

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
STATE OPENING AND BUDGET MEETING
2011/12 SESSION
WEDNESDAY
7 SEPTEMBER 2011
10.30 AM
Ninth Sitting**

The Speaker: I will call on the Honourable Deputy Premier [the Honourable Minister of District Administration, Works, Lands and Agriculture] to say prayers this morning.

PRAYERS

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Conolly: 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

Apology

The Speaker: I have only one message. The Member for East End has a family crisis with his mother and he

has to leave the Island today with her. Please keep them in your prayers. She is very ill.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND OF REPORTS

Public Service Pensions Board 2007–2008 Annual Report

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

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

Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Annual Report of the Public Service Pensions Board 2007–2008.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: No.

Annual Reports for Ministry of Communications, Works and Infrastructure for years ended June 30, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009

The Speaker: Honourable Deputy Premier.

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Conolly: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Annual Reports for the former Administration known then as the Ministry of Communications, Works and Infrastructure, [for the years ended] 30 June 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 comprising the entire tenure of the former Administration.

The Speaker: Thank you Honourable Deputy Premier.

There is an error in the Order Paper that it was to be laid on the Table by the Minister of Community Affairs, Gender and Housing. Please correct it on your Order Papers.

So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Conolly: No, Madam Speaker, only to say that I am extremely delighted and relieved that my Ministry can now begin the reports for this Administration having [been] usurped [for] the last two years trying to prepare the former four years of reports, which we gladly lay on the Table this morning.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Deputy Premier.

Annual Reports of Judicial Administration for 2004/5, 2005/6, 2006/7, 2007/8, 2008/9

The Speaker: Honourable Second Official Member.

Hon. Samuel W. Bulgin, Second Official Member: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, with your leave, I beg to lay on the Table of this House the Annual Reports for the Judicial Administration for the period 2004/05, 2005/06, 2006/07, 2007/08, and 2008/09 Financial Years.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

Hon. Samuel W. Bulgin: No, Madam Speaker.

Annual Reports for Portfolio of Legal Affairs year ended 30 June 2010, and 2008/9, 2007/8, 2006/7, 2005/6 and 2004/5 Financial Years

The Speaker: Honourable Second Official Member.

Hon. Samuel W. Bulgin: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, with your leave I beg to lay on the Table of this House the Annual Reports for the Portfolio of Legal Affairs for the Years ended 2004/05, 2005/06, 2006/07, 2007/08, 2008/09, and for the Year ended 30 June 2010.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

[No audible reply]

Ownership Agreement Annual Report for Cayman Islands Health Services Authority for 2007/8 Financial Year

The Speaker: Honourable Minister responsible for Health, Environment, Youth, Sports and Culture.

Hon. J. Mark P. Scotland, Minister of Health, Environment, Youth, Sports and Culture: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am pleased today to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Ownership Agreement Annual Report for the Cayman Islands Health Services Authority for the 2007/08 Financial year.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

[No audible reply]

The Speaker: No?

Ownership Agreement Annual Report for Cayman Islands Health Services Authority for 2008/9 Financial Year

The Speaker: Honourable Minister of Health, Environment, Youth, Sports and Culture.

Hon. J. Mark P. Scotland: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Ownership Agreement Annual Report for the Cayman Islands Health Services Authority for the 2008/09 Financial year.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

Hon. J. Mark P. Scotland: No, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Cayman Islands' Annual Economic Report 2010

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Cayman Islands' Annual Economic Report 2010.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Premier wish to speak thereon?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yes, Madam Speaker, I do.

Madam Speaker, the Annual Economic Report is a comprehensive report on the state of the domestic economy based on data and other economic information for the year 2010 as collected by the Economic and Statistics Office as of the 30 April 2011.

It also includes an overview of the global economic environment based mainly on published up-

dates on the International Monetary Fund and the World Tourism Organization as of the same cutoff date (30 April 2011).

Madam Speaker, the Annual Economic Report 2011 contains an Executive Summary and a Summary Indicators sheet which are intended for easy reference of the key economic developments during the year.

In my brief introduction today, I aim to present a background of the international and regional economic environment of the Cayman Islands in 2010, as compared to 2009. I will proceed to summarise our own domestic performance in 2010 as compared to 2009, and will conclude with the economic outlook for the year 2011.

In the international and regional economic environment, Madam Speaker, the Cayman Islands' economic performance in 2010 was recorded against the backdrop of a strong global recovery, albeit at varying degrees of growth across regions. The global economy grew by 5 per cent in 2010 compared to 3 per cent in 2009.

The advanced economies which provide most of the demand for our financial and tourism services recovered and grew by 3 per cent in 2010 following a contraction of 3.4 per cent in 2009. The US rebounded by 2.8 per cent as financial conditions improved to support private demand.

In 2010 the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the Caribbean region improved to 3.4 per cent compared to 0.4 per cent in 2009, mainly due to strong growth in the Dominican Republic, Surinam and Guyana. However, growth in most of the English speaking Caribbean economies remained subdued. Jamaica and St. Vincent and the Grenadines recorded their third year of economic contraction.

Madam Speaker, consumer prices among the advanced economies, and the United States in particular, increased at an average rate of 1.6 per cent as demand of households for goods and services recovered, while commodity prices, particularly food and energy, rose in the international market.

Global tourism flourished in 2010. International tourist arrivals rebounded by 6.7 per cent or 58 million when compared to 2009. The Caribbean region had a mixed performance with some of the destinations recording strong growth in stay-over arrivals, such as Anguilla at 10.7 per cent, Cuba 4.2 per cent, Guyana 6.3 per cent, and St. Lucia 9.9 per cent.

The domestic economy, Madam Speaker, (turning now to the Cayman Islands), our economic output contracted in 2010 as the global downturn of previous years affected us for the third consecutive year. Madam Speaker, it is usually said that when the United States sneezes other countries catch a cold. This is exactly the case for our country as we depend on North America for the majority of our tourism and financial services; our strongest trading partner by far on all fronts.

In 2010, our economic output declined by 4 per cent compared to a larger contraction of 7 per cent in 2009. As a result our per capita income, or average Gross Domestic Product in 2010, fell marginally. We were better off according to these statistics.

Consumer prices in 2010 were generally stable, although there were a number of goods and services that showed higher average prices. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) increased by 0.3 per cent in 2010 as compared to 1.5 per cent in the preceding year.

Higher international prices for food and oil and petroleum products impacted our economy in 2010. Madam Speaker, just in Cayman Brac this weekend we had complaints about the high prices of goods in that Island, which I believe, and have promised, that we should have a survey on prices in the Sister Islands. But food, which accounts for approximately 8 per cent of household expenses, went up by 3 per cent. Electricity prices increased sharply as international oil prices increased by 21.6 per cent during the year. Higher fuel prices also pushed the average transport prices by 8.1 per cent. These increases were offset by continuing declines in the average price of housing.

Madam Speaker, I will next present highlights of the economic performance of our major sectors before I present an overview of the labour force indicators and the fiscal sector.

Overall, the financial services industry recorded mixed performances. Mutual funds declined marginally by 0.9 per cent compared to a decline of 3.5 per cent the previous year in 2009. Insurance licences contracted by 5 per cent while bank and trust continued on a downward trajectory, this time by 7.9 per cent as mergers and acquisitions continued. New companies registration rebounded by 3.7 per cent while new partnerships restrictions or registrations grew by 19.9 per cent.

Madam Speaker, the tourism sector staged a strong rebound in 2010. Total visitor arrivals stood at \$1,886,110 in 2010; a 5.2 per cent increase compared to the performance in 2009 when total arrivals declined by 3.4 per cent. In 2010, air arrivals accounted for 288,272 visitors, a jump of 6.0 per cent while cruise arrivals reached 1,597,838 visitors, 5.1 per cent lower than the previous year.

In construction, building permits declined on account of a strong fall-off in demand for residential buildings, which may be attributed to a lack of expectation in population growth. Similarly, activity in the real estate sector continued to be hit by low demand associated with the lower population level.

In the utilities sector, demand for electricity fell by 1.3 per cent, while demand for water fell by 2.1 per cent compared to 2009.

In 2010, the supply of labour, based on the preliminary estimated for the 2010 Housing and Popu-

lation Census, fell by 0.7 percent, and stood at 35,859.

Total employment in 2010 reached 33,463, which was 1 percent lower than in 2009. Consequently, the unemployment rate increased to 6.7 percent in 2010 from 6 percent in the preceding year. The decline in employment was also shown by the decrease in the number of work permits which stood at 20,452.

Madam Speaker, despite the economic challenges during the past year, the overall fiscal performance improved in 2010 as a result of our twin strategy of revenue growth and expenditure reduction.

Total revenue grew by 9.6 percent to reach \$515.8 million; this is associated with increases in revenue from international trade and transactions, and domestic goods and services.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, our modest achievement in improving our fiscal performance in 2010 shows our determination to support the private sector in leading the domestic economy to better times amidst renewed uncertainties in the economic prospects of the US and other advanced economies in 2011.

With the help of God, economic activity in the Cayman Islands is expected to turn around in 2011. GDP is projected to expand by 0.9 percent, as financial services is seen to bottom-out coupled with another year of growth in the tourism sector. Domestic demand is also expected to pick up in the construction sector along with support services for a series of private sector projects that are expected to begin implementation this year.

As a result of our management, Madam Speaker, our budget has turned around by some \$53 million (that is central government's budget), as we budgeted for a \$32 million deficit and we have come out with a \$25 million surplus. So this says that we are managing correctly. A \$57 million turnaround is nothing to sneeze at in these hard economic times, and the surplus that we have shown overall of \$25 million says much for what we are doing and what we are accomplishing and the way that the public sector, elected and civil servants, are working together to improve government expenditure.

Madam Speaker, I believe that it is going to get better as there are projects that are underway that are going to improve the economy, sustainable development in the Shetty Hospital, in the Economic City, for Cayman Alliance, that we just broke ground for the Esterley Tibbetts [Highway] road extension, and as the Dart Company renovates and expands the old closed down hotel on Seven Mile Beach. This is sustainable development, and as we also get underway with our cruise ship berthing in George Town and the renovation of Spotts Jetty, all of this is sustainable development. It means more revenue. Sustainable development means more revenue.

We are trying to do the same thing for Cayman Brac looking at all of the things they have said

can help them. And, Madam Speaker, there are at least two good prospects there, as the same people (that is, the CHEC group of companies developing the port here) have committed to doing something in Cayman Brac. Of course, they have to get underway here and complete the George Town Port, which is their first contract.

Madam Speaker, the Annual Economic Report is now available to the general public through the website of the Economics and Statistics Office www.eso.ky.

Madam Speaker, we have come through this thus far with our serious challenges. With God's help they are going to improve.

Cayman Islands Monetary Authority Annual Report 1 July 2009–30 June 2010

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

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

Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Annual Report of 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010 of the Cayman Islands Monetary Authority.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

[No audible reply]

Cayman Islands Law Reform Commission: 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2011—Sixth Annual Report of Law Reform Commission

The Speaker: Honourable Second Official Member.

Hon. Samuel W. Bulgin: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this House the Cayman Islands Law Reform Commission Report covering the period 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2011.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

Hon. Samuel W. Bulgin: Madam Speaker, just to say that in laying the report I would like to publicly record Government's thanks to the outgoing Chair, Madam Speaker, Mr. Langston Sibbles, QC, and Justice Andrew Jones [QC], for their sterling work on the Commission, Madam Speaker, from the inception. They have recently stepped down due to other commitments. And on Government's behalf I would certainly

like to thank them for their contribution to the Law Reform Commission efforts.

In the same breath, Madam Speaker, on Government's behalf, I would like to welcome the new appointees, Mr. Kenneth Farrow, QC (a private practitioner); and also Miss Vickie Ellis, the Deputy Solicitor General. They have now joined the Law Reform Commission, and, Madam Speaker, I am looking forward to their contribution. They will now join the other existing members who are Mrs. Aileen Nervik, Miss. Cheryl Richards and the new Chairman, Mr. Ian Paget-Brown.

I would certainly like to also thank Mr. Ian Paget-Brown for agreeing to chair the Commission. He is well known in legal circles here, and is a prolific writer of a number of articles and books relating to the financial industry in the Cayman Islands. So, I think it is an invaluable addition, Madam Speaker.

And so, we look forward to the coming year for the work of the Commission, as they continue looking at the various laws; the Strata Title Law, the Matrimonial Causes Law, as well as other projects.

Cayman Islands' Compendium of Statistics 2010

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Cayman Islands' Compendium of Statistics 2010.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

[No audible reply]

Maritime Authority of the Cayman Islands Annual Report 2008 – 2009

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Annual Report of the Maritime Authority of the Cayman Islands, 2008–2009.

We still do not have 2010 I guess.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

[No audible reply]

Financial Statements of Cayman Turtle Farm (1983) Limited 30 June 2009, and 30 June 2010

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Financial Statements of Cayman Turtle Farm (1983) Limited for the year [30 June] 2009, and for Cayman Turtle Farm (1983) Limited for 30 June 2010.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

[No audible reply]

Financial Statements of Port Authority of Cayman Islands 30 June 2008

Port Authority of the Cayman Islands Ownership Agreement Annual Report for 2008 Financial Year

Financial Statements of Port Authority of Cayman Islands 30 June 2009

Port Authority of the Cayman Islands Ownership Agreement Annual Report for 2009 Financial Year

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Financial Statements of the Port Authority of the Cayman Islands 30 June, 2008, and 30 June, 2009.

And [I beg] to lay [on the Table of this honourable House] the reports for the Port Authority of the Cayman Islands Ownership Annual Reports for the 2008 Financial Year, and the 2009 Financial Year.

Thank the Lord, Madam Speaker, that we can get to the next year.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

[No audible reply]

Annual Report of Judicial Administration for the 2009/10 Financial Year

The Speaker: Second Official Member.

Hon. Samuel W. Bulgin: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I beg to lay on the Table of this House the Annual Report of the Judicial Administration for the 2009/10 Financial Year.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

Hon. Samuel W. Bulgin: No, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

QUESTIONS TO HONOURABLE MEMBERS AND MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

Question No. 4

No. 4: Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier, the Honourable Minister of Finance, Tourism and Development: What were the terms and conditions under which the Government received loans totaling \$128 million from Cohen and Co., LLC over the course of the 2010/11 financial year?

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, the Government did not receive any loans from Cohen and Company LLC. Cohen and Company acted as agent for the 2010/11 Government borrowing of \$155 million or US\$185 million, by arranging two bridge loan facilities totaling \$128.5 million on behalf of the Government during the financial year 2010/11.

The first bridge loan facility of \$92.5 million was obtained from Scotiabank and Trust, and Scotiastand and Merchant Bank, Trinidad and Tobago Limited, and was drawn down on 22 October 2010. And the other bridge loan facility of \$36 million was obtained on 15 December 2010 from Banque Havilland S.A., a bank incorporated in Luxembourg.

The other terms and conditions of the above-mentioned loans are already a matter of public knowledge and, indeed, are in the hands of Members of this honourable House.

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Supplementaries

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

Madam Speaker, would the Premier and Minister of Finance explain why Cohen and Company acted as an agent when in fact the tender process called for whoever provided this financing service to the Government to do so as a lending facility itself? And perhaps, Madam Speaker, in doing that he can explain the benefit of using an agent rather than a substantive financial institution for such purposes.

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I think what I said earlier stands; that the terms, conditions, and many other things of the loan facility are already a matter of public knowledge. I have made many statements which they have and which the Auditor General has audited, and a report is in hand which states all of this.

Madam Speaker, the Member should know, though, that those banks use . . . Yes, Madam Speaker, most bonds, if it is a bond, those entities will use agents to go to market. But, as I said, Madam Speaker, this information is already public knowledge.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Suspension of Standing Order 23(7) and (8)

The Speaker: Yes. Sorry. Mr. Leader of the Opposition, we need to suspend Standing Orders to continue questions after 11.00.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, in order for questions to be asked after 11.00 am, I move for the suspension of Standing Order 23(7) and trust it does not bring a debate.

The Speaker: The question is that Standing Order 23(7) and (8) be suspended to allow for Question Time to continue after the hour of 11.00 am. All those in favour, please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: Standing Order 23(7) and (8) suspended.

The Speaker: Please proceed Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

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

Madam Speaker, would the Premier explain the basis for the loan facility of \$36 million being obtained from Banque Havilland S.A. on 15 December 2010? And also, Madam Speaker, indicate what, if any, connection exists between him or his Government or any Member of his Government, and the principals of Banque Havilland.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, those matters have already been aired publicly. It is in the document that the Auditor has which has been given to Members of this House. And that information is already public information and one that Members have in their hands.

As to any connection between any banker in this country or outside, certainly, I have no connection

other than to know people; who they are. I know who the bankers here are. And I know bankers outside of these Islands. So that is the only connection that I have with them.

The Speaker: Thank you.

One more question only please. This has been aired already.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, this is not a new question at all; this is simply pursuing this question.

The Premier has said that this issue with Banque Havilland and the \$36 million loan has been dealt with in the Auditor General's Report and elsewhere. Madam Speaker, I regret that that really is not the case insofar as the question that I asked. I asked what the basis was for the loan being obtained from Banque Havilland. That is the question, Madam Speaker, which has not been answered in the Auditor General's Report which I have in my hand. And I wonder if the Minister could be a little more fulsome or forthcoming in his response.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Oh, Madam Speaker, the Member will get a more fulsome debate on this I suspect, since it is a matter that he has already by way of motion before the House. So, it will be spoken to. I would guarantee. But on what basis? Cohen was the agent, Cohen got them and the Cayman Islands needed the money at that time. The basis was needed money at that time.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Next question please.

Question No. 5

No. 5: Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier, the Honourable Minister of Finance, Tourism and Development: Now that the Government has terminated the Framework Agreement with GLF for the development of a cruise-ship port in George Town, what are Government's plans to provide improved cruise-ship berthing facilities in Grand Cayman?

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

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

Madam Speaker, it would not be strictly correct for me to respond to the question of improved berthing facilities for cruise ships in Grand Cayman since we currently have no berthing facilities in the proper sense. What we have is cruise ship tendering. There is no dock where the ship comes in and ties up alongside a berthing facility. However, Madam Speaker, I will say that the Government's plans con-

tinue to be based on the same premises to make available cruise ship berthing facilities on the most cost effective basis in the shortest reasonable time.

Serious negotiations are ongoing in an effort to identify a private sector partner who has the capacity to do the job to the right standard and also the means to provide an acceptable financing package. The written question might have "project" but the words should be "who has the capacity to do the job to the right standard, and also the means to provide an acceptable financing package."

The Speaker: Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Supplementaries

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

Madam Speaker, just so that I provide some kind of context for these questions which may seem a bit out of date, those questions were submitted at the end of April. Things have moved on since then.

And, Madam Speaker, on 13 June the Government, or the Premier I should say, signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) relating to Grand Cayman Port facilities with China Harbour Engineering Company Ltd. (CHEC), which indicated the pursuit of an arrangement whereby the cruise ship berthing in George Town would be built, a facility in West Bay would be built, and the upgrade of the Spotts Landing would be completed.

I wonder, Madam Speaker, if the Premier can now tell us whether or not this MOU is still active, whether it is still operational or whether things have moved on yet again.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, oh, things moved on since 2004 when I signed with Misener to build a dock and that was dumped. And then it moved on, Madam Speaker, since when . . . they were in Government at the time and then it moved on when they went to . . .

What was that company called? [*speaking off the microphone to another Member*]

Atlantic Star.

And we did not get a dock. And we have been trying to get the best deal, as I have said. And at the time in 2004 when I signed with Misener, cruise lines were willing to build and pay for the dock. They stopped it. And then the cruise lines went to Honduras, to Jamaica and other places.

So, Madam Speaker, the Memorandum of Understanding with CHEC is still in place until November when a definitive agreement should be reached, hopefully will be reached.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, there is an addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding, which indicates that China Harbour would advance US\$3 million—

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition you are supposed to be asking a question.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Yes, Madam Speaker, but I have to place the question in context, with respect.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is simply, this addendum called for the commencement of the upgrade of the existing Spotts Jetty and Landing facility by 15 July 2011. And my question to the Premier is: What is happening in relation to that aspect of the MOU?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, I am glad to answer that one, because when I discussed with CHEC the building of the cruise berthing facilities we had to look at what obtained at Spotts—which is an atrocious facility, and which the cruise industry, in fact, threatened to pull out because they did not like, appreciate, and was unworkable for people, especially elderly up and down through that reef. But, Madam Speaker, I would say that even with the new and improved facility they will still have to use it, but it will be an improved facility.

When I sat with them we looked at that and we decided, *Look, the country is in dire need of facilities, we can't get the big one fixed, but while we are working on that we can work towards getting some work done on Spotts.* The project we estimated would begin was about six, seven million dollars and they said, *Look, we will advance \$3 million.* When I say advance—I better be careful with words—they would build out \$3 million. If we reached an agreement, of course, it would be covered in that agreement. If we did not reach an agreement, we would have to pay back what they would have spent up to \$3 million.

They did not give Government any money. No money went into Government's accounts. It was an agreement that I tried to get some work started in this country and if we had been building from then, the \$3 million, the multiplier effect would be what? Three times? Four times? I don't know, the economists can tell me what the multiplier effect is in this country. About three or four times? About \$12 million dollars at least, in the economy, started while we worked at getting definitive agreement on the George Town facility. That is what that was all about.

The Opposition (and God knows who else—all Opposition though) went and complained about it. They went and told them that there was \$3 million in the account. The Audit Office came and asked me if we had \$3 million in the account. They went and asked our staff where the \$3 million was instead of picking that up and reading the sense into it. They

went and asked where the \$3 million was, like somebody had put \$3 million into the account and somebody had taken it. That is what all the furore is somewhat about, Madam Speaker. And I told the Governor, *Look, I am sick and tired of this, I ain't moving it forward, I will tell the Chinese (CHEC) not to move forward with this until the definitive agreement is started.*

The Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Premier.
Are there any further supplementaries?

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I thank the Premier for that comprehensive response.

Madam Speaker, just to see if he would indicate now as to when it is likely that a definitive agreement will be signed with China Harbour.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, the Member seems to have every agreement that comes out of Government before the ink is even dried on it. Somebody has it. It goes on somebody's windscreen or under somebody's door. Somebody's bedroom, something they have. So, Madam Speaker, they ought to know that the definitive agreement is saying it should be signed by November. I repeated that just now.

The Speaker: Thank you.
Are there any further supplementaries? If not, can we move on to the next question?

Question No. 6

No. 6: Mr. Anthony S. Eden, Second Elected Member for Bodden Town asked the Premier, the Honourable Minister of Finance, Tourism and Development: What is the Government's policy regarding public access to the foreshore and beaches in the Cayman Islands?

The Speaker: [Honourable Premier].

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I thank the Member for his question.

Madam Speaker, the Government's policy regarding public access to the foreshore and beaches in the Cayman Islands is outlined as follows: The Central Planning Authority shall apply the hotel, tourism zone provisions in a manner to ensure adequate allowance for the public access to the sea.

Regulation 15(6) in the Beach Resort Residential zone, the [Development and Planning Regulations \(2006 Revision\)](#) as amended: **“Where [planning permission is granted for] a development [in a Beach Resort/Residential zone which] has a frontage of two hundred feet or more, the Authority shall ensure that a public right of way to the sea is**

set aside and dedicated; such a right of way shall be a [minimum] of six feet wide for every two hundred feet of frontage or part thereof, . . .”

[Section 20] “It is the duty of the Authority to ensure [that the open character of scenic shoreline land is preserved, in particular that of the beaches,] and also to safeguard the public’s right to use the beaches and to gain access to them through public rights of way.”

Also [section 32], “In Hotel/Tourism zones, the Authority, when granting planning permission in relation to land which has a shoreline of two hundred feet or more in a development other than private single dwelling units, shall require the owner to set aside and dedicate to the public a right of way of not less than six feet in width from the public road to the sea.”

Madam Speaker, I would say to the Member that our policy is to maintain and enhance the Caymanian people’s right to access and fully enjoy the foreshore and beaches.

The Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Premier.

Supplementary

The Speaker: Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

Mr. Anthony S. Eden: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I want to thank the Premier for the answer.

I know that some of the access markings need to be more defined and better set out, and just to ask that they see that this is done.

The Speaker: Thank you Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

Any other supplementary?

[No audible reply]

The Speaker: If not, we will move to the next question standing in the name of the Elected Member for East End. Is someone going to ask it on his behalf?

Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Questions No. 7 and No. 8

[Deferred]

No. 7: Why has the Ministry of Finance decided not to produce financial reports for the 2008/2009 financial year.

No. 8: Is the Government still supporting the proposed development of a port in East End by Mr Joseph Imperato and/or entities owned by or controlled by him or in which he has interests.

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

Madam Speaker, there are two questions on the Order Paper standing in the name of the Elected Member for East, who, as you explained a while ago, is dealing with a family crisis with his Mother’s illness and her need to be transported overseas.

I would ask, Madam Speaker, that question No. 7 and question No. 8, both standing in the name of the Elected Member for East End, be deferred to a further Order Paper when he is back.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, we would be prepared to answer if one of them is prepared to ask the question.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, we would prefer if it were left until the Elected Member for East End returns.

The Speaker: Okay.

That concludes Question time.

STATEMENTS BY HONOURABLE MEMBERS AND MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

The Speaker: I have no notice of statements by Honourable Members and Ministers of the Cabinet.

Jamaican Diplomats Welcomed

The Speaker: At this time I would like to break for a few minutes and welcome the Diplomats and senior team from Jamaica who arrived in the Parliament this morning.

They are: the Honourable Dwight Nelson, Minister of National Security and his team: Mr. Owen Ellington, Commissioner of Police; Lieutenant Commander David Chin-Fong, Jamaica Defence Force; Major General Anthony Anderson, Chief of Defence staff; Mr. Samuel Blake, Director Organised Crime and Defence Ministry of National Security; Sergeant Dainian Frater, Security Officer to the Honourable Minister; Mrs. Diane McIntosh, Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of National Security.

I think this is a good time for us to take a break so that the [delegation] can get to meet all of our Ministers and Members. We will break for half hour. That’s returning at noon.

Proceedings suspended at 11.30 am

Proceedings resumed at 1.58 pm

The Speaker: Proceedings are resumed. Please be seated.

OTHER BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Suspension of Standing Order 14(2)

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I move the suspension of Standing Order 14(2) in order to take Private Member's Motion No. 2 as outlined on the Order Paper.

The Speaker: The question is that Standing Order 14(2) be suspended to enable a Private Member's Motion to be dealt with before Government Business. All those in favour, please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: Standing Order 14(2) suspended.

Private Member's Motion No. 2—2011/12—Lack of Confidence in the Government

The Speaker: May I have a copy of the Motion please?

Okay.

Third Elected Member for George Town, Leader of the Opposition.

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

Madam Speaker, before I move the Motion, there is a housekeeping matter. The Elected Member for East End is not here. He was the named seconder of the Motion when it was filed. With your permission, Madam Speaker, the Elected Member for North Side is prepared to second the Motion in his absence.

The Speaker: Member for North Side.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: I haven't moved the motion yet; I'm just advising.

The Speaker: You are sure he is prepared to second the Motion?

All right, go ahead.

Thank you.

[laughter]

The Speaker: I didn't see an indication from him that he was going along with this so . . .

[inaudible interjection]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. 2 of the 2011/12 Legislative year entitled "Lack of Confidence in the Government." The Motion was filed on 27 April this year. And it reads as follows:

WHEREAS having regard to the general conduct of the Government since it assumed office on 28th May, 2009 and particularly with regard, but not limited to:

1. The Premier's handling of the published operational deficit of the Government for the 2008/2009 financial year, suggesting that the country was bankrupt;

2. The presentation of surplus budget projections for the 2009/2010 financial year which proved to be unrealistic instead of developing and adopting a 3 year plan to eliminate the operational deficit of the Government;

3. The failure to adequately address the issues and concerns raised in the Miller/Shaw Report regarding the fiscal sustainability of the Government;

4. The failure to get Government accounts up to date;

5. Announcing that the Ministry of Finance would not be producing Accounts for the 2008/2009 financial year;

6. Failing to hold regular meetings of the Standing Finance Committee of the Legislative Assembly;

7. Significantly increasing fees and taxes on businesses and the people of the Cayman Islands in 2009 and 2010 amidst the worst recession the world has known in 80 years;

8. Re-imposing in 2009 the 20 cent per gallon import duty on fuel used by Caribbean Utilities Company (CUC) which had been removed in 2008 in order to reduce the costs of electricity to consumers;

9. Further increasing the cost of electricity in 2010 by adding a further 25 cents duty per gallon to the cost of diesel fuel;

10. Proposing to sell off significant Government assets such as the new Government Administration Building and the Cayman Water Authority;

11. Overriding the decision of the Central Tenders Committee and awarding to Cohen and Company LLC a contract for Government financing in the sum of US\$185 Million, then subsequently having to terminate that contract because Cohen was unable to meet its terms regarding a rate-cap on interest.

12. The Premier declaring at a recent conference that Dart Enterprises would be conducting the remediation of the Landfill and creating a new one [in Bodden Town], thereby overriding [the announcement the previous week by] the Central Tenders Committee that the contract had been awarded to Wheelabrator Technologies Inc. of the United States of America (USA).

The Speaker: Ah you have read “in Bodden Town” on that . . . creating a new one . . . it does not say “in Bodden Town” on my paper. Does your paper say differently?

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: I am sorry, Madam Speaker, I am reading from the old one.

The Speaker: I just want to be sure my page is correct.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Yes, Madam Speaker, I am reading on the one that was submitted rather than the one that was approved. I'm sorry. So, I will read 12 over again.

12. The Premier declaring at a recent conference that Dart Enterprises would be conducting the remediation of the Landfill and creating a new one, thereby overriding the decision of the Central Tenders Committee to award the contract to Wheelabrator Technologies Inc. of the United States of America (USA).

13. Persisting in the announcement of major projects without a reliable assessment of feasibility, costs, benefits or economic or environmental impact;

14. Promoting and supporting major dredging of the North Sound, including a channel to accommodate mega-yachts and the creation of 2 Islands in the North Sound;

15. Promoting and supporting the excavation of a large area of the East End sea coast and inner land;

16. Promoting and supporting the development of an oil refinery in Grand Cayman;

17. The incidence of crime;

18. Unemployment levels among Caymanians;

19. The proposal not to adopt an electoral system based on one person, one vote;

20. The Premier's attitude to the Freedom of Information Law and his threats to impose fees and fines on certain sectors of the media;

21. The extent and costs of official travel;

22. The failure after almost 2 years in office to complete either the John Gray High School or the Clifton Hunter High School and the hurricane shelter facilities which they include; and

23. The failure after almost 2 years in office to secure a contract for the construction of much needed cruise-ship berthing.

The Speaker: You didn't read the resolve.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Sorry, Madam Speaker.

BE IT NOW THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Legislative Assembly does declare a lack of confidence in the Government.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Is there a seconder for this Motion?

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller, Elected Member for North Side: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Member for East End, I beg to second the Motion.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Motion has been moved and seconded.

Does the mover wish to speak to the Motion?

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

Madam Speaker, as I intimated when I moved the Motion, this Motion was filed on 27 April this year—more than four months ago. It has taken an awfully long time to get to the Floor of this House.

Madam Speaker, convention in our system of Government, the Westminster style of Government, demands that motions such as this, which seek a declaration of the House, a resolution of the House of a lack of confidence in the Government, are matters which ought to be dealt with expeditiously because it places the Government really in an untenable position and a position of uncertainty when these things are left hanging for this length of time.

But also, Madam Speaker, in this particular case, what it has done—and maybe, Madam Speaker, that was part of the strategy involved in the delay—is to render a number of the issues which have been itemised in the Motion, I wouldn't say irrelevant, but they are no longer topical in many respects because some of these issues have actually been withdrawn or the Government has taken corrective measures in relation to them. And, Madam Speaker, if the filing of this Motion had any part to play in that, then perhaps even the Government will agree that the Motion has merit.

Madam Speaker, shortly after the Motion was filed, the Members of the Government made it very clear, both Front and Backbenches, that they rallied around the Premier and they were going to continue to offer their support and express their confidence in his management of the affairs of the country. A public meeting was held on the steps of the Court House and the Government made that very, very clear.

Today, Madam Speaker, it is also clear that the Government has come again in solidarity, given the number of green ties that adorn the necks of all of the male Members of the Government. And so, Madam Speaker, it is obvious, or it appears obvious, that this Motion has but one fate, and that no amount of persuasion from me or any other Member on this side of the House is going to persuade even the more prudent Members of the other side to think again, to look again at the conduct of this Administration over the past two-plus years, and decide whether or not this is the kind of leadership that this country should continue to have over the balance of this term.

But, nonetheless, Madam Speaker, we believe and have had a careful look at this, that not only are the matters which are set out specifically in this Motion and which, I should say, Madam Speaker, are not regarded as, and not intended to be, exhaustive in nature. Not only are these matters still matters of major concern, and some of them even more so now than they were at the time the Motion was filed, but there are other issues and concerns which have arisen given the passage of time, which do go to the core of the issue of whether or not this House ought to continue to have confidence in the Government.

And, Madam Speaker, it is our intention on this side to put as many of these issues that we can in the time that we have squarely to this House to ask every Member on the other side whether or not, given the facts—not given what the Opposition says or speculates, but given the facts—whether they can look each and every one of their constituents in the eye and continue to put their hand up and say, *I have confidence in the leadership of this Government. I am satisfied with the conduct of this Administration. We are doing things the way they ought to be done. We are giving the country the best stewardship possible.*

Each of them, Madam Speaker, is going to have to answer that question not just to that conscience, which I believe they all have, but to those, Madam Speaker, who elected them in the first place, who reposed confidence in them and who, Madam Speaker, are increasingly concerned about the direction the country is taking and the manner in which the country is being steered.

Madam Speaker, all of the polls that have been taken in recent times relating to the issue of the stewardship of this country, have given the current Administration not just a failing grade, Madam Speaker, but an “F”; a truly “F” grade.

Madam Speaker, I had a quick look at some of the online polls conducted by both the *Caymanian Compass* and *Cayman News Service* over the last little while. And, Madam Speaker, there is little question about the views that the majority of people have about the present Administration and its stewardship of the affairs of this country.

Madam Speaker, all of those on the other side are politicians. They are all political animals. Some of

them are even greater veterans of this process than I am. And so, Madam Speaker, I know that they must be feeling the love out there. They must understand what public sentiment is in relation to their stewardship, and, in particular, the stewardship of the Premier.

Madam Speaker, an online poll conducted by the *Caymanian Compass*, the results of which were posted on 13 May, indicated that more than two-thirds of the respondents to the previous week's *Caycompass.com* online poll gave the United Democratic Party a “poor” or “failing” grade for the first two years of its four-year elected term. I won't go into all the details, Madam Speaker. It is obvious what . . . And there were 471 respondents to that particular poll.

Madam Speaker, *Cayman News Service* ran a poll recently. The question was: [Does McKeever Bush's performance as Premier match your expectations?](#) Madam Speaker, the result of 564 pollsters: **“He is a terrible Premier, which is exactly what I had expected.”** (72 per cent). And, **“I am extremely disappointed. I expected much more from him.”** (16 per cent).

Madam Speaker, the poll run on whether or not the Motion that is now being debated had the support of those persons who view *Cayman News Service*, produced an 89 per cent result in favour of the Motion that is before the House. And so, Madam Speaker, there are major issues about the way the affairs of this country are being run. In the time that we have, Madam Speaker, I am proposing to deal with a number of those issues in some detail. And my colleagues, as they rise to speak will no doubt deal with others.

Madam Speaker, a big point of this exercise is to provide the Premier with a platform opportunity to explain much that is yet unexplained to the people of this country about various issues for which he has responsibility. It is an opportunity, Madam Speaker, for him to tell the country why the Opposition is wrong to have concern about these issues, and to persuade them—not so much us, but to persuade the people of this country—that despite these issues it is still possible for this legislature and for the broader community to continue to repose trust and confidence in the Premier and the UDP's management of the affairs of this country.

Madam Speaker, this is an important Motion. It is not a motion that we have brought to this House without a great deal of thought, care, consideration, and, if I might say so, Madam Speaker, pressure from concerned people within the community, to register the country's concern about these issues and the general management of the country's affairs.

Madam Speaker, it is a motion that is brought as permitted under the Cayman Islands Constitution Order 2009. Madam Speaker, if I might refer you and this honourable House to section 51 of the Constitution . . . Or, perhaps Madam Speaker, I should start

with section 49 which deals with the appointment of the Premier and other Ministers for completeness.

Section 49(1): **“The Premier shall be appointed by the Governor as follows. (2) Where a political party gains a majority of the seats of elected members of the Legislative Assembly, the Governor shall appoint as Premier the elected member of the Assembly recommended by a majority of the elected members who are members of that party.”**

Madam Speaker, that is how this Premier, the current Premier, has come to be appointed as Premier. He has been recommended to the Governor by a majority of the Elected Members who are Members of the United Democratic Party.

Madam Speaker, section 51 deals with the tenure of office of the Premier. Subsection (1) reads: **“The Governor shall, by instrument under the public seal, revoke the appointment of the Premier if a motion that the Legislative Assembly should declare a lack of confidence in the Government receives the affirmative votes of not less than two-thirds of the elected members of the Assembly; but before so revoking of the Premier’s appointment, the Governor shall consult the Premier and may, acting in his or her discretion, dissolve the Assembly instead of revoking the appointment.”**

Subsection (2): **“The Premier shall vacate his or her office if, after the polling in a general election, the Governor, acting in his or her discretion, informs him or her that he or she is about to appoint another person as Premier.”**

Madam Speaker, section 52 is also relevant: **“Tenure of office of Ministers.”** Section 52(1) reads: **“Any Minister shall vacate his or her office – (a) if he or she ceases to be a Member of the Legislative Assembly for any reason other than its dissolution; (b) if he or she is not a Member of the Assembly when it first meets after a general election; (c) if he or she resigns his or her office by writing under his or her hand addressed to the Governor; or (d) if he or she is absent from the Cayman Islands or absent from three consecutive meetings of the Cabinet without – (i) in the case of the Premier, having given the Governor prior notice of such absence; or (ii) in the case of any other Minister, having obtained written permission for such absence from the Governor, acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier.”**

And, Madam Speaker, the relevant bit of section 52 subsection (2): **“A Minister other than the Premier shall also vacate his or her office if – (a) the Premier vacates his or her office; or (b) his or her appointment is revoked by the Governor, acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier, by instrument under the public seal.”**

Madam Speaker, if this Motion is to carry, it requires two-thirds of the elected Members of this House (or 10) to vote in favour of the Motion. If the

Motion succeeds, then the Premier’s appointment is either revoked, in which case all of the other Ministers’ appointments also stand revoked, or the Governor dissolves the House and calls for another election.

So, Madam Speaker, it is a serious matter. It is not a matter to be entered upon lightly. And, Madam Speaker, it is not something that the Opposition has brought without a great deal of thought and concern about the consequences. But, Madam Speaker, the concerns about the direction of the country, the way the country’s affairs are being managed, are so grave, so serious, so worrying, that the Opposition has been persuaded that this Motion had to be brought.

Madam Speaker, these issues have to be debated, discussed and resolved. When this exercise is over in another few hours, the country will know one way or another where all Members of this House stand in relation to the current management of the affairs of this country. And no one on the other side will be permitted, will be allowed henceforth from that moment to say what many say, *Well, you know, I really don’t support Mac with this; you know I don’t support that but it is nothing I can do.*

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Is that what they are saying?

The Speaker: Refrain from the names, though. Please use his title. Thank you.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Sorry, Madam Speaker, I didn’t do that in an attempt to be disrespectful. I am simply paraphrasing what we hear generally.

[inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Let’s hear the Leader.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, the line will have been crossed when the vote is taken on this Motion. And it will be a group above the line and there will be a group below the line. And the country will be under no illusion whether or not each and every Member on that side of the House supports the actions of the Premier in respect to every issue that is discussed and debated and put forward during the course of this debate.

Madam Speaker, I want to start the discussion on the substantive issues with the issue of incidents of crime. Madam Speaker, the stunning silence of the Premier and his elected colleagues on that side of the House in relation to what must be described as the most serious and persistent crime wave this country has ever faced, is something which must cause all of us in this House and in the broader community to lose confidence in the ability of this Government to manage the affairs of this country effectively.

Madam Speaker, we have all sorts of ground breakings, all sorts of speech makings, all sorts of promises, we make all sorts of deals, but what is this Government's position on the crime wave sweeping across this nation which is driving tourists from our shores; which is keeping good people at home in the nights; which is turning George Town into a complete ghost town at night? What is the Government's position? What is the Government's plan? What is the Government proposing that we do about this?

Madam Speaker, almost every night those of us who are linked into the 911 advisories receive another one of some armed robbery occurring. Almost every day the headlines in one newspaper or the other or one of the online news services scream about another armed robbery perpetrated. When last has anyone heard the Premier say what his position is in relation to it? Or what is it that the Government is doing about it? The last time I recall (and I might be mistaken, and I am sure if I am when they get up to speak they will remind us all) was when he offered sympathy to the tourists who had been robbed up at East End. That was months ago. Months ago!

Madam Speaker, this morning the *Caymanian Compass*' headline story was: "[Crime Spree in George Town](#)." Madam Speaker, have you seen this morning's paper?

The Speaker: I saw the paper this morning.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: "Six robberies and one attempted robbery occurred in central George Town between the 11 August and Monday, 5 September within a roughly one mile radius.

"All but one of the cases involved robberies hitting a local business, in all cases the suspect or suspects involved were reported to have used a gun. No one has been injured thus far, but in at least one case a shot was fired during the course of the robbery.

"The latest incident happened Monday night when a busy George Town gas station became the latest target of armed robbers.

"The Royal Cayman Islands Police Service said the two robbery suspects who hit an Eastern Avenue Texaco on Monday night were wearing what appeared to be police jackets."

And then, Madam Speaker, it goes on to describe in detail more of the events that occurred.

The article goes on, Madam Speaker, under a subheading "**Other Stores Robbed.**"

"A Popular George Town waterfront restaurant located in the heart of Cayman's downtown tourist district was hit by armed robbers late Thursday night.

"The Royal Cayman Islands Police Service said two masked men entered the Casanova by

the Sea Restaurant around 10 pm on Thursday—one of them brandishing a handgun.

"Officers said the suspects demanded cash and then fled once they were given some money. They were last seen running towards the Rock Hole area, which is located just east of the restaurant.

"No one was hurt and no shots were fired in the holdup, police said.

"A fashion store on Shedden Road was robbed on 29 August by armed men who witnesses said pulled up in a grey Honda Civic. Both men appeared to have firearms, according to the store clerk.

"On the weekend previous to the Shedden Road and Heather Street robberies, two businesses on Mary Street were targeted by robbers."

And it goes on and outlines the details.

The story then gives a crime spree timeline—

"11 August: Auto parts store robbed around 9 pm by two armed suspects.

"19 August: Would-be robber foiled at Solomon's Grocery. . .

"20 August: Uncle Clem's grocery robbed around 9pm by armed suspects who fired a shot.

"28 August: A man robbed at 12.45 pm in the street by suspects who took gold chain and bracelets.

