



2013/14 SESSION
of the
BERMUDA
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT

May 2014

Sittings numbers 19 - 22 of the 2013/14 Session

(pages 1865-2272)

Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, JP, MP
Speaker

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

BERMUDA HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT****9 MAY 2014****10:01 AM***Sitting Number 19 of the 2013/14 Session**[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]***PRAYERS***[Prayers read by Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker]**[Pause]***CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES****17 and 21 March 2014**

The Speaker: Members, we have Minutes of the 17th of March and the 21st of March to be confirmed. All Members should have received those Minutes, and, if there are no objections, then the Minutes will be confirmed.

Are there any objections?

There are no objections; the Minutes of the 17th and the 21st of March are confirmed.

*[Minutes of 17 and 21 March 2014 confirmed]***MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR**

The Speaker: There are no messages from the Governor and no announcements by the Speaker.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker: No messages from the Senate.

PAPERS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS TO THE HOUSE

The Speaker: The Chair will first recognise the Honourable Minister of National Security, Minister Dunkley.

You have the floor, Deputy Premier.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Good morning, Mr. Speaker, and good morning, colleagues.

The Speaker: Good morning.

CANNABIS REFORM COLLABORATIVE REPORT

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to attach and submit today for the information of this Honourable House of Assembly the [Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, "An analysis of cannabis reform in Bermuda."](#)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Any objections to that?

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Junior Minister, Minister Sylvan Richards. You have the floor.

2012 NATIONAL TRAINING BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

Hon. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to attach and submit for the information of the Honourable House of Assembly the [National Training Board Annual Report for 2012](#). Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Are there any objections?

There are none. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable and Learned Attorney General. The Honourable M. J. Pettingill, you have the floor.

PROCEEDS OF CRIME (ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING AND ANTI-TERRORIST FINANCING) AMENDMENT REGULATIONS 2014

Hon. Mark J. Pettingill: If you please, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to attach and submit for the consideration of the Honourable House of Assembly the [Proceeds of Crime \(Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing\) Amendment Regulations 2014](#).

The Speaker: Are there any objections to that?

There are none. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Public Works. The Honourable Minister P. J. Gordon-Pamplin, you have the floor.

LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE WEST END DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND THE BERMUDA NATIONAL MUSEUM

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.

I have the honour to attach and submit for the information of the Honourable House of Assembly the [Lease Agreement between the West End Development Corporation and the Bermuda National Museum](#).

The Speaker: Yes, and Honourable Members know that this is for the consideration of the House. So therefore, it will be placed on the Order Paper for next meeting.

Thank you, Honourable Members.

PETITIONS

The Speaker: There are no petitions.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS AND JUNIOR MINISTERS

The Speaker: We now move to Statements by Ministers.

The Chair will recognise, first, the Premier, the Honourable L. C. Cannonier. You have the floor.

REORGANISATION OF DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform this Honourable House of plans to retain an independent consultant to provide assistance with the creation of an evolved [Human Resources \[HR\]](#) model for the Bermuda Government.

Mr. Speaker, you would be well aware of this Government's focus on building a more efficient and effective public service. One of the key components of an effective and efficient public service is a well-functioning Human Resources Department that serves the needs of all of the public service. Currently, this critical element is dispersed across the public service. It is not aligned with best practice with regard to structure and mandate and does not serve the entire public service. You would also be aware, Mr. Speaker, of our plans to establish a legal authority to enable reforms to government departments, quangos, government funds, boards and committees. In order to implement such decisions, it is imperative that the public service has a human resources function that is structured and equipped to do so.

A recent review by government's Management Consulting Section confirmed that human resource activities are spread across multiple departments, without an overarching framework to govern

their efforts. Further, there is no clear human resource strategy or approach for managing all of the employees. Currently, the Department of Human Resources mainly provides transactional services for employees represented by the BPSU (the Bermuda Public Services Union), whose members account for approximately 41 per cent of the workforce. Therefore, a majority of our employees are not served by a centralised HR function. Our model is consequently inefficient, ineffective and confusing, leading to inequality and frustration for the Government and employees alike.

Mr. Speaker, such a structure cannot support public service reform. The Chartered Institute of Professional Development has outlined one of the most widely used HR models across the world. This model forms the basis of HR units in the UK civil service and many other public bodies. It is also the most commonly used model by the FTSE [*Financial Times* Stock Exchange] 100 companies. This model will enable us to establish a structure that can better serve all of government.

Mr. Speaker, we anticipate that under this model the government's HR Department will evolve to include the management of compensation and benefits afforded to government employees, and the organisational review and design functions. Both of these units now sit elsewhere within government. As a result, it would not be appropriate for our Management Consulting Section to undertake this review, as they will be a subject of the review and reorganisation, as well. Therefore, an independent consultant will be engaged.

Mr. Speaker, this reorganisation is an important component of our efforts to reform the public service. Not only will it better enable us to manage our most important resource, our employees, but will also position us to implement the changes that are to come, leading to a more efficient and effective public service.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for National Security. Minister Dunkley, you have the floor.

CANNABIS REFORM COLLABORATIVE REPORT, "AN ANALYSIS OF CANNABIS REFORM IN BERMUDA"

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Premier—sorry, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Oh, thank you.

[Laughter]

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: This Statement refers to [the Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, "An Analysis of Cannabis Reform in Bermuda."](#)

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will recall the November 2013 Speech from the Throne and its promise to engage in public consultation regarding cannabis/marijuana policy reform. Shortly after, Mr. Stratton Hatfield and Mr. Khomeini Talib-Din approached me individually to express their interest in facilitating and participating in the promised public consultation. I put the two men together and advised them to recruit additional members with their like interests to form the Cannabis Reform Collaborative (or the CRC, as they called it). The group began meeting on the 5th of December and had as its mandate to produce an advisory document on cannabis policy reform that identified the benefits and consequences of reclassifying, legalising or decriminalising cannabis and to investigate its medicinal uses.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Chair, Mr. Hatfield and Mr. Talib-Din, the CRC comprised Lamar Caines, Jules Van Belen, Cordell Reilly, Dr. Ernest Peets, Robyn Swan, Kyle Bridgewater, Alex Jones, Harry Masters and Joleesa Simons. Together, the CRC has experience and varying levels of expertise in activism, policy, law, addictions treatment and drug education. The CRC worked diligently to engage the public in discussions about Bermuda's current cannabis policies and to canvass the public's views on reform through town hall-style meetings, focus groups and electronic surveys.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of the CRC's work, and again when the document was delivered to myself on April 17th, I indicated that I would table the report in this House for the information of Honourable Members. As such, I am pleased to table the final advisory document and a motion later inviting this House to take note of its contents.

Mr. Speaker, the team at the Ministry of National Security is currently reviewing the contents of the report and the resulting recommendations. It must be noted, however, that cannabis policy in Bermuda is far reaching, affecting our social, health and economic climate, and therefore requires a holistic approach to reform. Where it is found that reform is in fact warranted, changes will only be made in a measured fashion, with careful consideration of the Bermudian context.

Mr. Speaker, please allow me to conclude by thanking the chairman and the members of the CRC for their very hard work. The group members have all volunteered their expertise and the many hours needed for the production of this very comprehensive document.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister of Finance, Minister Bob Richards. Minister Richards, you have the floor.

FINANCE MINISTER'S VISIT TO RISK AND INSURANCE MANAGEMENT SOCIETY CONVENTION

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to inform the Honourable House of Government's recent attendance at the [Risk and Insurance Management Society Convention](#). Risk and Insurance Management Society is known as RIMS. On April 28th and 29th, the Premier, accompanied by the Minister of Education and Economic Development and myself, led a large contingent of Bermudians in attending the Risk and Insurance Management Society Convention, which this year was held in Denver, Colorado. The RIMS convention is the largest annual gathering of insurance providers and potential customers on the calendar and provides a unique opportunity for industry participants to network with each other and with current and prospective clients.

Mr. Speaker, Bermuda has attended this convention for many years, and the Bermuda booth has traditionally been one of the main centres of activity on the convention floor. This year was no exception. There were many Bermudians who travelled to Denver at their own expense solely to represent their country at the Bermuda booth. I would like to thank them for their commitment and enthusiasm.

Several corporate attendees with Bermuda-based operations were also located close to the official Bermuda booth. For the first time our booth, which features a Bermuda cottage, was organised by members of the Bermuda Business Development Agency (BDA). I would like to thank Mr. David Cash, interim BDA CEO, and the BDA team for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, as a jurisdiction, Bermuda's presence at RIMS could only be described as "dominant." Bermuda hosted a reception on the evening of the 29th of April, which was attended by hundreds of convention participants, enabling the total Bermuda contingent a further opportunity to network on behalf of our insurance and reinsurance sectors.

Mr. Speaker, our highly visible presence at RIMS remains a necessary component of our overarching strategy to keep the Bermuda brand synonymous with excellence, prudence and innovation in the global marketplace for insurance. Therefore, attendance and a strong presence at RIMS affirms our commitment and our unwavering support to a key sector of our economy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Minister for Economic Development and Education. Dr. Grant Gibbons, you have the floor.

CONTINUED INCREASE IN COMPANY INCORPORATIONS

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning to you.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members of this House will be aware that one of the indicators of an improving economy is positive growth in the number of [new companies registered](#). Around this time last year, I reported that we were seeing some very encouraging signs of an increase in company formation. I am very pleased to report that this trend continues. The increase in the number of new registrations in 2013 has continued into the first quarter of 2014. Overall, new company incorporations, both local and international for the first quarter of 2014 were 17 per cent higher than in the first quarter of 2013. This is on top of the fact that the 2013 results revealed the largest number of new company incorporations since 2008 and a healthy increase over the 2012 results.

Mr. Speaker, in the first calendar quarter of 2014, a total of 307 new companies registered in Bermuda. This can be compared to the first quarter of 2013, which saw 262 new companies register in Bermuda. This, in turn, was an increase over the 251 of the first quarter of 2012. The incorporation of 267 new international business companies in the first quarter of 2014 represents a 21 per cent increase over the 220 companies registered in the same period in 2013. That 2013 increase was, once again, an increase over the 204 registrations in the same quarter in 2012.

Mr. Speaker, these figures clearly show strong and consistent growth. Consistency of growth is a major indicator of our ongoing efforts to keep Bermuda evolving as a world leader in insurance, re-insurance and international business.

Mr. Speaker, companies locate in jurisdictions with a proven and dependable track record. These new registrations are indicators that Bermuda is moving in the right direction after a number of difficult years. An increase in company registrations invariably has a positive effect on jobs and growth, which benefits all Bermuda residents through increased spending in the local economy.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to see an increase in the total number of companies on our register. At the end of the first quarter of 2014 there were a total of 18,910 local and exempt entities on the register, an increase over the corresponding 18,271 in the first quarter of 2013, which was, again, an increase over the 17,761 on the register at the end of the first quarter 2012.

Mr. Speaker, we attribute this increase to a greater confidence in Bermuda as a place to do business, and we will continue to build upon this positive

momentum through the combined efforts of the Government Ministries, the Bermuda Monetary Authority and our partnership with the Bermuda Business Development Agency [BDA].

