



**CAYMAN ISLANDS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
ELECTRONIC VERSION**

2016/17 SESSION

3 June 2016

*Fourth Sitting of the First Meeting
(Pages 117-138)*

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

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

PRESENT WERE:

SPEAKER

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

MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

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

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

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

ELECTED MEMBERS

GOVERNMENT BACKBENCHERS

Mr Roy M McTaggart, MLA	Second Elected Member for George Town
Mr Joseph X Hew, MLA	Sixth Elected Member for George Town

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, OBE, JP, MLA	<i>Leader of the Opposition</i> , First Elected Member for West Bay
Mr Bernie A Bush, MLA	Third Elected Member for West Bay
Capt A Eugene Ebanks, JP, MLA	Fourth Elected Member for West Bay

INDEPENDENT MEMBERS

Mr Anthony S Eden, OBE, JP, MLA	<i>Deputy Speaker</i> , First Elected Member for Bodden Town
Mr Alva H Suckoo, MLA	Fourth Elected Member for Bodden Town
Mr Winston C Connolly, Jr, MLA	Fifth Elected Member for George Town
Mr D Ezzard Miller, MLA	Elected Member for North Side
Mr V Arden McLean, JP, MLA	Elected Member for East End

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
THRONE SPEECH AND BUDGET ADDRESS
FIRST MEETING OF THE 2016/17 SESSION
FRIDAY
3 JUNE 2016
11:01 AM
Fourth Sitting**

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

The Speaker: Good morning.

I will call on the Honourable Minister responsible for Education to say prayers today.

PRAYERS

Hon. Tara A. Rivers, Second Elected Member for West Bay: Good morning. Let us pray.

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

Bless our Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth II; Philip, Duke of Edinburgh; Charles, Prince of Wales; and all the Royal Family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Premier, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Leader of the Opposition, Ministers of the Cabinet, ex-officio Members and Members of the Legislative Assembly, that we may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of our high office. All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake.

Let us say The Lord's Prayer together: *Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name. Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.*

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

The Speaker: Please be seated.

The House is now resumed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OR AFFIRMATIONS

The Speaker: None.

READING BY THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER OF MESSAGES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Speaker: None.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

The Speaker: None

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND OF REPORTS

The Speaker: None.

QUESTIONS TO HONOURABLE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

The Speaker: None.

STATEMENTS BY HONOURABLE MEMBERS AND MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

The Speaker: None.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

The Speaker: None.

OBITUARY AND OTHER CEREMONIAL SPEECHES

The Speaker: None.

RAISING OF MATTERS OF PRIVILEGES

The Speaker: None.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILL

SECOND READING

APPROPRIATION (JULY 2016 TO DECEMBER 2017) BILL, 2016

DEBATE ON THE BUDGET ADDRESS AND THE THRONE SPEECH TOGETHER WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY STATEMENT

The Speaker: Before calling for any other Member to debate, I will recognise the Honourable Premier to acknowledge the visiting dignitaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PREMIER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Premier, Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin: Madam Speaker, good morning.

Madam Speaker, we have visiting with us from the British Virgin Islands the Minister for Health, the Honourable Ronnie Skeleton, and his Chief Officer. We had a very engaging meeting this morning to talk about their potential use of certain facilities in Cayman.

[Continuation of debate thereon]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

Does any other Member wish to speak? Does any other Member wish to speak? Might I remind Members that is customary to call three times and then the debate will be shut down?

I recognise the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, you know I wasn't going to speak in this debate.

Some Hon Members: Ooh!

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: And Madam Speaker, pray don't take this as part of my budget speech. Madam Speaker, I awoke this morning to have the *Cayman Compass*, front page, on my table criticising us. Its bold headline, "**Baines departs citing political interference.**"

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: I'm gonna tell you whose paper it is in a few minutes.

And, Madam Speaker, in the same paper is the editorial, "**Missing boaters: The police, Baines were right.**" Not strange to me because I am concerned, Madam Speaker, in our democracy the positioning of the written word and how it panders to who they want it to pander to. I am concerned when two newspapers fight the Government for their advertising budget. I didn't want to begin upset, and I do hope by the time I get to my budget debate I will come a little bit lower.

Madam Speaker, I am a legislator. I won eight elections. I have been involved in public life for much longer than these 32 years. I have a responsibility to question matters and to do so responsibly. My motion on the matter of the five missing persons made no personal recitals. In these headlines he says that they were lies and we were malicious and vindictive. We made no personal recitals in my motion, if anybody recalls my motion. If I am going to speak to an issue, I am going to speak to an issue by way of motion, I certainly set out the entire matter as best as I can. I am no lawyer. But since the *Compass* is questioning the work of the legislators and questioning our integrity, really, and says that it agrees, as it usually does, with Baines, that it was only to smear him, Baines is talking absolute rubbish!

My motion, as I see it, contained no recital to enumerate the many, many, matters, the many problems, the faults of the Commissioner of Police, the leadership. And what gall, Madam Speaker, for him to say that the motion was brought to smear him. What gall! Madam Speaker, look at the situation in country, not just today, when we have had three to four really serious robberies out of his own police station—robbed the police station three or four times. Not only went into the container loaded with drugs, which we don't know where those drugs went, whether in fact it was consumed some on the Island or whether it was part of some transshipment deal or what! But the liar is, Madam Speaker, the lies were told when the Commissioner came out and said, *There was no robbery*. Don't we all recall that? I am sure we do. He came out and said that there was no robbery; not once, but twice. And the next time they went and stole, what did they steal? Three motorcycles, not once, but twice. And then we must not question because of what? Where he comes from? Well, you all know where I stand about that.

Madam Speaker, my motion was asking for a review. Remember what I wanted? A judicial review and that is what I contend should have taken place because the two justices that we agreed on to work with the Englishman that they brought down who they call him the Commander, what happened? We are going to get our report from the two of them. And I can tell this world that Justice Mary Lawrence is a woman of impeccable character—no, she didn't win any elections, but nobody in this honourable House can question her honesty and her integrity and her love of

these Cayman Islands. Nobody can do that. And you know what? We can't question her capabilities either because she is an intelligent woman and the truth is, my choice, and what we agreed on, on this side, was because we knew that they could not dig that hole so small that Mary Lawrence wouldn't find it. And we know that when she found it, she could very well articulate on paper a proper report.

My motion was done because of the conflicting public row with the Commissioner, the family, and others. Because I could not understand what had happened to the five missing persons and it was at that point I publically questioned what had happened. I did not, Madam Speaker, and Members perhaps don't know this, but I did not even visit the big family here in George Town—yet—because I wanted no one to say I was taking sides. So I didn't go to visit the family. But I had a constituent who was part of the five. I did speak to his uncle because his uncle is a pastor in my district. The young man lived five houses away from me, him and his family. And I knew him [since] he was in primary school, playing in the football league that I helped manage. I wasn't about to take any sides. And then there were two children and two other adults [who] were missing from the District of George Town.

No matter, Madam Speaker, who they are, no matter the colour of their skin, no matter whether they may come from the moon, or they come from the United Kingdom, or they are Caymanians, my duty is to do the right thing. And the right thing was to have the matter reviewed by an independent source, or sources. Unfortunately, as I had my doubts then, and I spoke so publically, we have to question how independent it was. We will get a report from the two justices that we appointed—your side and our side. We will get a report from them.

I will say that I did speak to Ms. Lawrence and she said that the report that is tabled here, they did not see before it was tabled. She says that they gave a set of recommendations (our two appointed justices), none of which are in the report that was laid here the other day by the Deputy Governor. Yes, they saw a preliminary report. They gave their recommendations, but they have not seen, and as we know, the report that came back was not signed by either of them. What strikes me plenty about that, Madam Speaker, is that when you read the report it says that they were called in to observe. We didn't think they were going to observe—now, watch the words. The next section says they were supposed to work, but the report says they were called to observe. We will hear from Ms. Lawrence and from Mr. Nixon of how much or how good were they able to do any work. Or was this the whitewash that I anticipated and that I complained about? Remember what I said in the dining room? It has got more whitewash in that limekiln that uncle Eli used to have.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Limekiln. You know what that is?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Uncle Eli.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts, Minister of Planning, Lands, Agriculture, Housing and Infrastructure: Oh! I know what limekiln is.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Okay, I know you know.

Madam Speaker, what I say to Mr. Baines, there is no evidence in court about me lying. There is evidence in court which says who are malicious, and who was not telling the truth. I am cautioned in my own mind, Madam Speaker, that the word "liar" or "lie" is unparliamentary. And there are reports and documented evidence also from the United Kingdom given by witnesses in the United Kingdom as to who don't tell the truth. I am struck by his departing words. He said, "He made the decision to leave the Cayman Islands." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE] He made the decision to leave. What does that mean?

An Hon. Member: He quit.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Does it mean that he quit? Well, if he quit why did we pay him \$100,000-something for? Now, I don't mind. I would have paid \$200[,000] just to see him go if I was Minister of Finance. Get rid of him and, *go and may God be with you*. I would have paid him off, you can believe that. You know I did agree with that with Balandyne. [He] didn't want to go either. But we paid him and said, *Go on about your business*.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yes, that would be a good investment. They count lime lizards and pay for that, I don't see why we can't pay him and make him go.

Madam Speaker, you will know, you were part and parcel of the administration when we spent in 2009 to 2012, \$144,000 million to help Baines control crime in this country. And the more we helped him—and I know that this administration did the same thing—I know that they helped and I know that they put money for him. You know where some of the money went? Go buy equipment in the Governor's office for him to spy on us. You don't know that? Yeah, I know it.