"29 August: fashion store robbed around 7.15 pm by two men who pulled up in a grey-coloured Honda.

"1 September: Casanova By The Sea robbed by armed suspects around 10 pm."

"5 September, Texaco convenient store robbed at 10 pm, one suspect armed."

Yesterday was the 6th; we're overdue, should have one tonight.

Madam Speaker, that is today's (Monday) paper headlines.

Same publication—*Caymanian Compass*—"[Robberies a 'cancer' for tourism industry](#)."

"A frustrated restaurant owner whose premise was robbed at gunpoint last week is calling for steps to be taken to combat the escalating robberies in Grand Cayman.

"Tony Crescente, owner of Casanova By The Sea at the waterfront in George Town, whose restaurant robbery was the fourth armed hold-up reported last week, said security on the island needs to be stepped up.

"Referring to the spate of armed robberies that have occurred in the recent years as a 'serious cancer', he said, 'It needs to be addressed and it needs to be addressed fast'.

"It is too late to fight this with a stick,' he said, adding that unarmed security guards could not be expected to risk their lives when faced with gunmen and that they should be allowed to be armed.

"He also called for armed fast response police officers to patrol George Town and other areas where businesses operate rather than needing to unlock police arms from storage in response to robberies. 'Put armed police on the road in every district, in every business district,' he said.

"It's the responsibility of everybody to secure this country. We are not in Baghdad.'

"After the hold-up was reported on Friday, he started getting calls from concerned friends and customers from all over the world and fears news of the robbery may affect his business.

"Mr. Crescente said the tourist trade had fallen worldwide in the past two or three years. 'This is the last thing we need right now.'

"I have been here for 27 years and this is the worst I have ever seen it,' said Mr. Crescente.

"He said if Cayman continued to lose the sense of safety that for many years has been the backbone of the Islands' attraction to tourists, then the tourism industry would fail.

"This was echoed by the Chairman of the Cayman Islands Tourism Association Harry Lalli who said that other Caribbean islands also have pristine seas, wonderful beaches and great weather, but safety and security in Cayman had always been a major draw for tourists visiting here.

"Mr. Lalli said he found it 'very disturbing' that the robbers had hit a popular restaurant while diners were still on premises 'rather than what has been the trend which is to hold a place up after closing time.'

"He urged police to increase their patrols of areas popular with tourists. 'I'm hoping the police can be very vigilant and catch some of these guys', he said."

The story goes on, Madam Speaker.

I could close my eyes really, and if I pull any newspaper over the course of the last year and a half or so, chances are that there is going to be a story about the situation with crime.

Now, Madam Speaker, when the UDP began their campaign for the 2009 Elections, they put out a very nice glossy document called "[A Better Way Forward](#)." And on page 11 they have a section entitled "Crime and Policing." I'm quoting just a couple of paragraphs from it: "**The PPM has severely neglected public safety, and our society has not become any safer over the past four years. [Two thousand and eight] represented the highest murder rate in our country's history. Burglaries and other crimes continue to create uncertainty in our communities. And there is plenty of anecdotal evidence suggesting that many crimes [continue to] go unreported.**

"Despite spending very large amounts on crime prevention, the Government cannot show

any positive results. In addition, the Police have faced additional challenges as a result of the PPM's neglect."

It then goes on, Madam Speaker, to write an indictment, really, against the stewardship of the PPM Administration in relation to the issue of crime. But, Madam Speaker, for completeness I should also refer to a *Cayman News Service* story back on [8 January 2009](#), just before we got into full election fever.

I am going to read from the article: "**With a record number of murders in 2008 and the killing of a seventeen year old last weekend, the Leader of the Opposition**" (who is now the Premier) "**has criticised the PPM Government for what he said was its failure to deal with rising crime. He said that the PPM has pointed the finger at the UDP when it was in office, and now he said the government should be held accountable.**"

I go on and he says—(I'm quoting him, Madam Speaker, from the article): "**We already have severe worsening economic conditions and people are suffering, we don't need an ineffective approach to dealing with issues such as crime and security at this time. When the PPM came into power in 2005 they put the blame squarely at the feet of the UDP for crime rates. Now after their 3 and a half years in power we are seeing the highest murder rates in our history and increasing burglaries and other crimes in general, the PPM should now be held accountable for the serious situation that we are in regarding crimes in this country.**"

Madam Speaker, the article goes on: "**However, Kurt Tibbetts responded to Bush's criticisms at the government press briefing on Thursday morning, 8 January and said that the government was very conscious of the goings on in the islands and had repeatedly been in discussion with the police and the governor but was not responsible for the problems affecting the RCIPS because of the special investigation.**

"**It is known that this government has allocated and poured more resources towards the Royal Cayman Islands Police than any other government—more than double any other government.**"

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I understand you are trying to emphasise crime, but you are going way back into the PPM Government. We are dealing with a motion on the present Government. You are quoting extensively from papers that I have not seen as well.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Yes, Madam Speaker, my intention will become clear shortly, but I will stop and just go to the point.

Madam Speaker, prior to 6 November 2009, when the new 2009 Constitution Order came into effect, responsibility for internal security was purely one of the special responsibilities of the Governor. In practice though, Government has always had a real role to play and a real say in what happened from a policing standpoint because, after all, it is the Finance Committee of this House that actually votes the funding required for policing, like it does for every aspect of Government.

So a certain degree of control, direction, influence has always been able to be exercised in relation to the way internal security has been managed. But certainly in my experience in the four years that we were in Government, you really did not have a great deal of control or decision-making ability when it came to policing issues. In fact, under the former Governor, Stuart Jack, and the commissioners who were under him, what we got were very selective briefings and a call always for support and a show of solidarity when things really got bad. But by and large we were shut out from much of the decision making.

But even in that scenario (and that is the relevance of what I just read, Madam Speaker), the now Premier (who was then Leader of the Opposition) railed about the issue of crime and said that it was squarely the responsibility of the PPM Administration.

Madam Speaker, I don't think that alone is what sealed the elections, but it certainly was a factor. But now, Madam Speaker, not only have the roles changed, but we now have in place a Constitution document which creates a National Security Council, which is peopled by the Premier and two other Ministers (they have got a clear majority), plus the Leader of the Opposition. So they have four elected Members plus two private sector appointments, the Deputy Governor, ex-officio, the Attorney General, ex-officio, and the Governor in the Chair.

[inaudible interjection]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: In the Chair!

[inaudible interjection]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, the National Security Council is a powerful body! It is as powerful as the elected Members who sit on it are prepared to make it be!

The Government, Madam Speaker, cannot say that this is the responsibility of the Governor and therefore the Premier shall remain silent on issues relating to crime. The Government must do what the Government was elected to do—stand and own the issue of crime! That is the only way, collectively, we are going to make any difference! As long as we allow the situation which currently obtains to continue, we

will get the results we have gotten over the course of the last few years.

Now, Madam Speaker, we come . . . I appreciate both the Premier and the Deputy Premier raising the issue of the Constitution, because I will turn to the section and read it one more time, and hope, Madam Speaker, because I've tried in other fora to persuade them, that they are not eunuchs; that they are able to make decisions about policing and internal security in this country. If nothing else commands them, I hope their conscience commands them to do something about the dire situation which exists in this country now!

Madam Speaker, I will read from the Constitution. I know the Premier and the Deputy Premier are becoming distinctly uncomfortable. But hopefully, Madam Speaker—hopefully, hopefully—this may stir them to actually do something for a change in relation to this particular issue.

Madam Speaker, the Fourth Elected Member for George Town said I should read slowly because he wants to understand.

Madam Speaker, I am going to start with "Special responsibilities of the Governor", section 55.

Section 55 subsection (1): **"The Governor shall be responsible for the conduct, subject to this Constitution and any other law, of any business of the Government with respect to the following matters— (a) defence; (b) external affairs, subject to subsections (3) and (4); (c) internal security including the police, without prejudice to section 58;"**

"The Governor shall be responsible for the conduct, subject to this Constitution and any other law, of any business of the Government with respect to the following matters—" (I'll skip over (a) and (b) again)—"(c) internal security including the police, without prejudice to section 58;."

Section 58, Madam Speaker, is the section which created the National Security Council. And, Madam Speaker, for the benefit of those of who were not around the process at the time, the idea of a National Security Council actually came from the United Kingdom itself. They produced the report (which I was trying to find over the last couple of days and have not been able to put my hand on it) . . . but one of their agencies produced a comparative analysis of all of the Overseas Territories' Constitutions, and who had responsibility for what.

It identified what it called "weaknesses" within the present structures that were created by those constitutions. And one of the things identified was that because the Governor alone had responsibility for internal security in relation to most of the Overseas Territories, there was a lack of local involvement in the policymaking and in the understanding of what the issues were relating to crime. That is why Cayman's is not the only new constitution that has a

National Security Council. Most of the other new ones have it as well. The way that it is structured is a little bit different in some respects, but essentially it is the same creature.

Now, Madam Speaker, section 58 (1): “**There shall be in and for the Cayman Islands a National Security Council which shall consist of— (a) the Governor, as Chairman; (b) the Premier; (c) two other Ministers appointed in writing by the Governor, acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier (which means the Premier tells the Governor who they are to be); (d) the Leader of the Opposition or his or her designate; (e) two persons representative of civil society appointed in writing by the Governor, acting after consultation with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition; (f) the Deputy Governor, *ex officio*; (g) the Attorney General, *ex officio*; and (h) the Commissioner of Police, *ex officio*.**” (I think I missed him or that office when I was mentioning it earlier).

Subsection (4), Madam Speaker: “**The National Security Council shall advise the Governor on matters relating to internal security, with the exception of operational and staffing matters, and the Governor shall be obliged to act in accordance with the advice of the Council, unless he or she considers that giving effect to the advice would adversely affect Her Majesty’s interest (whether in respect of the United Kingdom or the Cayman Islands); and where the Governor has acted otherwise than in accordance with the advice of the Council, he or she shall report to the Council at its next meeting.**”

And so, Madam Speaker, this is not your normal or usual advisory council where the chairman accepts the advice or doesn’t accept the advice and that is it. The Governor, on matters of internal security and policing, is bound to follow the advice of the National Security Council unless he determines that in doing so it would be contrary to the interest of Her Majesty’s Government. It is a powerful, powerful Council!

But the attitude adopted by the present Administration is that *this really is not our business. This is a matter for the Governor.* And that is why the entire country waits and waits, praying, pleading, hoping that the Government will do something about the crime wave that is washing over us! And the Premier sits quietly saying nary a word about crime; running up and down all over the place, breaking ground on this road, making this announcement about the grandiose project that will never happen, while what can be dealt with internally, what is driving tourists away, what is frightening investors, what has the local people staying in their homes—can’t even go out for a dinner or a night on the town without being afraid—is left neglected. *It’s not our responsibility,* says the Premier and his Administration. *It’s the Governor’s.*

That, Madam Speaker, is why this Legislature must follow the lead of the broader community and say we no longer have confidence in this Premier and this Administration to manage the affairs of this country.

That’s crime, Madam Speaker.

I hear the mutterings, but I do hope, Madam Speaker, that when those on the other side rise to make their contribution, that we hear something more than an excuse or a series of excuses as to why the Government has to take a hands-off approach to crime.

The people of this country have entrusted the present Administration with the affairs of this country. That includes the issue of crime. We have a new Constitutional Order which gives them everything they need to wade in and weigh in on how the policies relating to internal security are managed. And they must do so, Madam Speaker. They must do so. They have not done so in more than two years. It is now time, Madam Speaker, for them to seize the nettle and accept that this is part of the cross that they were sworn-in to bear.

It is not just, Madam Speaker, about making nice speeches and breaking ground; it is about some of the hard core issues that you have to battle over. And I concede, Madam Speaker, that it will not be easy. It will not be easy to persuade the representatives of the British Government who operate here about some of the things that we actually have to do if we are going to get a handle on this issue of crime.

I mean one of the things in my view that absolutely has to change is the attitude of the Commissioner of Police to licensed firearms and the issue about personal protection.

The Speaker: We’re going off the subject of the Premier again, of the Government again.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, this is the issue of crime, with respect. This is well within the four corners of the Motion. The Motion is talking about the reasons why the country and this Legislature should not have confidence in the Government.

The Speaker: We’re going to the Commissioner of Police and that is not in the Motion.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Just a minute please.

Standing Orders say you cannot criticise these people. You cannot criticise “. . . **Judges and other persons engaged in the administration of justice or Officers of the Crown may not be raised or impugned except upon a substantive motion;**” [Standing Order 35(7)]

We cannot discuss the Commissioner of Police in this relation. You can bring a motion on the subject and we can talk about it then.

Point of Order

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

Madam Speaker, a motion is before the House which deals with specific areas that the Opposition is complaining about on the actions of the Government; specific areas. It says nothing about what he has spent the last hour debating.

Madam Speaker, I say that this is a tremendous problem and a great matter of import. I like it when we defend the Commissioner. The poor Leader of Government is taking all kinds of licks and in something that has no relevance before the House as it is. Nevertheless, I give the Opposition Leader leeway, as far as I am concerned, to say anything here if he would only take some blame himself. But that is not happening.

The Motion is very specific in matters that are to be debated here now. Very, very specific.

The Speaker: Yes, Mr. Premier, and I have called the Leader of the Opposition to order on the point.

Please proceed, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, there are two points. One of them is the issue that you raised about the inability of Members of this House to criticise the conduct of officers of the Crown. The other point, which I will turn to, is the one that the Premier has sought to introduce, to somehow proscribe what can be discussed on this Motion by what's actually itemised. I'll come to that.

But the first, Madam Speaker, in my respectful submission, [is that] Standing Order 36(7) does not preclude any Member of this House from dealing with policy issues. This is not a personal attack on the Commissioner. This is a discussion of what is a policy of the Government, or I should say that aspect of the Government for which His Excellency the Governor has direct responsibility—internal security. Because the issue about firearm ownership and the issue about what personal protection we can and cannot have are real live issues. That is not personal. I am not saying anything about Mr. Baines personally. I'm not saying that he is carrying out his job badly. We are discussing the policies. And if we can't address these issues on the Floor of this House, then Lord help us all, because I don't know where else we are going to be able to discuss them where we can get any resolution.

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Lord will help you and I will do so too. We can

discuss them on a motion. You bring a substantive motion on the subject and you can discuss it. We are discussing something entirely different right now.

We are discussing the question of whether the Government is the Government [that] should be the Government in place. That is the question before the House. That is the resolution. And we need to stick to that topic because it is a very lengthy one, and if you do want to cover it all you need to get started on it. But you cannot bring other matters in on that same motion.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I believe for the benefit of us all I need to return to what the Motion actually says.

The Motion says, Madam Speaker: **"WHEREAS having regard to the general conduct of the Government since it assumed office on 28th May 2009 and particularly with regard, but not limited to:"** And then there are 23 listed items. That was drafted quite deliberately—not to proscribe the debate in this House on this issue to simply those 23 points which are here, but to allow debate on any issue which Members feel is relevant to the general conduct of the Government, and whether or not they should continue to have confidence in the Government. But in relation to this particular matter that has caused this point of order to be raised, the incidence of crime is specifically listed as one of the areas to be debated. So, Madam Speaker, with—

The Speaker: And you have not been curtailing your debate on that subject sir. You can continue on your debate, but there are some things that you are bringing into it that are not related to the debate.

The conduct of the Commissioner of Police [as to] whether or not he allows guns is not relevant to this issue.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, with respect. This is not the conduct of the Commissioner. This is an issue about how we deal with the incidence of crime in this country; what are the policies that the Government should be pushing for in its role of membership of the National Security Council. These are the sorts of issues that need to come to the National Security Council to talk about what people, what defenseless women, are able to take in their handbag when they go out in the event that someone springs upon them. These are policy issues.

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, you quoted from the Constitution. Now I will quote from the Constitution: **"The National Security Council shall advise the Governor on matters relating to internal security, with the exception of operational**

and staffing matters . . .” [Section 58(4)] That is the Commissioner of Police.

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: That’s right!

The Speaker: Now can we proceed?

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I can see that I am going to be shut down. That’s fine!

The Speaker: You’re not going to be shut down. I am just trying—

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr. Leader of the Opposition: I have effectively been, Madam Speaker, with respect.

[inaudible interjections]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, these are policy issues. These are not operational issues.

But, Madam Speaker, perhaps that signifies the level of concern generally in this House about this critical issue of crime. We are dealing with semantics. We are dealing with Constitutional and Standing Order niceties while every single night, nearly, someone is robbed at gunpoint.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Of course, it’s important but *[inaudible]*

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: The level of insensitivity to these issues is something that I hope the entire nation takes cognisance of. And I say no more.

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: Madam Speaker, I rise on Standing Order 35(4) **“No Member shall impute improper motives to any other Member.”** And I can say without fear or contradiction that this Member, of any Member of my Cabinet, takes crime very seriously and we do not have to sit here and take insults from the Member.

The Member sits as a part of the National Security Council under section 58 of the Constitution, and I am sure he has consulted with the former Leader of the Opposition who would have told him the concerns we have raised to Cabinet. If the Member counts the composition of the National Security Council he will see that we have three, recommended one and so did he. And with the nonsense that we have heard so far, I am sure he can convince on policy likewise.

The Speaker: Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I will continue this aspect of my debate in another forum. But I am going to say this, Madam Speaker: If, indeed, the Deputy Premier is sincere in what she just said, I do hope the Members of the Government are prepared to take the stand that they are yet to take about the role of the National Security Council in the issue of internal security and policing. If, Madam Speaker, it requires that I take a drastic step in relation to that Council to be able to properly address this issue, I am afraid, Madam Speaker, I will not resile from doing my duty.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: *[microphone not turned on]* Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Member would tell the House what his plan is.

The Speaker: Ah—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: *[microphone not turned on]* And if we don’t know, since we don’t know what obtains and what should obtain in the National Security Council, no more than what we do and when you be there, then tell us!

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Just tell us!

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I would be delighted to. I started down that road and I was stopped summarily.

[inaudible interjection]

An Hon. Member: Yeah right! *[inaudible]*

The Speaker: I am not sure what you mean by you were “stopped summarily.” But, would you please continue with your debate? Thank you.

[inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Order on that side.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, this morning there were a number of questions put by me to the Premier in relation to the Cohen financing matter. And, Madam Speaker, the Premier referred me *[and]* the House to the report of the Office of the Auditor General in which he claimed all of the issues and questions that I had, had been answered, either there or in public pronouncements by him.

Madam Speaker, I don’t know that any example, other than the one of crime which I tried to deal with a little earlier, provides more evidence of the cavalier attitude, the recklessness, the disregard for the rules, regulations, the law, procedure, fairness by the

current Administration, more than the Cohen financing fiasco.

Madam Speaker, this matter had its start just about a year ago. And the first public pronouncements about it were made toward the end of October of last year. Madam Speaker, the Premier . . . in the almost 11 years I have been here, I don't know if I have ever seen anything like this. The Premier made a national address and he repeated much of that in a statement in this honourable House some days following it, in which he acknowledged that he had disregarded the Central Tenders Committee (CTC), that he had, I should say, overridden the Central Tenders; that he had disregarded the financial regulations; he had thwarted the tender process for the financing needs of the country. The Government was seeking some US\$185 million to support continuing public sector operations. And he had done all of that because **"I had to decide whether to choose substance or choose process."** [[Premier Explains New Deal](#), www.gov.ky]

Madam Speaker, my predecessor in this Office, my good friend the First Elected Member for George Town, was then the Leader of the Opposition. He made a statement on national television and radio, Madam Speaker, condemning this issue or the handling of this issue, and saying among other things, that the Premier and Minister of Finance had acted unlawfully in overriding the decision of Central Tenders Committee and awarding this contract to Cohen and Company LLC.

Madam Speaker, the Premier said at the time, and I am quoting him: **"With the state of the economy as it is and the Government still needing every dollar that it can save . . . I chose substance over process."** He said, Madam Speaker: "[Cohen's] **proposal allows government to benefit from the current low interest rates while guaranteeing that the interest rate will never go above the agreed fixed rate.**"

". . . [T]his saves the Cayman Islands Government tens of millions of dollars. It is not possible to give an exact figure until the long term financing facility is finalized." [Ibid]

He is reported as saying, Madam Speaker, that he did not take the overriding of the Central Tenders Committee selection lightly, but that he felt **"duty bound to get the best financing terms possible . . ."**

He is quoted as saying: **"I sincerely believe that the best interests of the Cayman Islands, in this instance, are served by overriding the selection of the Central Tenders Committee which will save this country millions of dollars."**[Ibid]

Madam Speaker, he came to this House, following the statement made by the First Elected Member for George Town (who was then Leader of the Opposition), and he condemned the Opposition. The only thing he did not say we were was that we were

gentlemen. He said, Madam Speaker, and I am quoting from an article in the [Cayman News Service of the 3rd November](#) last year: **"The Premier claimed the offer from Cohen and Company was accepted because it would enable Government to benefit from the current very low interest rate environment, but still did not reveal what the rate would be. 'I have stated time and time again that when the process is completed the full rates and conditions will be made public. But let me repeat again for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition: this information had been given to the public . . . and why is it that the Leader of the Opposition can't understand? Why is it that he would want to mention the word corruption?'"**

"He said that Tibbetts and the rest of the opposition did not know what they were talking about and the fundamental lack of understanding of basic finance was what had gotten the islands into the financial mess it did under the PPM administration.

"I asked them all to wait until the process was complete, as we now go to a bond issue and I would inform the country at that time. If we lose out on rates now because of the kind of airing the wild and unfounded allegations this matter has got from the Opposition on TV, on CNS and Rooster, the loss of the savings in millions of dollars in interest for the country, can only be blamed on their reckless and damning behavior."

And so, Madam Speaker, the Premier insisted there was precedent for his actions, and while it might not be set down in law the practice has always been over the years that if Cabinet was not satisfied with CTC they carried out the process themselves.

He said that **" . . . he had saved millions of dollars for these Islands with the deal already signed and sealed but now could not give any guarantee that even with the falling interest rates in the USA that the rates would be improved because of the "stupidity—the viciousness—the recklessness of the Leader of the Opposition."**

And so, Madam Speaker, that is the kind of tenor, the kind of response that the Premier and Minister of Finance had to questions being asked about him overriding CTC, disregarding the regulations, disregarding basic principles of fairness in relation to the others who had bid, and giving this deal to Cohen.

Madam Speaker, some time a bit later when the Premier made his statement in this House, with your permission I asked him a number of questions about this deal. And, Madam Speaker, if I may again quote from a report, this time from the [Caymanian Compass of 5 November 2010](#), the following is reported:

"There were two bid invitations issued by the Treasury Department. The first was terminated, Mr. Bush said, because it contained no mention of Government refinancing, as agreed with

the UK's Foreign and Commonwealth Office. The request for proposals was reissued and the Central Tenders Committee chose a winning bid which was then ignored.

"Seven financial institutions submitted bids by 9 September and were evaluated by the Treasury Department's Technical Committee, consisting of Financial Secretary Kenneth Jefferson, Gloria Myles and Deborah Welcome, Mr. Bush said. The Committee recommended the second lowest bid—the joint bid by two banks. The lowest bid offered a 3.5 per cent interest rate, but the bidder pulled out after stating it was unable to meet a 29 September deadline to provide some of the funds."

I'm quoting him now: "On September 25, 2010, I indicated to the Financial Secretary after discussion with my fellow Ministers that the second lowest cost bid did not represent good value for money, nor was it offering the historical deficiency refinancing of Cayman Airways, which was mentioned in the request for proposals."

"He told legislators that, at that point, he determined that the bid process had failed and considered it abandoned.

"As the minister of finance, it is my ministry that asked the CTC through the [Financial Secretary] to undertake the process, so I considered I had that authority. In other words, if I had the authority to start the process, I had the authority to stop it if it was being adhered to', said Mr. Bush.

"Mr. Bush has said that he telephoned Cohen and Company while in New York to determine whether it would provide funding for the government-owned airline. '[None] of the other bidders were so positive and supportive of our national airline, unless they got the government to give them the entire government loan at a very high interest rate,' he said.

"Leader of the Opposition, Kurt Tibbetts, in a public address Monday, accused the premier of acting unlawfully and contravening the law and established bidding practices to obtain the \$185 million loan.

"Mr. Bush insisted that under Section 34 of the Public Management and Finance Law, and according to a legal opinion from constitutional expert Jeffrey Jowell, he could legitimately chose a bidder other than the one recommended by the CTC.

"When asked by the Peoples Progressive Movement MLA Alden McLaughlin if he would make that legal opinion available to the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Bush responded 'The legal opinion is mine. I know what was provided to me.'

"Mr. McLaughlin also quizzed the premier on allegations that the United Democratic Party Treasurer Peter Young was involved with the financial arrangement with Cohen and Company, by

introducing them or representing them with the financial proposal that went before the CTC. Mr. Bush replied, 'I don't know what Mr. Young did or did not do, I can say he is a member of the party. I know certainly he made no such representations to me . . . and nor did Cohen and Company say anything to me about him.'

"The premier had noted earlier in his speech that Mr. Young was a member of the UDP's General Council to which Mr. Bush had reported information related to the government loan arrangements and acknowledged that he had asked Mr. Young 'how the bond worked'.

"Also in response to one of Mr. McLaughlin's questions, Mr. Bush refused to reveal what fees were associated with the financial arrangement made with Cohen and Company. He said he would not reveal the interest rate of the deal until the loan arrangement was finalised.

"I have stated absolutely clearly that I am not going to get into the actual rates and what was charged until the whole process is complete,' adding that the criticisms levelled by the Opposition on the deal would have a 'negative effect on the bond rate' and could lose Cayman 'millions of dollars in interest.'"

He finished up, Madam Speaker, by saying, "My Government took a very grave, but legal, decision to disagree with a process which gives a sense of safety. The matter has revealed to me that the Central Tenders process cannot be a one-size-fits-all methodology for capital works, service contracts and financing."

So, Madam Speaker, as summarised as I could put it that was what was said by the Premier and others of us involved about the whole Cohen financing arrangement.

Madam Speaker, the problem I have with much of what I just read, which has been attributed to the Premier, is that it simply was not true.

Madam Speaker, when I turn now to the Auditor General's Report it will become clear that no savings were realised, let alone millions of dollars. It will also become clear, Madam Speaker, that there was never any tender for, or any requirement that Cohen provide any funding for Cayman Airways. Granted, the Premier wanted that, but there was just one little problem: he did not have the approval of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in that respect—a fact which has never been mentioned by him, at least not publicly. Not to my knowledge. I certainly did not hear it and certainly have not read it anywhere over all the time.

That was supposed to be one of the great differentiating factors between Cohen and the other bidders who had been sidelined, ignored, in essentially what became the third attempt to place this US\$185 million loan arrangement. Because none of the others, the Premier claimed, were prepared to provide that financing—but Cohen was.

Madam Speaker, this is the opportunity for the Premier to explain to all of us here and to all of those within the sound of our voices and who may read what is distilled from this debate, to tell us all, really, why was Cohen in this deal at all. Why did Cohen get preferential treatment? Why were the established lending institutions, who had properly bid, in one case (in the case of the joint venture of First Caribbean Bank and Royal Bank) actually being awarded the contract, why did they get it jerked away from them and put in the lap of Cohen?

What was it that seemed so attractive about Cohen, who is not known for this kind of arrangement? That is not their usual business. Who persuaded the Premier and his Cabinet that we should throw the rule book out of the window, we should dis long established lenders to Government, local institutions, in favour of Cohen and Company LLC? Because that is the question the Auditor General has not answered.

Madam Speaker, looking at the Auditor General's second audit, the audit of 2nd August, 2011, entitled "[Management of Government Procurement Case Studies](#)," which is an addendum really to the first report of 5th July (which I will come to in a bit), page 1 of the Executive Summary, Madam Speaker, paragraph 5, starting with the second sentence: "**The Minister of Finance has the powers under the *Public Management and Finance Law (2010 Revision)* to enter into loans on behalf of Government, and the Minister of Finance believed that by canceling the second loan tender and contracting with Cohen and Company that he was acting in the best interests of the Government and would achieve significant savings.**

"**However, by canceling the second loan tender we found that:**" (And these are the findings of the Auditor General).

"**The Government paid an extra CI\$450,000 in legal—**

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I am not sure if it is proper for you to quote from that document. That document has not been presented to Parliament and laid on the Table. I don't have a copy of it here to follow what you are saying either.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I can let you have a copy.

Madam Speaker, with respect, the Standing Orders—if you give me a moment I will turn up the relevant one—provide that as soon as the Auditor General's Report is given to the Speaker and dispatched to Members of the House it becomes a public document. And as a public document it is capable of being published anywhere, let alone in these hallowed Halls where there is certain privilege that obtains. And so, Madam Speaker, in my respectful submission I am more than entitled to refer to this.

The Speaker: With respect to you, there is only one method by which this House has to make a matter public and that is if it is laid on the Table of the House. Anything else done before that is circumventing that process. You may quote from the document, but I will have to have a copy of it in my hand when you do.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Okay, Madam Speaker, if you can give me one moment so that I can arrange for a copy of the Auditor General's Report. And I will also turn up the relevant Standing Order for you Ma'am.

[inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: A copy of the Auditor General's Report that he is supposed to be quoting from, I do not have a copy of it.

[pause]

[inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: I am aware of which quote he quoted from. He quoted from five. But if he is going to quote from any report I do need a copy. He was reading originally from the newspapers, and I tried to follow what he was reading. He is now reading from what is supposed to be an official document. I would like to have a copy of it in my hand.

[pause]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, for the sake of completing this I will just read the relevant Standing Order as I understand it.

[Standing Order] 77 (1): "**There shall be a Standing Select Committee, to be styled the Public Accounts Committee, to consider reports of the Auditor General—(a) on the accounts of the Government; (b) on such other accounts required to be laid before the House as the committee may think fit; and (c) on any matter incidental to the performance of his duties or the exercise of his powers as the Committee may think fit.**"

Suborder (3): "**Upon its receipt by the Speaker, a report mentioned in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to have been referred by the House to the Public Accounts Committee for consideration and shall forthwith be distributed to all Members and shall become a public document.**"

The Speaker: I am aware of the section you are reading from. I am well aware of the section you are reading from. Read your Constitution now and the Auditor General's Report to the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislative Assembly. That is where he makes his report. Read that as well. But we won't argue that

now, that is an argument for another time. You can proceed as long as I have a copy of the document in my hand when you are quoting from it, since it is supposed to be an official document, which I have not read.

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

Madam Speaker, might I suggest that we take a five minute suspension while that is being done?

The Speaker: They only have to bring.... If they have copies out there they should be able to produce one in less time than that.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Fine.

The Speaker: But we can take a five minute suspension if you wish.

[pause]

The Speaker: In section 77(5)—and I have not suspended the House. I would remind you I did not leave the Chamber—“77 [(5)] **The Public Accounts Committee shall make their report upon the report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the Government before the Auditor General’s Report is laid on the Table of the House . . .**” (That is when it becomes an official document in this Parliament.) “**and both the Committee’s report and the Auditor General’s report shall be laid at the same time.**”

It is not an official document until it has been examined by the Public Accounts Committee and [laid] to the Table of this House. Then it becomes an official document in this Parliament.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I am not seeking to lay it on the Table of the House. It is a public document which I am referring to, so I am not going to fight that battle with you.

The Speaker: You are quoting from? May I ask which page it was again? And which one, I have two in my hand.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Yes, Madam Speaker, it is the second report I am dealing with first, August 2011, the “Case Studies.”

The Speaker: Okay.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Page one, the Executive Summary.

The Speaker: Mm-hmm.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: And I had started, Madam Speaker, the second sentence of paragraph five.

The Speaker: Okay.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: “**The Minister of Finance has the powers under the *Public Management and Finance Law (2010 Revision)* to enter into loans on behalf of the Government, and the Minister of Finance believed that by cancelling the second loan tender and contracting with Cohen and Company that he was acting in the best interests of the Government and would achieve significant savings.**”

“[6] However by cancelling the second loan tender we found that:” (and these are the findings of the Auditor General) “**The Government paid an extra C\$450,000 in legal and arrangement fees for the short term financing alone, when compared to the winning bid from the second tender.**” That is the tender, Madam Speaker, the bid that had been made by First Caribbean and Royal Bank. “**Had the Government proceeded with obtaining long-term financing through Cohen and Company, the extra arrangement and legal fees would have been significantly more.**”

And that is because, Madam Speaker, you will remember that in February . . . at the end of January, the Premier announced that he was going to terminate the arrangement with Cohen and Company. So, the Auditor General is saying that if the Government had proceeded with obtaining long-term financing through Cohen and Company, the extra arrangement and legal fees would have been significantly more. What Cohen and Company had done (as we will come to), is they had arranged two short-term loans over the time or over their tenure with the Government.

The Auditor General goes on: “**Contracting with Cohen and Company did not comply with the financial regulations. The contract awarded to Cohen and Company provided intermediary services and did not provide a loan as the original tender requested. The contract was awarded without going through an open tendering process while disregarding the advice of Ministry of Finance officials that awarding a contract to Cohen and Company created risks for the Government.**”

“[7] Therefore,” (says the Auditor General) “**in my opinion the process used to acquire the contract with Cohen and Company lacked transparency and fairness. In addition, I believe that the award of the contract to Cohen and Company did not provide good value-for-money and resulted in C\$450,000 of extra cost to the Government.**”

“[8] By early January 2011, Ministry of Finance officials determined that Cohen and Company could not deliver on the promises it laid out

only two months earlier. With the cancellation of the agreement with Cohen and Company, the Ministry of Finance, with the assistance of an expert consultant, successfully tendered for the loan and obtained value-for-money in early 2011.

“[9] The Government paid CI\$307,000 to arrange the long term loan obtained in April 2011 as a result of the tendering process conducted by Ministry of Finance officials with the assistance of an expert consultant; considerably less than had it proceeded with the arrangement with Cohen and Company.”

That, Madam Speaker, is the Executive Summary.

Madam Speaker, on page 10 of his report the Auditor General starts to set out in some detail the facts relating to this matter and, Madam Speaker, it makes for startling reading. Starting at paragraph 32, the section entitled “Hiring Cohen & Company did not confirm to the financial regulations”: “[32] On October 15, 2010, the Minister for Finance entered into an agreement with Cohen & Company Capital Markets, LLC . . . that is headquartered in New York City to facilitate acquisition of borrowings related to the authority to borrow CI\$155 million” (or US\$185 million) “in 2010/11. Acting as an intermediary, Cohen & Company’s role was to arrange short term borrowing and a long term bond issue with a financial institution. The Government entered into this agreement without going through an open tendering process required by the financial regulations and practices outlined in the Central Tenders Committee guidelines.

“[33] Concerned about raising a loan of approximately CI\$20 million for Cayman Airways (which was not part of the tendering process), the Minister of Finance instructed the Ministry of Finance officials to withhold notifying the winning bidder of the September 9th tender. Although the Ministry of Finance was directed by the Minister of Finance to include the refinancing of the \$20 million loan for Cayman Airways in the intermediary contract, this was not done.” Pardon me, Madam Speaker. My throat is becoming a bit dry. “According to Finance officials, the FCO’s borrowing approval of CI\$155 million was for the entire public sector and did not include CI\$20 million borrowings in respect of Cayman Airways. In other words, one of the main reasons expressed by the Minister of Finance for hiring the services of Cohen & Company could not be followed through by Finance officials due to the lack of authority to proceed in the first place.

“[34] The decision to contract with Cohen & Company was made by the Minister of Finance against the advice of Ministry of Finance officials. We were informed by the Minister of Finance that he directed the Government to enter into a contract with Cohen & Company as it was his belief

that Cohen & Company offered better value-for-money, and it would have saved the Government a total of CI\$24 million over the fifteen year term that the borrowing would have occurred. The basis for these savings was contained in submissions to Cabinet that we reviewed as part of our audit.”

And so, Madam Speaker, when I say that much of what the Premier said when he spoke to the nation and made a statement in this House in late October, early November, of last year was simply not true. There were no savings to be realised. There was no contract for Cayman Airways. There was nothing that we had been able to discern which gave Cohen any level of attractiveness over anybody else who had properly bid.

“[35] The Minister of Finance informed us that he was unhappy that both the first and second tender processes did not include refinancing for the \$20 million debt of Cayman Airways. He also informed us that he had the following concerns: that Ministry staff did not have the skills to conduct the loan acquisition process.”

I suppose he did. That’s not the Auditor General saying that part Ma’am, that is me.

The Speaker: I was wondering where you saw that.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: That was me Ma’am; that was me.

“[T]here were conflicts of interest with Government officials . . .” I think we should hear about those. And I hope whoever gets up to respond will answer some of these unanswered questions. “. . . and, about the general process that led to the approval by the Central Tenders Committee of the loan awarded to the First Caribbean and Royal Bank of Canada. He informed the audit team that the results of the tendering process did not provide best value-for-money. He indicated that his unease with Ministry officials’ advice resulted in him going to his political party colleagues for advice and asking them whether they believed better rates could be obtained from the markets.

“[36] From our review of the information, Ministry officials identified significant risks associated with Cohen & Company to the achievement of the proposed savings; however, these were not discussed in the information that went to Cabinet. The risks were communicated to the Minister of Finance by the Financial Secretary based on a thorough review by Finance officials. The concerns ranged from the likelihood that interest rates promised could not be achieved to the fact that there were significant reputational risks from dealing with Cohen and Company. The concerns regarding Cohen & Company’s original offer raised by Ministry officials in an email to the Minister of Finance when they learned he was going

to cancel the tendering process and contract with Cohen and Company, included:

- no short-term funding was formally promised by Cohen & Company while the long-term loan bond was put in place;
- all three of Cohen & Company's options were bullet bonds, (which only require interest payments to the maturity date). In addition, the interest rate recommended by Cohen & Company would have fluctuated daily, (so the true interest cost of the loan is unknown and the amount shown in the analysis of the options provided were not appropriate);
- there was a danger of reputational damage to the Government being associated with Cohen & Company in view of one of its principals being charged with securities fraud; and
- Cohen & Company is not listed on the Bloomberg website as one of the leading contenders in underwriting issues in the capital markets. The Ministry official indicates that 'I find it quite difficult to believe that Cohen & Company has the ability to deliver what it says.' Furthermore, the costs associated with the underwriting costs were approximately double (CI\$1.55 million vs. CI\$777,000) the FCIB/RBC bid in the tender process."

Madam Speaker, the Auditor General goes on: "[38] From our review, it is also our opinion that there was insufficient due diligence on the part of the Government to assess the likelihood that the proposed borrowing facilities and savings from those facilities could be achieved at the cost outlined. In other words, it is our opinion that the decision to award Cohen & Company a contract on the basis of their proposal fell far short of what we would expect for the Government to have entered into a contract of this nature. For example, we would have expected the Government to have reviewed the borrowing option put forth by Cohen & Company and compared it against other companies who could offer the same type of facility.

"[39] In awarding the contract in October 2010 to Cohen & Company, we found that the Government did not comply with the financial regulations and associated contracting rules designed to ensure that the award of contracts greater than \$250,000" (quarter of a million dollars) "provide a fair and transparent process with due regard for value-for-money. In paying all of the fees associated with the hiring, including the extra legal and arrangement costs, of Cohen & Company and using them to arrange the short term financing arrangements noted above, we believe the Government of the Cayman Islands got little

value-for-money for the costs of the services that were provided."

"[40] The Minister of Finance was concerned about the cost of financing the CI\$155 million loan when the recommendation was made by Ministry officials after the second tendering process was complete. He informed us that he went to his political party for advice at that time.

"[41] We were informed by Mr. Peter Young, the UDP Treasurer that he pointed the Premier in the direction of Cohan & Company based on his knowledge of the industry. We found that Mr. Young provided information to the Ministry of Finance officials from Cohen & Company as well as some analysis to assist them in securing the intermediary agreement on behalf the Government.

"[42] In our opinion, Mr. Young, who is not a public servant, was providing a service to the Government of the Cayman Islands in that regard. As he is not a public servant, or under contract, Mr. Young is not subject to the same contractual obligations as a public servant or a contractor.

"[43] We have concerns when this occurs as we expect that all transactions conducted by the Government be carried out by public servants or individuals under contract to enable the effective management of any risks relating to the transaction. We expected to find management practices in place to ensure that any real or perceived conflicts of interests were appropriately managed and the risks mitigated and found none."

Madam Speaker, the Auditor General went on to outline how the extra cost incurred for interest and loan fees actually came about. He says, Madam Speaker: "[44] In approving the contract with Cohen & Company, the Minister of Finance believed there would be significant cost savings for the long term financing, mainly associated with promised lower interest rates. The Minister of Finance estimated the savings initially to be around CI\$24 million. To obtain the lower interest rates for the borrowing promised by Cohen & Company, the Government was prepared to pay a significant amount for an interest rate cap upfront. The costs were estimated from CI\$2.36 million for a 7% cap to a CI\$4.83 million for a 4.5% cap. In the short term, Cohen & Company promised to raise funds for the Government financing 'in a matter of days.' The decision by the Minister of Finance to hire Cohen & Company also included a commitment from them to provide funding for Cayman Airways which never materialized in the contract that was signed. In fact, the funding of approximately CI\$20 million for Cayman Airways was a significant reason given for cancelling the tendering process conducted by the Ministry and proceeding with a contract for Cohen & Company. In fact, the Government did not have authority from the FCO to

obtain additional loans, including a loan on behalf of Cayman Airways.

“[45] It should be noted” (says the Auditor General) “that the contract with Cohen & Company did not provide any firm commitment in terms of providing funding for the terms under which Cabinet discussed the agreement. The signed contract only provided the terms of how Cohan & Company would arrange loans but with no specific timelines, interest rates or other borrowing terms. It did, however, provide for Cohen & Company to receive a 1% arrangement fee that would have cost the Government CI\$1.55 million and legal fees and expenses of approximately CI\$390,600.

“[46] From the time the contract with Cohen & Company was signed on October 15, 2010 to the time the contract was cancelled on January 27, 2011 the contractor was unable to provide the promised long term financing. In a press release on February 2, 2011, the Minister of Finance announced that the Government had advised that the 4.5% interest rate cap on long-term financing could not be obtained at the price previously represented to government. The increase in the price of the cap was such a magnitude that it would wipe-out the cost savings promised by engaging Cohen and Company. Through a review of the Ministry of Finance documentation, we found that the cap at 4.5% (the interest rate offered during the tender process of a traditional 15 year loan) went from CI\$4.83 million up to approximately CI\$21 million. In addition, while Cohen & Company had proposed a 15 year bond to the Government in October 2010, the company offered a 7 year bond issue during the negotiations that ensued.”

“[47] Cohen & Company did, however, arrange two short term loans with financial institutions as shown in Table 5.” And Table 5 of the report shows that those were a short term loan from Scotiabank obtained on 22 October 2010, in the amount of US\$92.5 million for a 90 day term at a rate of LIBOR plus 2.25%.

And then this curious loan, Madam Speaker, of December 14th, 2010, from Banque Havilland—a bank which has only existed for about a year—in the amount of US\$36 million for a 37 day term, again at the same interest rate, LIBOR plus 2.25%.