Mr. Speaker, the figures speak for themselves. They show quantitative evidence that there is growth and renewed confidence in Bermuda as a place to do business.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister of [Community], Culture and Sports, Minister Wayne Scott. Minister Scott, you have the floor.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUEEN'S BATON RELAY IN BERMUDA

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to address the Members of this Honourable House on the subject of the [Queen's Baton Relay](#), which visited Bermuda from 25th to the 27th of April 2014, marking the 59th stop on the 288-day and 118,000-mile journey of the Queen's Baton through the 71 nations of the Commonwealth. The seven-member visiting team was comprised of representatives of both the Glasgow Commonwealth Games 2014 organisation and BBC Scotland.

Mr. Speaker, the Queen's Baton Relay, which was introduced upon the occasion of the Commonwealth Games 1958, which was held in Cardiff, Wales, is a much-loved tradition of the Commonwealth Games, for it symbolises the coming together of all nations and territories that comprise the Commonwealth in preparation for the Games themselves. The organisers' vision is that the Queen's Baton Relay will unite the Commonwealth through sport, and connect and involve its citizens, especially its young people. It is also the organisers' hope that the relay will be an exciting, dramatic and inclusive physical and digital countdown to the Games and that, as the baton traverses the globe, it will champion the values, successes and spirit of the Commonwealth family.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Honourable House and the people of Bermuda may be assured that the Bermuda Olympic Association (BOA), host for the baton's visit to Bermuda, and the Government of Bermuda strongly embrace the organisers' hopes and expectations in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, the relay, in preparation for this summer's Commonwealth Games to be held in Glasgow, Scotland, from the 23rd of July 2014 to 3rd of August 2014, began at Buckingham Palace on 9th of October 2013 with Her Majesty the Queen placing her secret message of goodwill to the people of the

Commonwealth in the baton. Following the relay's launch at Buckingham Palace it journeyed to India and the countries of the Far East, then to Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands. The relay next journeyed to the 17 Commonwealth nations in Africa, to Mauritius and the Seychelles, and then across the Atlantic to Guyana and the Caribbean region.

Mr. Speaker, the Queen's Baton arrived in Bermuda from Belize and left our Island on the 27th of April (which was a Sunday) for Canada, before its return across the Atlantic to the Commonwealth nations in Europe. The relay will conclude its journey at the opening ceremony of the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow on the 23rd of July, when the final baton bearer hands over the baton to Her Majesty the Queen. Her Majesty will then read her official message of goodwill aloud before declaring the 20th Commonwealth Games open. Eleven days of exciting and outstanding competition showcasing the best of the Commonwealth will begin.

Mr. Speaker, a magnificent Bermuda Regiment fanfare greeted the Queen's Baton at L. F. Wade International Airport on Friday, the 25th of April, as Mr. Kalam Juman-Yassin, Regional Vice President of the Americas Commonwealth Games Federation, alighted from an American Airlines jet and handed the Queen's Baton to Mr. Philip Guishard, BOA Secretary General, thereby heralding the beginning of a whirlwind and memorable 42 hours in Bermuda. My colleague, the Honourable Patricia Gordon-Pamplin, Minister of Public Works; Mrs. Judy Simons, BOA President; and Mr. John Morbey, Bermuda's first Commonwealth Games medallist, who won a silver medal in Kingston, Jamaica, in 1966, were also at the airport to receive the Queen's Baton.

Mr. Speaker, Saturday, the 26th of April, proved to be one of the most exciting days in the annals of Bermuda's sporting history. The day's relay commenced in historic St. George's when sea cadets, accompanied by former Commonwealth Games swimmer, Chris Flook, as baton bearer, rowed from Convict Bay to King's Square where the baton, greeted by the St. George's Town Crier amidst the pageantry of a ducking stool enactment (which, of course, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Speaker as the town nag was in the ducking stool, I might add!), was handed to the Mayor of St. George's, Garth Rothwell. Former Cup Match Captains Calvin "Bummy" Symonds, St. George's, and Campbell Simons, Somerset, and current Cup Match stars Greg Maybury Jr., Somerset, and Micai Smith, St. George's, also received the baton in King's Square.

The visit to our World Heritage site concluded when former Premier, the Honourable Dame Jennifer Smith, received the baton on the steps of St. Peter's Church (their Majesties' Chappell) from Brian Wellman, 1994 Commonwealth Games bronze medallist in triple jump.

Thereafter, Mr. Speaker, the baton began its whistle-stop tour from the East End to Warwick, visiting many of our most significant, beautiful and iconic locations en route and being carried by a wide cross section of Bermuda's population, including athletes past and present, schoolchildren and senior citizens. The BOA Organising Committee for the baton's visit to the Island express regret that time simply did not allow for the baton to visit all nine parishes.

Mr. Speaker, other highlights of the baton's visit to Bermuda included:

- Government House, where His Excellency the Governor received the baton from Antoine Jones and Conrad Lister, 1998 Commonwealth Games silver medallists (tenpin bowling, men's doubles) and where gymnasts, seven-a-side rugby players, boy scouts, girl [scouts], Bermuda Regiment Junior Leaders, the North Village Community Band and the Bermuda Islands Pipe Band were participants;
- the Cabinet Office, where the Honourable Premier received the baton from Clarence "Nicky" Saunders, Commonwealth Games bronze medallist, high jump, 1982, and gold medallist, high jump, 1990 (I will just point out, whose record of 2.36 metres still stands to this day);
- the Warner Gombey's added a great deal of colour and excitement to the Cabinet Office ceremony;
- the Annual Exhibition at the Botanical Gardens, where I, too, had the privilege of receiving the baton from Nicky Saunders, who was accompanied by Bermuda's four other Commonwealth Games medallists, who along with Clyde Best, Bermuda's legendary footballer and Hall of Famer, participated in a Relay of Honour around the Main Ring. The Main Ring ceremony commenced with a stirring performance from the Bermuda Regiment Band, followed by Baton Bearer Kyra Scraders, our CARIFTA Games 2014 silver and gold medallist, who led her CARIFTA Games 2014 teammates on a Relay of Honour around the Main Ring;
- Commonwealth Games 2014 participant cyclist, Nicole Mitchell, who led a group of cyclists from the National Sports Centre to the Birdcage on Front Street, where the baton was handed to 2014 Commonwealth Games 800-metres participant Shaquille Dill. Shaquille, in turn, led some 50 representatives from Bermuda Pacers, Flyers and MAAC running clubs along Front Street to the Cabinet Office. Thereafter, representatives of Bermuda Pacers, Flyers and MAAC participated in a colourful baton relay through the streets Hamilton to Fort Hamilton, with hun-

dreds of Bermudians cheering them as they ran.

Mr. Speaker, other stops on the relay's journey around Bermuda included:

- Palm Grove Gardens in Devonshire, where Olympic Games bronze medallist, Clarence Hill, served as baton bearer, accompanied by former Commonwealth Games athletes;
- the Aquatic Centre at the National Sports Centre, where Commonwealth and Olympic Games diver, Katura Horton Perinchief, and young members of the Dolphins Swim Team served as baton bearers;
- [At] 141 Front Street, former Premier Sir John Swan, former Commonwealth Games athlete, Debbie Jones Hunter, and representative Bermuda businessmen received the baton;
- Warwick Long Bay, featuring Commonwealth Games triathletes Karen Smith and Kent Ming as baton bearers;
- South Shore, Warwick, featuring Bermuda Long Riders (which is classic bike riders) as baton bearers;
- WindReach Recreational Centre, Warwick, featuring persons with physical and intellectual disabilities as baton bearers; and
- Fantasy Cave, Hamilton Parish, with Commonwealth Games 2014 squash participant, Nick Kyme, accompanied by young members of the Bermuda Squash Racquets Association, serving as baton bearer.

Mr. Speaker, on the evening of Saturday, the 26th of April 2014, my wife and I attended a dinner at Sul Verde Cafe, Tucker's Point Resort, hosted by the BOA President in honour of the visiting Queen's Baton Relay team and the accompanying team from BBC Scotland. Upon the dinner's conclusion, Mr. Alastair Cameron, head of the visiting delegation, presented the BOC President with a granite stone taken from the head of the baton. It was a hugely symbolic gesture—a little piece of Scotland that the team leaves behind in each country visited on the baton's 288-day journey as a token of thanks and appreciation for all the time, effort and creativity that the local team has spent in organising the event. Mr. Cameron commented on the warmth of the welcome that his colleagues had received in Bermuda and made the observation that the visit was much too brief. He concluded by again thanking the BOA President and her team upon arranging a visit to Bermuda that was first class in all respects.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with Mr. Cameron in saluting BOA President Judy Simons and the Bermuda Committee for the Queen's Baton Relay, headed by former Permanent Secretary, Mr. Robert Horton, upon organising a truly first-class event. They have done Bermuda

proud. Wonderful images of the people of Bermuda and our beautiful Island are travelling far and wide as a result of the baton's very successful visit to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, some 35 athletes are expected to represent Bermuda at the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow this summer, competing in athletics, cycling, gymnastics, swimming, squash and triathlon. I plan to attend those games and know that our athletes will take with them the full support, prayers and best wishes of the Government and the people of Bermuda as they compete in the Games.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Minister Scott, you have another Statement, and you may continue.

HERITAGE MONTH 2014

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to share with Members of this House and the people of Bermuda many of the wonderful events being planned for [Heritage Month 2014](#). This year's theme is *Bermuda's Historical Treasures*. The Department of Community and Cultural Affairs, aided by the very committed and enthusiastic members of the Heritage Advisory Committee, has chosen a theme that draws singular attention to some significant aspects of our collective cultural heritage. This year the spotlight is focused on some of our treasures.

Mr. Speaker, our unique cultural heritage has in many ways been shaped by our environment, our connection with the sea, and beliefs and practices that have forged and moulded our way of being. This sense of *being Bermudian* has evolved over centuries and is reflected in our people, our architecture, our foods, artistry and our music. As we come together this month to celebrate all that is good about *being Bermudian*, there are activities for every palate. When the phrase "historical treasures" is mentioned, some of us immediately think of some of Bermuda's distinctive buildings which display beautiful architectural features.

For those of us who would love to have a peek inside some of Bermuda's treasured sites, Open House Bermuda will provide locals and guests the opportunity to visit historical forts, some church towers and National Trust farmlands. This event will take place tomorrow, Saturday, May 10th. The department is grateful to Mr. Richard Lowry, Heritage Officer within the Department of Planning, for his collaboration to make this event possible.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of our maritime heritage, the department has organised a talk that will be given by Dr. Struan Smith, who is the Curator of the Bermuda Natural History Museum. He will focus

on the organisms and conservation of the Sargasso Sea. This lecture, which promises to be most informative, will take place at the Bermuda Zoological Society Hall from 6:30 pm to 8:00 pm.

