



**CAYMAN ISLANDS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
ELECTRONIC VERSION**

2012/13 SESSION

23 August 2012

Fifth Sitting of the First Meeting

(pages 185–210)

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

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

PRESENT WERE:

THE SPEAKER

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

MINISTERS OF THE CABINET

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

OFFICIAL MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

Hon Jennifer M Ahearn	Temporary <i>Deputy Governor</i> , Member responsible for Internal and External Affairs and the Civil Service
Hon Jacqueline Wilson	Temporary Attorney General, Member responsible for Legal Affairs

ELECTED MEMBERS

GOVERNMENT BACKBENCHERS

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

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

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

INDEPENDENT MEMBER

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

APOLOGIES

Capt A Eugene Ebanks, JP, MLA	Fourth Elected Member for West Bay
-------------------------------	------------------------------------

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
STATE OPENING 2012/13 SESSION
THURSDAY
23 AUGUST 2012
10.07 AM
Fifth Sitting**

The Speaker: I call on the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town to read Prayers this morning.

PRAYERS

Mr. Anthony S. Eden, Second Elected Member for Bodden Town: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

The Speaker: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed.

READING BY THE HONOURABLE SPEAKER OF MESSAGES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Apologies

The Speaker: I have an apology for absence from the Fourth Elected Member for West Bay who is away from the Island on urgent business.

STATEMENTS BY HONOURABLE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

The Speaker: I have no notice of Statements from Honourable Ministers and Members of the Cabinet.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

Appropriation (July 2012 to June 2013) Bill, 2012 (Budget Address)

[Continuation of debate thereon]

The Speaker: At the conclusion of the sitting last night, we concluded the debate. I will call on the Premier now to make his reply.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, let me thank Members on this side and those Members on the other side who didn't speak who chose to give up time recognising that we have a long process in Finance Committee.

Madam Speaker, even though I was in and out of the Chamber I paid some attention to what Members were saying. The Leader of the Opposition took his full two hours to criticise. And I know they will attempt to say that they gave alternatives or solutions but I don't see where they are. I will begin with that, Madam Speaker, because he took time to criticise the Government to try to tell us that we shouldn't criticise what they did and that we can't blame them.

Madam Speaker, politics is a blaming game. Plenty of it! And I believe that when something is done that is grossly wrong you must either take responsibility and make a change, or you keep going down the road in the wrong you did. I don't believe that. I be-

lieve that you should say this was a mistake, get up and move on. I believe that. And they will continue to do so and they are aided and abetted by very vicious, narrow-minded parts of the media. Thank God not all of them are alike.

In my opinion you will never see fair reporting by those who chose to twist and, rather than report, give their opinion in the reports. I never considered that good reporting. I have always considered your opinion . . . and I think true journalism is that. You, the paper, whatever media you are, you give an editorial; that's your opinion—not the story. But it's all about competition in Cayman and who can be the strongest opponent to whatever Government is in. I am just happy that I am old enough and I have seen it and I will see it again. I am the target today. Tomorrow it is going to be somebody else. You can believe that.

I can tell them, Madam Speaker (and I say this to the Opposition), when I was Leader of the Opposition I chose very carefully what I would take a stand to fight on. True, you never had a lot of information. We didn't learn things until we got elected and then we found out things. Nevertheless, I did not get out and I did not do anything that would have caused the country any concern. Not from my standpoint as an Opposition leader. I gave the Government as much rope as they needed to do the programme. They were elected and that is the way I thought we should operate as an Opposition.

I didn't walk out. I gave support to the budgets, as much information as I had. Not to say I am coming to vote against any budget. I took my motions and dealt with the issues. I will never forget 2008 when it was evident that the world was going into an economic crisis, because as far back as 2006 you saw it. And Bloomberg . . . you read it in the *Economist* and the world, the international stage. If you watched it you saw that it could not be sustained. In 2000 it became clearer, and in 2008 it fell. I will never forget that just before that, I brought a motion which detailed that the Government was headed in the wrong direction and that they had to make some change. Did they listen? Of course not!

I keep repeating what I was told by my friend, the former Leader of the Opposition (who was then the Leader of Government Business), the First Elected Member for George Town. He said, "Not on the kindest of mornings" am I going to listen to you, or do what you say.

Madam Speaker, you take what they [say] about confidence. When Lehman Brothers was falling to pieces the Leader of Government Business, when asked, said that there was not going to be any problem for us about \$200,000 in loss. Madam Speaker, either they didn't care, didn't know, but certainly they were not paying attention while the expenditure was heaping up.

So, they say we must not blame them. But who are we going to blame? They screamed at me yesterday and told me that we are not treating the United Kingdom right. I mean, can you really believe, Madam Speaker, that any one of them out there really feels that knowing that we have been in this country for 50-odd years and they have been the same thing and we know them? We know our people. And they will get up there to talk so that their friends on *CNS* [*Cayman News Service*] can give them the headlines, and probably the [*Caymanian*] *Compass* too.

They criticise, Madam Speaker. I see where the *Compass* said that I gave mothers some flowers on Mothers' Day. Madam Speaker, I am the Premier of this country. They don't pay for any reception for me. I never had any that called them to pay for. The lunches that I do . . . I chose not to have dinners and so on, as such, unless it's a specific thing that the finance industry or some other industry asks me to do. But I did not bother with all those things. I did not take any allowance for entertainment. The lunches that I have . . . they do give me a helper. My wife does the cooking, assisted by my son sometimes. And we prepare lunches for various sectors of the community who we think we ought to entertain to that extent. But we purchase everything ourselves at my residence. My wife is a good cook, thank God.

So, Madam Speaker, I chose to give mothers . . . and you see what the *Compass* said—"In West Bay." Now, you tell me if this is fair reporting, Madam Speaker. Because West Bay is my district they want to make people think that I am only concerned about the district of West Bay, and that I would only give mothers in West Bay. This has been mothers across the country. I chose to give them on Mothers' Day. In fact, I didn't get any out this year. But that's what they say.

Yet, the Governor has a reception practically every week! Maybe several times a week! And you never see one thing said about that. And you are not going to see it because as a Caymanian and the Premier, and coming from the side of the street that I have come from, for one, they don't want me here; and two, I am not . . . firstly, I am not supposed to be here because of where I come from; and two, they don't want me here. I am far too outspoken, and cause them far too many problems because I am not easily sunk and pushed around.

Madam Speaker, fairness? They wouldn't know it if it slapped them down every morning. Good conduct? Good behaviour? Decency? Some of them should be the last ones, Madam Speaker. I can stand here and tell them because it is the truth. Nobody knows where they came from, what they did, except, that they know I do research. They know that about me. They know that I know about them. I don't chose to get out there to fight them personally and do the things that I see those papers trying to do—

particularly *CNS*. That's why I sued them. And they are going to pay, Madam Speaker. They can run, but they cannot hide. They are going to pay. There are sufficient cases against Internet news lines that have been successful in the region and elsewhere. And that is why you see what is going on in the United Kingdom with the press, because of the same nasty, dirty behaviour.

The Speaker: Watch the adjectives.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, come, please.

The Speaker: No. Just keep . . . there are a lot of words that you can use.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, you were a reporter. You used to come to this House.

The Speaker: I did.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: And I saw your reports too. I remember well!

[Laughter]

The Speaker: That's quite—

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: You were not easy then, Madam Speaker, as a reporter. I remember.

The Speaker: That's correct.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: So, Madam Speaker, we ought to have some sympathy to a Member who is defending his position.

The Speaker: Yes. But I have had those same words hurled at me from this Chamber too.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yes, but you can't use that against me. You can't use —

The Speaker: There are words that are acceptable and there are words that are not. Let's just proceed.

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

The Speaker: Mr. Premier, please proceed.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: *[Shouting]* MADAM SPEAKER, GIVE ME A CHANCE, PLEASE!

The Speaker: You have a chance.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Okay. Give me a chance to talk!

The Speaker: And then stay within the borders while you do it.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: If you check these Standing Orders and this Erskine May, McKeever Bush is within his rights.

The Speaker: I have them too.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: I am. Please; this is not Sunday School; this is a place for defence.

The Speaker: No; it's a place for debate.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: And defence! I'm not here to row with you this morning, Madam Speaker. But I took my licks yesterday. I need to give as good, as I got. I am asking you to take a 15 minute break, Madam Speaker.

The Speaker: The House is suspended for 15 minutes.

Proceedings suspended at 11.15 am

Proceeding resumed at 11.54 am

The Speaker: Proceedings are resumed. Please be seated.

Honourable Premier.

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

When I asked for the break, just so you are clear, I had two officers in the committee room that I needed to get information from. And I thank the House for that break.

Madam Speaker, I want to make clear that this country has never questioned what the Governor of these Islands spends. I have been through 28 budgets or more, and we have never done it. We have never seen any criticism either of elected officials that goes on today. So, as an elected Member who is elected to serve the people, Members must have that opportunity to make themselves absolutely clear on what they are trying to say.

I don't think there is anybody who wants to get in a fight all the time. Certainly, I don't. But there are times when your buttons are pushed by people who have no standing to do so. So when I get accused . . . as a public official I expect to. I expect people to do so. If they want to name call, make accusations as they have done from the floor of this House and no defence of me in certain times when they are wrong, I have to defend myself. I do it in accordance with the

Standing Orders of this House. And when our Standing Orders are not specific, we follow [Erskine] May's; that is the Bible of parliamentary procedure and precedent. And when I am accused of spending money on giving mothers flowers on Mothers' Day, and I am accused that I am only giving it to West Bay . . . who should defend that, Madam Speaker? Do you mean that because I am the Premier I should not defend my position and say this is a bunch of lies that are being written, carried as gospel and going down in history and nobody corrects it? No! One of these days there are going to be students ardent enough who will do their research. They will go to the papers and read something pertaining to this House or to the civil service and come here and search the records. And this is the only place that there will be such a record. So, when people deliberately mislead the public of this country, any Member is duty bound, not just for any other purpose, but duty bound to defend their position, particularly in a debate where everybody has been [let] loose to ramble all over the place. And that's not just today, that is time and eternity.

There was a time when Members here could speak for five days—a whole week—as our National Hero did, the late Jim Bodden. And there was a time when I did (I think the two of us hold the longest record) speak for well over two or three days. Then that got cut down to four hours, and then that got cut down to two hours. And the truth is, Madam Speaker, we really don't need that length of time. That is the truth. But the fact is this: On the Appropriation Bill and the Throne Speech, any Minister moving a Bill has all the time in the world he wants to take to deliver his argument. And people might say that is a waste. I see where they say it is rambling. You have to ramble sometimes to find yourself home and get across what you're saying.

[laughter]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: It's only because they don't like what you say that they say you are rambling.

But you are duty bound! That is what you are elected to do! And nobody . . . I point to it all the time. Nobody defends McKeeva like McKeeva. No one! My partners, colleagues, do their share, but I have my own history, my own knowledge. And I can hear good and see good, and they don't dig the holes too small that I don't see through it. And I do not respond to everything.

Madam Speaker, I thought I would make it absolutely clear how I feel about the kind of criticism and the kind of actions that I see existing in this country today. Viciousness! Viciousness, Madam Speaker, is what it is because they can do it. They feel they have a licence to write anything and say anything. And if they can't write it they get somebody [else] to

write it for them. Some of the letters I see penned I know it's not coming from them. But they do it. They do it with impunity to Members of this House. And they have always done it with utmost disrespect as if we were not elected by the people, as if we just came in here and are somehow pushing ourselves over everybody. No! We get the light shone on us. We put up our deposit. Our families get cussed. We get threatened. We get accused, get investigated. And then we must smile like a Sunday School boy and say, *What good people they are.*

We are trying hard to be good Christians. But I am minded that there was only one perfect man, Madam Speaker. And they crucified him. They kissed him on his cheek and crucified him—as much as he'd done for them (as one of my colleagues was saying yesterday). When they were out in the boat in the wilderness in the rough sea, he was resting. They called him up so that he could calm the waters. But they crucified him. Many times when they needed the sick to be healed and the helpless to be helped they called him and he helped them. But they crucified him.