The Auditor General notes, Madam Speaker, that the first short term loan from Scotiabank was extended by the Ministry of Finance officials for a further three months. And then, Madam Speaker, because the Auditor General is at pain to vindicate the officials within the Ministry, I believe that it would only be proper if I read that bit as well.

“[49] It should be made absolutely clear from our review” (says the Auditor General) “of the documentation and communications with Ministry officials from the time the agreement with Cohen & Company was signed to the date it was can-

celled that the Minister of Finance” (*the Minister of Finance*) “and not the Ministry of Finance officials directed the negotiations that ultimately led to the decision to cancel the agreement. Ministry officials informed us that they were not included in the negotiations or management of the contract. For example, they had to process high arrangement fees of CI\$75,600 plus legal fees for a CI\$30.2 million one month short term loan with Banque Havilland in December 2010 only months after they had acquired a short term loan with Scotiabank of CI\$77.7 million that cost CI\$191,937 plus legal fees. The additional loan was required because of cash shortages and the inability to put long term financing in place.

“[50] In arranging loans with financial institutions, we expected the Government would deal exclusively with top tier banks and financial institutions; a practice that had been followed by the Government for previous borrowing activities. To assess whether this was the case in 2010/11 we conducted our own research into Banque Havilland, one of the institutions recommended by Cohen & Company and which was used by the Government to finance its public debt requirements. We found out that Banque Havilland was opened in September 2009 and offers private banking services to high net worth individuals and high net worth families. The bank is owned by the Rowland Family of Great Britain. From our review of worldwide financial institutions, it is not a top tier bank or lending institution.”

And then, Madam Speaker, the Auditor General goes on to do the comparisons which give the result that I outlined at the start when I read from the Executive Summary, in which he says: “[52] By our calculations summarizing the information received from Ministry officials, the Government paid approximately an additional \$449,996 in fees for its short term borrowings by dealing with Cohen & Company instead of proceeding with the winning bidder from the Ministry of Finance open tendering process in October 2010.

“[53] Had the Government proceeded with the long-term financing arrangements as outlined in the contract with Cohen & Company, it would have cost over CI\$854,000 more in fees for the transaction compared to the winning bid from the second tender process. Not included would have been the additional fees for whatever company issued the bond.”

Madam Speaker, I have read extensively from this report because it must shake the confidence of my friends on the other side of this House that they were persuaded to back an arrangement based on information which has been systematically disproved by the analysis carried out by the Auditor General. Madam Speaker, it can only be described as misrepresentations made both to the country and presuma-

bly—because I am giving the rest of them outside the Premier, the benefit of the doubt—misrepresentations about what the nature of this arrangement was, about what savings would be achieved, and about what it is that Cohen and Company could actually do.

Madam Speaker, there is also a matter which has been raised by the Auditor General but not really discussed, and that is the involvement of Banque Havilland to be charitable. Obtaining a loan from a bank of the nature of Banque Havilland, a bank which essentially served wealthy families, essentially a private bank, a bank which was all of a year old, as a source from which the Cayman Islands obtains funding, must raise real questions in everyone's mind.

And then, Madam Speaker, coupled with that we have the report that the family which owns Banque Havilland, one of their companies connected to that family had a very fancy plane flying around these parts over Christmas and New Year and it just happened that our Premier and some of his colleagues and his loyal soldiers happened to be transported back to these Islands from parts unknown. I don't know, maybe other people know where they came from just around this time in December of 2010 when Banque Havilland loans the Cayman Islands Government some \$30 million.

Madam Speaker, there may be perfectly good reasons for all of this, and if there are I expect that my friends across the way will be at pains to explain all of that when it is their turn to speak. But in the absence of proper explanations—and thus far, there have been no proper explanations for any of this—there must be a lack of confidence in the leadership of the UDP Party, of this Administration, and of this country.

I cannot believe that some of the people of stature who sit across the aisle from me have just accepted that all of this is okay, that there are no issues with any of this. Do all of them dismiss the findings of the Auditor General in the way that the Premier did? Do they all believe that the Auditor General is just the hit man, that he is vindictive, and that this is pure unadulterated bureaucratic harassment? That that is all this is? Do they not have some concern about any of this? Madam Speaker, those of us on this side do for sure.

But more important than us, right across these Cayman Islands just about anywhere that I have gone people are in a state of shock. [They] express concern, disbelief that these sorts of goings-on could just be treated as run of the mill, quite normal. When the Auditor General writes a critical report, you condemn him, and that is supposed to be the answer to all of this.

How often have we seen a governor actually have to speak out in defence of one of the offices, one of the critical offices, one of the institutions established under our Constitution to provide checks and balances on the exercise of executive authority? I don't know if I can ever remember in the almost 11

years that I have been here. And so the Governor gets slammed too.

Dare I, the lowly Leader of the Opposition, say something I get not one but two fullpage ads. If you think I am guilty, you check him out. But, Madam Speaker, in the fullness of time the Auditor General I am sure will come to write reports on projects for which I had responsibility, and that is quite proper because they were big projects and in some instances things did not go right, and there are bound to be criticisms—fine. But I would just suggest, Madam Speaker, that contrary to the implications in the full page ads (one of which is running today) that somehow I have some nice cozy relationship with the office of the Auditor General, that it is not really that that has kept the Auditor General from pursuing with alacrity an audit of any of the projects for which the PPM Administration was responsible. It is because, Madam Speaker, the projects that we did . . . you could not smell them from 100 miles away! The Auditor General follows his nose, Madam Speaker, and that is why we have these kinds of reports on the Cohen financing deal.

Now, Madam Speaker, I hope when my friends on the other side get up they will explain to us how it is that \$450,000 in additional costs actually justifies substituting substance for process.

Madam Speaker, the Auditor General also wrote a report in which he pointed out the incidents of and the dangers inherent in what he termed political interference in the procurement process in Government.

Madam Speaker, on page 29 of his first [report of 5th July](#), the Auditor General said: **“Political interference is creating risks, uncertainty and morale problems in Government operations.**

“[137] During our audit, we found several instances where politicians have been involved in the day-to-day operations of the procurement function. There are significant risks and negative consequences when this happens.

“[139] We found evidence that some politicians are not complying with the procurement rules that have been established by the administration and, in some cases, contravening the laws and regulations. In other countries, the practice of politicians being involved in the administration of government's transactions has resulted in cases of corruption and abuse. There are limited checks and balances for government transactions that are conducted 'outside' the administrative processes in place, increasing the risk of corrupt transactions occurring. Without some form of oversight of the individuals conducting the transactions, there is no assurance that the risk of fraud and corruption is being effectively managed.

“[140] When politicians override the actions and decisions of administrative staff, their morale can be negatively affected. The employee's sense of value to the organization is diminished

and the sense of ownership and responsibility for ensuring that they are doing the best work for their employer is lost.

“[141] During our interviews, we were told of a number of recent situations where political interference had created the uncertainty and angst amongst government employees. For example, in one case, politicians met with middle management officials to question their decision with regard to procurement. In another case, we found that politicians directed the appointment of individuals, who were not government officials to a Departmental Tendering Committee. The government employees participating on the committee were informed that they could not participate in the evaluation of the bids. In another case, Cabinet reviewed the results of a tendering process and held up the announcement of the winning bidder. In the meantime, politicians questioned entity officials repeatedly regarding the decision rather than simply asking the Chief Officer to provide assurance, in his opinion, whether he could assert to the rigour and fairness of the process.

“[142] We found a senior public servant who submitted his resignation to the Government as a last resort to demonstrate his unease with the level of political override that was occurring and the impacts it was having on his ability to do his job effectively, and members of committees stepping down and not wanting to participate in the current procurement process because of the impacts of political interference.

“[143] During our interviews, we found evidence that public servants no longer wanted to participate in the procurement function, or do so with great trepidation because of the risk of political interference and the possibility for abuse of the process that might be associated with such activities.”

Madam Speaker, that is the kind of management, that is the prudent fiscal management that the Premier so loves to boast about. Now, Madam Speaker, if that is not the best evidence we could ask for to justify the loss of confidence which the broader community and this House should have in the Premier and the current Administration, then I don't know what else will ever convince people.

Madam Speaker, if we could at least be assured that the Government has learned from its mistakes, has seen the error of its ways, we could say, *Okay, we all make mistakes; the business of government is difficult.* Yes, the Premier wants to get things done but the response has not been that; the response has been to shoot the messenger, to condemn those who have inquired into, investigated into, and written these sorts of reports.

And, Madam Speaker, we saw yesterday another example of substance over process. We saw the breaking of ground on the supposed extension of the

Esterley Tibbetts Highway by the Dart Group as part of this “ForCayman Investment Alliance” which they are entering into with the Cayman Islands Government. But there are no signed contracts. This is a huge land swap arrangement, but no land has been swapped, no agreement has been given, there is no assessment done, none of the provisions of the Vesting of Lands Law, or the Royal Instructions as part of this overall deal have been done. But, Madam Speaker, I will leave that at this stage for others of my team in due course to deal with when they rise to speak.

Madam Speaker, I want to conclude really with another issue which begs, begs, pleads for an answer, pleads for an explanation by the Premier. In fact, Madam Speaker, he has promised to offer an explanation to the country to explain the circumstances. We have been waiting now, Madam Speaker, for months. And that, Madam Speaker, is the matter of the ongoing criminal investigation into the Premier.

Madam Speaker, when the Premier raised this issue—and the Premier himself raised this issue first—at his rally on the Public Beach months ago, he told the country . . . I don't want to misquote him, Madam Speaker, so . . . He told the country, Madam Speaker, this (and this is reported in the 27 June edition of the [Caymanian Compass](#)).

He said: “‘[The Opposition's] plan is to get me investigated, say that I have done something, take a real estate bill that I billed someone and say that I have done something wrong and then they're going to investigate me further; that is their game plan,’ Mr. Bush told the crowd. ‘They can't convict me because the truth will prevail. But what they will do in the meantime is to try to tear the Government down.’

“‘There has been no end of the maliciousness and you will see them this coming week going to the press again talking about corruption.’

“‘No matter the police investigation they have called to try to put me away, which have all proven nothing, because you can't twist things to say something is bad when the facts are not real and it is not there.’”

Now, Madam Speaker, since all of that, it has become very clear. The Governor has issued a statement. He has confirmed that there is a criminal investigation into the Premier in relation to a letter of October 7th 2004, written to—

The Speaker: Mr. Leader of the Opposition, did the Governor say “a criminal investigation” or “an investigation”? There is a difference in the semantics of the words.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, the Governor's response was this, in response to a letter to my colleague, the Elected Member for North Side:

"In answer to your request, I can confirm . . ." I was reading from the report, Madam Speaker, but I just remembered I actually have a copy of the Governor's letter so I can read that.

[pause]

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

The letter is dated 20th July 2011. It is addressed to Mr. Ezzard Miller [and] signed by the Governor, and it reads:

"Thank you for your letter of 14th July, attaching a copy of a letter dated 7th October 2004 on Windsor Development Corporation letterhead purporting to be from W. McKeever Bush to Mr. Stanley Thomas. You wrote that in your view this letter indicated prima facie evidence of corruption and/or extortion and you therefore requested I establish a commission of inquiry to investigate the matter. In answer to your request, I confirm that the matter is already the subject of an ongoing investigation by the Royal Cayman Islands Police Service. In light of this, I do not see the case for considering a commission of inquiry. With best regards, [signed] Duncan Taylor." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE]

Madam Speaker, I am not aware of the police carrying out any investigations that are not of the criminal kind. But if you wish, I need not use that word again. It is what it is.

But, Madam Speaker, I should also say that I wrote to His Excellency the Governor on 10 June 2011 in the following terms. **[CERTAIN WORDS WERE ORDERED BY THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER TO BE EXPUNGED FROM THE RECORD]**

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, this is your letter? This is your statement, is that it, to the Governor?

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Yes Ma'am. This is the letter—

The Speaker: This is your assumption to the Governor?

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Yes Ma'am. This is my letter to the Governor. **[CERTAIN WORDS WERE ORDERED BY THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER TO BE EXPUNGED FROM THE RECORD]**

The Speaker: I am sorry. I am going to have to stop you. These are your assumptions and your understanding. Unless there is documentation to back that up on the Floor of the House, if there is an investigation ongoing I think you should submit your infor-

mation to the Commissioner of Police and not on the Floor of the House. It is not a trial going on here this afternoon.

[inaudible interjection]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I am simply reading a copy of a letter which has been sent to His Excellency the Governor. And, with respect, I am entirely entitled to do that.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Your assumption?

[inaudible interjection]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: What rules?

[inaudible interjections and laughter]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: **[CERTAIN WORDS WERE ORDERED BY THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER TO BE EXPUNGED FROM THE RECORD]**

Point of Order

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Conolly: Point of order.

The Speaker: Yes Ma'am.

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Conolly: Madam Speaker, the Member is reading a letter which I understand has been inscribed by him. Unless he has the evidence and back-up, the documentary evidence to produce here—and perhaps he can start, Madam Speaker, by circulating a copy of that letter which was not sent to us—I do not see how we can accept this in this forum, Madam Speaker.

There are too many infringements of the rules of debate—too numerous to mention—starting with imputing wrong motives and lack of evidence. If he has the evidence I beg you, Madam Speaker, to have him lay it here.

The Speaker: You are correct, Deputy [Premier].

Unless you are going to produce evidence, this is not a trial of the Premier. These are your assumptions. Where you got your information from, unless it is accurate you should not bring it to the Floor of the House. You are actually not only impugning someone's good name, but you are making accusations that are totally unfounded at this point in time.

You are not quoting now from the Auditor General's report, you are quoting from your own per-

sonal assumptions, and I will not permit any further reading of that letter.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, if I may. This is not a court of law. This is the Legislative Assembly of these Islands, the Parliament. It is entirely in order for me to read correspondence which has been sent to His Excellency the Governor relating to these matters. I have never heard of evidence being given in this House by the Members debating. Members do not give evidence. Members say what they say under parliamentary privilege. We debate it, we argue it. That is a part of our function. What will constitute—

The Speaker: Excuse me! The rules of debate—

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: I am about to ask you a question, Madam Speaker.

What would constitute the evidence which the Deputy Premier and your good-self claim is necessary? If I were to read a witness statement which has been given to the police, would that suffice? What is it that we want?

The Speaker: This is in section 35(1) of the Standing Orders: “**Reference shall not be made to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending in such a way as might, in the opinion of the Chair, prejudice the interest of parties thereto.**”

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I agree, but there are no judicial proceedings on foot.

The Speaker: You have already said that there are criminal proceedings, which leads to judicial proceedings.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: There are no proceedings on foot, Madam Speaker, unless you are aware of something that I am not. There is a criminal investigation underway—

The Speaker: There is no criminal investigation. The Governor did not state “a criminal investigation.” I have told you, you cannot use that word unless he has said so in his letter, and he has not said so in his letter.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: I withdraw it, Madam Speaker. There is a police investigation into alleged financial irregularities.

Point of Order

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

Madam Speaker, I did not intend to get here and get into this because I wanted him to go . . . in fact, I wanted him to get on the steps of the Assembly, not in here, and say what he said. And I hope that if the papers are going to print it, that either you make a ruling whether they can or not.

He mentioned statements given to the police and if he produced that whether that would be good enough. I would like him to produce those statements and say . . . Well, if he produces them he would have to say who they are because obviously they would show who they are and how he got them. I want to know. I really want to know these things.

When it is due time, Madam Speaker, I will make a statement and I would bring some lawsuits too. But that is in due course.

I have given the police a long time, and the authorities a long time to run with this. It is not the first time that I have been maligned in this House about these sorts of things, and it won't be the last I suspect, simply because of who I am and where I come from. I already know that.

But let him now table these statements that he is claiming to have, since you allowed him to read such into the record of the House that he had no business because this Motion talks nothing about it. Talks nothing about what he is talking about! And we are debating specific points.

And does he have the evidence? I challenge him, and if he does not have the evidence it must be struck and the press must be told they can't report it under the procedure of this House.

I was not going to rise, Madam Speaker, but it has gone on, and gone on and gone on.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin, Minister of Education, Training and Employment: Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Minister of Education.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Under Standing Order 35(4)—since the Honourable Leader of the Opposition needs to understand something about the conduct and rules of this House which he throws out the window at his whim and fancy, very arrogantly—you cannot impute improper motive on other Members. And you cannot do it backwardly by simply saying *I wrote a letter, let me read the letter.*

You know, Madam Speaker, I am tired of sitting in this House and hearing Members facetly, foppishly, arrogantly, talk about “with due respect.” Madam Speaker, I can't tell you how to sit in that Chair, but you need to get control of this House.

I am tired . . . after my 11 years of being here . . . and that Member came here the same time as me. Same time! Same time as me! But his absolute disregard for the Chair and any other person in this House has really, really, really gone beyond all measure now

for these last two years since the 2009 general election. Okay?

So I can write a letter . . . The new rule that he has now introduced in this House is that I can write a letter. . . I write the letter, you know, and then I read it, and that is different than me saying it.

You know, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, you should be ashamed of yourself. You utterly should be ashamed of yourself. But you wait until the debate.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, what is the Member's point of order?

[inaudible interjections and general uproar]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I know this is an uncomfortable time for them but—

The Speaker: It is not just an uncomfortable time; it is your time to conclude your debate. It's . . .

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: But, Madam Speaker, I disagree very much with being cut off in carrying out my constitutional duty, but so be it. I will—

The Speaker: It is not your constitutional duty to defy the Chair and to keep repeating what I have told you to desist from repeating.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I—

The Speaker: That is not your constitutional duty.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I—

The Speaker: In any case, your time has run out. It is 4.23. You were supposed to stop at 4.23 pm. I will give you two minutes to wind up because we are going to call for an extension of the House at 4.30.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Well, Madam Speaker, I will close with this. This is in the public domain. There is a letter **[CERTAIN WORDS WERE ORDERED BY THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER TO BE EXPUNGED FROM THE RECORD]**

The Speaker: We are not going to go down that road again. I said I would give you two minutes to wind up—

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: I'm winding up.

The Speaker: —and that is being generous because your time expired at 4.23.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: I am winding up, Madam Speaker.

I am simply going to ask the Premier when he rises if he would explain—

The Speaker: Any further personal matters between you and the Premier, you will have to settle somewhere else.

You will not read any further on those matters. These letters, that there are no verifications for, and the other statements that you have made, or that somebody has made, are not admissible in this House this afternoon.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I rose on a point of order earlier because I sat and listened to imputation by the Member of my character, my honesty, that he wrote a letter—a letter I don't know anything about—to the Governor which is now in . . . the press will have it, and [it] gives further stick to all the things that the Opposition is raising every day on the radio.

Madam Speaker, for peace and order in this country, and I am asking the Member to produce his proof or I am asking the Chair to strike it and to strike it from the public as far as the radio carrying it and the press writing it. This will get its airing, Madam Speaker, when the police are finished with it, I hope.

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, you need to withdraw your statements on that matter.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I made no statements; I read from a letter.

The Speaker: A letter which you wrote, which is your statement.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: It is not a statement, Madam Speaker; it is a letter I wrote.

The Speaker: Then I shall order it struck from the record.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, you do as you wish.

The Speaker: It is struck from the record.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I have seen where you have made orders in the past for matters to be struck from the record, but, Madam Speaker, the papers have carried it. They

seem to forget. And this is not a matter of not wanting it reported. It will get reported in due course. But fairness is fairness. And he did say he had police statements.

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: *[addressing the inaudible interjection]* Oh well, we will get the record of that. And I am saying, Madam Speaker, that if it is going to be struck, it is going to be under the rules, which everyone—even the press in attendance—has to go by.

The Speaker: We can go further in this debate. *[Standing Order 24(4): “A motion shall not contain personal opinions or controversial allegations unnecessary to the main issue upon which the House is being moved to declare its will.”*

The matter is going to be struck from the records and I would expect the press to honour that request, that order, as well. Thank you.

Now I will call for the suspension of the House or the continuation thereof after the hour of 4.30.

Moment of interruption—4.30 pm

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, we had proposed to work late, which we will do, but we had also agreed to have the Annual General Meeting for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, which should take at least an hour, and I'm asking all Members to be reminded of that. At least one hour we would be. So if we take the suspension at this time, I would expect that we should start back at 5.30. Would that be sufficient time, Madam Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes, but first you have to move to have the business continue after 4.30. That is the first motion.

Suspension of Standing Order 10(2)

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, I move for the suspension of Standing Order 10(2) in order for the House to sit after the hour of 4.30 pm. And in so doing, it would bear in mind what I have just asked.

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.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: Standing Order 10(2) suspended.

The Speaker: Now I will suspend the House until 5.30.

Proceedings suspended at 4.33 pm

Proceedings resumed at 6.33 pm

The Speaker: Please be seated.

Proceedings are resumed.

When we took the break the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had just completed his presentation. He used his allotted time of two hours.

Does any other Member wish to Speak?

[pause] Does any other Member wish to speak?

[pause] Does any other Member wish to speak?

If not . . . Oh!

Honourable Deputy Premier.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Private Member's Motion No. 2–2011/12 —Lack of Confidence in the Government

[Continuation of debate thereon]

The Deputy Premier, Hon, Juliana Y. O'Connor-Connolly: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise to debate Private Member's Motion No. 2–2011/12 entitled “Lack of Confidence in the Government,” the Government being one of which I am a part, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I won't waste the time of the honourable House here today to go through all of the preamble in the “Whereas” clauses culminating with some 23 points. However, I would refer to the “Resolve” that they are seeking, which is asking this honourable Legislative Assembly to declare the lack of confidence in the Government.

Now, Madam Speaker, before I really dig into the merits or demerits of the Motion, I want to first focus my attention to the comments emanating from the Leader of the Opposition in his most recent remarks as he made several innuendoes, some direct comments and indirect, as related to crime and to the responsibilities. And with your kind permission, Madam Speaker, I wish now to draw Members' attention to section [55](1) of our Constitution—the “Cayman Islands Constitutional Order 2009”, subsection 1 (a), (b) and (c).

“**The Governor**”—not the Premier or any of my colleagues—“**The Governor shall.**” It does not say, Madam Speaker, ‘*may*’ which is discretionary. And I know my learned friend, the Leader of the Opposition, who is with years of experience in the legal framework, knows that words mean everything in law insofar as interpretation is concerned. **It says “shall”** (the discretion is removed from a statutory perspective) **“be responsible for the conduct subject to**

this Constitution and any other law, of any business of the Government with respect to the following matters.” And, Madam Speaker, it is important for persons to pay attention to what the Constitution . . . that he picked up a Queen’s Award for [of] having such a colossal contribution to drafting it. So I know he full well knows when he gets up on this honourable floor what it should say; at least I would hope so.

It says that the Governor shall have responsibility, **“(a) for defence; (b) external affairs, subject to subsections (3) and (4); (c) internal security including the police . . .”** who are responsible and charged, as we all know, for law and good order. There is more than just governance. That is an important part but it is tri-party relationship that people have a legitimate expectation that it will be done within this jurisdiction. And it is **“without prejudice to section 58.”**

Madam Speaker, for clarity, section 58 (1) deals with this now infamous National Security Council that the Leader of the Opposition tried so much to take himself out of the equation. **It says: “There shall be in and for the Cayman Islands a National Security Council which shall consist of (a) . . .”** I’m going through the composition, Madam Speaker, so that the public can hear who is on this Council. It is the Governor who chairs the Council; the Honourable Premier, two other Ministers appointed in writing by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice. I am one of those Ministers and so is my honourable colleague, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town. The Leader of the Opposition, who until early this year, was the First Elected Member for George Town and currently is the Leader who just spoke.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Third.

The Deputy Premier, Hon, Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: Third?

[inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Premier, Hon, Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: Third

An Hon. Member: And mover of the Motion.

The Deputy Premier, Hon, Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: And mover of the Motion who, when he takes time to attend this important National Security Council, sits there as well, Madam Speaker.

We have two persons, Mr. Dan Scott, Ms. Bridget, formerly known as Kirkconnell, as the civil society appointed persons. We have the Deputy Governor who has no vote that sits in an ex-officio capacity; the Attorney General likewise, no vote; the Commissioner of Police likewise, no vote.

Madam Speaker, I have been there attending every time it met except when I have been on official

business, and the same for my other colleagues in Cabinet. And I have no knowledge whatsoever of any National Security policy to deal or combat crime in these Islands by the Leaders of the Opposition, in particular the now current Leader of the Opposition.

And, Madam Speaker, the role of the Opposition is an important one. They are the eyes; in fact, they are the government-in-waiting. But it seems to me that the impetus and the modus operandi for this Motion we now have before us is not because they are the government-in-waiting. As I see, they have five Members and I am told there is an independent Member, and I believe when he says he is not a part of them because his actions so bend to that effect in this Parliament. Madam Speaker, the Constitution says on the basis of democracy where there is a majority of Members. So, if there is a government-in-waiting, they should have declared who their other candidates were in bringing this Motion.

This Motion, if it succeeds—and it won’t succeed, Madam Speaker—would mean in effect that the Premier would be removed and the entire Government, despite what has been said. If you read, Madam Speaker, with a careful eye the majority of what is set out in here is targeted at the Premier. And they knew what they were doing, Madam Speaker. But when one reads the same Constitution that the learned Member for George Town, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said, it is against the entire Government.

I wonder, Madam Speaker, whether I could pose the question [as to] whether it was statutorily entrenched to ensure that what occurred in 2001 could not occur again, because it is almost impossible under this Constitution that they have put in place to remove any government or any premier. Perhaps in his reply he can respond to why it has been so difficult to remove any.

He knows that this move, with the numbers that they have, will not succeed. It is not just against the Premier . . . and even if it were, this Government supports the Premier. There is no charge which has been laid at the Premier’s feet that he has been convicted. And we on this side, upstanding citizens, uphold the rule of law. We still believe that a person is not guilty until proven. And, of all the persons, Madam Speaker, he should know that. And failing his bringing substantive evidence we are going on the presumption that every Member in this House is duly elected and has not received a criminal charge by virtue of the Constitution which will make them ineligible to be in this House.

Madam Speaker, the Member, when he got up tried everything he could and fell far short, I may say in my respectful opinion, of laying the blame of crime at our feet. The Constitution clearly says under [section] 58(4) . . . and the Member knows this, Madam Speaker. And before he jumps up to say that I am in breach of the Constitution, let me refer Members’ attention to 58(6): **“Before assuming office each**

Member of the National Security Council shall sign a declaration that he or she will not disclose to any other person, without permission of the Governor, information acquired as a member of the Council; and, without prejudice to any other penalties that may be imposed under any other law, the Governor, acting in his or her discretion, may by published directions in writing exclude from the activities of the Council, or revoke the membership of the Council of, any member who breaches such a declaration.”

Since we are in the environs that the Opposition wants to tear everything down that they possibly can, including the Government, I sought consent from the Governor by virtue of this section to speak to a particular matter which occurred in the National Security Council. And by virtue of email I so received that consent. So, Madam Speaker, I proceed on that basis.

When the National Security Council last met, Madam Speaker, my learned friend from George Town was present for that occasion. The question came up as to whether the National Security Council was an advisory council or not. And he put forward his best arguments, because he has a way with words. The Attorney General was there and other good sounding members and it was determined there in the National Security Council that the Council is an advisory council. It is obvious that the learned friend from George Town has not accepted that position and has sought to resurrect that issue here on the Floor of this honourable House.

But, in fact, Madam Speaker, it says in 58(4): **“The National Security Council shall advise the Governor”—advise—“on matters relating to internal security, with the exception of operational and staffing . . .”** The two most important fundamental aspects of our police force. Even if we went along with his argument none of us here, including him, can advise the Governor or the Commissioner of Police how to run the police force. So if he has an issue with the way that the Commissioner of Police is running it, if he feels that the Commissioner of Police is inefficient or inadequate, then he should bring a substantive motion to the Floor of this House and have it debated on this Floor. And he should not seek, Madam Speaker, to introduce it through a back door, especially since they heralded themselves in the PPM as a sunshine government based on the principles of accountability and transparency. There is a very conspicuous discrepancy in those arguments, Madam Speaker.

It goes on to say, “. . . **the Governor shall be obliged to act in accordance with the advice of the Council . . .**” And I believe this is where he is getting all of his inertia. He needs to read the rest of what he takes credit for drafting in the Constitution, because it is absolutely clear, Madam Speaker, that there is a caveat. And those of us who studied English, there is a condition precedent entrenched in this provision which

puts it straight in line of an advisory council. If he does not appreciate that then he should make an appointment, Madam Speaker, to have an audience with the UK Government to attend the Eagle House to ask for independence. Because until then Her Majesty the Queen's Representative is His Excellency the Governor. And whether he likes it or not, he has to adhere to it. Otherwise, take his argument for internal self-government or independence or the right for him to do whatever he wants under absolute powers somewhere else. But as long as I am here, and as long as I have the mandate, Madam Speaker, from my constituents and the greater populace in the Cayman Islands, I will not allow that Member to come on the Floor and be the authority of nonsense when it comes to the Constitution, knowing full well that the Member knows better.

Madam Speaker, it goes on to say that “. . . **unless he or she considers that giving effect to the advice would adversely affect Her Majesty's interest**” (note it puts in brackets) **“(whether in respect of the United Kingdom or the Cayman Islands); . . .”** That tells me, Madam Speaker, there is a statutory entrenchment for His Excellency the Governor to act in the interests of Her Majesty, but also in the interests of the Cayman Islands. If he feels that His Excellency the Governor is not doing a good enough job with crime or any other matter under his carved-out responsibilities, again, might I invite him to do the honourable thing and bring a substantive motion rather than beating the Cabinet that he knows has absolutely no responsibility and is on equal footing with him as an individual Member of the National Security Council.

Madam Speaker, crime is perhaps the most important thing that is happening in this country. It affects our financial industry, it affects our tourism, it affects everybody.

Years ago tourism had a public relations quote which was going around that tourism was everybody's business. Might I respectfully submit, Madam Speaker, that crime is everybody's business. It has risen to national importance. It was not introduced by our Government and it was not introduced by his Government. But what we have in commonality is an interest to preserve the serenity, the calmness, the safeness of this country. And it will not happen, Madam Speaker, when we have Members in and outside of this House acting irresponsibly in pursuit of instantaneous power, forgetting that we have a country to run, we have an economy to resuscitate because of their poor management, their overspending.

Madam Speaker, it cannot succeed when we have Members, one of perhaps the most learned Leaders of the Opposition since the last election, one who heralds his legal expertise and experience. And I know the Member, he is very capable, Madam Speaker. He knows the ins and outs of Government. And there has not been a declaration of amnesia, so I

have to go on the premise that when he makes these statements and innuendoes that the Government is responsible for crime, or that the Government has some utopia or some gigantic or colossal power to force the Governor and the Police to do these things . . . the Member knows much better. And he should love this country sufficiently enough not to be so reckless in his statement to the House.

Madam Speaker, it goes on to say: “[58 (5)] **The Commissioner of Police shall— (a) provide regular briefings to the National Security Council**” (and the Commissioner does this, Madam Speaker) **“on matters of internal security, including the police force save insofar as to do so would prejudice current operations;”** So, even with the reporting element that has been introduced into this Constitution that he crafted, there is still a carve-out that the police can hold back any information that would prejudice current operations.

Section [58(5)]: **“The Commissioner of Police shall— (b) have responsibility for the day to day operation of the police force and shall report regularly on such operation to the Governor.”** Madam Speaker. Not the Governor in Cabinet, “the Governor.” So there is even a further carve-out for the police to have their independence as they should have.

I would not want to be in a country where there is interference into our police force. No, Madam Speaker; and I don’t think the Member would want [that] as well. Our Government does not get into the practice of calling up the police station to find out what the charges are, or any other operational thing. No Auditor General has come and said that, as many reports that have been put out. That has not been laid, and, in fact, believe you me, Madam Speaker, if that was the case it would have been number one on the censure motion that is here.

Madam Speaker, we will also see that there is a new provision where the Commissioner of Police shall also inform the Honourable Premier of “any significant” . . . and I love the English language, Madam Speaker. It didn’t say of *any security developments*; it said “any *significant* security development.” So the Commissioner has that inherent discretion to determine what is significant, whether it is of a security nature and a developmental nature in the Cayman Islands, including the occurrence of any significant criminal activity.

Now there is a lot of difference between somebody reporting to you because you have to go on what they say. And the Commissioner has a relationship with the National Security [Council] with His Excellency the Governor and the Premier in that he duly reports what he thinks in his interest is necessary to keep them informed. It is not a reciprocal thing where it says . . . I don’t see, Madam Speaker. Perhaps the Member can stand—and I will give way—that the Honourable Premier and the Cabinet of the

country can tell the police what to do, and that we are responsible. I don’t see it, Madam Speaker, and I have looked quite carefully here.

For him to get up, Madam Speaker, at a time where persons, females especially, are afraid to be out on the streets after dark, and to make people believe in the interest of vote getting (in my respectful submission) that this Government, my colleagues, is responsible for crime? Well, what happened to the murders and the thefts and robberies and rapes and the incest that went on during their Administration?

You see, Madam Speaker, in logic there is proper reason and there is tautological reason. If I were in logics class today, I would have had the supreme example of tautological reasoning by the Leader of the Opposition. He started at one point and ended up in the next point and we still do not know where he went, Madam Speaker. Because there is no way that he, having the benefit of creating and drafting this modern Constitution Order, so much so, that it got him a Queen’s Award—not from his Government, but from my Government, Madam Speaker. And he now comes to make honourable Members of the House (including myself), the wider public, and the press believe that he is speaking as a voice of authority. And he should be. The credentials are there.

But, Madam Speaker, it is weighed like Nebuchadnezzar and found in the balance. Because if someone leaves believing that we in the Government can stop crime, that is erroneous deductive reasoning. And I trust, Madam Speaker, that each Member here, regardless of what side of the House they find themselves on, if nothing else is achieved from this Censure Motion we would recognise, Madam Speaker, that crime is everybody’s business. We have a duty to report.

There were innuendoes against the Honourable Premier about allegations—not charges. There was no documentary evidence produced, Madam Speaker, to the Floor. And the Member knows the onus of proof, he knows the significance of injecting doubt, much less reasonable doubt, and he is clever at that. He is a master at that, Madam Speaker. But thank God each day as we nation build that type of politics, where we seek to deceive those persons who are not privileged or the beneficiaries of the knowledge that he was afforded, paid for by scholarships of this Government, Madam Speaker, it is wrong! We nation build by helping each other out! If he has so much evidence, take it and be a substantial witness for the Crown, Madam Speaker, but do not use the privilege of this honourable House to smear any Member, his colleagues or my colleagues, because at the end of the day we are politicians. But more importantly, we are Caymanians trying to nation-build.

Madam Speaker, the National Security Council may regulate its own procedure, so if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition feels that the National

Security [Council] is not doing a good enough job, then he has the high duty—even more so as Leader of the Opposition—to bring us back on track, to share his utopia of knowledge with the National Security Council in the interest of this country. That has not been done to date, Madam Speaker, and I read my Minutes.

Madam Speaker, when we first took office the Honourable Premier asked for a special taskforce to tackle crime. The request was put forward. It was felt at the time, Madam Speaker, that it was not necessary, that the necessity was there to augment the HR within the police with a special level of detectives, et cetera. The police were given the money. As recent as Cabinet this week, Madam Speaker, over a million dollars was again given to the police to combat crime. That is where we play our role, Madam Speaker. We have the power to vote monies. The police make the request and we have to recognise and be ever cognisant, Madam Speaker, that we are in dire financial times.

Yes, we know it is a worldwide recession. But, Madam Speaker, blind Bartimeus would know that the last Administration contributed greatly to what happened here because of their lack of foresight, because of their grandiose projects. And yet those Members on that side (not speaking of my friend from North Side or my good friend from Bodden Town) have the audacity, Madam Speaker, to get written, directly or indirectly, to talk about the Hilton Hurricane Shelter on Cayman Brac, which is in here.

Before they jump up on relevance, Madam Speaker, let me please bring your attention to it: **“Persisting in the announcement of major projects without reliable** (this is number 13, page 2 of this nonsensical Motion they are wasting the time of the House with today, Madam Speaker) **assessment of feasibility cost benefits or economic or environmental impact.”**

Well, Madam Speaker, the jury may be out, but if I have to be accused of building a Hilton for the people of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, and, by extension, anybody in our jurisdiction in the time of a storm, and having the foresight to not have a repetition of what occurred in the most recent hurricane (Paloma) in Cayman Brac—which the Minister knows very little about . . . because the first flight that came over, instead of touring the constituency to see what went on, they spent it in an air-conditioned air traffic control [tower]. The current Leader of Government Business was eating Kentucky fried chicken while mosquitoes were eating us, Madam Speaker. That is the first point.

[laughter]

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: Madam Speaker, let’s talk about major projects without feasibility. Let’s look at these schools.

Yes, Cayman needs schools, Madam Speaker. But where was the planning for the recurrent expenditure for these schools that my good friend the Minister of Education has to do? Or where was the capital money for this school? Or where was the due diligence on Tom Jones?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Yes!

Deputy Premier, Hon Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: The Minister will get up . . . and knowing the Minister as I do, he is a chef, not just of flowery language, but of language with authority that has sense and that is non-tautological, Madam Speaker. So I await his contribution for the Leader of the Opposition and hope that it will help him fill in the gaps for his reply.

Madam Speaker, I understand now that because they could not stop with all of the things that they could conjecture from their supporters, their foot soldiers, their grounds men, their electronic magicians to stop the Hilton on the Brac, they are now saying, *Well, maybe if we can’t stop it, maybe we can do a change-of-use.* Well, go to Planning for that change-of-use application because I am in contact with my constituents and they are sick and tired of the era where a selected few elect themselves to be the majority and everyone else in the social stratification becomes naught.

As long as I am alive, Madam Speaker . . . when I first got elected in 1996 I told the people of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman that I would be a voice in this House. I do not go looking for fights, Madam Speaker. But when you try to deprive, through economic wealth and political power, the rights of my people, you then get on the fighting side of Juliana O’Connor-Connolly, the Member for Cayman Brac.

Madam Speaker, when you come and bring a Censure Motion, and one of the basis is because you are building a Hilton . . . and these are the same people who are the people Government and don’t stop the progress! What progress, Madam Speaker? What I see happening *ya*—and those of you who know me—

[laughter]

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: —those of you who know me, Madam Speaker, know that I don’t speak that way.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: What I see happening is this!

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O’Connor-Connolly: I’m getting to that, Madam Speaker.

What I see happening is this! And for those who do not know what the reference is, it is YouTube, Madam Speaker.

The relevance of this is . . . what I see happening, is this: May 2009 came and persons on that side have not yet woken up to the realisation that it took a majority to form the Government, and when it was formed they were not in it. And the Leader of the Opposition needs to wake up and smell the roses and realise that the progress was not stopped, the progress was given an audacity for hope. There was a new fresh wind blowing. In fact, the same Hilton that they referring to on the Brac that should be used for the school, the Minister and I have consulted and we are taking care of the needs of the school. We have plans, not because we do not go and blog it. We consult with our persons. In fact, if they had taken the time to be on the Brac last week, Madam Speaker—before wasting time with this Censure Motion—they would see that the Government had lost contact with its people and, in fact, one of the best weekends ever, Madam Speaker, was the retreat we just had on Cayman Brac. We know what the constituents are wanting.

[inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Connolly: We still know, Madam Speaker, that there is perhaps a silent more conservative majority in Cayman that perhaps does not have access to Internet or to the blogs or what have you, and they don't have that motivation to grab (I can't find a better adjective, Madam Speaker) power.

Good comes to those who wait! And maybe, just maybe, Madam Speaker, if they behave themselves they may get a chance at something. But, what I see happening, Madam Speaker, is that this here is a deliberate attempt, a deliberate attempt to abort the democratic process of the will of the people.

This same Constitution here, which was drafted by my learned friend, put for the first time a people-initiated referendum. If he had all of this support, which I thought in here would be filled today, Madam Speaker, with all red; a sea of red would have been here, so much so that the poor Serjeant would have to get support. Where is the support that gave him the [inertia], the synergy and the energy to bring this at this time?

Madam Speaker, I am not an accountant. I have two degrees. I worked very hard to get them, but not in accounting. I rely on my good friend, the auditor, to my left, and others that so chose that occupation. But what I see happening, Madam Speaker, is that there are currently four Members in here, if my good friend from North Side supports it, and I suspect from seconding it he will. Unfortunately, my good friend from East End had to be unavoidably away because of the care and concern that he pays to his family, in particular his precious mother. I haven't heard an excuse for the past Leader of the Opposition, but where are they going to get the support from?

They made sure that the Attorney General could not support them—and I know he wouldn't because that same Leader of the Opposition took away the vote! The Deputy Governor is an *ex officio* Member, so obviously no support is coming from him. And, Madam Speaker, I can tell them, despite the rumours, despite the innuendoes, that not one single Member of my male colleagues sitting behind me or beside me is going to vote in support of this. What we see happening here, Madam Speaker, is a Government that has taken this country out of the economic mess that we inherited when we came.

We spent countless hours in the Glass House trying to get the Budget together, trying to appease the FCO which was never hitherto fore happening so we could get a budget through. There were times that we did not know how we were going to pay the loyal, faithful civil servants.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: That's right!

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Connolly: There were times that we had to rely on the overdraft facility and much more. We had to stagger payment of bills. So for that Member to get up and talk the nonsense, Madam Speaker, in paragraph 1, "**The Premier's handling of the published operational deficit of the Government for the 2008/2009 financial year, suggesting that the country was bankrupt.**"

Now, Madam Speaker, we know in financial terms what bankruptcy means. But if the people in Cayman did not stop the progress of the increasing deficit, bankruptcy would then be a glamorous word to describe the state of affairs from a financial perspective of what was happening in Cayman.

And then he goes on, with audacity, that the Government, in particular the Minister of Education, after two years hasn't finished the school. Does he know that is why he is not sitting over here today, Madam Speaker? Because the majority of people in this country felt that he bit off more than he could chew.

I finally, Madam Speaker, heard kind of an apology on *Rooster* some mornings ago.

Caymanian people have always been wise people. They sailed the seas long before GPS was in vogue, and did it well and were well sought out. We still go abroad and place in a top ten percentile. The only weakness we have, Madam Speaker . . . and for some reason we are still into this colonial entrapment from a mental perspective that we won't emancipate ourselves from mental slavery. And that principle, that decades old principle of dividing and conquering, for God's sake, put it one side, Madam Speaker. We have a country that is worthwhile saving.

We have a new and upcoming generation [where] some have lost the fear of the Lord. And, yes, though we have people, when you mention God's

name in Parliament they think you are a fanatic. Well, I have news for them, Madam Speaker, because I will record here and now that I am not ashamed of the Gospel of God because it is still the power of salvation.

He has founded it—not the Leader of the Opposition—upon a rock and established it. And the only thing that will bring us down, Madam Speaker, as Caymanians is when we do what I see happening here and now. What happened here, Madam Speaker, is that there is a divide and conquer from the highest echelon down to the lowest place in this country. They have come from within and from without, and have recognised that the one weakness that we as Caymanians have is tearing each other down.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yes!

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor Connolly: If we are going to nation build . . . and we have to, Madam Speaker. We have to learn to respect one another. We have to realise that a prophet or a prophetess can still be recognised, respected and appreciated within this country.

