report: “. . . the report confirms what has been widely believed that, as the number of cruise ship visitors has skyrocketed, the number of stay over visitors has correspondingly diminished.”

Then he went on: “Such large volumes of relatively low-spending visitors are seen as deterrent to stay over visitors, as well as cruise ship visitors, themselves, seriously diminishing the quality of the experience in George Town and at the key attractions, for example, Stingray City. It is also seen as a major contributor in congestion and the reduction of the quality of life for those of us who actually live here” [2004/5 *Official Hansard Report*, page 22]

He went on you know. That was on the 7<sup>th</sup> July 2004. But first, he had said in 2003 and I quote him: “Indeed, judging from what has been said by the Honourable Third Official Member and the Leader of Government Business, the Government seems intent on a course of action to encourage even more cruise ship visitors. The Government is supporting and promoting another cruise ship facility in your district, Mr. Speaker, and again we wonder with all of the additional numbers, are we really going to get further ahead in that sector or is the price going to be much more than we would wish for it to be.”

He said: “We are developing a product but the growing question is—and has been floating around for a long time, but it is really hitting home to many people now—for whom are we developing the product?” [2003/4 *Official Hansard Report*, page 295]

You see, Mr. Speaker, that was the byword then—“Who are we developing for?” They didn’t want cruise ships. They didn’t want people. Now they come here with their crocodile tears.

No wonder the Leader of the Opposition has gone out of the room.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** *[Addressing inaudible interjection]* You wouldn't know what it is. You would not know.

That was Thursday, 19<sup>th</sup> June 2003, which I just read. The first one read was for Wednesday, 7<sup>th</sup> July 2004.

Then they said on the 12<sup>th</sup> of May 2004: **“More importantly, in the long term, the unconstrained growth in the number of cruise ship visitors will simple strangle the tourism industry as the built and environmental infrastructure is overwhelmed by the sheer number of bodies that are forced upon them.**

**“It is for this reason that the report recommended Government limit the number of cruise ship visitors to 9,200 or four ships per day.”** [Ibid, page 1529]

How much we are getting now? Just about 1.5 million?

*[No audible reply]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** Just about 1.5 million. And they are saying now, though—now, in 2011—they are cursing us, complaining about us saying all manner of evil about us, that we are hurting people because we are not getting enough cruise ship passengers.

Would to God that the Leader of the Opposition would stop and believe for just a little while—mind you, just a little bit—that there are people who have commonsense and a good memory, and that there were people who flogged them out of office because of their inconsistencies.

On the one hand, berating us out there for doing it back in 2003/04, when I was hell bent on getting something done for the country. And now the very same people using the very same subject to come back and criticize me now—ha, ha, ha! They think we are fool-fool, but we nah so fool-fool, you hear?

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* No, no, I am not speaking out of two sides of my mouth. I'm being very, very straight. And what I am saying . . . Yeah, your leader, you can tell him when he comes back. Yes, you tell him that he is speaking out of both corners of his mouth!

*[pause]*

*[Hon. Mary J. Lawrence, Speaker, in the Chair]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** Madam Speaker, they have the luxury . . . and this is the

worst time to be in Government, when things are bad, the way they are bad around the world and here and hurting our people.

They have that luxury now to come back and do the same thing that they did in 2001 to 2005, where they complained about everything under the sun, where every project was made to look bad, where everybody was supposed to be a criminal, where nobody must come into the country, where nobody must do anything. Well how we are going to get anything done?

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* I'm trying though, BoBo. And I'm getting some things done. But they have the luxury of criticising the Government for things that they could have done that they helped stopped from 2001 to 2005. And then they took up in 2005 and 2009 and got nothing done!

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** *[Addressing inaudible interjection]* You were part and parcel of it. Very much big up in it.

So, Madam Speaker, I think that remarks by the Leader of the Opposition . . . he spent a considerable portion of his contribution questioning the credibility of the figures in the SPS and attacking the credibility of the Financial Secretary. This is not the first time he has done that. But let me demonstrate in very simple terms how his credibility is questionable and how he is being economical with the truth.