Mr. Speaker, we will be celebrating another treasure blossoming in Bermuda—our literary artists. One of the programmes organised annually by the department is the Writer-in-Residence Workshop. This particular initiative is the responsibility of our Folklife Officer, Dr. Kim Dismont-Robinson. In March 2012, the Writer-in-Residence was Rachel Manley, granddaughter of Norman Manley and daughter of Michael Manley. That was actually in March 2013. And the focus of that workshop was writing memoirs. The culmination of this workshop is an anthology of writings featuring some of our own authors. The book *Take This Journey with Me: Bermuda Anthology of Memoir and Creative Nonfiction* will be launched on Thursday, May 15th, at Bermuda Society of Arts Gallery, City Hall, from 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 18th, a Mini Folk Festival will take place at the Bermuda Arts Centre in Dockyard. There will be poetry readings, musicians who will provide entertainment and artisans who will be there to demonstrate their creativity as they engage in their craft work. This event begins at 5:30 pm, and we invite people to come out and enjoy a fun afternoon with some of our visual and performing artists.

Mr. Speaker, a singular highlight of this year's Heritage Month will be the Food Festival planned for today, Friday, May 9th, in St. George's. The culinary Food Festival promises to provide our guests with the opportunity to sample some of the foods of yesteryear—fish, fowl and hog. All who attend will have the chance to experience culinary delights by Fred Ming, Tavern by the Sea, Wahoo's Bistro, Griffin's, Go Jo, Sweet Saak, White Horse Tavern and Temptations. There will be old-fashioned children's games that will undoubtedly interest the young people. Stan Seymour, fondly known as "Lord Necktie," will be there, along with James Martinez, to delight the audience with their music, and the Bermuda All Stars Steel Orchestra will get us moving and dancing!

Mr. Speaker, there is more! Some of the department's Folklife Films will be screened at the World Heritage Centre on May 9th, including the following:

- *Bits and Bites: Culinary Arts*, featuring Fred Ming and Dolly Pitcher;
- *Folklife Documentary: Farming*, featuring Carlos Amaral, Richard Bascome, Omari Dill, Frances Eddy, Harry Kromer and Tom Wadson;
- *Bermuda Shark Project*, featuring Choy Arning, Neil Burnie, Tim Hasselbring and Jeff Manson;
- *Kitchens of Yesteryear*, featuring Joe Gibbons.

Mr. Speaker, everyone is invited to come to St. George's this evening and experience *A Taste of Bermuda*. Schedules outlining these activities will be distributed as people park at Tiger Bay; as well there will be schedules on hand at the World Heritage Centre.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to all of our cultural industry partners who have been working collaboratively with the Department of Community and Cultural Affairs to make Heritage Month so successful. I am grateful to all of the participants, the Bermuda Arts Centre at Dockyard, the Bermuda Craft Market, the Bermuda Society of Arts, the Bermuda Zoological Society, the restaurants of St. George's that participated in *A Taste of Bermuda* and the World Heritage Centre. I am also very grateful to the members of the Heritage Advisory Committee, the Historical Heartbeats Committee, the Bermuda Police Service and the corporations of Hamilton and St. George's.

I would especially like to single out Mrs. Louise Tannock, the Cultural Affairs Programme Manager, and her team for planning and preparing these Heritage Month activities. Job well done!

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Minister for Public Works. Minister Gordon-Pamplin, you have the floor.

PERIMETER LANE REPAIRS

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as promised, I rise to provide this Honourable House with a brief summary of the progress of the [works on Palmetto Road](#), following the wall collapses that took place on the 28th of February 2013 and the 14th of February 2014.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members are aware that earlier this year there was a collapse of a wall, which formed part of a large drainage pit, following a substantial quantity of rainfall. The drainage pit is located on Palmetto Road just to the west of the junction with Bishop Spencer Road.

Mr. Speaker, the collapse of the wall and the resultant washout of storm water caused:

- damage to the utility services in the area, with several utility poles being dislodged;
- washout to a bank supporting Palmetto Road;
- damage to the property at Number 6 Perimeter Lane belonging to Mr. John Roach. This property was also flooded as a result of damage to a water pipe;
- closure of Palmetto Road between Roberts Avenue and Dutton Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, the wall affecting Number 6 Perimeter Lane is currently being designed. It is anticipated that this project will go out to tender in July 2014, with a proposed start of construction in September 2014.

Mr. Speaker, temporary measures have been set up on Palmetto Road to deal with the road drainage; a more permanent solution involving boreholes will be constructed in the next few months. The property belonging to Mr. John Roach has been repaired and is now habitable.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the wall collapse affecting Number 12 Perimeter Lane that occurred on the 28th of February 2013, it is anticipated that the revised retaining wall will be advertised for tender on 15th of May 2014, with a tender return date of June the 6th, 2014. Subject to Cabinet approval, it is hoped that a contract will be awarded in early July 2014, with construction to follow shortly thereafter. The anticipated construction period is three months.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore anticipated that Palmetto Road will be reopened again to two lanes towards the end of this year. I wish to thank the motorists who use this section of Palmetto Road for their patience whilst the traffic lights have been in operation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister. I see you have another Statement, Minister, so you may continue.

NEW REQUEST REPORTING SYSTEM-PUBLIC WORKS

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I rise again to announce the launching of a [new request reporting system](#) for the Ministry of Public Works. This system has been developed in order to better coordinate, address and respond to the large volume of requests received from Honourable Members seeking assistance from the Ministry of Public Works. Mr. Speaker, all Honourable Members will be invited to submit all requests to a general e-mail box, the address for which will be provided in due course.

Mr. Speaker, in order to efficiently address all requests, Honourable Members will be asked to provide contact details, an accurate description of the location of the problem to be addressed, such as road repair or maintenance, traffic sign or signal outages, maintenance, trash removal, sanitation or parks-related issues.

Mr. Speaker, the request will be logged and a receipt response will be sent within two working days. The project will be triaged for urgency and allocated for dispatch. Dependent on the project, a progress report will be provided to indicate either completion or expected date of completion. This pilot programme will allow the Ministry to efficiently coordinate its resources and to allow standardisation for project com-

pletion. At the moment, many calls are made to individuals within the Ministry and, oftentimes, may fall off the radar if the issue is not properly logged.

Mr. Speaker, in future, it is our intention to expand this system to allow the public to submit requests on all matters relating to the Ministry of Public Works, using an online web-based request form.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that this system will greatly assist in resolving the pressing concerns of our constituents, while using the Ministry's resources more efficiently. We encourage Honourable Members to report their constituency concerns through this medium and to communicate their opinion of this new system. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Health, the Honourable and Learned Member, T. G. Moniz. Minister Moniz, you have the floor.

DISPOSAL OF WASTE UPDATE

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity this morning to provide my honourable colleagues and the public with an update on the steps being taken to improve the methods used to [dispose of sewage waste](#) generated in and around the City of Hamilton. Honourable Members will be familiar with the incidents over the last year which have resulted in what are called "grease balls" coming ashore from the Seabright sewage outfall. As the Minister for Health and Environment, one of my responsibilities is to assure that the bathing waters around Bermuda do not pose a public health threat.

Mr. Speaker, based on the results of water testing that has been done (and those results have been posted on the Ministry of Health website), I can say with confidence that Bermuda's beaches are safe. The water quality meets the standards set by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, which is the standard that we measure ourselves against. However, that does not mean that, as the regulator, I am content to have the operators of our waste disposal systems continue to operate as they have in the past. It is obvious to me that improvements *must* be made. To that end, I am requiring improvements to be made to:

- first, the amount and type of grease that enters the system;
- [second] the operation of the disposal system—that is, the pipeline. And I would point out at this point that that pipeline is both owned and operated by the Corporation of Hamilton and has been for about 75 years, the pipeline leading to the outfall; and

- third, the processing of waste as it goes through the system.

Mr. Speaker, keeping grease out of the sewer is a legal duty for premises and establishments that are connected to the Hamilton sewerage system, regardless of whether they are inside or outside the city limits. The Chamber of Commerce restaurant division and the City Engineer met together last week to have dialogue on the Fats, Oils and Greases (called FOG) policy, and attendees were receptive to the need to implement greater controls on injurious sewage such as grease.

Cities worldwide have policies to control fats, oils and greases, and the need for better controls is not peculiar to Bermuda. It is, however, a critical issue for Bermuda right now, because whenever grease bypasses the Front Street screening station and combines with sewage in the City of Hamilton sewer main, it can form grease balls that greatly increase the distance that contaminants can travel and increases the risk that it may be blown onshore and ruin Bermuda's image of pristine pink sand beaches.

Grease in sewers is not a new issue. Our forefathers prohibited its discharge into sewers in the Hamilton Sewerage Act 1917. Greater effort to comply with these provisions to keep grease out of the sewers is what is required today. Resources have been identified to work alongside the restaurants and the City of Hamilton to implement the FOG policy. Restaurants will be required to install grease traps and interceptors and to keep logs to assure that the required separation is occurring. The cost is estimated at \$500 per unit. The Department of Health will introduce a portable meter and testing system that will monitor compliance by sampling establishment wastewater. Non-compliance will result in action, and verification of FOG compliance will become a condition of annual food establishment licensing administered by the Department of Health.

The City of Hamilton provides collection of used fryer oil and will do everything it can to facilitate compliance with the FOG policy. Anyone connected to the city sewer system can contact the City Engineer with any questions. Applicable establishments and premises will be expected to be compliant with the policy and with all provisions relating to grease control in the Hamilton Sewerage Act, by July 2014. Documented verification of ongoing compliance will be required for the 2015 food establishment licensing period at the end of this calendar year.

Everyone who resides, works or uses a sink or drain in the Hamilton sewerage district, which includes the City of Hamilton, West Hamilton, East Broadway, Berkeley, CedarBridge and Cedar Park and Prospect housing neighbourhoods, are asked not to put grease down the drain and instead make a concerted effort to scrape plates and put it in the trash, whether it is bacon grease or grease from deep-

cleaning appliances like ovens or fryers. Even residents who live and work outside of Hamilton can contribute to this effort and do their part. When grease goes down the drain anywhere in Bermuda and causes a blockage, it is likely that the sanitation truck that removes that grease will put it into the City of Hamilton's sewerage system via the Tynes Bay septage facility. Grease is a Bermuda-wide problem to address, and as a first step, we must address it at source.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Hamilton is vacuuming grease off of the wastewater treatment plant wells at the Front Street screening plant, as needed and multiple times every week. Daily checks on grease levels are being conducted. Public Works is implementing the same regimen at the Tynes Bay septage plant, and the City of Hamilton has agreed to share the use of their vacuum truck with Public Works to prevent their septage plant pumps from introducing grease into the sewer lines.

The Ministry of Health and Environment is requiring both parties to log these activities to assure grease removal is optimised. Ministerial instructions have been drafted by Ministry of Health and Environment [MoHE] technical officers under the Public Health Act and the Clean Air Act to require improved performance in sewage plants operated by both City of Hamilton and Public Works, requiring grease separation and sewage treatment. Performance targets and compliance time frames are being fine-tuned. The Tynes Bay septage plant improvement is a key component because the grease separated at source through the FOG policy will be delivered to Tynes Bay for disposal. It must not be returned to the sewer at this location.

Mr. Speaker, the existing treatment systems at both Front Street and the Tynes Bay septage facility have been identified as strong candidates for re-engineering. Suitable rotary belt filters may be available in the medium term for placement in key parts of the system to improve grease and solids removal in an accelerated fashion and as an interim measure, without having to wait for the possible construction of a new sewage treatment plant from scratch, which will take years.