An Hon. Member: For the room.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yeah, that room when you go in, you got to stand and take a picture. Then you stand in the cubicle and they X-ray you, and then you go through a door, and after that you don't know what happened.

[Laughter]

An Hon. Member: Oh my goodness!

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: And I am not being disrespectful to Her Majesty's representative. I am just telling you the facts.

Madam Speaker, this is not done yet; believe you me. I am waiting to see what our two appointed justices recommended and whether they believe that this report is fair and just. I have my concerns about it.

I am really, really surprised and disappointed that the *Cayman Compass* takes such a stance to question work of legislators in the manner that they have done. As I said, I am very well concerned about what I see the fight going on in this country to get Government's budget for advertising. And you cannot have a free press, Madam Speaker, if that is the problem. That's an observation, Madam Speaker. I hope they say that's not the truth, or that is not the facts. That is my observation. And I have been long enough, I wasn't born yesterday. I have been here long enough and I have been in this House long enough to see operations over many governments. I don't like what I see. If I have not been doing my work, then ask me if it is right for any media, with PR contracts, to write an editorial condemning the people's elected representatives for trying to do their job. If we hadn't done anything, perhaps it would have been a *Compass* editorial. And I have good friends there, you know that.

This stinks to high heaven and I am fed up in our little democracy with the game playing with people who are birds of passage. I man born here; I have nowhere else to go. My grandfather's and great-grandfather's bones are in the North West Point Cemetery and here I live and move and have my being and here is where I want my bones to rest. None of them love these Cayman Islands, and none of you love it any more than McKeeva Bush. I may not be right. I never declared that I was an angel, not perfect in any shape or form. Sometimes only a sinner, saved by Grace, but I know what I am seeing cannot be good for us, nor our children, and my good friend from Bodden Town, our grandchildren which we prize. It cannot be good for them. What I see happening here. For people to go out and do what they please and ridicule you as they please and they feel, and ladies and gentlemen of the Honourable House, we had better take stock and better understand just what is happening around us, for we are divided and we are conquered. Pray, Premier, that I am wrong. Pray.

Madam Speaker, that was my introduction. I hope you don't hold it as part of by budget speech.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: I don't have a problem with it.

Thank you, Premier. I hope when I sit down you don't get up.

[Laughter]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, let me begin, I have been through too many Governors and many presidents of this Chamber who are Governors. Thank God I saw some of that pass. I was instrumental, me and my good friend, Mr. Roy Bodden, who is now the President (and a good one) of the University College of the Cayman Islands (UCCI). We were able, after, I think, three motions to move the Governor out of this House, who was the chairman of—

An Hon. Member: President.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: —was president, presiding officer, and so we have seen. . . and I should say, my colleague, from Bodden Town—

An Hon. Member: North Side.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: —North Side. I think me and him moved one motion as well, which failed. But we were successful. So I have seen many administrations come and go.

Madam Speaker, I am looking for part of a document that I had. But—

The Premier, Hon. Alden McLaughlin: Can I give you my speech?

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: I think you can deliver that best.

Madam Speaker, I have always been respectful of Her Majesty the Queen. I have met her seven times and a fantastic lady. I always say that any time I met her she would ask about something in Cayman that she had seen. I know that she respects the Commonwealth.

Madam Speaker, our party supports human rights, but I must say we are not willing to change our culture and fly in the face of our laws. I ponder why it is the Governor is taking her precious time to give credence and stir up more controversy of opening now the LGBT conference. The churches in this country are now going to have to stand in the gap, and I am reliably informed that they will in their own way. But that takes up precious time and resources as well.

Madam Speaker, I am baffled at some of it. We are a welcoming country. That is why we have loads of outside people we need in various industries. We are a tourism destination, but we don't know, Madam Speaker, who comes here. We don't know what their private life is, and that is their private life. Let it be their private life. One of my colleagues said, *When people come with things, I don't want to hear about it. It is their business. It is their business.*

What I am finding, Madam Speaker, is what people are objecting to, of how this matter came to the forefront. People think it was done to satisfy an agenda. There was no need, Madam Speaker, in my opinion to flout it. Application could have been made and the immigration process would have been satisfied, one way or the other. But no, they have to make the racket so that it would entail testing our immigration regulations and testing the people of these Islands who really care about people who come to fly in the face of what the vast majority of Caymanians expect. And that is, the express will of Almighty God; the vast majority of Caymanians expect that. Caymanians are weary. I am finding more and more, a people who come, and rather than to do what the vast majority of people from outside who came here in the early days, and some presently have done, it seems that some of them come to show how pushy an individual they can be; always in the papers or in the blogs spouting off. And naturally our people object to those kinds of things. A good many of our people do so.

Madam Speaker, my difference is with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office [FCO]—not with the UK people, not with Her Majesty the Queen, not with all of them—with the FCO. My differences in the last term came because (1) of beneficial ownership; (2) The social legislation meaning to bring down life sentences from 25 years to 13 years, and same-sex unions; and (3) direct taxation. That is income tax, property tax, and VAT [Value-added tax]. And that started from 2009, my first trip to the United Kingdom. I told them, *No, not under my watch.* And there was no foot stomping, but firm discussion. And I didn't roll over, so they knew they would have to discredit me to get me out of the way. Respect, Madam Speaker, begets respect. If they don't respect us, most likely it breeds the same attitude among people in here and people on the outside. If our people are starving while they talk about process and misleading the world, they don't deserve respect.

Madam Speaker, I do hope that Her Majesty's representative in this country will think a little bit about the desires of the vast majority of the people of these Islands. As I said, I don't care who wants to do what in their private life; that is their business! Do what you want. I ain't joining in, but I am not changing any law, nor am I going to support any cultural move. No. Respect for everybody, yes. I welcome . . . I don't care . . . I get cussed, I lost votes because of it because I stand up for expatriates and I don't mind saying it is

more Jamaicans because they are most times the underdogs in the country. It is not that. I ain't going to change any law to satisfy their agenda; nobody's—sorry—when it is what I think the majority of people don't want, and I don't have a mandate for it.

I see Bermuda—is it?—going for a referendum on the issue and maybe other territories. Maybe that is what we ought to do if we are being pushed by them. But, you know, we subscribe to human rights, but that doesn't mean that I don't have a right, or that Mr. Eden doesn't have a right, the First Elected Member for [Bodden Town], or Mr. Tibbetts, the First Elected Member for George Town do not have a right, or the Premier doesn't have a right. We have our rights too. And that should be respected.

I will stop there, Madam Speaker. Let me begin by commending the Government in presenting the Budget.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

But too much of it misleads the public. Madam Speaker, to present an 18-month budget on the heels of the election, and not have presented the 12 months to June next year, position, for comparative purposes, can't be said to be good. I don't think so. Not good processes. I know, Madam Speaker, that we are changing year ends. I know that we have to present and consider the budget for the 18 months, ended December 31st, 2017. Madam Speaker, I would say that when the system was changed to what it is today, it took a six-month budget, so we could have done the same thing here. Now, my friend, the Honourable Minister of Finance, will say something else about that because I have already discussed it with him, but I hold to my position.

What I also know, Madam Speaker, is that the Government's accounting system can quite easily produce the projected performance for the 12 months from July 1st, 2016 to June 30th, 2017. It would have been appreciated had the Government chosen to present supplementary information so that the country can clearly see what their final 12 months in office would look like. This would have made the data provided, Madam Speaker, I think, more complete and fair. That's my feeling.

Madam Speaker, we all know that the first six-months of a calendar year, January to June, perform better than the last six months, July to December. We therefore know that the 12 months from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 would have a surplus; whereas, the six months July 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017 would or could have a deficit. And that is normal given the composition of our economy and tax base. I have no issues there and completely understand that outcome. Madam Speaker, what I know is that this Government must have a reason not to be giving relevant information and information that would be of use to this

honourable House as it considers this budget. It will also have a great value to the general public when they go to the polls next May.

Madam Speaker, this is the single reason I believe that the PPM are hiding the breakdown of this budget. I have given it, in my own simple arithmetic, a shot to estimate what the 12 months, July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 would look like if we take all of the other information provided in the Annual Plan and Estimates in the Financial Statements section starting on page 342. I have taken the monthly receipt of cash contained in the projected statement of cash flows as a guide, as to how the revenue will flow into Government coffers, as I assume, Madam Speaker, that there will not be a lot of long-standing receivables in the revenue profile. I clearly understand that this is only a guide. As I said, it is my own simple arithmetic, but it is the best I can do since the Government has not given information to this House and the general public. On this basis, here is how I can best piece together what the performance will be.

Madam Speaker, we will recall that in 2012/13 Government then, our administration, made a net surplus of \$63 million. By 2013/14, it went to \$109 [million]. And 2014/15 (and these are all unaudited), \$149 [million]. Now we go to the PPM 2015/16, it is \$140 [million]. In 2016/17, Madam Speaker, they are saying anywhere, \$104 [million]; my guess as to what the 12 months would be; and for the 2016/17, \$48 million. Isn't it that the surplus for the 12 months would greatly be reduced and therefore that is not being shown? What would be the surplus for the 12 months that I am talking about? Why is it not being shown?