When the Leader of the Opposition rose to his feet, he said that members of the press were not in the Legislative Assembly and something needed to be done about such a deplorable situation. Approximately two hours later, when he finished speaking, Madam Speaker rose to her feet and found it necessary to correct the Leader of the Opposition, in a firm and dignified way, because she pointed out that the press were indeed in the Legislative Assembly.

They are here. They are not upstairs but they are here. So much so that he went out to do an interview with one of them. He is their blue eyed baby today!

*[laughter]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** I don't know if it will be that he gets on this side of the House. But that is an example of his own credibility.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and most, not all, of the Opposition would have the country believe that their administration was misled in their last year by the Financial Secretary. I

know that that . . . I don't know what went on at the Glass House, because let me tell you, I heard them talking about there is no news out today and they can't get this and they can't get that.

But if you think that I had an easy time getting information when I was over there, where the country could not know what was going on, only the little bits of drips and drabs there when they would go on their so-called television show. Nobody knew what was going on. I didn't know what was going on there but I listened here when they came.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition expects sensible and knowledgeable people to believe that the Financial Secretary could develop a Budget and a forecast all by himself? And that their Cabinet did not have their hand in shaping that Budget and those forecasts? You mean to tell me that the Leader of the Opposition really believes that people are going to believe him? In this day and age?

They had everything. They had even come here and said, *This is our Budget*. It's in the *Hansard*. This is not the budget of the Financial Secretary. Our budget! The Member for East End was of the biggest and the loudest on shouting that.

Now, all of the documents that he spoke about had to pass through Cabinet before coming to the Legislative Assembly. So, were the Ministers in the last Government asleep when that happened?

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** Well, he will have to question the Financial Secretary. And he cannot answer because he is not a Member of this House. I have to answer for him at this point in time.

I know some of the games people play. I am 56; I am not 16 anymore.

Did they have a hand in shaping a certain desirable result that is a deficit that they thought would be acceptable to the electorate before the May 2009 Election? And when it went wrong they said it was the Financial Secretary. Now that part I know. That is what you all did. You had the deficit and you did not want us to know. We didn't know that there was any deficit! We did not know when I was Leader of the Opposition. Not a word was said!

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* I know the truth. I was there leading the Opposition, Madam Speaker.

Not a word was said. I believe the questions are still unanswered as to what the deficit was or what the Government's true position was financially. It is precisely the same situation.

What I hear them saying now, Madam Speaker, reminds me of what the late Mr. Jefferson said in

1990. When he came here with a budget he said, "Madam Speaker, the Government has given me this speech to read." He was the Financial Secretary. And what are they saying now? That was the Financial Secretary's speech, but it wasn't theirs. I do not believe that.

The Opposition must accept that they messed up, not because of the Financial Secretary, because it was that same Financial Secretary who they did not have any problems with when they were there for the first two or three years, when they said they were producing surpluses on the back of hurricane Ivan's recovery of these Islands. They remember that? Oh, you do not remember that?

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition used *Hansard* extensively to demonstrate his points—twisted them; that is what he did. So, let me remind him of what the *Hansard* says in respect of a statement made by the Financial Secretary.

He said: "**I wish to turn to the 9 February 2009 forecast—the 2<sup>nd</sup> Forecast Financial Results and Position to 30 June 2009—and to speak briefly to the reason why the Government was forced to take a Supplementary Budget to the Legislative Assembly.**

**"On 9 February 2009, the Portfolio of Finance & Economics prepared a 2<sup>nd</sup> Forecast Financial Results and Forecast Position in respect of the year to 30 June 2009. The Forecast Financial Results and Position showed that operating revenue was projected to decline by CI\$40 million, from an original budget of CI\$528 million to a revised figure of CI\$488 million for revenues. In that Forecast, operating expenses were expected to increase by CI\$41 million, from an original budget of CI\$515 million to a new figure of CI\$556 million."**

**The forecast done on the 9 February 2009 . . ." (when the Opposition was still the Government) ". . . predicted an operating deficit for the year to 30 June 2009 of CI\$688 million. This CI\$68 million forecast deficit for the year—done as of the 9 February 2009—was made known to Ministers and Official Members of the Cabinet."** [2009/10 *Official Hansard Report*, page 53]

So, do not say that he did not tell you.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** *[Addressing inaudible interjection]* Well, if you are agreeing then you are disagreeing with your leader!

