



**CAYMAN ISLANDS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
ELECTRONIC VERSION**

2012/13 SESSION

26 November 2012

Twelfth Sitting of the Second Meeting

(pages 527–552)

**Hon Mary J Lawrence, MBE, JP
Speaker**

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

PRESENT WERE:

THE SPEAKER

Hon Mary J Lawrence, MBE, JP.
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

Hon W McKeeva Bush, OBE, JP, MLA	<i>The Premier</i> , Minister of Finance, Tourism and Development
Hon Juliana Y O'Connor-Connolly, JP, MLA	<i>The Deputy Premier</i> , Minister of District Administration, Works, Lands and Agriculture
Hon Rolston M Anglin, JP, MLA	Minister of Education, Training and Employment
Hon Michael T Adam, MBE, JP, MLA	Minister of Community Affairs, Gender and Housing
Hon J Mark P Scotland, JP, MLA	Minister of Health, Environment, Youth, Sports and Culture

OFFICIAL MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

Hon Franz Manderson, Cert. Hon., JP	<i>Deputy Governor</i> , Member responsible for Internal and External Affairs and the Civil Service
Hon Samuel Bulgin, QC, JP	Attorney General, Member responsible for Legal Affairs

ELECTED MEMBERS

GOVERNMENT BACKBENCHERS

Hon Cline A Glidden, Jr, MLA	<i>Deputy Speaker</i> , Third Elected Member for West Bay
Capt A Eugene Ebanks, JP, MLA	Fourth Elected Member for West Bay
Mr Ellio A Solomon, MLA	Fourth Elected Member for George Town
Mr Dwayne S Seymour, MLA	Third Elected Member for Bodden Town

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Hon Alden M McLaughlin, MBE, JP, MLA	<i>Leader of the Opposition</i> , Third Elected Member for George Town
Hon D Kurt Tibbetts, OBE, JP, MLA	First Elected Member for George Town
Mr Anthony S Eden, OBE, JP, MLA	Second Elected Member for Bodden Town
Mr V Arden McLean, JP, MLA	Elected Member for East End

INDEPENDENT MEMBER

Mr D Ezzard Miller, JP, MLA	Elected Member for North Side
-----------------------------	-------------------------------

APOLOGIES

Mr Moses I Kirkconnell, JP, MLA	First Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman
---------------------------------	--

OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
SECOND MEETING 2012/13 SESSION
MONDAY
26 NOVEMBER 2012
2.06 pm
Twelfth Sitting

The Speaker: Good afternoon everyone.

I am going to ask the Third Elected Member for Bodden Town to read prayers this afternoon.

PRAYERS

Mr. Dwayne S. Seymour, Third Elected Member for Bodden Town: Let us pray.

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

Bless our Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth II; Philip, Duke of Edinburgh; Charles, Prince of Wales; and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the 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: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed.

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

Apologies

The Speaker: I only have one message from the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman who is absent today. Apologies for his absence.

**PRESENTATION OF PAPES
AND OF REPORTS**

Strategic Policy Statement for the 2013/2014 Financial Year

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

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

I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House, the [Strategic Policy Statement](#) of the Government of the Cayman Islands for the financial year ending 30 June 2014.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereto?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Very briefly, Madam Speaker. My remarks will be brief, as I said, the most important facts that I need to make can be said briefly.

Firstly, the Public Management and Finance Law (PMFL) requires the Government's Annual Strategic Policy Statement, the SPS, to be presented to the Assembly no later than the 1st of December each year. The Government has obviously bettered this requirement because the SPS has been represented to the House today, 26 November, which is ahead of the required timeframe stated in the Public Management and Finance Law.

Secondly, the SPS, which was just tabled, has been agreed by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. These are two very important facts that I needed to have made in connection with the tabling of the SPS to this honourable House.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

**Immigration (Grant of the Right to be Caymanian)
Order, 2012**

The Speaker: Honourable Deputy Governor.

The Deputy Governor, Hon. Franz Manderson: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House an order entitled, The Immigration (Grant of the Right to be Caymanian) Order, 2012.

The Speaker: Thank you.
So ordered.

Does the Honourable Deputy Governor wish to speak thereto?

The Deputy Governor, Hon. Franz Manderson: Not at this time, Ma'am. We have the Government Motion on the agenda and I will speak to that.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Standing Business Committee Report—Sixth Meeting 2011/12 Session

Standing Business Committee Report—Throne Speech and Budget Address First Meeting 2012/13 Session

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

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

I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Report of the Standing Business Committee on the [Sixth Meeting of the 2011/12 Session](#) of the Legislative Assembly, and, Madam Speaker, the Report of the Standing Business Committee on the [Throne Speech and Budget Address First Meeting of the 2012/13 Session](#) of the Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: So ordered.

Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak thereon?

[no audible reply]

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.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Suspension of Standing Order 24(5)

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I move the suspension of Standing Order 24(5) to enable a Government Motion to be dealt with during the current Meeting.

The Speaker: The question is that Standing Order 24(5) be suspended to enable a Government Motion to be dealt with during the current Meeting.

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

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: Standing Order 24(5) suspended.

BILLS

SECOND READING

Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012

The Clerk: The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, Second Reading.

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I beg to move the Second Reading of the [Stamp Duty \(Amendment\) Bill, 2012](#).

The Speaker: The Bill has been duly moved. Does the mover wish to speak thereto?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, Members of this House will be aware THAT as a result of the Budget deliberations the Government was advised to increase certain duties and fees. The Government then announced its intention to amend the stamp duty rates on immovable property and to amend the stamp duty rate on the cost of insurance policies covering immovable property. The Bill before us seeks to effect those changes.

Under this Bill, stamp duty will increase to 7.5 per cent across the board. This simplifies the existing law so that there will now be no difference in the stamp duty rate as regards the geographical location of property or whether property is transferred to a Caymanian or a non-Caymanian purchaser.

The stamp duty rate presently applicable in Central George Town and along the Seven Mile Beach corridor is already 7.5 per cent and will remain unchanged under this Bill. These measures are necessary at this particular time. I do hope that Government will be able to reduce the stamp duty rate once Government's financial situation improves, and I would remind Members of this House that there is precedent of such rate reductions in the past.

The Bill contains good news for Caymanian first-time residential buyers as this Government is committed to ensuring as many Caymanians as possible are able to own their own homes. Qualifying first-time buyers will benefit from a significant relaxing of the thresholds applicable for concessionary stamp duty rates. So, a Caymanian purchasing a residence for the first time will be exempted from Stamp Duty if

the value of the residence is below CI\$300,000. If the residence is valued between \$300,000 and \$400,000 the stamp duty rate is 2 per cent.

For qualifying Caymanian first-time buyers purchasing raw land to construct their own house concessionary rates are also applicable in this instance. For land worth up to \$100,000 there will be an exemption from stamp duty; and for land worth between \$100,000 and \$150,000 the stamp duty rate is just 2 per cent. So that's a reduction. Madam Speaker . . . well, it's a reduction on one end and an increase in land worth on the other end for those buying; an increase that they do not have to pay on, that is.

Madam Speaker, this Government is proposing to make a further amendment to the Stamp Duty Law with regard to the duty applicable to property insurance. At present there is a flat rate of \$12.00 per policy. It is proposed to introduce a stamp duty rate of 2 per cent on the cost of new or renewed property insurance policies. This will apply only to immovable property, not to household content insurance.

Madam Speaker, this is the summary of the amendments contained within the Bill. I ask Members for their support.

The Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Premier.

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

Member for North Side.

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

While I can appreciate and understand the need for Government's revenue to be increased in these particular economic times, I have a particular difficulty with increasing stamp duty on insurance on property from \$12.00 to 2 per cent. For the average person in my constituency that's going to work out to be about \$150 to \$200 per year, and I think that's a substantial increase.

My fear is that it may mean the difference between somebody actually having house insurance, or other property insurance, or not having it. So, Madam Speaker, I have filed an amendment, for which proper notice has been given, and it has been circulated, to delete clause [2](c) from the Bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

First Elected Member for George Town.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts, First Elected Member for George Town: Madam Speaker, like the Member for North Side, we on this side have some difficulty with the proposal regarding the 2 per cent on property insurance premiums.

Madam Speaker, it is a known fact that, I wouldn't wish to say the vast majority, but I would wish to say the majority of homeowners in this country . . . in fact, I believe I can say the vast majority of homeowners in this country have mortgages. In recent years many of them, in order to be able to pay their insurance premiums have had to make arrangements with the financial institutions that hold their mortgages. And those financial institutions, in instances, have allowed those annual premiums for property insurance to be added to their mortgage. And in many instances that is amortised over the term of the mortgage.

In flat terms, if they are paying 2 per cent of value . . . let's say 2 per cent of value is what the insurance premium is. So if the value is \$300,000 then their premium would be somewhere in the region of \$6,000 per year. Madam Speaker, in many instances insurance companies, in their attempts to be lenient, allow people to pay over a period of time during the year. In fact, if you are what they consider a very valuable customer, sometimes they allow you up to 10 payments. So it's almost like your CUC bill or your water bill that you pay almost every month out of the year and it just goes on, and on, and on, and on.

Madam Speaker, that is for those who can afford it on a monthly basis. But, as I said before, in many instances there are individuals who have to take that premium and add it to what they owe the bank. So, if we are looking at a \$300,000 value and we are looking at \$6,000 for a premium, and we are looking at 2 per cent of that, which is \$120, it may sound like nothing; but the fact of the matter is, in many instances that amount is just swallowed up into the whole thing and it goes on, and on, and on, and on.

And, Madam Speaker, what it does . . . and this is what a lot of people are not told. When you have a mortgage with what is termed a fixed payment for the foreseeable future, when you continue to add these amounts, whether it is your insurance premium and now this 2 per cent, which seems like not a large amount of money onto that principal of your mortgage every year, it would shock [you] to know, if calculations were made, by the time the mortgage is paid off how much more you have paid out of your earnings during that period of time.

So, Madam Speaker, the point is not to say to the Government that this is a rape case, but the point is while if the Government wishes to look at it from this point of view, that there's no escape out of it, that's fine. But the fact is, because there is no escape from this it is not like CUC where you can try to be energy efficient to make your bill go down. It's nothing like that. What is the value is the value, and that's the end of the story. And what percentage you pay, that's the end of the story. You don't want to get people under-valuing to avoid some of these payments because Ivan taught so many of us the difficulty of being under-insured.

So, Madam Speaker, the point that I make is that in most instances it causes an ongoing affair on the part of these individuals who have to pay these premiums—which, by and large, is the vast majority of the population. Madam Speaker, we certainly would wish to ask the Government to reconsider.

The other portions in the Bill are voluntary. If you wish to buy a piece of property you know what you are up against before you buy the property. And there is a certain amount of relaxation for first-time homeowners or first-time purchasers, which we all appreciate. I think everybody is in agreement with that. But this portion of it, Madam Speaker, I don't know what the projections are for how much it would actually mean in earnings for Government, but we would wish to ask them seriously to reconsider this position. I do believe that it is just one more boulder on the top of the shoulders of the people of this country with regard to them having less and less ability to meet their commitments all the time.

So, I trust that the Government might hear the pleas and reconsider. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, First Elected Member for George Town.

Minister of Education.

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

It is a known fact that any form of revenue enhancement measure is always going to be met by some resistance from some quarter. In crafting a budget and the various pieces that fit into the puzzle, all governments have to be most careful about how they put that mix together. Certainly, that was front and centre in this Government's mind as we looked at the various options that were available.