Even if we gave the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues the benefit of the doubt that things were not going as they would like, as an Opposition I would be worried if the Government did everything that was pleasing to the Leader of the Opposition and his comrades. Madam Speaker, that doesn't happen between husbands and wives, between parents and children.

It is healthy; it is robust to have constructive opposition. But, Madam Speaker, when we have issues, like crime, that is national, we should not see politics; we shouldn't see the next election; we shouldn't use it as a political football or any other type of football, because when we do so we are self-inflicting wounds. They may win the next election . . . God forbid! God forbid, Madam Speaker, because what I see happening here is that unless this Government who has prudent responsibility, who has a proven track record that we have gone from over \$80-something [million] deficit to now the recent \$24 million surplus . . . Do the math!

What I see happening here, Madam Speaker, is that if you want real progress you do not regress, you do not suppress, you do not divide, you do not come to the forefront and say *Simon says it's time for a general election*. If they want a general election go the right route, Madam Speaker, because the good people of Cayman will see this Motion for what it is—a waste of the time [and] of the people's money.

We could be here, if we were serious, in that committee room sitting down as a Committee of the whole House putting together a strategy to go to the Governor as one Caymanian Parliament saying, *Your Excellency, we appreciate your efforts. We have given you what you have asked for the Commissioner of*

Police—money. Is there anything else that you need? What can we as 15 elected Members here do to make it better in our country for crime?

We know the people. The police have a problem, Madam Speaker, of getting confidence, getting evidence and information. We know our constituents. Let's fight this war against crime together and not score points on one another by blaming each other for it, Madam Speaker. You think that we can stop somebody [from] going into a house in whatever district tonight? We can't even get proper security as Members of Parliament because people like the members of the Opposition will go on and blog and make hoo-hah about it. It's their constitution; tell him to go in other jurisdictions and see the treatment that you get as Ministers.

But if they do not stop this . . . Madam Speaker, they think that crime is bad in Cayman now? It will go to the next level. It started off low. It went to tourism. Watch and see the turn that crime takes in this country if we as big hard-backed men and women in this House play politics with crime, Madam Speaker.

I say without fear of contradiction to any Member on my side or that side, shame, shame, shame. We love Cayman. We ought to. We were born and bred here. This is our country. And if we don't take this country seriously enough and ask not what it can do for us, and begin to ask what we can do for this country, instead of seeing who can be sensational enough to get a headline, or who can bring a motion like this to go down in history having brought a censure motion when you know you have no chance of winning it, you have no evidence whatsoever, or if you are doing it, you are holding it back. And the receiver is just as bad as the thief, Madam Speaker, even in basic criminal law.

If we see criminal activity happening, let's go to the police. Let's tell them what we see. There has to be more with us than we with them. Am I to believe that there are more criminals on the street than good-thinking citizens in Cayman? Absolutely not, Madam Speaker! And when there were real men and women who were willing to put country before self we would not be having debates such as this here today. This time could be much better spent helping some child do his homework, finishing Cabinet papers up in the Government House, dealing with international things.

When this Government came in we were on all different colour lists. Thank God, not the red list. And the Honourable Premier and his financial team worked to get over twenty-something countries signed up with Tax Information Exchange Agreements (TIEAs). We have been able to work with an economy to the best of our ability. Every project we bring, Madam Speaker, faults are found with it. There is criticism, and nothing seems to satisfy their appetite. But we on this side recognise that the *modus operandi* is to frustrate all of the efforts of the Government to do just

what they are doing here—to be able to say that the Government did nothing.

So come, Bobo, come; let's sit under some Breadfruit Tree and come vote for me.

Madam Speaker, that type of politics is wrong! It is wrong! Our forefathers and our foremothers went through blood, sweat and tears to build this democracy, this freedom, this liberty that we enjoy in the Cayman Islands, coupled together with a reverential respect for Almighty God. Are we just going to tear it down because we don't want to sit over there and we want to sit here? God forbid, Madam Speaker.

Some Members go through Parliament and don't get the privilege of sitting over here. I remember the late Captain Mabry [Kirkconnell]. He didn't get to sit here. But he still served his country to the best of his ability. Whether you liked him or you didn't like him, he spent 20 years here. That tells me that he got the majority of the vote of the people. There are other outstanding politicians who did that. You do not have to sit on this side to get things done. Yes, it helps, in that you are around the table of decision making. But don't do it to the detriment of the country, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition . . . crime was so important to him that he sneaked it in, in my respectful view, on the second page under 17, "The incidence of crime." How nonchalant. How nonchalant, Madam Speaker. Crime was so foremost on their minds that it was of national importance . . . and mind you, Madam Speaker, under the Standing Orders that same Member knows—I trust he has read them—that he could get up on an adjournment and bring a statement or a motion on a matter of national importance to deal with crime. Obviously, by his own lack of action, crime could not have been that important if he could just deal with it here.

Madam Speaker, it was in my respectful view a deliberate attempt to fluff it up with all of these reasons none of them could stand the test of time. Otherwise, they would have put it on this Table for all of the public consumption that was necessary. So they get to this here today, Madam Speaker, and all of a sudden crime has become the order of the day. Thank God. The realisation and the possibility—the possibility, Madam Speaker—for a partnership with the Opposition and the Government on at least one issue would be crime, but no, Madam Speaker. What I see happening here is the great giant from the Opposition standing up, valiant and tall trying to allocate the blame and divide and break asunder what is happening here.

Progress is happening in the country. There is reason, Madam Speaker, to have confidence in the Government. My colleagues work extremely hard. None of us do seven and a half hours. There are times that I do not get to see my children, even living in the same house, because they leave, I leave early

and come back late. My colleagues do the same thing. And people can rant and rave about the salary we make. But, Madam Speaker, we could never be paid enough, from an economic perspective, for the work that any sensible politician does in this country that loves this country, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we have to grow up. Everything else around us is maturing. We brag that we have a mature Constitution. There is no sense getting a Mercedes Benz if you can't run a wheelie with a caliber stick, Madam Speaker. There is a quantum leap between the two. And there has to be a meeting of the minds. If we want to be controllers of our destiny in whatever capacity, private, public or corporate, we have to act like mature citizens.

We could have an entire *Hansard* filled with the most eloquent, the most articulate words, and the best justification of our position. It will matter nothing if we leave this country worse than what we found it.

What I see happening here, Madam Speaker, is a bunch of eager, egotistical enthusiasts who want to take back the reins to run this country. Well, the people said, no, Madam Speaker. And if any of us are here long enough we will probably hear the same no. Some of us are smart enough to get out while the going is good, like my good friend, Mr. Norman. But most will become victims of their circumstance.

Wait until your turn. Go read the Standing Orders. Get familiar with Erskine May. Learn how other countries came through these trials and tribulations. Talk to our neighbours. We are in a global village. Bermuda is having similar problems. I got back from a meeting in Anguilla. All of the Overseas Territories were having similar problems. Bermuda is having so many murders. They asked for the same thing as our Honourable Premier and my Cabinet did, a task force, and had difficulties getting approval for it.

We have to understand that while we are an Overseas Territory there are certain things we can only ask for and ask for. Is he advocating that we go and get *wawmpuhs* and wheelbarrows and march through the streets of George Town and cause more chaos in our country? That is not the *modus operandi* of this Government. The art of negotiation is what we try.

The Premier flies to London, there's criticism here. How ludicrous, Madam Speaker. And before I forget: "Official Travel"—"21. The extent and costs of official travel." That's a reason to bring the Government down. Well, Madam Speaker, when I was sitting in the hallowed halls here and they were in the Government I heard great criticism that their former leader was afraid of the plane and wasn't travelling. So that's why we didn't know what list we were on, or what list we should be on. Our Premier knows—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Conolly: And I am very reliably informed that they spent over \$11 million! Can I say that's too much? Or too little?

Madam Speaker, if we are not at the table . . . you [ever] heard, "out of sight out of mind"? With the position that Cayman finds itself in financially, Madam Speaker, not everybody on the block is our friend. There are those out there who wish to see us fall. I know that, having gone to negotiate after Ivan to get assistance for Cayman. There were people laughing in the faces of the Premier and me, and almost wishing that Cayman had not risen up.

But what I saw happening then was that Caymanians were genetically encoded with a resilience to rebuild and recover. And what I see happening now, [is] that the Premier and the Cabinet have those same genes that I know my friend from George Town has—I won't even say "had", "has." He needs to maximise his potential and contribute from a positive perspective to the development of this country, Madam Speaker.

We have to preserve what was given to us. There is so much to be thankful for, Madam Speaker. We have so much to be thankful for in this land. And, yes, we have a concern about crime. We all do. We have transformed our lives about it. But it is relative, Madam Speaker. They will blow it up, and blow it up until they destroy this country. They will call for civil unrest; they will refer, as I heard one of the Members of the Opposition referring, to what happened in Egypt with the social networking. What good, Madam Speaker . . . is that going to happen?

Let's give them the benefit of the doubt. Suppose this here succeeded today and the Government, of which I sit a part of, falls. They are going to fill this side here? Where is their plan? Where is their policy? Where is their compassion for democracy to be alive and well in this country? We have a good police force. We have a good judiciary. If he claims there is so much corruption, if he claims there is so much allegation, is he saying that he has a loss of confidence in the legal system and the judiciary and those who are charged with law and order that he has to come and take it in his hands to try and be judge and jury, prosecution and defence lawyer with the Honourable Premier?

I don't think so, Madam Speaker. That is why the financial system has done so well, because they have been up-girded and supported by a good judiciary, a good legal system that we are proud to have until the Constitution just changed over the role [of] the Honourable Attorney General, the Second Official Member. We have to instill confidence in these establishments until they prove us wrong. And then we don't run and hide like Elijah in a cave, Madam Speaker. But we quickly collate, put our minds together, all 15 of us, to find systems to improve and augment this democracy.

It isn't the best form of government, but it is what we have that has worked best for us. And until the Leader of the Opposition comes to a stage where he has the boldness and the confidence to say, *Let's go march the Glass House because we no longer want to listen to the Governor*, then he should not bring this type of censure motion to the House. In fact, is he censuring us or is he censuring the principles of democracy? Is he seeking to censure the Government? Or is he seeking to get a little window open, a door ajar, to Eagle's House? Be transparent and tell the country what [you are] endeavouring to do.

Madam Speaker, when we nation build . . . and Members of Parliament will go to all lengths to bring the Premier down, to bring the Government down without evidence, without concrete evidence, and their main *modus operandi* is for them to get power. You see this Constitution that's here, Madam Speaker? I didn't vote for it. And I told my constituents not to vote for it. And had more people taken the opportunity to read it, and [had] those who drafted it took a moment to pause and be still and know that there was that possibility, small though it was in their minds at the time, that they would not have been the immediate beneficiaries of this Constitution, I wonder, Madam Speaker, if the provisions would be so written. I really wonder, Madam Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Conolly: And now, Madam Speaker, that this Constitution says that their four-year term unless the Premier—which they drafted—calls for a general election . . . they can't wait for that. And you see . . . the second principle, I submit they learn, Madam Speaker, is not only do you try to divide and conquer, but let's try to cut the head off. Let's try to cut the head off. In fact, let's try to get rid of the head altogether. Let's make a Nelson Mandela out of him.

They should read history, because with the pursuit of those in South Africa, and the pursuit of all the rules of law in the interest of democracy, poor Mandela was locked up and almost forgotten. But light came. And today when you walk the streets of London there is a statue of Nelson Mandela.

They should read the *Passage to India* and other historical accounts of what goes on and they would see that these censure motions fall right in the hands of the elephants that are trampling the ants.

Madam Speaker, there are so many issues of significance at hand and of importance in this country that we need to attend to. The Government cannot do it by itself, we need the support of the people and we believe we do still enjoy the majority of support. The Member got up and apparently got the authority from polls that were being run. And I am sure that he forgot to say that they were not scientific polls, and he forgot to say what the margin of error was on these polls,

and he forgot to say what categories, whether it was random or otherwise. When are we going to begin to run this country on polls?

Madam Speaker, the only polls that I am going to run are between the light poles of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman and the ones that NRA put here going to and fro to the houses and making contact with the people of Cayman. And, Madam Speaker, notice that I said “the people of Cayman.” For me, that is those who are born and bred Caymanians, those whom people still have problems accepting as Caymanians that they refer to as “status Caymanians”; they are still Caymanians, Madam Speaker. Those who are residents here and those who are widows . . . because if we are going to maintain that “He hath founded it upon the seas”, it tells me S–O–W; you take care of the Strangers, the Orphans, and the Widows.

I will pause for people to digest that.

Caymanians came on the scene because of our friendliness, our hospitality, our level of tolerance for one another. And, as I read, listen and look, we are fast losing that. We ought to be more concerned about preserving our culture than destroying the Government that was fairly and squarely elected by the majority of the people.

If we have that intellectual capacity, Madam Speaker, use it to teach some school child who is failing in math or social studies or history. Teach him how the Government works. Go and adopt some child that needs help. Go up in Dog City, where I saw a picture coming on my Blackberry today of someone being accosted for stealing breakfast out of Kirk’s and find that person to get Social Services to assist them and give them some food. There are many hurting people here in this country. And it is going to take all of us, all 15 of us, Madam Speaker, to make it better.

What I see happening here, Madam Speaker, is a total disregard for the Constitution insofar as it relates to the democratic principles. A censure motion is the motion of last resort. Is the Leader of the Opposition and those who chose . . . and I am hoping that I know at least two, possibly three, of my colleagues on the Backbench who will express a lack of confidence in the abuse of this draconian motion by not supporting it when we ask for a division on this vote later on tonight, Madam Speaker.

I would be greatly disappointed if I saw those Members support this. Because having worked with them, having worked closely with some of them, I know that deep down in their hearts if there is to be a conscience vote it would come from those two, possibly three, Members.

This is not the time, Madam Speaker, for a censure motion against the Government, when we are just finally beginning to see a little window, a little glimpse of light or illumination by the valiant efforts of the Premier and our Cabinet where people are now beginning to mobilise that audacity for hope to know

that, yes, we can make it. To come and criticise a road groundbreaking yesterday . . . did he take the time to find out that sections 3 and 6 of the Road (Traffic) Law were approved in Cabinet yesterday for an expedited gazettal? And that it followed the correct process?

Why only champion and get up on a stool or under some coconut tree or mango tree and say all that is going wrong? Be fair! Talk about all of the good that is happening in this country. They get up and talk about all of the unemployment. Where are we going to get employment from if we do not get our projects going? Yes, they must follow procedure. Yes it must be done correctly. I am the first one to advocate that. But there must be value for money, Madam Speaker, and the people put us here to ensure that that happens.

There are processes when it doesn’t happen. When there are breaches there are systems to take care of that. And this Motion is a lack of confidence in our systems that have been put in place for generations and generations and that were so properly tuned up when the Leader of the Opposition heralded and championed the drafting of this Constitution. This has more auxiliary bodies and commissions put in place to ensure that it is right. Give them an opportunity to do their job and to carry out their terms of reference.

There are times for censure motions. Like in 2001 the majority of the House felt that it was an appropriate time. There was a time when Mr. Ballantyne was here that a censure motion came. There was a censure motion that came on Mr. John McLean. They have been used at different times, Madam Speaker. But no time is like now when they left the environment in Cayman economically with much to be desired.

Can they not see that they are now breaking down the social fabric of this society? And this would be the icing on the cake if they have the numbers to succeed. Thank God, Madam Speaker, whether by design or by coincidence, the Constitution is so written that you really, really would have to be in bad shape to get them removed. And it is my respectful view, Madam Speaker, that the occurrence in 2001, what they referred to as a coup (and I am sure there are others who have better adjectives for it), would not occur again.

The reason I say that, Madam Speaker, is because it says in section 51(1) of the Constitution: **“The Governor shall, by instrument under the public seal, revoke the appointment of the Premier if a motion that the Legislative Assembly should declare a lack of confidence”** (this is what they are trying to do today) **“in the Government . . .”**

Before this, Madam Speaker, it said where you could do an individual Member. That is no longer the case. The Opposition today is asking for the removal of the entire Government. What I see happening here is that they cannot wait for the general election. They want an early election hoping that they can

get in. Madam Speaker, no poll in the world will allow that to happen with the way they are behaving.

Madam Speaker, in my respectful submission it is absolutely irresponsible without the proper evidence to be here at this time with this censure motion. It says if “. . . **the Government receives the affirmative votes of not less than two-thirds of the elected members of the Assembly; . . .**” and even then, Madam Speaker, they were not satisfied when they drafted this Constitution to stop there. They had the conjunction “but”—a very important word—“. . . **but before so revoking the Premier’s appointment, the Governor shall consult the Premier**” (the same premier the motion was supposed to have succeeded) “**and may, acting in his or her discretion, dissolve the Assembly instead of revoking the appointment.**”

So, let me put it as how they envisioned it: The election in May 2009 would have come. They had this brand new, fabulous modern Constitution that either the former Leader of the Opposition, or the now Leader of the Opposition, [would be] the Premier. If our Government tried to do what we did in [2001] to remove them for lack of performance—yet again—and effectiveness and efficiency, then they would have to get two-thirds of the majority to take them out. And if we succeeded by some miraculous way by our persuasive arguments and our provocative debate and adversarial discourse, that we would march up to the Glass House and the current Leader of the Opposition or the former Leader of the Opposition [would] knock: *Mr. Governor, I am here to tell you that we lost the vote through a no confidence censure motion vote but we made sure we still have the power that we don’t have to listen to that.*

Democracy?

What I see happening here, Madam Speaker, is this: They would say, *Mr. Governor, Your Excellency, we are not listening to that. We still have the power. We ask you, Mr. [Governor], sir, to exercise your discretion to call a general election . . .* and put this Government into another upheaval and another piece of expense that we don’t have money to pay.

Madam Speaker, we are coming up on the dry quarter, traditionally, for the country where the majority of our funds from the corporate world . . . the receipts come in in the first quarter. Had it not been for the foresight and the vision and the aptitude of our Honourable Premier and our colleagues, both Backbenchers and Cabinet, working and burning the midnight oil with the civil servants and, yes, traveling across the globe to get it done, we would be going in October and November not knowing where money was coming again, for the third year, to pay our civil servants. What I see happening here is they got a big economic surprise. And in order to blow some of the bubble out of the success of the Cabinet they come with this draconian censure motion.

Madam Speaker, what I see happening here is a futile attempt to abort, to intrude, to neutralise, to dissolve, to dilute, to make less, to be an insignificant attempt by less-than-mature endeavors to bring this country we love and call home to its knees in the midst of the crime that they say we have that everybody is to blame for, except the Leader of the Opposition. In the midst of the recovery, that’s slight though conspicuous, let’s stop the progress, call an election and hope that we get back in.

Madam Speaker, if that were to happen . . . perhaps the polls have been hiding a phantom candidate in Cayman Brac, phantom candidates in Bodden Town, and, God forbid, West Bay, where they are going to get these four gentlemen out and find four new ones; and phantom candidates, four in George Town, to run this country. Madam Speaker, we need to stop. Stop and think what our actions are doing. There are ways and means of doing everything.

Let the systems work. Let the chips fall where they will. But as parliamentarians, let us commit and realise and become ever cognisant that our performance in this House, Madam Speaker, must ride on our commitment, not to ourselves, but to our country, to our children and future generations. The people, the populace are expecting no less. So when there is a project, criticise it you may, but constructively offer positive and workable alternatives. And that is what I like about my friend from North Side; rarely does he not offer alternatives.

We will be much better off. We cannot, in conclusion, Madam Speaker, build this country by the old mercantile way where we go and get those poor little people who either are disturbed or economically deprived, getting them out to get a few bottles of beer, send them out to get whatever to go and harass and curse and carry on, send them out to do the dirty work and we sit back, Madam Speaker, nice and lily white, pie-in-the-sky. While the fiddler is fiddling, those poor ones are falling through the social cracks. We are a Government, Madam Speaker, which is not prepared to leave, as my Pastor said in a wonderful sermon recently, “one hoof behind.”

We as a people, Madam Speaker, we as a Government, are not prepared to leave one hoof behind. And we do it by joining our hands, our hearts, our bodies and our souls together as one formidable Caymanian people. And if I may be so bold, Madam Speaker, to borrow the motto from my good friends, the Jamaicans, that there is a new-found love by all and sundry in this House: “Out of Many” we can, we should, we shall, we will “be one People.”

What I see happening here, Madam Speaker, is a travesty in the face of democracy. It is a colossal waste of time, Madam Speaker, without concrete evidence. What I see happening here, Madam Speaker, is an egotistical elevation for a premature rise to power. As a result of that, the people, the good-thinking people in this country, will listen to this debate. And I

have no doubt that as they go to the next election which, God willing—and He's not appearing—in less than two years' time, will do as they have always done. Do the right thing. Get the better balance and vote for a better way forward, which is not what I see happening here, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I thank you and my honourable colleagues for your indulgence. I trust that there will not be a condemnation that is private. But that there will be an [unadulterated] admission and a confession that what is happening here was not given the pre-requisite forethought and a reasonableness test was not passed, but the pursuit of selfishness, blinded (hopefully temporary) their sight.

May the words of wisdom and the inspiration of the blessed Holy Spirit wipe our eyes even with tears that we can see and behold that He hath founded it here. And until He is ready, Madam Speaker, no weapon—no weapon, Madam Speaker—will prosper. And no tongue that rises up shall He not condemn.

So, let them talk. Let them write. It only serves to fully inspire the dream that I have, and I have confidence that my colleagues share, for a better Cayman, a more rounded citizenry which can see, bisect, detect, inspect, adhere through the magnetism of good common sense that what we see happening here is a political stunt at its highest degree. And thank God for the power of the majority vote that this will not proceed.

I thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Deputy [Premier].

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

The Fourth Elected Member for George Town.

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon, Fourth Elected Member for George Town: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise to make my contribution to this Private Member's Motion, [No.] 2–2011/12.

Madam Speaker, I want to first of all start by saying that I think that as I listened to my colleague who raised some issues, I noted that she talked a bit about the Member for North Side. And I think she was very, very kind today, I have to say, because I listen to that Member talk all the time and I don't hear him offering any solutions. But I am going to address that issue in a little while because I noticed that he is glued to his seat today, but I believe it is because he has had nothing so far to encourage him to get up.

But, Madam Speaker, I am not going to stand here today and talk about the Leader of the Opposition, which he has to be spoken about. I am not giving some equitable distribution in terms of some of the flogging to the Member for North Side, because I think, Madam Speaker, it is more than appropriate,

the fact that it ended up today, that who ended up seconding that Motion is the Member for North Side.

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

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: Let the records reflect, Madam Speaker . . . Sorry, I see we have a change in Speaker.

I hear one Member talking about gender equality but, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think it is appropriate that the Member for North Side seconded the Motion. Because, let us not ignore for a second the reason why we have arguably wasted three quarters of the day debating this Motion. And I am sure we are probably going to go on for a little bit longer. We are here wasting the people's time and money (and I see the Member for North Side is now leaving) because . . .

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. Ellio S. Solomon: I wish we could have gotten that one on the microphone.

Because, Mr. Speaker, here is the situation . . . Now the Leader of the Opposition is leaving, which is quite appropriate. They should stay and listen but they can go in the kitchen and do it.

You see, the reason we are wasting time, Mr. Speaker, is because at the end of the day those two Members, first and foremost, are greedy for power. That is why we are here. They cannot wait; the sun can't set; the egg can't warm; the milk can't spill, nothing can happen before those two Members seeking to try to see who is going to be the next Premier.

I tell you, I have seen some conflicts but I am waiting to see how it is going to end between the two of them. Because you talk about a cut throat defence . . . I want to see how that one is going to end. Two of them want to be leader because you can't, you can't . . . Listen, the Member for George Town is one who believes that I know it as a fact in the so-called guided democracy, and he believes he knows it all, can do it all, arguably by himself, which is probably why they are only leaving one Member of the Opposition here. And the Member for North Side also knows it all. I hear him every Tuesday! He knows all answers to every question and even has questions and answers before something is delivered. So, let us not doubt for a second why we are here. Let's not fool ourselves. We are not here because the Member for North Side or the Member for George Town has some legitimate expectation that they believe the Government is doing bad and they should air it.

When the Member for George Town rose from his seat and went through tediously laboriously killing me and the rest of the Members in this honourable House with reading through 24 points, he even failed to mention the very resolve section. And for the bene-

fit of all, a motion is about “Whereas, Whereas, Whereas, Be it therefore resolved.” That is, in other words, two plus two is . . . ? Four! And you are not doing this country, the Motion, or anybody any good if you are not giving the answer. But that is the typical thing you hear on Tedious Tuesday and on Whining, Whining Wednesday—a lot of arguments, a lot of complaints, a lot of bickering and no answers. Which is why I say when they talk about the Member for North Side about solutions . . . what solutions? What solutions? I hear wish lists and there is a difference between having a solution to a problem—

Point of Order

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I wish to draw your attention to Standing Order 34(9) and Standing Order 36(1) and ask you to so rule.

The Deputy Speaker: Member for North Side, you said 34 . . . ?

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Under the provisions of 34(9) I am asking you to rule on 36(1).

The Deputy Speaker: Did I hear you correctly, 34(9)? Under the provisions of 34(9)?

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: I'll check it. I'll check. I may be wrong with the number.

The Deputy Speaker: Okay.

[inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Whatever the number is, sir, I take it that your point of order is on a point of relevance?

[addressing the Fourth Elected Member for George Town] Honourable Member, I know that you just started your debate. I ask that you make sure that you continue to make it relevant to the subject matter of the debate.

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: Mr. Speaker, I am going to draw the relevance out for the benefit of that Member.

They are here, the Member for North Side, seconding a motion. You notice that when I am standing up there is always some point of order, but I notice now that the seat is not too warm anymore; he [INAUDIBLE] covers anymore.

The relevance, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that if you come down to this honourable House and say you want to remove the Government, as much as I hate to do it, and arguably, there is no justice in comparison, you know how we can prove that this Government is the right Government and we stay here is to show that

that Government—the individuals over there who formed that government—it is a terrible Government. And that is why when there was a no-confidence vote in 2009 the people voted them out. And that the Member for North Side, who is also trying to purport himself that this Government is bad and he should be here, because that is the intention is to show . . . Mr. Speaker, as we say, “weighed in the balance and found wanting.” That is the relevance.

So, no one tells me that we have to come to the House to defend the Government and can't talk about their slackness—but they want to talk about ours.

No, no, you have them sit there and wait.

Mr. [Speaker]—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, I can see [what] the Member wants to bring to your attention. I just want to caution you in the use of unparliamentary language.

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the unparliamentary piece was . . . But, Mr. Speaker, continuing on—

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: So to start, Mr. Speaker, I will pick up where my colleague left off. There is a good Scripture I wish to quote for the Leader of the Opposition and for the Member for North Side. Or I will paraphrase it. In Matthew Chapter 7 verse 5, it says (and I paraphrase): “You hypocrite.”

[laughter]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: “You hypocrite [first remove] the beam out of your own eye, [and then] you can see clearly to remove the [speck] out of your brother's [eye]” [World English Bible] That is what I start this with. And that is why . . .

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: I am being asked to repeat it. It says in [Matthew Chapter 7] verse 5, and I paraphrase “You hypocrite, [first remove] the beam out of your own eye, [and then] you can see clearly to remove the [speck] out of your brother's [eye].”

So that is at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, why we are here, because, what you have is the Member for North Side and the Third Elected Member for George Town, the Leader of the Opposition, who want to be over here. And they are willing to dupe and try to fool the people of this country. Anything they can do in order to try to get here. They have hinged their hope, Mr. Speaker, on one thing, and that is bad memory. But as long as I have blood flowing through my veins and life in my body and have not been usurped of my ability to stand in this Parliament and

echo it, I am going to remind the people of where we have come from, therefore what we have inherited, and how we have revived this patient and how we intend to walk on and move forward. Pick up our bed and to walk; because that is the situation.

In doing that, I [will] attempt to show it by talking about what the Government is doing, and also, to talk about the situation that we have found and what they have failed to do. And it is perfectly relevant, Mr. Speaker, because that is the three dimensions of this argument.

I noticed that when the Leader of the Opposition rose he talked about the ties we were wearing, and I did not hear the Member for North Side jump to his feet and talk about relevance. You see? But it is all convenient. So, he talked about our ties, he talked about the fact that he did not expect to have much luck here today because we are all wearing the same ties, so I guess he is saying that we are all unified. And again, Mr. Speaker, it proves my point; why is he bringing it here? He is bringing it here to make his arguments, along with the Member for North Side and anyone who seeks to join him, simply hoping that what it will do is somehow or another [cause] people to have a fog moment, get some bad memory, forget and actually think that the two of them mean the country and the world great, and that they should be over here and we should be on the other side. That is it! That is the simple reason.

Yes, we have worn the same ties because we are unified. I think the question we then need to ask ourselves is why they are not doing the same. Why are they not doing the same? Why is it that two of their Members are missing here today to support this important Motion? I would have been very concerned if I had arrived here today and there were two Members of the Government missing. Likewise, I encourage those listening to me and those in the Gallery and anyone who reads the *Hansard* tomorrow, or sometime in the future, why were the two Members of the Opposition not here to support the Motion?

Continuing on, the Member went on to a significant degree and length to talk about crime. And, Mr. Speaker, what I continue to hear, whether it is on the talk shows or in this honourable House, is a constant bombarding of information, the jack-hammering. But you do not get a lot of facts, Mr. Speaker. People at the end of the day in the best of parliamentary language that I can give you in this honourable House and on that radio are very economical with the truth. They are starving truth to death, Mr. Speaker, because the people are not getting it; because they get up there and say anything they want to say with blatant disregard for the facts. That is a reality.

When the Leader of the Opposition gets up and talks about crime and the National Security Council . . . I had a chance; you and other Members in this honourable House were involved with the working and drafting of the new Constitution. I don't remember

hearing the Member then talk about the issue of crime to this level. I did not see the efforts being made insofar as this National Security Council, which he has confirmed today is nothing else pretty much other than a cut and paste of what came from some other constitution. At least there seems to be some admission today. That is all it is. And I did not hear that same sense of concern about crime.

What we have to understand is that the United Democratic Party Government, after having won the election in May 2009, inherited the situation that we have found. The bad financial situation of this country, we inherited it. The crime rampant in the streets, we inherited it. And at the end of the day, the Leader of the Opposition, along with his colleague—the not-so-independent Member for North Side—knows that the Government of the day does not have the ability to get involved with the operational responsibilities of crime.

The Governor has gone on the same talk show that they appear on, on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and has stated clearly in the statement of incontrovertible truth that, “the buck stops with me, I am the one with responsibility.” That is what he said, that is what the Commissioner of Police said. Then why come to this honourable House, or why get on the talk show and try to suggest anything otherwise? Because they are starving truth to death!

They don't care! Say anything, do anything. *Just give me an opportunity to get reelected and put me in the Government.* That is it! And that is why I continue to refer to it as “vulture politics.” [They are] hoping that something dies so they can get something to eat! That's it! Dead or dying, that is what it is. It does not matter if the people of this country are fighting crime, starving to death, it does not matter. Their cheque is secure and, *What I want is the power and I am willing to sacrifice anything that I can and I have to in order to get . . . on what?* [Get on] this west side of the hall! That is it. And nobody, no one should lose sight of that. That is the reality of the situation and they can pretty up with 24 points or any other points they want. That is what they are trying to achieve.

Burger King politics: “I want it now and I want it my way.” That is what is killing this country. That is what you are getting from the two Members.

[laughter]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: You see

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

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: And, Madam Speaker, it hurts me. It hurts me. You know why? Because I know what it is. I see what people are facing out there every single day. I see the hardship. I have them come to my door and knock and they need funds. And it breaks my heart when I don't even have something or

enough to give them. And these Members, what are they doing? On the talk show just propagating rumours, innuendoes. *I don't care*, they say, *as long as I can*—what? *Get it now and get it my way*. Want power! That's it.

So how that Member makes his notes now? I bet he is going to stand up after this.

Let me show you because comparison is relevant. Let me show you. I heard the Member from North Side get on the radio the other day. He talked about attending . . . hold on a second now, the Bible says, "By their fruits you shall know them." How do we know if we have a mango tree? If you go to the tree and it has mangoes. How do you know if you have a pear tree, if it is an avocado tree? You go to the tree that has avocados. "By their fruits you shall know them."

Listen to this now: Listening one tedious Tuesday, Madam Speaker, I heard the Member for North Side and this is what he said. Oh, he was referring to the Fourth Elected Member [for George Town]. That's me. He is referring to me attending a seminar in the UK—*And what Mr. Solomon needs to tell the country is if he got his certificate or if he never passed*.

Now hold on a second. That is to suggest that we went on the seminar, that we went over there for a week or two weeks, we had to study and burst our little brains, and study and pass a test before we could get a certificate. That is misleading the public at best, starving the truth to death. Because, Madam Speaker, what he should have said in truthfulness was that all you had to do was show up and walk across Bridge Street, go listen to some of the parliamentarians to hear what they had to say and everybody smiled at the end of the week or two weeks, shook your hand and gave you a certificate. But he is on the radio trying to mislead the public that somebody was bursting his brain—namely himself—and passing some exam. Fraudulently! Starving the truth to death!

You see? But again, at the end of the day they don't care. It is all about the agenda to get on this side of the hall. That is one!

And I hear them getting up here and *blackgyaading* the Premier. I am going to give you another one. That's one.

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: Mm-hmm *[replying to interjector]*.

You see they don't talk now. He is on the radio again, the same Member for North Side, criticising, talking about the fact that—*Oh, corruption, interference*. That is what you hear all the time. But I bet you the Member for North Side was not saying that, Madam Speaker, when it was the situation whether it was this Administration or otherwise and his son being hired at the UK Office.

No! No, no, no you are not going to hear that. Or you are not going to hear the Member talk about when it would have been years ago that the same Premier put him in charge of the Quincentennial operations and the scholarships, and one of the recipients was his family member. You are not going to hear about that! Because that is not convenient.

No, what you hear is about interference of certain individuals in the process and how corrupt they are, but they don't talk about that.

I am going to give him something else for him to talk about. You see, Madam Speaker, behind the scenes . . . and the public needs to know, because you see the truth hurts. The truth hurts! And the true situation is that you have individuals who are willing to exploit the system. And I mentioned it one day *sotto voce* here on the Floor of the House.

Here it is! Here it is! Have the public go back and look in the archives, even with the not-so-independent Member for North Side. What is the situation? Wasn't it the same past Minister of Health who gave him a contract with the Health Services Authority? At least \$80,000. There was a contract given.

Wasn't it the past Minister responsible for Works from East End that gave the same Member for North Side a contract with respect to the Matrix? No! But you see, Madam Speaker, because they can't get a contract now, because they can't get a contract with this Government for the hospital they want to beat this Government down. That's it! That's the facts! I don't hear that!

The Speaker: You are getting near imputing improper motives. Stay away from it please.

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: So, Madam Speaker, continuing on, when we talk about the Government . . . And again, about the need, because, Madam Speaker, what you have . . . and I can tell you that the running of this country is not simple, Madam Speaker. It is not an easy job and the public did not vote us in to give us an easy job. It is difficult. And that's why, Madam Speaker, it is upsetting, to say the least, when you are going to have the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for North Side getting on the radio and trying to suggest that all the solutions to the problems are very simple and straightforward.

The Member for North Side came to the honorable House one day and he talked about putting in a minimum wage. It had to be \$5. Everyone working or employed in the country must make minimum \$5. Now there is a problem with that, Madam Speaker. Why is there a problem with that? Because if you had left it like that, first of all it would mean—

The Speaker: There is a motion that is coming before the House and you are not supposed to anticipate the debate on that.

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: Madam Speaker, with the greatest of respect, I am referring to a motion that the Member had already brought, and that is the specific details of which I am dealing with, even though I agree with you that there is another one coming. But that is the one I am referring to.

And this minimum wage that he was proposing was \$5 an hour for everyone working in the country. If you had done that, Madam Speaker, it would even technically mean a parent could not even get his own child to wash a car for less than \$5 an hour. And why do I highlight it, Madam Speaker? Because it says to you that every single thing that we do as Representatives, we are making sure that we have given proper thought to it, looking at all the ramifications of it and making sure that we are not wittingly or unwittingly locking somebody into a bad position, or a group of individuals into a bad situation. Those are the sorts of things we hear all the time. And this is why when I said earlier it is one thing to talk about having a solution versus having a wish list.

You can get up and talk about let's just drop the fees on all of this and let's drop the fees on all of that, but the other side of that, Madam Speaker, is to be able to say that the Government is in this particular position and where is it that we are going to get the monies from? If we are going to sacrifice at the end of the day five million here, where are we going to find the five million on the other side to balance the equation? Those are the facts; those are the nuts and bolts and the realities of running the Government.

And why at the end of the day are we trying to balance the budget? We are trying to balance the budget, Madam Speaker, because we have an obligation to provide certain services to the people of this country. And when we are short on those funds, we are short on providing the services. And that is why I hear the Leader of the Opposition, I hear the Member for North Side and they will, on one hand say, *Oh, how do we know that the country even has a \$25 million surplus, there are no audited accounts?* Again, suggesting to the public that the Government is misleading them; that there is no \$25 million surplus.

But when they are on the talk show and at the same time making one of their proposals, they will say, *Well, of course the Government can afford it because they have \$25 million extra.* Now which one is it? The Government has the money or they don't have the money. You see? But again it is convenient. It is a convenient situation.

So, I bring it, Madam Speaker, to make a contrast here and now. The Government inherits a situation that is a dire one. And I do it because at the end of the day if you seek to talk about removing the Government we have to put every single thing in context.

An \$81 million deficit is what we inherited. And we had to find a way to make sure that we were going to balance that budget. So, if at the end of the day there is a complaint, as perhaps rightly there

should be, as to why the Government had to increase fees, for example, \$10 million on the pump, then let us understand who put us there! The previous Administration is the one that put us there. Because, at the end of the day the \$81 million [deficit] is what we found. What we are doing is being men and woman enough to do what has to be done to balance that budget to fix the problem so that we can provide the services that the people need.

Who put the \$81 million deficit there? Who forced the hands of this Government to have to put the tax on? The PPM; that is who did it. So, do we apologise? Do we regret, Madam Speaker, that we even have to do it? Absolutely! Would we not do it if we could? Of course! But we have no other choice. That is why I said in this honourable House, if there has to be . . . they should plaster their photo on every gas pump because they are the ones who put the \$10 million on the pump. They are the ones!

They have on the censure motion something about CUC and putting 25 cents on the fuel. Madam Speaker, when they were in office and the country was booming [it was] as what Joseph told Pharoah [about the] seven years of bumper crop they were having. Do you know what they did? They gave CUC the chance to put a four-point-something per cent charge on the people of the country to the tune, Madam Speaker, of \$13 million.

When they cry about our \$10 million at the pump—to the tune of \$13 million! And why? Because CUC in all the years of this monopoly position making all the money that it makes, the PPM Government did not feel it was fair when Hurricane Ivan blew through and destroyed some of their poles, they did not feel it was fair for CUC to pay for it. They felt that what was fair and equitable and just was that the people of this country—the supposed persons whom they are coming here now speaking on their behalf—were the ones who should have to pay for it!

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: And the people had already paid for it, Madam Speaker! That is the point! Talk about double jeopardy, Madam Speaker. They had already paid for it! The people had already paid for it, and CUC did not have insurance.

I want to remind people, remind all of us that every one of us living in this country has an obligation to make sure that we have insurance on our house. And we know how many of us got messed up on that. Why should CUC have been any different? Why shouldn't they have had insurance? But at the end of the day what is important, as we said earlier, "By their fruits you shall know them." And their fruits said that when they had the crossroads to pass to decide which route they were going to take—the straight and narrow or the wide—they chose, Madam Speaker, to put the tax on the people of this country. And that is when

the Government had the surplus coming through the ears! Through the ears!

That's what they did. And I am sure it had nothing to do with all of the CUC pictures that were in their glossy red manifesto in the campaign. I'm sure it had nothing to do with that.

So let's talk facts. Let's all be honest with each other. Let's all be honest with each other and speak frankly; talk about what God loves to hear—the truth! Because he does not like ugly. That's the individuals or the group that comes and points fingers, as I said, to try to take what? A “mote” out of somebody's eye on this side? No! Don't be hypocrites! Take the beam out of yours so you can see clearly and determine if the other has a mote so that you can take it out of your brother's eye.

They have shown the people of the country, Madam Speaker . . . and that is why they lost a no-confidence vote in 2009. They showed the people, *I can have the money coming out of my ears and I'm spending it and sending it to Chicago for photocopies and building schools in a nonsensical way out of pure glass, and putting it east to west just so that the sun can shine through and heat the building up and increase the heating cost or the cooling cost.* All of that is what we had to deal with. And when I have the funds they say, *I am not going to make it that CUC has to pay his way like everybody else, I put the taxes on you the people.*

They spent hundreds of millions of dollars. So, when they talk about coming here to look for the persons, I will start again with the list: We took office having inherited a financial situation with an \$81 million deficit, and almost US\$1 billion in debt. And we found over 700 applications sitting there. And despite the fact that the Member, the Leader of the Opposition, today has over \$10 million worth of fill—just fill—piled up around the country—over \$10 million of fill piled up—he never took one dollar to build an affordable home in the Cayman Islands. And he has the audacity to stand in this honourable House and talk about voting us out?

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. Elio A. Solomon: Millions of dollars, and they did nothing. And I say it, Madam Speaker, to remind the people how far we have come as a country; how far we have come as a people; how far we have come as a Government. And that that group over there failed you.

Are times difficult? Absolutely! And perhaps somewhat to the adage we hear in the Caribbean, “Perhaps there are horses starving to death waiting for the grass to grow”, Madam Speaker.

This Government has done well, because the Government has removed the \$81 million deficit! And not only that, [but we] have found a surplus and are now starting to give back to persons who we had to

tax, because we say that we are sorry. We had to put the tax, but all of us have to row a little harder. We have lost 8,000 people out of the country, but we have to go as best as possible full steam ahead.

And by the grace of God, Madam Speaker, I believe that the majority of people in this country understand the circumstances that we are in because they are in the same circumstances themselves. And they know that if they are mothers and fathers right now facing financial problems, if the mother is no longer working or the father is no longer working, they know they have to tighten their belt. So how can it be any different for this Government when it loses \$81 million?

So I apologise. I am the first one on the front-line to say I apologise that we had to put the gas tax on. But I am not going to relinquish my duties to do what has to be done to serve the people of this country, nor am I going to fail in being a reminder billboard for that Government that sits on that side over there and remind them it was they who put the people of this country in the mess that we are in. And we are the ones who are getting it out.

They talk about no confidence in the Government? Madam Speaker, look at the situation. Again, when they had it in their hands, seven years of bumper crop, what did they do? How many investors did you see running around here wanting to invest? Zip. Zero. Nilch. None. “*Nyet*,” as they say in Russia. None! How much do you have now? You got them from Dr. Shetty—they want to curse him. You got them with Dart—they want to curse him. They got them with Enterprise City—they want to curse them. And I see them [lining] the Gallery here because somebody wants to get the Port project. We got the Chinese for that too. And the list goes on, Madam Speaker.