Sewage treatment at the King Edward Hospital is scheduled to come fully online within the next couple of weeks. The Department of Environmental Protection is monitoring the progress at the KEMH wastewater treatment plant via conditions in the operating licence issued by the Environmental Authority. This plant will remove solids and greases and, when added to the system, significantly dilute and improve the wastewater being discharged at the outfall.

I will be convening a Bermuda Seawater Quality, Scientific, Technical and Advisory Committee (called STAC) to advise the Minister of Health and Environment and Cabinet on various short-, medium- and long-term solutions to the south shore sewage

outfall problem until these matters are fully resolved. This committee will also advise on solutions to other seawater quality concerns that need to be addressed in order to protect public health and the image and the tourism economy of Bermuda. Inadequate sewage treatment is a complex problem because there are many stakeholders, and some medium- and longer-term solutions could be years in the making. The establishment of a primary advisory group for the Cabinet on this matter should:

1. signal that Bermuda is taking the matter very seriously;
2. ensure that advice is given to Cabinet in a regular and coordinated fashion from a single trusted source;
3. provide a forum for technical matters to be debated and resolved by scientists and engineers, with recommendations on options streamlined for Cabinet decisions;
4. accelerate the process of moving chosen short-, medium- and long-term solutions into implementation;
5. possibly de-politicise this national infrastructure matter;
6. ensure that the most appropriate technology is recommended to decision-makers; and
7. regularly communicate progress being made to the general public.

Key departments and advisors will be requested to send a representative to the STAC committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Government, municipal, quango and private sector stakeholders are collaborating and taking a multi-pronged approach to reducing the grease going into the system and treating the waste as it moves through the system to the outfall. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.
That completes the Statements by Ministers.

QUESTION PERIOD

The Speaker: All right. We move now into Question Period. And the Chair will recognise first the Honourable Member who is the Shadow Public Safety Minister, MP Roban. You have the floor.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, and good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: CANNABIS REFORM COLLABORATIVE REPORT

Mr. Walter H. Roban: My question for the Minister in relation to his Statement is, Does the Minister have

any information for this House as to what public consultation will be done on the report that has been tabled here in this House as relates to other groups?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, thank you for that question.

I can first inform Honourable Members that it is the intention to table the motion later today in this session to allow that report to be debated by Honourable Members of this House. And then from there the Ministry will continue to look at the reform that is required. And anybody is available to get involved and consult at that time.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Roban, supplementary?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Yes, I have a supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Walter H. Roban: In light of what the Minister said, would the Minister agree that perhaps a more assertive approach might be better, with contacting directly? There are many groups. There are people in the medical profession; there are charitable organisations; there are nonprofits that have a very clear interest in drugs and the use of alternative substances in this country—

The Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: —that they should be directly consulted on what is in this report, and not just put out for them to find their way to his office?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, yes. I believe that the Honourable Member can take some assurance from the fact that the Ministry, through the Department of National Drug Control, will do that and continue to do that on a regular basis.

The Speaker: Thank you.
MP Roban, you have another supplementary? Another question?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Yes, I have another question.

The Speaker: Okay.

QUESTION 2: CANNABIS REFORM COLLABORATIVE REPORT

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Can the Minister give any further detail as to the role the DNDC [Department for National Drug Control] is now going to play with this particular report, and how are they going to be involved with the process now that it has been produced?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, to answer that question, I think it is sufficient at this time to say that, obviously, the Department of National Drug Control plays a very leading role in this. So they will work very closely with the Ministry on any reform that takes place as we go forward after this debate in this Honourable Chamber.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Thank you, MP Roban.

We did not have a question for MP, Minister Richards? You did not.

[Question on] the next Statement by the Minister for Economic Development, and I will recognise the Honourable Member, the Shadow Economic Development Minister, MP Wayne Furbert.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: CONTINUED INCREASE IN COMPANY INCORPORATIONS

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, the total number of incorporations in 2008, which the Minister always refers to as far as the benchmark, was approximately 1,343. Would the Minister agree that one of the reasons [for] the drop-off in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 was the world economic climate and uncertainty?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that may have been a contributing factor.

The Speaker: Thank you.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us what the other contributing factors were?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: The information we have received anecdotally, and particularly from international business, is policies of the former Government contributed to lack of interest in locating to Bermuda.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Yes, Honourable Member. Carry on. This is the second supplementary?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: No, another question.

The Speaker: Another question? Okay. Yes, carry on, MP Furbert.

QUESTION 2: CONTINUED INCREASE IN COMPANY INCORPORATIONS

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: The Minister talks about new registrations and incorporations for 2014. Can the Minister give us a breakdown of what those types of incorporations were, registrations, 2014?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The new incorporations would be both local and international companies. With respect to local companies, I do not have detailed information in terms of what all those companies do. I think that is the kind of thing that possibly could be obtained by going through the incorporations. With respect to international business, I think it spans the gamut. Some of those would be insurance entities; some of those would be holding companies; some of those would be related to shipping or maritime. Some would be related to financial fund companies. I do not have a detailed list with me at the present time, as these are preliminary numbers.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Furbert?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought the Minister who came to Cabinet to talk about incorporation—

The Speaker: Honourable Member—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: —would at least have informed this Honourable House—

The Speaker: Question?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: —how many types of incorporations are being formed? And to just name the gamut—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, no, no, no. Honourable Member, you know you just . . . go ahead.

The Speaker: Okay. All right, potential jobs, yes. Honourable Minister?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I am asking the Minister, could he at least tell us, basically, or at least get back to Parliament on the types of incorporations and the number of jobs that were affected by those incorporations?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I thought I gave the Honourable Member an indication of the types of companies, particularly on the international side, that were formed. I can get a more detailed list. These are preliminary numbers from the Registrar of Companies, and I do not have a detailed list with me of the names and all of the types of companies that were formed. But certainly, the Registrar of Companies would have that.

In regard to the number of jobs, the Registrar of Companies does not keep information on the number of jobs that companies would either have or hire, as the case may be. That information comes from elsewhere within Government. And, as I have said before in this Honourable House, that is a more difficult number to get because it involves extrapolation from other Government departments.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Yes, MP, all right. You have a question, MP Blakeney?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes, yes, I do.

The Speaker: Yes?

QUESTION 1: CONTINUED INCREASE IN COMPANY INCORPORATIONS

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: With regard to jobs, because the Government has said that they are focused on jobs—

The Speaker: Yes, and the question?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes.

Could the Honourable Minister tell this Honourable House if there is any plan, through the incorporation process, to determine from a questionnaire related to the incorporation of the potential for jobs that would be created by the incorporated company, as well as segregating those that would be earmarked for expertise outside of the country that would need work permits versus Bermudian jobs? Because the key is jobs for Bermudians.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the Registrar of Companies currently does not collect, nor, when a Memorandum of Association is before it (as the Honourable Member I am sure would know) does [he] collect or ask that information. I think that is something we can certainly look into. I think probably a more basic issue is determining whether it is a physical presence company or not.

The Honourable Member will know, historically, when this data was collected in the 1990s by Brian Archer, an economist, and others, there was a separate survey that went out to look at what was a physical presence versus a non-physical presence company. And I think that is something that we need to have a look at to try and get a better handle on.

There are other ways to get that, but it is indirectly, for example, through the Tax Commissioner's Office, to try and find out whether somebody is paying payroll tax, for example, within a specific company. That is an indicator; but it is not absolute, because sometimes these companies which look like they may be paper companies actually have somebody who is, or people who are, hired. So I think it is something we are trying to get a better handle on, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Supplemental.

The Speaker: Yes. MP Blakeney, supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: With regard to the data, it surprises me. So with regard to you not having the kind of information, how is it then determined if you do not know a paper company is a paper company without hiring people, versus a paper company that does hire some people? And then there is the projected number of employees exodus-ing, or leaving, the country. How are you able to determine that, not having that sufficient data, to put a number on how many people are leaving the country?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to answer that question. It is a little unclear in my mind exactly what the Honourable Member is getting at.

He will be aware, as he was in the former Government, that there are a number of sources of information relating to jobs.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: What is this back here? Hold on a second, Honourable Minister.

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

The Speaker: Are we okay? All right.
Thank you, Minister.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, the Honourable Member will be aware that there are a number of different sources which relate to the collection of information about jobs. The primary source every year is the employment survey which is taken by the Department of Statistics in August. And that data has already been released. That basically looks at the number of filled jobs by companies over a certain size, and it is an indicator of the number of filled jobs out there by both Bermudians and non-Bermudians.

There are other ways of trying to get an understanding of unemployment, which is a different indicator, as well. But primarily, the Department of Statistics (which is not, obviously, the Registrar of Companies) does do an annual employment survey. They do other surveys as well, which help to try and get a sense of the number of jobs that are available and the trend from year to year.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

Yes, MP Blakeney?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Thank you. One final supplementary.

The Speaker: Sure.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I just want to get a clarification.

Is the Minister not able to tell us with regard to the latest figures how many companies are physical companies versus those that would be paper companies? Latest figures?

The Speaker: Thanks.
Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered this. But I have said that, at this particular point, the Registrar of Companies does not collect that information. What the Registrar of Companies does is register a new company, and that can be counted. It also gets a sense of what type of company it is, broadly based.

We are, as I have said already, looking to see if we can get a better understanding, perhaps by changing the information the Registrar of Companies collects. Okay? And the former Government had ex-

actly the same problem—because we inherited the current system. But there are other ways, perhaps, to triangulate that information. One of those possibly is through the Tax Commissioner's Office, because an employer, company, has to pay payroll tax on behalf of an employee. So that may be a way to get at it indirectly. That is what we are working on right now.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.
Supplementary?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good morning, Mr. Speaker. This is a supplementary to follow up on the last question and response by the Honourable Minister.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, on page 3 of 4 of the Minister's Statement, first paragraph, he says in the middle of the paragraph, "An increase in company registrations invariably has a positive effect on jobs and growth . . ." And then in the last sentence, he says, "[these] figures," which he speaks of in the additional paragraphs, he says, "[these] figures speak for themselves. They show quantitative evidence that there is [indeed] growth and renewed confidence in Bermuda . . ."

Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister cannot provide us quantitative—

The Speaker: What is your question?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Quantitative—

The Speaker: Question, Honourable Member?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: This is the question. I am asking him.

The Speaker: Right, right.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: If he cannot provide us quantitative evidence of the difference between physical presence and paper corporations, how can he make the statement previously that this has a positive effect on jobs and growth? But there is no quantitative evidence provided.

The Speaker: Thank you.
Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member is being completely disingenuous. We all know that it is companies that hire people and provide jobs. Of the number of new

companies that we have, a certain proportion are physical presence. In addition to that, those that are not physical presence require the work of accountants. They require the work of other companies, particularly in the insurance and reinsurance sector. They require the work of lawyers. All of that translates into spending by new companies in this country, which results directly in jobs and additional money going around this community.

I cannot imagine the Honourable Member does not understand that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Minister. Thanks, Honourable Minister.

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Shadow Minister of Finance. You have a supplementary on this?

Mr. E. David Burt: Yes, please, Mr. Speaker. Count it as a supplementary or a question, but it is on this same line.