I keep repeating what the late Sir Lynden Pindling told me: "My son, you're up front as a leader; but you're only up front to be shot first." I have been able to deal with the noise and pestilence from within and from without. I have nothing to be ashamed of when I stand in this House, except that I do have to carry on sometimes because of the kind of attacks that are made. I have never come here, Madam Speaker, just to tell anyone in West Bay or anywhere else that I went to any university or any college, except for the college of hard knocks. I didn't tell them that I came here and knew everything, because I didn't. I told them that they knew who I was and where I came from, and I would do what I could to represent them to the best of my ability.

The day I make a mistake I will come back and say that I made a mistake. CEF [Community Enhancement Fee], according to some debate, is a mistake. According to others it was the right thing to do. I believe that we did the right thing because we, as a Government, had no intention of going down that path, Madam Speaker. And so let me get right to that. When the Leader of the Opposition complained and carried on, of course, that's the job of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition gave a good, good Opposition speech, but that is what it was—an Opposition speech. [They brought] their supporters in the Gallery, knew who he had as friends in the press and [he] gave an Opposition speech. But there were no solutions to the problems in this country. None! There were a lot of accusations and assumptions, but no facts, Madam Speaker, and no acceptance of what they did this country. None!

We needed revenue for this country and we said that. What we didn't realise when we were told to get revenue and we got [\$]40 [million], we thought

with everything being the way it was that we could run the country. The UK came back and said, *No; I need you to put in the past service liability. You must start to do that. You said that's your intention and we agreed.* But that was another \$15 million of expenditure.

When we found that, though, they came back and said, *I need you to find another \$10 million of cuts.* Because immediately they saw us start to get the revenue, they said, *No. Don't go down that direction; don't even cut capital because I am not going to consider that. I don't want you to cut capital because I am not going to consider that as a cut. I want you to cut these consumables, civil service emoluments,* that whole line. I don't have it . . . maybe I do have it in front of me some place here. But that's what they zeroed in on.

They zeroed in on transfer payments, Madam Speaker, those areas where we had to be paying veterans, seamen social services benefits. The scholarships of this country and the training programmes, that's what that is all about. That's what they zeroed in on. And they got more and more involved in that as soon as the papers and the Opposition here were fanning that flame. *Nation building, nation building, PPs* was the song of the Opposition. So, the UK knew what to put fire on. Not that they needed that because they have access to every piece of paper that ever is produced, blank and written on in the Glass House or the Admin Building.

So, Madam Speaker, we were told what we had to do. And as we found the revenue they said we had to cut. And when cutting became more difficult and to the point where we thought it would produce nothing but diminishing returns, they still said cut more!

Madam Speaker, we had to find more revenue. And where CEF, the Community Enhancement Fee came in, was because we reached a point where we couldn't go any further, but they demanded the revenue at that time. They demanded more revenue because they said not just cuts; it had to be revenue. Not just revenue, there had to be cuts. It had to be sustainable, it had to be credible. And, of course, Madam Speaker, while they said, *We are not telling you exactly what items, we are giving you this frame and you have to work within that framework.*

Madam Speaker, the financial sector and the business community had already told us in our discussions, *No! We cannot afford any more fees on the workplace.* And I made it straight and plain that this Government was not going down the road to VAT [Value Added Tax], as was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. Now, he can't say he didn't say so. He said so. And he also said VAT or property tax. So yesterday when he said that they are not doing anything, he can't say he didn't say that several weeks ago. He did!

My policy, our policy has been no income tax, no property tax, or no death tax; none of these kinds of taxes. We must do it out of the business of the country and we believed we could do it. And that is the same thing the Miller/Shaw Report said. So when they now come and talk about the Miller/Shaw Report, they are just being hypocritical, because they were the ones saying we shouldn't get it. *What are you doing that for? It can't work.* Yet they come and say it is the best thing since hotcakes. But that's not all the change their tune on. They have spoken out of both corners of their mouths quite often.

But, Madam Speaker, what were we to do? Demanding of us cuts and the need to get more revenue and make it sustainable. So, we have been working with the Financial Services Council to get the first \$40 million, \$50 million in revenue. That was secured. We then called the group together and they offered their services. I read them out on Monday, the one with Mr. Roy McTaggart of KPMG, and Mr. Dan Scott and Gene Thompson, that group. And they said, *We are going to find the revenue.*

Well, when we couldn't find the revenue, this matter was produced—not by them—about the CEF. I always said that if you can get the revenue what we can't do is to make the country go down the river. We have to do something. And, as I said, there was a huge enough debate about the CEF (Community Enhancement Fee), some for and some against. But one thing I think Members of this House should sit up and take notice of is that when something affects that particular sector, if anyone doubted how much fire can be heaped on anyone in this legislature, they shouldn't doubt after that. They shouldn't doubt what people will do, what people will say, how much they will carry on.

The things that I saw in the press, the lies that were told . . . Moody's told me it is not going to hurt you from our standpoint. So did Morgan Stanley and others. What this will do is to solidify your position because you are getting revenue and it's certain. But the choice came. We didn't want to go down that direction, none of us—no one in Cabinet and no one on our backbench. We had said the fees that we always supported were the normal ones, the standard ones in the country. So, if that was a mistake then, we certainly pulled it back. And I'm glad we did.

But the Opposition is not happy about that because they wanted that beaten stick. They thought they would ride that into the ground. That's what they thought. That's what the Leader of the Opposition thought. I don't know about the so-called independence because on one Tuesday they say one thing, then by the time they get to Radio Cayman they are saying something else, the same day.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: No. You're part of it at times. I am going to get to you. Don't worry; I'm not going to leave you out. I know you want me to deal with you.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: The Member would feel bad if I didn't mention him.

But, Madam Speaker, they didn't want that pulled back. What we know and what I have said is that if I didn't achieve anything else we would get the budget of this country fixed. I said that. We were not going down the road of huge grandiose projects. We were not going down the road of large road expenditure. Not even in hurricane shelters, Madam Speaker, because we found another way that we believed we could work that at less cost, less risk. No, we didn't go down those roads. What we chose to do is to spend some money to try to help people. But that is what I am being criticised for.

So, Madam Speaker, that's in the past. I take my hat off to the private sector that came and said, *Here, this is what we think we can afford and still be competitive*. They said you are changing your immigration policy for better. The tourism sector had asked us to remove outgoing immigration and that is being done. All of those things to help. Expand the airport; that is being done. So they said, *We will be able to withstand it. This too shall pass*. And I take my hat off to them for helping.

Madam Speaker, if you listen to them, particularly the Member for East End who said he was trying to make a point that nation building was the cause of the civil service salary cut that they took. And they accused nation building. He screamed out in his short debate and said, *Give that money to go elsewhere in the government*. That's what the Member for East End said.

Madam Speaker, you see when they don't have to sit down, when they can say (him and the Member for North Side), *Cut it \$20 million; I can cut out \$70 million*, when they can say that it shows in these serious times with the amount of work it takes with the kinds of systems that government has in place that you have to work through, even down to the very printing of the documents, it takes forever—two or three days—and if one thing is changed, then five or six documents have to be changed, and it involves probably 13 output groups. So, ministries, departments, everybody has to be involved all over when there is one change. That's the kind of system this is.

They think they understand, the private sector thinks they understand just what that is. But they don't know what elected officials and the civil service have to put up with, with the system. They do not know. That's why it has to change, Madam Speaker. It has to change. I have been saying that. And if I could do it

myself . . . but elected officials are not elected to do those things, you know. Elected officials are elected to say that my policy is to change it. But if you listen to them yesterday, *The Premier! It's him!*

Madam Speaker, did any Leader of Government Business sit down and write their own speech and do the necessary things in these books? Did anyone? They think that they can blame me for it? No! It's not an elected member that does that; the civil service has to do it. They have to do it, but they must understand and appreciate too just how much the civil service has to do and what it entails. So when they criticise they are not telling the truth. That's the real thing that irks me—not their criticism—the untruth that is told and the things that are insinuated.

So, they say that nation building is the cause. Look at that report today, Madam Speaker. Any wonder that they have my ire up? Any wonder? Madam Speaker, I have to be at that point, getting nettled the way I was when I read that kind of report, because I know that they have been saying that this is the cause. Look at how they write it, Madam Speaker. Look! Do you think it's fair? And then you think I shouldn't come here and say it's unfair? Well, if I shouldn't come here and say that it's unfair, how should this House vote the same person out and he can't come back here? Why? No!

I know, Madam Speaker, that they would like me to be somebody else, Madam Speaker. I can't be that. You know me too long. You had a hand in training me too!

Madam Speaker, some of the things that they said about nation building, *Give that money back. Make it spend in civil service*, they said. I heard some of the same claims and some of the same talk back in 1994 when we were trying, Mr. Eden, to get sports started here. I heard it; *You shouldn't be putting that kind of money on sports. You don't need those facilities. You don't need coaches*. I don't know who else remembers, but I was the Minister of Sports and I remember. But look where sports has come to because I started it, because we could build the Truman Bodden [Complex] for \$3 million when they told me that I had to put cement down on the ground for cars to run on, and asphalt. *I said, no; we don't need to do that, plant grass. That's easier to keep, less costly, less heat. It's green!* But I was told no, in fact, rejected in Cabinet once. But what would the country be today without those facilities around the districts, without those coaches around? What would we be? You wouldn't have been able to send many people as a country. And some people don't value this, you know—*Oh, no, no, Cayman? Shouldn't do that! Not Cayman; it's too small. You shouldn't be able to send anybody off to Olympics. Leave that for the United States. Leave that for the metropolitan countries*. Well for us to get people to that level you have to train

them. You have to spend money to get it done. You have to have the facilities.

So what do they think this must be, just a rock for them to come and make money? No! There is a life here otherwise. So what do they want us to do? What would the Member for East End want us to do about giving them this money back? Get more police? Build more courts? Get a larger prison to send our children to? Do away with the nation building vote where we are training them, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, what is it?

Well of course it's what are we doing. What is the purpose of developing young people's leadership abilities and commitment to serve the community, encourage more Caymanians, including those who might not qualify for other scholarship programmes to become qualified and equipped for the working world and in so doing promote development of individuals and communities? Give specific consideration to students who are otherwise qualified but who have financial needs.

Madam Speaker, what are the areas of study that they could get into? Some of these couldn't get into the regular education. I heard them talking about it. Now their big thing is, even if you had it, it shouldn't be with him. It shouldn't be with the Premier! What a pile of nonsense, Madam Speaker. I am the Minister of Finance. I am the Premier. And I shouldn't have anything except just being there to stand up and take licks? Listen, Madam Speaker, I have considered myself a social thinker all my life. I have worked in social development. That's why I became Minister of Health and Human Services and that's why I became Minister of Community Services, Youth, Sports, Women's Affairs and Culture, because I knew. And they knew I knew. That's why they could put me to do it.

Yes, we have a sports minister; yes we have a health minister. Madam Speaker, that vote has been cut. With all the things that were requested we now have a shortfall. But what are they, Madam Speaker? There are people who might need \$1700 because they just don't have it to get into a course. There are people that want to do certain things that they can't get done through the government's regular education programme.