On the one hand we don't want to go too heavy on any one single aspect of the economy or one single aspect in terms of a specific change in law or regulation that would increase the revenue that Cayman Islands Government (CIG) projects to receive. When a number of ideas were presented to Government, we looked at each one and tried to predict what impact, if any, it would have, and who it would affect. We have been most careful, even in these most difficult times, at looking very carefully at every single item and weighing the costs and the benefits. It would be irresponsible of us to look at an item and just look at the dollar amount we project to receive and see that as a benefit without weighing up what the cost would be.

The first thing that we looked at with regard to weighing up that cost was who it was going to impact and what we thought the impact was going to be. Like many governments—I dare say all governments in the past—we tried to ensure that any fee that was going to hit the average household . . . that we do it in such

a way in which the impact would be minimal. And we tried to ensure that it was in an area that would be sustainable. The particular measure that we are speaking about as it relates to the percentage on the premium of property insurance already has a small fee attached to it.

When we looked at the average value we understood what properties are being insured [for], and then extrapolated out to get the calculation of what the premium would be and what 2 per cent of that premium would be. We ran a number of scenarios including the one that the First Elected Member for George Town just spoke to, which were properties at around \$300,000. I want to be sure that it's abundantly clear that this fee is 2 per cent of the premium that is payable on the property.

When we did calculations on \$250,000, \$300,000, \$350,000, we went a little lower. We saw a band that we thought would allow collectability to be sustainable, but it wasn't so high that we believed it would push people to underinsure their property. Madam Speaker, the analysis is simple. If we use the exact same principle used by the First Elected Member for George Town, the \$300,000 property, on average, property insurance is around 2 per cent of the value. A \$6,000 premium, as he said, 2 per cent of that is \$120 per year, \$10 per month. You have your property insurance in four installments, that's \$30 per installment. But let's say that you are able enough to get it on 12 installments. That's \$10 per month. We didn't believe that that was a tipping point for people to now take the risk of under insuring their house. The fact of the matter is that \$120 per month over a 10-year period, a decade, is \$1,200.

We just thought about the experiences we had recently with Hurricane Ivan and Hurricane Paloma. We saw what recently happened in the United States and, as a Government, we just didn't believe that that number would cause that tipping point, that it would cause people to then say, *Hold on. I want to avoid this \$120 per year. Here's what I am going to do . . .* which is to reduce the reported value of their property upon which their premium is partially calculated on.

The First Elected Member for George Town spoke to a bigger issue in his debate as well. And that is this whole concept of how property insurance premiums get financed. He is quite right, that if persons finance property insurance by adding it to the principal amount of their mortgage, I dare say that the vast majority of people who have a relatively new mortgage would never be able to repay it. In the early years of a mortgage you are not paying a lot on principal. If you refinance and put that on (because that's, in effect, what you are doing, a financing) you then finance your property insurance and you add it to your principal. Your principal will never, ever go down and you will continue to see it steady.

One example I saw (about a decade ago, when I was in this Legislative Assembly) was the person's principal over a three-year period actually increase because they got into this arrangement. That, Madam Speaker, is a matter that the Government, I believe, has to deal with on the side.

Banking and banking arrangements pique my interest because they impact thousands of people in our community. The vast majority of people in our community finance to get themselves into real property, in particular, a townhouse, a condo. And 99 per cent of the time, I would dare say, they go to a lending institution to finance a significant portion of the cost of that asset. I would hope that in today's market lending institutions are not engaging in this practice. Or, if they are, they are in a very clear and transparent manner going to their customer and ensuring that their customer understands the potential impact this could have on their capacity to pay. That's a matter that I think we, as Government, need to investigate and engage lending institutions on to ensure that practice is not happening. That practice is one, where I, and I believe all Members of this House, stand against such a proposition. We would literally have thousands of our people never pay off their mortgage.

Madam Speaker, my understanding is that this is something that good lending institutions in today's market in Cayman actually frown upon. They see that as a key measuring stick as to whether or not you can afford your mortgage. From what I have been told, and I say this is something that Government would have to engage in and get real data on . . . for the most part these financial arrangements happen at the insurance company level, where insurance companies, because they have seen how the market has reacted to premiums, have engaged in a very common practice of having a discussion with their client and saying, *Okay, if your premium (and I will use a very simple example) is \$2400 a year for your property, pay it over 12 months. Pay us \$200 per month if you can't come up with the entire \$2400 in that single payment.*

We have to ensure that our consumers get the best possible information to make the right decision. And the right decision could never be to have large numbers of our people in a scenario where they cannot pay off their mortgage because they are increasing their mortgage, or at least keeping it flat by having the property insurance premium added to their principal which more than eats away at the amount of principal they have repaid in a single year.

We have to understand at all times what issues are facing our people and ensure that, where necessary, we get the right information, and if there is something happening that we do not believe is in the best interest of the consumer generally, that we act.

If we get back to this proposal, Madam Speaker, I think, given what we understand to be the general case in the marketplace—and that is that the

vast majority of people get into insurance premium financing—that when you look at financing by the insurance company, and we think about what additional amount will be added on, I don't believe that this amount is going to be burdensome. However, Government understands what is happening in the economy generally and we certainly do not want to have any fees. But the fact of the matter is that we have to clearly understand that, given our current financial position, we have to enhance our revenue to be able to comply with our ratios and be able by 2016 to meet those ratios so that we do not continue to be in the hands of the United Kingdom and are able to become much more fiscally independent—the way we had been up until a few years ago.

Madam Speaker, I think Members need to look at the entire package. When we look at the entire package we will see that the vast majority of the revenue measures are coming from the financial services industry through increases in bank and trust company licences, through increases in the company licences, increases in the exempted limited partnership fees, increases in the departure tax, and increases in the room tax. So, we really have tried to spread this across so that we have as minimal an impact on our economy as possible, but it is nigh on impossible to do that without having some elements that will creep into the domestic economy as well.

We believe that when we look at the domestic economy this package does not bring any amount of revenue and fees that will stifle it in such a way that the average person is not going to be able to participate, or, for those that are participating, continue participating. I think we have done a fantastic job at striking that balance.

I think we need to be very fair about this and clearly understand that the vast majority of people who are engaging in premium financing at the insurance company level, when we look at these amounts, and, as I said, and as the First Elected Member for George Town said himself in his example of a \$300,000 property with a \$6,000 premium, that premium would now go up to \$6,120. I believe for those who can afford that and pay that in one installment, that \$120 is not overly burdensome. I do not believe that it is going to be any tipping point that would cause people to say they will lower the amount that they are reporting that their property is insured at because they want to avoid that fee (\$120 in that example). I think that is an example that a lot of us would agree a lot of Caymanians operate at that level.

Even when you get into premium financing, I don't believe that amount is going to be so burdensome that it causes that tipping point. But I take on his point, and I can say that Government needs to ensure that we have the right data on what's happening in the economy and what's happening in banks. Ultimately, we need to ensure that our consumers are being protected as best as possible. Certainly, this whole busi-

ness of premium financing can be a vexing one when it is being done by a lending institution. We need to really ensure that we are not having that as a widespread practice because that could harm a lot of consumers and cause them to have mortgages that last, in extreme examples, forever!

Madam Speaker, I think that when we look at this entire package and look at what Government is doing in terms of first-time Caymanian property owners and how we are actually making that more attractive, that is a good thing because we are encouraging at an even greater level more Caymanians to be involved in property ownership, particularly home ownership. And I think that when we look at the other increases, the fact of the matter is that for the most part if you are talking about persons who are trading in real estate, et cetera, I do not believe that we are hitting the very common man, the average man who we, as Government, believe we ought to do all that we can to ensure that no material single, or cumulative, tax measure would negatively affect.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we can find a way that all Members of the House would support the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012. We have to agree on some of these things sometimes. It's always easy to say don't do it, once it's \$1. But we as Government do not believe that we are creating any tipping point that is going to push people into under insuring. We also believe that given what's happening generally in the insurance marketplace that this is something that is not going to have that material effect on the vast majority of people.

Certainly, Madam Speaker, I think that as we push forward and as a number of our projects go through the procurement stages and we get more economic activity, that this Bill will have been but a little blip on the political radar and we will have seen a scenario in the next few years where we (whoever might be in this House) might be reducing or eliminating some of these fees because we would have hit our targets. We would not only have gotten ourselves compliant, but we would have ramped up our reserves and gotten Cayman on a stable footing.

Madam Speaker, this four-year budget programme that we are on (2013/14/15/16 budgets) is about ensuring the Cayman Islands are put on a stable footing that we are able to reduce debt, increase reserves, and ensure that fiscally we get stabilised. I think this Government ought to be commended at such a difficult time in a difficult environment that we have been able to keep the budget reamed in the way we have and the size of the civil service reamed in, and at the same time come up with a mixed revenue enhancing package that has achieved our goals and not had any material impact on the average person. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister of Education.

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 on the mover of the Bill to make his reply.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Members who made some remarks in this debate.

The Government heard and understood very clearly the points made about the 2 per cent levy on insurance premiums that this Bill would introduce. Let me say that the increase resulting from the measure is not as drastic as may be forming in the minds of Members.

If the insurance premium now is \$1,000, for example, the extra levy would be \$20.40 per year. The insurer, the company, passes this \$20.40 onto the insured. The insurer is no less worse-off than before. That's the insurer. Of course, the person whose property is insured will have to pay that \$20.40.

If the insurance premium is \$2,000 then it's \$40.81. If the insurance premium is now \$3,000 it will be \$61.22 per year. If the premium is \$5,000 then the extra levy will just be around \$102.04 per year. If it's \$10,000, the extra levy will be \$204.08. If the insurance premium is \$15,000 the extra levy is some \$306.12. If the insurance premium level is \$17,000 . . . and, Madam Speaker, I can tell this honourable House that's what my premium is, \$17,000 per year, and we have to pay that, as the First Elected Member for George Town mentioned, in several payments, of course. But that extra that I will have to pay is \$346.94. A premium of \$20,000 would be \$408.16 per year.

So, Madam Speaker, it is not as drastic. But what I would say is that Members ought to remember where we were. They don't need to think that this is something that we just want to do. When the First Elected Member for George Town calls us to reconsider, he didn't say what he is going to put in place of that revenue. In fact, none of them made an offer as to what would replace it.

Now, when we put on these fees, Madam Speaker, we had an option. The only option was to cut more expenditure, which we cut. And no one needs to believe when we have gone through all that already . . . we cut, and we cut, and we cut until services can't be performed. And we don't need to add anything into it about who is spending what and where. Across the board we have had to cut, and cut 'til it hurts now. But we had to do that. Or, we could have taken what the United Kingdom told us from 2009, cut 600 civil servants, or put in income tax, property tax or some other kind of tax. And we know, when it was suggested from the private sector that we could increase on people working here 10 per cent or 5 per cent, what an uproar that caused.

So, Madam Speaker, what were we to do? Put in income tax? Put in property tax? Well, there would be some people that would support that, but that's not our policy. So, Madam Speaker, I understood and I will feel the pinch myself, as I said my premium will attract some extra \$346.00 a year.

But, the next point that the Member for George Town mentioned was that this was bad, but any other thing would be voluntary. You see, Madam Speaker, being voluntary is not the point here, if you want a house and you don't have property, it is not voluntary; you have to purchase. And looking at that aspect of it, a person with [a house valued at] \$300,000 will not have to pay on purchasing land. And if they buy a house between \$300,000 and \$400,000, well, it's only 2 per cent. But up to \$300,000 it is free. So the point about it being voluntary doesn't hold water because, as I said, if you don't have land, if your family is not giving a piece of land, and even if they gave it to you, I think it attracts a very minimum payment which I have been waiving ever since I got into office. But, if you don't have that, you have to buy. And if you buy, it's all free.