Madam Speaker, these numbers are a stark contrast to the picture that the Premier and his Government has painted. The reality is that as revenues have grown, they have allowed expenditures, as much as they say have cut back, they allowed it to grow. Once again, from their own numbers, Madam Speaker, expenses grew by approximately \$36 million between being audited 2014/15 results, and the forecast 2015/16 results. And I ask, is this the reason they have tried to make the presentation, the budget, confusing before a general election?

I am going to plead with my friend, the Minister of Finance, that, this time around with the PPM, we really need that pre-election economic and financial update, because we have never had one from them. But, not saying I want to see you elected on the other side, I give that you are a very studious person. All right? However, you should make that promise.

Madam Speaker, the budget is confusing without those things I have pointed out. Madam Speaker, we must remember, which I said to the Minister of Finance, that in April 2009 they said we had a deficit of \$17 million, when, in fact, it was recorded at some \$80 million. And the Opposition or the country knew anything about this \$63 million difference. I don't

understand it, Madam Speaker. Good electioneering budget though, 2 per cent bonus.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

[It was] 2.2 per cent? Better yet. Not going to have no problem with that. I can tell you the man who makes \$3,000 or \$2,500 is not going to be very much for him; the man who makes \$12,000 or \$10,000—better. But so it goes in our makeup. As I said, I would like to see that comparative financial information.

Madam Speaker, to try to fully understand and appreciate where we are, it is necessary to look at back at where we have come from. The Government, Madam Speaker, was in the worst financial condition it had ever been in when the present Premier demitted office in 2009. We had begun in the worst recession the country and the world had ever seen in recent times, probably since World War II. The principles of fiscal responsibility, as much as they thumped their chest today, have been thrown out the window as the PPM spent on the heels of Hurricane Ivan rebuild, which took place in 2005 to 2007. As Leader of the Opposition, I warned them, and I even moved motions to try and get the Government to slow down on its spending and capital projects, but they went fool heartedly with their plans into expenditure. I will never forget the words of my friend, the Minister now, the First [Elected] Member for George Town, who told me right there, and I heard, *Not on the kindness of mornings, would I agree with you.*

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

Not throwing it out of context. Those are the words.

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts: Go ahead. Go ahead.

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

All right.

Madam Speaker, when we took office, we were faced with a budget crisis like none ever previously experienced in this country. Due to the fact that the principles of responsible financial management as outlined in our own Public Management and Finance Law have been broken. The Foreign and Commonwealth Office became empowered to have the final say over our budgets—and boy, they were in a glee. When I went there—ah! I don't want to face that again in life. Maybe I won't have to. In fact, upon my first correspondence with London after the 2009 general elections, they made it very clear that they were desirous of having a specific framework implemented to govern our financial affairs, projects particularly. This was the seed that gave rise to the framework for fiscal responsibility. This is not a framework, Madam Speaker, for tendering. Nah, it isn't about process; it is

about how we go about building buildings and having expenditure. This is a framework for fiscal responsibility. We presented two budgets where we were forced to raise significant revenues in order to get budgetary approval from the FCO. They said if we didn't do it, we wouldn't get any budget. We did this with the caveat, Madam Speaker, that we would try to control Government expenditures and that we would rollback fees on critical areas like the duty on CUC's [Caribbean Utilities Company] fuel and other areas in our economy. We could only do that once we got the budget under control.

The Premier now, who was the then- Leader of the Opposition, had lots to say about the taxes and fees we were forced to impose in order to balance the budget and rectify the mess they left behind. He especially condemned us on the increased fees we had put on the financial services industry. Madam Speaker, here is what he had to say in this honourable House.

These are excerpts from the *Hansard*, June 15, 2011. He said, **"The national tax burden still increases as this is another cost for the financial services sector to have to observe. But it is really the fees and taxes that were imposed in the preceding two years that have had a truly crippling effect on the local economy as they have impacted local businesses, average people, and the financial services sector."** [Official Hansard Report, 15 June, 2011, page 43]

On August 22nd, 2012, he said, **"And I say, Madam Speaker, that the plan must be holistic because it must look beyond the reduction of cost and unfunded liabilities. The plan must also examine revenue and tax policy."** [Official Hansard Report 22 August 2012, page 145]

Madam Speaker, on the same day he went on to say, **"So, the issue is not about new taxes and fees. The issue is about the operational expenditure continuing to spiral up and up, about the Government's failure to address the fundamental problems and reasons which underpin that particular course, that particular trajectory, and their failure to do anything to stimulate real economic activity in Cayman."** [Official Hansard Report 22 August 2012, page 146]

Madam Speaker, these revenue measures were very unpopular at the time. Did we want to implement them? Of course not! No! But we had to ensure that the good ship Cayman did not flounder, did not sink under the weight of four years of the PPM expenditure during which time the current Premier was one of the leaders, if not the de facto leader. How quickly we forget the \$80 million deficit. And I heard the Member, the Second [Elected] Member for George Town. . . you ever saw anything like that, the temerity of him? [He was] crying me down because we had raised taxes while he was part and parcel of

the group that suggested what taxes and how to place them.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Tell me it is not true. You know it is true. You know it is true. You can shuffle papers as much as you like. You know what you found. You were part and parcel of it. That's why he told the Premier in the three-way discussion—me, him and the Premier—when the two of them started fighting about who's not joining who on CITN. He said, *I'm not joining you. Never would work with you, you destroyed this country, bad expenditure.* That's what he told the present Premier. The Second Elected Member for George Town got up there, trying to thump his chest; even to that was weak.

[Laughter]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Even to that was weak.

Madam Speaker, we can't forget and everyone should be honest and upfront even if they wanted to take a pound of flesh out of McKeeva Bush, it is okay. But let's say what it was. How quickly we forget how the high school projects were done. How quickly we forget how the Government office accommodation project, no matter what the process is. Let us examine, Madam Speaker, Government's performance—and I can say, compared to the rhetoric, they have not rolled back any fees. He said that we're having such a chilling effect on financial services, and the Second Elected Member for George Town, you would know that that was the right thing, as I said. You helped to show us, or agreed with the areas, so you would know it was the right thing. They have not rolled back any work permit fees which we acknowledged should have only lasted until the economy and Government finance turned around. That is what we said. They have not controlled expenditure as they claim. They have done some, but not as much as they claim. They have not come up with any new or inventive revenue measures to end those that he claimed were having a chilling effect on the economy. They have not ensured that all the tax breaks reached the consumer. And that is what the young Member for Bodden Town was trying to say yesterday. I think even the Member for George Town on this side, Mr. Connolly who spoke, was saying the same thing.

[Pause]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: What they claim is so good, for whatever reason, is not reaching the consumer. Madam Speaker, truth is that property insurance . . . let's take a look at it (little family income). Property insurance is down a bit.

CUC down by, let's say \$200 on a bill. Ocean freight, down. All that is down, but groceries are up by how much percentage? Health insurance is up by 1,000 per cent, year on year, by some insurance companies. So, I think to complement the two Members earlier that I talked about who spoke on these, maybe the Member for North Side did too. But we are not ensuring that the tax breaks reach the consumer. They have not implemented any policies to increase real employment amongst Caymanians. So, the pretty picture is pretty dismal. They have not implemented any policies to grow the economy. They have not attracted and negotiated any new economic packages to secure our economy.

Madam Speaker, for an administration that has criticised and castigated me and the previous administration, including the Speaker, this has been the most regressive three-plus years that the country has seen in some time—well, except for 2007, 2008, and 2009. Had it not been our foresight and vision where would we be? Had I not taken hard decisions where would we be? All of the major new revenue generating ideas that this Administration boasts about were the hard work of the UDP. Let us examine the projects that they have bragged about today. The special economic zones [SEZs] and Cayman Enterprise City [CEC], UDP project; Health City Cayman Islands, Shetty Hospital, UDP project; now they brag about people coming and can come, good ministers, our friends, can come from far away as BVI and look at it and try to get some synergies. It is a good thing. That is what we envisioned.

Now, that's a one! NRA [National Roads Authority] agreement was a UDP project. Kimpton Hotel, part of the NRA agreement, UDP project; Hotel in Beach Bay, started under the UDP. I had to change the law. I got questioned too by them under it, but I did it. That's why the man could start. Ironwood Development, started under the UDP. And so, what are you going to say? You didn't get it done? Give me two hours more and I can tell you some more why we didn't get it done. But we started it, born and bred, went out and looked for it, talked to them, travelled, talked to them, and got it to where it is. That is the one that I look at and sit back and listen, and smile inwardly sometimes.

We had forgotten, as far as negotiating, the incentive packages of the Beach Bay Hotel and having opening talks on Ironwood. Maybe you can blame it on the general elections—maybe. But what is then for them to castigate us about? What have you done to generate interest and investment in our economy? The truth is that you have had dampening effect. We would be miles ahead of where we are now if those things had started from the very outset. For three years, they said, to sign the Dart Agreement. Stop talking nonsense, man! Three years? No. Political gimmickry! Only wanted to start now so that they can pile up money, get this project started, get front page

news, this PR and that PR, and boy, aren't they good at that? They can take pictures. They know how to do that good. While I shied away from them, they run to the pictures.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. Oh, yes! That's why they caught me with my mouth open that time, because I don't want to take any pictures.

[Laughter]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, once again, when they talk about stabilising Government finances, the Government has chosen political spin, and they are good at that, to make political spin on this matter.