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** I am talking about the one we have here! So, if you disagree or you agree, then, you are disagreeing with your leader

who said something else this morning! And I am saying the FS is not here to defend himself. But he has had to defend it in Cabinet and there are other Official Members who are in Cabinet still.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** I am the Minister of Finance—

**The Speaker:** Across the—

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** —Madam Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Please, through the Chair.

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** I am the Minister of Finance and all of these things have to be verified. And I can only go by paper that is put in front of me with dates on it.

I am not saying . . . Madam Speaker, I was not there. I don't know. But I know what paper I have seen.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** *[Addressing inaudible interjection]* Now you know I cannot accept every paper that comes in front of me.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knows how to twist things. As I said earlier, Madam Speaker, it is funny how the Opposition speaks out of both corners of their mouths; they lament facts, and the same projects that they are opposing, they are now trying to say that they support them. Why? They have got to stop twisting things, Madam Speaker, and trying to play with the minds of people. That is their problem.

They know that we have put the projects on the table. I have talked about these projects from the day we started and before, as a Government. They know some of the reasons why we cannot get some of them started. But I will tell the world this; they will get started and it will be for the betterment of the people of these Islands.

Now, my job, and the big problem, is trying to get it done now while people are hurting, while people are losing their homes, can't pay their bills. And we have to let the powers that be understand that! But as I said, you go and try to do something and then you get investigated; you get the Auditor General saying that you are not doing the right things. And the Opposition gets up and says that he is a good fellow! They join hands with him because he is criticising the Premier/Minister of Finance. They do not care, Madam Speaker! As I said, remember, "Ride the back of the

tiger, reap the whirlwind." You know what that means? You find yourself in his belly.

Today is me, tomorrow it could be you. The systems that have been produced are blocking this country right now. That's what—systems! You all wanted it. It was the best thing in the world to happen. You wanted a new constitution. You wanted these commissions, and you wanted this good governance. No more peace order. They can get out and march on the street and kill one another, it does not seem to matter. Good governance! Peace and order no more! The words are "good governance."

I said in London that there is no use, and there will never be good governance if we do not have peace and order. If we do not put our people to work, if we do not help them save their homes, if they cannot send their children to school properly we will not have peace and order. I ain't afraid of saying those kinds of things. I have been here seven terms and if I cannot say that now I will never be able to. I am not afraid of anyone and their vote. That's why . . . and they are talking about taking hard decisions? Why do they think there is all the hype against me today? Because I have taken hard decisions; that's why! You think it is because they are just doing that so? No.

It was this McKeeva Bush who chased one commissioner out of this country. It was me who took the governor out of that Chair. It was me who took Ballantyne out! Yes, it was me who took him to court of first instance, and won! I got nothing to be scared of, and still not scared, I say when your hands are clean and your heart is pure, regardless of how it looks and what people will say, it will come out. It is going to come out and then I have nothing to worry about. When your hands are clean and your heart is pure.

So, let them go ahead. But I will tell the Opposition when I hear them carrying on, on the radio . . . they will come in here and say one thing but what I hear them on the radio with and what the people are hearing them with is a different story. They are not giving the Government any support. I heard the Member for East End shouting to the top of his voice—*shouting to the top of his voice*—how he is supporting us. *Aren't you ashamed of yourself? [Addressing the Member for East End].*

Support? Yeah they are supporting us all right. They are helping to carry this country down with the forces out there that are doing it! They are trying to slap us in the face every which way and you are encouraging them and helping them and scheming with them! That is what the Opposition is doing. They love it. As I said, today it is the blue eyed baby. Election seems more important to them.

And so, Madam Speaker, let me say that I am satisfied that the Government is trying to do the right things. It is difficult for new order, and some of it I accept, because at the end of the day the English are

right about how much we can spend and how much we can borrow and shouldn't borrow. The English are right about that because we know that about our homes. You can only spend what you make. And when you go overboard, then you get into trouble.