Madam Speaker, there is the Cayman Islands Youth Development Consortium, the Cayman National Cultural Foundation Mind's Eye and Cayman Traditional Arts, \$120,000, Madam Speaker. Hundreds of school children doing that after school programme. That's what these are. And the Hope Foundation for Today . . . When I say, Madam Speaker, Cayman Traditional Arts, look at what the programme is all about. Have they gone and really extrapolated and talked about it and looked at it and said this is what it's all about? No, they don't do that. They cuss nation building.

That is a programme from every district, well over 400 children (I believe) involved for \$120,000, Madam Speaker. Hope Foundation, that's a programme to aid people who have come out of prison, Madam Speaker, and have no place, rather than going back out on the street. Isn't it better for Government to give [to] these people than for them to be back on the street to get back in prison again?

There are young people who are developing and trying to promote their musical talent. Who is going to help them, Madam Speaker? These are our children, you know! But they don't want us to nation build; they don't want our children to improve! They would rather build the prisons and the courts and hire the judges. They don't want them to improve; they want the recidivism because they get nowhere then!

Listen, I've been here nearly 28 years. I've seen it. I get cussed and blamed for it. But we've put these programmes in place and then you have one or two politicians, plus people in the press, plus others who have their own agendas, cussing it, destroying it and by the time the next government gets elected it's wiped out and those young people get nowhere. We were adamant as a Government that that was not going to happen.

The young girl who runs this programme is a product of the programme. She just did her masters, Madam Speaker. Look at the things it covers.

Madam Speaker, they talk about the church. I help Wesleyan Church because West Bay has no hurricane shelter while Bodden Town has two. East End has two. Cayman Brac is struggling. We certainly know when there's a problem in Cayman Brac. The Aston Rutty Centre cannot do it. And if the Member on the PPM side says otherwise, he's not telling the truth. He knows that when there is a problem the Aston Rutty Centre cannot hold the people. Where do the people go? What do they do? They have to run up in a cave. And they cuss that.

Madam Speaker, it's time for the truth to be told. And if I have to take another hour to do so, I am going to do so. You can't run this country without giving this sector something. And it makes absolute sense for me to have built, or try to build with the Wesleyan Holiness Church, give them some money to build a civic centre, or to help build it, and the church takes care of it, the church maintains it, where 400 and 500 people congregate every week, three or four times a week, if not every day of the week now . . . most churches have something going on. Where do they go? What do they do?

The people who are cussing it will pick up and go back somewhere else sometime. Of course they may believe they are not going to do that. I hope so, though. Some of them I hope they go back. The first hurricane comes, Madam Speaker, they pick up their bags, brush their tail and go on. We're here! Even that

they lie about, you know. They say that I went too. Yeah, right!

Madam Speaker, those are things that irk me because I see it in the community and most people are not seeing it. Most people are looking what I can do, Let me do that, let me be the one they start the website to get 6,000 people registered. So what are they going to do? And 12,000, they claim, maybe they get them from all over the world, but yet they say it is Cayman.

Madam Speaker, that is not in there. That money that we had in there, we took it out. So, when they want to talk about churches getting, very few, Madam Speaker, will get. It is less than \$1 million for a number of churches and church-based programmes. But, Madam Speaker, we said in our campaign in our manifesto that we would work with the churches because that's where the people were at. How are we going to work with the churches? One part is that we must go there and ask the pastor to pray for us and thank him or her. Well, we are supposed to help them too. Yes, we give some . . . those of us who believe in tithing, tithe. There are others who do not. And some of them don't have anything to give. Government can plan and programme with these people.

Madam Speaker, I had a taste of it in West Bay. We had a taste of it in Prospect School. They stayed there for weeks on end. You think you can have school with 400 people in it? You can't! You have to have the facilities. And you can't have them all over the place. Thank God that there are people who don't need to go because their homes are such to the extent that they don't have to worry about a hurricane coming.

So, Madam Speaker, what do they want me to cut out of this? Not these church-based programmes. Not cutting them. They can cry as long as they want, they can do all of that. Look at the community vocational programme, Madam Speaker. Government is giving it \$40,000. Look at what it is doing. Look at the things they are doing—plumbing, electrical installation, carpentry, air-conditioning repairs, welding. Any interested Caymanian over the age of 16 years. Madam Speaker, I am proud of Allan Moore, who himself is a master electrician, and Lorna Bush and others who are working with him, Burns Rankin and others who are working with him. And that's not good? I must cut this nation building programme? No, Member for East End! Not cutting it.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: The Member for East End rows about the church-based programme, but he's the first one there looking votes whenever there is a function.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Not me. Never did.

Madam Speaker, what about the institute for paralegal certificate programme? Forty thousand dollars, twenty thousand dollars, whatever it is. Madam Speaker, there are a number of young girls who can have that attainability that they can become paralegals. But that's bad. Why is that bad, Madam Speaker? Because you are taking people of the community that normally would not have that opportunity to be able to get that level of training. This is widely recognised by the Law Society, the Bar Council, the United Kingdom Government Solicitors Regulation Authority and Legal Services Ombudsman, headquartered in Berkeley Square, Mayfair, London. Why? It cost \$1,675 per person.

No, Member for East End, I'm not listening to you on that particular matter.

Madam Speaker, look at the one for Superior Auto, \$60,000. What is it? At least a dozen young men and I think even a young girl was in this programme. What are they doing, Madam Speaker? Training to be mechanics and going to Jamaica to do their exams. I am proud of the owners of Superior Auto. These are the kinds of people that help make a country. They nation build. They are contributing. They are not smearing people. They are not out there just carrying on, stirring up strife, looking news and not being positive.

No, Madam Speaker, we are not cutting this vote any more.

Madam Speaker, it is past time that these sorts of things were done for people in our community. For far too long a certain level of people didn't get anywhere. For far too long education scholarships went to certain families and friends. We know! We've been here. I wasn't just born here, or just come here, I know the history. There were times you couldn't get a job in the Glass House. They said there were none. Yes, but look at who got them.

Madam Speaker, far too hypocritical and I am not a hypocrite. I know what they want. They want us to go back to then. They want our children . . . they want these kinds of children to be the hewers of wood and carriers of water. They want them to be the ones who iron the frocks and the dresses and the pants. They want them to be the maids. They want them to cut the grass piece. But some of them, Madam Speaker, can be the mechanic. Some of them can be the concert pianist. Some of them can be the paralegal. Some of them have the ability. All we need to do is give them the opportunity. And this Government . . . I am not concerned about who is going to elect me, or whether they will elect me. I have had seven elections that I've won.

Madam Speaker, if the people don't want me again, all I can say is that I will get rest. But woe be onto this country if who I see writing in the papers, who I see talking about they are going to galvanise together . . . woe be onto us. As I said in my speech the other day, they don't know how to sell an aspirin, so do you think they know how to cure a headache?

Madam Speaker, the facts are the facts. Now look at what they are saying about the civil service, as much as they are trying to say we shouldn't take the money for the nation building. Much is being said about the civil service management group giving up the 3.2 per cent. Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said that the Member for North Side can only tell 10 per cent of the truth. That's what he said in the papers, and he never corrected it. But I tell you what. I don't know that I can say that he even tells 10 per cent of the truth, not after listening to him yesterday.

Madam Speaker, under the Constitution . . . and I say this because he made the accusation that I cut the civil service salary. Under the Constitution, as politicians, (I repeat), we have no responsibility or control of the civil service of this country. He should know that because he claims to be one of the architects of the Constitution who got an MBE for getting it through—one that I don't believe had enough votes to pass! But anyway, it is what it is. The civil service of this country is strictly under the control of the Governor and his deputy. Furthermore, the civil service chose to elect a management council of good civil servants to speak for them.

Madam Speaker, I also named out on Monday the civil servant members of the Expenditure Reduction Committee. All civil servants, when they gave us their recommendation they chose to cut back on police and police housing, Hurricane Ivan benefits, and they chose and recommended to sell the helicopter. Now, none of that is going to happen because I said, whether we agreed or not, the UK will have a say on that because it is a reserved subject; the Governor's subject. So it is taken out. It is not there.

But the same civil servants recommended that civil servants also pay some of the cost of their health insurance premium. They made the recommendation of \$100 for a single person; \$150 for a couple, and \$200 per family—all per month. That was one proposal. Another proposal for an alternative was co-pay for health care, of 15 per cent of the cost per visit, plus \$10 co-pay per prescription.

Then they made another proposal for the civil service to be required to take a one or two day . . . sorry, one or two week furlough. That furlough equated to about 3.9 per cent of the person's salary. Now, if we had taken that, you are taking the co-pay and you are taking what they were recommending for part of the insurance cost, when we took all that was proposed, Madam Speaker, it would have really devas-

tated the civil service. It would really have devastated their income. I don't know if they have any disposable income, but I tell you what, they wouldn't have any after this.

And then the Leader of the Opposition gets up and tries to say that McKeeva Bush did that, Madam Speaker. That really irks me because be sure what he said is going to be carried. I am not sure that what I am saying will be carried or written by *CNS*, or *Compass*. I'm not sure. But I am talking the facts.

Madam Speaker, when that man got up there and said that yesterday, I'm wondering who will stop him. Nobody can stop him.

I had to wonder about the recommendation. And we said if that's what they are recommending, well, we'll accept it. But, boy, it's a tough one.

Madam Speaker, the management team, sensible as they are, came and made a presentation and a recommendation to Cabinet which proposed that instead of all those very and more serious cuts and loss of benefits, they would take a 3.2 per cent salary reduction, the COLA [Cost of Living Allowance] rolled back. We call it "COLA" rollback, but it's a salary reduction, that's what it is. Now that is nowhere as tough as those other recommendations. That's a lot of money that would have come out, I think.

Madam Speaker, the one or two weeks furlough was going to affect their pensions, any loss like that. But this 3.2 per cent will not affect the civil servants' pension.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me say that I have been one person that has always believed that when we have to do any such thing that the higher salaries should take the licks. Civil servants argue, and perhaps rightly so, that the higher salaries have higher costs, of course. They are not just making a higher salary. So the more you make, the more the reduction is going to be on the higher salary. But coming from a little bit of socialist background, I guess, I feel the more you make the more you can give. But certainly, the more you make the more you are spending. And the more your cut is going to be. But I always believed that the top ones should take the biggest cut. That's how I always felt.

Mind you, some salaries are big. But mind you, Members of this House give too.

So, Madam Speaker, again to make you absolutely aware, the Cayman Islands Constitution Order 2009 says, [section 55 (1)] "**The Governor shall be responsible for the conduct, subject to this Constitution and any other law, of any business of the Government with respect to the following matters . . .**" and it goes down (a) is defence; (b) external affairs; (c) internal security including the police, without prejudice to section 58; (d) and I read this: "**the appointment (including the appointment on promotion or transfer, appointment on contract and appointment to act in an office) of any person to**

any public office, the suspension, termination of employment, dismissal or retirement of any public officer or taking of disciplinary action in respect of such an officer, the application to any public officer of the terms or conditions of employment of the public service (including salary scales, allowances, leave, passages and pensions) for which financial provision has been made, and the organisation of the public service to the extent that it does not involve new financial provision.”

Does that tell you that the Premier can do so? Or the Minister of Finance? No! No, Mr. Leader of the Opposition. I don't know if he's in the House. He's probably in the back somewhere about, hiding. Well, he's not in his chair.

Madam Speaker, the man has to stop telling lies. And I know that when you say “lies” it's unparliamentary, but when you can prove it it's not unparliamentary. It's a fact! The man has to stop doing it. He has to stop doing it. The Constitution is clear. I have no say over it. I can agree when they make a recommendation. As a policy I can agree, but I have no say. The Governor has it, with his deputy and whomever they appoint. Right now they have the acting Deputy here with us. She's responsible too, just in case there is any doubt. They are the ones. That is how the Constitution is, Madam Speaker.