In the worst recession that the world has ever seen when big financial economic giants like the United States are drowning in the pond of finances, the Cayman Islands has reached a point of stability plus surplus. And we have some people willing to invest in this country. And we talk about if people have confidence in the Government?

Evidence, Madam Speaker, that the people have confidence in this Government. And that is why they are fighting, kicking and scratching so hard. Because they say, if this Government manages to get these projects off the road, *We are going to be put in political exile. We will never see the west side of the Parliament.* That is what is frightening them. That is what is frightening them! But when it was their turn, oh, were they heeding advice? No, that arrogant Member, the Leader of the Opposition—what he said? “Only God can stop me!” Well, I tell you what? God and the people stopped him in 2009. So, Madam Speaker, that is his full stop; period; bullet point. That stopped him.

Again, Madam Speaker, showing the point of a Government that inherited a tough situation [of] having very little and doing very much. When we can say that with all of the capital expenditure that they engaged in, they built not one single affordable home. And what did we get? Myself and the good Minister here from George Town, what did we get? Eighty-one million dollar deficit, almost one billion US dollars in debt. And what did we do? Today, two years, midway in our term not even finished yet, and while they are trying to bring a censure motion, what do we have? Sixty-seven homes already constructed, and at least another 150 to go.

Have them sit over there and watch. That is doing something without money. That is what you call doing much with very little! Contrast that to they who did very little with very much.

E-government . . . I will give you something simple. I mentioned that and that probably sounds like gobbledygook. There were four years [and] you never even heard about e-government. I don't think . . . well, I won't carry that on. E-government, four years, nothing happened! Now what are we doing? Utilising e-government! Madam Speaker, you never heard about it so rampant in Government.

The Minister of Health, the Minister of Education, Labour, everywhere using technology, Madam Speaker. To do what? Increase efficiency, effectiveness of service, drive down cost and improve that service to the customer while reducing the cost. That is what we are doing with e-government.

Did they think of that in their seven years of bumper-crop? No! But in seven years of famine, Madam Speaker, we worked and balanced the budget, got a surplus, and are still finding, still being Jack-be-nimble, being quick and finding ways to reduce the cost on the people of this country. That is why we try to reduce cost, because by reducing cost we can take it off the pump that the PPM put there. We can take it off of all of the other instruments that they put it on. We can do that because we are working towards improving efficiency and effectiveness of service.

The same Member, the Leader of the Opposition, with the audacity to come here and talk about how he wants to have us removed. Pensions! Have we forgotten? Mercer Report. I know how they love reports. The Mercer Report, March 26, 2007, a date that should forever be burned and etched, Madam Speaker, on the memory of that Member for George Town that clearly states that there were a myriad of things to be done in respect to pensions.

And let me remind you what it is: Pensions, the people's money, things that they need when they get old and can't work anymore and need to retire. Things that they conveniently use when I come with my pension motion. What did it say? Here are things you should do to improve the system. And what did he do? Zero. Zilch. Nada. "Nyet." Nothing! That is what

he did. And the Pensions, according to the Mercer Report, lost nothing less than \$200 million.

So, you know what I want, Madam Speaker? When there are persons out there now listening to Tedious Tuesday and Whacky Whiney Wednesday, I want them to understand that when they are paying at the pump, when they are having the financial challenges . . . and we have our people who are losing homes every day. Remember that the Leader of the Opposition did not even so much as say, *Let's do what Ellio Solomon is talking about, give the people a little access to some of their money, let them be able to build or save their homes.* No! He let \$200 million go right down the tubes.

I think he told them to look forward to the future. 'Longevity,' I think he referred to it as. Two hundred million, Madam Speaker, and that was March 26th 2007, and it has been losing money ever since.

Unaudited accounts: Just the other day two of my colleagues and I sat with the new Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee—to which that new Chairman, Madam Speaker; is a welcomed change, a breath of fresh air. I think the Auditor General was telling us that we can expect a balanced sheet as to what the Government is going to be having, or what the Government has in terms of its finances in February, March, next year.

I see a nod from the Chairman of the [Committee].

You see, Madam Speaker, that is progress. Because you will hear them beating their lips up again every Tuesday and Wednesday talking about the Government's unaudited finances and accounts. That again is something that we inherited. When they had the Member, Mr. Bodden from Bodden Town as Chairman, I remember sitting there. He was going to meet September, and September came and he never met. He was going to meet in March and . . . never met.

So, again, we apologise if we inherited the situation of unaudited finances. But what we are also proud to stand here and fess up about, is the fact that we are fixing the problem, and boldly so. And come March, as you have received the validation from the Chairman of the PAC, we get balanced accounts, Madam Speaker.

And why could we not do it with the last Chairman? Again, excuses! Excuses! You see because they talk, Madam Speaker. Oh how they love Caymanians, everything they do is for Caymanians. A lot of talk and lip service and people starving and dying in the streets. Horses are starving waiting for the grass to grow, when it comes for them. He quit! That is what it is. And as I said in the papers and say it again today, quitters quit. That is what he did; he quit rather than get up and say that he was going to do something.

And, Madam Speaker, I am going to tell you, it upsets me, because you know what—at the end of the

day I do not believe that the people of this country deserve to be duped by anyone in this House. And that includes the not-so-independent Member for the district of North Side. About they love Caymanians!

Again I will highlight it: The Government comes and says here is [\$]50,000. Let's go to North Side, let's give some people some clean-up, those same starving people that you referred to. Those same people who need work and the long list of crying and wailing and gnashing of teeth that they referred to. And does he do it? No! Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I had to go down there. We had to walk there and drive there to get to North Side in the clean-up project, and to give people honest employment, which is all they want.

So all they want is an opportunity to be able to feed their families and they are not asking for handouts. They are asking for an opportunity to earn it. And that Member denied them! That is what he did.

Back on the crime again, Madam Speaker: You would listen and think, and swear down that at the end of the day this Government has done absolutely nothing with crime. And, Madam Speaker, the information shows something completely different. We see again, working now towards, for example, the implementation of the CCTVs to make sure that the eyes-in-the-sky, Madam Speaker, the police officers, the electronic one that constantly record, never sleep, never wink, never misses a beat. That is what we are putting in the skies, Madam Speaker, at a fraction of the cost. Two point something million dollars I believe the number was, if I don't have it incorrect. Is that not a step in the right direction, for example, in terms of dealing with crime? And you heard the Member get up here today and talk about crime.

I draw to the attention of the Members of this honourable House and to the members of the public that if the Leader of the Opposition was truly concerned about crime, if the Member for North Side was truly concerned about crime as he purports to be, why did I not see a single march for crime? Why were they not marching in the streets about crime? No, that was not the political priority.

What was the political priority? Stop the projects. *If we don't stop those projects, guys, we will never get on the west side.* So you see, you didn't see a march for that. And at the end of the day, he now, as Leader of the Opposition who now sits on the National Security Council . . . what has he done?

I hear him throwing challenges out. He must stand there and tell the people, other than flapping his lips, what he is doing. What is he doing about crime? Is he going on the television and having his broadcast about that, demanding that the Governor do something? Demanding that the Commissioner of Police do something? No! He comes here and wants to sneer and beat the Government. Because that is his objective—*put me on the west side.*

So, Madam Speaker, we continue to see that the objective is talking about simply coming here. And they know, Madam Speaker, that they cannot get the votes. The Member stood up and said that we have 15 Members of Parliament; he said we need two-thirds. Now a half-day of schooling in math on Friday tells me that that means he needs 10 people to vote. And normally, inclusive of the not-so-independent Member for North Side, they would have a total of six, which means they would need four. Today he comes even armed with less!

He didn't come in lining the seats with his six fortified individuals ready to vote. He comes with four of them—two missing. And I still believe two of the Members over there, at least, are not going to vote with them. Because I believe that the two of them have confidence in the Government too. That is why they are here. That is why it is only the two of them here. And you know, Madam Speaker, I am willing to put myself out on a limb you know. I'm willing to put myself out on a limb for those two individuals. I have confidence in them; confidence in their confidence in us, Madam Speaker. They are not going to vote against this Government. They have confidence in us.

[inaudible interjection and laughter]

Mr. Ellio Solomon: And I know that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to tow and pull them, but it is not any bells on their necks, Madam Speaker. They are not voting with them. They have confidence in the Government.

I hear the Leader of the Opposition [who] comes here and is already two short. I want to remind him what the adage says: "For you to be a leader you have to have people following you." If you don't have people following you, you are not a leader; you went for a walk!

[laughter]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: Those are simple points, Madam Speaker, but very important to understand. He is going for a walk, and the sun is setting. He can barely see in front of him.

Madam Speaker, I want to make something clear, you know, because I know when they get up they are going to say, *You see, all we got was ridiculed, personal attacks.* And I want to get it clear: No, there are no personal attacks. Personal attacks are when somebody casts and attacks you on something that you cannot change—the colour of your skin, your height. Those are personal attacks. My mother says that is changing your dirty ways. That is not a personal attack. Change or reform your ways! What you are doing is not right. Head in a different direction. That is what we are talking about. Not personal attacks, constructive attacks.

I am even telling them how to do it. I am saying rather than getting on the radio and making complaints, come with solutions. And rather than coming with wish lists proposed and camouflaged surreptitiously injected as solutions . . . No! Think about what you are proposing and make sure that it can actually work.

Like the Member down there, Madam Speaker, cleverly coming in here and writing a letter and reading . . . So you see, the Standing Orders say, "Do not impute wrong doing." So they go into the backroom, write a letter, supposedly to the Governor (which he is still waiting for his copy), and comes here and says, *Look at what I wrote*. And reads it and imputes.

You ever saw anything like that? Have you ever seen a more backdoor (should I say) stealthily cunning approach, Madam Speaker? Talk about clandestine! My goodness! Madam Speaker, it is amazing.

Let's talk about crime a bit more. Crime, Madam Speaker (and this I am happy to table). This is a Government's midterm report dated 8th June 2011. So these words are not my words: "Crime is down 9.02 per cent. Overall, serious crime is down 13 per cent with 104 less victims." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE]

And, Madam Speaker, I will be the first to admit one victim is one too many. But I believe that complementary to the whining that we hear and the repetition we hear, they need to complement it with some facts so they don't try to paint a picture of gloom and doom to everyone in this country.

"Burglaries are down 15.42 per cent with 95 less victims." Attempted murder is down 67 per cent with 12 less victims." And murder down by 80 per cent with 8 less victims. [UNVERIFIED QUOTE]

So, Madam Speaker, I want them to know that the situation is improving, and that is not me getting up and heralding and waving my hand for any confidence in the Governor or the Commissioner of Police. Those are just the facts. Let the facts speak for themselves. Let the public hear them and make their own determinations.

But what I have a fundamental problem with is when the Leader of the Opposition and the not-so-independent Member for North Side come here and attempt to hoodwink, bamboozle and mislead the general public into believing that this Government can go down there and tell the Commissioner of Police how to conduct his duties and therefore we have greater authority and further responsibility for crime. That, Madam Speaker, as I've said earlier, is at the minimal, starving the truth to death.

You see, Madam Speaker, that is wrong and I keep telling them—I keep telling them—when we campaign, whether in 2009 and 2013, it is a zero sum game. Somebody wins, somebody loses. But when we are in this House in the four-year operation, Madam Speaker, all we are doing is giving this country away to the third hand, to the third leg—and I don't

have any problem in saying it—the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, so that the UK can have all of its instruments and mechanisms gain more and more control over the people of this country while we are down here squabbling and arguing (as the Premier oftentimes mentions), fighting over fire ants while elephants are trampling on us.

That's it, Madam Speaker, and that is deconstructive, destructive for the people of this country. Because what we need to be is not by words of expression that I hear from some Members on the Opposition Bench, but in true form, stand here and stand unified with the Government, come forward and let us see if we can find solutions together and work towards implementation. And don't run out and quit on us and come here and starve the truth to death.

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: Yes. [replying to interjector]

So at the end of the day . . .

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: I hear you. [replying to interjector]

[laughter]

Mr. Ellio A. Solomon: So, we see, Madam Speaker, in summary, we have a situation that this Government inherited. And in finality with the appeal, Madam Speaker, I know confidently that the people of this country understand because every household in this country, I believe just about every household, if not everyone, has in one way, shape or another, had to tighten its belt. And therefore even though there are people in this country that are upset because they would like things to happen quicker, that is understandable, that is human nature. We live in a click-click world; want things to happen quickly and we understand that.

Yet, Madam Speaker, I am confident and I believe that the majority of people in this country understand that just as they had to tighten their belts, this Government has to tighten ours, so that we also, at the end of the day have to say . . . they said to their children, *Sorry you can't have this*; we had to do likewise insofar as the Government funds. Nothing different!

So, from an empathetic standpoint, Madam Speaker, I believe the majority of people understand that. I believe what the people of this country are waiting for, is for this Government, now that we have stabilised the patient, and beyond stabilisation, Madam Speaker, even to a point of a \$25 million surplus, that they are waiting for us now, Madam Speaker, to deliver the projects. And let's get on with the work and not

listen to the Opposition, which is inclusive of the not-so-independent Member for North Side!

So, I want to publicly, Madam Speaker—because I don't want my constituents in George Town to misunderstand that I say it privately and I say it publicly to my frontbench, they have my support. Let us move forward with these projects, let us put people to work. Give them something to do! That, Madam Speaker, is the one thing that is going to employ our people. Give them an opportunity and we kill two birds with one stone. We silence the Opposition, because that is the only thing that is giving them anything to talk about. And that is why they are fighting so hard in their effort to get on the west side—talking about trying to stop the projects.

Madam Speaker, I say it with utmost sincerity: What we are seeing is politics at its worst. And I continue to refer to it as vulture politics waiting for something to die, [for] anyone to die; [for] any project to die as long as [they] can get reelected. Because when someone knows that that thing is going to put food on some family's table and they are willing to come in and grab the plate, remove it from those individuals simply to serve their own political benefit, Madam Speaker, their own political expediency, that, Madam Speaker, is politics at its worst! That is vulture politics, Madam Speaker, and that is what we are seeing.

So, Madam Speaker, I am sure now that the Leader of the Opposition, having been absent, and the Member for North Side . . . either there is going to be a scurry to return back in here or we can at least now, Madam Speaker, hopefully, sit, call this to the vote, get the answer to this Motion that we knew we were going get months ago, and we can get on with the people's business in terms of serving them. That is what we were elected to do and that is what Ellio Solomon wants to do.

I thank you very much and other Members of this honourable House for the opportunity to make my contribution. God bless the Cayman Islands.

The Speaker: 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 . . .

Honourable Minister of Health.

Hon. J. Mark P. Scotland, Minister of Health, Environment, Youth, Sports and Culture: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the hour is now getting late and in the interest of time, and certainly following from my two colleagues with their eloquence, I won't keep other Members waiting very long. I just want to speak very briefly to the Motion which was tabled—"The Lack of Confidence in Government", [Private Member's] Motion [No.] 2 of 2011/12.

The mover of the Motion spoke at length and, in fact, went over his time slightly in tabling the Mo-

tion. But of the 23 points that are in the Motion, he only managed to address, I think, three of them [while] spending a significant portion of his time on crime, which, Madam Speaker, all of us share the same concern about. Spending most of his time, as I said, in addressing the issue of crime which, as my colleague, the Deputy Premier said, we all share the same concern.

There's not a Member in this House who would say that we do not think crime is the number one issue facing our country at present; violent crime, crime being perpetrated with guns. But, Madam Speaker, I don't think the mover of the Motion, in speaking so long to crime, convinced anyone that that is a reason to have a lack of confidence in the Government. Because, as my colleague, the Deputy Premier also spoke about, when it comes to crime the matter of the operational aspect of policing rests solely between the Governor and the Commissioner.

I am also a member of the National Security Council, as is the Deputy Premier, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition now (as was the previous Leader of the Opposition). It is clear in the Constitution under section 58(4) what the role of the National Security Council is. It says: "**The National Security Council shall advise the Governor on matters relating to internal security, with the exception of operational and staffing matters, and the Governor shall be obliged to act in accordance with the advice of the Council unless he or she considers that giving effect to the advice would adversely affect Her Majesty's interest (whether in respect of the United Kingdom or the Cayman Islands); and where the Governor has acted otherwise than in accordance with the advice of the Council, he or she shall report to the Council at its next meeting.**"

Madam Speaker, the key words in there that I want to refer to are on matters relating to internal security "with the exception of operational and staffing matters." And, inevitably, in any discussion that comes up regarding crime fighting, the violent and serious crime that we are having now, and strategies related to fighting that crime or addressing it, those are going to be termed most likely, operational and staffing matters, and those obviously, then, in accordance with the Constitution here, do not fall within the remit of the National Security Council.

In fact, as it goes on, section [58] 5[(b)] says that one of the duties of the Commissioner of Police is that he shall "**have responsibility for the day to day operation of the police force and shall report regularly on such operation to the Governor;**" So, the Constitution speaks clearly to the role of the Security Council in advising on crime. As you know, Madam Speaker, the Council has also produced a long-term crime reduction strategy which has been tabled in this honourable House, or at least has gone to Cabinet and it may be a public document by now, Madam

Speaker, But that has been one of the big accomplishments of the Security Council.

So, when the Leader of the Opposition speaks to the National Security Council's or the Government's failure on crime, he's in error, Madam Speaker; in that the role for the day to day operations for crime-fighting falls solely with the Commissioner of Police and the Governor.

Madam Speaker, as I said, obviously, the Leader of the Opposition spent a lot of time on crime fighting. I believe he was trying to certainly heighten the public's emotion. My colleague, the Fourth Elected Member [for George Town] spoke to it a bit at length in terms of what he is doing, in terms of seeking power, and the Opposition being the Government in waiting, which is what they should be. But again, as my colleague from Cayman Brac, the Deputy Premier, spoke to: How could it be a Government in waiting with only five Members, at best six? And what plan do they have if this Motion was to have even a slight iota of a chance to succeed—which it does not because it requires 10 votes at least? And as all of my colleagues have been saying, there's very much doubt that they could even get four votes on that side of the House.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, in his debate, talked about the lack of confidence in the Government. My colleague, the Fourth Elected Member for George Town spoke a bit about it as well, and I'm sure other colleagues will address it. But this Government has been working extremely hard, Madam Speaker. I don't have to repeat (but I will) the mess that the Government finances were in; \$81 million in deficit when we took over in 2009. And just a couple of weeks ago we heard when it was reported that we have already turned that around to a modest surplus at the end of 2010/11.

Madam Speaker, we have done things like the reverse the trend of increasing operational expenditure in the Government. We certainly want to thank the Civil Service for their efforts in that regard. We have, for the first time in many years, not borrowed money this year for Government's operations. Madam Speaker, we know that that trend could not continue because anyone who has a business knows that if you have to keep borrowing money to run your business the business will not last very long.

Madam Speaker, in 2010/11 our revenues increased slightly. We had to impose some new fees in the last few years. But those were fees that we had no other option to impose because we had to increase the revenue in order to meet the Government's obligations.

Madam Speaker, tourism, as we know, has been increasing year on year over the last few years. We ourselves do not speak as much about that as we should. But that is a big plus for the economy, Madam Speaker. As we know, the stay over tourism has increased slightly, and cruise tourism has also seen an

increase. In fact, [the personnel] of some of the tourism properties [whom] I have spoken to, have mentioned that this is the best they have had [it] in almost ten years. These are things that the Leader of the Opposition did not mention in his debate; but certainly [these are] things that would give confidence in the Government that the economy, as my colleague, the Deputy Premier said, is starting to rebound, even if slightly. And hopefully that trend will continue in the next years to come.

Madam Speaker, in my own Ministry I can speak proudly of accomplishments over the past two years, things that would certainly give our Government reason to be proud of, and would give the public reason to have confidence in us as a Government; not just myself as the Minister of Health, but the Premier, all of my colleagues, and indeed, the entire UDP Government in terms of our achievements

I'm sure other colleagues will speak to some of their achievements as well. But the Ministry of Health has been quite busy.

As you know, Madam Speaker, we have entered the MOU with the Dr. Shetty project to construct the Medical Tourism project here in the Cayman Islands. That is well underway. They recently announced the acquisition of property and will soon be able to make a Planning application to start their project.

Madam Speaker, we made amendments to the Health Insurance Law, the Health Practice Law, we enacted the Medical Negligence Law. We are working on a Mental Health Taskforce, and the Pharmacy Law. We have implemented the digital radiology system at the Cayman Brac Faith Hospital. And, Madam Speaker, our accomplishments have been numerous. But just to say most importantly, that this Government continues to work diligently. We continue to work and do what we said in our manifesto in 2009, which was to be the "better way forward" for the Cayman Islands. We still believe that this Government is the better way forward and continues to work in that regard.

I just want to say briefly, Madam Speaker, in closing (as I said, I do not want to speak for very long), that the nine of us [who are Members] of this Government, continue to have confidence in the entire Government, including the leadership of the Premier. And, as one of my colleagues said as well, we still have the confidence of the electorate with us in our endeavours to restore the economy of the Cayman Islands; in our endeavours to create much needed employment at this time, as we know that is one of the major concerns we still have. Everyone on this side of this honourable House has that as one of our primary concerns as well and therefore why we are trying to implement the projects that we are [doing] in trying to get the economy to rebound so that jobs can be created. Because that is one of the main things we think

is contributing to some of the crime at present, Madam Speaker.

So, Madam Speaker, as I said, the Government continues to work hard to restore finances. The PPM left us in great debt and deficit, to the point that we had to go to the FCO in the past two years just to gain approval for a budget. Madam Speaker, that is not any situation that the country wants to find themselves in, as the Premier has alluded to many times, [of] having to negotiate with the desk clerk at the FCO in order to get the country's finances approved. And certainly, we know that we are back on track from that situation to be able by the next two years to have some surplus and reserves left in our finances for the country.

Madam Speaker, as I said, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that this Motion has no chance to succeed. I believe there was an editorial in one of the newspapers some time back referring to or speaking to this Motion and to the attempts by the Opposition to bring the Government down (for want of a better term). The response in that editorial was that the way that that should be done is to wait until the next election. As the Fourth Elected Member for George Town alluded, the last vote of no confidence was in 2009 when the country voted out the PPM. If the country so desires in 2013, the opportunity is there and at that time when they go to the polls they get to select who the leadership should be. We are confident that the country in 2013 will also select the UDP to continue to lead this country, as we have started to lead the country in a better way forward in the right direction.

And so, Madam Speaker, in closing, again what I see happening is that the PPM, as my colleague the Fourth Elected Member [for George Town] said, is obviously trying to get on the west side of the House. But I don't know how they plan to fill the nine seats with only four or five Members and no solutions. And, Madam Speaker, in closing, this Motion has no chance to succeed. It has no support from this side of the House. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister of Health.

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

Fourth Elected Member for Bodden . . . Third Elected Member for Bodden Town. Sorry.

Mr. Dwayne S. Seymour, Third Elected Member for Bodden Town: Soon come.

Madam Speaker, thank you for acknowledging me.

I rise to give a contribution to Private Member's Motion No. 2-2011/12. It is not clear, Madam Speaker, what the Opposition Leader hopes to achieve from bringing this Motion. Not really sure. I guess we can drum up some suggestions just to slow

this Government down in terms of the progress that we are trying to make for this good country. It is almost like someone got under a tree and had some kind of toxic talk with a few people around who are supporters and said, *Throw another curve ball at them and slow them down, otherwise you are not going to get elected in the next election if those guys of the UDP get through with some of their plans that they have on the table.*

Madam Speaker, this Motion is almost like a dog trying to catch his tail; it'll never happen. It sounds good, it looks good too!

[laughter]

Mr. Dwayne S. Seymour: But it will never happen.

Madam Speaker, this Motion in itself is another attempt for a grab at power; nothing more than that. They should create some kind of real life show stating, *So, you want to be the Premier?*

[laughter]

Mr. Dwayne S. Seymour: It's a crying shame, Madam Speaker, that we are in this situation today; wasting time in here this time of the night when we could be amongst our constituents or with our families.

I am somewhat concerned, and every time I rise, Madam Speaker, I always bring this concern out in terms of our young people and what they are thinking. What are they thinking about what is going on here at the Parliament? How are they looking at us? Can they really see through what the Opposition is trying to do? Or is it affecting them? You know we wonder why, Madam Speaker, some of our young people are not even interested in politics. [They] are scared to enter or even discuss it. Not interested at all! It is because of the harm that we are doing by spreading the propaganda, making every politician seem like they are corrupt.

Madam Speaker, you know it bothered me when I heard the Opposition Leader, the Third Elected Member for George Town, mention something tonight. And we must be careful in here in this Legislative Assembly, of the words and suggestions that we use. We must be careful! What I heard the Member say earlier was in his suggestion that a robbery may happen tonight. I was most concerned that this very responsible man would make a comment such as this, knowing the trouble that we are having in this country today. Is the Member suggesting something to the robbers to do something tonight? Highly, highly irresponsible!

Madam Speaker, the Opposition beat us to death. Sometimes they don't even know what they are beating us about. But it is like that child who grew up confused. And every time he tried to do something in the house his parents would say, *Don't do that.* Every time he tried to do something, *Don't do that, don't do*

that! Every time the UDP tries to do something, *Don't do that! That's corrupt! Don't do that!* Then we wonder why the child is confused when he grows up.

Even a broken clock is right twice for the day! There must be something good that they can say about this Government. I mean, we rescued this country from the mess that they left us in—\$81 million deficit—to the now bright position that we are able to offer something back to the persons who were looking at us because we had to be the persons who bore the brunt down on them, taking their salaries from them, percentages. And they are looking at us because we are the persons who had to make the decision to save this country. And the Opposition has the audacity to bring a no confidence vote on the Government that I am part of?

Madam Speaker, I can tell you I am not supporting anything like that, and I have full confidence in my Cabinet Ministers and my Backbench, that we are a unit together. Yes, we do not all talk alike, we do not all walk alike, we do not all dress alike—sometimes we wear the same tie and that seems to bother people. We argue and fuss but we do not fight. And I don't always get things my way, but we need to learn how to operate and be social in this world. We are not going to always get it our way.

They get on the radio talk shows and it seems like they are the only ones in the world who love this country. No one loves this country like them. If they love this country so much, Madam Speaker, would they have spent themselves so foolishly after the kindness of words? *Not even on the kindness of mornings will I take advice from you, Mr. Premier, even though you know how to balance a budget. We are not taking that advice from you. We are going to spend because we have. It's times of plenty and the money is there and we are going to use it.*

Madam Speaker, the Opposition is wondering why . . . I'll try to help them a little bit, to try to understand why they got voted out. Look at all the projects they chose to do, Madam Speaker. Look at how they operated during their tenure. Not one direct injection in the economy that would directly go to our people. And they wonder why they got voted out.

Look at what we have done [since] we got in. Look at the PRIDE cleanup. Direct investment! We didn't go to Paul Jones or Tom Jones or whoever and made them ship the money all off the Island. And we didn't even ensure that local contractors, as we are doing now through the Minister of Education and Housing, are being employed. We didn't care about that! Indirect! And they wonder how they got voted out and are on the other side.

Madam Speaker, sometimes you hear the young people talking and they have little technical stuff that they use about the Blackberry and everything else in the world. And you know sometimes when you hear them talking on Tuesday and Wednesday mornings you would swear they have an

app for good governance, you know. Download a new app. Go on Google and be a googletician. Run this country by Google and app. An app for new governance.

Madam Speaker, the Opposition needs to realise the power that they have when they are speaking on the airwaves. They have a great responsibility, you know. And we cannot make the people of this country feel like their second marriage is a failure. Can you imagine how the people feel if their second marriage is failing? It is not a good feeling.

They have come and said, *Look, UDP, we believe that you all are the right group to get this country back on its right footing.* No one cared where the money was coming from to pay for any of the projects that we had, the PPM Administration. It is so evident, Madam Speaker, we can't even finish the schools that they left behind—the monstrosities.

Madam Speaker, as I wrap up, I want the Opposition and the Independent to understand some of the reasons why crime has escalated. One of the most important words in the world is 'hope'. Hope is one of the most important words, as my colleague from Bodden Town reminds me. We had an election in 2009, the majority of people elected the UDP, and now we have the Opposition with some very convincing stuff trying to make us all seem corrupt, inept, anything in the world; impotent!

We have the people of this country confused saying, *Well, we thought you were the ones, UDP, that would help us and they are telling us something else.* We have our people confused. We have a great responsibility when we are talking to our people. They have great hopes that this Government can turn this economy around as we have done before. Give this Government a chance. Only two years we have been in office and have managed to achieve so much. Not only nationally, but in the district of Bodden Town the stuff that past Members said could not be done, which we are doing now, like the Belford drainage project.

Madam Speaker, just to name a few: Projects like the CoeWood Beach, we will get these done before our term is finished; I can assure you of that. And it won't be using a grandiose style plan that takes up 75 per cent of the beach, millions of dollars.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind the PPM that as they got into office they almost crippled our financial industry, like closing every office they could overseas, from not attending conferences overseas, lack of interest in the financial industry—

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. Dwayne S. Seymour: —putting us on the Blacklist; no agreements signed.

Madam Speaker, my colleague from Cayman Brac, the Deputy Premier and my graduate friend, the Fourth Elected [Member] for George Town said so much that I almost did not want to get up. But I . . .

had to understand that this was a historic moment in my time in the House with such a censure motion. And I had to give my contribution, I had to. The people of Bodden Town want to know that I can give my contribution, and that I can be heard and I can stand up and defend this country and them. The seat of democracy started there.

Madam Speaker, as I close I want all elected Members to put our dirty ways aside, to put our power-seeking ways aside, to put our mischievous behaviours aside, because I can also remind the people that you are a politician and you are talking politics and trying to be the one who is in power. You are not going to say anything good about the person in power. We can have some sessions on that. And I think we need to educate our people, and they need to understand what is going on.

Madam Speaker, all politicians in this honourable House have a responsibility to the youth of this country to give them hope. All we have been doing for the last year and more on the radio talk shows and the blogs, is tearing us down, and it lends to that 'crab in a barrel' mentality where no one wants to see anyone rise. And people are getting rich off of it.

They see the Premier with a new vehicle, they cry that down. If they see Miss Julie get a new vehicle or a new escort, they cry that down. All of our people . . . we are allowing people to come in here and suggest what's good for our people when they have it good for their people and their country. Our people who are elected by the majority of people in this country . . . You know, I need to pay more attention to that before I end because we are the most important people in this country. We should be the most important people in this country although governed by the UK and the Queen.

The people represent the Cayman Islands. The people! And they chose us whether you are Opposition or you are in the Government. And we need to somehow stop suggesting to the people that the decisions they make should not be honoured and revered.

Madam Speaker, I am very young in this House, very young in politics. I'm getting better at it. But I do not want to turn into a political monster, which I have seen happening over the past few months and years since I have been elected. It is not a pretty sight. Our young people are talking about it. I am probably the politician who is out there most amongst young people and in the social circles. That is how I surrender myself. And I hear it. Up until last night I heard some very cruel things and we need to get people back to work.

Stop trying to stop us from making this country succeed and being the greatest in the Caribbean and admired by the world.

I thank you and God bless.

The Speaker: Thank you, Third Elected Member for Bodden Town.

Does any other Member wish to speak?
[pause]

Minister for Community Services.

Hon. Michael T. Adam, Minister of Community Affairs, Gender and Housing: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise to make a few remarks on Motion No. 2–2011/12 that was put before this honourable House, which seeks approval for a no confidence vote in the Honourable Premier and, by extension, in the sitting Administration of which I am a Cabinet Member, and humbled to be serving in my capacity as the Minister of Community Affairs, Gender and Housing.

Madam Speaker, as others have addressed this Motion in the various matters, I will keep my comments focused on a select number of points contained in the Motion. First, let me say that I do respect the right of any Members of this honourable House to take any action which is within the boundaries of the democratic and legislative process, and which they feel is in the public's interest.

I also would like to make the point at the outset that I do not believe that motions such as the one being debated here today should be taken lightly. That means that not only should we debate these types of motions carefully, but it also means that those presenting such types of motions should take due care whenever introducing them due to the wider implications and messages that such motions communicate to both the local and international community and the great worldwide web. And it makes me wonder how the world is thinking of us when they see this type of motion being put forward and knowing the current crisis that the world is in, much less what we are facing here in these small Islands.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me address the selected points in the Motion which I referred to earlier. In item 1 the Motion criticises the Premier for his handling of the operational deficit for the 2008/09 fiscal year. I am not sure what particular aspect is being criticised, but I believe the Premier was right in explaining in a very transparent manner the state of things in our country. He also did so while making it clear that he was planning to address the various challenges and that he still felt confident in the economy moving forward. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I believe he also handled the matter carefully in terms of the country's reputation.

One cannot and should not attempt to blame the Premier for the way that his presentation was covered by the media. Neither am I seeking to put any blame on the media, because it is right of the media to focus on what they deem to be the most important aspects of his or anyone's speech. What I would say is that the Premier did the responsible thing by ex-

plaining very carefully the status of the country's finances.

Madam Speaker, if we do not acknowledge the status of things, how can we move to address them? If we do not reveal the information to the public, how can we seek their support as we seek to find the various solutions? And solutions we found. I therefore strongly contend that the Honourable Premier did the correct thing by presenting very clearly and transparently the status of the country's finances.

It is important for us to acknowledge that just because something may not be deemed to be politically favourable to the Opposition does not mean that it was not the proper and just thing to do. I therefore do not believe that the inclusion of the Premier's handling of the published operational deficit in this Motion is credible. Certainly, Madam Speaker, you cannot seek to remove someone from office because they told the truth about the country's financial situation.

The second point in the Motion suggests that an inaccurate budget forecast is grounds for removal from office. Again, Madam Speaker, if I have ever heard of a frivolous charge, it is this one. How many budgets, anywhere in the world can we say were accurate upon reflection? And you can only give your best estimates, your best projections. How many budgets anywhere in the world can be expected to be accurate or even close to accurate when the country is in the midst of a historic and uncertain economic recession along with the rest of the world?

As the Opposition should know, Madam Speaker, the worst time to also forecast a budget is when you are in the midst of an economic recession, because at this stage you are not able to as accurately determine whether you can expect a further fall or a recovery without detailed data, and this type of data usually comes with a time lag, as we all very well know.

That said, Madam Speaker, that last technical point is the least of my observations in this area. The main point is that a forecast which is proven to be unrealistic is not sufficient evidence of any mismanagement or wrongdoing by the Premier. Anyone can reflect on the budget a year or so later and say that it was not accurate. Hindsight, as they say, is 20/20. The Premier guided by his Ministry formulated a budget with a forecast that was as realistic as anyone thought at the time. And as you have heard, we were all involved with this as well as his Ministry and [there were] some tireless days and nights and many, many hours.

This aspect of the Motion is seeking to allege that the Premier somehow made up these forecasts instead of formulating a three-year plan. In fact, the Opposition should note that the Premier did, in fact, produce a three-year plan which was approved by the United Kingdom. And this was done carefully and in a timeframe that also allowed this Government to gather information and monitor the local economy, and in

particular, the Government's financial situation first. We did not do this on the Opposition's timetable but we did it with credibility.

[inaudible interjection]

Hon. Michael T. Adam: *[replying to inaudible interjection]* That's right.

Having had some time to assess the financial disaster that was left behind by them (as you have heard all of my colleagues speak to) for us to address, I often refer to this as a very deep, deep hole, and we needed a very, very tall ladder to climb out. And you know I am happy to say I believe we are above the water level now or on ground zero and climbing rapidly. And I think I believe this is why they are worried.

In item 3 the Motion curiously criticises the Premier for failing to address issues and concerns contained in the famous Miller/Shaw Report on fiscal sustainability, while at the same time contradicting this in another point made later in the very same Motion at point number 10. The Motion seems to criticise the Premier for his intention to divest government assets, such as the Water Authority and others, and yet the issue of divestment is one of the key recommendations stemming from the Miller/Shaw Report. I don't believe this point was a credible inclusion in the Motion for other reasons. The Premier and this Government have clearly done a lot to address the issue of fiscal sustainability.

The clear evidence is there for everyone to see, Madam Speaker. We have reined-in government borrowings, we have reined-in government expenses and we have managed to turn, as you have heard over and over, an \$81 million deficit into projected surplus now in two years of some \$24 million to \$25 million. And lest we forget, we have prevented the imposition of income taxes and other forms of damaging direct taxes on this economy. I can't stress how much this was being hammered into our heads by the FCO (Foreign and Commonwealth Office). What more must a Premier and this Government do to get recognition for addressing the issue of fiscal sustainability?

Is there no bearing on the conscience of the Leader of the Opposition, that he is making these frivolous accusations regarding financial management when it is now clear for all to see that the lack of audited financials between the years 2005 and 2009, the record borrowings under their Administration, and the historical deficit of \$81 million are all a clear sign of fiscal mismanagement?

Does he not understand that such fiscal mismanagement has in fact led to the very issue of fiscal sustainability that we are now faced with? And how hard is it for his conscience to recognise that this Government led by the Honourable Premier has done practically everything? We keep thinking every day what next we can do. Practically everything in his power to address fiscal sustainability!

Point 4 in the Motion alleges that the Premier has failed to get government accounts up to date. It is unclear to me how this point could be made with a straight face by the Opposition. The PPM Government stood by and watched four years of financials slip into a dark hole during their term. We found those down in the bottom of the deep hole I was talking about earlier on. We did not do this, Madam Speaker, but we have been charged with fixing it. And we are fixing it and doing just that.

How dare the PPM Government—who did absolutely nothing, and who put us in the current state—criticise us for not moving fast enough to address this issue! I ponder, Madam Speaker. Has the Leader of the Opposition not seen the various reports, even [those] of the Auditor General's Office which acknowledged that we have made much progress?

Madam Speaker, items 7, 8 and 9 seek again to criticise the Premier for essentially imposing a number of revenue measures. The essence of the point being made is that these revenue measures have hurt the economy and people. Madam Speaker, since coming into office this Government has tried everything, and used all tools available to address the challenge. And let me describe briefly the challenge.

We were faced with an economic recession as we all know. As far as I am concerned it is still with us. And we were also faced with a very serious fiscal situation which was created by the previous Government. This fiscal situation meant that it was extremely challenging to secure the United Kingdom's approval for a budget. As you have heard us mention, and as everyone agrees, this indeed was a major historical event due to the fact that the PPM's mismanagement again led us to being non-compliant with several ratios agreed with the FCO on many of these, and all at the same time.

The Government is tasked with ensuring a balanced budget. This simply meant that we had to reduce expenses and increase revenue. It is very simple. But getting it done is quite a task. In my humble opinion that is the only way to achieve a balanced budget, reduce expenses and increase revenues. But we were also faced with an economic recession which meant that we were limited in the reduction in expenditures because if we had withdrawn a significant amount of government expenditures from the economy, this would only make matters worse as it would lead to further unemployment and further challenges for our local businesses.

On the other hand, we recognised that we had to find ways to improve revenues even though increased taxes are also a challenge for the economy at this time. We simply did our best in managing these conflicting challenges, Madam Speaker, and the only true test of how we did is the result of our economy, which we are now seeing come through to fruition. For example, we can now say with confidence that we have indeed successfully addressed the fiscal situa-

tion, and our approach to the revenue measures was a contributing factor to this success.

Madam Speaker, we still have a tremendous amount of work to do. I just wish I could get back to my Ministry tomorrow. I have a lot of work to do! The global economy continues to face challenges and so does our own economy, but we have been doing our part despite the criticisms to get this economy moving again. The Honourable Premier and others will address this, I believe, so I will not elaborate further.

The main point, Madam Speaker, is that it is easy for anyone to get up and say we should not have raised any taxes or that we should have cut tens of millions of dollars from government expenditure. But we must also recognise the challenges and the various implications in how we achieve that. We must strike a balance that manages the negative impact as best as possible, while achieving our objectives in the face of the recession, and that is exactly what the Premier and this Government did.

Madam Speaker, there are others who will perhaps address more of the various items contained in the Motion; those who will follow me and those who have already gone before. But I do wish to make a final observation that many of the remaining items seem to be included in this Motion, almost as an afterthought, as their inclusion lacks credibility in an even more extreme manner than the selected issues I have previously outlined. These cases, Madam Speaker, represent politics at its very worse, and I implore the Opposition to reconsider their entire approach to this Motion and future motions.

Take, for example, the observation on the incidents of crime. Is the Opposition seeking to blame the Honourable Premier for an increase in crime? An area that he is not responsible for. We have heard it over and over.

An Hon. Member: They know it.

Hon. Michael T. Adam: Madam Speaker, I do confess we are responsible to the people and we have been advocating for getting control over the current rash in crime.

Another example is the extent of the cost of his official travel. Should the Premier not undertake official travel? And is it not obvious that he has taken an aggressive approach to promoting the Cayman Islands internationally to raise investor interest and attract investment, particularly in these challenging economic times? What is the Opposition's assessment, which they have clearly not carried out, [on] the amount that should be spent on official travel?

For sure, Madam Speaker, we cannot conclude because the Premier may have travelled more than the previous Leader of Government that he has therefore travelled too much. We have all seen the results of the work done by the previous Government. The Honourable Premier did not sit back and watch

the economy and our troubles go by, Madam Speaker. He has been active in addressing them. He tries hard and seeks to meet with potential investors because he is the Minister with direct responsibility, as we know, for inward investment and commerce in our country. He works hard, Madam Speaker. Let's not criticise him for doing his job.

Points 14, 15 and 16 are also curious, Madam Speaker, to me. These points essentially criticise the Premier for raising ideas about possible new projects, for supporting them subject to the appropriate due diligence and the public's input [as to] why is it not acceptable for the Premier to entertain new ideas. You've heard about the ministerial MOUs. This is what he is doing. Whether these ideas come to fruition is a matter for the consultative and democratic process. But he cannot and should not be criticised, in my opinion, for discussing them or expressing his support for them. We have to keep focused on trying various means of attracting inward investment.

Ironically, the Opposition Leader with his criticism and inclusion of these items seems to have already made up his own mind that none of these ideas should have even existed in the first place. If it were up to the PPM we would talk about nothing, discuss no ideas, and show no support for anything. If it were up to the PPM, indeed, Madam Speaker, we would simply do nothing. The Honourable McKeeva Bush is a capable leader with the right intention and approach at this very crucial stage of our economy and, indeed, the history of these Islands.

Before Mr. Bush, we had a Government and a Leader who was oblivious to the state of the economy; what makes it tick, how to improve it, how to control government finances and how to put people back to work. These seemed to be all very difficult questions for the PPM. But these areas, Madam Speaker, play precisely to the strengths of the Honourable McKeeva Bush. He inherited a budget deficit, again, of \$81 million and within two years we are now talking about a surplus of \$24 million to \$25 million. People forget the most important things when they embark on political attacks, I'm learning rapidly. And unfortunately because of the inclusion of too many, in my opinion, frivolous items in this Motion, it is my belief that it amounts to no more than a political attack.

This Government, under the leadership of the Premier provided a three year plan to the FCO and this Minister of Finance, the Honourable McKeeva Bush has shown emphatically that our finances are better than that projected in that three year plan. He has worked tirelessly to bring about major projects to bring additional revenues to the Government for many years to come, and to put our people back to work.