Look around us—look at Greece, Portugal. We do not have to go that far. The United States, as I said the other day, as big as it is, there was never a day we thought that it would be downgraded. They are, though. Never a day did we think so. And probably . . . I hear Mr. Obama himself saying that he is having the same problems; investors who are approved for projects and won't start to build. You cannot force businessmen to spend you know. And, the more upheaval in a country, the less appetite that people have for doing things. They shrink and pull back and say, *Is what they are saying true?*

And let me tell you, some of the outlandish things that are being said. They even want to object and stand outside (they are not coming inside the House) because McKeeva is in the House. I see them in the House, though. They are not hurting me, Madam Speaker. They are hurting this country. And it does not seem as though they have a care in the world about it.

The Member for North Side made the point that Table 3 in the SPS generally shares increasing operating expenses, which contrasts with Government's Fiscal Strategy No. 1, in controlling government expenditure. Madam Speaker, I said in my initial contribution to the Motion that all public sector agencies will have to curtail in a cost increase to keep them to a bare minimum. I did not say that there would no increases at all. There will be some. It is unreasonable for the Government to show constant or decreasing expenditure when we know that there will be some inflation in the economy. Inflation will cause expenditures to show higher amounts.

I said in my initial contribution to the Government Motion that the movement of operating expenditure in Table 3 represents a modest 1 per cent annual growth.

#### **Moment of interruption—4.30 pm**

**The Speaker:** Excuse me, Honourable Premier. We need a motion to continue after the hour of 4.30.

#### **Suspension of Standing Order 10(2)**

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** Madam Speaker, I propose that we suspend Standing Order 10(2) to allow the House to sit after the hour of 4.30 pm.

**The Speaker:** The question is that Standing Order 10(2) be suspended to allow the House to continue

after the hour of 4.30. All those in favour, please say Aye. Those against, No.

**Ayes and one audible No.**

**The Speaker:** The Ayes have it.

**Agreed: Standing Order 10(2) suspended.**

**The Speaker:** Honourable Premier.

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Member for North Side also questioned operating expenditures in respect of the current year, which have grown from approximately \$490 million to \$511 million shown in Table 3. That movement, Madam Speaker, is explained by the fact that since the start of this fiscal year the Government has had to incur additional or supplementary expenditure to deal with matters such as crime fighting. And they know that—because, we sat here a whole day and debated that Motion!

Why is he now questioning it when he knows that we asked for that expenditure? He knows that we voted to spend the money. He knows that every Member in this House spoke on that debate. Now they are going to make it look as though McKeeva is doing something wrong and think people are fool-fool enough to buy it.

Madam Speaker, the movement in operating revenues was also questioned. Members were obviously not listening to my initial contribution because I clearly said that the movement in revenues shown in Table 3 is entirely consistent with the expected annual growth in the economy and nothing more. And I repeat, Madam Speaker. The revenue figures are entirely consistent with economic growth expectations.

Madam Speaker, the Opposition said that all I had were plans. Where are their plans? Where are the alternatives?

**Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition:** We want some action.

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** [*Addressing inaudible interjection*] He wants some action, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition . . . well, as I said, if we left with \$10 and nowhere to get anything else, how much do you think we are going to be able to spend? One hundred? The Member will get action. I hope that he will appreciate it.

I hope he will back me when I have to take some steps to push things forward, rather than criticising me, Madam Speaker; rather than getting out there and telling people that I am doing the wrong thing to get people employed. I hope that he is going to say

that the Leader of Government (or whatever he wants to call me) is doing the right thing.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** *[Addressing inaudible interjection]* *Humph!* You didn't do any better.

Madam Speaker, sometimes I am amazed, you know, at that Member who complained about unemployment and going down, because it seems to me that the work permits today are lower on my side of the fence, or since my watch, than when he was there. How much was it? Twenty-six thousand?

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** And they say we are not doing anything.