Madam Speaker, as I said, if we took this off what would I replace it with? On a \$300,000 premium which, as I said, only attracts \$6,000—roughly \$10 per month, \$120, thereabouts, less than \$120 per annum. Now, if you took this revenue off (which I will come to the point I want to make) what then would we be replacing it with? I am asking Members of the House, what would we be replacing it with? Not a soul has said what we could do.

I will be having a meeting with the Minister next week, if I leave this week for London for the annual meetings. I will be having bilateral with the Minister. And that is about the only thing I am going to put to him. Can we reduce? Of course, Madam Speaker, we know what the answer is. They are going to tell us, *No! You're stuck at where you're at.* They already told us that, about reducing. If you reduce, you find something else to replace it with.

When we go to Committee stage I have an amendment. I challenge Members to tell me what I can replace that revenue with. Madam Speaker, every Member in this House well understands the precarious situation the country was and still is in. And they well understand, they should understand, this is the last thing that we want to do—any one of these fees; it's the last thing. The private sector says this is what they support. That group. So, if they can come up with something to replace this, and I ask the Member for George Town to do that, and the Member for North Side, give me a replacement. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The question is that a Bill shortly entitled, The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, be given a second reading.

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

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, given a second reading.

The Speaker: The House will now go into Committee to consider the Bill.

House in Committee at 3.00 pm

COMMITTEE ON BILL

[Hon. Mary J. Lawrence, Chairman]

The Chairman: The House is now in Committee, please be seated.

With the leave of the House, may I assume that, as usual, we should authorise the Attorney General to correct minor errors and such the like in this Bill?

Would the Clerk please state the Bill and read the clauses.

Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012

The Clerk: The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012.
Clause 1 Short title

The Chairman: The question is that clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

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

Ayes.

The Chairman: The Ayes have it.

Clause 1 passed.

The Clerk: Clause 2 Amendment of Schedule to the Stamp Duty Law (2011 Revision) – rates of duty.

The Chairman: Member for North Side.

Proposed Amendment to Clause 2

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Chair, having given the appropriate notice, I now move an amendment to the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, which reads: "That clause 2(b) and (c) of the Bill be deleted."

The Chairman: The amendment has been duly moved. Does any Member wish to speak thereto?

I would like the attention of the House please, we are conducting the Committee stage of this Bill and it is very important that I have everybody's attention.

The amendment has been duly moved. Does any Member wish to speak thereto?

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: That's one of the problems, Madam Chair. We as Members don't know.

I can tell you that I have seen committees broadcast on TV repeatedly after . . . over the weekends and days after. We know that when it was granted properly through the House Committee to do the radio broadcast it was deliberately stated that Committee stage would not be broadcast on radio because unless you have the Bill in front of you it's very difficult for the listening audience to understand what was happening. But that is not the case with the television. It has been broadcast already, and this is live so it's gone.

Madam Chair, I think I gave the reasons in the debate as to why I was moving the [amendment], so I don't think I need to prolong the [proceedings] by repetition.

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

If not, the question is that the amendment stands part of the clause. All those in favour please say Aye.

Some Hon. Members: "Aye."

The Chairman: Those against, No.

Noes.

The Chairman: The Noes have it, the amendment falls away.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Chair, can I have a division please? I think somebody needs to correct their vote, not me!

The Clerk:

Division No. 10

Ayes: 2

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller
Mr. Anthony S. Eden

Noes: 8

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush
Hon. J. Y. O'Connor-Connolly
Hon. Rolston M. Anglin
Hon. J. Mark P. Scotland
Hon. Cline A. Glidden, Jr.
Capt. A. Eugene Ebanks
Mr. Ellio A. Solomon
Mr. Dwayne S. Seymour

Absent: 5

Hon. Michael T. Adam

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr.
Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts
Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell
Mr. V. Arden McLean

The Chairman: The result of the division is 2 Ayes, 8 Noes, 5 absent. The Noes have it.

Negated by majority on division: Proposed amendment to clause 2 failed.

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

Amendment to clause 2

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

In Accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders 52 (1) and (2) I, the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Finance and Development, give notice to move the following amendments to The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012: That the Bill be amended by deleting clause 2(c) and substituting the following: "(c) by inserting in the appropriate alphabetical sequence the following heading and provisions 'POLICY OF PROPERTY INSURANCE 2% of the cost of new or renewed property insurance premiums for the purpose of this charge to duty – (a) "Policy of property insurance" includes every writing whereby any contract of property insurance is made or agreed to be made; and (b) "property" means immovable property in the Cayman Islands."

The Chairman: The amendment has been duly moved. Does any other Member wish to speak?

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Yes, Madam Chair.

The Chairman: Member for North Side.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Just to ask a question.

Madam Chair, I don't know whether the introduction of . . . in the Cayman Islands here . . . but I am aware that there are several large properties in the country that purchase their insurance abroad. And they would, therefore, be exempt from this fee.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Oh no. Of course not! No, Madam Chair, that is not correct.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: How?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Because the amendment clearly, and that's why we have it there so it clearly articulates and stipulates property means immovable property in the Islands, not the premium; the property.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: But there is no legislation that I am aware of that makes property insurance compul-

sory. So, my submission is that the Government would not, in fact, know whether the property was insured, how much it was insured for, and what the premium is if it is done completely outside the jurisdiction.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: No, Madam Chairman. The Member is right; we can't force anybody to pay insurance premiums. Not on this. But, what this does is ensure that if that property is in these Islands and that property is insured, they have to pay the 2 per cent.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: It's not overseas.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: No. Let me see if I can clarify what I am saying, Madam Chair.

I am aware that large properties for price reasons purchase their property insurance abroad. There is no requirement that I am aware of for them to report to Government having purchased that insurance. So how, then, will the Government know, 1) that they have insurance; and 2) what the premium is going to be.

Here is my concern, Madam Chair: If we are going to pass it as the Government has done, it should apply to all properties in the Cayman Islands and persons that can afford it should not simply be able to go overseas and purchase it and not have to pay the 2 per cent. That's what I am trying to ensure, Madam Chair.

The Chairman: First Elected Member for George Town.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Thank you.

Before there is an answer for that, if I just might add to it, the additional part of the equation to what the Member for North Side has just brought out is if there is a loophole that's being created unwittingly or inadvertently, then it also means that the larger properties, whether they be private or commercial, once they realise this they are going to seek to insure their properties and pay those premiums overseas just to avoid these amounts. While the amounts seem infinitesimal to what the Minister of Education spoke about earlier on in regular premiums and the 2 per cent of the premium, with those larger properties, whether commercial or otherwise, we are talking about a fair amount of money. And that's where the biggest chunk of income will come from.

So the two things that we want to make sure of, even when we might disagree with it actually happening, is the Government has the numbers so if they are going to make it happen, how do they ensure that what we are just speaking about now doesn't happen; and what is the mechanism they will use to ensure

that these premiums are collected? And how will it be done? Is the Government going to set up a special unit to do so? Is responsibility going to lay with the insurance providers? We don't know anything about that, and certainly I think that is something that the bases need to be covered on.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Chair, in regard to this Bill, we believe that this Bill does what it is set out to do.

I believe that even section (a) of what we are doing here . . . we'll catch some of that. What we are not going to catch is captive insurance, which insures people overseas. We can't do that. But I believe if anybody . . . what we can't do is force anybody to buy. We won't know . . . we don't have a way of knowing, because of the whole structure of business in the country, whether they have or they don't. And we can't force anybody to do it. But what we can do is put something in the Insurance Law, similar to what we had to put in for health insurance, as the Minister of Health was just explaining to me. And I am going to explore that. But as for this one . . .

The Chairman: Member for North Side.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Chair, I just want to assure the Government that this is going to happen—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: And I want to assure the Member, as I just said, that there is . . . and we know certain things happen; it was happening with health insurance. Now, how much is applicable to property insurance, we don't know. I am prepared to look at the Insurance Law to see whether we can capture those things. Mind you, I don't know of any. If Members have a list . . . I heard the Member for George Town saying that that's where the greater portion of premium will come from. I don't know if that's right, but a good premium would come from a Marriott Hotel or a Westin Hotel, a Ritz Hotel or whatever. But I don't know that they are not covered here, and I don't know if they are covered because there is no mechanism here for that. But if the Members have such a list, I would invite them to give it to me as commissioner of stamp duty.

The Chairman: First Elected Member for George Town.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Madam Chair, thank you. And through you to the "commissioner"—

[laughter]

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: No, I am not saying that in jest, because I understand the Premier's point. But the point that really needs to be considered is that we do not wish to create amending legislation which will in-

vite all of these entities to ensure that their properties are insured overseas. I am saying that we have to be careful of that regardless of what we say we are going to do with the Insurance Law.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Chair, if that is the Member's concern then this is not new. We are only adding 2 per cent on it. It's not new what we are saying here. "Policy of property insurance' includes every writing whereby any contract of property insurance is made or agreed to be made."

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Chair, the Premier is right. This is not new. But at \$12.00 it really wasn't worth my time, for instance, to seek to insure my house overseas. But when it comes to between \$180 and \$250, it certainly is worth my time because I know I can get a better rate than what is being proposed and charged at the local market.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Well, thanks for that information. Mine is \$346 and I am nationalistic enough to try and pay it here, because the Government will get it.

An Hon. Member: But that's not the point.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: The point is, Madam Chair, that . . . there are several points that I do not think we can cover at this point in time in this Bill. And I have given Members the assurance that I am prepared to look at the Insurance Law to see where people might be getting away, as they are trying to say, or that they are implying, and then see how we can deal with it from that perspective.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: The kind of amendment that you are looking to put in the whole Insurance Law, for instance, would be that all properties in the Cayman Islands shall be insured and they shall be insured with a company in the Cayman Islands, because that's what's in the Health Insurance Law. Then we are making property insurance compulsory, and I don't think we want to go down that road either.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: And I am not going to the American legislative process where Bills that have no meaning to other Bills are attached. We have a process and I believe that that can be covered better under the Insurance Law than under the Stamp Duty Law, that's all I'm saying, if there is a problem.

The Chairman: If everyone—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: I thank Members for their concern, Madam Chair. I believe it is a genuine concern and it is something that I am prepared to look at. I am just explaining that if it is not

caught in this, then I am prepared to look at the Insurance Law, but not the Stamp Duty Law.

The Chairman: If there is no further debate, I will put the question that the amendment stands part of the clause. All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes.

The Chairman: The Ayes have it.

Amendment to clause 2 passed.

The Chairman: The question now is that the clause, as amended, stands part of the Bill. All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes.

The Chairman: The Ayes have it.

Clause 2, as amended, passed.

The Clerk: A Bill for a Law to amend the Stamp Duty Law (2011 Revision) to increase the duty on specified property transactions; and for related and connected matters.

The Chairman: The question is that the Title do stand part of the Bill. All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes.

The Chairman: The Ayes have it.

Title passed.

The Chairman: The question now is that the Bill be reported to the House. All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes.

The Chairman: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: Bill to be reported to the House.

House resumed at 3.21 pm

The Speaker: Proceedings are resumed. Please be seated.