Madam Speaker, we know it will take time for some of these projects to materialise but we are not talking about setting up mom and pop stores, we are talking about major investment. These are significant projects valued in the hundreds of millions of dollars

and creating not tens or hundreds, but thousands of jobs. Madam Speaker, the Opposition should be congratulating him for making such progress.

Finally, Madam Speaker, it has been almost two years since I was given the opportunity by the people of this country to serve. I am confident that in my role as a Minister of Community Affairs, Gender and Housing, I have tried to do more than just implement the promises made in the UDP's manifesto during our 2009 campaign. You have heard my colleague, the Councillor for Housing, speak of my accomplishments in affordable housing. I have also sought every opportunity along the way to ensure that as we continue to work our way out of these turbulent economic times (and I believe we are doing so) we ensure that we maintain stability within our society by addressing social issues that are worsened by the economic downturn that we are all experiencing.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Minister for Community Services.

Does any other Member wish to speak?

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

Honourable Premier.

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

Madam Speaker, the Opposition finally got their day to hammer out a criticism which, Madam Speaker, melted down to nothing. There are some areas that I will answer and there are some that I will simply pay no attention to.

It's obvious, that the Motion was tabled in an effort to smear me. It's obvious, because any time, historically in our parliamentary processes, the Westminster form of Government, that you have an Opposition that purports to be the government-in-waiting, if they put forward an attack motion—as they did—which they call a censure motion, or a lack of confidence, then they come with viable alternatives to whatever they are criticising.

In my style of governance, Madam Speaker, I have hid nothing from the people of these Islands. I have hid nothing because everything that we do, we are supposed to do it for the people of these Islands. I have not sought to attack anybody's character, talk to them about where they come from, and about whose pedigree they belong to. No! I have been in politics since 1984 without losing one General Election. And I have been around politics from the time I was seven years old, when they put me on the car bonnet and drove us around the district. I said "Vote for T. W. Farrington." So, I have been around it all these many years. I have sat in the gallery here. At the old Town Hall I listened through the window and I heard and I say what politics does, how it is played.

Madam Speaker, I am not surprised about the attacks because I was never supposed to be in this House from one side, and I managed to get in and then that side thought that I should be carrying their bag all the days of my life, and until I said, "No! I want to see pension in this country for people, I want to see labour laws in this country and not the old Truck and Master's Law. I want to see our workers making a proper salary, I want to see pregnant women have benefits, I want to see the glass ceiling removed." When I started to do that, then I was a "nobody." Even to those who smiled in my face, Madam Speaker, I was a "nobody" for them. I have been through all of that.

No, I did not expect to be the Premier. I fought that constitutional process because I did not believe that this country was going to benefit in any tremendous way from what we were getting. And I knew we were going to get it because it was fixed that way. The British allowed what the then Government was doing. They wanted us to get to a point with a constitution that they could live with. They had not really planned to give away some of the things that they ended up giving away and now they are in a pucketary, as the old people like to say, about certain aspects of it. And they are saying you are not supposed to have this power and the Constitution says you have this authority. That's certain things.

But my colleague, the Deputy Premier, I think made absolutely clear, the process of the National Security Council. There is no question about it, Madam Speaker. She's absolutely correct. And if they called on the Attorney General of this country, who is still here, by the way (he has been here with us so late), he would tell you the same thing. So no matter how much the Leader of the Opposition screams and shouts about *it is the Premier*. I know what he is trying to do. He is trying again to level everything at my head or at my feet so that people can be upset with me. Never mind if they shoot me. Lynden Pindling told me that you are only out front as a leader to be shot first. So, he is not worried about that. He just wants the people to pounce on me to say, *You are responsible*. I know what I tried to do, and as much as I can do. And she clearly outlined it.

When it comes to concern, Madam Speaker, about crime, we are on all fours with the Leader of the Opposition. And we are in complete agreement that something more drastic needs to be done. But I part ways with him on his blame game. We are most concerned about the rise in crime. Madam Speaker, one point is that it is not driving tourists away; the truth is that tourism has never been better. Tourism has increased. But that is not the problem. It can decrease, and that is my worry. My other worry is about where we are on the whole matter.

He wants to find out what the Premier is doing, and he repeated that so strongly, Madam Speaker. "What is the Premier doing?" he says.

Madam Speaker, why not say the truth? Say that the Premier by himself cannot do anything. Tell the truth. I am the Premier, but I do not have control over the matter of national security. I do not control the police. I can give the Governor my suggestion as much as the Leader of the Opposition can while he is on that National Security Council. And we have done that. But, Madam Speaker, what else can we do?

The Constitution is absolutely clear. And I am not going to take the time to go into it because it is well documented from this side.

Madam Speaker, I do have an obligation, as he says. I have an obligation because I care, and because I am an elected official. I care because I am concerned about the general conditions here in these Islands. We have given the Governor and the Commissioner every support that we can. We have purchased equipment; we have given support as has been allowed by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in the emoluments for staff. Just on Tuesday in Cabinet we gave the Commissioner support for items at a cost of over \$1 million. So, I am not surprised that he would scream and shout and lay blame on me. But where are his solutions?

If he says the National Security Council is so important, he's a member. Where is the solution from him? Was he genuine enough to say or to make it known that the National Security Council is only an advisory body? It is important. But this great feat of getting a Constitution did not go far enough. While he labours to lay blame on us, he needs to accept his failure to put proper mechanisms in place in the Constitution as he had power to do for elected government to be relevant to the arm of the government that deals with national security. And we do not have that kind of authority. We do not.

He said that he brought the Motion to look at the conduct of the Government and he begged Members on this side to vote the Motion. He said to look our [constituents] square in their face—I would say that he was kind of giving an altar call, but no, no, no, no, we knew that preaching was not genuine—to see whether they should be supporting me. Boy, I must really give you a hurting though. You must really feel bad that you created that constitutional post, bought up all that champagne up there and could not use it.

The people . . .

Keep it for the next time to see if you can use it then too.

Madam Speaker, he went on to talk about the polls, these polls, these voters. But I want to ask him, are these polls voters? The [Caymanian] *Compass* he said was 471, and the one in *CNS [Cayman News Service]* 564. Madam Speaker, I am not worried about these polls. I listen to the heartbeat of this country and he can't do that no better than McKeeva Bush! And that's why I could whip him solidly at the polls the last time—because, Madam Speaker, it was those same polls that said I would not win.

CNS and the *Compass*, the *NetNews* and all the other polls they were running from Hartley Henry and everybody else. They brought them down here by the threes from Barbados to work with them, to tell them how they could beat McKeever. And you did not, because you do not understand the psyche of the people of these Islands. You thought you did; but you did not. And those that you have with you now don't either.

Those are the same people who said that I would not win. They were wrong then, and they will be wrong again.

He called on me to explain why the affairs of the country are run like they are, and to tell the country why they should not listen to the Opposition. And I want to take time out to do that. I want to take time out to tell the country why they should not listen to the Opposition. And this is what I have seen happening. And the following are some of the reasons why our people should not listen to him or any of them that he has writing on the blogs now, who somehow have caught life because they have millions of dollars to pour into a campaign. I hope they eat him out and vote him out. They have done that to some of them before.

So, he called on me. Let me just tell them why they should not listen to him. "A 'reminder' [for Opposition Leader]." I am reading from the *Caymanian Compass* [31 August 2011]

"When you talk about what my Government and I should be doing, it leads me to ask a few questions. Mr. McLaughlin, your Government went four (4) years without any audits of your work. The Office of the Auditor General has said that there is some \$69 million (in one Ministry alone) unaccounted for under your Governments administration, of which you were the de facto Leader of Government Business. Below, I have listed items which are unaudited and some of which could involve conflicts of interests, because of close family member's involvement. I must ask, was that family connection declared?" And I say this in the purchase of the Governor's Square property.

"I trust that there will be audits or investigations carried out on all of these matters. As the Minister of Finance, I will ensure that either the Government Audit Office—who did not carry out audits from 2005-2009 (your Administration)—or an independent source, conducts a full forensic audit or investigation on the following matters:

- **Procurement for the High School projects (public commitment made to do so)"** Let's see what happens.
- **Procurement for the Government Administration Building (publicly stated would be on the way)**
- **Orion Development agreement – signed in 2009."** When nobody was looking or listening.

(And we want to know what millions of dollars that commits the country to.)

- **Purchase of millions of dollars' worth of fill, and site development of the abandoned Beulah Smith High School in West Bay**
- **Millions of dollars of site fill at Bodden Town for Emergency Centre (abandoned)**
- **Boxing match over \$1.5M by the Department of Tourism**
- **Signed agreement with Atlantic Star for cargo and cruise port development in George Town**
- **Land acquisition and ownership for roads development – who owns some of the land?**
- **Purchase of property and millions of dollars of fill for abandoned George Town Primary School project**
- **Purchase of Durty Reids for road works"** (Who owned it when the Government bought it?)
- **Lease by the Maritime Authority of over \$2.5M in Strathvale House**
- **Purchase of Sammy's Inn and the remodeling and construction cost to facilitate Cayman Airways** (We know that there was a contract before Cayman Airways had it. Nothing was done and Cayman Airways bought it. Then they sold it to Cayman Airways. That's what I want to get to the bottom of. How much? Who?)
- **Security contract for the Government Administration Building which was awarded to Security Centre earlier this year (said to be underway)"**

And I am going to have a contract of the CCTV done. That is not under them, Madam Speaker. I don't think CCTV started with them. There might have been some talk, but the contracting was not done. It is one of those things that I am being blamed for interfering because we saved some money in stopping it for a while. Oh, they got their way because the committee was made up and is still made up. All of these Madam Speaker, except for the CCTV contract, which is new, is all unaudited.

"In light of the information above, Mr. McLaughlin, it really looks like you can criticize me for alleged mismanagement of Government's finances!!!"

"When you consider all of the above, it becomes very clear how you can defend the Audit Office. I guess some of the people who didn't have to worry about audits carried on them can berate me for speaking out on the unfair manner in which an audit is carried out and written.

"Good going Alden McLaughlin!"

End of quote.

That is one reason why, Madam Speaker, people should not listen to him. A further reason is this one: Government—"Accounts a National Crisis." His friend, Dan Duguay. Government—"Accounts a National Crisis", 2005–2009; another good reason why nobody on this side is going to listen to him.

Another good reason why they are not going to listen to him is this, "Good Progress Made on Government Accounts." Alastair Swarbrick, Auditor General, my friend.

[Laughter]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: People might laugh, but I have no problem with Mr. Swarbrick, Madam Speaker. I have problems with the Audit Office, the way they conduct audits, the way they write them to smear people because some people can't have their way with everything in this country.

I want to get to that point a little later on, Madam Speaker, because these people who criticise me about audits . . . Mr. Miller would understand this. The Member for North Side, that is. Madam Speaker, if they don't see what's going on in this country, if they do not see that there is a deliberate effort to do certain things in this country, then they do not understand the thousands of years that certain people had to do certain things and to learn how to do it, and how glad they are when we are fighting each other and when we are tearing down each other because the old maxim of divide and conquer has not gone away.

They did not learn that there should not be money spent on the Premier's office, Madam Speaker. They set it up—not for McKeever Bush, because I will be going one of these days. That money can be spent on the other Head of State. So much so, you have to look through a picture and go through security to get in there. And the Premier did not even have an office, not even a sign that said "Premier's Office." They still have it saying something else.

I had to carry my own furniture in—mine! Nobody bought it. They had that on the blogs too, but that is more of their lies. No, they do not see any of that, Madam Speaker. They would rather tear McKeever down because—*let's beat him; he's the one we can get. And if we tear him down the rest of these can be easier.*

If you ride the back of the tiger, you reap the whirlwind. And you listen to me today. You can tear me down. I am 56 years old, Madam Speaker. I have been through the fire, baptised and been through it. And every one of you, including on this side, if you don't stand up and see what is happening and this Constitution that we have does not make it any better. In fact, it makes us worse than what we were before! Because you have so many commissions that report to one section in this country, Madam Speaker, that any time you have to go to do anything for any constituent, anytime you have to make a case for a con-

stituent, you are interfering with that arm of the Civil Service.

Or, it does not have to be them who make the complaint, but if they make it, they can make it so that you are interfering. But it could be an aggrieved person outside who does not like you and was just making a complaint. They will run and carry saying, *It was me who faxed that you know. I faxed it. I know about it and exposed them because I thought it was wrong.* Yes. Madam Speaker, these are the sort of things which are happening. And these are things that are supposed to be for good governance, all good governance, fine and well, but what about peace and order? Where does that come in? What about fairness? Where does that come in?

So, go ahead. It's easy to kill the AG (Attorney General), he's Caymanian. Take away their security. Take away the Deputy Governor's security. But everybody else must get a load of it. Loads! Take away mine.

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: If you all do not see what is happening, I know one thing . . . the Member for East End sees it, because he speaks about it often. And if I went and got a *Hansard*, I would not need to do any more than read certain things he has said.

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yes, my friend, the former Minister of Health, cites it often.

Madam Speaker, I say, ride the back of the tiger and reap the whirlwind. Go ahead. Remember what I said some Throne Speech ago? "Go ahead and hate your neighbor, go ahead and cheat a friend. Do it in the name of heaven, justify it till the end . . . There won't be any crying come the judgment day . . . One tin soldier rides away."

Madam Speaker, the Motion that they have here . . . I don't know what they were thinking about. Did they think that they could come here and get a motion where we were not going to be able to defend ourselves and that they did not have any record? I mean, they just came here, you know. They were not here before.

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Mm-hmm.

Madam Speaker, they complained about the Premier's handling of the published operational deficit of the Government for 2008/09. Well, Madam Speaker, the United Democratic Party came into power in May 2009. At the end of the financial year, 30 June 2009, the Cayman Islands had an unaudited central government operating deficit of \$69 million (or there

about), and the statutory authorities and government companies had an overall net deficit of \$12 million. This meant that the entire public sector had an unaudited operating deficit of \$81 million for the year ended 30 June 2009. This meant that we inherited results that did not comply with the principles of responsible financial management. And, more importantly, Madam Speaker, very little cash balances with which to cover government's operating expenses in the year that started on 1 July 2009.

In fact, on 1 July 2009 the unrestricted operating bank balances of the government totaled a meager 7.65 per cent, which was only enough to cover five days of government's operating expenses. And I declared publicly in 2009 that the government was in serious financial difficulties, not for the purpose of creating any panic; but for the purpose of (a) informing the public as to our results in financial position; and (b) to put the public sector on notice that severe expenditure restraint would be necessary.

If I had not done that—I had tried to put any measure in place and had gone to the Civil Service and said you have to cut back—they would have eaten me, and then say I was not telling the truth. In fact, the Opposition said I was not telling the truth.

Madam Speaker, it is obvious that they did not really know where they were going because this is what they *Compass*, on Tuesday, [15] June 2009 said, "Gov't deficit rises to \$74 million." And that was Mr. Ken Jefferson. And he gave the position. Mr. McLaughlin was there too (the now Leader of the Opposition). And he said that he didn't know. And he suggested that there had been a manipulation of the financial picture to make the PPM Administration look as bad as possible and that the party would be issuing a full statement this week.

He said he didn't know. He said he could not understand how the operating expenditures could have risen to \$17 million in such a short period of time. He explained that the amount could not relate to the overrun on the schools (of course that was his every word then). **"If there are overruns on the schools or any capital project, this cannot affect operational expenditure."** He said: **"This would increase capital cost, not the operational cost."** Capital cost or operational cost, it still was money we didn't have.

But he went on to blame and point the finger at Mr. Jefferson and said, *Mm-mm, you're setting us up. You set us up.*

So, Mr. Jefferson set [them] up and now I'm not telling the truth, even when the accounts came out. So what does he want?

Can't dispute it, Madam Speaker; can't dispute it.

It is ironic, Madam Speaker, that I am being criticised for the same comment that the former Leader of Government Business made during the November 2000 elections when he also declared that the

country was broke. See him here. He is here, in the *Compass* of Tuesday, 28 November 2000. "Government in Deficit", the Minister says, and that's Mr. Tibbetts . . .

I am being censured for it today because I get out and talks about the financial mess that we inherited.

Madam Speaker, he also said that our budget projections for the 2009/10 financial year grew to be unrealistic instead of adopting a three-year plan to eliminate the operational deficit of the government. I think the Minister of Community Affairs addressed it. I am not going to take the time at this late hour to go through it because I think he did an excellent job in that it showed what the deficit was. But I would want to give a reason so, perhaps, they might understand.

They might cuss me for it, but just let me say that at that time when we projected the \$15 million surplus that . . . or \$5 million surplus, sorry. We projected a \$5 million surplus, and ended up with a \$15 million deficit. Now, that was the first go at it. But in the environment of worldwide severe economic difficulties, Madam Speaker, experienced during 2009 and 2010, a \$15 million operating deficit is certainly not a bad result. It certainly represents a huge improvement from the previous Administration last year in Government at May 2009 which experienced the deficit (as I said earlier) of \$81 million for the entire public sector. That was a tremendous turnaround.

But let me get to the main reason. The main reason for a modest \$15 million operating deficit for 2009/10 was the non-implementation, or the late implementation of certain revenue measures intended for that year. For example, the business premises fee slated for that year was not implemented because the Government received from the business leaders in the Island, after a meeting with them, that it would create undue difficulties for business owners. So the Government heeded those representations. But this was a fee, Madam Speaker, which was given to us by the business leaders committee that we have put together. They came back after they gave it to us. We included it in the budget and they came back and said, *No, no, that is not going to work.* And they are doing that again too. It's the usual thing from them.

The Government had budgeted to earn \$1.6 million in business premises fees in 2009/10. Another fee that the Government was unable to implement, was the annual renewal fee for tax and trust undertakings of which \$15 million was budgeted to be earned in 2009/10. Again, the Government listened to the representation from the private sector that the implementation of such a fee would probably make the Cayman Islands uncompetitive. And the Government listened to those representations although those two fees came from that group.

So, in the circumstances then, a \$15 million operating deficit resulted and it is, as far as I am concerned, considered reasonable performance. So go

ahead and cuss me about it, but that's what happened. Go ahead and map one-off. You are right on that one.

Now, he goes on to say, Madam Speaker, the failure to adequately address the issues and concerns raised in the Miller/Shaw Report. That is still ongoing. But we have taken up some of those things. And they know that as well.

The next point, though, the failure to get Government accounts up to date: Madam Speaker, I did not think that he would have the audacity to talk about that. It has been now heralded in the media that this Government has achieved a historic first, because ministries and portfolios, offices and government statutory authorities and government companies have prepared their 2010/11 financial statements in compliance with the Public Management and Finance Law. So if there is any doubt about this, please go and check with the Audit Office. I hear you all go in there a lot.

My Government has done well, in terms of driving the improvement in reporting the state of public finances, and we will continue to do so in the future.

Madam Speaker, they can't talk about annual reports. They should be ashamed, Madam Speaker. He should have amended that Motion after his first cut, after he brought it in here and the Clerk looked at it, and the Speaker looked at it, he should have amended it and written down that they are going to censure the Government, censure me, for these reports.

Madam Speaker, just look at these reports. Just look at them. From the 26th of June 2009 to the 18th of August 2011, the Government tabled 93 annual reports and financial statements from ministries, portfolios and public authorities. And today we did another 29, I think it was, which makes it some 112 reports, Madam Speaker, all to do (most of them, very few, only one or two or three for 2010/11) with that Member's time in Government!

Tell me that that is not so.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: What I see happening is this . . . 112, Madam Speaker! I should not have to come here twenty past ten in the night to talk about this, Madam Speaker. I should not have to.

Madam Speaker, the Ministry of Finance has submitted its 2008/09 financial statement to the Cayman Islands Audit Office, and the audit, therefore, is currently in progress. This can be confirmed by page 14 of the Auditor General's Report, entitled "Financial and Performance Reporting Progress Update as at 31 July 2011." The Government will produce consolidated financial statements for the 2008/09 financial year. And this will be submitted to the Auditor General's Office for auditing.

The consolidated financial statements will be prepared once the audit for all public entities is completed and audit opinions given by the Cayman Islands Audit Office. So, when they complain at point 5 announcing that the Ministry of Finance would not be producing accounts for the 2008/09 financial year, Madam Speaker, it is talking nonsense.

So, what are they going to say? If he is going to come back to say that, *Oh, the Motion just came late*, all that would have happened is that he would have criticised us for not having them there at that time. But they would have been ongoing and the intention was there. And then I would have been able to come back in a meeting such as this and say, *See? You were talking nonsense. See? It's done. It's done!*

They have to be realistic. They have to be stopping these dirty politics that they are paying, by Hartley Henry driving them. They have to stop it.

You see, in 2005 and 2009 they went out there between 2003, particularly, to [20]05 and there was nothing left that they did not say; that I was being (I remember Mr. Tibbetts saying so) guided by West Indian politics. It's in the *Compass*. I have it saved for my scrap book. I was being guided by West Indian politics. And all the while, Madam Speaker, can you imagine? The people that they were claiming that I was being guided by had lost every election and I had to go on every one down here.

That's their sense. That is what they said. And all the while, on top of that, they were saying that I was being guided? They had a consultant named Hartley Henry, running up and down through our airport.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: *[Replying to interjector]* Hmm-hmm.

Who?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Oh, they had other ones. But we got friends throughout the region also.

That man I am talking about. Some of their friends came here and told them, *I am not coming to campaign against Bush. I am not coming here to campaign against McKeever*. That's what they told them. But not Hartley Henry.

Hartley Henry is a known political West Indian consultant who chose the very colour for the party—red! Songs and everything else that they . . . and yet, they still go out there and say that I am guided by West Indian politics. No! I do not have that kind of money. I do not have that kind of money to give anybody for politics. I go out and beat the road and the highways and byways. And if people can't elect me by what I have done for them then I don't need anybody

from anywhere to come and tell me that. I don't need them to come and tell me that.

And I don't have to worry about any polls. Let them do their polls. The best poll is me, because I go in the district. People know me. They come to my door. They knock on it. They come to my window, they knock on it. They come to my desk to get scholarships. They come to my desk to get advice. They see me at a funeral, they ask me to sing. They ask me to talk with them. I sit down and counsel with them. That is the best way to get elected.

Throw away Hartley Henry. Throw him away. Don't come talking about who I have advising me. Me and God!

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Maybe not.
[Replying to interjector]

[laughter]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: I think, Madam Speaker, the Fourth Elected Member for George Town did an excellent job in his exposé in exposing the increase that we had to do for CUC. I will not take the time of the House to go through that because that was one of the best that I have heard for a long time.

Madam Speaker, suffice it to say that they gave CUC a big increase—gave them a big increase. And we paid for it. All the while CUC had insurance too. They had insurance and then they put on this one on top of us and we had to constantly pay.

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yep, pay twice.

Madam Speaker, we do well for Cayman Brac. Cayman Brac is still significantly duty free. Am I right?

[no audible reply]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yes.

Madam Speaker, I think also the Minister for Community Affairs did a good job on many of these items, and the Minister of Health.

Point 21, where they talked about the extent and cost of official travel. They well know, Madam Speaker, that ministers have to travel. They know that I am the Minister responsible for Finance, Tourism and Development. Madam Speaker, they know that I am responsible for Cayman Airways. I am responsible for public finance (meaning finance), but also financial services.

Nobody has to believe that I just like to jump on a plane . . . I am pretty well scared until I get up above the clouds. Then I am pretty well cool. It is not

something that I like to travel, because I can't afford to take my wife with me. So, I just don't like to be out there all the time, but there are things that I have to do. And I won't go into it because the Minister of Community Affairs said it right. As a Government, we are going to have to do this, and it will cost the country and it is time that we say this to the country rather than continuing to make people believe that every Government that comes in is doing something wrong because we have to travel. If we do not do this, I am saying that the next Government, whether it is us or somebody else, is going to suffer the same thing. You are going to get blasted for having to spend money to do things.

As I said earlier, other people can come in here . . . You know, some time ago throughout the West Indies there was this thought process that said that if you buy a sack of beans in Barbados and you put it in a sack from overseas (I think it went) . . . or if you bought the sack of beans overseas, put it in a sack from Barbados, they still would buy it. But if they put it from Barbados, dress it up, they still wouldn't buy it. In other words, that old cliché is that you cannot be a prophet in your own country, something like that. That is what I am trying to say.

But if we continue, Madam Speaker (to get back on track), to pound one another because our responsibilities take us abroad . . . if we are going to do something . . . Madam Speaker, I could have sat behind my desk every day and just tend to people, tend to people, tend to people, answer calls, answer calls, talk to civil servants and get nothing else done. Then what would have happened to the tax information exchange agreements that I had to be at, at times? What would have happened to the United Nation things that I had to be at personally?

Sometimes I was lucky I could get somebody of the caliber of Mr. McField or somebody else to go to those meetings. And I have sent them.

Madam Speaker, because there was not any sustainable development on the table here and the world was crashing around us and we had been black listed, or gray listed, whatever—we were in a bad shape. I had to go, myself, George McCarthy, the Attorney General, Cindy Scotland, others, Langston Sibbles, others. Then we hired for the United States, Sidley Austin to help us. They had been let go. They had somebody else, a PR company trying to do legal work, or a legal company trying to do PR work; something [like that]. But it was not working.

But if we had not gone and talked to people, sat down in the United States State Department, if we hadn't gone and signed with the UK, we would have been under much more pressure than we were. But we had to spend the money to do so. Some of it, I could go to the Community College and do telephone or video conference. But I tell you, you really cannot get a good job done when you have to do certain kinds of work. You can't negotiate treaties like that.

You can't most of the time negotiate business like that either. So, we did some of that. And there were times we had to turn down meetings.

There is an important meeting this week in the Caribbean, or next week, which we will not get to, dealing with investment and meeting the Chinese investors. Most of the Caribbean is going to be there because everybody is looking to them. I won't be there.

Madam Speaker, when you have a Ministry as diverse as mine, and other Ministers have them as well, but mine is the economic one. Try to turn around the economy, try to stabilise Government's finances. What are we going to do? Are you going to censure me for that because it costs me to travel? When I go to Florida, it doesn't cost Government anything for a hotel bill. It does not.

Madam Speaker, the previous Government, them, spent \$11,563,450 on official travel from 11 May 2005 to 19 May 2009. Eleven point five million dollars for ministers and official members, chief officers and civil servants—\$11 million! And you are going to come and complain because we now have to travel and censure me for it?

I have work to do. I have to promote the country. I am not going to have Cayman's name called in London or anywhere, in Brussels, and we are not there. That happened to us when the Foreign Office came back and said this happened at 12.00 one night and you were not there at the meeting. And when we called you, you did not send anybody. Do you think these are *Anancy* stories, Madam Speaker? These are the facts of life; things that I have had to go through.

So, Madam Speaker, I don't take anything for granted in this world today. I don't. The world is watching us constantly. I speak a little bit long on this one, Madam Speaker, because they used this quite a bit against me and they have used it in the past, about having to travel. The world is watching us. They are scrutinising everything we do. This industry that we have is still the envy out there. It is still the envy of the UK. It is still the envy of the United States. It is still the envy of most metropolitan countries. When you talk about Europe, they are rabid.

So, Madam Speaker, when President Obama said he was going to bring legislation, Mr. Tibbetts said, *Ha! It's only political posturing*. Yeah? He got elected and he brought it.

Talk is cheap. Criticism is cheap. And, Madam Speaker, they can make as many notes as they want, but we have not lost any confidence. The world out there still has tremendous confidence in this country. That is why the world is beating a path to our door to do business. And I am thankful for that. It did not happen just because of us. Yes, we had something to do with it, because we do have an open door policy for good business. But it took people generations to make us what we are today.

There are other legislators gone who built this house called the Cayman Islands. So, it *nah no* need to get out there think you are going to frighten the world about what is happening here and it is so bad, and Armageddon here and warfare on the next side and heaven and earth coming together in the middle. No, no, no, no. None of that is happening, Madam Speaker. People still want to do business here and we have to pick and choose the best one, despite the negative.

In spite of what they say about me, I still can go to any city in this country, I still can go to the State Department, I can still go to London, I still can go to Brussels, I can go to any country and I could go there tomorrow, as I was there a few days ago representing tourism in Canada, and could meet Canadian Government officials. No, no, no, no. This smear campaign is not working. It is not working, praised be the Lord.

Madam Speaker, the part that really gets me is the criticism, not in this Motion—this is bad enough. But the extraneous matters that they raised in connection with us not having Caymanians at heart and not doing things for Caymanians. Everyone knows that this economy, whether the PPM was in or us, any government would have been under tremendous and serious pressure, no matter who was there. It is just the style of government that is different.

I believe in meeting things head on. And I can tell that the present Leader of the Opposition is not going to be any better. The last Leader of the Opposition was different, had a different style. This one? You have a bull in a china shop too! The only thing, he thinks that he's better than me. He certainly has more degrees than me, but he doesn't have any more common sense than McKeeva Bush, and he can't go on the world stage and do any better than me. He can't, no matter how much people he has to prop him up. If you put him back here . . . trouble.

Now, I am not an angel. I do have my faults. As I said, I have a different management style.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr. Leader of the Opposition: I am going to write that down.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Yes. You can write that down. I am not an angel. I am not like you. You are an angel. Oh yes; a Devil's angel.

[laughter]

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

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: No, no. Far from it! I am trying every day to be a better Christian, but I ain't no saint.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Yes.

Did you hear him say that he is going to make sure that I'm a saint? He thinks that too, Madam Speaker. He really believes that he has that kind of power this time of night.

[laughter]

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

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Well, you might read over me yet. No, no, this is a strange world. We live a short life, my son.

Madam Speaker, I take those things seriously because there is a constant trying by elected . . . from Members from within this House, and some people outside there who think they know it all about the failures of this country. Yes, we have our problems; but this country is not failing in that way. We are going to go from strength to strength.

If we could turn our budget around in these hard times, and we can have a surplus at this point in time, we are going to improve on it. And therein lies the problem with the Opposition with the things they are saying on the radio, that they come here and try to say, and the things they are trying to do, because they know too well—Hartley Henry has told them, *If he turns this economy around, and he puts people back to work, you guys can't win. But if you crucify him and you make him out to be worse than anybody else and you can get anybody else to help you, then you stand a chance.* And so, that's the road they are on. But they are going to have a fight—as weak as I am—in more ways than one.

They won't get it that easy. And I tell you this: You ain't coming West Bay. You ain't got one seat there. Not one. They don't like you anyway.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: And you put certain people on your platform in town—they Pharaohs—who people know about them moving fence posts at night and all kinds of things. Let them go ahead.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: No, yours, yours, yours. Don't worry. You are part of them. They are writing blogs for you and giving me advice. But if they come, they better be prepared for the light that

will be shed on them. The spotlight will be shed on them.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* Whose? Is that who it is?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Ah, I don't blame you, my son. You have them; don't worry. You can feel them when you come around sometime.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Humph.

Madam Speaker, this thing about Government not paying attention to Caymanians and we are not doing anything to help Caymanians, I want to present further evidence of Government's diligence and hard work since it took office in May 2009, Madam Speaker.

I want to provide the House with details of waivers and refunds processed since May 2009, along with applications processed under the Government Guaranteed [Home Mortgage] Assistance Programme. I think both the Minister and the Councilor, the Fourth Elected Member for George Town, responsible for Housing, could talk about the number of houses that have been built.

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Sixty-seven, Madam Speaker, in this downturn in our economy!

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Conolly: *[inaudible]*

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: And we are going to start 12 in Cayman Brac.

How many did they get built?

[inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: And you are going to criticise me? You are going to try to censure me? Boy, what you thinking? Where you going?

[laughter]

An Hon. Member: What you see happening now—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: What I see happening here is that we got houses.

[laughter]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: We got houses.

Madam Speaker, the Public Finance Section of the Ministry of Finance, Tourism and Development and the Lands and Survey Department processed some 1,113 requests for waivers and refunds of stamp duty, customs import duty and other government fee waivers—all Caymanians, Small, and some bigger:

- 675 first-time Caymanian property owners benefitted from stamp duty waivers;
- 56 import duty waivers.

Those stamp duty waivers amounted to \$2.8 million. The 56 import duty waivers valued at \$811,000. That's \$3.6 [million]. Another \$113,000 in stamp duty waivers.

Madam Speaker, more than \$4 million . . . Caymanians . . . these are not big businesses that I am talking about; I am talking about small Caymanians who buy a piece of land, or, under our system, whose land is valued a little bit more than the [\$]200[,000], so we waived the stamp duty on the . . . you know, if it's 200 we waived up to that amount, and then if it's 290 or 250, 260, whatever the amount is after that, to help them out. They were supposed to pay, but we waived it for them. This is small Caymanians getting something out of the economy. And here they are building them up saying, *Nobody is giving you anything*. They are trying to whip people up, Madam Speaker.

How many homes?

The National Housing Development Trust processed and approved 179 applications on the Government Guaranteed Home Assisted Mortgage Programme—\$32 million! With the Government guaranteeing 35 per cent of that—\$11.2 million—for Caymanian families since 2009.

So, there may be skeptics listening to my voice who may ask what this has to do with Government. This has everything to do with Government, Madam Speaker, because each of these 179 approved loans has to be signed by me, as Minister for Finance, for the provision of the Government guarantee on the loans. We work hard, Madam Speaker, to improve the lives and the betterment of ordinary Caymanians.

One . . . what? Close to \$5 million for small business loans since 2009 and other loans for small people. These are not huge conglomerates that we are giving loans to, Madam Speaker. The Development Bank is giving small Caymanian loans to small Caymanian businesses. This is close to \$20 million plus we have given . . . we have made provision for work, which we have put the Councillor for Housing in charge of, and the Third Elected Member for Bodden Town and others—twice now. What? It must be \$3 million. Yes, \$3 million or \$4 million.

This is, as I said, over now, I guess \$20 million.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Over 800 [people]. We recognise the bad state of people. Government can only do so much, Madam Speaker, but what bothers me is that you have these people who sit on the radio shows and sell an idea to these people, not knowing who it is listening that has a foul brain and might go pick up a gun and shoot somebody because somebody is not doing the right thing for you. That is the level of irresponsibility that we have to deal with from Members of the Opposition.

And, Madam Speaker, just this year again, we increased the summer programme for students, paying them \$1,000 a month; some 200 students throughout our ministries and departments of government.

Madam Speaker, I would like to have a magic wand that I could wave over the Island, and say that this is how I want to turn things around for the betterment of everybody. It can't be done that way, Madam Speaker. We are limited in our resources and we have to do what we can. But we are helping Caymanians and we are determined to do more.

Madam Speaker, the Nation Building Fund came under criticism. Madam Speaker, I have a letter to Pastor Winston Rose, Church of God, Cayman Islands, Bodden Town, 24 April 2009—just on the cusp of the election—promising \$1.25 million for their church hall. This came from Mr. Donovan Ebanks, copied to K. Tibbetts, Leader of Government Business, Anthony Eden, Minister of Health, Charles Clifford, Minister of Tourism, and Mr. Frederick, Deputy Director of Hazard Management Cayman Islands (HMCI). And there was nothing wrong with this, you know. This is Government working hand in hand to help build a church hall that Bodden Town needs.

But to come and cuss me about it and carry on and say that this is the first time anything like this happened, and this is crooked and you're getting votes and all of this—what is this, Madam Speaker?

Hon. Cline A. Glidden, Jr.: Hurricane Shelter.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: I know! That's what I am saying. It's a hurricane shelter. But it is not getting votes. This is for the church—a good partnership. That's what we're doing, getting children educated, helping the community.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: They can do it, but I am a no good you-know-what because I do it.

I am going to table it here. I am going to table it.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Make the copies and bring them back.

There is too much of this hypocrisy going on, Madam Speaker.

I am cited in the Motion being criticised. Censure me! Censure McKeeva Bush, censure the Premier because he isn't doing anything about the cruise ships.

Madam Speaker, now this is the same Opposition that said in 2003, "**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,**" (that was Mr. Linford Pierson, at the time) "**and again we wonder, with all of the additional numbers, are we really going to get further ahead in the sector or is the price going to be so much more than we could wish for it to be**" [2003 *Official Hansard Report*, page 295]

And then we had the Leader of the Opposition (that was the Leader of the Opposition then, Mr. Tibbetts), who jumped on the bandwagon and was criticising me for trying to get a cruise ship pier here. Had a signed agreement and they were cussing me about it. I am going to take the time to read this letter, this agreement into the record.

This goes on 29 April 2003:

**"Mr. John Bolles
Vice President
Misener Marine Construction Inc.
5440 West Tyson Avenue
Tampa Florida 33611**

"Dear Mr. Bolles,

"RE: CRUISE SHIP DOCKING FACILITY GEORGE TOWN GRAND CAYMAN

"Thank you for your letter dated 28 April. Be advised that I, Honourable McKeeva Bush, on behalf of the Port Authority of the Cayman Islands, give Misener Marine Construction Inc. (Misener) of Tampa, Florida the exclusive right to design, build and finance a cruise ship berthing facility in George Town, Grand Cayman providing the cost is reasonable for such project. The cruise ship berthing facility shall consist of a minimum of a fixed pier extending westward from the existing cargo pier, with the capacity to berth two (2) mega cruise ships (Eagle Class).

"The process is to consist of three (3) steps:

"Step 1: Misener shall develop an overall master plan for two (2) fixed cruise ship piers (one as ref-

erenced above, and one extending westward from the Fort Street tender pier) all in conjunction with a STAR Center ship maneuvering study. A GMP (gross maximum price) and construction schedule shall be presented for the project and prepared with a financial model to secure financing. This step should be completed by 1 July 2003.

"Step 2: Misener is to gain acceptance from the major cruise line representatives of the Florida Caribbean Cruise Association (FCCA) that the berthing facility meets the cruise ship operators requirements. Upon FCCA approval, Misener is to gain approval of the Cayman Government to proceed in finalizing the financing model. This step is to be completed by 1 August 2003.

"Step 3: Upon securing financing, Misener is to complete the design and construct the facility. The goal is to complete the facility by August 2004.

"Misener's acceptance of the "Letter of Intent" is important to the people of the Cayman Islands. It is however subject to contracts between the Port Authority and Misener once all the details are finalized and presented to the Port Authority Board.

**"Respectfully yours,
[signed] Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, OBE, JP
Leader of Government Business
Chairman of the Port Authority Board
Minister of Tourism, Environment, Development & Commerce"**

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Well, Madam Speaker, they didn't get it because when the PPM got in they killed this deal. Misener had gone by then, gotten the cruise ships to agree to help them build, finance, the port. And the rest is history.

Madam Speaker, this motion? It's a pity that we have to take the time to deal with it because of all the matters. In fact, I had no intention of speaking. Other Members wanted to speak. I was not gung-ho about speaking because the truth is . . .

Madam Speaker, I am going to lay one of these on the Table of the House.

The Speaker: So ordered.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: So, Madam Speaker, the last matter I am going to raise is the one they talked about, the one about the oil refinery.

I do believe that if we can get an oil refinery that has the right technology in today's world, that we ought to work with the entrepreneurs to do it. But it will have to confirm to the right environmental protection matters in this country.

But to say that we should not have it . . . I am not going to say that. I think it is right for us to find out

whether it can work here or not, because by installing such a refinery here on the Islands we would be in command of our destiny and participate in setting the ultimate cost of refined products such as diesel, which CUC is now killing us with, and gasoline in this country. And Government would collect revenues and royalties which would be placed in a sovereign fund, (that's the way they are headed). Those revenues would be shared directly with the citizens of these Islands by way of annual dividends or funding green energy projects.

That would be what I would sign with them; that is what they said they would do. That is what I would sign. So, Madam Speaker, when they come talking about censuring us . . . for what? To get me?

Madam Speaker, I tell them I am no angel. I am no angel, Madam Speaker; but I am a hard worker. And I am as good and as clean as either one of them out there, either one on that side out there, either one of them. And, Madam Speaker, they better not just run ahead with themselves and think that they can only smear me and get away with it. They can't do it in here because you have not allowed them.

And, Madam Speaker, I already have three law suits to hand out in this country, one for *CNS*, one for *Rooster*, and one for Mrs. Orrett, [which are] drafted and going to be handed out shortly. And if they think that I am not taping them, and if they think I do not have every word they said written already and transcribed they are making a big mistake, because they are going to get it, Madam Speaker.

I have kept my mouth shut on their smear tactic because it is wise for me to do that. It is wise for me to do that. And they can scheme and they can go plan and they can do all these things that they say they are doing, but the day they step outside that Assembly and don't have the Speaker to deal with, they will have the law to deal with them.

So they can criticise my actions in Government, but they better just not go any further, because, as I said, I don't see lily white over there. I don't see it. Everyone has faults. Every one! Every one of us! Every one! Everyone has a background. From college they have a background.

From college, right Moses? You know. You just behave yourself.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: I'm talking to you. I want you to behave yourself.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, the Government, each Minister, has worked tremendously hard since 2009; every one of those Ministers and backbenchers. Every one of us worked.

We've sat, looked at things and have tried to get things done.

If I have to make an announcement, Madam Speaker, I do so. I am the Premier. But I am not going to sign anything unless people know. I make an announcement.

I will say that we will get Dart to remediate. But I added on to that, and I am saying so because I am challenged about that as well. But I added on, that he would have to go through whomever the process had chosen. That's what I said. I have it taped. They think I am bluffing. The disk is there, Madam Speaker, and I will call the Standing Orders if I am challenged on it, to play in this House what I said. And I did not overrun any Central Tenders Committee. I have never done it. So, let them go ahead in their blame game. The facts and the proof is there waiting. The disk is here in our system. And it will be played back so that people will hear what I said about that. Not sidestepping any process. But they are the best one.

That dump is a killer for this country. It is a killer! And we need to get something done and work with people who can do it. Not promises. Not people wanting to run around with a letter, go someplace and say, *I got this letter. I'm a member of this one and a friend of this one and, therefore, I want you to give me money. I want you . . . No!*

And because we stopped it, then now we are bad people. We are bad people because we stopped it.

The Minister has been working a long time on that, she, the councilor, and her ministry staff. These are difficult things to get through, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I am sure there will be others on our side, as there will be others on that side. And we said we are going to finish tonight. So, vote against me if you may, but hear what I say. If you had been here you wouldn't be able to do any better. You might not do things the way I do it. You might not even . . . well they certainly don't talk the way I talk. But how I see it is this: This Government has done a sterling job. I mean the nine of us. And many, many good civil servants have backed us and continue to back us. This is what I see happening here.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

Does any other Member wish to speak?

[pause] Does any other Member wish to speak?

[pause] Does any other Member wish to speak?

[pause]

Minister of Education.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin, Minister of Education, Training and Employment: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Before us today in our honourable House is a motion that calls for the House to declare a lack of confidence in the Government.

Madam Speaker, this Motion and the way in which it is crafted talks about having regard, **“WHEREAS having regard to the general conduct of the Government since it assumed office . . .”** It goes on to list some 23 points. And what is always important in any motion is its resolution, which is what we vote on. **“BE IT NOW THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Legislative Assembly does declare a lack of confidence in the Government.”**

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

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: So, Mr. Speaker, as I read this Motion when it was first filed, and I reflected on the fact that it's being moved by the Third Elected Member for George Town, the now Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Elected Member for East End, two Ministers in the previous Administration, and I reflected on the conduct, their conduct, and the results of that conduct for the country, I had to really think. I had to really think clearly.