They are down! In a country which has to depend on services, I would think that that is pretty good, trying to hold it down that much. We cannot kill business altogether. What we must do is increase business that will employ people. And that is what he and his cohorts are trying very hard to stop. They say that we must have plans. I ask them, where are their plans? Where are their plans? Show us.

The Member for East End says, *Where is the beef?* Well, he would not know much about it unless he ate it. But where are their plans? Tell the country their alternative. Don't come with the same old tired excuses. Don't come with the same lamebrain things about they now support this.

They did not support Dart's dock, they did not support GLF dock, they did not support the Chinese with the dock, they did not support the Shetty Hospital, they do not support the Special Economic Zone, they do not support any of those things. The only thing they see is the finishing of the schools and they support that. They have to. But they did not leave any money to do anything with. No funds, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, immediately upon taking office the Government recognised that not only was the state of finances in the Public Sector in a state of deficit position and burdened with a large debt, but also that a large number of our people were unemployed and struggling to make ends meet. Madam Speaker, the situation called for my Government to take immediate action; action which dealt with the issue in the short, medium and long term.

So, where we have put in place changes to our immigration policies, that will undoubtedly, if promoted and managed correctly, bring about positive long-term economic benefits to the people of this country. And where the projects that we have been working diligently to see brought to fruition will have tremendous benefits in the medium and long term, we

had, Madam Speaker, and continue to put in place short-term measures that will bring about assistance in the immediate future.

One such measure, as small as it is, Madam Speaker, has been the Island wide clean-up referred to as the PRIDE clean-up. The PRIDE clean-up has been nothing less than 700 to 800 Caymanians employed across all three Islands. Many of our people, Madam Speaker, have looked on and commended this programme, both for its effectiveness in providing employment for those who need it, and for the economic stimulation it helps to create. People marveled, Madam Speaker, at what was done at that time. And so, Madam Speaker, we are going to have to do that again.

We are going to have to employ people—I don't know if it will be that many people, Madam Speaker, but you can believe that it will be several hundred people employed. And the Fourth Elected Member for George Town and the Third Elected Member for Bodden Town both worked hard in that last time. And I think the Fourth Elected Member for West Bay also put that in place. And we are going to start that process with those Members leading it. I think work will begin around the 12<sup>th</sup>. That is for two weeks in December; the PRIDE clean-up.

Mr. Solomon, the Fourth Elected Member for George Town, and the Third Elected Member for Bodden Town, and the Fourth Elected Member for West Bay will lead it and get it going. I want to thank them for it.

Madam Speaker, I am a hopeful man. They criticise me about having some hope, and I carry that hopefulness prayerfully into my public life. I even sustained the hope each time we sat in this Chamber despite repeated disappointments, that the debate contribution by the Opposition will genuinely challenge my thinking and the thinking of this Government. They have disappointed the public yet again. I will remind them of the final words of my presentation earlier today, words that represent our objectives in this Strategic Policy Statement. And I will follow that by saying a bit more about the need for a development model for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

I concluded my earlier statement with these words, and I quote: **"I have also presented my vision for the future, one that is filled with hope and promise, but one which clearly indicates that the Government, the wider public sector and the private sector need to act in an effective partnership to better our present economic and financial position. We must take action and do it in a harmonised way. Under the grace of our good Lord to better our Island's economy and to ensure that Cayman continues to be a most desirable place to live and move and have our being."**

In my presentation, Madam Speaker, I made several references to the need for substantive change

in our development model, and the way we do business. I made reference to Government acting as the sole or primary provider of services; services that the public often pays little for in the way of fees. I made the point that all public entities would be expected to comply with the FFR borrowing ratios and must therefore consult with central government on such matters.

I gave a strong reminder that we are operating in the real world, in real time. There is point to all of this, Madam Speaker. These observations need to be further reinforced. Let me add that the Framework for Fiscal Responsibility—bitter pill though it may be—is representative of the kind of hard necessity that compels us to be inventive. It critically focuses us on the acute need to work effectively across all ministries and to plan and work as one government. It gives new urgency to the need to resolve the longstanding issue of the scope of independence of public entities, as compared with the sovereignty of Cabinet in the area of peace, order and good governance.