The Speaker: Oh, no. You cannot ask a question. It has to be a supplementary. Or did you have your name . . . you had your name here? Oh, yes, you do. You do.

He does, Honourable Members. He does.

Mr. E. David Burt: It is okay. Do not worry. I gave you a pass, Minister of Finance.

The Speaker: Yes, it was actually . . . right. You told me you were not asking the Minister of Finance a question.

QUESTION 1: CONTINUED INCREASE IN COMPANY INCORPORATIONS

Mr. E. David Burt: Right.

Mr. Speaker, although I am sure it is not the Economic Development Minister's responsibility to report on the things from the Department of Statistics, I find it curious that in his Statement he says, "an increase in company registrations invariably has a positive effect on jobs and growth" without—

The Speaker: And your question?

Mr. E. David Burt: —without stating the fact that the Bermuda economy lost 1,166 jobs last year and 261 companies closed down. Why did he not mention that fact in his Statement?

The Speaker: Okay. That is the question. Honourable Minister?

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Let the Minister answer, please. Honourable Member?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member will be aware that these total registration numbers are net of companies that closed down. Every year a certain number of companies will close down. It happened before the Progressive Labour Party formed the Government. It happened during the time of the Progressive Labour Party, and it is happening now. It is a natural fact of corporate evolution. Companies come, and companies go.

What is more important is new registrations, which shows growth, and the fact that, unlike under the former administration, the actual total number of companies in the register is now increasing, whereas it was declining in the previous five years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you. Honourable Member?

Mr. E. David Burt: A supplementary?

The Speaker: No, you carry on, Honourable Member. You have a supplementary?

Mr. E. David Burt: Oh, absolutely.

The Speaker: All right.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: Because I do not believe that the Honourable Member answered the question. The question that I asked was, Why did he not include the fact—the full picture—that the Bermuda economy lost 1,166 jobs last year and 261 businesses closed down, as reported by the Department of Statistics? Those were not preliminary figures, Mr. Speaker. Those were the final figures.

The Speaker: All right. Minister. Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is not listening. I said these are net figures. The Department of Statistics—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Members! Let the Minister speak. Let the Minister bring clarity to this. Yes. Carry on, Minister.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: The Department of Statistics will report in due course, as they do on a quarterly basis, the full information. This is an effort to

bring to the House at this particular time early results as basically collected by the Registrar of Companies. It is good news. I simply do not understand why the Opposition continues to look for the bad news here. Because anything which results in a 20-odd per cent increase in new international companies and essentially last year looking at, I think it was on the order of actually 22 per cent increase in local business is good news, Mr. Speaker. It indicates that we are coming out of what has been (and they will recognise this) a very difficult period prior to that.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Minister. Thank you very much.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Shadow Minister for Economic Development, MP Wayne Furbert.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes, yes—

The Speaker: I am trying to hear you.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes.

The Speaker: And you have—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: This is a supplementary.

The Speaker: A supplementary.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes. The Member said that these are net figures. But he states in page 1, “The increase in the number of new registrations . . .” New registrations—this is not net figures. And if you look at the BMA [Bermuda Monetary Authority] report, they are new registrations. They are not net figures, Mr. Speaker. So can the Minister confirm, are they net or are they new registrations?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member had carefully listened to, or read, my Statement, he would find that I said we continue to see an increase in the total number of companies on our register. At the end of the first quarter 2014, there were a total of 18,910 local and exempt entities on the register, an increase over the corresponding 18,271 in the first quarter of 2013, an increase over the first quarter of 2012, where there were only 17,761 companies.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is misleading this House.

The Speaker: He answered the question the best way he could.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: He did not answer my question.

The Speaker: Yes?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: He was talking about new registrations for that quarter, not for the total period. And so the question is, once again we ask the Honourable Minister . . . the new registrations, are they net or are they new registrations? And if they are new, we ask the question, What are the physical companies that in fact will increase jobs?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Quantifiable evidence.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered this on any number of occasions as I have stood here.

The Speaker: Yes.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I think the issue is I just read out the net number of companies on the register. When you refer to new incorporations, whether they are local or international, that is what they are. They are new incorporations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

I think, Honourable Members, we move away from that question now. Your second question. Honourable Member, I think the Minister has . . . I am not allowing any other supplementaries on that particular issue. So I am going to recognise the Shadow Minister for Finance. I am going to recognise the Shadow Minister for Finance.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: For a new question?

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: And not the Shadow Minister of Economic Development?

The Speaker: I said I am going to recognise the Shadow Minister for Finance.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: All right.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 2: CONTINUED INCREASE IN COMPANY INCORPORATIONS

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my second question is along the same line, and it goes specifically to the Minister of Economic Development.

Given that there was in his Statement an increase of company incorporations last year, how does he affect that between the decrease of jobs and decrease of companies that also happened last year employing people in this country?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think if the Honourable Member will look closely at the data from the Department of Statistics, which is actually from August (so we do not have any recent data from the Department of Statistics on jobs), what he will find is that the decrease in jobs between 2011/12 and 2012/13 slowed appreciably. On the international business side in 2012, there was a loss of about 210 jobs. Last year, it was a loss in this August to August period of about 100.

When you inherit a situation, as this One Bermuda Alliance Government did, which is going downhill at a rapid rate you do not change that loss overnight. So what we have seen, actually, is a dramatic decrease in job loss in 2013 versus the extraordinary job loss in 2012. So, the trend has definitely slowed.

There is a difference between new company incorporations and jobs, basically. I think the issue the Honourable Member has to understand is, whether it be local or whether it be international companies, the trend that had been there over the previous five years was still very strong at the end of 2012. We believe, as a consequence of these new incorporations and as a consequence of what we see as very much an increase in confidence, that we will be able to come out of that job loss and will start to add jobs.

Some of these new incorporations are adding jobs, and existing companies are adding jobs as well, from what we can tell from an anecdotal perspective. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

All right, thank you.

You have a supplementary?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: No, I have a direct question.

The Speaker: I thought you had asked two questions already. You have already asked two questions. Yes, yes.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Am I not allowed three?

The Speaker: Yes, you have one more.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Well, that is what I have.

The Speaker: All right. Carry on.

QUESTION 3: CONTINUED INCREASE IN COMPANY INCORPORATIONS

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister said “companies locate in jurisdictions with a proven and dependable track record. These new registrations are indicators that Bermuda is moving in the right direction.”

I ask the Minister, would the Minister agree that Bermuda has always had a proven and dependable track record? And what is the direction that Bermuda is moving in?

The Speaker: Thanks, MP Furbert.
Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think I have used the word “confidence,” as, indeed, my colleague, the Minister of Finance, has on a number of occasions both in a Statement and otherwise.

The issue that we faced as a new Government coming into office was a dramatic lack of confidence in the economy in Bermuda. And from what we can tell, there was concern about the former Government.

What we have seen is a change in attitude towards Bermuda. We saw it at RIMS. We have seen it in a number of areas. Bermuda certainly has a good reputation, but there was a cloud over Bermuda when we basically came into Government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

MP Weeks is not here. I thought he had a question.

Okay. We now move to . . . We pass Minister Scott's two Statements. We move now to Minister Gordon-Pamplin's Statement on Perimeter Lane. I had MP Weeks, but he is not here.

MP Dennis Lister, Shadow Minister of Public Works.

QUESTION 1: PERIMETER LANE REPAIRS

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, mine is just a brief question, really, to the Minister. And I note that she is a new Minister and has come up to speed quite quickly on

this one. My only concern here, again as the new Shadow Minister for it, Mr. Speaker, is that I remember comments publicly that have been made by Mr. Roach as the landowner, just one thanking Government for what they are doing, but wanting to be kept more informed in the process. He seemed he was getting left somewhere in the process and in the dark—

The Speaker: Your question, Honourable Member? Get to your question, Honourable Member.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: My question, basically, Mr. Speaker, is, as the new Minister, is the Minister improving that process of keeping Mr. Roach informed on what is taking place, and aware of each step as it is going forward?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the question, Shadow Minister.

Mr. Roach on the day of the event, which was February 14th . . . I was actually onsite. The following day, I was onsite. Between my Permanent Secretary and me, we are in constant contact with Mr. Roach. The repairs, significant repairs, the clean-up of the yard, the temporary measures have all been put in place by members of the Department of Works, who have done a stellar job in this particular instance.

Mr. Roach is completely satisfied. He has been kept up to date as much as possible. With whatever new information has been gotten, he has been in receipt of it. So, yes, he has been 100 per cent up to date. There may have been a time when we were still waiting for information. But as soon as information is made available, he is in receipt of it.

The Speaker: Thanks, Minister.
MP Lister?

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Second question?

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 2: PERIMETER LANE REPAIRS

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Minister, this one is in reference to the other portion of the wall that collapsed in 2013. Just questioning the speed and the process of getting us to move forward.

That wall fell down in February. The process is indicating that it will be rebuilt by the end of this summer, (September, I believe the Statement indicates). Can you give an explanation as to why the process is taking so long, over a year, for the earlier portion of the wall to get to that stage? Because

Works still has not started on the rebuild, even though I know it is going out to tender soon.

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Yes. That particular section of the wall was rather a more complicated situation. And the wall required a complete redesign. That has taken time. The tenders have now gone out. And I am quite pleased to say that we are pushing to ensure . . . As I mentioned, when we had the second collapse, I indicated that we were going to push to ensure that that entire stretch is taken care of. That has been my priority. I have put a lot of effort and energy into ensuring that it reach the stage that it has reached. And I think all I can do is account for that which I have been responsible for within the course of the last couple of months.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Okay. No questions on Minister Gordon-Pamplin's Statement concerning MP requests.

I now move to the final Statement by Minister of Health, and I will recognise the Honourable and Learned Member, MP Kim Wilson. You have a question.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: DISPOSAL OF WASTE UPDATE

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: First and foremost, I would like to commend the Minister, in particular with respect to the improved technologies and operations that are being implemented concerning this particular issue, which, regrettably, has received widespread national press.

On page 5, the Minister indicates that under improved technology they would be looking at both the Front Street and the Tynes Bay septage facility as being identified as strong candidates for re-engineering, which obviously can have cost consequences. I wonder whether the Minister can answer whether or not consideration has been [given] to extending the pipe and then adding a further type of diffuser on the actual pipe itself so that it can further decrease the amount of sewage and so forth that is being generated and coming out into the shores?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is a good question. There are reports going back years which include reports looking at extending the pipe. The pipe itself is some 75 years old. So you cannot just extend the pipe. It would be a

question of putting in a new pipe. If you put in a new pipe, you would use new technology. You are talking about maybe using horizontal drilling technology. You are talking about considerable expense; you are talking about a considerable period of time to design and implement that.

But longer term, the answer is yes, we are looking at that. And obviously, if you end up in a longer term of years treating the water more, you are looking at more of what they call a grey-water situation, a tertiary level treatment that would deal with that water.

There are also the options that are used in some of the plants that are presently around at some of the private developments, I think. Southampton Princess uses a lot of the grey water, tertiary level water, to water the golf course and such. And their big pond up there is really . . . that grey water that comes out of their plant that they aerate and they use for watering.

So there are other possibilities that you are also looking at at the same time.