From the table which I talked about earlier, they have acknowledged in their 2013/14 Budget that the UDP had generated a \$63 million surplus. And they all want to criticise me about all the ministries I had, but remember this, there was only five of us there, Madam Speaker. They shouldn't criticise me because I was Minister of Finance, I took the economic drivers, the hard work, tourism, planning, Cayman Airways, financial services and public finance, among other things. I thought that was necessary to move and push because in the campaign people say we want something done, you know, in 2009. Mind you, that is another thing that we got to understand. Our people too can change. They'll move on you and say you must get this done, and then next time they'll say, *Wha you done that fa?* Anyway, that \$63 [million] was in fact the second consecutive year of surplus under my leadership. Madam Speaker, to have gone from my \$80 million deficit when we took office to a \$63 million surplus, then, four short years, was nothing short of withstanding fiscal management.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Well, I'm only talking about the figures they gave us. Now, you see, that's why I wanted you to go before, you know.

[Laughter]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: So, Madam Speaker—

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Ask Ken about it.

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yeah, we asked Ken.

Madam Speaker, our work, we did it by cutting where we could cut without sending home loads of

people. And from then, if the Governor wanted to say, we were trying to cut the expenditures, *while not sending people home?* I don't know if they call it restructuring or what, but from then we were doing that. So what they are doing now is not that vastly different from what we started. Remember, I came in here and cut my salary and Mr. Tibbetts' salary? Right? We cut it?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: All right. I don't know, I give mine away most times and that's why I nah got nothing.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, that is a \$133 million improvement in the performance of the Government budget. So what is not to be proud of? So, I could stand here too and justly thump my chest, but that's not the end of it and we know that. We did it by keeping some expenditure in check, raising revenues, and being visionary with our investment partnerships strategies.

Our approach to getting firmly committed and incentivised private sector investment has made us the envy of many places in this world. And if we believe, Madam Speaker, that we don't have to give concessions, we just need to get something out of it, I think—I hope—that we all recognise by now that we have to give concessions. In the past I have had to support concessions that some feel is a “giveaway.” Anytime I was presented with a request from any local businessman for assistance, whatever it was I gave them support. The records will prove that is so. Concessions are needed and are given according to the project and its size, the economic environment at the time, and the long-term benefit to the country. That is what Caymanians can get out of it immediately, and the immediate needs of the country. These are but some of the reasons for concessions that I have in the past supported. You have to or you get lost in today's economy, where everybody is looking for the same thing that we want. Not much difference.

Madam Speaker, say what he wants, the Premier has been quite happy to paint all of our hard work red! Paint it red, and take credit for it. Truth is, if we were in school, they would be given a detention for public plagiarism. In fact, Madam Speaker, I'm hoping that the good people of George Town and the rest of the areas expel them at the next reporting session on May 24, 2017, because it is plagiarism at its best.

Madam Speaker, my friend, the Member for Cayman Brac, Deputy Premier, the Member for the sister islands, in his contributions spoke about having to meet with the cruise lines in 2013 to try to get the number of cruise passengers to where they were in 2014. Madam Speaker, the cruise lines have a two-

year planning schedule and it behoves me to say how the 2014 increases came about from his discussions in June 2013. Madam Speaker, the truth is that from 2005 to 2009, and he knows this, at that time there had been such a falling off in both cruise and stay-over tourists. He knows that. Say it's true.

The Deputy Premier, Hon. Moses I. Kirkconnell: That's not true.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Not what?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: There hadn't been a reduction?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Well, if I say a “fall-off” and I say a “reduction” what difference is it? Which school you went?

An Hon. Member: West End.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: No, he knows what I am saying. He knows what I am saying.

There had been a fall-off in both cruise and stay-over tourists. It literally took us three years of promises to get these entities again to trust our word about improvements at the airport and our assistance that we would build a cruise berthing facility, with improvements for the disastrous Spotts jetty, which was and still is a huge problem for cruise tourism. We had to promise that, and I was all out trying to get it done, because the truth is, they threatened, and if not, then they would pull. You know that is true. Am I telling the truth?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: All right. You agree with anything I'm saying, you just don't want to say it.

Madam Speaker, what the Member did not say was from 2009 to December 2012, I had been in continuous meetings with the FCC and with individual cruise lines, and I had received assurances from them that they would start to schedule more stops in the Grand Cayman, but they wanted Spotts jetty fixed. They wanted other things, which we know we tried and we didn't get where we wanted. That was the beginning. Madam Speaker, the Member can take credit, but he can't take credit for that.

The cruise lines began rerouting their ships in 2012, their ships to Asia and Europe, leaving the entire Caribbean in a negative growth position; not just

Cayman. But even so, Madam Speaker, we held our own. So, he needed to have mentioned that because of major spikes in the price of oil in 2012/13 that these same cruise ships began to reroute ships back to the Caribbean. And the increases that resulted in 2014/15 were not because of any special arrangements, but simply Cayman benefited from the world economy and the lower prices and their rerouting their ships.

Madam Speaker, that brings me to the heated discussions on cruise [tourism]. The Member knows he has no problem with me supporting cruise tourism. I fought for that and we got it turned around because the attitude was before that if you look at the speech that Mr. Tibbetts made in 2002, that was the worst thing in the world to do, to try to bring more cruise visitors.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, I was also criticised in 2011 by the now-Premier who was the Leader of the Opposition then, for not having a cruise facility after two years in office, he said. Madam Speaker, you ought to remember because the truth is you spoke in that debate. The Speaker spoke in that debate and we know when she speaks, she makes a good speech. And that was one of the best speeches that I heard her make in this House—anywhere. But, no, we didn't get it. That was a motion he moved against us, part of it was for not having a cruise facility after two years in office. Well, I doubt we will see one after four years of this Government too, but that might not be a bad thing. Maybe it may be a good thing for the country as we have time to think rather than be pushed by businesses in George Town, and spend \$300 million because we need to help the businesses, and not just them, but everybody else. But we know the big push is from businesses that have buildings and other expenditures. The taxes can go anywhere. George Town business people can't really move their buildings, but of course they can expand. And I am not criticising them, they know I have stood up for them.

Madam Speaker, the United Kingdom has had much to say about process.

[Pause]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, they're constantly telling us how to build that facility and most of the other facilities. But they made no bones about it. I don't know about to them on the next side but they did so to me. They wanted someone from their end to be involved. They wanted someone from their end to get business here. They said that plainly. Bellingham said that at Pedro Castle. They must get business here.

They talk about process and how we should build a facility. Madam Speaker, a cruise facility is needed. We need to ensure our tourism cruise product as a foundation stone in our economy is properly done. Madam Speaker, shipping as a whole will not

decrease in the future unless the bottom drops out of the world economy, as it did from 2007 to 2010, around there. But I believe, Madam Speaker, we must create proper facilities for cruise. We must create proper facilities for cargo and cruise.

Madam Speaker, sometimes, and I don't believe that we can continue the way we are trying to do it right on the doorstep of the other two that sit there. Whether we can make that hardened decision to look somewhere else, takes a lot of guts, I think, because of the power of the business people in George Town who sit on the waterfront. But I can tell you it is not a good situation to have cruise and cargo so tightly knitted as it is. As I said, not getting it done so fast and the way we wanted to do it, may be a good thing. It gives us time to think.

Madam Speaker, we need to create facilities for mega yachting. We are missing huge amounts of business. And so, since the UK wants to get business in Cayman, maybe they could come and discuss with us the development of a relevant cruise facility and an enhanced cargo facility, a mega yacht facility, to draw more shipping and the business that shipping can create. But, in that development which the UK will fund, build it, perhaps they will look at building or developing a military port which they would control here in the north western Caribbean. Madam Speaker, I know that there will be a whole lot of deep matters to consider of who control, but I believe, Madam Speaker, put it on the table for discussion to see if there is room for such a proposal. Madam Speaker, aren't we a strategic part of this end of the Caribbean for the United Kingdom? I think we are; whether we would want them that close to us, I don't know.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yes. Well, it could be a multi-faceted matter.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Project. They're not going anywhere with that one. I know them.

I think perhaps there are pluses and minuses and the people may be counting themselves too behold to who pays for it, which would be, as I said, the UK. If and when people want to move for more autonomy, well, that is something else they could think about, but you know, in all of this I am saying, I do recall and remember that Cuba has been wanting United States out of Guantanamo Bay for over 50 years.

Madam Speaker, I saw my friend, the Minister of Tourism, I didn't know if he was laughing at the idea or laughing at one more thing has come up for his cruise facility—one more thought—because remember we had the floating dock, and all these other ide-

as, but I am not ready to say yet that I am wrong. I am not saying that I am right. I am saying that maybe it is something to put on the table and discuss with them.

[Pause]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

I know, Madam Speaker, that they want to build the pier and they will say that I got sins in it that I didn't get it done, and that we had a problem in getting out Italians. I am glad we did because they didn't have the money. The Chinese had the money though. And the truth is we would have had it built by now.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

We would have had it built by now if they had left the Chinese alone. And the Chinese made all kinds of proposals to try for them, but you didn't want me to get anything done. That is the last thing in the world [that] they wanted me to get anything done. But we did proper cruise facilities, and it is not going to be long before it manifests itself well. But, do we put it there, Madam Speaker? I can tell the world this, I hope they are seeing some of the weather here, and, as I said, you know, it is good sometimes to sit back and look and listen.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

I am talking about northwesterners and the weather that hits us forefront right here.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Mm-hmm, that's a good question.