And I know. I work with these people. They take their position seriously. I mean, there are some you will find laxidassical in every institution, every organisation. But, thank God, the vast majority of the public servants in this country pull their weight or we wouldn't get anything done.

Madam Speaker, when the Member says that nothing is being done, he is not telling the facts. He screams, saying nothing was being done; that we didn't do anything and that's why we are in a mess today. Madam Speaker, that's not true. We know what put this country in a mess financially and he needs to accept it. That's why he's not going to sit here, because he doesn't want to hear it. Maybe the PPM don't want to hear, but the facts are the facts. If you borrow too much, you can't pay it back in time, it adds up. I will come to it later.

Madam Speaker, there have been a number of cost-saving measures being proposed for the 2012/13 budget. So we can't say nothing was done. We might say it wasn't done in time or time enough. You have to give credit where credit is due. The roll-back will save [\$]4.2 [million] based on current staff complement and the 1st of September implementation. But also, that will put this country in good stead. There will be an adoption of an 80/20 policy on existing vacancies, cutting 145 of the approximately 200 new vacant posts across the core government. By adopting a freeze on these vacancies the government will realise a projected cost savings of \$6.4 million. That savings estimate is calculated using an average total

annual remuneration of \$59,000, inclusive of salaries, pensions and health insurance costs. And that is also based on nine months' funding as not all posts were budgeted for the full year.

There was also an adoption of a hard freeze on salary increases which will be implemented with immediate effect and closely monitored by the Deputy Governor, who is the head of the civil service. They will also undertake to reduce the size of the core civil service by approximately 360 employees over the next five years, assuming there are no requirements. And that will be done through a voluntary separation policy, which is estimated to result in an initial outflow of approximately \$1.5 million in 2012/13; and net savings in future years of \$1.8 million.

There will be natural attrition, and the careful management of requests for replacement of departing employees through the established recruitment moratorium process. A very robust argument will be required to replace any departing staff members and any requests in this regard will be subject to intense review and scrutiny by the Deputy Governor. The average staff turnover in 2010/11 was 11.6 per cent of total headcount.

The ongoing Rationalisation and Transformation Review, which focuses on the efficiency and need of Government services, may result in some services being privatised or discontinued which will result in a reduction of headcount. The changes to the headcount numbers will, of course, have to be done based on the policy priorities of the Cabinet Ministers. And that's where we are going to have to be diligent.

Adoption of new post retirement employment policy: Civil servants aged 60 and older, and in receipt of a Public Service Pension Board pension, where such pensions had at least 10 years prior service, to be appointed at point 1 of the applicable salary grade when they receive a new or renewed employment contract. Estimates are that this will save approximately \$500,000 in the 2012/13 financial year and \$1 million in the 2013/14 financial year.

Then there will be a conversion of settlement allowance to a short term loan, that is, where persons are recruited from overseas they may receive the equivalent of one month's salary to relocate, but this sum is now repayable within six months. We are estimating that we will save approximately \$200,000 through this policy change in 2012/13 and \$400,000 in future years.

The Speaker: Excuse me, Mr. Premier, are you quoting from your budget address? Or you have notes you are quoting from.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: No, Madam Speaker. I am quoting from notes that I have.

The Speaker: All right. I just wanted to know because it wasn't marked. Thank you.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I can get you a copy of this, so you can have it.

The total estimated savings for 2012/13, total gross savings of \$11.3 million, less voluntary separation outlays of \$1.5 million, for a net savings of \$9.8 million as a result of the human resources cost reduction. Yet the man said yesterday there is nothing being done! Nothing being done. Well, as I said, it was a good Opposition speech, but a lot is being done.

Madam Speaker, when the Member said there was nothing being done and that's why we are in problems. The problem is that when they hired in between 2005 and 2009 600, 700, 1,000 civil servants because of the various systems, the PMFL [Public Management and Finance Law] included, that's where the problem started. They can't get out of that fact, Madam Speaker. You cannot put on 1,000 persons in an organisation and think, particularly one where you have the kinds of health costs and benefits you have, and that's not going to affect. And you think that we can just solve that in three years? I wish!

But, Madam Speaker, that's just the explanation. What are we doing about it? And that's the point, because he said nothing is being done about it. Madam Speaker, we agreed from early with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (2009, because that was September 2009) and at that time we had to do it to get the \$312 million. It was on a condition of granting approval to borrowings to commit. We had then to commit to a review of the public service, focusing first on the major spending departments. And that started, Madam Speaker. How can people forget that there was spread across the papers this kind of information? What I am giving here now is not new information because we talked about it in previous debates.

Yet he came back yesterday and said that nothing is being done, nothing was done. The first phase of the review of the public services consisted of four agencies: CINICO, the Department of Tourism, the Prison Service, and the Public Works Department. And we saved. And they wondered how, Madam Speaker, we could say we had surplus. Because, Madam Speaker, at several points in our three years, things were better than at other times. Savings were accepted by Cabinet, some \$16.4 million. The second phase covered the RCIP Service, Education Children and Family Services, the Cayman Islands Airport Authority, the Ports Authority, the Fire Service, Customs and Computer Services. And the savings accepted by Cabinet were \$8.3 million.

Madam Speaker, the Cabinet has still to consider other savings proposed by the teams. Those savings will be spread over a three-year period. We

couldn't make all the cuts at one time. But that's how we were doing better than at other times. How many is this? Nine plus eight is 17, plus \$16 million, \$30-something million spread over a period of three years. Savings! And they talk about we are not doing anything and there is no plan.

The problem with the civil service and with us as an elected government is that we have the poorest PR in the world. It is no wonder, Madam Speaker, that you can't write something before CNS gets it. And they think they're smart. And the person who gives it to them thinks they are smart. All that is doing, Madam Speaker, is spreading things before it's complete. And so the wrong impression is left there and the writers, they are not going to correct it. Uh-uh!

So, don't talk about something not being done. That was \$30-something million spread over three years. You can't do it all at one time because it affects people and in our economy if you are affecting people you are affecting the economy, making it worse. We didn't need Greece to tell us; we saw that in 2009. And we told them so.

Then, Madam Speaker, phase four of the Review is in three parts. And that is now currently ongoing. That is a Rationalisation Review to review the functions and services being provided to the public by all government agencies, identifying those that have become obsolete and need to be abolished, or misplaced and need to be transferred, or require separation where there are governance, regulatory or human rights conflict issues, or combining where synergy would better serve the needs of the country. Also, Madam Speaker, to focus on those functions that could be better carried out by the private sector, either through privatization or the contracting out of services. And that will be completed by May next year.

Two: to review reports and to develop an action plan to implement those outstanding recommendations. That is the Keith Luck Report, which was a report that Cabinet authorised, then the Miller/Shaw report (another one), and then the review of the PMFL, those three reports. This will be completed by this year December, God willing. To follow up on the reports of these three phases to progress implementation, will be completed by October 2012.

Madam Speaker, it is downright disingenuous, to say the least, for the Leader of the Opposition to stand here yesterday and accuse the Government, and when he is trying to butter up the civil service, he was accusing them too, because they are responsible to put these things to us. So, he might think that people are so fool-fool because he says so, that they don't understand when they are being criticised that way, and he's buttering them up and criticising them. He must think that people can't see through that. But people are not that fool-fool; they know when they are being criticised.

He's not that good. I wouldn't be terming him that. Anyone who wants to give him that kind of educational credit can go ahead. Theatrical acts, the key to what he was being yesterday.

Madam Speaker, what I have said here shows that the public service have put measures in place. What they can't do fast enough, Madam Speaker, is rid us of the load that we are carrying. That's the problem that the public service has. They do good work, but they don't have good PR. And you just can't rid the country of what you took on because it will crush in our small economy. That's why. That's why. But I thank them for their work.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if we could take the break at this point.

The Speaker: You want to do a full lunch break? Is that it?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I would be pleased if it were one hour.

The Speaker: I will do an hour and a quarter. We will come back at 2.30. Proceedings are suspended until 2.30.

Proceedings suspended at 1.11 pm

Proceedings resumed at 3.19 pm

The Speaker: Proceedings are resumed. Please be seated.

When we took the break the Premier was making his presentation.

Honourable Premier, would you continue now?

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, when we took the break I was starting to deal with the criticisms made by the Leader of the Opposition on the various misleading statements made by him in his contribution.

Madam Speaker, one point he made was that the chairman of the Immigration Review Team had resigned, and he was trying to make some hay out of that. But, Madam Speaker, there is no truth to that statement. She has not resigned. The Immigration Review Team completed their work, and I brought that here, tabled that report and asked for public feedback. That report was sent to the public. Cabinet has now received the feedback, mainly only from about four people actually, and what is going to happen now is that that report is coming to Cabinet for Cabinet to accept the term limit report and then the law will be changed. That is the next part of the process.

That committee also recommended a manpower development plan. And what is going to happen

now is that we are going to give that committee the work to do on the manpower development plan. So, Madam Speaker, there is nobody resigning. The Chairman has certainly not resigned. I don't know if anybody else has; we haven't been notified of it.

So, if he wants to make a point of some kind, that Member will say anything, and think he can get away with it. Madam Speaker, that Member went on and on and on about confidence and incompetence; "Incompetence" being a theme that he is picking up from the Member for North Side—both of them. And, of course, the Leader of the Opposition has been as nasty as possible about confidence.

Madam Speaker, I said just now that the Immigration Review Team, being chaired by Sherry Bodden-Cowan, is not going back for the manpower committee. They are going back for the growth management. They recommended a growth management plan. So we have asked them now to start work on that so they are about to go back to start work on the growth management plan.

Madam Speaker, as I was saying just now, [that] in these situations the Leader of the Opposition likes to be as nasty as possible. Oh, he screamed on and on about confidence, about the [Community] Enhancement Fee, saying that that has brought what [there's] destruction now of the country. That never caused this country any problems, Madam Speaker. What caused the problem in this country is when that Leader of the Opposition said early in his appointment that he was going to start a campaign the likes of which this country has never seen. That is what caused the various blips in this economy. And they have. They went on a campaign, never the likes have I seen, two of them on the radio every week. And although the Member for North Side says he is independent, he is no more independent than Satan is God!

So, the two of them can be credited for causing all the uncertainty in this country. And I will come to it as I go on here, because I am going to deal with all of them now.

Madam Speaker, what creates loss of confidence is when ministers will not do their work, are incompetent to the extent that institutions will lose money. Madam Speaker, what happened to pensions? Pensions under the Leader of the Opposition as the Minister responsible for private sector pensions . . . there was over \$200 million lost. Our people's money! Two hundred million dollars! I never heard anyone from that side over there and the businessman over there is supposed to be the Member for Cayman Brac. I never heard him saying anything about it. He never said anything about it then, and he's not said anything about it since, because they don't want people to believe that they had any share in that responsibility.

But he was the Minister responsible for private sector pensions, running up his mouth about thinking long term. I would think that \$200 million is very long term, and hard to get back. Two hundred million dollars! And he has the audacity to talk about incompetence.

Madam Speaker, talk about incompetence, three words they were using, “confidence,” “incompetence,” and “expenditure.” Madam Speaker, in 2008 KPMG did a report called “The Cayman Islands Financial Services: Protecting our Leading Industry.” They talked to him and warned him about what was going on and the number of businesses leaving these Islands. The work permit approval process was burdensome, inconsistent and slow compounding the already difficult process of recruiting. They said the turnaround time on work permit applications was three months, backlogged needed to be cleared and applications needed to be processed in a timely manner or they were going to lose business.