REPORT ON BILL

Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I have to report that a Bill entitled, The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, was examined in a Committee of the whole House and amended.

The Speaker: The Bill has been duly reported and is set down for a third reading.

THIRD READING

Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012

The Clerk: The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, Second Reading.

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I move that the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, be given a third reading and passed.

The Speaker: The question is that the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, be given a third reading and passed. All those in favour please say Aye. Those against, No.

Ayes and Noes.

The Speaker: I think the Ayes have it.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, can I have a division please?

The Speaker: Yes, Member for North Side.
Madam Clerk.

The Clerk:

Division No. 11

Ayes: 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

Noes: 4

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts
Mr. Anthony S. Eden
Mr. V. Arden McLean
Mr. D. Ezzard Miller

Absent: 2

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr.
Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell

The Speaker: The result of the division is: 9 Ayes; 4 Noes; 2 absent.

Agreed by majority on division: The Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill, 2012, given a third reading and passed.

The Speaker: I would remind Members that if you intend to vote on a division you have to be in your own seat to do so. You cannot vote from any other seat in the House.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Madam Speaker, could you, just for my enlightenment, quote the Standing Order that says I have to be in my particular seat to vote, and I can't vote from any other microphone in the House, please? I don't recall that Standing Order.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, from my knowledge of the workings of this House, and it's a precedent and convention that you have to be in your seat to vote. You can't be in the seat where the Member for North Side sits . . . Well, we know where you sit, and the House knows it from ever since you've been there. No, when you vote . . . Madam Speaker, let's not split hairs here. When they vote, they know they [should] be in their seats. They know that.

Now, as far as this vote is concerned, let's not make a big contention over it because the vote is carried. But we can't change the precedents and conventions for Members when they want it to be that way.

The Speaker: Can we proceed please?

[The Elected Member for North Side rose]

The Speaker: I will—

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: No, no, Madam Speaker, please, Ma'am. I have asked you to identify the Standing Order under which you have just ruled, because I really need now—

The Speaker: I will take a recess, do the research and bring your answer back. Thank you very much.

Mr. D. Ezzard Miller: Thank you, Ma'am.

Proceedings suspended at 3.30 pm

Proceedings resumed at 4.14 pm

The Speaker: Proceedings are resumed. Please be seated.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Voting on Division

The Speaker: When we took the break I had been challenged by the Member for North Side regarding

the ability of a Member to cast a vote in a [division]. One of the precincts of parliament is that there is order within its chamber. There is a way to do things and there is a way not to do things. We have procedures that are set down, and we have procedures that are handed down. In all of my knowledge of parliament if you were called to vote in a division you had to be in your seat.

The names on the roll are called in a particular order; it's called in the order of seating. While there is not a specific Standing Order regarding this matter, Standing Order 40 says: "**The Presiding Officer is responsible for the observance of the rules of order in the House and in Committees of the whole House respectively, and his decision upon any point of order shall not be open to appeal and shall not be reviewed by the House save upon a substantive motion made after notice.**"

Standing Order 43(3) reads: "**(3) A division shall be taken by the Clerk calling each Member's name and recording the vote given. The Clerk shall then announce the number of those who have voted for and against the proposal and the Presiding Officer shall declare the result of the division.**"

It is my role in this parliament to maintain order. You cannot be running around like chickens and voting from every corner of this Chamber when it's time to vote. And so, I am making the ruling this evening that you will be in your seat when a division is taken if you so wish to vote.

Thank you.

Now, may we proceed with the rest of the Order Paper?

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Government Motion No 5/2012-13—Immigration (Grant of Right to be Caymanian) Order, 2012

The Speaker: Honourable Deputy Governor.

The Deputy Governor, Hon. Franz Manderson: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise to move Government Motion No. 5/2012-13. The Motion reads as follows:

WHEREAS section 20(1)(e) of the Immigration Law (2011 Revision) provides that the Governor in Cabinet, acting upon the recommendation of the Caymanian Status and Permanent Residency Board, may grant the right to be Caymanian in accordance with the section;

AND WHEREAS the said section 20(1)(e) provides that such grant be ratified by the Legislative Assembly;

AND WHEREAS the Immigration (Grant of the Right to be Caymanian) Order, 2012, was laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Immigration (Grant of the Right to be Caymanian) Order, 2012, be affirmed by the Legislative Assembly pursuant to the provisions of section 20(1)(e) of the Immigration Law (2011 Revision).

The Speaker: The question is: BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Immigration (Grant of the Right to be Caymanian) Order, 2012, be affirmed by the Legislative Assembly pursuant to the provisions of section 20(1)(e) of the Immigration Law (2011 Revision).

The Motion is open for debate. Does the mover wish to speak thereto?

The Deputy Governor, Hon. Franz Manderson: Yes, Ma'am.

Madam Speaker, in 2005, the Immigration Law was amended to allow for a more open and transparent process for the granting of the right to be Caymanian by Cabinet. Section 20(1)(e) of the Immigration Law (which I just read out) has been complied with in that the persons in question, Mr. Chandi, and I will give his full name for the record, Mr. Haresh Kumar Lal [Harry] Chandi, and Mr. William Robert Maines, applied to the Caymanian Status and Permanent Residency Board for the right to be Caymanian. The Board approved their application and made a recommendation to Cabinet stating that their application should be approved.

The Cabinet subsequently reviewed their applications and approved for them to be sent to the Legislative Assembly for ratification.

Madam Speaker, you will have noted that section 20(1)(e) states that only four grants of the right to be Caymanian can be made by Cabinet in each year, and I can confirm that no other grants have been made by Cabinet.

Madam Speaker, please allow me to set out the significant contribution that Mr. Chandi and Mr. Maines have made to the Islands and the contribution that convinced both the Caymanian Status and Permanent Residency Board and Cabinet that they deserved the highest immigration status that we grant to non-nationals, that is, the right to be Caymanian.

I will start with Mr. Chandi. Mr. Chandi is well known in the Islands, having lived full time in Grand Cayman since 2008. He was born in India and is a citizen of both India and the United States of America. Since 2001 he has been a director and part owner of Magnum Jewelers in the Cayman Islands. Members would be aware that the business has grown substantially in the Islands and provides a significant choice to visitors and residents, adding to the many attractions of retail shopping in the Cayman Islands, and adding to the vibrancy and competitiveness of that element of our economy.

Prior to assisting with the establishment of Magnum Jewelers, Mr. Chandi gained extensive ex-

perience which he brought to benefit to these Islands and the business which he shares with Caymanian partners through his extensive experience for 17 years in total, working in the jewelry trade in the US Virgin Islands.

Madam Speaker, we are advised that more recently Mr. Chandi has acquired a personal interest in a local hotel, upon identifying that the property was in a distressed state and within weeks of closing its doors. Mr. Chandi was able to use his connections to bring a well-respected group of investors who were able to acquire a substantial interest in the hotel saving it from imminent closure. This act alone saved 130 Caymanian jobs at the hotel only weeks before Christmas. Mr. Chandi's involvement arose due to the owner of the hotel recognising Mr. Chandi's respected position and extensive international relationships and approaching him directly.

The impact Mr. Chandi has made since forming a formal connection with the Cayman Islands in 2001, and more recently since he became a resident in 2008, is substantial and highly significant. He has invested vast sums of money in developed real estate and he has also invested in local businesses. His company alone employs directly 11 persons and he pays substantial work permit fees to the government. These aspects of Mr. Chandi's contributions to the Islands are perhaps well known. What is, however, not so well known and forms the focus of his contribution and is separate from his charitable contribution (which I will come to shortly), is that Mr. Chandi alone is the individual responsible for the introduction of Dr. Shetty to these Islands and the dramatic and exceptionally important contribution to the Islands and the economy which Dr. Shetty is in the process of generating.

Madam Speaker, the Narayana Cayman University Medical Centre and associated complex are expected within the next 20 years to provide the means of effectively doubling the size of the economy of these Islands all by themselves. This will provide direct opportunities for thousands of Caymanians and spin-off opportunities for a thousand more. At the same time, it will stabilise and invigorate our economy whilst also providing increased stability and diversification by providing yet another pillar to join development, tourism and financial services as the mainstay of these Islands and their people.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Chandi has done a lot of charity work and I would like to give a bit of background in relation to that. He almost never associates publicly with his good deeds or charity. It is not something that he brags about. The following is not a complete record of all that he has done, but I wanted to give Members of the House an idea of some of his charitable work. I think this is very moving, Madam Speaker, in terms of his generosity to our people.

Mr. Chandi made possible and financed a surgery for a 4-year-old Caymanian girl who was born

with a hole in her heart. The surgery was so difficult and perilous that it was determined that Dr. Shetty's cardiac hospital in Bangalore, India, would be the best facility to perform the open-heart procedure. Mr. Chandi paid for the surgery and the entire stay in Bangalore for the girl and her mother. Happily, the surgery was successful and the girl is back in Cayman doing well with her family.

In another instance, a 14-year-old boy was the victim of a shooting incident and was left paralysed from the waist down. Working through a local organisation which works with paralysed children, Mr. Chandi was able to organise a fully fund a trip for the boy and his mother to the Special Olympics in the United States. In addition, Mr. Chandi has committed to donate a sizeable sum of money to the Cayman Special Olympics programme each year.

Mr. Chandi has also contributed financially to a number of charitable based organisations, including the Lighthouse School, Meals on Wheels, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, the Cayman Islands National Trust; donations to the Little League, the Cayman Islands Marine Institute, Cayman Islands Hospice Care, and the list goes on, Madam Speaker.

We can see, Madam Speaker, that Mr. Chandi has done a tremendous amount of work in improving our economy in the Islands. He has done a lot of charitable work. His actions have maybe saved the life of one of our people, and that is a significant contribution to our Islands.

Madam Speaker, I turn to Mr. William Maines. He was granted permanent residency in the Cayman Islands back in 2003 and has been visiting the Cayman Islands for some 30 years and has developed close ties to the community during the ensuing period. He travels frequently off the Island to perform some of his other duties and attend his business interests. But the majority of his time is spent here in Cayman, and this is where he feels is his home. He has invested a significant sum of money in properties here. I have a list of some 19 properties that he owns or has invested in. This has generated many, many millions of dollars for our industry and for government.

His contribution to the community is also vast. He has made and is capable of making an outstanding contribution to the community. He has been an extremely active member of the local community delivering aid in times of need and has been generous with his resources. In particular, the following instances draw attention to his generosity: The applicant's plane was the third plane to land with food, water and supplies after Hurricane Ivan. Two days later the applicant sent a second planeload of generators, chainsaws, and related supplies which were delivered through his local partner.

We all remember Hurricane Ivan and the significant damage that we received. We are certainly grateful for this type of assistance.

The applicant donated a complete commercial kitchen to help a facility in the Sister Islands with research. He has generated a defibrillator to a local sporting organisation after a young boy died after being hit with a ball. If a defibrillator had been there it might have saved the young man's life.

Madam Speaker, I think what is moving to me and what demonstrates his high involvement in our community and the way he has been able to assimilate himself into our community (which I think is a key characteristic and something that we all look for, is a person's ability to assimilate themselves in our community), is what was said about him by his many, many referees who provided personal references for him. I will just give a few instances of this. One of his local referees said, "Mr. Maines is a long-term resident of Cayman and has made numerous investments in the Cayman Islands including a number of investments in companies that we jointly own. He is a very generous man and cares deeply about the Cayman Islands and its people." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE]

Another referee said, "I have had the pleasure of associating myself with Mr. Maines on a social and business level for the past 10 years, during which time I have developed a high level of trust and respect for his many attributes. He is a man of impeccable character and honourable in all his dealings. Our years of association have also made me aware of and privileged to his acts of kindness and generosity in helping those in need in the aftermath of Hurricane Ivan." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE]

Moment of interruption—4.30 pm

The Speaker: I would like to pause at this moment to ask for a motion to continue the business of the House after 4.30.