We also find it urgent to be inventive, and in that regard there is an attraction to expanding the scope of private/public partnerships, including encouragement of social enterprise investment and broader and deeper engagement with the private sector around the expansion of the concept of corporate citizenship. They know, and we know, that there is much giving in Cayman. They know, and we know, that in other jurisdictions corporations may have whole divisions devoted to managing this aspect of their corporate life. There is a good deal for us to explore here, Madam Speaker.

The private sector also knows how resolutely I have rejected the idea of direct taxation; how strongly I have defended the Cayman model. Everybody knows how outspoken I have been, how outspoken I have been about rising expectations and about how unrealistic people are sometimes.

Madam Speaker, the Opposition queried a word in the Framework for Fiscal Responsibility about our realigning. How can they even question that, when earlier, they moved a censure motion saying that I was not putting in place the [Miller/]Shaw Report? And what did the [Miller/]Shaw Report say, Madam Speaker? It talked about us getting new revenue at a new revenue base, not income tax. I went to London and I told the Minister, *I ain't for it, I ain't doing it*—income or property or payroll taxes. And they still come.

Listen, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition must be speaking tongue-in-cheek—and it must be very, very swollen too!

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** *[Addressing inaudible interjection]* I wish I could keep you a bit longer.

Madam Speaker, you see that is the *modus operandi* of the Opposition. They have to confuse the issue because they can't beat us at debate. They have no ideas, so what are they going to do but twist things to try to win their case. The Member out there is some kind of lawyer. He knows that is what he is doing.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** He knows that is what he is doing. He is twisting the truth, the facts, to try to get a case. He really does not have a case. And the jury, when they come back in, will find them in the balance wanting.

We are growing, Madam Speaker. We are competing with the best—these Islands. We unquestionably want what is best for our people as a Government. That might not lead to abandoning our model but we may need to trade in for an updated version.

Public/private partnership, social enterprise investments enhance corporate citizenship. These are fruitful avenues to explore that may be of real benefit to us in the evolution of a development model for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

There are other areas, for instance, less developed sectors like agriculture and fisheries that have on real terms declined over the past half century. Now global trends, Madam Speaker, tell us that food security will be ignored at our peril. And here we are with opportunities to work more creatively between the producing farmers and fishermen and the merchants, large and small; the hotels and restaurants, from the backyard gardener to the commercial producer. All may strengthen our performance in food security. And I was very pleased to see a national workshop on this issue just two weeks ago. The Deputy Premier has this subject as a priority, and rightly so, and the Government is behind her, Madam Speaker.

Not only are there positive balance of payments and business and employment opportunities to be explored in that particular sector, but availability of fresh and low additive foods is also the [way] to go for a healthier population.

And this will be my parting comment, Madam Speaker, because I want to end by stressing that while institutions public and private can do their part and they have a great deal of impact in a democracy, the action of the individual is not to be underestimated. I therefore urge the population of the Cayman Islands at large to reflect on and pray about all of what is being said here today, not as a people who have no hope.

Let the Opposition . . . let them die in their mess if that is what they want. If they do not have any hope, I am just sorry for them. I have tremendous hope that things are going to improve! And they

should have that, Madam Speaker, at least the audacity to hope.

No, we have great hope; not as a people who have no hope, but as a people of faith and good commonsense! Be alert, I say to my people, to how you can participate in making the change to a new development model for Cayman, be alert first and foremost to the amount of power you have to improve your own life and wellbeing.

It is a positively staggering reality that so many millions of dollars are spent each year from the public purse and the amount has been steadily increasing on treating what are called chronic non-communicable diseases (or NCDs). This literally means that millions of dollars of public expenditures could be saved eventually if our population would progressively undertake simple lifestyle changes, Madam Speaker. I am aware that this is not a simple "one for one." But public health authorities across the Western world have been urging these changes for decades as they have watched the situation worsen to reach epidemic proportions. We are at or nearing this point in the Islands, as I understand, and we need to act.