The Speaker: Yes, MP Wilson? Yes?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Yes, thank you.

The Speaker: A supplementary or a second question?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: A second question.

The Speaker: A second question, okay.

QUESTION 2: DISPOSAL OF WASTE UPDATE

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Minister.

My second question relates to the issue at page 1 where the Minister indicates that the water quality meets the standards of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. And recognising that the ratio of our sewage disposal to the vast amount of water which is disposed, I wonder what the Minister can speak to insofar as to what steps are being taken to minimise the perception that what is happening in Bermuda with respect to the distribution of wastewater to seawater disposal is causing?

That is probably not very clear, Mr. Speaker; if I could reword that.

The Speaker: Yes.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: It is a matter of perception, because if you look at us, generally speaking, the percentage of waste that is being deposited into the ocean . . . and the ratio, is very high. And it meets all international standards. So my question to the Minister is, What further steps, particularly, is your Ministry [taking] to raise public awareness and decrease the

perception, the negative perception, that Bermuda has filthy water, et cetera?

The Speaker: Yes, thanks, MP Wilson. Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, we have continued to liaise, obviously, with media releases, but in particular with the US Consulate General when this started. All of this started off with some water testing that was . . . It started off with some water testing by people who were not here to test water. And they produced some results under conditions that we are not familiar with. And we have never been able to reproduce those results either before, at the time or since. So no one else has received the same results. So I put it no higher than that.

All of the water tests that we have made have been better than the EPA testing. This sort of issue arises everywhere. It certainly arises up and down the East Coast of the United States. So we have done our best to continue to communicate the water tests, the safety of the water and to get as much publicity as we can. But as everyone is aware, bad news tends to travel much faster than good news. So once you have some bad news, it is very hard to reverse that course. So it is a continuing process.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
I recognise MP Roban, MP Walter Roban.

QUESTION 1: DISPOSAL OF WASTE UPDATE

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question for the Minister is, What practical role is the Corporation of Hamilton as the owner of the pipe and operator of that pipe these 75 years? What practical role are they playing with the Government to mitigate the situation, as you seem to have mentioned the steps today?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, we have sat in meetings. We did set up a Cabinet subcommittee to look at this. We have pulled in all the players, including the Corporation of Hamilton, but including, of course, the technical advisors to all of the different bodies. They are aware of the problem.

They have a filter system at the pumping station, which is on Front Street opposite the Supermart there. The filter system, for some technical reason, is not catching all of the grease. Some of the grease may be coming in after that. So we are trying to tackle all of the areas.

The two biggest likely culprits are restaurants in the city and then the septage facility at Tynes Bay, where all sorts of people dump stuff. There is a sys-

tem there to filter it, but we are going to improve that. The Minister responsible is working to improve that.

I say all of that to say that the Corporation of Hamilton is very much a part of the process. And, in particular, the Health Department and Corporation of Hamilton are cooperating and coordinating to certainly improve keeping fats, oils and grease out of the system. So they have been very cooperative with us.

The Speaker: Thank you.

MP Roban, your second question?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Second question.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 2: DISPOSAL OF WASTE UPDATE

Mr. Walter H. Roban: In light of his Statement, can the Minister inform us if there is going to be a requirement for the City of Hamilton to pass any ordinances as a measure of enforcement against its own area as to the issues you raised about limiting the fats and stuff that are dumped into the system? Because clearly there needs to be higher levels of enforcement, at not only the legislative level, through us, but also through the Hamilton Corporation? So what will be done with them in relation to ordinances?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, in response to that, as we have said on page 4 of the [Statement], what we propose to use at the present time are the provisions of the Public Health Act which allow me as Minister to issue directives to people who are putting material into the sewage system. So I will issue those directives to the Corporation of Hamilton.

We have also met with the restaurant division of the Chamber of Commerce. And the simple situation is that if someone is in breach of the directives that are given, they will not receive their restaurant licence next year.

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Walter H. Roban: In light of that, I ask again, would the Minister not agree that getting the Corporation to pass some ordinances that reflect the level that is required, also so that they are playing a role in enforcement, be also a suitable measure than just relying on the public health legislation?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, I mean, that is an idea which I will take under advisement. It really comes under the Minister of Home Affairs who has responsibility for municipalities. And I will share that with him.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

I now recognise the Honourable Member, the Shadow Minister for the Environment. MP Blakeney, you have a question?

QUESTION 1: DISPOSAL OF WASTE UPDATE

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes. Given the fact that quality controls help to ensure any kind of efficiency measures taken, what are the quality controls and how often are those quality controls measured in conjunction with the testing? How often are tests done? Is there a follow-up of testing during the shoulder season versus the high-end season where there are going to be more people in the water, and that kind of thing?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, at the moment, the seawater tests which have been going on for a long time, but at present the seawater tests are done twice a week. It takes 24 hours to do a culture from that water. So as soon as we receive those tests, they are then posted on the website and released publicly.

The Speaker: Thank you, thank you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Supplementary?

The Speaker: MP Blakeney, yes. What is your supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: With regard to the quality controls, how often are the technologies that are in use calibrated to ensure that there are no slippages such as what has been experienced? Because it appears as if there was a reaction to a problem, as opposed to a prevention from a monitoring system that would have identified and caught the problem before it became of major concern.

The Speaker: All right.
Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, these issues are not new. I have said the pipeline is some 75 years old. Most recently there were reports passed over to the Bermuda Government by the Corporation of Hamilton in 2010. No action was taken as

a result of those. It seems . . . and I agree with the Honourable Member in the sense that there appears to have been slippage in the sense that there has not been the enforcement of standards with respect to the restaurants since that time either by the Chamber of Commerce or by the Government.

But we are clamping down on that now. And as my Statement said, they will be monitoring or bringing in testing equipment to verify whether the restaurants are doing what they are supposed to do.

The Speaker: Thanks, Minister.

The Chair recognises the Honourable Member from Sandys South. MP T. E. Lister, you have the floor.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning to you.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: DISPOSAL OF WASTE UPDATE

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, we have made some significant changes in how we approach tourism. And we are keen to have tourism rebound. I am just wondering if the Minister can tell us how his Ministry and Tourism are working together to ensure that we speak with one voice on this, to ensure that whilst Health is working very hard our Tourism is not saying something else. Because, in fact, some of the comments I have read in the paper from the head of the Tourism Authority were bothersome, at best. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you.
Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, that Honourable Member sometimes seems capable of reading my mind. I am very mindful that even though we want good publicity we must not over-promise and under-deliver. So, you know, I have been very careful in this to say we have got to go step by step. It is an incremental situation. The problem was not created in a day, and it will not be solved in a day.

So, of course, people who are more in the public relations end tend to want to make wonderful promises and then turn to other people and say, *Now, you keep my promise!* I am saying, *Well, you never should have made the promise in the first place.* So, you know, there is an issue there. And I understand the desire for people to spread the news of how wonderful Bermuda is.

This is not a unique situation. Almost anywhere that is near the water has these same issues that are ongoing. Our situation, as they go, is a very good one, and we are confident that the beaches are safe. So we are doing the best that we can, and we

are cooperating. We have had a number of meetings with the leadership of the Tourism Authority to address any perceived lack of congruence between the message that is being delivered to the public.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, thank you.

You have a supplementary? Supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Michael J. Scott: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the supplementary.

I recognise the job of work that Minister Moniz is doing with this. Minister, what is the cost to restaurateurs and whoever else is responsible for depositing fats into the line? What is the cost of grease traps to these restaurant operators and whoever else are putting grease into the system?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, the only additional cost by the measures that we are putting in place is the \$500 that is quoted in the Statement. So there is an additional cost to each establishment of \$500.

The other additional costs are really going to be whether we need any additional resources in terms of monitoring what they are doing. And we are going to be bringing in equipment to monitor and to keep people honest. When they say that they are doing certain things, are they in fact doing them? So, you know, we can no longer trust that people are doing what they are supposed to be doing. In the past, I think there was very much a trust system. The restaurants were doing the right thing. But, you know, we now know that we are going to have to have enforcement.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

You have a supplementary? Yes, the Leader of the Opposition.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In response to the question from the Independent Member, Mr. Lister, the Minister referred to having consultation with the Tourism Authority. I have to ask the Minister, beyond going to or even prior to going to the Tourism Authority, has the Minister had discussions in consultation with the Minister of Tourism in this regard? That is where the coordination should occur, I would think, at the Cabinet level.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Well, Mr. Speaker, the discussions took place both within Cabinet and at Cabinet subcommittee levels. So, yes, discussions did take place, and certainly remarks went back and forth.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you very much.
Yes, MP Wilson.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Yes, thank you. This is a supplementary to the one that was just asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Speaker: Yes.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, carry on.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: I was coughing. Excuse me.

The Speaker: Go ahead. You are okay, Madam.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Concerning the issues concerning discussion and dialogue, I wonder whether or not the Honourable Minister can indicate what further steps are taking place, or were there any steps taking place prior, that included regular dialogue between the Government of Bermuda and the US Consulate General so that statements like this that started this could have been avoided?

The Speaker: Minister?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: I guess my question would be, What dialogue takes place between the Government and the US Consulate General?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have got to be careful what I say there.

[Laughter]

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: The difficulty was that the information . . . It is a difficult situation. Certain tests were done, which, as far as Government were concerned, were not authorised. We do not know under what conditions they were done, and we cannot vouch for the results. We have never been able to reproduce those results—thankfully—before, at the time or since. So those results were done. It was not an authorised testing of the water. Those results were done over a year ago. At some point in time, they were leaked to the media. The media, I understand, held them for a period of time and then leaked them at completely the

worst time, at the beginning of the tourism season. They decided to stick it on the front page of the paper.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: We were . . . Well, I will speak to you privately.

So at that time, we were behind the eight ball. The Consulate General really appeared to have made up his mind, and we could not . . . In our view, the conditions for not having him send out the release were impossible. He then, of course, went to the State Department. In my view, once he went to the State Department, it was outside of his control. So, you know, what we were saying at the time was that all of our tests, which were scientifically done, showed that the water quality at all of our bathing beaches was well within the EPA requirements in the US. So, on what basis would the US Consulate General release a statement about the water quality when it was well within what would be approved within the US?

And that is the one area that we could not understand. I do not understand to this day. But, you know, it does not help me to be at loggerheads with the US Government on those things. It has now become a PR problem because the statement was issued and e-mails were sent to US citizens. Initially, we were advised that that would not happen, but it nevertheless did happen. So we are going to try and improve that communication.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Thank you, MP Lister. You have a supplementary on that?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Supplementary to the questions that were really supplementary to my question.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, there are times when Minister "A" is being invited to answer questions, but the question is really better suited to another Minister, and the Minister may defer. In this case, the question I really have, especially listening to the last response, is that, as I watched this unfold it appeared to me that there was a breakdown in the relationship and the process between Bermuda and the United States. Friends do not do this to friends. It is not the way you operate.

So I would like my question, if the Members are willing, to really be directed to the Premier to tell us what went wrong? Is it still wrong? And what is going to be done to fix the relationship? Because we have a relationship problem here, so it would appear.

The Speaker: Minister?