Minister of Education.

Suspension of Standing Order 10(2)

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Subject to Standing Order 10(2), I move that the business of the House progress beyond the normal hour of interruption of 4.30 pm.

The Speaker: The motion is that under Standing Order 10(2), the business of the House progress beyond the normal hour of interruption of 4.30 pm.

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

Ayes and one audible No [Mr. D. Ezzard Miller]

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: Standing Order 10(2) suspended.

The Speaker: Honourable Deputy Governor.

The Deputy Governor, Hon. Franz Manderson: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The last quote from the referees is, "Mr. Maines is known to me as an honest, trustworthy and personable individual. He has always conducted his affairs in a professional and diligent way. His integrity is no doubt of the highest caliber." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE]

Madam Speaker, I think what is also instructive is the information that the Cayman Status and Permanent Residency Board provided to Cabinet in recommending Mr. Maines. They said, "The Board considered his civic and humanitarian contributions. The Board also took into consideration the referees' strong letters in support." And these were from mostly born Caymanians, people who have grown up [and lived] here all their lives. "The Board further notes his active involvement in the Cayman society and his strong financial commitment to the Cayman Islands. He is a man of strong independent means and will not be a burden on the Cayman Islands." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE]

Madam Speaker, I have set out in some detail the background of these two fine gentlemen. Certainly, the Cabinet takes this responsibility very seriously. You will have noted that there have been no other grants of the right to be Caymanian this year. As a matter of fact, I don't think there has ever been any grant of right to be Caymanian since the law was changed in 2005. But given the very strong contribution that these gentlemen have made to the Cayman Islands it was felt that they were deserving of the right to be Caymanian and I would ask honourable Members to support the Motion.

Thank you.

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

Member for North Side.

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

I wish to register the strongest possible objection that I possibly can to the grant of Caymanian status by this route. Madam Speaker, since 2009 there have been at least three, if not four, amendments to the 2003 Immigration Law which provided opportunities for persons of this nature to be granted permanent residence in various categories—as investors, as business owners.

I don't know either of those two people. I believe I had lunch with Mr. Harish Kumar la Chandi when the Member for East End and Mr. Gene Thompson invited me to a lunch to discuss their proposal for the Narayana Hospital, which we just heard is being used as, if not the main, one of the main reasons why this person should be given Caymanian status.

Madam Speaker, we need to make up our minds how this man got here because we have heard other people lay claim to bringing him here and being totally responsible for his still large investment that is to come forth in this country leading to, I think this Motion used such figures as doubling the national economy and providing employment for thousands of Caymanians. I pray and hope the day soon arrives because we have been at least two years in the waiting and there is not a lot that has been done by that group to fulfill these promises.

So, Madam Speaker, I cannot place any confidence that that will ever happen and, therefore, lend my support to someone being granted Caymanian as a right for that reason.

The other reason given that the . . . and, Madam Speaker, it would have been nice if we had gotten copies of these dossiers as part of the Motion because it is very difficult to keep up with the list as it was being called out and being able to respond accordingly.

But, as I recall, one of the other reasons given was that the good gentleman is involved in some jewelry stores and he brought great expertise in jewelry sales to the Cayman Islands, but he only came here in 2001 and he's only been a permanent resident since 2008. I believe we had jewelry stores here quite some time before that. I am not sure that the work force was not better represented in terms of Caymanian content in the other ones that existed here long before that. What we have seen happening is that the introduction of these kinds of wealthy individuals being allowed to set up stores in partnership with or without Caymanians has driven one of the most respected, loved, and longest jewelry stores, "Caymania," out of business. And in that case it left Caymanians not only out of employment but out of ownership and deeply in debt because they had taken strides to expand their businesses before and during the advent of these mega investors who come here.

So, Madam Speaker, it appears from what I listened to from the mover, that both of these gentlemen already have some form of permanent residence [PR] and, therefore, as I recall the Immigration Law, will be granted Caymanian status as a right in the year 2015. So, again, Madam Speaker, my concern lies in why the urgency. If I remember correctly, the mover said one already has PR for some nine years. And that is the gentleman that I don't know. I have searched with my limited capability the archives of the *Caymanian Compass*. I find no great articles reporting his activities and contributions to the country. I took the time to Google them, can't say that I found a lot.

Madam Speaker, this ability of Cabinet under the Immigration Law to grant four people the right to be Caymanian, is something that should be reserved for very, very special people. In my humble opinion, neither of these two people rises to that bar.

Madam Speaker, the investment criteria listed by the mover does not impress me. There are people in my constituency who have invested more than that and who have done it consistently since 1968! Long, long time. Employed as much as four generations of North Siders, and they didn't see the need to apply to be given Caymanian as a right, or even to be granted Caymanian status.

Madam Speaker, we have to be careful when we are allowing people with this economic capacity which has been touted and which appears to be the only reason why we are giving these two people this right to be Caymanian, because all of their charitable donations did not mention individual personal time. It talked about "donations" and cash contributions. I have been involved in a lot of voluntary organisations in this country for a long time. Other members of my family have been involved as well. None of us have seen these two people out there performing charitable service to Caymanians.

So, Madam Speaker, if the only reasons we are giving Mr. Chandi the right to be Caymanian is because he introduced the Narayana Hospital group and . . . Madam Speaker, you know, we're making a huge deal out of this unfortunate case where one Caymanian with a hole in their heart was helped. That's not the first time that's happened in Cayman, you know, Madam Speaker. That is neither historical nor miraculous! There are people in this country who help on a regular basis Caymanians needing assistance. And often time, Madam Speaker, it may not be so flamboyant, or it may not be so dramatic, or it may not be so high in value, but there is a little book that I carry around in my briefcase which talks about the *Widow's Mite*. But here we are singling out the ones who may be giving pennies on the dollar because we brag about their wealth and their investments and think we should give them the right to be Caymanian.

The same goes for Mr. William Robert Maines. I don't know who he is. I listened closely to the presentation of this dossier. Madam Speaker, quite frankly, I am not that impressed. The references were really not that supercalifragilisticexpialidocious or fantastic. They were rather run-of-the-mill things that are submitted on a routine basis about people who are applying for permanent residence to the Board.

Madam Speaker, most people in this country know my position on the granting of Caymanian status, et cetera. No doubt this speech today will be added to the pieces of timbre that they used to construct the wall of Ezzard being so anti-expatriate. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to wear that label because these are the kinds of people that we allow into our country. We welcome them. Caymanians are allowing people to provide them with opportunities. And as soon as they get in charge they drive Caymanians out of business and they take the hardcore business line, which is what got them in the position they are in to be

able to come here and purchase Caymanian status. Because that's what this is, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, Caymanians are finding it increasingly more difficult to enter the competitive environment of entrepreneurs because we, as a Government, and Governments before, have consistently done this kind of thing and allowed these people. Once they get that certificate, the right to be Caymanian, it goes to all their generations. It goes to all their people. And we have no more control over them.

So, Madam Speaker, I will be voting no against this Motion. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Member for North Side.

Does any other Member wish to speak?

[pause] Does any other Member wish to speak?

[pause] Does any other Member wish to speak?

[pause]

If not, I call on the Deputy—

Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

Madam Speaker, I wish to say a few words about this Motion which is the first one ever brought to this House under this section of the Law, the section that was inserted during our administration, the section that was inserted to avoid the problems which occurred with the mass status grants in 2003.

This process . . . it is important that the country knows that ever since we had an Immigration Law, even when it was called the Caymanian Protection Law, there was a provision for the Executive, the Cabinet and before the Executive Council, to make grants of Caymanian status, now known as the right to be Caymanian, and that the section was utilised quite often. It is something that was reserved . . . I wouldn't say reserved, was utilised often in relation to former governors and so forth, persons considered worthy and deserving of Caymanian status on the basis that they had made significant contributions to the overall wellbeing of the country.

What happened in 2003, Madam Speaker, was unprecedented, was something that created major concern, chaos even, when the then Cabinet led by the current Premier decided to grant Caymanian status to some 2,650 people, or there about. That created major, major concern right across the community and when we were elected to office in 2005 part of the mandate we had was to make changes to the Law to make sure that that never occurred again, hence, the limit on grants by Cabinet to four per year.

But we thought also that we ought to take it a step further, that there ought to be transparency in the process. If we were not going to utilise the Board, where Caymanians were actually able to sit and determine these matters and come to a conclusion and that it was something that was going to be done by the Executive, that the Executive ought to provide an

explanation to the House and to the broader community as to the basis on which they were making these grants. We did not want to see a repeat of what happened in 2003, where all sorts of people who were completely unqualified, completely unsuited, some of them actually dangerous to the community, wound up getting Caymanian status.

Although, I should hasten to say there were many who got Caymanian status in that mass grant that were and are very good people; it is just that it was not subject to any process, there was no criteria, there was no transparency. We had people traipsing up and down the country putting together lists of people who would get Caymanian status. So, we wanted to avoid that.

The one bit of disappointment I have had in the presentation today, which is a matter of concern, is that it is grossly unfair to Members on this side for us not to know in advance the basis on which these grants are being made and that we are asked to vote to ratify them. It is not, in my view, sufficient for that to come only when the motion is actually moved and the mover speaks to it. The basis on which these grants are made ought to be communicated to Members of the House in advance so that we can, as the Member for North Side said, have the opportunity to more carefully consider what our views are in relation to these.

Madam Speaker, the reason I believe that this has come about is that under the relatively new regime which was implemented under the 2003 amendments to the Immigration Law, essentially persons in this category, that is, persons who cannot claim Caymanian status by virtue of some connection to a Caymanian whether by virtue of marriage or descent, have to go through a process of obtaining permanent residence and then, having obtained that, have to stay here for an extended period beyond that (I think it's up to 15 years, going from memory) before they will become entitled to obtain Caymanian status.

So, my understanding is that because of what Cabinet (the Board first and now Cabinet) has deemed to be exceptional service to the country, it is felt that these two persons, Mr. Harry Chandi, and Mr. Bill Maines, ought to be essentially fast tracked as an indication of the country's gratitude to them.

Madam Speaker, I have met both of the gentlemen concerned. I met Mr. Maines in the immediate aftermath of the hurricane back in 2004. Indeed, my next door neighbour knows him well and, thus, I can witness firsthand some of the major contributions he made in tangible form to help people all around to deal with the aftermath of the hurricane with substantial—and I mean substantial—amounts of money donated in both cash and in terms of things like generators and foodstuff and a whole range of other activities. Although I do not recall having seen him or talking to him since then, I am aware of the significant

contributions he continues to make to Cayman and its wellbeing.

I think most of us will have met Mr. Chandi, if not before, certainly in relation to his involvement with Dr. Shetty and Mr. Gene Thompson and the Shetty hospital. So, Madam Speaker, I see this process that is happening here today as carrying out the spirit and intent of the legislation, that is, we no longer have a situation where individual members of Cabinet or this House can actually make recommendations and wind up with Cabinet approving grants of Caymanian status, or the right to be Caymanian. But the recommendations actually have to come from the Board. The Board itself is not able to grant the right to be Caymanian because the tenure of the individual or individuals concerned is not sufficient.