Madam Speaker, the United Kingdom, if we do this, then, they can decide whether we go where we go. Whether you go out south with it, which most people are saying go out to Red Bay area. Most people you hear talking about say it should not go here. I mean, I have been told that too. But you know, we have had tons of paper, tons of reports, tons of studies from the days of the Mr. Linford Pierson, and probably before that. Captain Charles and them in those days, they have been talking about this.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

Yes. North Sound, beautiful to look at, but I can tell you one thing, I don't know if we are going to be able to sustain what is going on there, and Government getting what out of it.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: The only person who got any snapper there is Kurt.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

And he got um tied. I agree with you, he got um tied. But—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

What?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

True?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

I don't know where you caught um, I eat um.

[Laughter]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

But, Madam Speaker, this country has some hard decisions to make, I want to be part of that. As long as the people elect me, I don't want to be on the outside and not getting anywhere. We need to work together on some of these things.

Mega yachting is a huge business. The whole Governor's Sound area would triple four or five times maybe, the value in those canals and those houses if mega yachts can get up in there. How will we do it? You leave the shoreline from probably... where? Snug Harbour and go straight down to Morgan's Harbour and you go out 300–400 feet, and you've got 20–25 feet of water, in some instances by those canals that came out there. We don't want to touch certain things because we worry about what people are going to say and what they are going to do. (I hope I got two hours left.)

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

And, we are not doing anything while we have a shipping conference provide for them and get a few dollars there. Shipping can get the real money for us and if they happen to topple our financial industry, we would have a real economy through the whole spectrum of shipping and marine operations. As I said, we wouldn't have to worry about unemployment. We would have to worry about how we control. Then we would have to worry about providing housing in the country, and all this sort of thing. You will have other worries. But I do believe that we do not need to be talking much longer on these issues. And I don't believe that you as a Government is going to get any

cruise ship pier in this term. You aren't going to get any. Uh-uh.

I have time to sit back and look and question these things that I am talking about in my mind because I want to look for greater economy. I am concerned about having to try to go to get \$300 million to go out, or \$250 million or whatever it is going to be out there, in a cost with the cruise ships, being part of it. I am concerned about that. And I can tell you, we are not going to get any going into 60 feet of water, or 30–40 feet of water and don't think that they are not going to create a lot of cost. It is going to do that.

Anyway, I am not going to spend any more time on that. But the Minister has my support. The Government has my support in continuing to find a place. I am not saying out there is going to be the place. It may be that if they don't take up any idea of anything that I have said, maybe one of places was a Pageant Beach site. Maybe that is it, but I don't believe, and I had my own struggles with it, to put a cruise ship and cargo together. You don't have much room for growth and you've got room for trouble, as we know, easy to come.

Madam Speaker, I know that my friend, Minister of Financial Services is reluctant to get up. It is not by anything that I would do him, because he has all my support in certain matters. But they can't say that my administration was irresponsible on how we managed the affairs of the Government, but yet still use our economic model and our revenue measures to accomplish surpluses they boast of, or start projects my administration negotiated. The Premier cannot speak about the special economic zones and the support he lent it, but at the same time forgot to mention that the economic city fees were strongly opposed by him and his Government when the debate regarding the special economic zones came to this honourable House. And now that he is the Premier, he certainly didn't reduce any fees in the special economic zones.

They can talk about improving the agreement, but without my foresight and vision, what would they be improving on? You see, they can duplicate, they can replicate, they can copy and paste, but they have shown time and time again that they are not creating that kind of economy. They are not good at it.

My administration which you were a part of Madam Speaker, as the Deputy Speaker, created the special economic zones. We took an idea and brought it to fruition amidst all the criticism and negative hyperbole. Yes, undue criticism, negative embellishments. We've transformed the idea of special economic zones and medical tourism into viable entities which has tangibility today and is providing jobs now, and will provide more jobs in the future for scores of Caymanians.

Madam Speaker, all they need is to listen. And while I am speaking about special economic zones, let me touch on something for a moment. The Minister responsible for Financial Services made

some remarks regarding the defensive agreement between Cayman Islands Government and Cayman Enterprise City (the developer), that was inaccurate. In part he stated here in this Legislative Assembly: “. . . **I have never seen such a lopsided agreement that had been signed originally. It removed all flexibility from Government. It even provided that Government simply engaging in discussions with a potential party carrying out similar business to CEC was a breach of the agreement by Government.**”

Let me first state, I have never pretended to be a lawyer. I am a legislator and a political representative of the people of the Cayman Islands. And my constitutional responsibility was to drive foreign direct investment and growing development in these Islands. When talks began with the original developer for the creation of a special economic zone, the HAHN Group, I felt and my advice was that the business model was a good one, creating the first zone of its kind in the western special economic zone, attracting the best of brand, attracting blue ship companies, that never saw the benefits of having a physical presence in the Cayman Islands. We as a Government, recognising the benefits, approved a general policy as regards the SEZs, with the objective of improving the condition for private sector investment within the Cayman Islands and, as such, the Government expressed its intention to pass a law to provide for and regulate the establishment and operation of special economic zones.

The developers submitted a proposal to develop in the Cayman Islands a special economic zone focused on science technology, research and academia, commerce and trade, termed the world's first global *Enterprise City*. The definitive agreement [DA] was agreed to by both parties after much discussion with key participants in driving this project forward, including the Cayman Islands Legal Department, the Attorney General's Office, senior civil servants within the Minister of Financial Services, the Department of Commerce and Investment, and the principals of Cayman Enterprise City: their legal team and other key members of their team. And this was a vigorous process, from what I recall, with over 20 versions being drafted before both sides agreed to what was finally agreed to.

I therefore find the statements of the Minister lacking. This wasn't some slap-sandwich agreement drafted on parchment paper, devoid of thought and legal opinion. To the contrary, this was a document that consumed several hundred hours of critical thought and discussion with some of the best legal, tactical and strategic minds the civil service had to offer, along with a top law firm which represented the developers, Cayman Enterprise City. To say that the agreement prevented Government from speaking, and using his quote: “. . . **with a potential party carrying out similar business to CEC was a breach of the**

agreement by Government” is nothing short of the Minister not seeming to understanding the real intent and the purpose of that special economic zone.

Many of the zones or free zones, the world over, are in jurisdictions where there is some form of direct taxation regime. So it is imperative for the host country to create free zones that protect and ring-fence companies operating within a free zone from paying many, and in some instances, any form of direct taxation because the Cayman Islands, Madam Speaker, is probably the only place in this side of the world, perhaps the last place in the world, to not have a direct taxation regime. We had to provide concessions on import duty, immigration fees, and make Government services highly efficient and streamlined. So, essentially, we had to find creative ways to differentiate a zone company from a company operating outside the zone.

We also had to ensure that the developer was protected from aggressive competition which could have hard negative consequences to its success as a technology specialising in economic zones. That isn't to say that we could not and would not speak with other developers who may have been entrusted in establishing a SEZ in another industry or sector. But it would be unreasonable for any government to expect a foreign direct investor to spend hundreds of millions of dollars and before it can begin to make a return on its investment we entertain another developer to come into the market and literally choke off the potential the original developer had, and as a result, the initiative fails.

That is not good business approach and it certainly would not be good to have ultra-high-net-worth individual [UHNWI] speaking negatively about the jurisdiction when their project fails because the Cayman Islands Government was unwilling to provide an incubation period and see the business grow, mature, thrive, and flourish. New economic zone operators can be set up. It just can't be a new zone operated as going to threaten the life of the Cayman Enterprise City. I hope that they understand that. And you can tinker with it, but it can lead to unnecessary hardship for the CEC.

The Minister knows something about law. I don't know though that he has negotiated any new industry for this country. He laughs; I hope he wasn't laughing at me because I want to tell him that even the law he claims to be familiar with, laws that as a lawyer he would have to deal with people like us, by mere lowly legislators, like myself, pass them. [I] still understand some; not all of them. Any good legislator will know, Madam Speaker, that there is always room for improvement. And I think the Government knows that. There have been scores of laws that were passed here from the 1980s to present that over time have been amended or repealed and replaced. As legislators, that is our job.

[Pause]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: You have no problem with it, but you did criticise it.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Huh?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, the original definitive agreement shows what is meant by “excluded person.” And the points beneath that section and what “free zone” means, and between those sections and what I have just laid out, will perhaps make us understand what the spirit and intent of the definitive agreement was. Also, read what it says regards obligations, representation, and warranties as it relates to the developer's obligations and that of the Cayman Islands Government.

Regarding Tech City, Madam Speaker, yes, I know all about Tech City. I think I should go and study a bit more about what the original proposal looked like, but I won't say anymore on this other than to say that the developer of the Shetty-affiliated IT project were in talks with CEC long before the Minister came on the scene, and there would not have been any conflict as we would have done exactly what he is doing now and made the necessary amendment to the definitive agreement. That is how you get business! Both CEC and Shetty-affiliated IT people saw where there were synergies that would complement and benefit one another. Again, if he would just take the time—I hope, and let me say he has read the original definite agreement—he would see that what the definitive agreement prevents is direct competition. The Shetty IT project was not competition but rather an improvement to the cluster of IT-type companies in the zone. We would have simply expanded the IT ISIC codes to include what they wanted to do or create a new park within the CEC, just as he has done with the creation of a maritime park—no rocket science.