Madam Speaker, when did that get fixed? Did he do anything? No, Madam Speaker, that got fixed during our administration. And he didn't do anything about the number of work permits then, nor did he do anything about the time it took for a company that needed the work permit to get it. He didn't do anything about . . . he's talking now about work permits, and too many work permits. Mind you, he's being very cautious, you know. He is all over the place now. He claims boardrooms and barrooms and restaurants and even churches, Madam Speaker. He's on a platform talking about getting votes.

So, he's all over the place, according to him. But what did he do? As we saw what happened to the business, we can see the incompetence. It has to be incompetence if they didn't know that Lehman Brothers would cause us to lose more than \$200,000. Got to be! And I heard it was him who told the then Leader, because he was the Minister responsible for the financial services, I heard it was him that told the Leader then to say that.

Madam Speaker, if he wants to talk about incompetence, under him as Minister for Financial Services, Cayman fell from 16th to 25th in the top 50 financial centre ratings. From 16th to 25th while he was minister! He wants to talk about incompetence, Madam Speaker, this country, the 5th largest financial centre in the world, getting on the OECD [Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development] blacklist. That was incompetence! And then he thought he could fool international powers and business by running and putting a few islands, Faroe Islands, the next one, and trying to group them together to say that he had enough that they could take him off. They took him off all right; helped convince the people to take him out! But they didn't take him off, Madam Speaker; they didn't take the Cayman Islands off. That was a job that

I had to do, as incompetent as he and the Member for North Side say I am.

Madam Speaker, let me say, I think I can give a good account of my work as Minister of Finance. No, I am not an accountant. I didn't tell anybody I was. But I have good sense, Madam Speaker. Good common knowledge. And I can talk the lingo too. I am not an accountant, but, Madam Speaker, you don't need to have a degree to be Finance Minister, or any minister. You don't.

Madam Speaker, for those who call me incompetent, I don't see them doing anything with their lives. I don't know of any business they have that has been so successful. Yet they get up every Tuesday morning talking about incompetence? Huh! Madam Speaker, under my stewardship as Minister of Finance, the Government made good ground to safeguard this country's financial centre—several good sound long term and solid accomplishments. While they were here cussing me and getting in the news, I had to be travelling, yes, to increase the number of signed Tax Information Exchange Agreements [TIEA] between the Islands and other countries, to get them up to where OECD could take us off. And we accomplished that in the first several months of our administration—even the one with the mother country. Yes, I hear the Member for East End talking about agreements. I had to sign one with HM Treasury. And all of this resulted in the Cayman Islands once again being returned to the international white list. And this was a critically important achievement in order to protect our financial services sector.

Madam Speaker, you never heard them say that. Uh-uh. I didn't hear the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac say anything about that. Nor did the First Member for Cayman Brac, who I hear might be the Deputy Leader soon, but certainly he's the one who speaks about business on that side. And he should, as a very successful businessman. And I want to remind him of how much we help him. And so, Madam Speaker, with a steady hand at the wheel and prudent fiscal management, the Cayman Islands was able to retain its coveted Aa3 financial rating by Moody's, under whose leadership? Whose? While the United States tumbled down and the UK tumbled down and the rest of the countries falling, even as those other countries saw downgrade in theirs. Another key accomplishment for who the Member for North Side said “is a high school drop out.” I had enough sense to talk to them, though, to tell them, to show them to follow instructions by people with knowledge. I wonder what he did with his high school knowledge.

For three years, Madam Speaker . . . and again, I did not hear the businessman over there, the First Member for Cayman Brac, say anything about this. For three years the country bemoaned the lack of timely annual accounts. Not for three years, for years!

Under our leadership, my leadership as the Minister of Finance, public finance, the Government prepared and submitted a complete set of annual accounts in 2011 by the legal deadline established in the Public Management and Finance Law. This was the first time that such an achievement was made since the introduction of the Public Management and Finance Law in 2004. The first time! No accounts! And you are talking about confidence?

You are talking about confidence and you are talking about competence. Ask the Member for North Side why, Madam Speaker, he is embracing the Leader of the Opposition—who he criticised tremendously when he was campaigning about the same thing. Now he gets up and says that I should resign because I am a high school dropout and don't know how to manage finance. Who did this? I didn't hear him say any of them say anything about it.

The First Member for Cayman Brac talked about he is the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. Well, he is. But he ought to be thankful and he should be speaking on these things. But did he do it? No, because he plays his politics as good as anybody else; my friend, the First Member for Cayman Brac.

Madam Speaker, they can dig, dig, dig, dig, but they cannot dig up any wall or hedge around them to prove that it was not them that put this country in the doldrums when they borrowed and they borrowed and they borrowed. And all of them stood right here and they didn't say anything—including the First Member for Cayman Brac. He was part of it! The First thing that I had to do was convince, firstly, the UK, who tried to slam me into doing taxes, but they agreed because it was under their Governor that they borrowed \$400 million and spent and spent and spent on programmes that never had any money and commitment and legal contracts. But that \$312 million allowed us to amalgamate certain long term debts into a single bond with a favourable interest rate and was part of a wider debt strategy of fiscal sustainability.

And if we hadn't done it . . . they say that I destroyed the country because I said the country was broke. I didn't say that country was broke. What I said was that they bankrupted the Government. Government's coffers were bankrupt. That's what I said. And if anybody thinks that we have money let them go back. Let them go back; we still can't pay all the fees that the Member for East End left for roads.

So, Madam Speaker, this was a high school drop-out who could do that—from Hong Kong to London, to San Francisco, to New York and Boston. But the lawyer couldn't! The lawyer couldn't.

Madam Speaker, I inherited a fiscal position where Government finances ended in 2008/09 year with \$81 million deficit. I hear the Member . . . like I said, he must be dyslexic or autistic because he says it was only \$18 million. So he turned the \$81 [million]

into \$18 [million]. Within two fiscal years that position was turned around into an unaudited surplus and our current budgetary plans will feature an even greater surplus in excess of \$70 million for the current 2012/13 fiscal year.

Yeah, these were fool-fool people, incompetent people that are doing this? No, these are sensible people putting us back on a sound financial footing.

Madam Speaker, they can talk from now until the fowls cut teeth. I have been a staunch defender of our financial services industry. And I have ensured the presence at a negotiating table whenever discussions or threats presented themselves. They talk about expenditure and spending to go off. Of course, the private sector who wants them. But this is not the financial industry complaining, you know. These are other people, some of them who get defended in this House, Madam Speaker. It's right in the news, talking foolishness about having to travel. Some things you can do by telephone, but not everything. You have to do it at a negotiating table.

And this afforded us the opportunity for robust engagement and to also ensure that measures for potentially adverse impacts on our jurisdiction were effectively mitigated. And such efforts have resulted in the Cayman Islands taking the top spot in the second quarter of 2012 as the most popular destination for investors doing deals involving offshore targets. They say loss of confidence? No! The proof is otherwise! The proof is otherwise. And I will show some of it, Madam Speaker, in a few minutes.

Madam Speaker, under my leadership the good ship Cayman has been sailing the turbulent financial seas to calmer waters. We have faced the storms of proposals from the FCO for direct taxation on property, income and value added tax, or VAT. And we have overcome those obstacles by rejecting them while keeping our finances afloat.

Each Government has a four-year term after each election. Yes, I had to borrow during the first two years of our administration, as I explained just now, because we inherited unfunded \$100 million projects and other incomplete capital projects and unpaid capital projects started by them, including the Member for East End who left one building half finished up there and roads not paid for—which there was no revenue to pay for. And my Government has since worked hard and I am pleased to say that again under our stewardship the Government incurred no long-term borrowing in 2011/12 and will not be incurring any long-term borrowing in 2012/13, nor in 2014/15, and 2015/16. None!

Conversely, over the two-year period the Government would have paid back over \$50 million in capital in those two years, thereby reducing our debt stock and also over \$60 million in interest. We have done so in the midst of a worldwide economic crisis and have also been able to improve our infrastructure

and deliver on key capital projects, such as the expansion of our primary school classrooms and new facilities for MRCU.

Madam Speaker, last year our GDP grew by 1.1 per cent signaling a turnaround, as small as that is, from the contraction which began in 2007. And why they are so nasty now; the Member for North Side is finishing up on Rooster at 11.00 and getting on Radio Cayman at 12.00, [along with] the other East End Opposition Member, is because they are beginning to understand that the Government is getting some traction. And that other people who might have not seen the good in what the government was trying to do, certainly saw it when they had to come up and start to pay for some of the things that government was doing.

Now they are offering their support—not the Opposition. I don't trust them. I am talking about the public, members who did not offer support before. So, Madam Speaker, after much hard work and long, long nights and marathon negotiating sessions, we have now prepared a fiscal trajectory that places these Islands on a path whereby in four years we will have cash reserves of well over \$200 million; compliance with all debt ratios which are even more onerous than those which existed during the previous PPM administration. One where there is no borrowing, will be required, during that period and will result in our current debt stock being reduced by a further \$100 million, about [\$]400 [million], thereabout, [\$]500 [million].

I believe that is a fiscal path that any minister of finance can rightfully be proud, and is something that I have worked hard to achieve with the help of my colleagues. And I want to thank the Financial Secretary, Mrs. McLaughlin, Mr. Michael Nixon, Mr. Ronnie Dunn, and several others who worked with us to help us get to this point.

Madam Speaker, incompetence? They don't know what that word is. Madam Speaker, they talk about competence and confidence. They scream about CEF [Community Enhancement Fund], they scream about criminal investigations. Well, perhaps one should have been on that person who was taken off a Cayman Airways flight by the police for breaking that woman's arm. That should have been some kind of criminal investigation.

Madam Speaker, I have been elected seven times and in the public arena a long time. They can't point to anything criminal. They have tried, but that's because they can't control me. I have [been], and will always be, a target because I have always stood in the gap for these Islands to stop those who want to run these Islands into the ground. I, of course, fought the UK Labour Government. I heard them talking about the diplomacy; I have no diplomacy. I wonder where is his. You mean diplomacy is sitting down just agreeing with somebody . . . and he said the words I use. The words I use? What about his actions?

Remember what I say about him; he likes to punch below the belt or, instead of punching above his weight, he is punching below his weight. And he has the audacity to talk about people's behaviour? When did anybody strike anybody up in this House and carry on like a mad man in these precincts? When? He did it! And he has a nerve to point his finger at me? He should be the last one.

Madam Speaker, I will speak where I know and I will be respectful at all times, but I am not going to allow them to get away with anything that will put damnation on this country. And there are things that I cannot trust because history tells me otherwise, Madam Speaker. I would not expect to be loved. I am not going to get any knighthood. I am not looking for anything named after me. No! There are those who are looking for that, not me.

Madam Speaker, in the past I moved the Governor from your seat! I refused to sign their savings directive in its original form because what it meant to this country in that original form, and I said, "No, I am going to hold out long enough so that Cayman can get something out of this, because we might have to sign because of our Constitution and because of our colonial status. But I am going to get something out of it." And I knew they were wrong! Therefore, Madam Speaker, I took them to court and I won. We won. And do you know what we got out of it? What we have been asking—for them to recognise the Cayman Islands Stock Exchange and help push our application for IOSCO [International Organization of Securities Commissions] membership. We got it. Now we are in better standing.

Madam Speaker, I also refused to agree to their meaning of "life sentencing." I don't know if the PPM wants to do that or the people from East End and North Side, but not me. Life sentence to me is a life sentence. So, no, they don't want me; they want to scandal me.

Madam Speaker, I am a student of history. I know. And when the Member for East End gets up and talks about the United Kingdom . . . he, of all people, trying to be a hypocrite. He can't even be a good hypocrite because he and the Member for North Side were the ones who were saying the Governor had to go. But they forgot what they said, you see, until their friend in the *Caymanian Compass* exposed them and ask what those two were talking about. That's the kind of hypocrisy you heard yesterday from the Member for East End.