But what we have here is a recommendation from the Board in relation to both of these gentlemen to the Cabinet, so the Board will have decided these are suitable people in accordance with the provisions of section 24 of the Immigration Law, which sets out the criteria by which you should be adjudged as a suitable person or not to obtain the right to be Caymanian. And then the Cabinet must have independently come to their own conclusion about that. And now what we have before the House is a Motion seeking the approval of the House of these two gentlemen as good suitable persons to have the right to be Caymanian.

So, Madam Speaker, I see the process working as we anticipated it would work. I am prepared, and the other Members of the Opposition here are prepared to give our support to the Motion. We do believe that these are the kinds of people, and two individuals who have distinguished themselves in relation to their care and concern and involvement in the Cayman community. So, without more, I can indicate to the House our agreement with the Motion being brought by the Honourable Deputy Governor.

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

Does any other Member wish to speak?
[pause]

Member for East End.

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

I rise to make a short contribution to this Motion that is currently being debated. I believe, hopefully in the spirit of cooperation with the Leader of the Opposition, I think I should echo some of the statements he made, in that the intent of this Motion is precisely what we set out to do as members of the Government in 2006 (I think it was) when we won on the platform of if we ever were elected as the PPM we would immediately bring an amendment to the Immigration Law that what happened in 2003/04 would

never, ever happen again unless it would come back through Parliament.

Madam Speaker, I believe we succeeded in doing that. Since 2003 we have not seen any mass grants. So, the Government has to decide after application has been made to the Permanent Residence and Cayman Status Board. If the Government is satisfied that they are worthy, that anyone is worthy, they must tell the people that. I don't know one of the gentlemen. I know the other. I know it now appears that there are some revelations that he singlehandedly brought Dr. Shetty here. I am grateful for that because there have been many claims as to who brought Dr. Shetty here.

The hospital is going in my community. I look forward to the construction thereof wherein my people can now get work. Hopefully some of the next generation in East End, or this generation, can work there, but, more importantly, some of the next generation can become doctors and nurses. Hopefully, one day we will see an East Ender or [another] Caymanian be a renowned heart surgeon as well, or otherwise.

Now, Madam Speaker, you know I couldn't debate this unless I brought up matters of immigration. One of the things that I have always advocated is the removal of all boards on immigration matters. It's too subjective. It is interpretation that those boards use. It takes something away from Caymanians. Madam Speaker, I have had numerous representations from constituents and Caymanians who after being married to a foreigner are being asked to provide all manner of information that has absolutely no relevance to the application.

Madam Speaker, I think it's unfair. I have seen it. I think it's unfair that a Caymanian who has the right to be Caymanian for generations and marries someone else and wants to bequeath that right to someone else after years of marriage and the Immigration Board asks them how much money they have. I don't recall in my many years here . . . but not only ask them, Madam Speaker, but they must prove it. I don't recall ever, any government ever asking me how much money I had to be a Caymanian or to remain a Caymanian. Madam Speaker, their argument is . . . and I was told that the innocent have to suffer for the guilty.

Madam Speaker, section 24 of the [Immigration Law](#) says, "**In the course of processing an application for the right to be Caymanian, the Board shall satisfy itself that . . .**" among other things, when we go down to (d) "**the applicant has not committed an act of insolvency or bankruptcy, or been involved as a shareholder or director of any company or other entity which has been the subject of liquidation especially where creditors have been adversely affected.**" That's one of the criteria they have to consider.

On the application for the grant of the right to be Caymanian, question 19 asks, "**Have you ever**

been bankrupt or owned shares, equity or rights in a non-public quoted company or been a director, manager, or officer of a company, partnership or entity which went bankrupt or ceased trading without creditors being paid in full? If so, please provide details." When that question is responded to in the negative, Madam Speaker, that Caymanian is then told that historically the Board required bank references to satisfy the section 24 provisions, and it is on that basis that the request for bank references are made.

Now, Madam Speaker, I cannot understand why the Board would request such rubbish after the question has already been answered in the negative. There are no personal bankruptcy laws in this country. It is creditors who will take someone to court and that becomes a public record, if the court adjudged that the company is bankrupt. If there are reasons to believe that that applicant lied or anything else, or provided false information, then there is a process, because in section 27 of the Immigration Law says, **"Loss of right to be Caymanian. The right to be Caymanian granted by the Board may be lost . . . (a) where the holder has supplied false or misleading information in a material particular, to the Board."** So, I would like to know the value of providing a reference, other than for them to sit around the boardroom table and discuss what a Caymanian has accumulated and then come outside and talk about it.

Therein lies my reasons for not having the Board. And, Madam Speaker, this has been my clarion cry for a very long time. Not today. I have always believed that we should set down the criteria in writing and the civil servants do the tick box. Once it's ticked off and you have met the requirements it is issued to you.

Madam Speaker, I say all that . . . on the application form for the right to be Caymanian it says, in a declaration, **"I, the above-mentioned person, am hereby applying for the right to be Caymanian by virtue of section 22"** (subsection so-and-so) **"of the Immigration Law (2007 Revision) and declare as follows: a) that the information contained in this application is correct to the best of my knowledge and belief; and [(b)] that I am aware that it is a criminal offence to make a statement or representation that is false in the material particular which I know to be false or do not believe to be true."** Nevertheless, we continue to ask Caymanians to provide proof that they can support their spouse, provide proof that they have land.

Madam Speaker, it is wrong. It is unfair. Swear a declaration. Then they want you to provide affidavit. Madam Speaker, I don't want to beat up on everybody, but it needs to be corrected in order that Caymanians who have the right, who acquired the right, particularly through birth, or even those who acquired it by virtue of grant, have the right to bequeath that right to be Caymanian to others.

Madam Speaker, when they send you back your letter asking for the things that are not available, they even have advertisements on it! I thought that went out 20 years ago, 15 years ago, Madam Speaker. Someone has to sit down and do this and straighten it out because a judicial review is imminent.

I appreciate that a job has to be done. Stop giving Caymanians a hard time. It is unfair. Governments must stay out of people's bedrooms. It is not their place.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Stay out of people's homes. People need to have certain freedoms in the land of their birth! And one of them is that you only come into their homes if you are invited, or they are committing a criminal offence.

Madam Speaker, why do you believe Caymanians feel so disenfranchised? Every time they touch something someone raps them on their knuckles. That is what is happening in our country. We need to move away from it. Every society must be governed by rules and laws. And the system requires that to maintain order. When you go to the distance where you are crucifying the people of the country, you are walking on thin ice. And when you start hearing the cracks, you had better get off it!

Madam Speaker, why would they try to send out things like "you must submit documentary evidence that the necessary advertisement has been placed in a local newspaper twice a week for two consecutive weeks" four times in all, "Please submit full pages of the ad. Photocopied adverts will not be accepted." [UNVERIFIED]

Madam Speaker, I know when the Deputy Governor gets up he is going to ask me if it is ticked. It is not ticked, but it's still on the requirement form. It sends a message that is not necessary or good for the minds of Caymanians.

Madam Speaker, I recently had a young man who applied for his wife's status after being married some eight or nine years. When he submitted his birth certificate to prove along with it that he is Caymanian he had in the 80s through a deed poll changed his first name, because it was spelled wrong initially. You know, many of us in this country have that. It was spelled wrong based on what they heard in those days. In 1980, I believe it was, he changed through a deed poll, his first name. When he submitted the certified copy to the Immigration Board he was subsequently written and told that he needed to prove that the name prior to 1980 and the current name is one and the same person. A document that was certified by the Registry, by Government!

Now, Madam Speaker, there is no way . . . the onus cannot be on the individual to prove or disprove a Government document.

Then they ask you if you were married prior, to submit your divorce decree. They have now turned into police! The only reason they want a divorce decree is to prove that you dissolved that marriage prior to getting married again. That's what it is for. And the last time I heard that was called bigamy. So that's a criminal offence in our Penal Code, wherein the police must investigate. The only thing the Immigration Board needs to be concerned about is marriage of convenience. Is that how you do it? That's not how you do it, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, someone . . . and I invite the Deputy Governor and his PS, or Chief Officer (whatever they are called now), to sit down and deal with this. It has taken a piece of a Caymanian away. As a Caymanian I should not have to be worried about what is going to happen tomorrow. I should be going about my daily chores trying to keep my family alive. But here I have to worry what next Government is going to ask me to produce.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Well, Madam Speaker, it may not. I need to clarify that, because the Premier . . . I know he will get up and tell me it's not necessarily the elected Government, and that's true. But they play a role in it if these things are brought to their attention to help Caymanians. So I am calling on the Premier and his elected Government to also see what we can do about this because it brings so much stress on Caymanians. The way they feel about being Caymanian is no more.

Madam Speaker, is it any wonder that we see our people . . .

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Is it any wonder we see our people when the national song is being played they don't stand to attention? Many do not.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Well, anyone who is Caymanian should, at the very least, stand in reverence of this country during those times.

Madam Speaker, I leave my colleagues and your good self with that.

The Speaker: Honourable Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, the trouble with the processes in this country is that we as legislators who always, and some more than others, worry about the vote and not about the systemic problems, and not about fairness. And when the trouble comes is when we, as legislators, must be involved in these sorts of situations ourselves. If we all tell the truth, we look around the world, and I don't

know of any country that status or citizenship is granted by the Parliament. I don't know. I don't know which country you would find it in. Not in the region of the moon would you find it. No!

Yes, Cabinets and leaders have certain prerogatives; they assist people and are able to grant citizenship. Ministers are able to grant by just seeing, because they don't necessarily do the work in some instances of granting work permits and all sorts of things. They do not even bother with boards. But which country? And the problem comes up when as Cabinet we have to do it, or through the process as it is now here in this House.

We can never satisfy people. And then, Madam Speaker, just listen to the debate, and you see the gaps in what people are saying, how they walk on eggshells because it's close to an election. And they talk about you have two people now before us and so because one supports and is a partner of one side and the next one supports another side, they walk on eggshells and never be true. To thine own self be true.

Madam Speaker, I have never been scared to stand here or over there or when I was over there to speak my mind. Never been! Never been scared to [speak] my mind. Never been! I never [speak] out of both sides of my mouth. My trouble is that I am too straightforward and it's too easy to buck me because I am being straightforward. Even to the Speaker, Madam Speaker, at times has had to cramp my style in debate because I am too straightforward.

Talk about a list, Madam Speaker, . . . before I get to that . . . Madam Speaker, the Cabinet grant in 2003 was done because of the serious abrogation of human rights of thousands of people who had been here for 10, 15, 20, some here for 40 years. And the First Elected Member for George Town said there were 16,000 people who needed to be put right. But nothing was done. They were here without any rights. Some parents with children, no rights; some children with parents, no rights. Husbands here, but not the wife; no rights she had. Wife here, but not the husband; no rights he had. All working for the people of these Islands for all those years, kicked out—kicked out!—when it suited us. I say “us” to put it broadly. Not me, Madam Speaker.

Kicked out when enough [had been gotten] of them. And those poor souls had nowhere to go. I will never forget it. One Jamaican lady was here for 24 years working in the Social Services Department. She couldn't count Jamaica as her home; she had no home to be in! She had made her home here. She had two children until one day here they told her she had to go. Where was she going? She landed on my doorstep. I said it stops here. I am going to make a case out of this if it costs me my seat.