Would you like to answer that, Premier? All right.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes. I do not believe there is any relationship issue or challenge. I myself spoke with the US Consulate as well concerning the issue. It was simply a matter of difference of opinion. He felt that he was obligated, based on these results that he had seen, to release them, and, quite frankly, he felt that for himself, had he not done that his own job might have been at jeopardy.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes—no. Well, I must say that consultation, questions were asked. And we were corresponding back and forth. However, he felt that he was going to go ahead and release the information regardless of the consultation that was going on.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Premier.

Thank you, Honourable Members. That concludes our Question Period.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Mr. Speaker, is it out of time, or do I get my question? My Parliamentary question?

The Speaker: Oh, goodness. No, we are not out of time.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: No, we are not out of time. Thank you, Honourable Member. Yes.

The first is an oral [answer] by Dr. E. G. Gibbons in reply to Parliamentary Questions by the Honourable T. E. Lister. Yes.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleague to the right of me was very worried that he was going to lose out. I assured him that that would not happen.

[Laughter]

QUESTION 1: EDUCATION COMMISSIONER

Hon. Terry E. Lister: My first question to the Honourable Minister is, Will the Honourable Minister table in this Honourable House the survey that the former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Heatley, reported in his job application showing satisfaction [that] education had risen from 23 per cent to 93 per cent during his short tenure?

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: I thank the Honourable Member for that question, Mr. Speaker.

[Laughter]

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say the Ministry has no knowledge of the survey to which Dr. Heatley was referring.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

Yes, you have a supplementary, MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Well, thank you for that answer. My first supplementary is gone.

[Laughter]

An Hon. Member: There is no survey!

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: That is right; the survey does not exist.

But here is the second question. Here is the second question, which is the second supplementary; that would have been my first supplementary. Given that Dr. Heatley included this false information on his job application, what impact did this have in your assessing his ongoing credibility as an education leader in Bermuda?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I am going to try and be very careful here, because as I think we have tried to indicate in this Honourable House, the issue of staffing matters is not the purview of the Minister, per se. But suffice it to say again that, obviously, Dr. Heatley is no longer with the Ministry.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

That is it. Those were your two supplementaries, Honourable Member.

QUESTION 2: EDUCATION COMMISSIONER

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes. Those are my . . . Well, actually, I only asked one question; I still have one more. But I am going to pass and go to question number two.

Question number two says, Will the Honourable Minister please confirm for this Honourable House that Dr. Heatley's salary was \$190,000, as he stated in his job application?

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Heatley's salary was, as listed in the job advertisement, \$171,893.46. That is PS-46, PS grade 46.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Minister.

You have a supplementary?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes.

The Speaker: All right.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Can the Minister inform this Honourable House of the terms, if any, of Dr. Heatley's severance package?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there was no severance package.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you very much. Yes?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Once again, the Minister did an excellent job of giving me the answers I want. And my second question is no longer required based of the answer to the first question.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Let us get to the next one because time is running out, and we want to get to . . . MP Lawrence Scott has a question for the Minister of Tourism.

QUESTION 1: AUDIT OF DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND PORTS

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Honourable Minister of Transport share with the Members of this Honourable House and the Bermudian people the findings of the audit conducted on the Department of Marine and Ports as a result of their latest industrial action in February of this year, and if he will make a Statement?

The Speaker: Yes. Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Internal Audit has commenced its review, and their work is currently ongoing. When the review is completed there will be discussions with the Bermuda Industrial Union on steps that we plan to take as a result of this report.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that this is an internal audit. So there is no intention to lay the

findings of the internal audit in this Honourable House. However, I will keep this Honourable House apprised through Ministerial Statements.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Yes, supplementary. What processes, policies and procedures has the Minister put in place to avoid further industrial action?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is the whole purpose of the internal audit. Once we ascertain the breakdown and the recommendations, then the Ministry will implement the required policies and procedures.

The Speaker: Thank you. Another supplementary?

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Yes, second supplementary. Is the Minister confident that the Marine and Ports workers are satisfied that his handling of the latest industrial action is to avoid or prevent any further industrial action in the future?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I can reiterate the comments made by my colleague, Dr. Gibbons, at the Ministerial level we are not responsible for staffing issues. The Cabinet Secretary and the Permanent Secretary and directors are responsible for staffing issues. We certainly are here to provide support and, if necessary, bring about changes. But the civil service is doing what it has to do to make sure that we resolve the issues at Marine and Ports.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you very much. Thank you, Honourable Members. We have completed, with one minute and 30 seconds to go.

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

The Speaker: We now move to congratulatory and/or obituary speeches.

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Minister Wayne Scott. Minister Scott, you have the floor.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I know it has been awhile since we have been in the House. I will try to be brief. I know everybody will have congratulatory remarks today.

First of all, I would just like to offer congratulations to Bermudian gymnast, Sadia Wilson, made headlines on the 9th of April when she was called up to the England gymnastics squad. Of course, that raises some additional issues for her. But Ms. Wilson continues to be a positive role model for our young people. And I think that we just wish her the best on behalf of the Bermuda Government and people of Bermuda. I know that her dream is to compete in the 2016 Olympics, and I think she is well on her way.

I would like to offer congratulations to all the track and field athletes who represented Bermuda in the 2014 CARIFTA Games. I am not going to go through and read all the names. But, of course, you know, we brought home five medals for that small team, including a gold, three silver medals and a bronze, so just a fabulous job by our young athletes.

And also, the Bermuda Swim Team, which was a much larger team. We placed ninth overall out of 17 countries in the 2014 CARIFTA swimming championship, bringing home 22 medals, including 20 individual medals, 2 relay medals, 7 gold, 11 silvers, 4 bronze. On behalf of myself and the Government of Bermuda, and of course, all the people of Bermuda, both teams representing the Islands at the CARIFTA event made Bermuda proud, and we salute you. I know my Shadow Minister is not here, but I would definitely like to include him in my remarks.

I would like to very briefly, as well, also commend the awardees (who again, I am not going to read all of them in detail) of the Bermuda Entertainment Union Black Tie Awards and Variety show, which was held on Sunday, the 6th of April, at the Earl Cameron Theatre. Suffice it to say, we have some amazing talent in this Island. And I would hope that as a country we can continue to support our artists, because they actually do make us all very proud.

So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Premier.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We had the opportunity on April the 24th for a memorial service in honour of the Honourable Sir David Gibbons in his passing. This service was well attended at the Cathedral. And as I was going through the bulletin that was given out in the memorial service, we certainly can see from 1948 right on through to 1993, the many accomplishments and public service that can be attributed to his love for Bermuda. So I just wanted to recognise the Gibbons family and the passing of the Honourable Sir David and his great contribution to our wonderful Island of Bermuda.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member. Lawrence Scott, you have the floor.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have this Honourable House send a letter of congratulations to the PHC [Pembroke Hamilton Club], and I will associate my Opposition Leader (my Leader); and Minister of [Community, Culture and Sports], Minister Scott; and Shadow Minister Rolfe Commissioning. Can I just say the whole House there? Because of the fact that they held, for the first time in awhile, a family event. And I will declare my interest. Myself and Minister Wayne Scott were the main event—

The Speaker: You were the main event?

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: —where we both dressed up in sumo wrestling outfit attire and went head to head.

[Inaudible interjection and laughter]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: But our participation is not the main focus. It is the premise and the principle which they did it. They went, they brought the community together. They had a very good turnout. President Jonathan Ball is to be commended on his efforts in putting this together. And I hope that it is an annual event for years to come. I would just like to thank them for bringing the community together once again.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise . . . I have got to recognise, he was up earlier, the Honourable Member from Warwick. MP Jeff Sousa, you have the floor.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Good morning, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members and those in the listening audience.

I rise this morning to ask this Honourable House to send condolences to the family of Topy Cowen, the former Mayor of Flatts Village. I know that the Deputy Premier, MP Michael Dunkley, would like to be associated with these comments, and I would hope the entire House.

I have worn my pink tie today to honour my mate, Topy, who truly loved Bermuda and our people, and was particularly passionate about our hospitality industry. He was appointed Chairman of the Visitor Industry Partnership. He rose from a stock boy to general manager and went on to manage the Pink Beach [Club] for 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, we all know how passionate he was about Flatts Village and how he had proposed a bridge so that the people of Bermuda in the area could enjoy that special part of Bermuda more.

Topy believed in a better and stronger Bermuda, and an Island of equality no matter what race or background a person came from. He believed one man can make a difference. I was fortunate and served alongside him when he was President of Hamilton Rotary. He was also Chairman of the Eastern Division of the Police Consultant Committee and the

Eliza Dolittle Society. Topy was awarded the Queen's Certificate and Badge of Honour in 2004.

Topy Cowen leaves behind his devoted wife, Sandra, and his children Heidi, Ricky and Heather, and grandchildren. I know that the people of Bermuda have special memories of Topy, and he was a true son of the soil.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke [South East], the Honourable Member Rolfe Commissiong, who is the Shadow Minister for Human Affairs.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask this House likewise to send a note of condolence to the family of Ms. Joan Elizabeth Ismay Swan Robinson-Dickerson. Ms. Robinson-Dickerson was a constituent of mine and well-known person in the Pembroke community, Mr. Speaker. She leaves behind her children, Sinclair, Ismay, Heather and the late Anthony Robinson, who was a noted entertainer and vocalist in Bermuda. Some of us in my generation will remember him quite fondly. Nonetheless, like I said, I would like for the House to send condolences to the family of Ms. Robinson-Dickerson.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Economic Development. Minister Grant Gibbons, you have the floor.

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to send a number of congratulations. The first is to Ms. Aliyyah Ahad, who has been named as Bermuda's 2014 Rhodes Scholar. Ms. Ahad recently graduated from the University of Toronto and is planning on doing a Master's Degree in Migration Studies at St. Hilda's College in Oxford. She had a sterling academic career, and we certainly wish her very well in her ongoing studies.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I would also like to send congratulations to Robin Spencer-Arscott, who was named as winner of the Bermuda Insurance Institute's Lifetime Achievement Award. I think most Honourable Members will know Robin. He has done an extraordinary job over some 50 years in promoting Bermuda, particularly in the insurance and reinsurance side. I think he really should be recognised for the amount of work he has done. I know a number of people . . . Yes, Kim Wilson, Mr. Dunkley and Mr. Blakeney would also like to be associated with that.

While I am on my feet, Julia Henderson was also named Young Industry Leader of the Year. She works at Brit Insurance. And Catlin should also be

congratulated for their winning the Corporate Social Responsibility Award. They have been very active in a number of different social areas, as well.

I would also like to ask that congratulations be sent not only to KPMG, who are the sponsor, but to the winners of the KPMG Annual Investment Challenge, which just concluded yesterday. The winners were, in fact, the Berkeley Institute, but the Bermuda High School and also Somersfield Academy did very well. Quite extraordinary, Mr. Speaker, they had \$50,000—not in real money, I hasten to add. But the return over six months was close to 30 per cent by the winners. So, anyway, they have done extremely well. And I think perhaps some of the local investors should take notice.

[Laughter]

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: But I would like to thank KPMG and recognise them for continuing to sponsor this award. This is their ninth year. It gets really good involvement by the students. All of the senior schools have participated, and Somersfield Academy as well, and there was clearly a lot of enthusiasm there yesterday.