Madam Speaker, at times a leader has to stand up and do what he has to do regardless. And in this whole budgetary process that's what we had to do. When we came to the point that we were at where they wanted us to be, there was no sense in holding back, not with the timeframe that we have to deal with. We had to come here and present our budget—legally, constitutionally. And they talk about no diplo-

macy (they say). You see, Madam Speaker, that's the same rot that he was talking in 2003 and 2005 when he was defending Ballantyne in his professional capacity. Him! The Leader of the Opposition! Ballantyne, the Attorney General that we had to run away from here for the spying operation in Eurobank, when I was leading the Government.

So you think that I am liked? Of course not, Madam Speaker! They tolerate me, and I tolerate them. I respect them, though. I respect them. Yes, I do have a good relationship with the Conservative Government, much better than we had with the Labour Government. I do have a lot of time for the Minister. But that doesn't mean that if I feel that they are wrong that I am going to sit down and keep my mouth shut and let them do what they want to do. I am not going to do that. That's why we have the kind of Constitution we have today, where we don't know, Madam Speaker . . . where they don't know; I knew if it didn't pass because they ran too quick to burn up those ballots, because I told the Governor I was going to challenge it. I told him so. And within short order they had been burned up and we didn't know. Never saw the official results as a Cabinet.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: *[Replying to inaudible interjection]* Past that.

Madam Speaker, no, I don't have anything to be sorry about when it comes to my . . . the way I have to protect this country. Some people don't understand anything, but if you stand up to them they will get insulted, they might take it out on you later on, but I don't sit down and worry about that. My first duty is the protection of these Islands as best as I can. That's what I said out there that day when I took my post as the Premier, that I would be the defender of this country. And I have tried to do that to the best of my ability. It's hard, you know, when you're trying to do that though, and you have people who are cutting your throat. It is hard when all forces should be joined together.

But I have read the history of the Caribbean. I have read the history of Africa and of India and the outlying outposts who were all colonial outposts and I knew what happened. You do not only get hit from outside by the colonial forces, you get hit from within from your own people, Madam Speaker, who are conniving and working against the best interests of the nation by doing the things they do, declare corruption on every move, talk about incompetence and paint everything as black as possible and build every anthill into a molehill, or a molehill into a mountain. Twist everything. We saw it in the Caribbean, particularly they that went to university, Madam Speaker, some of them who would twist and turn and have enough

competence, not to be successful, but enough competence to cause trouble.

Madam Speaker, now we are moving. We have to amalgamate some more loans or bonds to work with those people to try to save some money. And we're going to do that as well.

Madam Speaker, you also hear them talking about waste and encouraging local investors. The Leader of the Opposition and the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac [and Little Cayman], there is much talk by them and criticism about waste an unneeded expenditure. But they are being hypocrites and talking out of both sides of their mouths. How can you talk about unnecessary expenditure and try to blame us for it? Because that's what the [First Elected] Member for Cayman Brac did. When they can go behind my back and get all sorts of freeness from Cayman Airways and social services for people to keep their support. That costs money! Where do most of them think that money comes from and expenditure comes from? We give Cayman Airways how much? Millions? Free tickets? Cost! Don't complain when you're doing that.

When we gave Brac Power and Light \$500,000, is that waste and unneeded expenditure? No! And you know it; the Member knows it! But it was money. Madam Speaker, when they gave Caribbean Utilities Company—who had insurance!—\$13 million! What was that? These outlays of cash piled up and are the cause of the cash problem today. The cause is not because we give our children an opportunity through the Nation Building, a few thousand dollars for scholarships. No! But when Members can get benefits, as I am talking about, or when as an entrepreneur in Cayman Brac they get benefits through the Department of Tourism, is that waste or unnecessary expenditure? They can't be so hypocritical, Madam Speaker. The Member is a good businessman. He knows better!

Madam Speaker, the Member should remember all these things before he points his finger at this Minister or at this Government to talk about unnecessary expenditure and this Government causing the problems in the last three years. He knows better. He knows better!

Thirteen million dollars to Caribbean Utilities Company when the people of this country had to pay and pay and pay. And the Member for East End, who was the Minister responsible, jumps up with glee to defend their position. Thirteen million dollars! You wanted something to pay civil servants? Don't take it out of the scholarships for this country for these children. Go after Caribbean Utilities to give us back some; that's what the Member should do, Madam Speaker. Every one of them who wants to criticise this Government that is giving scholarships and community programmes. A few thousand dollars—you're talk-

ing about one fell swoop? Yes; it was one fall down swoop! One fall down swoop. Thirteen million dollars!

The [First Elected] Member for Cayman Brac [and Little Cayman] who has good business sense well knows that over the years you outlay cash, outlay cash, outlay cash and there is no revenue coming in, your revenue declining, then what happens? At some time you are not going to be accountable? Where is the weight in the scales, Madam Speaker? Where is it? Where?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: You wouldn't know.

He said, Madam Speaker, the poor governance (that's the Member for Cayman Brac I am referring to), "poor governance," he says, "caused the crisis." He says "poor governance caused the crisis in the last three years." What poor governance? He didn't elaborate. You mean it was the deal that they gave Caribbean Utilities that made everybody's bill go up just as high as their mortgage payment? The Member for East End says he can't take no more. Well, if he can't take the heat he should do what he just did, walk out. Get out of the kitchen! Poor governance? Make I tell you that that agreement was poor governance; that Caribbean Utilities agreement that is licking everybody for six in this country. Your light bill is more than your mortgage.

Mr. V. Arden McLean: You want to use the formula.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: No, you won't get that formula.

Madam Speaker, he said "poor governance caused the crisis in the last three years and caused the UK to demand of us." Shame. Shame-shame on the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac who would get up here and say that. No, Madam Speaker, that is not what caused the crisis. He knows when you keep taking money out of your bank account and you ain't got 'nothing' left and you're getting lower and lower and lower and you are giving and you're giving and you're giving, he knows that that is what caused the crisis plus others.

Let me tell him what it is: It is what he was party to—wasteful spending; no plans for revenue; wasteful spending; Madam Speaker, marl piled up six feet high in West Bay where there was not even a flood before. In Bodden Town, marl piled up. In George Town, marl piled up three, four, six feet high. Nothing done with it just before the election! If there is criminality anywhere, I hope to God one of these days somebody is going to do a proper audit—\$10 million worth! Ten! Ten! Take it out of cash. So you're going to have less cash? Sure you're going to have less cash, nothing replacing it. Wasteful spending!

He's talking about condos. Somebody telling him some Anancy story about they're not going to build any condos now. I know one thing, just had somebody come and put ten stories, two or three stories on the waterfront—ten [stories] for 13 apartments. I am going to come to that too. But I don't know about their plan for revenue.

Madam Speaker, wasteful spending and possible corruption, Madam Speaker! What is the deal with the way of 30 or 9 acres of land which lay down there in front of SafeHaven in front of Governor's Square? Given to the first cousin of the Leader of the Opposition for how much? A few hundred thousand dollars! Nine acres of dry, flat, good land! And they have the nerve to talk about nepotism? Where is it on this side of the House? Where? And they talk about corruption? No! If the Governor wants to do something or anyone wants to do something go and check in to those things. You want to talk about wasteful spending and suspicious expenditure? Look at Cayman Airways' building sold twice, one transfer. Sold twice and one transfer.

Yeah? How much? Two or three million dollars to purchase, or whatever it was? Where was the [First Elected] Member for Cayman Brac then? He was part of the Government; a very integral part of the Government. Not a minister. Maybe he should have been. Maybe we'd been a little bit better off. But certainly he didn't do his good governance that he talked about.

What caused the problem for the United Kingdom to come down? A murderous immigration policy that drove away the financial services. No revenue and loss of jobs. The most devastating borrowing plan—\$400 million in four years or more—and deficits of the highest ever in our history; the Public Management and Finance Law, broken. No government accounts for four years. And then all of that, Madam Speaker, and you break the law, what do you think the United Kingdom, who'd been waiting to grab you up, is going to do? They are going to hold your foot to the fire. And that's exactly what they did with us. That's what we've been struggling with since June.

Come on; tell the truth about these things. Those are the things, Mr. Member for Cayman Brac, that are what made the United Kingdom take control, the breaking of the Public Management and Finance Law. You all broke the law. They grabbed us up, gave us a little leeway. And they ask why we can't fix it in three years. Madam Speaker, you can't fix this thing in three years. It shows. We got four years and we got another four-year plan, which we have had to be committed to. It shows it couldn't be fixed. But it is not that civil servants and us were not trying and cutting back expenditure here and there. Yes, we had to be bouncing in between deficit and a little surplus, holding it together. But at the end of the day, the United Kingdom said, *No, no. Not this time Bobo. I gotcha,*

I'm going to hold ya. I want you to fix your problem. And they gave us to fix the problem and we will fix it. But we will fix it, Madam Speaker, according to their plan. That is the facts.

Don't want to blame them? Who are you going to blame? I used the analogy, Madam Speaker, if I am in my house and I go outside early in the morning and I fall in a big hole that was dug, that I didn't know anything about, I can't get out with no ladder, then who dug the hole? Who dug the hole? The PPM dug the hole. Now, we're in the hole and we have to climb out. It's not easy. And it hasn't been easy. The country must blame them. Blame them! The Member for East End screams about not blaming them. No? He should be flogging them not just blaming them.

Madam Speaker, criticise the Government? They oppose everything and now come back and talk about nothing going on, no development, they say. Can you imagine the hypocrisy? Can you imagine, Madam Speaker, the hypocrisy? Madam Speaker, look at how many things we tried. He pointed them out yesterday. All the different things that we wanted to do. Everything! They went on the radio time and time again to criticise, to lay blame, to make accusation, to scandalise people, to move censure motions. You think when you tell an investor that you are going to burn down his place, his property do you think they are not listening? Do you think the world is not listening? Somebody is listening. What do you think happens when a place goes in chaos and marches and demonstrations are taking place? What happens? Chaos reigns and people sit up and take notice and say, *Hold on! I'm not going there.*

So if anyone was telling that Leader of the Opposition that they had 18 condos to build and they are not going to build them now because of CEF [Community Enhancement Fund], it's got to be something more than that; CEF is not on the table. He says he is not putting in taxes, we say we are not putting in taxes. Now we don't know what the other group is going to say. But I know who has—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Mm-hmm.

Madam Speaker, we know that they did not have any plan. They still—up until yesterday—didn't put a plan before us. Some Anancy-yancy little old made-up thing he wants to talk about after the Deputy Governor brings a plan and after they recognised that we were doing something over three years because the various cutbacks have for some \$30-odd million on the plans, on various departments over three years. Over \$30-odd million. And he wants to talk about . . . he still didn't give me no plan. I never heard any plan. Where is his plan?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Yeah. And many a plan, Madam Speaker—like one old man in West Bay used to say about when the Planning Board asked him why he going to start his house for; that he needed a plan. He said, *I don't need no plan. I got a plan; I need a house!*

[Laughter]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: That's what he said, *I need a house; I don't need no plan.*

Madam Speaker, we need something from them solid. He said we didn't invite them. Can you imagine? The people who come in here listen, Madam Speaker, we did all that we had to do as a Government to give them the room to be part of it. They had all the time in the world to offer and make any kind of plan. No, they preferred to walk out of the House, get out under the tree and hold a mock parliament. That's what they did, when they can't have their way.

They were on the radio, on *CNS*, on television, in the papers and under the trees. But they didn't offer any solutions. Now that they hear some of what we are trying to get done, they say we should have done it. You hear them talking now about Shetty. They never mentioned it so strong because they know there is going to be a ground breaking. But who opposed it more than them when it came out? Who? Who opposed it, Madam Speaker? Those two on the south-east corner, the Member for East End, the Member for North Side opposed it. The PPM Leader now opposed it.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeeva Bush: Opposed it? You opposed it till it would stink, what you all were carrying on in the first days.