That, Madam Speaker, all those people, and particularly the hardworking poor Jamaicans in this country—and others, mind you; not just them, but oth-

ers . . . But I can tell you, Caribbean people of African descent were the people that were pitched on in this country. They didn't want them here. They want them here to work. And I use the phrase "you don't like your neighbour, but you want to borrow his bicycle."

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is playing up to them now. I will never forget the meeting out there on the courthouse steps when I was torn down to the lowest—and we hear him call my name again in this debate—torn down to the lowest out there. Oh, everything, every manner of evil that could be said was said. Mm-hmm.

Madam Speaker, I am not saying that there were some that didn't deserve more than others. Maybe it was. I can't say I know of every one. I think there were some that were even granted that were not given. I believe that exists until today. He walked the length and breadth of this House, then, and within the halls of the Glass House, talk about a list? Which one of them didn't have someone that they wanted on that list, some friend or special person? Girlfriend, probably boyfriend. I don't know of any boyfriend, but girlfriends and different kinds of friends, Madam Speaker. Which one of them didn't have them? And some had their own list of certain *frien' frien's* who they wanted to get status. And they didn't come bring it themselves, they brought it to one of us, or they sent it through somebody else in Cabinet.

I took the licks then, Madam Speaker, as I am taking today, because I am an easy target. I have recognised that a long time. Read Psalms . . . read it. Madam Speaker, you know how far people have travelled this evening? Read Psalms 129. That goes to the core of what I believe.

I am an easy target for them. I am. But this is what my Bible tells me: **"Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth, may Israel now say:**

Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth: yet they have not prevailed against me.

The plowers plowed upon my back: they made long their furrows.

The LORD is righteous: he hath cut asunder the cords of the wicked.

I may have sins, but it is not going to be one that treats people bad, Madam Speaker. My mother always told me you spit in the sky it falls in your face. If you harm people's children, your children are going to sup salt someday and you are going to be paid back for it. No! I am not that type. I will never be, Madam Speaker!

I am not going to stand in this House and cuss people who got status and then get on a church platform and talk about how much we love Jamaicans. Ho, ho, ho, h-o-o. Not McKeeva Bush, Madam Speaker. No! Or I ain't going to any reception to tell them how much I love Jamaicans when they stood on that courthouse step and railed against me giving them status.

What else should be known, Madam Speaker, is that the 16,000 people that the then Leader of the Opposition (and he became the Leader of Government Business, and is now still the First Elected Member for George Town) spoke about, that some of them were going to court. And the facts are, had they gone to court for judicial review, the floodgates would have been opened for 16,000 people. That is not fancy talk or political talk, Madam Speaker, it is a fact, because we had that many here. We had that many here and they still speak out of both corners of their mouths now saying it was such a bad thing. They said it was completely unsatisfactory, chaos, unprecedented chaos . . . unprecedented chaos? The same ones they are looking their votes now, though!

Oh, Member for East End, you are a good boy these days.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, you know, we have got to stop being hypocrites. We cannot build this country just us by ourselves. It would have been good when we were 10,000, but look at us when we were 10,000 of just "us" and what we had. We had nothing! Madam Speaker, we couldn't even get a good education. Not a scholarship to be given. And then we moved up 15,000.

It wasn't until 1976 when we could get better houses, when we could expand our houses and we could separate our children. Mind, some people went too far. But, Madam Speaker, we cannot build a nation by ourselves. And that has got to be one of Cayman's most telling faults and problems in the future, because if we go back to saying that we don't need people here, then woe be onto us if we don't see how many businesses have closed down (they claim) because business has gone. Population has gone down. People have gone. Look at it.

Madam Speaker, there are some things that we have to live with and some things that we have to accept. It would have been good, maybe. I don't know who, but maybe some people would have loved it much better. And they say when we were small we never had all these people around us and it was better. Better? Yeah. We never had any economy. None! A vast majority of us didn't even have inside toilets. We didn't have running water until we started to develop. And we cannot develop this country by ourselves. And we cannot do it with two people.

Now, yes, we must be very, very choosy of whom we allow in. But we have to have systems, Madam Speaker. This system is not one. I will vote here today because I know both people. I know how good they have been. It was only talked about one. And that's why I said just now about walking on eggshells and how we can be, I think, not fair in the debate because you are praising one. Listen, both of

them gave during the hurricane. Come, come my friends. Both of them have done tremendous good.

My friend from North Side, I wouldn't make small of the fact that Mr. Chandhi helped the Caymanian who needed life and death treatment and could go to India and get it because of Mr. Chandhi. You don't make light of that. But, you know, each to his own. And I think this debate is all about our own conscience. But this is not the process. As much as those who put it in place now get up and pump their chests to say this is the best thing, we cannot be all things to all people. No, we can't. And, unfortunately, that's what this kind of legislation does.

Where in the world (I repeat) do you go to the House of Parliament, National Legislature, National Assembly, whatever they call it, and the representatives sit down and debate by a motion, who should get citizenship? Where? Tell me where. And the only way that any of those who come here can buy our business, any foreign national, whether they come from Timbuktu or America or the West Indies, or Europe, wherever, foreign nationals can't buy any business in Cayman unless Caymanians agree to sell their business! When are we going to stop blaming the foreign national and look at what we ourselves are doing? And when are we going to say to them, *Well, when?*

But, Madam Speaker, suppose I have a business and I don't have the funds and it's dying. What do I do? To get a partner, one that I can live with, that should be my prerogative. There should be guidelines, yes. And so guidelines will come through some sort of legislative mechanism. But it should not ever try to rule out the fact that I have a business, I have a real estate company. I have never chosen to go into any business regardless of what other people think. Got none! Had the opportunity to do it. Mind, ever since the crash, it's been a crash. But I ain't taking on anybody as partner. It's the only little thing that my wife and I have. I ain't doing so. And I am not fronting for anybody. Never did, not going to do it now. But if I chose to sell it to someone or part of it to someone, that's my business—not the state—as long as it is done through proper legislative mechanisms.

So, Madam Speaker, let us all understand that we may think we are smart in this House and that we can build stories and that nobody can see through it. We are not smarter than anybody. Hear what I tell you? People see through what we say and how we say it. People see it. And people's memories are much longer than we think. Some don't like me because of status grants. I know. They got a benefit off of it. I know. We know how it went. Some sit on radio shows today and cuss me about it and they were part and parcel of it. Ha, ha! Anyway, Madam Speaker . . .

In regard to the Motion as it stands before us, if any Member, as the Leader of the Opposition was talking about what should have been given to him . . . Listen, a piece of legislation, Madam Speaker, is put to this House. A motion is put to this House. My job

when I didn't have staff, when I was on the backbench or in Opposition, I did my research. I would call up the Member responsible and say, *Tell me a little bit about this. Do you have any information?* He might chose to say, *No, I ain't telling you.* And that's what the last Government used to do to me. But if I wanted to know more about the two gentlemen, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, I would have called the Deputy Governor and said, *Give me the bundle. Tell me about it. Tell me what information you have. I've Googled and I can't find any more. I have done my part. Give me something.* It is the easiest thing to do. It is what we are supposed to do. A motion comes then you are supposed to do your research.

If you can't find it, if it is, as I said, not Googleable (if that's a word!) . . . if you can't find it on the Internet, go to the Member. Don't come and walk on eggshells and speak out of both corners of your mouth. Don't, because you have one friend, want one, and you are doing the other one for political expediency. Not me! Not me! I said we took it because there were true extenuating circumstances. Thousands of foreign nationals, in particular those of African descent in this Caribbean, that lived here for years, did not have any rights and were getting to the point where judicial review was coming upon us. If we hadn't, those 16,000 people would have opened the gate wide.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: I am being told that I am repeating myself. Perhaps I am doing that for emphasis because they are the prime ones who criticised me on the courthouse steps about giving the status. Yet they come here with this system, as I said, I don't know what country you would go and find it, and think that this is the best thing in the world. One of these days you'll find out. I might not be here. You will find out how good it is, how good you can please people.

So, Madam Speaker, I give my support to this Motion, to the two people. I know the good they have done. We cannot build a nation by ourselves. And we want people that have the wherewithal to help us to build, people of good character, people who are legal. That's what we want and that's what we have in these two individuals. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

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

Minister of Education.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Oh, unna thought Rollie was going to make unna get away too.

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin: Madam Speaker, it would be remiss of me not to say a few words—and at the hour, brief words—on what is a first.

Madam Speaker, having lived through the era of leadership and politics that I have over these last 12 years, it is quite a journey for this community that has brought us to this point.

Let's be clear about something. A Member made reference to this Motion and what is before us, being (and I quote because I wrote the words down) "up to the Government" if these people are worthy. Madam Speaker, the last time I checked, every single Member in this House is going to have the ability to vote yes or no. It is not up to the Government whether or not these people are worthy.

The law is clear. I thought the Deputy Governor, the Honourable First Official Member, did a god job in explaining to the House and to those who may be listening and may not be aware of how the Immigration Law operates about how we got to this stage. The Immigration Board makes the submission to Cabinet, the recommendation. Yes, the Cabinet has to bring it forward, but it is quite clear what the intent of the legislation is and what the actual result of the legislation is. The result is where we are today, in the House, where all 15 elected Members have the right to cast a vote, yes, or no. This is not about the Government saying whether or not these people are worthy. It is up to each of us individually to decide for ourselves whether the case that has been put forward is meritorious or not.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if in the year 2012 it is acceptable to say that we don't personally know who people are. It is interesting who we know and who we don't know at particular points in time. I dare say that if these Islands that had a late season storm like we did back in 1998 when the storm came from the south and we were spared. But had we not been so lucky, I bet there would be many in this House who claim not to know who the people are that we are talking about, how conveniently they would have known who the people are.

The easy position to take is to pander to the crowd, to say what we believe the crowd wants to hear us say. The easy position is to take the ultraconservative approach because we know that when it comes to immigration, our community has forever been very conservative.

Of course, interestingly, that conservative shield comes off when it's our helper, our boyfriend, our girlfriend, or husband or wife, or son's wife, or gardener, or handyman, or employee in that corner shop that you have trusted for a decade and a half, shows up early, stays until the last customer leaves and we can trust. Funny how when it comes down to those relationships we can be most brave. But when

we want to take the convenient spot we quietly crawl in and say, *I don't know. Wish I'd known more . . .* I thought the Honourable Deputy Governor did a good job explaining the details to this House about the contributions that these members have made to our community, these two persons being considered.

It is quite easy also to have those shifting goal posts. A person can make a contribution, significant. But then the goalposts shift and say, *Well, you may have committed and done a lot but I didn't see you out there working with your own two hands.* I could never, Madam Speaker, shift goalposts like that.

This little community . . . there are too many of us in this House and, by extension, the wider community, taken for granted. Absent about three other places on the face of God's earth, you cannot find, but for about four communities on planet earth, where wealth top to bottom is concentrated in such a small population. I have spoken in this House for 12 years trying to make one simple point. We have built great wealth in these Cayman Islands on other people's money. We built it on the backs of tourists who come here. We built it on the backs of developers who came here. We built it on the backs of financial services that came here and pumped in billions of dollars over the last few decades. Do we believe that we can get 10,000 plus hedge funds registered here and that isn't someone else's money from somewhere paying the fees to register them, paying the lawyers' fees to set them up, paying the auditors' fees to audit them, paying the administrators' fees? All of which have created employment and scholarship opportunities in this country.