He claims that the agreement, he says, and I quote: “. . . **the agreement contained absolutely no provisions to hold CEC accountable if there was a breach of the agreement on their part. There were no performance metrics or obligations which they were required to comply with. In fact, the agreement did not even contain an express termination provision, no matter how egregious the failure by either party.**”

Again, read the obligations, representations, and warranties as they relate to the developer's obligations and that of the Cayman Islands Government. And read Schedule 1 of the definitive agreement which outlines the timetable for having things done. If

there are other things missing from the definitive agreement, then I would say, to take that up with the Legal Department, the Honourable Attorney General's Office and the other senior civil servants who assisted in drafting this document. That was not my responsibility; I don't draft documents. I am not a draftsman. I don't draft agreements. What I can say is this, if certain things were not carried out by both the developer and the Government and the timetable in Schedule 1 was not followed, there would have been a breach of the definitive agreement and the Cayman Islands Government could have exited the agreement. So, I don't know if you want to place such stringent performance metrics in place. I don't know. But he could be mindful that there needs to be a reasonable amount of flexibility.

Let me say this too, if he had included performance metrics in the original DA, then it there would have been considerable difficulty for CEC to succeed. To begin, they had to have some flexibility. Regarding his final comment and I quote: "... **it was 'particularly offensive' that the original agreement required Caymanian technology businesses that seek government concessions to effectively operate from within CEC.**"

I would say again, the Cayman Islands because of its tax neutral regime could not reasonably provide concessions to companies that operate outside the zone if, in fact, they were eligible to apply to enter the zone and become a zoned company. If we did that, what the Minister suggested, where would we draw the line of differentiation? From the comments espoused by the Minister, I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, that I hope they didn't do any damage by trying to do some of the things he said.

[Pause]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker—

[Pause]

The Speaker: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, is this a convenient time for the luncheon break?

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yes, Ma'am.

The Speaker: We will now take the luncheon break and reconvene at 2:00 pm.

Proceedings suspended at 12:43 pm

Proceedings resumed at 2:27 pm

The Speaker: Please be seated, proceedings are resumed.

I will invite the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to continue with his debate.

SECOND READING

APPROPRIATION (JULY 2016 TO DECEMBER 2017) BILL, 2016

DEBATE ON THE BUDGET ADDRESS AND THE THRONE SPEECH TOGETHER WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY STATEMENT

[Continuation of debate thereon]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I believe that it has become an obvious fact to most, if not all of our people, that the Cayman Islands financial services industry is under attack and it is under attack by many of the larger nations who find themselves as their competitors in the same arena, and unfortunately, it seems at times that they will stop at nothing until they have destroyed it, destroyed the very industry that has helped to shape our way of life for so many decades. It has been of assistance and a help to the international arena.

Madam Speaker, let me take this opportunity to again reiterate my support for the financial services industry for I have always been and will always be a big, if not its biggest, defender. And I will continue to defend it because the services we provide are good for the Cayman Islands, good for our people, and it is good for the world of international finance, as I have just said.

Having said all of that, Madam Speaker, as I pledge my support for the financial services industry, I believe it is imperative that we do not, as the old adage says, *continue to put all of our eggs in one basket*. As a nation, as a country, we must find ways to diversify the Cayman Islands economy. For this diversification, amongst other things, will allow us to more competently deal with the sort of attacks we are now facing. It will help us to deal with any unexpected shocks that may arise to impact one or both of the existing pillars of our economy. Madam Speaker, I firmly believe that where diversification offers opportunities for greater Government revenues, greater private sector investments, and greater employment opportunities as well as other benefits for our people, that we have an obligation to seize it. I believe that such industries do exist, Madam Speaker. One such industry, and we have all heard it, is that of medical research. If you, Madam Speaker, look over, you would understand that it is important, billions of dollars of money spending. None other than Dr. Tomlinson, whom we all know, Madam Speaker, has been talking about this for quite some time. We can do our own research and we can determine our own facts, but he has been in the forefront.

The United States is the eminent world leader of major health care ideas and innovations with, I understand, in a region of \$36 billion being spent annually on medical research. But that success, since the formation of the Food and Drug Administration, the FDA, in the early 1900s brought with it multiple levels of bureaucracy and escalating costs. And that bureaucracy and costs, coupled with the other factors, are causing many small, medium, and large US research companies no other option but to begin looking outside of the United States to conduct their research and to do business. Their primary aim, Madam Speaker, is to gain the international approval from the FDA and other similar regulatory bodies around the world, but to do so in an environment with less bureaucracy that will allow them to shorten the length of time as well as, wherever possible, and reasonably possible, to lower their costs of doing business as well.

It is well within that trend, Madam Speaker, that a tremendous opportunity, I believe, resides. The figures from as far back as 1995 will show that the expenditure within the United States in medical research alone was approximately \$36 billion annually, with \$18.6 billion of which came from the private sector spending. Madam Speaker, understand this, that if the Cayman Islands can make itself attractive to these companies, and if we are able to gain a fraction of it, a more—well, some kind of investment from it, just a mere fraction of 1 per cent, will bring an additional \$360 million to the Cayman Islands every year. Madam Speaker, think of what that would mean for the Cayman Islands, for the construction of needed infrastructure projects, health care, education, and so much more. The opportunities, I believe, Madam Speaker, are tremendous.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the Cayman Islands is a place that can easily satisfy the needs of many of these companies. This is evident in the fact that even without enough effort on our part, many of these companies are already knocking at our door. We have a lot to offer here that will make the Cayman Islands an attractive place for them to do business. We have a stable government, excellent jurisprudence, sound infrastructure, a peaceful and safe working environment, excellent climate, proximity to the United States, and we do speak the English language. These, Madam Speaker, are but a few good reasons why I believe that we are poised to attract some of these research companies.

Madam Speaker, now is the time. We have an opportunity to assemble some of our brightest minds, to create the proper legislation and infrastructure that we need to withstand international scrutiny, but yet remain sensitive to the needs of the research companies. Achieve that balance, Madam Speaker, and I believe we can truly create another leg of the Cayman Islands economy and one that blends perfectly with what we have already started insofar as medical tour-

ism. If done properly, I am confident that those companies can and will operate here in the Cayman Islands and avoid much bureaucracy as well as lowering the costs whilst meeting all of the international standards insofar as their research, which will allow them to gain recognition from international bodies, such as the Food and Drug Administration; recognition that will ensure that they can sell their final product to an international marketplace.

Madam Speaker, this push for diversification does not have to end with medical research. Instead, medical research has only to be the beginning, for there are numerous areas of research to be explored. We as a country, as a people, should do just that—explore the options and where there is viability, seize upon it, get it done, and we have another industry for the country. Madam Speaker, Cayman can be a place of excellence in many areas. We have done well in the finance industry although they seem to be wanting to destroy us on that front, but we do have expertise. We do have capacity to bring these sorts of research companies to Cayman. I know the Government has heard some of it; I have heard some of it before. I think we need to jump on it to get something done.

Madam Speaker, I want to turn myself now to the National Roads Authority/Dart Agreement. The Premier said that today we have an economy buoyed by increased investor confidence. I am not going to say *no* to that. What I will ask, was Dart, who is the only real developer who so far has put his money where his mouth is of any huge amounts, was he not here before? Was the agreement not in place? Madam Speaker, the ultimate stroke of the genius of the Government, and I am not in one person of meaning that, but their policy genius is that the Premier—and I am not saying that derogatory about him being a genius, what I am saying is the genius of the policy, the policy genius. Has the—

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: They come to this House and brag about signing the Third Amendment to the NRA/Dart Agreement.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: You hear what Moses . . . you should have read it before you got up here.

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Should have read what?

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: What about it?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: But that's . . . I'm delivering my speech, what do you want?

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Huh? This is not last minute.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, that is their time, five minutes gone.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: I do have a few questions though to pose to them, since they have not released the agreement to the public.

1. Hotel Room Tax Rebate. The Premier's announced this was taken out. I wonder if a similar value was added to the cap for the concession to the Dart Group will simply get the concession just in another form.
2. Sunrise Adult Training Centre Lands. My cousin over there needs to listen if they haven't told her. I don't believe. . . I think they treat her bad. They haven't told her anything. We had negotiated to have lands near the Harquail Theatre donated and the majority filled in to have a more central location for the [Sunrise Adult Training] Centre, and to have it near other facilities that residents could utilise. That is the theatre and the National Gallery, public beaches there, and so on. Has Government secured that valuable item?
3. Other Community Lands. We had negotiated 20 acres of lands for community and Government purposes. One such item was to be a new cemetery. West Bay, Madam Speaker, is in crises with cemetery spaces and this would be welcomed news. Has Government secured that valuable item?
4. Madam Speaker, I knew by talking to them—Dart, that is—that they would have developed a cemetery on that land for us, if they had included it in that agreement. What have they done about it? We passed a motion, and I'm not hearing anything. People are passing away and we are looking for spaces all over the district now. Madam Speaker, we need a new cemetery, and as I said, they could have/should have negotiated with Dart to develop a cemetery, five or six acres of the 20 acres. We need it badly.
5. Soto Land at the Public Beach. Madam Speaker, there is always too little space on public holidays for people to adequately camp out and picnic. For that reason, we have negotiated that the former lands leased by the Sotos be given back to Government. That is

the land next to the Public Beach which butts and binds the new road. And if you come across there, you will see a big pile of fill and they are now planting some trees on it. That is between the public beach and the new road, the road that we traverse now back and forth to West Bay and town. That would have allowed for the developments with appropriate flora, et cetera, of an expanded area for the public to camp and picnic next to the public beach while having clear open access to the beach. Has the Government secured that valuable camping and picnic site for the public?