So, our 21<sup>st</sup> century development model, Madam Speaker, must stress nimbleness, must stress creativity, must stress imagination, and must stress initiative. We must have self-reliance. It must stress proper planning, and it must stress coordinated action.

As I said before, Madam Speaker, our ability in Cayman is proven. It is proven back from the days of wooden ships and iron men and women. And it is time to adapt and apply to match our 21<sup>st</sup> century realities. I said yesterday that from that little small shop in Cayman Brac, the late Captain Charlie Kirkconnell became the biggest conglomerate here; from a little mess man to a master mariner, taking ships across these wide oceans; from little boys to big time lawyers in our country, big time accountants in our country, doctors.

I remember Dr. Steve working with his father in construction when he came home from school. Look, now, at the Chrissie Tomlinson Memorial Hospital. This country had possibility in the past and I have tremendous hope, as I said about the festival song in Jamaica: "Nuh Weh Nuh Better Than Yard." Nowhere!

We have the possibility. Let us not kill the country by being so negative. If you want to write petitions, fine; but for God's sake tell the truth about things. Tell the truth! That is what will make us free.

So, Madam Speaker, I am proud of where we are. I am hurt by what I see sometimes happening, but I am proud that we have come so far and we are not about to give up. This Government has the ability. We have the plans and we are going to get the work done. And if you think not, just watch us in the next several weeks. Those who say 'do something,' I hope that when it is done they are going to say 'thank you,' or at least they will say that they got it done. Even if

they say whatever else they want to say, I hope that I do not see you petitioning to stop it.

*[inaudible interjection]*

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** *[Addressing inaudible interjection]* You look at him.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for your indulgence. I want to thank Members for theirs; those who spoke, those who did not. This Strategic Policy Statement is fair, is the best that we could at this time, and our people will be better off when it is implemented.

I thank you, Madam Speaker, and I say in closing, yes, a thrill of hope. "**A thrill of hope the weary world rejoices, for yonder breaks a new and glorious morn.**" Yes, it is time and we can do it.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The question is: BE IT NOW THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly approves the policy priorities, aggregate financial targets and financial allocations set out in the 2012/13 Strategic Policy Statement as the indicative parameters on which the 2012/13 Budget is to be formulated.

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

**Ayes and one audible abstention.**

**The Speaker:** The Ayes have it.

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush:** Can we have a division then, Madam Speaker?

**The Clerk Assistant:**

**Division No. 22–2011/12**

**Ayes: 8**

Hon. W. McKeever Bush  
Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Connolly  
Hon. Michael T. Adam  
Hon. J. Mark P. Scotland  
Hon. Cline A. Glidden, Jr.  
Capt. A. Eugene Ebanks  
Mr. Ellio A. Solomon  
Mr. Dwayne S. Seymour

**Noes: 1**

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr.

**Abstentions: 3**

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell  
Mr. V. Arden McLean  
Mr. D. Ezzard Miller

**Absentees: 3**

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin  
Mr. D. Kurt Tibbetts  
Mr. Anthony S. Eden

**The Speaker:** The result of the division is: 8 Ayes, 1 No, 3 Abstentions and 3 Absentees.

**Agreed by majority on division: Government Motion No. 4/2011-12 passed.**

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Speaker:** Can we have a motion for adjournment please?

**The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we are going to adjourn this honourable House until 10.00 am on Monday. And we will be working late Monday. We have several Bills and motions that we are trying to get through. I can say a timetable is set for . . . Monday we will meet, and after that the final session, I hope, would be for the 14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, and 16<sup>th</sup> if we need those three days.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The question is that this honourable House do now adjourn until 10.00 am on Monday. All those in favour, please say Aye. Those against, No.

**Ayes.**

**The Speaker:** The Ayes have it.

Before I call the final vote on this, I would like to extend my thanks to Miss Nana Bothwell. We are desperately short of staff in this Parliament and she stepped up to the plate to fill in for us. I do appreciate it.

The House is accordingly adjourned until 10.00 am on Monday.

**At 4.58 pm the House stood adjourned until 10.00 am, Monday, 5 December 2011.**