Madam Speaker, they seem to forget, but we don't forget. They opposed everything. They bad-mouthed the investor who is going to come. Who wants to come, as I said. He says no confidence? Well the Leader of the Opposition, perhaps he is right. Where is the confidence, I want to ask him, in him? Where is the confidence in him? Like rats leaving a sinking ship, which is going nowhere, nobody wants to follow the mutineers. Nobody wants to follow any mutiny. There is one. When what is required is a steady hand on the helm to bring us home safely. Confidence? When, as is evident, Madam Speaker, in the defection of his founding member, his policies of hate and obstruction are taking him nowhere. Even his founding member got up and ran quick. And they have the audacity to talk about the Government?

My Government is still together! Although he is trying hard to say things . . . nobody *nah* believe it. Don't come with that. I've been through all that before.

All right? I've been through it. I hear you all out there trying to make people cause war. I know that.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: We know your style.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, they went on and on to say about loss of business. There has been a slowdown in business. We acknowledge that. But there is no loss of confidence, Madam Speaker.

Over the past five years the fundamentals of the insurance sector have remained sound and the industry in general has been relatively resilient in this very, very challenging market environment that we are now dealing with. In the first two quarters of 2012, we have recorded tremendous growth with a total of 29 applications submitted during the period, and 18 licences at 30 June 2012 (more than that since then). A total of 16 applications were received in May and June alone. To put this in perspective, Madam Speaker, more licences have been received thus far in 2012 than for the entire year of 2010, and 15 more licences when compared to the same period last year.

No confidence? Madam Speaker, the number of new mutual funds processed during the quarter ending 30 June this year, amounted to 525! And this is much higher than the 285 processed during the same period in 2011. The total number of regulated funds as at 30 June 2012 was 10,846 comprising of 8,572 registered funds; 1,735 master funds, 416 administered funds, and 123 licensed funds. This is some 1,437 more funds than the 9,409 for the same period in 2011. And during the calendar year of 2012, we witnessed a material spike in fund registration due to the amendment of the Mutual Funds Law in December last year to capture master fund structures. Some 2,263 funds were registered during the first six months of the calendar year and, Madam Speaker, what was, or is, a unprecedented number of funds in the history of the division.

They talk about no funds? No confidence? Well, who is doing this? Not a foreign investor in the financial sector services?

Madam Speaker, I heard him go to town about no confidence. Let's look at Planning [Department]. We have waived planning fees and building permits for local business. And I want the [First Elected] Member for Cayman Brac to listen because he asked this question.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yeah, turn around.

You see, when they say we are not doing anything for local business or local people Government approved 1,914 waivers, various fees of import duty and stamp duty during the period of July 2009 to 30 June 2012 totaling over \$7.6 million. And this includes waivers—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: I'll come to you about George Town dying. I will deal with it because you see the town dead. But it's not just dying today—for 30 years it has been, because there was nothing else going on, Madam Speaker, until they got competition. But people begged them and preached to them, *Do something; don't close down at 5.00 in the evening down here.* For 30 years that's what happened here. Not just the cruise ship. Yes, we lost—because of what you all did—400-and-something-thousand cruise ship passengers.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Of course we've had three years! It's not three years they haven't been trying to get it, but it's three years that stumbling blocks have been put in our way. We are going to get it!

Mr. V. Arden McLean: Doing nothing!

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: We are going to get it! Well "nothing" is much for you!

Madam Speaker, the Member for East End doesn't know what he's talking about. He should keep out of big man talk!

Madam Speaker, every . . . I can look at the number of Caymanian businesses that we waived fees and import duties for in this town.

[Inaudible interjection]

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

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: I would appreciate if all Members in the House would find their seats and stay in them!

We are coming up to the hour of 4.30 and we need to take a vote. Please, all Members get in your seats and stay in them.

Thank you.
Mr. Premier.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Any time that my Government was approached by a local business the Planning fees or import duty of company fees or

property fees were waived to assist them. Some of the biggest family companies!

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: No, Madam Speaker! They're asking me I must hurry. I will take another half an hour. When they were out there chatting, chatting, chatting, I had to listen and now I am replying to their foolishness, unfortunately, but it has to go into the record!

Madam Speaker, there is no Caymanian family that approached this Government—small business or large business—that hasn't been assisted to waive their fees. In the housing guarantee, that's a waiver—thirteen point nine million dollars. And you put that together with the [\$]7.6 [million], that's \$21.5 million of assistance given just in waivers and other assistance to Caymanians, first time property owners and so on, wanting to help Caymanians get ahead. Don't tell me that we're not helping people in a very bad time.

So, the [First Elected] Member for Cayman Brac, he gets some of this too! So don't talk about he is not getting some of it!

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: He's getting some of it too.

Of course there is a quiet confidence, Madam Speaker, because they believe that because they get on the radio . . . I use the term "quiet confidence" because you know what? They get 200 people out to march, or they get 3,000 or 4,000 people out to vote for them, the same amount they got in the Referendum, that's what they had at the polls. And they say that's a majority in this country? No it's not! It is not!

And, yes, we are not perfect; we have made mistakes but we get up and we move on. We get up and we [INAUDIBLE] can't kill this country; far too many Caymanians for that.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, there is a quiet confidence because Caymanians recognise that the Government was attempting to do something. Do you think everybody is blinded by one radio show? By the Member for North Side flapping his jaws every Tuesday? No! Nor the Member for East End! People have better sense than that. I know it's discouraging for me when all sorts of stumbling blocks are thrown in your path you can't get anything done. You ask why we can't get anything done? The processes in this Constitution, and if you get in Government you're going to find out.

You go through the process, Madam Speaker, as we did for the Water Authority, the sewerage. It

says you must set up the committee, ministry, set it up, carry it to Cabinet, Cabinet passes it, it goes out for an RFP [Request for Proposal], goes out, that comes back, people bid. People bid on it, it went public. We didn't have anything to do with it except at Cabinet level when we passed it. The committee—yes, there was a committee. We never had any more to it than that.

Madam Speaker, they want to find out why we can't get anything done. One of them or somebody goes to make a complaint to say that something is wrong. What do you think they want to do up there? What do you think they want to do? They want that. Immediately they said, *This has to stop*. So they get at the board, they get at the civil servant—not the politician; they get at the civil servant—and say, *Stop this!* For three years. It has to go back out. So it takes time. They don't want my Government to get it through because it's going to give us revenue!

Moment of interruption—4.30 pm

The Speaker: Honourable Premier, it's the hour of 4.30. I need a motion to continue.

Suspension of Standing Order 10(2)

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 10(2) for the House to conduct business after 4.30.

The Speaker: The motion is that Standing Order 10(2) be suspended for the House to conduct business after 4.30.

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

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

Agreed: Standing Order 10(2) suspended.

The Speaker: Honourable Premier, please continue.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Madam Speaker, when I complete my speech, we propose that we are going to take a break and then start the Finance Committee process. At least we will start the process with the Internal and External Affairs Portfolio. Madam Speaker, it would be good if Members would indicate if they wish to call any particular person. That would save some time.

Madam Speaker, as I said, no Caymanian family, big or small, when they request of us, could get some assistance. The processes that exist are the big problem. And they say it's good governance and want

to check on it? What do you think the civil servants are going to do if the Governor says to them, *'I don't like this; this doesn't look like good governance?'*

Madam Speaker, the United Kingdom Government said, *Listen, that building costs too much money. Try to do something. Rent it. Make some money off of it. But whatever money you take off of that, we want to pay down the loan, because your loans are too big.*

They said the same thing of the Water Authority. And they said the same thing of the sewerage. The sewerage we saw as something completely different. But the money, the \$50 million, or so, you could get from the Water Authority would pay down the loan. I repeat—I said that before, but I repeat it because it's a fact—we set up a committee, Ernst & Young, Deloitte, KPMG, PriceWaterhouseCoopers, and Canover Watson, maybe one or two other people, for the investment council, and they tried. I read the letter before. They try and they try and they try—one stumbling block after another. They finally wrote a letter and they said: "I am sorry but we can't waste our time because we are not getting anywhere. We can't get any response from out." [UNVERIFIED QUOTE] And they couldn't get any response from the civil servant because the Auditor General was jumping down the throat of the civil servant before they could get anything started. And he was in the papers every Monday morning criticising somebody, making it look like the whole world, the whole Government was corrupt or everybody was falling down. So nothing got done! And you ask why?

It's not like when they started the schools, Madam Speaker. They went in there, started \$110 million school! Two, three of them! Gave the company probably the only bit of cash they had—\$12 million. Twelve! The company never had to put up a bond, they put it up for the company—they, the PPM Government, put up the \$12 million for the company. If I had done that—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yeah, they would have done something to me all right. They would have done something to me! They did that, Madam Speaker, and allowed the company to go and start building. And you call that good Governance, Mr. Member for Cayman Brac?

You weren't a minister, but you were part and parcel of it. You should have stepped out when we were complaining about it. No, you voted . . . the Member voted for them!

Madam Speaker, bids that they said were all right, \$30-odd million, if not more, below . . . how much did they bid? Fifty? Sixty? It was more than 30. One hundred and ten million dollar school! And, Madam Speaker, it is different now. The ball game is dif-

ferent now. And I heard the Member for East End and the Leader of the Opposition, attribute all that's going on talking about Turks and Caicos . . . they should be ashamed of themselves. They should be ashamed of themselves to say those sorts of things in this House, Madam Speaker, to do what? To embarrass me, to paint me black, to say all manner of evil—when they know what they did! When it wasn't nepotism, it was something else. With no accounts in Government! And they have the audacity, the temerity to point fingers?

Madam Speaker, when they talk about the Member for North Side only telling 10 per cent of the truth, they are worse! They are not telling any truth! None!

Madam Speaker, it is ridiculous. What caused the problem, Mr. Member for Cayman Brac? Why the UK has stepped in, are those same reasons I have pointed out to you this afternoon. Our fault will be that we tried to get things done in this awful time. We had to vote more funds because of crime, we had to vote more funds because the economy is down, and so there was more expenditure. So that's a big problem, more and more. But that's not what caused the huge problem in this country. You borrow more than you can pay back and that's all the United Kingdom said to us.

Madam Speaker, there is a quiet confidence. Right now before the Planning [Department] is one development for 110 homes and another development for 80 homes, and another housing development for \$35 million plus others before Planning. I guess you're going to soon hear they are going to burn them down or that something is radically wrong with them. As soon as something gets started they are like Indians against the white pioneers. As soon as they saw them coming they wanted to scalp them!

[Laughter]

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: So, Madam Speaker, if there's any loss of confidence, it's not because of any CEF [Community Enhancement Fund]. Planning applications already for the year 2010/11 are 1,090; and the year 2011/12 are 1,272. Building permits, 806 (2010/11) and for 2011/12, thus far (this is up to June I am giving now, Madam Speaker), 838. Madam Speaker, for times like this, that is not bad. This is just the middle of the year. We've still got six more months to go. Up until June we had that for the calendar year.

So, Madam Speaker, all this big racket theatrical display we saw by the Leader of the Opposition who instead of being a lawyer should be some kind of old actor, should sit up and take notice. All that yesterday brouhaha was what it is, a good Opposition speech. He said that the \$81 million deficit will never be audited. Madam Speaker, he would hope that.