6. The Old Victoria House Site. Given the cost and lack of undeveloped land on Seven Mile Beach corridor, we thought it important, Madam Speaker, to secure another public beach. Our system of requiring developers to give a six-foot access to the beach has been fraught with challenges and we have lost much of it. We have a motion to try to deal with some of it. Not the least of which is that the public inevitably winds up on a development site once they traverse the six-foot right of way. If we agree that there is no real beaching experience created by these six-foot right of ways between two buildings, what then? Our thought process was to allow that developer to consolidate these rights of way on his land in exchange for an expansive piece, another 100 feet that the public could use in a meaningful way and not be on the doorstep of a development. Has this Government done anything in that regard, about those six-foot rights of way?
7. Dragon Bay Lands. I don't know what the deal has been struck because we don't see the report as yet, but they have announced it. What premium has the Government received for converting the lease of Dragon Bay lands, some. . . what is it? One hundred and something acres?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: So, it is a freehold.

Are there any conditions attached, Madam Speaker? Did they get any net new revenue for the life of the property? When I was Premier, this was under discussion and we insisted that we enter a new agreement with the then-owner, an additional 2 per cent to whatever stamp duties paid, would be added for transfer over these properties to ensure that the people of the country in perpetuity truly benefited from the conversion. However, Madam Speaker, it did not go ahead because our Government had no mandate to sell such an important and huge piece of land belonging to the Caymanian people. It fell away. And it is

not that it wasn't under discussion; it was with that owner then of Dragon Bay.

Madam Speaker, one of the things they have severely criticised my Government for was the hotel rebate in the Dart Agreement. From what I am hearing, and, as I said, it is not public yet, the hotel room tax rebate was removed. Has it been added back to the cap by estimating the value of the Kimpton concessions? We had placed a cap on waivers of \$24 million. They, in their negotiations, I understand, have now reached \$37 million. Madam Speaker, are there really smoke and mirrors?

Madam Speaker, this amended agreement came out of the ForCayman Investment Alliance where Government and the Dart group of companies were looking at ways in which to generate economic activity in a time, 2008 . . . well, we saw the downturn from 2007 straight up until at least a little turnaround began in 2011. So, we negotiated and I took licks for it. But people are driving the roads and they are happy. The hotel is on its way and they are happy. Unfortunately, far too many Caymanians want to sell something to Dart, but then they don't want Dart to do anything with it. Well, how we going to do that? You have got to expect to sell 100 acres to him, he makes you family rich with \$7 million or \$8 million, and then he sits down and he holds it in his pocket? Sit down and put his foot up on it? What is he going to do with it? He wants to invest it. So don't sell it then. If you don't want anything done with it, and you don't want him to get more control, then don't mess with him. Leave him out!

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yeah.

Madam Speaker, it must be remembered, as I said, we were started in the midst of an economic downturn that the world has never witnessed.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

This Government should be thanking us for having the courage to do something that they would never have. We know that! We know that they turned down good offers for collaboration during 2005 and 2009 term with Dart. And they seemingly had a phobia about working with a company that was investing so much in Cayman. I mean, if not the Government bench, then, it was supporters who were out there cussing us about it. I mean, the big word for some of their supporters was "UDP: United Democratic Party" meant under Dart's power. That was a big thing in 2005.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Well, is it true today?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

You hush. You went down there and sat down there with them up in a room, and cowered, and signed the document. And then they got to the Cabinet and they signed another one. Don't talk to me about that! I know how it goes! You did the right thing though, you know. But don't be a hypocrite now and try and beat up on poor McKeever about it. I did the right thing! I faced all the opposition, all the criticism and took my licks. I might not even get an invitation to go to the hotel.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yes. Laugh at me! That's all right. They can do that.

I know when something needs to be done, that I had the leadership capacity and capability to move forward boy when it needs to be done. No procrastination.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

And then wait until what? Wait until the cusp of an election and say that they could only do it because they had to renegotiate. Don't tell me, man! Sit down. You want the road? See the road there. One! If Arden was down there I know that's what he would have done. And if you want that overpass, let's decide it going to be done. Because you know you had made up your mind that it had to be done because it was a good thing for the country, and I know that you all know what is good for the country.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition:

Yeah, but you don't always follow that kind of line, you know. You don't always follow it. Give you credit where credit is due. You signed it. Now, as I said—

An Hon. Member: Smoke and mirrors.

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Smoke and mirrors.

The road is one of the best pieces of road in Cayman.

Now, how about the landfill? And the cold water they poured over that, our attempt to remediate the landfill and create a state-of-the-art waste management facility with separation, recycling, proper lining, and the safe disposal of hazardous material. Madam Speaker, if we do not do something about that dump,

it is going to poison the entire Cayman Islands. Hear what I tell you?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: That along with that sewerage system needs to be upgraded and put throughout this country, that sewerage system. That needs to be done now. That in itself is such a huge dig that it would take probably a hire of 600-700 people, Madam Speaker, to do a national sewerage system for this country. And it needs to be done! All we need to do is remember where some families stood waist-deep in sewerage during Hurricane Ivan. Madam Speaker, they were trying to create a state-of-the-art waste management facility with every environmental precaution and consideration. It was going to be a facility that would be the envy of the rest of the Caribbean. We were drowned out by the misinformation. Now, the Premier stands in this Honourable House and speaks of his support for a proper waste management facility and his administration efforts to address the current landfill and the environmental woes associated with it. You cannot have it both ways, Premier. You can't. As a famous rapper, Eminem, said in one of his songs:

***Won't the real Slim Shady, please stand up,
Please stand up,
Please stand up.***

[Laughter]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: In June 2011 we announced the contents of the Investment Alliance with Dart. At that time I stated boldly, and I quote, "Investments around the world has been uncertain. The Government would not plan to engage in any further long term borrowing, even for needed projects, including schools and roads. Even now, investors the world over are still exercising caution, waiting and watching, before committing to large projects, therefore the need for partnerships with the private sector to build national infrastructure facilities, social and education programmes without incurring any debt or obligation to repay at the time, now and in the future is an essential part of my Government's economic growth strategy." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE] That was in June 2011. The Dart group has contributed very significantly to the economic growth and development of our country. If we want to tell the truth, were it not for them, doing things at this time, we wouldn't have had anything much going for us.

Madam Speaker, they kicked me in the face for it, but they have continued the discussions with them and they have signed the agreement. So, it wasn't me who converted lease-hold property to free-hold property. And so, as for the new investors they spoke about, where are they? It can't be the Kimpton.

It can't be the Beach Bay development project, and it can't be the Ironwood.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: We sat and I changed the law to get him where he is at. If I hadn't changed the law, then nothing could have happened. He would have never been able to buy that property.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeever Bush, Leader of the Opposition: I came here and I changed the law. You can say what you like, Premier, but that is a fact. I know you got all the time in the world when you get up. You are in a good position to be more and more political. So, no Bobo, it can't be these developments they are referring to in this budget.

Madam Speaker, I have watched carefully as the Government has completely, I think, mishandled the single most important environmental and health crisis this country faces—the George Town dump, or "Mount Trashmore," as we call it. For far too long we have talked and talked and hired consultant after consultant. The current Government has continued that trend and have done nothing. From when the Minister for North Side was the Minister who put out a plan, nobody wanted it. And we keep going back and forth in this country and how many years later? We have not got . . . we are still up there poisoning the environment, poisoning our people, destroying the North Town with all the leakage into that. We have talked and hired, and talked and hired consultant after consultant.

In 2005–2009, under the Member for the East End who was then the Minister responsible for Waste Management, Gershman, Brickner and Bratton were selected as consultants, and the country went an extensive research exercise which that Minister invited the then-Opposition, which I led to take part in. That was Mr. Rolston Anglin, [who] was selected from my part to sit on Mr. McLean's solid waste management committee. Mr. McLean saw the wisdom in using a bipartisan approach to a very controversial national issue. He also had some of his backbenchers on the committee and they were, at the time, Ms. Lucille Seymour, Mr. Alfonso Wright, and Mr. Moses Kirkconnell, now the Deputy Premier. So, a comprehensive report was formulated and my Government, after 2009, sought to continue the work and it was a good report that he had started. We did not make as much progress as we would have liked, but at least we did not start over from scratch. We felt like we could have worked out a proper a solution by establishing a proper waste management system with recycling, composting, some form of sensible technology to deal with

household waste and a properly engineered and lined landfill.

By 2013, we still had a growing dump in the heart of our commercial and tourism centre. Madam Speaker, it would have been bad enough if they had rejected the work that my party had done, that level of politics that maybe they would be willing to go into. But this wanton waste I don't think is good for the country. If they wanted to kick my programme, I don't see how they should have kicked the work that their own former colleague had started. The PPM Government hired, Amec, I think it is, A-M-E-C, Amec Foster Wheeler, a UK firm, along with KPMG to be the consultants on yet another review exercise. How many times are we going to review the dump? We don't need to go that route I don't think. You have enough reports. And Cayman has never had a sustained consequential recycling effort of dry households, dry recyclables, until the company called Junk Recycling started one in 2013, and I thought that was a good move between Government and the private sector. In addition to serving paying clients, they started a public service at seven supermarkets across Grand Cayman in 2014. They were able to prove that the public would recycle at the depots.