Then we come to today. And we see here the presentation by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. As I think about the almost last 11 years that I have been blessed to be a Member in this House . . . and so has he. We got elected the same time, back on 8 November 2000. And I think about the fact that the Third Elected Member for George Town is now the Leader of the Opposition, and I listen to the way, the absolute immature and reckless way in which he conducts himself in this House, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that he is one of those who tries to conveniently say that he and I come from what would be a sort of new Cayman. A Cayman where, certain educational opportunities existed and those were taken advantage of.

What I can say, Mr. Speaker, is, that I cannot believe how much the Third Elected Member for George Town has digressed as a legislator. I cannot believe that this Member, who apparently has a handful of other professionals in this country *mamaquised* . . . I don't know how, because quite frankly it's not his speaking ability. It's not his analytical ability. It certainly has not been his leadership (because I am going to come to that in a minute). I don't believe in opinion, I just like facts. I just like performance. It hasn't been any of those things.

What it is, Mr. Speaker, is that you have some people in this country who have so much hate in their hearts, that they will stick around anyone once that person professes to not like the person that they hate which, at this particular point in time, is the Premier.

I have watched the Leader of the Opposition, the Third Elected Member for George Town, particularly over the last 12 months, continually berate the Chair in this Legislative Assembly, continually challenge the Chair in this Legislative Assembly, continually flirt with and in today's circumstance absolutely

positively break the rules in the House for his own political gain. I can say that as a young Member of this House I am absolutely positively ashamed of that type of behaviour. What is ironic is that it is the same type of behaviour that some of the people who stick very close to him accuse the Honourable Premier of.

Today he took the opportunity to read from a letter that he himself penned, the content of which broke, not one, but two Standing Orders in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not know what it is and where it is that they see the People's Progressive Movement going under his leadership. I can honestly say as the youngest Member in this House with a very young family, his behaviour is worrying. The fact that his party installed him as leader earlier this year, more than two years out from a General Election, and in his first address he announces that this is going to be a campaign like none other, tells me that they are not a party that is about this country. They are a party that is about power. And it is about power at any cost.

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

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: You see, Madam Speaker, the way that God made us up, when you have two particular traits, one is a trait that causes you to have hate that can accumulate and harbour hate, and one is of arrogance. When you combine them you get what I describe as what can be the worst of humanity.

But they try to bank on people like the Honourable Second Elected Member for Bodden Town to give them credibility, you see. They hope that that is what is going to give them the credibility come 2013. What I can say is that I am just over 27 months into my term as Minister. I can put my record up against his four years. And I am going to do that in just a minute because we want to talk about confidence and what this House should have a lack of confidence in and in whom.

I can rest very well at night. And quite honestly, if God spares my life, God willing, in 2013 I look forward to taking my record on the road, to taking the record of this Government on the road and back to the people of this country. I look forward to taking our record and comparing it to what has to be described as the absolute worst government this country has seen in decades, which was the PPM Administration.

You see, Madam Speaker, there are certain things that come down to personal opinion. But there are certain things where we have to simply peel away the personalities, the arrogance, the hatred, and look at the facts and simply paint them—not written by me, not written by them—for what they are. Facts, Madam Speaker, are a very stubborn thing. It is hard to run away from them, and it's hard to get away from them.

I was not surprised that we have a motion of no confidence within his first year of assuming the leadership of the Opposition. I was not surprised that he organised a march when this economy is still in

recovery, for he does not have any true love for this country. What he has is a deep, burning desire for the political power in this country. And when you have a deep burning desire for power, you will say, act, pretend and do all things to try to get people to believe. But I say that, ultimately, it still winds up being your actions that speak much louder—much louder—than the fleeting words that come from your mouth.

Madam Speaker, his motion speaks to a huge array of items. Of course, the majority of them he did not address today. He honed in on a couple of points, but, of course, the recurring theme was to attack the Office of the Premier and the Premier. When I look at his so-called list of 23 items and reflect on where the country is at, and the fact that this gentleman had a significant hand in where the country is at and is now going to run around this country saying, *Well, Government, I'm tired of you talking about how we got here. Let's just concentrate on what you've done.* And ultimately, I believe, still not grasping the magnitude of the outcomes of their behaviour as a Government.

Madam Speaker, let's just look at some of the facts. And I would love for him to even try to dispute any of them. In May 2009 I took up office, interestingly, in the Ministry for which he was the Minister. I inherited the Ministry of Education—some other important subjects like Labour and Pensions, but let's focus on Education right now, something that is on the heartstring of every Caymanian and what should be at the forefront of all of our minds—a Ministry that did not have one single education professional employed in the Ministry. Not a single person with compulsory education experience!

I inherited a PR campaign that said we had a new national curriculum. When we investigated it was but a rubber stamp with a few minor changes in about three subjects of the UK National Curriculum.

I inherited one of the most ill-conceived pieces of legislation, the 2009 Education Modernisation Law, which he rushed down to this Legislative Assembly five days (I think it was) before the House was prorogued before the last General Election, simply because he wanted to tick a box and say, *I did it.*

I inherited a Ministry that was responsible for Labour, yet he cannot point—in four years—to one single labour initiative, and he cannot point to one single labour reform that he executed in this country. Yet, his Motion speaks about the unemployed.

I inherited a department that was about to collapse. I inherited a pension regime that was so badly broken that the Complaints Commissioner has now wondered with an "Own Motion" about the fact that when I took office there were 625 cases at the National Pensions Office and the office simply could not, cannot cope. They ordered a study; did nothing—a not a single pension initiative or significant legislative change in four years.

Madam Speaker, his Motion says that we—"we", the current Administration . . . one of his points

is that we have gone into projects. Point 13: "**Persisting in the announcement of major projects without a reliable assessment of feasibility, costs, benefits or economic or environmental impact.**" Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition started the Beulah High School and wasted millions of tax payers' dollars. They are still sitting there. And what did he say? He put the project "on hold."

Madam Speaker, he had the audacity in Finance Committee a few weeks ago to ask me, as Minister, if our Government has formally taken the policy to discontinue the Beulah Smith High School. I mean, really, Madam Speaker, really, really, really . . . what world is the Leader of the Opposition living in? He and his Government entered into a major project completely disregarding proper analysis, completely disregarding affordability, completely disregarding all of our calls as the then Opposition, and, quite honestly, the call of many in the community for restraint. Yet he has the audacity and is so bewildered that he is now going to come two years later in the year 2011 and ask me if our Government has formally adopted the policy to discontinue the Beulah Smith High School? What world are they living in?

What world is the Third Elected Member for George Town living in? It is certainly not the real world. It is certainly not a sober world. It is certainly not a world that has anything called logic. It is certainly not a world that has anything that resembles what is in the best interests of these Islands. Madam Speaker, he has gone on record publicly saying that the \$10 million that this Administration managed to negotiate in the three-year plan for our primary school project . . . *Oh, we shouldn't have done that! We should have used every resource to put towards the high schools.*

Madam Speaker, is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition saying that when he demitted office that he was still in such a folly because all that his Ministry was about (as I have uncovered) was conferences, travel, big parties, big events, circumventing the rules? And we are going to get to that in a minute. That was what the Ministry was built on. He was just on what they call one big ride!

So, Madam Speaker, did he not know that the primary schools in this country are littered with modulars? Did he not know that in every single one of them we have mould issues in? Did he not know that the primary school is for children 10 years and younger? Did he not know that those are our most vulnerable learners? Madam Speaker, did he not know that at our four largest primary schools we are overcrowded?

I wonder what he knew. I wonder what he actually took his time to really know, other than getting up for his posed pictures for the big PR ride that he was on, that they were hoping was going to be their wave to ride back in in the 2009 General Elections.

[inaudible interjection]

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: I inherited an early childhood care unit that had one person in it doing absolutely nothing other than a couple of inspections for licensing of institutions. Nothing on curriculum, nothing on standards and nothing on schemes of work. When I held my first meeting with pre-schools and announced to them that the Government was starting from scratch—that's how I opened the meeting—I was greeted with a standing ovation and cheers! That was what I saw happening.

What I saw happening was that we were completely ignoring our youngest learners and spending tons of resources on literacy and numeracy at primary and secondary level. Yet, in four years, he claims that he had success. Madam Speaker, when I announced in this honourable House the Government's intention to reintroduce reception (this was during Question Time on one of our first Budgets), that same Member said he agreed with the policy and wished me well.

Now, Madam Speaker, if during the times after Ivan when we had the Ivan rebuild, which we warned then was fool's gold . . . we warned them that is not normal economic activity. You cannot judge the Budget on the rebuild after a major devastation. Did he listen? No! Warned them that is not your barometer, that is not the base from which you can build and project, because there has to be a trail off. Even if the world did not go into recession, you had to have a trail off once the Ivan rebuild was over. But he does not understand that because he just does not get it. If I wasn't convinced of that anytime in the last 11 years, I am certainly convinced of it now.

Madam Speaker, he said he was dreaming of introducing that and that that was such a good policy. Madam Speaker, this Government could reintroduce it at George Town Primary School from last September under tremendous budgetary strain, and yet he could not do it in four years. Four years in which the country saw and benefitted from all of the re-spend, all of the cars that were imported after Ivan, all of the homes that were rebuilt, all of the apartments that were rebuilt. Let's think about just up in the Prospect area. One entire apartment complex washed away that was built. Do you know what type of impact that had on this economy, even at reduced duties?

So in those times he couldn't do it? No, Madam Speaker, what that means is he didn't get it. He doesn't get it, and he didn't do anything about it.

Madam Speaker, I inherited another pie-in-the-sky dream by that same Leader of the Opposition. He went into the high schools and said, *Oh, I'm going to create schools within a school*. Madam Speaker, our schools have been divided into houses for many years. Our educators recognised for about four decades that you needed to break your school community down into small, manageable chunks, create leadership within the school to manage those students and care for those students, versus having one wide-open

general population in your school. This isn't anything new. This isn't anything that he discovered.

But I inherited a system. We have a campus director, a super-paid principal and four deputies. Money wasted on administration when our school system is starving for more professionals for more assistant teachers, for more teachers' aides and for more support assistants in the classes. Yet that same Member wasted this country's money. For every principal that he hired under his leadership we could have had assistant teachers and senior support aides in our classrooms that we so desperately need. Yet, he has the audacity and temerity to come here and talk about the Government failing. He is the same Member who demitted office as Minister. Can he tell us if he left a national sports policy? Can he tell us if he did anything to try and develop a student athlete policy?

I know that my colleague, the Honourable Mark Scotland, has made a proposal for us to try and support our student athletes to try and ensure that they are not only being developed on the sports field and grounds, but also being developed in the classroom and we are setting standards so that they can start to take up educational opportunities in other countries because they will have the academic qualifications. There is no rule that says that because you are athletic you cannot learn. That is not written anywhere in this world.

Madam Speaker, can he tell this House why it is that the security contracts at a number of schools have never been tendered?

Madam Speaker, one of his big points . . . and the Honourable Premier tried to bring some soberness to this. But, you know, those who desire power—and are as power hungry as the Leader of the Opposition—will never, ever, ever have the capacity to be mature as legislators and have any honour in this regard. So he will always swipe at and grab at anything he can because of his thirst for power.

But, Mr. Premier, I must agree with you, that one of the things that we should be trying to do is educate our people that there is a cost to leadership and governance. That happens in any organisation. If you are an accounting firm, if you are a law firm you try to cut back in tough times on certain things, but even in tough times you have to have business travel, you are going to have to have training and development.

But, Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition can explain then, why—since official travel is one of his points—when he was Minister in four years we can compile \$1,708,117.06.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: For what?

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: For official travel.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Him?

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: In his Ministry.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: [inaudible]

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: And, Madam Speaker, I say what we can compile, because one of the things . . . and I don't know what the auditors are going to make of this when they come in, but one of the things we found out is that in many instances the proper documentation that underpinned trips was not completed. So, what the accounting staff has had to try and do is piece together through credit card statements what was official travel, what was not official travel. That's the type of ship that he ran. But, boy, he has the absolute gall to come down here and talk about that we should have lack of confidence in this Government.

Madam Speaker, can the Honourable Leader of the Opposition tell this House why they picked the particular location for his proposed George Town Primary School? Can he also tell the country—since point 13 of his [Motion] is that you have to do proper analysis and business studies—why he not only purchased the land in that location, but he also bought all of that fill?

Why is it that this country in these times, as I reported to this House during the Budget Session, has millions of dollars in fill sitting around the country lying idle from projects that he stopped? Can the Leader of the Opposition tell us why he developed that grandiose plan when close to 50 per cent of the students from that school are out of the catchment area? Can he tell us?

What I can tell the honourable Member is that as of next February, God willing all goes to plan, his district (along with his colleague, the First Elected Member for George Town, my colleague the Honourable Minister of [Community Affairs] and my colleague the Honourable Fourth Elected Member for George Town) is going to have probably the most modern primary school other than Red Bay and Prospect, because this new addition is going to allow us to get rid of the old school block. The other school block that exists is the one that was built under the leadership of Mr. Truman Bodden which overlooks the Annex Field.

So, we are going to have the capacity, the opportunity to not only have our students in some of the best learning spaces and environments, but we are going to be able to do so even in the midst of an economic recession. Even in the midst of an economic recession we are delivering to our youngest learners much needed facilities, getting rid of modulars, getting our children and our teachers into environments that they need. However, if we went along with his theory on educational development, the country would have to wait until we can afford a \$100 million high school, or a \$30 million to \$40 million primary school. That's when you can get new plant and get learning environments that are adequate for our children.

At this stage, Madam Speaker, I am happy to say that not only are we going to be opening in October of this year the Sir John Cumber extension, the Savannah School extension, and hopefully somewhere between December and January, the Bodden Town Primary extension, but through negotiations in the ForCayman Alliance, we are also now going to be able to go to our most difficult areas as it relates to lack of space at primary and further develop our areas that are most vulnerable at present. He knew. It's been known for quite a long time that the Sir John Cumber Primary School at 500-plus students is simply too large to manage optimally. So, we ensured that we negotiated funding.

This country has always cried, *Oh, developers come in and the country gets nothing*. Now, this Government goes along and negotiates a solid economic package, a solid long-term economic package that includes much necessary investment that the country needs. That is the type of partnership that we need with our private sector. If we are going to support development the country must benefit. We ensured that education, training, housing and community development were key parts of the package in the ForCayman Investment Alliance.

Madam Speaker, we are going to be able to go back to the Sir John Cumber Primary School now and really look at how we can develop an infant and a primary school on the same campus. Fortunately, the way this school has developed, there is already a natural dividing line. And what is the benefit? They are going to be able to share the field, enhance our parking, hopefully get the Department of Children and Family Services Office relocated in the short term, share the volleyball and netball courts, and share the hall. Can you imagine if the Premier and the Members for West Bay and the District of West Bay—the second biggest district—had to wait until public finances could afford to build a brand new primary school how long we would potentially have to wait? So, Madam Speaker, this is good.

We have also negotiated funding for the District of Bodden Town—the fastest growing district. So now we are going to be able to go back to that entire Savannah/Prospect area which is so rapidly growing and look carefully at our school plant and ensure that we can meet the needs of today without having to import modulars that are not only costly, but so difficult to maintain and pose such potential health risks to our children.

Madam Speaker, can the Leader of the Opposition tell us whether or not this House should have confidence in anyone bringing such a motion who resided in Government and in four short years quadrupled the national debt? How can I, as an Elected Member, soberly, rationally, and in good conscience go back to my constituents and say that I listened to a person who just demitted office a few 27 short months ago as a Minister and resided in power in this country

for four years and quadrupled our national debt? How can I, or any Member of this House, listen to anyone who demits office with an operating deficit in a single year of some \$81 million?

But of course, Madam Speaker, what we hear, the story now is that they were getting bad information. This one and that one was giving them bad information. What would be very interesting is if the honourable Member could tell us how many management accounts were formally [done as] Minutes while they were the Cabinet.

Madam Speaker, Can the Honourable Leader of the Opposition tell this House why we should have any confidence in a Government that so poorly executed a plan that it wound up building an administration building that now has to operate around six . . . I am going to be kind this evening. It's very late, so let me be kind. It's midnight, almost the next day, almost International Literacy Day, actually . . . Madam Speaker, how can we have any confidence?

They talked about, *Oh yes, we are going to save money in rent. We are going to save money in leases.* Yet, Madam Speaker, [it costs] \$6 million to operate the building. Now, that's a great business plan. That's great planning. That's great execution. Oh yes, because that's their strength, you know. Their strength is taking all of the rules and, being these wonderful practitioners of the rules . . . because all of their projects smelled like roses, he said. They smelled like roses. I wonder what the budget is smelling like now that we have to fund these roses that they delivered!

Another rose that is going to be delivered to the country is the Clifton Hunter High School. We are hoping to have that completed in the first quarter of next year.

I didn't inherit any operational plan. How can you say that you are planning if as you develop a concept you are not going to say, *Okay, let's not only look at what the cost is going to be to deliver the project, but let's also ensure that we're estimating what the cost of maintenance is?* That isn't any rocket science. You know the number of square feet. You know what the typical average cost per square foot is for cleaning, et cetera. You build it all up and you can come up with a fairly robust number for how much operating costs are going to be per year.

So, Madam Speaker, you know, you see all of this and yet this is the same group that is apparently saying that they are the government in waiting. God help these Cayman Islands. God help these Cayman Islands.

Madam Speaker, proper planning, he said. How can you execute a plan that all of your costs are going to be about \$100 million per school? Yet, Clifton Hunter was built under his leadership—three academies, 250 per academy. That's 750 students. I took office [and] that catchment area already had over 800 students. John Gray High School, four academies,

1,000 students. Those two catchment areas already had close to 1,100 students.

So, there is not only the travesty of his ill-conceived design, there's not only the travesty in terms of eventful spend which his plans boxed this country into, and what else we could have gotten had we had a rational approach to school development, but on top of that, Madam Speaker, what we then learned is that it is not even like you can say, *Well, at least it's built that we can accommodate students for the next five to ten years.* You inherit a plan, you get the brief, you hear the numbers, you look and say, *Well, hold on. If we have 2,200 kids at secondary and you are telling me that the capacity is somewhere around 1750, how are we supposed to be making do?* But we are going to make do, Madam Speaker. We will make do!

Madam Speaker, the Member fully understands, I hope, the state of Government accounts—not public finances now; Government accounts—when he demitted office. He knows that a private sector firm was brought in on a million-dollar-a-year contract to try and catch up Government's accounts to get them to the point that they could be ready for the auditors. Yet, Madam Speaker, he comes along now with this big bagpipe, blowing this tune asking us what we are doing.

I'm happy that the Premier could report that for the first time under the Public Management and Finance Law (PMFL) we were able to hand over to the Auditor General a set of accounts on time for audit.

Madam Speaker, the whole world knows, but let me say it because the fact is that I know how the Leader of the Opposition and the Elected Member for North Side are—right? Their style is that everything is new. Something could have existed for two or three decades but if they roll out of bed on a Tuesday morning or a Wednesday morning and say it, it must be new—new development, breaking news.

Let's hope now that we can be very clear about the fact that the Cayman Islands Government has not had its fixed-asset register valued for many, many years. So we know there is going to be a significant issue when the Auditor General and his Office conduct their audit of central government. I would presume that at a minimum we would get a qualified opinion. We know the cost implication and resource implication. However, this Government is committed to starting the process of undertaking that exercise because it is one that the country needs to undertake, that Government needs to undertake. We do need to look at our asset register and ensure that within the rules of our public sector reporting the carrying value of our fixed assets is appropriate.

We also know, Madam Speaker, that when it comes to assets the two largest Ministries are, of course, [my] Ministry, because of the school plant and the libraries, and the Honourable Deputy Premier's Ministry, because she has the Government Admin-

istration Building and a number of other buildings within her Ministry. So one of the issues that we know exists and we have been public about (but I am going to say it again) is the fact that in this year's financial statements both of our finance teams are still working to ensure that we get all of our allocations to individual fixed-assets done correctly. Because, Madam Speaker, as you can only imagine, when we have massive projects we have to ensure that all costs are being costed to the asset appropriately. The easy ones are going to be payments to contractors, for example. That is easy.

If a contractor is working on the Sir John A. Cumber Primary School, [it is] very easy to cost that and book it to that asset. Work on Clifton Hunter High School in Frank Sound, very easy. But the key is to ensure things like the invoicing from Public Works and to ensure that our soft costs which are able to be capitalised under accounting rules are allocated to the correct assets.

Overall, I think we are pretty close to having our fixed-assets in our Ministries quantified. What we still need to ensure is that asset by asset the specific amounts that are allocated to each of those fixed-assets is correct. And that is a very timely exercise. And it is also timely, Madam Speaker, especially when you have a set of consultants that may be working on a project that has more than one asset. For example, Madam Speaker, we have one construction manager who is working on both the Clifton Hunter and John Gray High School projects. So we need to ensure that the invoicing, whatever is being charged to Clifton Hunter is being booked to that asset, and what is being booked to John Gray is appropriate.

Madam Speaker, I can say that as a Legislative Assembly we should be commending the finance teams across Government. Instead of being here going through this Motion we should be spending productive time, and certainly productive time like commending them for all of the hard work that they have undergone to get us thus far, because there has been a lot of hard work put in; there has been a lot of overtime put in by finance teams across Government. Madam Speaker, you know the private sector loves to jump up and down and talk about inefficiencies in the public service. Of course, most of them have never lived there, been there, know what it is like. They like to talk about the inefficiencies, but certainly, anytime anything good happens they are very, very short on their compliments. So we, as elected Members, whether Opposition or not, should be commending those hardworking civil servants for the work that they have done, and it is much work, Madam Speaker. And they have gone above and beyond.

Madam Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition needs to recall is the fact that not only did he preside over the University College when it went through what is the greatest stain and calamity in its history—

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Juliana Y. O'Connor-Connolly: Yeah, what happened with that?

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Mind you, this was the gentleman who was running around blowing those same pipes that he was blowing this morning. That was the one he was dragging to every corner of the globe.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Oh yeah.

[inaudible comments]

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Greatly contributing to this \$1.7 million—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Hassan Sayed. How much?

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: To this \$1.7 million in official travel. I wonder, Madam Speaker, if he would be willing to talk about those fiascos.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Yeah. And did he appoint him? Worthless thing he is. Kurt needed to flog him instead of appointing him.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if he can explain to this country why he as Minister of Education—Minister of Education—could have developed at the University College a Post Graduate Diploma in Education that the Department of Education has not endorsed, and [why] not a single person under his leadership, or mine, having gone through that programme has been registered as a teacher in the Cayman Islands. It is about the headlines when it comes to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Yes.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: No attention to detail and hard work. Let's roll out the headlines—*Wha ya say Sayed? You got a teacher training programme? Let's go, let's go, let's go old boy. Let's announce it, let's get the PR, let's talk about it.*

What I've committed to—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: All Sayed was doing was buying his girlfriend loads of jewelry with our money. Where it is?

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: What I have committed to is that we are going to put in place a properly accredited Post Graduate Diploma in Education programme because the country needs it and because we do need to have a bridge for people who study locally. We also need to have a bridge for anyone who wants to change their career and get into Education. But that bridge must be one that, at a minimum, the Depart-

ment of Education and the Chief Education Officer have signed off on so that persons can be recommended for licensure as duly qualified teachers in this country. And so I have committed that any person who has gone through the ill-conceived programme of the Third Member for George Town, that the Government will honour the monies they spent and will get a credit toward the new programme. That is the only right thing to do. It is the only right thing to do, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, can the Leader of the Opposition tell us why in four years he did absolutely nothing about the Alternative Education Centre (AEC) which he knows from the time it was behind the Fort, it was nothing more than a segue to a life of crime or death?

We did a longitudinal study a few weeks ago, and 73 per cent of all persons who have gone through the Alternative Education Centre in the Cayman Islands are either dead or currently in Northward Prison.

[inaudible interjection]

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Yes, in four years. With all these grandiose plans and all the work and the bragging we used to hear down here about this team he was developing—*my team*. Four years, nothing done about the Alternative Education Centre. What I can report to the House is that we have put in place, not only for the first time in the country's history, a written documented behaviour for learning policy. Not this pie-in-the-sky stuff, and, *Oh, I said I did it*, and then when you go ask people, everybody is looking around with their heads in the air whistling Dixie.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: What they were whistling?

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Well, they are whistling something, Premier.

Proper policy put in place nationally, in every school. School based policies. And ensuring that at the Ministry level we have people who are going out to our schools and conducting the type of training that we know our teaching professionals need as it relates to behaviour for learning.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: And now he wants to censure you.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: He had to know from his days that one of the biggest issues in all of our primary and secondary schools was behaviour. He had to know! It could never be that he did not hear the message from teachers like I have heard it; the behaviour of a small few was getting in the way of the learning of the majority.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: He knew because he sat over there and criticised Truman when he was here. He knew.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Yet, Madam Speaker, four years and he leaves AEC in place [with] nothing done. Nothing done! I am 27 months in and we are now going to have all of the students who were formally AEC candidates for the tutorial unit back in our mainstream school, properly accommodated by trained, behavioural specialists ensuring those most vulnerable children have some success educationally and some hope for a future.

History has told us . . . I can remember being a young elected Member in this House and he sat in that same Finance Committee when we heard about the young men who were here down behind the old Fort Building on the waterfront smoking ganja. He can't tell me he did not hear that. He was here!

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: He criticised Truman for it!

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Yet, Madam Speaker, in four years, glitz and glamour, all over the globe; high-faluting plans and consultants who came in and told us nothing that our education professionals had not been saying for decades. It is about conducting yourself in such a way that you are going to get down to the hard work and get the work done.

I might not be a glitz and glamour guy when it comes to the press. I might not be travelling all over the place. I can tell him that he can go and search those travel records. He can do a PQ, an FOI, an OCC, an audit; he can do anything on them. What I clearly know is that ultimately there are times when you have to . . . and I agree with the Premier on that. But you need to do your work. And you have to ensure that you are listening to what is happening on the ground.

If our cadre of teachers can't offer us an insight, at a minimum an insight, into what is fundamentally at the core in terms of the issues in our system then they shouldn't be in the classroom. So we clearly know what our issues are. It is about identifying, it's about then acting—but not just acting with glossy reports and press conferences, pointing at plans and taking pictures and then putting it in colour.

Madam Speaker, can the Honourable Leader of the Opposition tell us why under his leadership the Occupational Safety Health Administration, or OSHA, training was discontinued at the Department of Employment Relations? Can he tell this country why something as important as training for safety, not only in the workplace but also at construction sites, was not being conducted? That was one of the first things I was told within days of taking office. And we had to go and get our officers recertified. And it wasn't that they had just lapsed in April of 2009. No, no, no, no. Hadn't

been any in some 12 months, from what I recall in terms of the timeline. Yet, Madam Speaker, we have a gentleman, a Member of the House who comes up with his trumped-up 23 so-called points, including others, he says.

Madam Speaker, just sitting here for a half hour I could come up with 34, 32 major failings. But I concentrated principally on what would have been his ministry at the time. There are some others in there—major failings for four years. Four years, Madam Speaker. Four years. You know, this country going through all the hype, all the glitz, all the glamour. Do you know what I loved? A few months ago in the House he challenged me. He said, “Oh, it’s in the Ministry, go look.”

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: You went and looked?

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: I went and looked. And I really need to bring them down here as a display to the House.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: And this is what you saw happening.

[laughter]

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: And what I saw happening in his 10 strategies . . . every one of those had, if I recall, a two-inch binder. There were about three or four of them that had about four or five pages. Loads and loads and loads of documentation. And then when I asked the all-important question, “Okay, if that is what you are saying is your strategy, what was the absolute real life outcome? What did you actually do? Give me the ‘do’. What happened? How did this impact teaching and learning in our classrooms?”

And, Madam Speaker, what we are still battling with are the impacts and outcomes, the effects of the absolute many ill-considered, what we would call these strategies, initiatives on this initiatives on that. Madam Speaker, Leadership-101 tells us that you need to clearly set out your roadmap [not] in some highfaluting way. Clearly set out what your road map is, what your standards are, train people and get them to deliver. But in setting your roadmap include them. Because when you do not include people and bring them along, you are going to get real, real resistance.

Absolutely, Madam Speaker, there is never going to be any Ministry anywhere that even after having done all of that is going to get everything absolutely right. But, Madam Speaker, you really give yourself some real opportunity for success if you are going to take the time to involve people and get it right.

Madam Speaker, what was interesting is that on 10 February 2003, in this same honourable House, the same honourable Member who is moving this Motion, when the House was then discussing a censure

motion as it related to the former Attorney General, none other than a Mr. David Ballantyne, he said: **“That is an important question which must be answered, and spending time debating a Censure Motion—which can have no practical effect—is not going to answer . . .”** because he was talking then . . . let me read back.

“Successive Attorneys General and Governors must have known of the existence of MI6 and of the existence of an MI6 agent, most ominously, as the head of our Financial Reporting Unit. What are we going to do about that? That is an important question which must be answered, and spending time debating a Censure Motion—which can have no practical effect—is not going to answer that question.” [\[2002/3 Official Hansard Report, page 857\]](#)

He goes on to say, **“While we spend time unproductively debating a Censure Motion which will have no practical consequence . . .”** [\[Ibid, page 858\]](#)

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: **“That did not happen and the situation continues to deteriorate, with this Censure Motion providing further fuel for the fire.”** [\[Ibid\]](#)

How I would interpret that, Madam Speaker, is that our country is going through a really, really tough time economically; a state of public finances in dire straits. What is this censure motion going to add to it? What is the practical effect of this censure motion? How is this censure motion going to help? How is this censure motion going to address the issues?

What he should be doing is submitting quality motions to this House that challenge the Government to bring necessary policy or legislation that is going to assist the people of this country. Right? What he should be doing is moving motions like the Fourth Elected Member for George Town is moving, which call for jobs for Caymanians only, so we can actually look at the labour market and see where we are and decide whether we need to have outright bans in certain areas, quotas in other areas, to ensure that this age-long issue that we know has existed in this country where Caymanians are systematically excluded from certain industries and professions, is discontinued. And that people clearly understand that the old regime, where we expect that the private sector is simply going to do the right thing, is not one that the country can continue with any longer.

Cayman is not the only country to have recognised that. You can’t find many countries that do not have work visas, work permits (whatever we want to call them), quotas and restrictions in many, many areas. This Government is sensible. We know the areas that we need to continue to foster growth in because they are what I and the Government like to call,

'creators of wealth and economic activity.' We know those are the areas that we must be welcoming, that we must be tolerant of and not simply wear an over-zealous, nationalistic hat to the tea party. We must know the areas that are going to create opportunities for Caymanians, create growth in our economy. But we also know the areas that we clearly identify from the time we—and I said "areas", I did not say "jobs" specifically—were on the Immigration Review Team that we knew what naturally would have been the areas which might not have gotten key employee, for example.

So, Madam Speaker, we know some of the things we have to do in the labour market. Yet, his motion speaks to what are we doing about unemployment, knowing that that is one of the easiest areas to beat up any government globally right now. Any country that is in recession is going to be strained as it relates to unemployment. But, Madam Speaker, what did their record show? What can they show? Can he look back, point back to the House and the public and say, *Look, Members of this House; look members of the general public, here is what I did when I was Minister of Labour?* I have proven that I have a track record. So I now have some ground to stand on in being able to say that I can deliver and I should be able to criticise.

So, Madam Speaker, what I can say to this House is that, God willing, in the November sitting we will be bringing legislation to address the spirit of the motion that was passed in this Legislative Assembly. We will be bringing forward legislation as it relates to pension withdrawals. We are going to bring forward legislation that we know can help people. If we are not going to provide avenues to assist our people in the areas we know cause vulnerability in our community, then why are we here as a Government? That is one of the key roles that Government has to play in its society.

We know that inadequate housing is the root cause of much of our social problems. We don't need to look at the Yolande Forde Report. We need to walk around our communities. How many of us who have been elected to this House have not gone to areas where we look at the housing and said to ourselves, *Good grief! How can a child coming from this environment have a real possibility for success? What a travesty that is, that we have bright children throughout this community, in the hundreds, whose life chances are being snuffed out simply because of a lack of access to adequate housing?*

So, Madam Speaker, they can question all they want. Minister Adam and the Fourth Elected Member for George Town spoke to the work that they have done in regard to affordable housing. This Government, given the financial constraints in which we live, given the fact that we have a budget that is a solid budget, yet around 10.00 am on the day we are going to deliver we get a call from the FCO saying,

Sorry; it's not good enough. Cut more. You are not compliant. Your law says that when you are not compliant we have a say. And so we had to go and cut more; cut more into funding that we know this community needs. We know the community's needs and areas where we want to spend more money. Yet, Madam Speaker, when we had a time of plenty, instead of being wise, prudent and restrained in what they were doing, instead of following the principles outlined in some of the points in this very Motion, the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues went on a spree. A spree of sprees!

You remember, Madam Speaker, years ago when men would go off and drink a lot? They would call that a spree. Yes.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: No, no, no, no. That would be unparliamentary. Not accusing any Member of a spree. Not a drinking spree. But what their behaviour reminds me of is what I saw as a young boy growing up when you'd hear the women saying, *I know where he is. Oh, he's off on a spree.*

Madam Speaker, what is happening around here is that they went on their spree of folly, absolute foolishness. Now they come down here harassing the Government. The Premier spoke about bureaucratic harassment. This is parliamentary and political harassment. Come down here, harassing the Government. No solutions! No solutions to any of our problems. Offer no better alternative. In my humble opinion, a much worse alternative.

What I can say to the Leader of the Opposition . . . You see, there are people in this world who think they have monopolies, you know. I can tell him that he does not have any more credibility in this country than I. When my four years are up, my performance, I can say, without bragging, is going to be sparkling compared to the folly of his four years. What I can say, Madam Speaker, is that they may believe that they can fool the people with these red herrings, but, God willing in 2013, if the Almighty puts strength in my body . . . if they thought 2009 was anything, just wait until 2013.

There is no guesswork now about his performance. There is no guesswork about his performance. When I put that together and document that, when I show the country how I could inherit a ministry that had thousands of dollars of mid-term reports that they wasted money on publishing and had in a store-room in the ministry . . . I heard that the week between the General Election and us taking office there was much shredding, but apparently there was too much for them to get rid of, so some was left.

When the public sees the absolute lack of stewardship, and the absolute disregard of value for money, the absolute cavalier attitude that they had as it relates to public debt, I can say this much: This

community is maturing more and more. More and more we get away from the politics of, I show up at momma's house, who's living with or next to grandma, and whoever I hear the two of them are voting for, that's who I'm voting for. There is very little of that any more. It's about people listening and looking.

I can safely say that this Government is on the right track. Will we make mistakes? Yes, we will make mistakes. Look at what the Honourable Premier did. Let's use one small comparative. He mentioned the matter of procurement of public finances and the involvement of Cohen. Madam Speaker, the Premier came to this country at varying points and updated and reported to the country what was happening. Ultimately when they could not deliver a deal that we felt was going to get us the greatest value for money, we went somewhere else. That is what you do as Government. You don't sit down and moan and complain and talk about, *Well, you know, there's a rule here. And, boy, that rule could cost you about \$10 million more, general public. But guess what; that rule is very important. So we need to tick that box. Let's tick that box and spend \$10 million more.*

I do not believe that is what the public elected us to do. I do not believe that is what the public elected us [for] and expects of us. We know we need to amend and get a more sensible procurement process. The Premier has asked for this in Cabinet. We have been talking about this. We brought in the Auditor General (I think it was his first visit to the Cabinet) and [we] said to him that this was a key area we wanted him to look at because there are significant weaknesses. We told him about some of the difficulties that we, as Ministers, were seeing, and the fact that we need to ensure that value for money is what is front and centre in people's minds; getting the greatest value for our tax payers' money. And it should not only be in tough times that we realise this; this should be front and centre of everything we do.

So, what did the Premier do? The Premier acknowledged that a mistake was made—brought it public. He acknowledged what he tried. I haven't heard the Honourable Leader of the Opposition yet try to make any public amends for all of the blunders that have underpinned these projects and what it is costing this country. How you can allow under your watch as Minister a procurement process to wind up awarding to a contractor who cannot provide you with the financial wherewithal to show that they have the adequate financial resources to take on the general contractorship of the job. Yet, you still make it happen.

And, Madam Speaker, not only under his watch was a company that could not provide evidence of the financial wherewithal, [but] to make matters worse he sat there as Minister and allowed them to have a contract where the bond was something around the order, from what I understand, to be less than half of what is the normal requirement.

All of that, Madam Speaker, all of those sorts of irregularities and shenanigans, yet he has the audacity, the feistiness to come around this House—the people's House. And, Madam Speaker, all I can say is that he wanted a debate on censorship. Ultimately, what should be censured is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Yes!

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Until all that has been done in that Ministry, for which he was Minister, is properly documented and accounted for . . . because, Madam Speaker, this is not about hearsay. This is what happened. It is there. It is in the Ministry. The results the country is paying for.

Yet, Madam Speaker, here we are at this hour, having to debate a motion which he himself criticised as the type of motion eight years ago. Boy! In eight years, my how opinions change. My, how the perspectives change.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Madam Speaker, what is crucially important is that as we develop our plans in the Ministry we have not left behind our Sister Islands. In fact, we have already started some work at the Cayman Brac High School. We started the consultation back in June and we are going to be going up early in this school term to meet with the public again and with our education professionals about the way forward for education in the Sister Islands. Much work has to be done as it relates to secondary and how we are going to reform secondary to ensure that our children in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman have the same opportunities for technical and vocational training as they do here in Grand Cayman. That is vitally important to the way forward, Madam Speaker.

We have to ensure that even in a situation where we have a small cadre of students (30-something per graduating class) we still come up with ways in which we can deliver what ultimately is needed to ensure that those children have the greatest possibility for a productive life in our community. That is what is ultimately going to drive down crime—when we get more young people taking up a productive place in our society. And they take it up when they have the right attitude, the right levels of attainment and therefore get the opportunities to participate.

We have to clearly acknowledge and recognise that many of our young people are on the sidelines. How Passport2Success . . . and, Madam Speaker, I am so glad that I haven't even given my colleagues a brief yet, because I like to give them surprises. So their back-to-school surprise is going to be the three-stream and the three-groups of Passport2Success that we are going to be rolling out. They already have part of the presentation on what the new

human capital development agency is going to look like and how that is going to change our people's life chances, whether they are employed or not.

My barometer is when we meet with the private sector, when we met with the human resource professionals. Two of them said they liked the programme that we are using so much. One said that they have already decided that they are going to incorporate it in their company because they have a relatively small company. They like it and believe it can do better for their organisation than the home-grown programme that they were using. And another from a much larger organisation . . . actually, Madam Speaker, in fact, that organisation probably has about five companies (that is about how many can come to me immediately). But they are going to look at it because they think too that what is going to be introduced is something that is going to be so beneficial.

So, Madam Speaker, no stone is being left unturned by this Government. We are putting in the hard work to get things done. And now, we have this sort of harassment in the Legislative Assembly. We have the Chair being harassed. We have the Government being harassed—everyone being harassed. Why? Because the Opposition, in their grasp, in their thrust and their rush for power, does not want to wait for the next General Election. Oh no. Oh, no, no.

My colleagues have adequately dealt with the issue of crime. I look forward to the day when there is a much fuller debate on that issue in this Legislative Assembly. I look forward to the day which is not far away when the Government makes its next push, because the public has heard the Government and the Premier and the rest of us pushing and talking about some of the key strategic matters that we believe are lacking in the country as it relates to how we are fighting crime.

We know the battles. Yet, the Leader of the Opposition comes down here to try and make the public believe that, oh yes, you got that National Security Council . . . the fact of the matter is, as I reflect on some of the crucial interjections that we, as the Opposition, managed to get through during the constitutional talks, was the whole concept of the Leader of the Opposition being there. I know the current Leader of the Opposition had problems with that. [He] couldn't see how it could work. How could an Opposition Member be part of such an important council when it's the Government and the Government needs to manage?

But, Madam Speaker, you see that is the difference between this Government and the PPM. We believe there are certain items that have to rise above the cut and thrust of politics. And crime has to be one. Crime is a community issue. There is not going to be any time in this country's history, other than the coming of the Lord, that there will not be crime. So, Madam Speaker, I am glad that we insisted, I am glad that whilst there are great limitations as to what role we

play, that at least we ensured the Opposition has a seat at the table as it relates to something as important as our national security, and can at least have a voice as Members try to influence the strategic direction in the country.

I am glad that we pushed and got the District Councils.

Madam Speaker, this Motion, in my opinion, has done nothing for this country. It has done nothing for this House. It has done nothing for our people. It has done nothing for our parliamentary democracy and its development.

I heard him come with this Anancy story, talking about, *Well, you know, this is a key tool*. Sure it's a key tool. Yes, it is. But it is a key tool that should be used advisedly and not so recklessly. And in my opinion, that is what we have before us; it's just a wide, rambling, reckless attempt by the Opposition to try to shake this country because they want a next General Election, they and their few fervent supporters whose hearts are so filled with hate and spite for anyone . . . they don't even have the decency to know how to be mature, how to understand that politics is a subset of life and that life is not a subset of politics.

It's sad. But, Madam Speaker, we try to grow nationally. We try to influence our people. That is certainly something that I see as a key role for every single Member of this House.

So, Madam Speaker, this Motion is one that has caused us to get up and debate and have to talk about all sorts of things. But ultimately, Madam Speaker, it is not going to benefit this Island. It is not going to benefit the economy. It is not going to benefit unemployment. It is not going to have an impact on any of those things.

Madam Speaker, our Members have spoken. We will reject this Motion. I encourage all the Members on the other side to reconsider the position they have taken, to reconsider what is going to come out of this, and to reconsider this move. This is not the time.

I thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you Honourable Minister of Education.

Does any other Member wish to speak?
[pause]

Member for North Side.

[inaudible interjection]

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller, Elected Member for North Side: Not my fault that we are here this time of the night. The rules of this Assembly require that we work 10.00 in the morning until 4.30 in the afternoon, which is adjourned until the next day. The last time this House met was 3rd August. There has been plenty of time in between to deal with any of this business of this House during regular times.

Madam Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 39(c).

Madam Speaker, in making my contribution to the debate on Private Member's Motion No. [2] – Lack of Confidence in the Government, moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and seconded by myself, in the absence of the Member for East End, it was truly disappointing to hear other Members in their speeches question and, in my opinion, ridicule the absence of the Member for East End, particularly having been announced by the Chair what the reasons for his absence were. But, Madam Speaker, there was a time between us politicians and fraternity Members of this Assembly when immediate family members, children and spouses were off [bounds], and there was a clear understanding that those things were not trespassed upon in this Assembly. That cannot be said about the contributions of certain Members here today.

Madam Speaker, a lack of confidence in the [Private Member's] Motion is neither novel, unusual or without precedent in this honourable House. This type of motion provides an opportunity for the movers and supporters of the Motion to challenge the decisions of the Government and expound the reasons why these challenges are being raised. It Provides an opportunity for the Government to explain the rationale for their decisions and policies and the effect they expected, or had hoped for, on the Cayman Islands, and, in particular, the economy of the Cayman Islands, and thereby the benefits or lack thereof for the people.