He's going to get a shock because, once again, it's not true; it will be audited. The PMFL makes it clear that the year-end 30th June 2009, the 2008/09 year in which the deficit arose, is the earliest year that the Audit Office will audit. What the Audit Office has indicated, and quite sensibly so, is that this particular year will be audited once more recent years' audits are completed. So, once again, that man is speaking so loosely.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that the Member for North Side was on about . . . You know, the truth is, I don't think the Member for North Side really understands the budget process. He seems to think we are back in 1984-1988 when he was here in Cabinet. It's a whole lot different! It's a whole lot different. He suggested that as part of the fiscal solution the Government should simply cut a percentage of the policy advice that Ministers receive. He was there, Madam Speaker, saying on the radio, he said: *Look at this—\$3 million for policy advice for the Premier. What is he doing with all of that in just one place?* On and on he went. He doesn't understand what that is, Madam Speaker?

As I said, such utterances show a complete lack of understanding as to what obtains under the Public Management and Finance Law. If they know, Madam Speaker, they are not educating the public because they don't want the public to know. They want the public to believe that I have [for] that \$3 million somebody up there giving me a little bit of *feyah-feyah* advice and that's what it costs. That's what they are insinuating. That's what they are talking about when that's not so!

Madam Speaker, whenever you see an output like "policy advice and ministerial servicing," the value associated with that output—contrary to what he is saying—is not a distinct item; it isn't a particular consultancy fee or a particular legal retainer or lobbyist or whatever. Rather, an output item consists of several direct and indirect costs of people, civil servants and resources within a respective government agency. So, \$3 million for the Premier because I have all of those other things to be done.

As an example, Madam Speaker, the chief officer in the Ministry of Health, like all other chief officers, is accountable for the delivery of all outputs within that Ministry. That means a percentage of her cost to the government, (that is, her salary, health insurance, pension, et cetera), is captured in every output produced by the Ministry, including policy advice to the Minister of Health. This is true, not just for her, but for all management personnel, such as the chief financial officer, the chief human resources officer, heads of departments, deputies and other key personnel. In addition, Madam Speaker, to a percentage of the time for these officers, the cost of the offices they occupy.

He's gone out of here, but he should have stayed here so that they could learn.

The depreciation on the computers they use. The paper and the toner, even, in the copier. Even the water that is used in the bathroom to wash their hands all forms part of the indirect cost of producing outputs.

It is, therefore, not as simple, as being suggested, that the government should just cut 30 per cent of these outputs. If it were that easy we would have had the budget in February!

Hon. Rolston M. Anglin, Minister of Education, Training and Employment: No wonder he found the \$70 million.

The Premier, Hon. W. McKeever Bush: Yeah, he found \$70 million all right, because that's all he was doing, making these kinds of cuts.

Should I or any Minister tell the Chief Human Resource Officer to stay home a twelfth of the time that was previously planned for her to provide policy advice and pay her that much less? Can we stop the machinery from depreciating by 30 per cent to reduce the cost? Can I ask the bulb in the office to burn 20 per cent less electricity because policy advice is not being produced today? Or, that if Mr. Ezzard want to cut it, burn a little less so to please him?

Madam Speaker, to say: "just cut 30 per cent off the policy advice", is the type of asinine comment that some people like to walk around and whisper in every corner every day of the week. Those are the types of comments that are used to misinform the public and cause anger among the community when discussing government's finances. But I would like to invite anyone so misinformed to call the Treasury, ask if they can sit with someone for a few minutes, let them take him through the process, show him how an output cost is developed, what the country receives for the amount spent, educate themselves and then perhaps we can have an intelligent discussion with them.

I want to make it clear that when an MLA suggests that advice to any Minister of Government should be cut, that means sending people home. So they should be careful, Madam Speaker, about such remarks without understanding what it actually means. It means sending civil servants home. He doesn't know that? He knows it. He said he would cut them 20 per cent, 30 per cent. Six hundred he says.

Madam Speaker, we have had a bad situation to deal with. It's one that I never ever thought that I would have to deal with as a Minister, much less one that holds the portfolio or ministries that I have, much less having the Office of the Premier also. Madam Speaker, I have never seen tougher times. I never thought when I came here in November 1984 and was sworn in that I would see this day when we got to this point. And so, Madam Speaker, yes, we ought to be

more than careful hereafter with what we do, what we as politicians ask for, what we allow our people to tell us to get. That's part of it. Others have their responsibilities and obligation. And that is to serve the Government to the best of their ability.

Madam Speaker, I consider that we have a good team. I am not concerned about the general elections, Madam Speaker. That's as far away from my thinking as possible. But we know, like David Cameron, what is needed. We can't predict how the crisis will end for others, and we cannot pretend that Cayman will be immune from consequences either. But this I can promise: We know as a Government what needs to be done, and we are trying to get it done—get the deficit under control, get the foundations of recovery in place, defend the long-term interests of our country, and hold the course.

Madam Speaker, we have done our part. I know the tremendous amount of good civil servants who work in my Ministry. And I row with them, Madam Speaker, they hear me. I know the work that they do. And in other ministries we can say that. So we must thank them. We thank them for their partnership. I am not worried, Madam Speaker, about their vote. If they didn't vote for me in the past, well, they didn't hurt me. And if they don't vote for me in the future, they are still not going to hurt me. If they voted for me, vote for me again!

What I am concerned about is our children, their future; our grandchildren. In the next 60 years what are we going to do? What are our plans to keep the good ship Cayman off the reef? Can we do it by the constant bickering every day of the week? Madam Speaker, anybody who is a human will get discouraged. Anyone! We will get discouraged if we have to fight officials. You will get discouraged if you depended on a Governor or anybody else in officialdom and you have to fight with them thereafter because that's what the time demands, that's the situation. You have to disagree. Thank God we don't hate anyone. We aren't going to let it get to that point, Madam Speaker, where we hate and build up this hatred. And I see it, Madam Speaker. I see it and feel it in the halls of power. They will do anything to destroy us.

Thank God, some of them have to go from here! I man born here, I man will die here. And that's where I want to be—rest where the bones of my ancestors rest in Northwest Point Cemetery and in West Bay Cemetery. I have nothing to be scared of because I have done nothing illegal. I am only scared about the times we live in, what people can do to you, what they can do to your family, what they have done to your business, what they can do to your business. I am scared of that, Madam Speaker. And at 56-, 57-years-old, you must sit and think about it.

I have said that I am not worried about general election. If the people of West Bay want me, they will put me back. I will say what one old man told the

next one when they asked him, *Well, what are you running for?* He said: *What I running for me son, is to keep you out!* So, Madam Speaker, that might be the case.

When it comes to national office, I don't know, Madam Speaker, if I want to sit here as Minister of Finance or as Premier. I believe that I—and I speak for myself right now—as the Minister of Finance with our team we have put this country on the right trajectory. I believe we have. It's been difficult. We have put it there. Each Minister can give a good account of what they have done in their ministries, each one, under tremendous struggle—battering in the papers, criticism of all kinds, stumbling blocks in your way, people questioning your integrity. Oh yes. Ministers have to be deterred at times, and have to be downhearted at times.

You get to the extent sometimes that you feel you'll write your resignation and say you've had enough. Let them take it if they want it. What I am not going to do, I am not going to kowtow to anyone. Not at this point, Madam Speaker. We've come too far. We've done a lot. I am not going to turn back now, although I stand here and I say I don't know that I would accept this again. I do have a group that will make that decision, it could be somebody else. But I pray to God that those people who are so ravenous for power that they would burn down things and the others who are following them, that, the good people of these Islands will seriously take note.

As I close, Madam Speaker, I say to the young people of this country that they can do a whole lot more good than being on the Internet. They can do a whole lot more good in a democracy, in a community where they have opportunity. Help us to hold on to that opportunity. Help us to help them get that opportunity. Don't beat us down when we are trying to give them the opportunity. Build a nation, fix the problems.

If you want to blame people, maybe that's okay. But, Madam Speaker, the young people ought to sit up and take notice at this point in time, not about the polls, Madam Speaker, but about what surrounds this country. We are quarreling over fire ants biting out foot and elephants are trampling us.

Madam Speaker, I always take comfort in prayers. I take comfort in song from Bob Marley to the hymns from the great hymn writers, as well as poetry, Madam Speaker:

***The woods are lovely, dark, and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles [miles] to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep.***

And my favourite hymn says:

***Courage, brother, do not stumble;
Though thy path be dark as night;***

***There's a star to guide the humble:
Trust in God and do the right.
Let the road be rough and dreary,
And its end far out of sight,
Foot it bravely; strong or weary,
Trust in God and do the Right;***

***Perish policy and cunning,
Perish all that fears the light!
Whether losing, whether winning,
Trust in God and do the right,***

***Some will hate thee, some will love thee,
Some will flatter, some will slight;
Cease from man, and look above thee:
Trust in God and do the right.***

***Simple rule, and safest guiding,
Inward peace [inward peace] and inward might,
Star upon our path abiding,
Trust in God and do the right***

***Courage brother, do not stumble;
Though thy path be dark as night;
There's a star to guide the humble:
Trust in God and do the right.***

Madam Speaker, we have done our part here. Our mistakes have been few, somewhat. But we are on the right path. The country is on the right trajectory with responsible governance in challenging times. I thank you, Madam Speaker, for your indulgence. Even the arguments me and you get in, Madam Speaker, can't help that sometimes, Madam Speaker.

I want to thank the staff who have been up late with us, the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk and others, the Serjeant, those who do the recordings and those who do the refreshments. And I want to thank my colleagues for sticking to it, getting the work done, being there. Their families suffer at times, Madam Speaker. They know what public service is or they would not have entered it. Maybe they didn't understand it would be so tough. Some of them are getting a real baptizing in this fire!

Madam Speaker, I want to thank again the team that put this budget together, Mr. Jefferson, the Financial Secretary, who, Madam Speaker, worked days and nights without getting any rest. I want to thank Mrs. McLaughlin, the Chief Officer, and her staff, particularly Mr. Michael Nixon, Ms. Ann Owens and Ronnie Dunn for their work. Madam Speaker, these are good public servants. They have worked. I know that. So I appreciate what they do.

None of us are perfect, as I said. None of us are perfect. We all strive and struggle to carry on. Madam Speaker, courage brother; do not stumble. I thank this honourable House.

The Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Premier.

The question is that a Bill shortly entitled The Appropriation (July 2012 to June 2013) Bill, 2012, be given a Second Reading.

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

Ayes and one audible abstention by the Member for East End.

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

The Speaker: Madam Clerk.

The Clerk:

Division No. 2–2012/13

Ayes: 8

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

Noes: 0

Abstentions: 4

Hon. D. Kurt Tibbetts
Mr. Moses I. Kirkconnell
Mr. Anthony S. Eden
Mr. V. Arden McLean

Absent: 3

Capt. A. Eugene Ebanks
Hon. Alden M. McLaughlin, Jr.
Mr. D. Ezzard Miller

The Speaker: The result of the Division is 8 Ayes; 0 Noes; 4 Abstentions; and 3 Absent.

Agreed: The Appropriation (July 2012 to June, 2013) Bill, 2012, given a Second Reading.

The Speaker: The House will now go into [Finance] Committee to consider this Bill and the financial documents.

There will be a . . .

[Long pause]

The Speaker: The Appropriation (July 2012 to June 2013) Bill, 2012, has accordingly been given a Second Reading.

Mr. Premier, you need to make a motion now to take this into Finance [Committee].

ADJOURNMENT

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

We propose to adjourn this honourable House at this point and to return at the completion of Finance Committee.

Madam Speaker, I thought I was explicit in what I was saying. I do beg that the House be adjourned at this time.

The Speaker: The question is that this honourable House do adjourn until the completion of Finance Committee.

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

Ayes.

The Speaker: The Ayes have it.

At 5.06 pm the House stood adjourned until the conclusion of Finance Committee.