I keep hearing all of these references to the "good old days." I know this much: I haven't been on this earth very long. But I was told many times by my parents, "Be careful of anyone who comes preaching about the good old days, because you know what they are like? They are like the rich man who says money isn't everything. Money isn't everything until you are poor." Just like the good old days were grand, unless you are the person who at 11 years of age had to go so the family could put blocks on top of each other so that you could stand on them to wash someone else's clothes.

It's hard for me, Madam Speaker, to be raised as the son of a domestic helper and the son of a painter and have any flare for good old days. So I apologise to no one for absolutely fundamentally disassociating myself with those lies and falsehoods that we like to paint when we are not 100 per cent comfortable. When the economy is on the upswing, the good old days were bad. A terrible thing! When we have a small episode of crime which pales in comparison to anywhere else on the face of this earth, the good old days are grand. Then, when it quiets down, [there's] no place like home.

When we can go to Miami on the shopping trips, come back with the suitcases stuffed, the good old days don't seem to be in our consciousness. How

have we built these Cayman Islands? We built these Cayman Islands with a lot of Caymanian hard work, but a lot of foreign hard work as well. We built it, when we look nationally, with a small percentage of Caymanian wealth and a huge percentage of international wealth.

I have said many times that when people hear the term “foreign direct investment” in this country all people can think about is bricks and mortar—running up blocks, building condos, building office buildings, building hotels. That’s foreign direct physical investment. What we don’t understand, or refuse to understand, is the amount of jobs and opportunities that are built in this country through many, many forms of foreign direct investment. It just so happens that the two individuals to whom this Motion applies have contributed great amounts of money to direct investment in business, and direct investment in development.

We say we want a fairly large number of wealthy persons residing in this country who invest and while they invest many Caymanians benefit. We say we don’t want it concentrated too much in any one person. Yet, Madam Speaker, when we have this opportunity for debate, all we talk about is that we don’t know the people well enough and we are going to stick to our position because our position is well known in the land. Well known positions don’t mean they are right!

This country is better off from the contributions of these two individuals. I dare say, Madam Speaker, that both have made, when you look on the balance, a real positive contribution to our community. I agree with the Honourable Premier when he says that whilst we may tout what we are doing here and say that this constructive legislation is a great thing, that we ought to understand it is quite unusual that we are, as a national House of Assembly, debating who should get Caymanian status or not. The Member for East End spoke to getting rid of boards.

So, naturally we continue to have these struggles with where Immigration should lie, even at this level. We still have Members who are not satisfied with the current process and structures. What we know is that there is no win when it comes to Immigration. There is no way in the world that anyone who is an elected representative is going to win when it comes to taking positions on Immigration, in particular in small countries. Just look at how much the United States has debated this issue and can’t come to a consensus—and they have 300-plus million people—admitting that if they got rid of all their illegal immigrants, their economy, in particular California, Texas, would collapse, two of the bigger states in their union.

So, Madam Speaker, we ought not to forget that this whole business and debate around Immigration and Immigration matters is one that every country grapples with. Oh, we can say that today, 26 November 2012, all 15 Members had an opportunity to have their say, and that the public has the opportunity to

know in the most open of circumstances who is being put forward for Caymanian status under this particular section. I dare say that we will probably get a cry pretty soon that they all should come here. Because, Madam Speaker, there are many others who qualify under other sections of the law that still go through the Board process, and the Board decides who will get Caymanian status.

I dare say that if people in our community have put these individuals forward that, irrespective of the fact that they have permanent residency, there is a provision under the law for this to happen and we ought to execute and carry out our responsibility now as elected Members and say, *Do we believe that the two individuals deserve Caymanian status or not.* That is certainly what this legislation calls for and that is what every one of us has to do.

I believe that given the explanation and the details that have been provided to this House that we do have two persons who meet the criteria and fit the bill in regard to the spirit and intent of what this section of the law, which was brought into force in 2005, was intended to do. It is now up to all of us to make that decision and to vote “yes” or “no.”

Madam Speaker, the Member for East End spoke at great length about how people’s rights (and I will paraphrase what he said), “Caymanian’s rights” are being trampled on. And that Immigration legislation shouldn’t be so intrusive. It’s getting into people’s bedrooms, he said. It really would be remiss of me if I didn’t remind this House before I sat down that, yes, he may have painted a case that all of us ought to take note of, but, Madam Speaker, I hope we are not going to be so hypocritical today that we are going to conveniently erase from our minds all of the atrocities that happen in this country day after day in regard to non-nationals and immigration as well, because we have to be balanced in whatever we preach. We can’t just preach to the crowd, in particular, the crowd that can vote.

How many of us, and which ones of us in this House, have had non-nationals come to us, in particular women who are going through domestic abuse and other forms of abuse, but have Caymanian spouses who are holding that over their heads. On the opposite side of the spectrum we have marriages of convenience. I am reminded by a colleague that that abuse, physical and mental, can go both ways. And he’s quite right, because I do know of a couple of situations where it is the non-Caymanian male spouse who is having that married card played over his head.

So, Madam Speaker, what we have to understand is that we can legislate all we want, but irrespective of how much we legislate, irrespective of what we put in the hands of the Board, irrespective of how great a checklist we create, and irrespective of how much we handle administratively, the law is the law; but humans are going to be human. Whether you have a non-Caymanian spouse who is taking ad-

vantage of a Caymanian and involved in a marriage of convenience, or we have a Caymanian spouse taking advantage of a non-Caymanian spouse and waving that marriage certificate of their head, a Caymanian business owner waving a work permit over a non-national's head, it comes down to the decency of humans and humanity.

The day that any of us think that we are going to create immigration legislation and processes that are going to be so airtight that it takes the humanity out of the situation, we are just kidding ourselves. If people are going to do the wrong thing for the wrong reasons, if people are going to be, deep down inside in their hearts, bad people, neither this House nor any future House is going to ever legislate around that.

What resides in any person's heart, and in particular these two individuals, I don't know. Only God knows that. What I can say is that based on the construct of the legislation and based on the evidence that is before us in this House, I believe that the two individuals meet the spirit of what was intended in this section. Therefore, I will offer my support.

So, Members, it is easy for us to try to describe one side of the ledger and our particular side of our Immigration based on a particular complaint we may have gotten yesterday. There is a big picture in Immigration. The fact of the matter, whether we like it or not, is that it is a reflection of humanity. It is a reflection of how people treat each other. It is a reflection of how people behave. Immigration will never be right and will never get it right as long as people behave in some of the ways that all of us know people behave, as long as we get the complaints we are getting.

So, I completely agree with the Member for East End when he made the point that irrespective of how a person is Caymanian (I am paraphrasing here), we ought to be treated with that dignity and respect and in the same way.

Madam Speaker, we have before us, I believe, a pretty straightforward and simple Motion. It is up to us to decide and vote what we believe in regard to the two individuals before us. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Minister of Education.

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 on the mover of the Motion to present his reply to present his reply.

Honourable Deputy Governor.

The Deputy Governor, Hon. Franz Manderson: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I want to thank everyone for their contribution. I just want to respond to a few points.

Firstly, the Member for North Side did make a valid point in that, yes, there have been a number of changes to the Immigration Law and new types of residency facilities offered. But section 20(1)(e) does allow for the Motion that we have here to be laid and the Government is duty bound to follow that Law. For the Government not to do so would be an abrogation of their duty.

The Member also mentioned that there was no evidence, that he couldn't find anything on Google or in the *[Caymanian] Compass* in relation to the contribution that these two gentlemen have made. I think from having the information in front of me, it is obvious that these two persons have not advertised their contribution. They have done so in secret and I think that's why the information was not readily available.

Moving on, the Member for East End raised a point in relation to section 24 of the Immigration Law and question 19 on the form. We are aware of this issue and the complaint made has been viewed seriously and I understand has been properly addressed and the application in question should be dealt with this week.

But I do want to, say in defence of the Immigration Department, having spent a lot of my time there, having sat on the boards, that a lot of these policies and procedures are there for a reason in that the Board does receive a significant [number] of applications that provide false information and, yes, asking for proof of a divorce has turned up a number of cases of bigamy. So, it's not that the Board wants to get into people's bedrooms, but certainly the Board feels it is duty bound to sometimes test the applications and determine that persons have provided the Board with correct information.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Governor, Hon. Franz Manderson: So, Madam Speaker, I just want to sum up by saying that the information provided here shows that these two gentlemen have made significant, not only financial contributions to our economy, they have helped in performing lifesaving activities which, as the Honourable Premier said, should not be taken lightly. They have gone out of their way to help us in times of crisis during Hurricane Ivan, and additionally, they have made tremendous contributions to our charities, something that we all should be grateful for.

These are special individuals, people who have come to Cayman who have assimilated into our community and they deserve the right to be Caymanian to be grated and I would ask all Members to support the Motion. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Deputy Governor.

The question is: BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Immigration (Grant of the Right to

be Caymanian) Order, 2012, be affirmed by the Legislative Assembly pursuant to the provisions of section 20(1)(e) of the Immigration Law (2011 Revision).

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

Ayes and one audible No

The Speaker: I think the Ayes have it.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, can I have a division please?

The Speaker: Madam Clerk.

The Clerk:

Division No. 12

Ayes: 12

Hon. W. McKeeva 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
Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr.
Mr. Anthony S. Eden
Mr. V. Arden McLean

Noes: 1

Mr. D Ezzard Miller

Absent: 2

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts
Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell

The Speaker: The result of the Division: Ayes: 12; Noes: 1; and 2 Absent.

Agreed by majority on division: Government Motion No. 5/2012-13 re: Grant of the Right to be Caymanian Order, 2012, passed.

The Speaker: When we started this sitting this afternoon—and I notice the conversation is continuing—when there is nothing in our Standing Orders to back up a particular order, you turn to Erskine May's rules of behaviour for Members not speaking: **“By the resolution of 10 February 1698 . . .”** (That's how far back it goes.) **“. . . and the [16] February 1720, Members are ordered to keep their places.”**

So, if there is any doubt about the position of this House and of this Chair, Members will remain in their places. I have said before, I have given latitude to Members moving around for consultation, but when it comes time to vote, please find your chair and vote from your chair. That is the correct procedure.

Now, can we proceed with the rest of the Order Paper for today?

OTHE BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Private Member's Motion No. 2-2012/13— Education Fund [Deferred]

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Order please.

Fourth Elected Member for George Town.

[pause]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, there is a desire to defer motions on the Order Paper. I guess we are looking for the appropriate timing to come back on those motions. There could be other business on 10 December, I'm not sure. So I think I could adjourn this House, or ask that this House be adjourned until the next Sitting. And then other business on the Order Paper will have to be carried over.

Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr., Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, if I might just suggest that because we are uncertain as to whether there will be another sitting, that the safe thing to do is that they are carried forward to the next Sitting or the next Meeting. Otherwise, you run the risk that they will fall away if the House does not resume again until another Meeting is called next year.

The Speaker: Honourable Premier, would you like to word that for me?

ADJOURNMENT

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Madam Speaker, if Members are in agreement, and it sounds like everybody wants to go that route, then I move that this honourable House be adjourned and that the [remaining] business on the Order Paper be deferred until the next Sitting or Meeting of the House, whichever one is the earliest.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: Don't anticipate it please.

The question is that this honourable House do adjourn—

Some Hon. Members: Aye

Mr. Dwayne S. Seymour, Third Elected Member for Bodden Town: Oh my!

The Speaker: —until . . . and that the remainder of the business on the Order Paper be deferred until the next Sitting or next Meeting, whichever is earlier.

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

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

At 6.25 pm the House stood adjourned sine die.