Last year the Premier, under whose administration dumps now falls, as Minister of Health, announced that his Government would be issuing a public tender for the private sector to expand the depot programme. The Government issued a public tender in January to adequately fund the public depot system, and curiously, I don't understand this, they excluded depots on the North Side and East End, and Cayman Brac and Little Cayman in that tender. I don't know why, but anyway, they were not included, as I remember. But all of a sudden now we are hearing that the Government has cancelled the tender and are going to run the depots themselves. I don't know—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Who? I ain't in any conflict of interest. I don't think there is anybody on this side who is in any conflict of interest. I don't know.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Well, if you have to, you have to, but it has been long understood that the desired outcome is to prioritise and the Premier said this. I don't know what you are complaining about, Premier, because I have it somewhere about you where you said—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Premier, this report said, "The Premier, Alden

McLaughlin, had earlier made mention of the plan when he addressed the Chamber of Commerce legislation luncheon at the end of September. 'We will not sit and wait for a final strategy document to advise us on what everyone already knows. The solution must include plans for more recycling and composting.' He said, 'Government was moving forward with an expanded recycling programme to collect. . .'" and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. [UNVERIFIED QUOTE] I don't understand that.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Well, how much is Government going to spend now then?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yeah, but how much is Government going to spend? Whether anybody got a tender or not, I don't know.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yeah, but how much is the tender? Please inform me.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: [It is] \$250,000? And you are going to hire seven people for that? And you are going to go around to all these places and do so? Wait then. Wait. I don't know if that is possible, but I would like to. . . If you can accomplish that, then, that is another thing that I can tap you on the shoulder for.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: Members, please keep comments through the Chair.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Okay.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, I—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Sorry?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Not me. No, no, no, no, no. Your law degree don't go that far, Bobo.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:
Uh-uh.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:
Who?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:
Well, I know you got a recording. You got about five people doing that for you.

I thought though, that what happened now, you spent another \$250,000 with a company to make Government smaller. So what happened to all of that, Premier? What happened to all of that? What I think you are about to do, and I mean, at any time you want to talk to me about it, then, tell me because I don't know. But I believe that what you are saying now will inevitably lead to more hiring within Government. I don't know if that is going to give the best result for Cayman. But I do hope so, from what you are saying. But you got 7 and you haven't touched 3 other districts and that's 10. And then you got to hire all the staff for that [and] all the equipment for that. You got to remember this when people bid. They aren't just bidding to pick up a garbage can down there and take it over here. But remember they have to cover their costs and their equipment. Now, if the Government is going to go into all of that, how much is it going to cost us? How much is it going to cost? I don't know because the truth is, that is not my forte. I don't know about these things. But I can read! And I listen!

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:
Who? Who?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:
No, that's your buddy; you go drink with him Bobo. Not me and him.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:
I done told him though to light a candle, sing a sanky [PHONETIC] and find himself back home.

[Laughter and inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition:
All right.

Madam Speaker, he says he will issue a public tender for an integrated solid waste management system. As I said, how good can it be for Government

to bind the country after a process that has not been brought to legislators and the public properly? I don't like this, tick-tock, or tick the box electioneering, and if they don't make it right with the people and they can't get them to do what they want to do then they have to take away contracts from um or what? Tell Bobo the truth. You are the one talking saying you talked with them. I don't know. Not me.

Madam Speaker, they have generated reports with options but have not stated what the endgame will be. So, I think I would like to see a foreign policy position and let the public have their say before going to tender around such an important issue. We cannot afford more and more expenditure. And the expenditure I know the Minister of Finance knows, the expenditure is creeping up, and the surplus is not as great for the year as they are saying. You know that.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, now that the Premier has announced that he has signed the Third Amendment to the Dart Agreement, I wonder if anything in that, Madam Speaker, has been secured for waste management. I don't know if that is in there, anything for waste management in that agreement. The Premier is saying *No*. Well, what I can say is that the time for test will be around the corner. And that curb side, dry recycling, green waste to chips, mulch compost, refuse, oil recycling and I think that is going on too. I don't know if Government is doing anything with that, but that is something that is important and I don't know. I know it is a small company doing it. And I don't know if Government is involved or encouraging it, but they ought to erase recycling, scrap metal recycling, automotive and white good recycling and sensible technology to deal with all leftover waste and general household waste collection and hauling. These are things that I am hoping will be addressed because, certainly, it will be. I don't know that Government should be in the construction waste hauling business. I think Government should exit the construction waste hauling business and simply be the regulator of the waste sector and not such an operator.

Madam Speaker, they said that Dart would be remediating the landfill and creating a new one. I don't know what he is going to do. I just hope that it's done.

Madam Speaker, they talk about fiscal management and claims that it has taken the country to the surpluses—their fiscal management. Madam Speaker, on page 18 of the Pre-election Economic and Financial Update under the heading, Forecast Financial Performance of Fiscal Year 2013/14 and 2014/15, it reads, and I quote, "For Fiscal Years 2013/14 and 2014/15 Government's operating surplus is forecast to be \$118.1 million and \$135.8 million, respectively." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE] On page 8 of the Budget Address delivered on Friday the 15th or May 2015, the Minister of Finance states, and I quote, "At 31st of March 2015 the forecast operating surplus for the Financial Year Ending June 2015 was \$134.6 million" [UNVERIFIED QUOTE] Madam Speaker, that

mandated economic update before elections stated \$135.8 million. And the Honourable Minister of Finance is stating \$134 million. So those operating surplus figures are different by approximately \$1 [million], and Madam Speaker, you will remember that because you delivered that election report before an election.

So, Madam Speaker, anyone with a little common sense can see that the surplus this administration is touting as their own is nothing more than using the same revenue measures that the administration put in place, including the duty on fuel. They can't have it both ways. They can't on the one hand criticise my Government for the revenue model we put in place, but summarily take credit for the operating surplus the country now enjoys. That's not right. That is not right.

So, Madam Speaker, look [at] operating revenue for a moment, according to economic update, operating revenue for 2014/15 was forecasted as \$693.2 million. The Minister of Finance has forecasted for 2014/15 operating revenue as \$660.2 million. The economic update forecast operating expenses for 2014/15 [is] \$531.6 million. The Honourable Minister of Finance forecasted operating expenses for the same period at \$538.7 million. The Economic Update forecasted 2014/15 expenses at \$28.7 million, the Honourable Minister of Finance forecasted expenses for 2014/15 at \$28.5 million. The Economic Update forecasted a cash balance for 2014 at \$250.4 million. The Minister of Finance forecasted a cash balance for 2014 at \$269.6 million.

I think, Madam Speaker, we are all getting the picture. The successes that the Government is trying to take credit for are not theirs because if you do not make money, you can't put it in the bank. And you did not put any increases; you kick me in the face for the increases I put there. I had to do so, so that the country would not go belly up and that we would reach the stage, and I can say with you, Mr. Premier, thank you. You need to paint it red. Thank you, because we are now out of the clutches for right now of the Foreign [and Commonwealth] Office. If you keep spending though, don't you think that they regard you so much that they wouldn't grab it back because they were happy the day they had their hands on us so that they could tell us what to do? Don't get back there by the whims and fancies of people who want everything for everything. You will get right back there. Prioritise.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Oh, yes. I don't have anything to ask for. I see you got everything in the budget. I can't bring any increases. We can't. Not on this side. We can ask for certain things. We can ask you to reorganise and probably we will do that. Like we were going to demand that you get the teachers for the school. Stop counting lime

lizards and stuff like that, and give my cousin over there her money for teachers! Yes.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yes, yes, yes, yes. It is true.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yes, we have got plenty space for her. We will make her the Minister of Education again. But she has to do a couple things. She has to light a candle and sing a sanky.

[Laughter and inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Four? Yes. She has one of um.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: She has one. It's three of us here. She [INAUDIBLE] You're not elected, she's elected.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker—

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Madam Speaker, I am forced to ask about time.

The Speaker: Leader of the Opposition, if we go in accordance to no Member may speak more than two hours, you will conclude at 4:40. I was looking at the hour of interruption and Standing Order 10(2) which gives the Chair discretion to allow you to go on for a short period, if you are going to conclude shortly. If that is not the case, then I will have to move to the operation of Standing Order 10(2). So if I could have an indication from you, sir.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: So, can I have an indication of what you will allow me to do at 4:40?

The Speaker: At 4:40 that takes up your two hours.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: What are you talking about? How much time you took?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Sorry, Madam Speaker. The First Elected Member for Cayman Brac [and Little Cayman] wants to throw some aggravation into the ring here.

The Speaker: Well, if we keep going, sir, that will make better use of the time; 4:40 will be your two hours and the Chair can exercise a very brief discussion. If you are going beyond 4:40, I have to call for suspension of [Standing Order] 10(2). I would much rather call for adjournment, but I am at the—

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Probably at 4:40—

The Speaker: —wish of the House.

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: All right, Madam Speaker, thank you very much.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Yes. Take the adjournment?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. W. McKeeva Bush, Leader of the Opposition: Okay. My colleagues give me good advice over here.

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

[Inaudible interjections]

ADJOURNMENT

The Premier, Hon. Alden McLaughlin: Thank you, Madam Speaker, they are taking advantage of me now, but that's all right. Everybody is in such a good mood. That's all right.

Madam Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of this Honourable House until 10:00 am on Monday.

The Speaker: The question is that this Honourable House be adjourned until 10:00 am on Monday.

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

AYES.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it. Accordingly, the House now stands adjourned until 10:00 am Monday.

At 4:30 pm the House stood adjourned until 10:00 am, Monday, 6 June 2016.