Madam Speaker, in my contribution I shall constrain myself to not calling anyone names, but dealing with the issues and challenges as I see them and what I believe to be wrong with the decisions and policies of the present Government. Madam Speaker, I will not be getting involved in any debate or blame between either the UDP or the PPM or defending either side.

Madam Speaker, I am very concerned that in spite of the many political pronouncements on various projects such as medical tourism, special economic zones, cruise berthing facilities and, more recently, the Alliance ForCayman, that the Government has been unable to get any of these projects started, which are providing any benefits to Cayman or Caymanians. Madam Speaker, I have not been able to assign any rational understanding to this, other than the lack of competence by the Government in doing a proper analysis and therefore producing an effective implementation plan.

Madam Speaker, the failure of the Government in getting these various projects off the ground cannot be attributed (as they have put out in their political spin) to people like me are asking questions or opposing these projects. I have one vote in this House, and in that minority position I understand quite clearly that I am limited in what I can expect to

achieve. But, Madam Speaker, I am still prepared to ask the tough questions.

Now, Madam Speaker, the recent announcement by the Government of the \$25 million surplus could be good news, and I hope it is good news, if the 2010 accounts had not been disclaimed by the Auditor General, therefore putting in question any opening balances for the 2011 financial year that may be used to compute this \$25 million surplus. And, Madam Speaker, it would also be good for the general public to know what the payable and receivable accounts are for the Government as of 30 June 2011.

Madam Speaker, in the documents as part of the budget that we passed here a few months ago in July, page 338 suggests that accounts payable on 30 June was projected to be \$67 million for core government and \$82 million for the entire public sector. Also, Madam Speaker, of major concern to me is the fact that there has been no contribution in reduction of the pension liability payments over the past three Budgets. So, Madam Speaker, the Government should be constrained in its proclamation of a \$25 million or \$24 million (I think was said that it was today) in making people have hope in this country.

Now, Madam Speaker, I am also concerned that the Government has not made any official announcement on the application for the Seaport in East End. I read in the media that the developer has, or may be trying to attract the Narayana Hospital University Group to buy some of the land and utilise it. And that he himself may have abandoned the idea of a seaport in East End. But I would be a lot more comfortable if the Government formally announced that they had refused his application.

Madam Speaker, I also believe in my view that part of the problem as to why these projects have not gotten off the ground is because of a lack of definitive informed decision-making, rather than what we find an abundance of, rolling decision-making by the Government. The Cayman public and any prudent investor who may be considering investing in Cayman are left in limbo, shock and awe. This is what is preventing the projects from getting off of the ground and the economy from rebounding.

Madam Speaker, I am of the formed view that the inability of the developers to get these projects off the ground and therefore for Caymanians to get the promised benefits in the economy from these jobs, is, as I said, what appears to be the rolling decisions. One decision is made this month for a particular company, and a couple of months later another decision is made. A couple of months later another decision is made for yet another company. And all of these projects have been presented to the general public as each of them being the economic saviour of the Cayman Islands.

Madam Speaker, if we take the time to look briefly at each of these economic saviours we will see, in the case of the cruise berthing, that first off we went

to Dart Enterprises Contracting Company (DECCO), a local construction company, zero experience in berthing facilities which was the first criteria in the request for proposals that were sent out, but whoever was making the decision chose to give it to the one company that had the least experience in building cruise ports of those who had applied.

We were told things were moving along well. Some months later we understood that that was aborted. We don't quite know what the full rationale for the abortion was, but we know that the people who were concerned with that project, then moved on to the second tender on the process, a combination of GLF [Grandi Lavori Fincosit] Construction, and Royal Construction. We were told that they were doing extremely well, things were progressing. And all of a sudden . . . in fact, even while one group, a part of the Government was saying that it was progressing well and they were meeting all of the challenges for the project, another part of the Government was announcing that they were negotiating with the Chinese as an alternative. The final analysis was aborted.

We now hear that we are expecting to have something signed by China Harbour Engineering (CHEC) in November. In the meantime the big cruise ships are crossing Cayman once a week and not stopping. The stores in George Town are suffering. If you walk around George Town now, almost every other store is closed.

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

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Even if they sign a proper contract for China Harbour Engineering in November, as planned, it is unlikely that they will be able to complete any phase of the cruise berthing facilities within 18 months to two years. So, many more shops and [other] Caymanian businesses that are depending on the cruise industry will fold in George Town.

Then, we had the big announcement [that] medical tourism was the next economic savior. We rushed here and passed all kinds of laws, some of which I objected to and I didn't agree with. I made that clear. I gave the reasons why. I did not agree with changing the registration process and making exemptions, et cetera. And here we are, it was going to be a 2,000 bed facility, they were going to make \$4-plus billion in 10 years; they were going to employ thousands of Caymanians and then all of a sudden they dropped to 200 beds, and then it dropped to 150 beds. Now I understand that they are trying to raise \$69 million. And we were all led to believe—certainly, I was led to believe by presentations made in this honourable House—that the money was ready and had to go now. They were ready to go immediately.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if they are only raising \$69 million, they are going to build less than 50 beds because the ballpark standard in

the healthcare industry in constructing hospitals is a million dollars a bed and they have to buy the land. So, I would suspect that we are probably looking at them building a 35-bed, 40-bed facility, which was what I said could have been maintained in the original proposal.

But in the meantime we have shut out other people—because we gave them exclusivity—who would have started medical tourism or expanded it because medical tourism is not a new kid on the block; it has been around a long, long time in this country. But they have been eliminated. So that has not turned the economy around. It is not likely to turn it around in the next year to 18 months.

Then we heard about the remediation of the landfill. And we had a big exercise on the awarding of those contracts. They were going to waste-to-energy because we all hoped that a waste-to-energy would provide some alternative source of electricity and just maybe—just maybe—we would lower the cost of living for our fellow Caymanians. In the middle of that process, that was aborted and now we are going to do something completely different which is again probably six to nine months from getting started and employing anybody.

Then we heard about the Special Economic Zones. Again, I've said I believe that there may be room for special economic zones, but I object to giving it to one exclusive developer and forcing young Caymanian entrepreneurs and bright young talent to have to go to this person to rent a space from them in order to get into the business.

Now we have the latest kid on the block, the Alliance ForCayman with the Dart conglomerate. I understand there was a groundbreaking for a road yesterday and we have been told here tonight that they passed it in Cabinet on Tuesday, so therefore it is legal. Maybe the rules have changed. Last time I was in EXCO [Executive Council] (which is now [called] Cabinet) official decisions were not made until the Minutes had been recorded the following week. Maybe that has changed. And to make the decisions they would have to write the Minutes the same day and they confirmed the Minutes. I don't know. I speak subject to correction.

Mr. Speaker, my objection to the Dart Alliance is I don't know the numbers on it. My preliminary calculations say that Mr. Dart is getting five times what we are getting, and I don't think that is a good deal. If I am wrong publish the evaluations and let me know what they are.

And, Mr. Speaker, we do have the Governor (Vesting of Lands) Law which lays out an elaborate procedure to be followed by the Governor (meaning the Governor in Cabinet), to sell, exchange or dispose of any government land. I understand that both parties to the ForCayman Alliance are committed to following the letter of the law and following all processes in that settlement, however it works out. So, Mr. Speaker, I

look forward to seeing the requirements of the [Governor \(Vesting of Lands\) Law \(2005 Revision\)](#), which in section 6 says: “The Governor may sell, exchange, grant or devise any of the lands, [tenements or hereditaments], which shall be so vested in him in trust, and to do any other act in relation to any such lands, tenements and here tenements which he shall deem beneficial for the public service or for the better management thereof:”

Section 9 says: “The Governor in Cabinet may sell, convey, grant or devise any of the lands, tenements or hereditaments respectively vested in the Governor under this Law and execute all such deeds and assurances as may be necessary fully and effectually so to do:

“Provided that in cases where a sum of money is the consideration for the sale of the land under this section, no conveyance shall be executed until such sum shall have been paid into the office of the Financial Secretary and his receipt endorsed upon the agreement of such conveyance and his certificate thereof lodged in the Office of the Governor.”

Section 10(1): “A disposition by the Governor under section 6, or by the Governor in Cabinet under section 9, is void unless, prior to the completion of such disposition-

- (a) full details of the land of which it is proposed to dispose, and of the terms of the proposed disposition, have been advertised in a newspaper circulating in the Islands and in the Gazette;
- (b) a report, accompanied by the documents specified in subsection (2), and recommending the proposed disposition has been laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly for twenty-one days by the Minister responsible for lands; and
- (c) a motion to reject the report has not been made within the period that the report is on the Table of the Legislative Assembly; or if such a motion has been validly made, it has been voted on and negatived by the Legislative Assembly.

“[10] (2) The report laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly under subsection (1) shall be accompanied by-

- (a) a report by the proper officer in the ministry responsible for lands containing all the details and terms of the proposed disposition and the reasons for proposing it;
- (b) a copy of the report of the survey required by paragraph 12(1) of the Cayman Islands Royal Instructions, 1972;

- (c) a valuation by the Government’s valuer of the land of which it is proposed to dispose;
- (d) valuations by two independent licensed valuers of the land of which it is proposed to dispose;
- (e) a copy of the resolution of Cabinet approving the terms of the proposed disposition; and
- (f) a copy of the advertisement of the proposed disposition published under subsection (1)(a).

“[10](3) Where pursuant to section 9, the Governor in Cabinet proposes to sell, convey, grant or devise any lands, tenements or hereditaments-

- (a) to statutory authority or government company; or
- (b) to any legal entity in the public interest and for the purpose of the agriculture, education, health, housing or any other similar purpose.”

And this is my concern, but I am glad to hear that the Government is not going to do this: “The Governor in Cabinet may waive any of the requirements of subsections (1) and (2).”

I’m quite happy to hear and look forward to this documentation on all of this land in this exchange process being properly, professionally valued and the necessary reports that I have just referred to laid on the Table of this honourable House for all of us to inspect.

Mr. Speaker, I support this Motion as a wakeup call on the Government to mend its ways and get down to the business of governance, [to] follow procedure, make formed [and] informed decisions in the interest of Cayman and Caymanians. Caymanians are hurting and suffering. Let us all accept our role in the interest of reducing their suffering. It is not only truckers and construction workers that are feeling the pinch. Many of our young intelligent qualified Caymanians and even some seasoned professionals are not getting opportunities because it is too easy to get a work permit often for people with less qualifications and experience than the Caymanians.

This year’s government budget projects a 25 per cent increase in the number of work permits. That is not conducive to enforcement of the Immigration Law to the benefit of Caymanians who deserve to be given opportunities in their own country. We need to enforce the Immigration Law and protect Caymanians.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Member of this Legislative Assembly. Minority as a single independent though I may be, failure of this Legislative Assembly and/or the majority Government represents failure for me if I have not done my part and played my role to the best of my ability. My role, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is to support the Government when it brings bills to pass into law or their published policies if by my anal-

ysis I determine that they are good for Cayman and Caymanians. Equally so, Mr. Speaker, my role requires me to be constructively critical if, in my view, these bills and policies are not in the best interest of Caymanians and Cayman. And, Mr. Speaker, I am comfortable that I have done my best to fulfill both roles.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently moved amendments that, in my view, would improve laws which the Government presented to this Legislative Assembly for the benefit of Cayman and Caymanians. I have presented motions—in fact, 12 to be exact since I was elected in May 2009—all of which I am convinced would have improved the lives and welfare of Caymanians. And I would have moved several more if the Meetings of this Parliament were not so drawn out.

For example, this current Meeting started in May. For almost six months we have been in this Legislative Assembly Meeting. If we had [it] as we used to, where the Legislative met four times a year, I probably would have moved as many as 24 motions by now. But, Mr. Speaker, what happens to people like me when the Meetings of the Legislative Assembly are drawn out for so many months . . . the Government is allowed to add business to the Meeting after the Meeting has started. The Speaker who allows them to, which in my view should not happen—but I am not allowed. I have to submit any business that I wish to put before the House (in the case of questions and motions) five and ten days before the Meeting starts. And I am not allowed—don't care how long the Meeting goes on—to bring any motions or questions to this House that I have not presented in terms of the Standing Orders before the Meeting starts.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned of the way parliament is functioning at the moment. Tonight is a good example! We are here at 1.30 almost in the morning because the Government and their majority decided that we should work beyond 4.30 and that we can't do this business tomorrow or Friday or next week Monday. And, Mr. Speaker, they have the majority if that is their decision. If I want to take part I have to accept their decision and sit here and wait my turn and make my contribution and stay for the vote. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have just as much stamina as most of them—or more than most, so . . .

Mr. Speaker, those are the kind of things I believe are wrong with the way the present Government is functioning. We need, Mr. Speaker, to stop the blame game. We need to get down to doing the work of this Parliament, this Legislative Assembly, within the rules subscribed under Standing Orders, the time that we should meet, 10.00 am to 4.30 pm, and we fit our business in those times.

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

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: And, Madam Speaker, I will close by asking the Government itself to stop assassinating the developers in the middle of their projects and moving on to another developer before they can get started because that is what is slowing the return of the economy down in this country, in my opinion, Madam Speaker.

So, Madam Speaker—

[inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: Order please.

[inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Order please.

Member for North Side please continue.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, in closing I will repeat what I just said: I implore the Government to give the developers that they have appointed, anointed, selected, to get a project off the ground.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Who you pushing for?

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: I'm not pushing for either one. I don't have any decisions to make.

The Speaker: Please. Order!

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Order?

The Speaker: Yes, please.

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

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Why you don't challenge that?

I've been around a long time.

The Speaker: I've been around a little bit longer. Just please let's . . . Everybody is tired, let's keep this thing going on an even keel.

[inaudible interjection and laughter]

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

First Elected Member for Cayman Brac.

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell, First Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise to offer a short contribution on Private Member's Motion No. [2]-011/12—Lack of Confidence in the Government.

Madam Speaker, most people have already spoken here tonight and the ones on the Government

side have acknowledged that it is basically the duty and the responsibility of the Opposition to shadow the Government, to make recommendations, to critique, to question. And that is my purpose in rising at 1.35 this morning, to discharge my responsibility, Madam Speaker. Because every day, if I come here, if I drive around Grand Cayman, if I am in Cayman Brac, if I am in Little Cayman, people come and ask. Today I got called out by the Serjeant because there were two people waiting outside to see me from Grand Cayman, with problems, with issues.

The people of this country are frightened, the people of this country are scared, the people of this country want some answers and they want some confidence of what will happen to them in the months ahead and the years ahead.

Madam Speaker, I personally believe that the Cayman Islands have tremendous days ahead of them and I am rooting and hopeful that this Government will be successful. I am hopeful that projects will be started. I am hopeful that much employment will pop up over the weeks and months ahead of us, Madam Speaker. Because, Madam Speaker, I believe the job of Government is to create an environment for our citizens to have a safe and secure place to work and live, provide education for citizens to have every opportunity to succeed, provide quality healthcare at an affordable cost, provide the opportunity of social wellbeing, provide the environment for small and large businesses to flourish whether it competes locally, regionally or internationally.

Madam Speaker, it is with this backdrop that I offer these short comments. Some of these comments I previously made in the last contribution to the Throne Speech, and the idea and the premise behind it was that we have no guarantee that the world economy is going to recover in the short term.

The Miller Report says that as a country we are much better off than most. We have consistent revenue of \$500-plus million every year, and we have shown a 5 per cent increase each year for the last four years. Madam Speaker, this should give the Caymanian people and our local investors encouragement. It should give them encouragement that we can weather the global recession together. And even if the world economy does not recover in the next two years, Madam Speaker, I will repeat, the Miller Report shows that we have a consistent revenue stream that we, as a people, as a country, should be able to weather the downturn in the world economy.

Madam Speaker, I listened to the comments of the last Member who spoke, and he outlined the Port project and many other projects. I am not going to spend a lot of time because he has already done that very ably. But what I want to say is that we need the Port and whatever we can do to make that start, I implore the Government to move forward with it because we know we are losing business by not having it, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we know that the initial contract talks gave great confidence to the George Town area, especially. And if you looked and thought about what the merchants did there, when they saw this on the horizon they made their plans, they looked at the labour they would need, they looked at the inventory they would need, they looked at the credit line they were going to need, they looked at how they would work with that coming on line because [there would be] two types of revenue streams: the stream of the construction workers and then, after that, the people who came on the cruise vessels themselves.

Madam Speaker, for whatever reason that did not work out. And now those businesses had to reconsider their business plans, and they had to think of what they would do next as they heard that another group was on the horizon and another contract would be signed. And that group, Madam Speaker, the GLF Group, gave confidence again. And that same business in George Town tried to hold on but they were losing market share from the cruise vessels, they were losing their ability to continue the look for a sunny day in George Town.

Madam Speaker, we could deal 10 years ago, we could deal 15 years ago, but we don't have that luxury, Madam Speaker. We have to deal today. And that is why I think realistically if we are going to accomplish anything as Members here looking to try to grow this economy, we have to work from today forward and understand that we cannot change the past. But what we can do is work harder in the future to learn from the mistakes that we have made—all of us! And we can come together, Madam Speaker, and try to identify the projects that are here which need to be short-term projects that can put people to work quickly.

Madam Speaker, like I said, that was one of the issues and one of the topics I wanted to deal with that was dealt with ably before me. And I am not, at this hour of the night, going to spend too much more time on it other than to make a statement that the businesses in George Town now and the ones who depend . . . the tour operators, the taxis, need that bit of good news, need to see the groundbreaking so that they can come back with the confidence to invest more money to look at how they can hire more people, how they can create more jobs, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, earlier there was a great deal of debate on crime. I too came with the newspapers about the crime spree in George Town, the robberies [which is] the cancer for the tourism industry; but that has been dealt with. And I am not going to deal a lot with that either, Madam Speaker, other than one of the issues that was not talked about was the representation of a very, very large organisation, the basic foundation of our tourism product itself. And, Madam Speaker, this was posted on [Cayman News Service Tuesday, September 6th 2011](#). I don't know if you want to copy this or I can—

The Speaker: I would appreciate it.

[pause]

The Speaker: Thank you.

First Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, as I said before, this was the 6th of September. CITA (which again is the body representative of the Tourism Association) represents just about every tourist business in the Cayman Islands and I think it has a couple of valuable points here; the biggest point being the issue of crime. It says: **“The industry body which represents businesses working in the tourism sector has expressed its growing frustration that constant calls to address the Islands’ violent crime problem with more visible policing has fallen on deaf ears. The Cayman Islands Tourism Association has asked the authorities time and time again to increase police patrols in the areas most frequented by tourists but at a recent meeting with the Commissioner, the President was told that there was no money for community police because of budget cuts. The Government has however stated on numerous occasions that the police are getting the resources they need to fight crime and the 2011/12 Budget allocation has remained at just over \$29 million.**

“Although the RCIPS has received the same appropriation for the current financial year of just over 29 million, Chief Superintendent John Jones, recently stated that the police’s headcount had fallen from its peak of a few years ago and its community policing was that most impacted. He said resources for neighbourhood officers were being used to support other areas in the face of the increase in violent crime and surge and robberies. The ‘feet on the beat’ he said, was one area that was under resourced.

“However, in the wake of yet another violent robbery at a restaurant frequented by visitors last week, Tina Christian of CITA stated that the need to prevent crime impacting tourism was critical.

“Our members are becoming increasingly frustrated that, despite endless calls, the patrols have not increased in the key areas,’ [she stated]. ‘A recent meeting with our President and the Commissioner has revealed that the community policing budget has been cut and this is where the tourism police would have come from.’

“For some time now CITA has campaigned to have police officers allocated to patrolling the Seven Mile Beach area, getting to know local

businesses and offering a secure presence for visitors, but so far, there has been no response from the authorities. She said CITA is not asking for mass coverage but a regular light police presence in areas frequented by visitors to make tourists feel safe and criminals think twice.

“We keep saying this over and over again because when word gets out about crime it will be devastating to the industry’ [she added]. ‘We are relying on our past reputation of being crime free, and although we are still better than many other places, the growing crime is creating more and more of a problem for the tourism product.’

“Christian said that the CITA membership knows it’s not just a police problem and that there is a much bigger picture. There are many long term issues to be addressed and the need for the community to play its part, but in order to protect the tourism sector, which so many people depend on, she said there was also a need for police visibility in key areas to deter the robbers and make visitors feel comfortable.

“She said the recent news from the Commissioner that the budgets had been cut was disappointing and that CITA would now have a lobby to lobby Government to see if resources can be found to fund community policing in order to guarantee a presence in the Seven Mile Beach area.

“We continue to say that we need to take crime issues seriously and we were under the impression that the police were getting the resources they needed but now we hear that there is no money to police tourism. It’s confusing.’ Christian added.

“She pointed out that in the face of the economic uncertainties, crime remained of critical importance to the tourism business. She said no one should underestimate what a devastating impact an armed robbery at a restaurant where tourists are enjoying a meal can have on the entire tourism product. As far as the CITA membership is concerned, Christian said, the resources have to be found in order to protect the sector which remains one of the country’s most important economic generators.”

Madam Speaker, thank you for allowing me to read that, because I think it is current and topical. Hopefully, if the tourism sector hears the debate, the commitment, and hears what was said, they will have confidence and will understand that there has been money voted just this week, and that there have been commitments and conversations in this debate of how seriously crime is being taken by the Government.

Madam Speaker, when the police . . . we talk about . . . I’m not going to get into the debate about the Security Council, but what I can say is that they come here in Finance Committee for money and I believe that everybody in this honourable House ask

questions, but the vote has been unanimous every time that I have been involved in voting for it. So they get the money—and if they need more, I am sure if they come they will get it. And if there is a topical issue that somehow was resolved through this debate tonight, that policing has a source for the money they say they are not getting, that if they need it they can get it. They know that they have the commitment of every Member in this honourable House.

So that, Madam Speaker, was something that I believe was brought out tonight. I think it is going to give some comfort to some of the tourism operators and other people in the community. But, as I said when I started off, Madam Speaker, there are a lot of questions and a lot of people who are looking for some comfort and assurance [about] what is going to happen in the months ahead here.

Madam Speaker, the last item that I want to touch on, which again is topical and current, is actually an article that was in . . . well it was yesterday's paper, the "Journal Lifestyles," the [Cayman Islands Journal](#). This article is written by Mr. Alan Markoff and it is an interview with the owner of the largest hotel property in the Island. It starts off by saying: "Those who know Ryan know that he loves the ocean and that he's particularly fond of Cayman's North Sound. With Dragon Bay's concept of little island neighbourhoods linked by a series of canals, Ryan hopes to "redefine life on the water" here in Cayman.

"But Ryan admits that unless he gets some cooperation from the government, the development might stop exactly where it is.

"Last year, Ryan sat with other key individuals from the private and public sector as a member of several committees, including the National Investment Council and Private Finance Initiative Oversight Committee/Big Four Committee. Ryan said he was surprised that there was some public resistance to the groups.

"It wasn't public resistance, but government disinterest that thwarted the groups' efforts.

"The one that absolutely astounded me was we put together the PFI/Big Four Committee,' he says. 'We had the chairmen of the Big Four accounting firms sitting around—never before—all sitting around one table, pro bono, offering all the support and work power of those firms to put together programmes to evaluate government, suggest to government, actually help to implement . . . and we have a civil servant who's supposed to show up as a liaison and he doesn't come—ever; just doesn't bother to come. 'It's not like any of us had a lot of spare time, but everybody showed up, everybody put in the work in, and we go to a meeting and nobody comes. And this went on . . . for about 18 months.'

"Eventually, the group sent a letter to government saying it was happy to continue, but it

wanted the government to show up to the meetings. There was response.

"So a couple of months later, we . . . sent another letter saying on the basis that you never come and never responded to our last letter, we're disbanded, unless you contact us.'

"That was eight or nine months ago, Ryan says, and there was no response."

Madam Speaker, I have one more excerpt: "You look at this current administration, and they're like 'we can't do anything with you', and you're saying 'what, you guys were all quite happy when I helped your constituents, you're all quite happy when I helped you out, but somehow it's wrong to support me?'"

"The fact that the government is catering to new investors instead of the already-established developers here irks Ryan.

"I get calls on a monthly basis, if not more often, from other jurisdictions . . . saying would you come do a project. People look at what we've done here and they say, wow, that guy can do stuff. [And they're throwing [offers] at me,' he says. 'Our [government] is throwing stuff at guys who are getting off of airplanes, who they've never met, and have no clue whether they're real or not. And yet when we go in as a proven guy, the same way Dart goes in as proven guy—both of us have been here 14+ years, delivered on what we said, put hundreds and hundreds of millions into the local economy, created thousands of jobs—and you're treated like a pariah. But if I were Bob Smith who got off an airplane last afternoon with a shiny suit and a good patter, I should get the whole immigration policy rewritten for my benefit.'"

Madam Speaker, this is the [disconcerting] part of what has been said: "He says he is prepared to walk away if he doesn't get some support from government and he can't make the Ritz sustainable."

[inaudible interjections]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: What are you saying over there?

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell: I am saying that I hope that that does not happen.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: That what doesn't happen?

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell: That the Ritz—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: You all gave him an agreement and now he wants us to sell the

whole of that land; land that he's been having . . . agreed. That I ain't going to do.

[inaudible interjections]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: You can't take one side and leave it you know. You should have come and asked me and talked to me *[inaudible]*.

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell: Madam Speaker, can I continue?

The Speaker: Yes, First Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

[inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Please, you can respond when the Member has finished from the other side.

[inaudible interjections]

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell: So, Madam Speaker, again, there is nothing that I can do about the past. What I can say is that I had that this morning when I got the newspaper. I did not have any intention of putting that into my contribution. When I read it, I continued to read it and I penciled it out, Madam Speaker, because I believe it is important that the Government knows that. And I believe it is important that that property continues to function on this Island.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: It is.

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell: And that is my point. Simple!

So, Madam Speaker—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: *[inaudible]*

The Speaker: Honourable Premier, please, I need to hear what the Member for Cayman Brac is saying.

Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell: Madam Speaker, that was basically the last point that I wanted to offer in my contribution.

Madam Speaker, I hope that what I have said shows that there is a tremendous amount of concern for short-term projects to start, and I believe that there are some short-term projects that are extremely important and should be prioritised because of what our core businesses are—tourism and finance. The Port, the largest hotel on the Island, the biggest hotel as far as employment.

Madam Speaker, let's have confidence and security that we can weather this global recession in all of us, and that even if the world economy does not

recover, that we will be okay here in the Cayman Islands.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, First Elected Member for Cayman Brac *[and Little Cayman]*

Does any other Member wish to speak?

[pause]

Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

Mr. Anthony S. Eden, Second Elected Member for Bodden Town: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

At two o'clock in the morning I can smell the bacon and eggs.

[laughter]

Mr. Anthony S. Eden: So I assure you that I will not be long; just a few things I wanted to touch on and I am going to continue to beat the monster known as crime all over the head.

I sat in a different Cabinet at one time and went through at least three commissioners. I am not here criticising any of them. All I am saying to the Government and others at this time, Madam Speaker, *[is that]* we need to do something. What is happening about crime in Cayman? As I told the Premier when they came to Bodden Town, all of the great initiatives that are being undertaken, if we do not get a grip on crime it is not really going to matter.

I felt comforted earlier when I heard the helicopter circling overhead. I went out by the back door and saw it going in different places. This is the approach, and I am sure that if the Cabinet puts it forward to the Commissioner. . . I remember the times when we had them in. They were always territorial about operation. But I know some of my colleagues will remember when we insisted that there were certain things which needed to be done, *[in that]* they must be more informed, they should be more proactive and be more visible. And once the Cabinet gives a general guideline, whether by policy, without interfering into operation on the ground, I am sure we will see a difference. And I will go back and will take licks as I have done in the past and probably will in the future.

I remember in 2005 when Cayman was more petrified than it seems to be now. We brought in Kernohan. For whatever you want to say about that gentleman, within six months, whatever he did—and it was with the public—it not only seemed . . . things came right down to earth. He was out there working with his men in those early days. Whatever may have happened afterward, Madam Speaker, so be it! But we need a different approach. We cannot continue using the same type of policing and not expect to get the same results.

There is only other area I want to just briefly speak on. A good friend of mine called me last night and we have heard so many things going on about the ForCayman Alliance and Dart. And I would suggest to the Government for their own good and the Cayman Islands, that the thing that keeps coming up is the value of the land that is being transferred. And I would suggest to the Premier (and he is probably doing it) to get the valuations and let this be put on the table and there is no way people can argue after that.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: I agree.

Mr. Anthony S. Eden: Okay. Well, I'm pleased to hear that, Madam Speaker. And once this is done at least that apprehension by many people of the direction that sometimes these Islands seems to be headed, can be relieved.

One of the things I was very pleased with earlier on when the Deputy Premier got up and spoke (and I've said this many times before and I agree with her), if the 15 of us . . . and she welcomed us to sit and work together. What a difference we could make for these Islands. That is the only how we are going to get things done. We do not all have singularly a solution. But, as the old people will say, "Two heads, even if it is two cow heads, it is better than one."

We are in a major crisis. To the North of us we see what is happening. It is a rudderless country and it is going from crisis to crisis. Their President will speak tomorrow night about trying to get jobs. But the lifestyle that those people are living there, only God can help them. And I am suggesting that we here in the Cayman Islands look to the North and see what has happened there and what can happen here in Cayman if we don't get our act together.

Get back, as I preached before, to our God-fearing days. There is only hope that we have because it is not only the great United States, it is all over Europe, and some serious problems still happening there, because once one of those countries there . . . if the stock market dips it has a ripple throughout the world. I'm not being a preacher of doom but we are into some hard times and we need to get our act together.

I just want to close, Madam Speaker. Yesterday there was an article in the *Net News* by a young writer, James M. Bodden III. I just want to read a few paragraphs from it.

"Cayman was never a perfect place but it was a serene place; that will never be again. This does not mean we should not try to do better. It starts with knowledge within you own life. Once you get yourself organized and where you want to be, then you will be that much more able to help and mentor others.

"We should be realistic firstly. We have to admit our flaws before we can move on, telling the truth is not a weakness; it is the path to inner

strength. The youth of the Cayman Islands have grown up hearing stories of the "glory days" of Cayman. Now that they have become a full-grown part of the community and realize that they are not experiencing the peacefulness that their predecessors did, there is a feeling of resentment and alienation. For Cayman to proceed and progress this feeling of divide and mistrust must be slowly healed over time. For this to occur, a dialogue must be started. This dialogue has to be from an honest and realistic place.

"Too often the older leaders of our population have ignored or talked down to the youth, often blaming them solely for their problems. This is an unfair and unbalanced place to start a dialogue and solve a problem. However, the older segments are correct when they speak of self-responsibility; too often young people "play the fool" and wonder where life left them. We all make mistakes but it is how we learn and rebound from these mistakes which makes us better and wiser people. This is where the ideology of community becomes relevant once again.

"In a community, there is no unvalued piece because all inclusion is necessary for the community to care for itself. It is not a matter of Caymanian versus Expat. It is a matter of who really cares for Cayman and who doesn't. Once we are able to clear the "cobwebs" from our vision and realize that we are selfishly ignoring our problems whilst we create more, then we can start on a new path to the community soul again. The more isolated and divided the Caymanians become the quicker our socio-economic structure will falter and disintegrate. This will lead to more poverty, more crime and more civil strife and disobedience."

Madam Speaker, these are [serious] words from a young individual and it behoves us all to listen, and listen to the young people. I know my colleague for Bodden Town, the Third Elected Member, constantly speaks about our younger people. We need to get them involved and let them understand the importance of getting involved in the community and taking their responsibility.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

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 will call mover of the Motion to conclude the debate.

Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

Madam Speaker, I believe this is a record. I don't know if I can recall in my years here a debate on a motion at two o'clock [am] the mover of the Motion just starting to wind-up with a full two hours stretched before him or her.

[laughter]

The Speaker: And a full House.

[laughter]

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I promise you I won't be that long this time around.

The Speaker: I'm good at staying awake.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I have been contemplating whether or not we shouldn't just continue and then perhaps we could leave at a decent time tomorrow afternoon. We could just order some breakfast and have a quick shuteye.

But, Madam Speaker, in the same vein as the Elected Member for North Side, I really do think that these kinds of marathon stretches are entirely unnecessary and put many people (and I am not speaking of the elected Members) at a great disadvantage, and unnecessary inconvenience, if not suffering.

The Government needs to be able to organise its business a bit better. Madam Speaker, there is no need for one month vacations and then we run the House until three o'clock in the morning, which I expect it will be before we get through with "A Lack of Confidence" Motion. Perhaps, Madam Speaker, they thought they would wear everyone down and that would shorten the debate. It has not worked, and I am not talking about myself either.

Madam Speaker, a great deal has been said, in particular about why the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition in particular, has brought this Motion. As I indicated at the start, Madam Speaker, we always knew that 9 trumps 6 no matter how hard we try. And that it would only be if we were able to persuade some of the more moderate Members on the other side, some of the more thoughtful Members on the other side to think again about the stewardship of their Administration and of their Leader, and to decide whether or not they were prepared to continue with that type of leadership.

Madam Speaker, the indication was made very early in the day shortly after this Motion was filed, that there would be solidarity among the Members. Madam Speaker, I do believe that that notwithstanding, this Motion has had a salutary effect. It did, Madam Speaker, in the four-plus months that it took the Government to prepare to deal with it, cause the Gov-

ernment to take certain action to change course in a number of respects. Courses I believe, Madam Speaker, which may well not have been changed had the Government not appreciated that they would have to deal with this and the issues which were itemised here, Madam Speaker, such as the dredging of the North Sound and the excavation of the East End Sea Coast, among a number of others.

Madam Speaker, despite the public bluster (and there has been much of that over the course of this long day), I know some of the Members, most of the Members, on the other side well enough to know that they do have, they must have deep seated concern about many of the decisions that have been taken, many of the approaches that have been used, much of the conduct that has been demonstrated by the leadership of the Government over these past two plus years. And, Madam Speaker, we can but hope that the effect of this debate will cause some adjustment in the course, some change in the way the Government goes about dealing with the critical business of the country.

Madam Speaker, I came in as I would expect for a great deal of criticism, and for that, Madam Speaker, I am entirely prepared. I deeply regret and find it most disappointing that the Minister of Education would launch a personal and vitriolic attack on me. Madam Speaker, I thought for a while about whether I should draw your attention to the relevant Standing Order about using insulting language about a Member, but I decided to let it go, Madam Speaker, for it is about time that this country comes to grips with the fact that much that emanates from the Minister of Education is based on personal feelings and has much less to do with my stewardship of the Ministry for which he now has constitutional responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I am not going to be drawn into debating my stewardship because on this occasion it is not my stewardship that is on trial or in question. This is about the conduct of the Government over the course of these past two and a half years. There will be ample opportunity for us to debate Education issues. I do hope that we can reach a level of maturity—all of us in this House—where we can debate these issues without launching personal attacks and accusing Members of the House of hatred and hunger for power and various things like that.

But I should say, Madam Speaker, when the most recent results of the examinations that have just been taken are made public, I hope the Minister will acknowledge that the trend, which was established under my Administration starting in the year before I left office, has continued, and that despite all that he says I never did wrong, that the foundations for where Education is going, which were built under my Administration, were sound. As long as he continues to build on them—despite how he feels about me personally—I will support what is being done in that regard.

Madam Speaker, it seems that the Government was taken by surprise in relation to the issue of crime. Much talk emanated from the Government Benches, but little was actually said of substance about what the Government is proposing that we do in relation to the present crime wave. We can, as I predicted, talk as much as we want about the constitutional position they take. My view, Madam Speaker, is that the concessionary position that has been taken by the Government in relation to their role within the National Security Council is a position taken conveniently. Because they do not wish to own this issue of crime and seize it with both hands and address it properly, it is convenient to say that the Governor and the Commissioner are responsible so that we can continue to make them the scapegoats.

But, Madam Speaker, I believe we all must understand that the way we are going about policing in this country is not adequate. It is not meeting the issues that we have, and at a policy level some major changes must be made. And it is my considered and firm view that those policy issues are matters which ought to be addressed properly in the National Security Council and fed down the line to the Commissioner for implementation as regards the operational matters and staffing.

Madam Speaker, my good friend, the Minister for Community Affairs, said he was very worried about the Motion and its implications. I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that he also ought to be worried about the way his Administration has approached much of the business of Government over the course of the last couple of years, and that in many respects it is the many breaches of the rules, the regulations, the procedure, the rush to judgment that is creating many of the issues that they complain about.

The Premier said, Madam Speaker, among other things when he was winding up that . . . No, I am sorry, it was not him; it was the Minister of Education [who said] there's harassment everywhere. There's bureaucratic harassment, there's political harassment, there is parliamentary harassment—*everybody is harassing us*. That, Madam Speaker, ought to tell that Minister and all the Government that something is wrong. Everybody can't be the Opposition. Everywhere they turn it is the Opposition. There are only six of us on this side. There is opposition, there is perceived harassment because people are dissatisfied—very dissatisfied—about a whole range of things.

Madam Speaker, there is and has been over the last two and half years, much rhetoric about turning the economy around, about providing jobs, about economic stimulus. But by and large it has been just that—talk! That, Madam Speaker, is no longer sufficient. The Government is more than half way through its term and it is time for them to demonstrate some actual achievement.

Yes, Madam Speaker, they say they have gotten the Budget issues resolved. I would have to

concede, Madam Speaker, that unless there are really, really major, major problems in the Budget Unit, that the fiscal position must have improved. I don't believe for a moment though, Madam Speaker, that it is what it has been indicated to be by the Premier. Just two things tell me that there are some real questions about this \$25 million surplus. One is that \$12 million out of it . . . and they did not actually volunteer this, this came out through an FOI request. They have acknowledged that was money taken from the dormant accounts. That is not something I see recurring on an annual basis. So [that is] not really, Madam Speaker, the kind of item that we can say, *Yes, that is going to be a consistent sustainable source of revenue*.

And, Madam Speaker, the other issue which we've looked at is that as far as we can find—and if I am wrong about this I will sit and someone over there can correct me—that in the three years, three budgets that this Government has brought since they took Office, there has been no provision for past service pension liability. In the four years we were in office we put \$50 million in past service liability to help to deal with the unfunded contingent liability of this country.

So, Madam Speaker, we ought not to paint the picture quite as pretty as the Premier has done. Because if we add the \$10 million—which is what we put in each year (\$10 million or \$12 million, something like that); I think one year we put in \$15 million—to the \$12 million, you are at \$22 million and you are back to your \$3 million surplus very quickly. And we have not actually seen any accounts. This is just our analysis based on our knowledge of how the system works and the budget documents that we currently have, not the actual accounts.

So, Madam Speaker, as I said, I concede and I am grateful because the country is, I believe, in a better fiscal position now than it was in 2009. But I don't believe, Madam Speaker, that we should rush to talk about how we are going to spend this additional money because the pressure is off, because I don't think that the pressure is off. Particularly looking at the global economy and what is happening locally, I do not believe there is really much basis for huge optimism that revenues are going to significantly increase over the next year or so.

Madam Speaker, it is one thing to fix the Budget situation. Kudos about that! But, Madam Speaker, there is no question that the situation with unemployment in this country has worsened. And I could go and read the statistics (which I won't), but it is certainly not getting better. And the economic pressures on the average person in this country are continuing to grow—people's inability to pay their electricity bill, their water bill, their mortgages. All of us who have been elected for a while know what it is that we have to do on a daily basis in terms of assistance, which I have never known in my almost 11 years to be as demanding as is currently the case. And, Madam

Speaker, in large part it is because the Government has not been able to get any of these economic saviours that they have touted actually moving to a point where they are actually providing some stimulus to the economy.

By and large, Madam Speaker, we believe that the way the Government has handled these matters, whether it is the cruise port project, which they signed the first MOU with DECCO back in December of 2009, and here we are in September of 2011 and we still have just another MOU with China Harbour; or whether it is the constant political interference in the way contracts are awarded and procurement is done; or whether it is a lack of confidence in the Government for one reason or another, something is preventing these projects from moving ahead.

Now, Madam Speaker, Government has entered into this arrangement with the Dart Group. We have major reservations that again this is rushed, and that there has not been sufficient assessment about what Cayman is giving up for what it is getting. We hope that the wheels do not come off of that one over the next little while when we are actually having to do more than make or issue press releases and make public statements about what it is that we are actually doing.

Madam Speaker, the Premier said the world is watching us. I agree with him. Indeed they are. Would that the Premier be guided by this reality in his general management of the country's affairs, because, Madam Speaker, they are watching the way that we do business.

What has transpired here today is an exercise of the democratic process. It is a test of whether or not the Government, which has the majority in this House, continues to repose confidence and trust in the direction the Administration is heading, and, in particular, in the leadership of the Premier. When the vote is cast in a few minutes we will all know for sure. And one thing for certain, those on the other side, and, indeed, those on this side, will have made their calling an election sure, and they will not, Madam Speaker, be able to resile from the position they take. They will not be able to say, *Well, I didn't really agree with what the Premier did, you know; but you know how it is.* This, Madam Speaker, has been their opportunity. They have made it quite clear they are content, they are happy, and they are prepared to continue the course for the balance of this term.

And so, Madam Speaker, so be it. I pray, Madam Speaker, God's guidance and direction for the Government of this country as they continue. And I pray His Almighty protection on the people of these Islands.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

The question is: Be it now therefore resolved that the Legislative Assembly does declare a lack of confidence in the Government.

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

Ayes and Noes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker—

An Hon. Member: The Ayes have it? She said Ayes.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, may we have a division, Madam Speaker?

The Speaker: Pardon me? I didn't hear what you said.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: I do apologise, Madam Speaker. It is getting late. Sorry.

The Speaker: I didn't hear you. That was all.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: That's okay. I should have stood.
May we have a division, Madam Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: What are we doing this for now?

The Speaker: Madam Clerk, can we have a division please?

Division No. 2—2011/12

Ayes: 5

Hon. A. M. McLaughlin, Jr.
Mr. D. Kurt Tibbetts
Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell
Mr. Anthony S. Eden
Mr. D. Ezzard Miller

Noes: 9

Hon. W. McKeever Bush
Hon. J. Y. O'Connor-Connolly
Hon. Rolston M. Anglin
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

Absent: 1

Mr. V. Arden McLean

[inaudible interjections and laughter]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: You wait until I bring that censure motion on you!

[inaudible interjections and laughter]

The Speaker: The result of the division is 5 Ayes, 9 Noes and 1 absentee. The Motion has failed.

Negatived by majority on division: Private Member's Motion No. 2–2011/12 failed.

The Speaker: And now, I am now going to call for the motion for adjournment.

[inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: I am glad everyone is so awake at 2.30 in the morning.

ADJOURNMENT

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Very awake!
Madam Speaker, we wish to adjourn this honourable House until 2.30 tomorrow afternoon.

The Speaker: The question is that this honourable House do adjourn until 2.30 tomorrow afternoon. All those in favour, please say Aye—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, if I may, we will work late if business continues in the same vein.

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

Ayes and one audible No.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.
The House is accordingly adjourned until 2.30 tomorrow afternoon.

At 2.27 am (on 8 September 2011) the House stood adjourned until 2.30 pm, Thursday, 8 September 2011.