On a sadder note, Mr. Speaker, I think that the passing of the late Arthur Morris should be recognised. Mr. Morris was an early pioneer. He was founder of the Bermuda Society of Chartered Accountants back in 1967 and was very involved as Bermuda and Fred Rice started to move more into the captive industry. I think he has been . . . I have got a number of people, Mr. Sousa and also Mr. Smith and Mrs. Roberts-Holshouser would like to be associated. He was an early user of computer technology and worked in a number of different areas. Charlie Kemp was one of his partners; more recently, Craig Christensen, as well. And I would ask that condolences be sent to the family, his family, which includes his wife, June.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to be associated with the condolences to the family of Topy Cowen. And I would also like to thank the Premier and Members who attended the memorial service of my uncle, Sir David Gibbons. Obviously, I am sure he would be pleased to be recognised for his contribution to this House and Bermuda.

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Sandys South. MP T. E. Lister, you have the floor.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the first person I would like to recognise is the passing of my godmother's husband, Mr. Herbert "Chico" Francis. Chico Francis was very, very well known in this country. He was the coach of the Dock Hill Rangerettes, the Social Club Jets, assis-

tant coach of the Big Blue Machine. And he really loved his sports. I want to associate the Honourable Member, Mr. Glenn Blakeney, and Members on the other side as well—in fact, all the Members. He definitely will be missed, and as I said, it is a loss to our family.

Secondly, I would like to offer condolences to the family of Ms. Lucretia Brangman. Lucretia Brangman was a constituent of mine. She worked many years in the Police Service, attending to the needs of the officers. She was retired for quite a few years. She was 91 at her death. I did not actually realise she was that old. My wife used to kid her affectionately because some years back, maybe some five or six years ago, she was the Glamorous Granny. So my wife always called her *Glamorous*. And she would break into a big smile when she spoke to her in that way.

I also want to be enjoined with the Honourable Grant Gibbons with regard to the remarks relating to Arthur Morris. Arthur Morris was really one of the builders of our profession. The accounting profession in Bermuda really started in the very early 1960s. And he, along with others, such as Dick Butterfield, my former senior partner, John Butterfield, were really there making that industry work and had a real impact right from the start.

I also want to join with Dr. Gibbons, the Honourable Member, in recognising Ms. Aliyyah Ahad. She is a Somerset Bridge girl, as has been mentioned, an outstanding student all the way through. She, upon graduating in 2012, came back to Bermuda and was actually part of the Cabinet Office internship programme, and lastly worked with both the Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman. So already at this early stage, she has had great academic success and great work experience. And I know in the future, Bermuda will really benefit from this outstanding young lady.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. Paul Wright on his appointment as Deputy Commissioner [of the Police Service]. The Honourable Kim Wilson would like to be [associated] as well. I had the pleasure of working with Mr. Wright when we were in the telecoms Ministry and trying to get legislation through that would deal with Internet predatory behaviour. Since that time, you will know that quite a few men, in particular, have been arrested, convicted and some put in prison for bad behaviour on the Internet. He was the one we worked with on there. So I know Mr. Wright has a commitment to the country and its people, and I am sure he will do a fine job in his present post.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Deputy Speaker.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.

The month of April was a very sad month for several residents of St. David's, be it from the west end of St. David's or the eastern end of St. David's. And so, therefore, I stand to send condolences [for the passing of] Angelina DeBraga, first of all. She was related by family to me, and I have to say that she was one of those little, petit women. She was from the Azures, initially. And you would always see her walking extremely fast. And it always reminded me of the energy that she gave to her children and to her family, who sadly miss her presence in their house and leave behind her children and her husband.

Secondly, we also saw the passing of Vearly Darrell. Vearly Darrell was a family member of the Chapel of Ease. And it was often very funny that she would depend on the bus to attend our church services. And often, Mrs. Darrell was found to be late for church. So it was of no surprise on the day of her funeral that she was also late. I can tell you that there were giggles about whether she caught the bus to her funeral. Mrs. Darrell will go down in the history, I know, of the Bishop of the Church of England as, together with her sister, Vearly and Relda were the first individuals that were confirmed by our current bishop. I know he will not soon forget these two women who were determined to become members through communion. She will be sadly missed by her family, and, of course, that is extended into the family church.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to send condolences to the family of Calvin Fox. I will do my best not to burst into tears. Calvin was one of those soldiers of St. David's, also a family member. He was the first recipient in Bermuda to receive medicinal marijuana. He followed the protocol. His family followed the protocol of how it would be done. He fought a battle which constantly saw a smile on his face up to the last few moments. Member Blakeney would also like to be associated. I happened to be with him in his last hour. I had shown up to the hospital to visit him, and he had already been moved to Agape House, which he never saw a full 24 hours.

But even to that point, Mr. Speaker, there was no shying of his smile. I joked with him about how I could not see the television; he was watching some football game. But, yes, he could see it. He has slipped his moorings, Mr. Speaker, and that is and will always be a sad day. But he will be remembered by many individuals in St. David's, including—and I had trouble saying this at the funeral, but by the Shotokan-Do karate fans. He was a member and a teacher.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair now will recognise the Honourable Member from Sandys, the Honourable and Learned Member from constituency 36, MP Michael Scott, who is the Shadow Attorney General.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Mr. Speaker, thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, may I be associated with the offer of a letter of condolences offered by the Honourable Member from Sandys South, the Honourable Member, Mr. Lister, on the passing and death of Lucretia Scott Brangman, to offer and be associated with offering condolences to her family? Mr. Speaker, Lucretia Scott Brangman was fondly remembered at her home-going service for being a woman of great and noble spirit, a great matriarch of her family. And it was a considerably large family. So I wish to offer condolences to her children, Eulene and Eyvette and Gerald and Walter and Kenneth and Janet and Stanfield.

As the Honourable Member, Mr. Lister, indicated, she was a dear friend to the Bermuda Police Service, where she worked for many years in the galley (or in there) providing wonderful meals for them. And members of the Police Service were present at her service to fondly remember their relationship with her. So I ask that I be associated with the offer of condolences from Mr. Lister. The fact that the name "Scott" appears in her name is an indication that she is a cousin of my family as well.

Mr. Speaker, may I also ask that the House send condolences on another great loss of Somerset, in the personage of Mr. Raymond "Bucket" Young. I wish to associate my Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Member, Mr. Dennis Lister, and Ms. Kim Wilson, the Shadow Minister of Health. Mr. Young, an excellent former employee of Works and Engineering, a special friend to Belita Outerbridge and to her children; his siblings, Hank, and sister, Vernora, a large family. But his passing came suddenly, and so it was a great loss to our Somerset community. And he is being mourned by very special close friends, Woody's, certainly the Works and Engineering family, the Anchor Boys, the Prison Officers Club.

It was a touching service, as all of these members representing these persons that I am mentioning were at the funeral at St. Anne's to bid him farewell. A great spirit, a great master mason and carpenter. His foreman from Works and Engineering (whose name escapes me), he was there, paid wonderful tribute to his staff member. So we bade farewell to a wonderful Somersetonian.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair is going to recognise the Honourable Member from Devonshire [North West], MP Glen Smith.

Mr. Glen Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

The Speaker: Good afternoon.

Mr. Glen Smith: It has been a sad week for the Cedar Park community. We have had two deaths in that

tight-knit community. I would like to send condolences first of all to the family of Judith Fox. Judith worked at Masters Limited for 40-plus years. She did have some learning issues and struggled with issues, but she managed to work through those challenges to be able to fulfil a life, to be able to have a job. She also spent a lot of time travelling up and down the Island in a bus to greet tourists, go and see friends, and her favourite game was Bingo. Judith leaves her sister, Paula, and brother, Danny Fox, and extended family.

I would also like to send condolences to the family of Alice Malvina Musson. Mrs. Musson had spent 42 years working for the Bermuda Bakery. And from there, when the Bermuda Bakery closed down, she went and worked at Meals on Wheels. I also during my campaign realised this, Mrs. Musson had a strong faith with the Lord, as many times I went to visit her, the Bible would come out. But she was also heavily involved with the Seventh-day Adventist Church. She assisted in the church feeding programme. And nothing ever fazed "Mal," which she is better known to everybody. She always put people first.

Mrs. Musson leaves behind her husband, Reginald, daughters Victoria Pearman, April, Rhoda and Delroy Musson, and extended family.

I would also like to send congratulations to CedarBridge Academy. On April 17th, I accompanied the Governor and his wife to CedarBridge to do a full tour of the school, and also under the direction of Ms. Kalmar Richards and her assistants, and also some of the teachers. And what a wonderful facility it is! But more importantly, we are there to honour the S2 honour students that have done extremely well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your time.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from constituency 2 [*sic*], the Shadow Minister of Education. MP Foggo, you have the floor.

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I represent constituency 3.

The Speaker: Three; excuse me.

[Laughter]

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Mr. Speaker, I just stand to be associated with the remarks given by the Deputy Speaker. Indeed, St. David's has been in mourning. Specifically, Mrs. Vearly Darrell, who did live on Cashew City Road and is a well-known St. David's Islander. And as the Deputy Speaker pointed out, she and her sister, Mrs. Jones, Relda Jones, basically after years of wanting to be a part of the Chapel of Ease Church—which they were, through their attendance—did receive communion from the Bishop, Reverend Dill.

Mrs. DeBraga, before her family moved to St. David's, they used to live in Turkey Hill, St. George's. And I did grow up with her eldest daughter, Maria, who is now Maria Brown, and did teach her two younger children, Josie and Rita. She did have a lovely service, and St. George's did, and the Roman Catholic Church did come out in full attendance to celebrate her passing.

Indeed, Calvin Fox, I knew all my life, but knew the Fox family in particular through their children. I taught both daughters of Calvin Fox, and that is Kava and Kameron, and felt duty bound to show, because you know, having that type of connection, I felt duty bound to show my respect for the family. I do know and have known their mother for many, many, many years, who is, I guess you can say, a very smart business lady. I can say St. David's, these names, particularly the Darrell name and the Fox name, are synonymous with St. David's because of the family ties. The Darrell name really goes back to . . . Everybody remembers Mount Area.

[Inaudible interjections]

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Right.

So everybody remembers definitely turtle stew and all of those St. David's Island meals, and Ms. Darrell and all of her siblings are definitely part of that Borden family.

So, on that note, Mr. Speaker, let me just take my seat. And again, condolences to the Darrell, DeBraga and Fox families. Thank you.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Deputy Premier, the Minister for National Security.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the condolences sent to the family of Mr. Herbert "Chico" Francis and to former Premier, Sir David Gibbons, and to Mr. Topy Cowen and Calvin Fox. I also ask this Honourable Chamber to send condolences to Mr. Larry Marshall Sr. and his family in the passing of his mother, Jean Elizabeth Pearman, whom I have grown very fond of over the last number of years. She passed recently after a bout of illness.

I would also like this Honourable Chamber to send condolences to the Crisson family at the passing of John Crisson recently.

Mr. Speaker, on a brighter note, I would ask this Honourable Chamber to send congratulations to the Department of Corrections on the graduation of a number of recruits early in April. We have got a number of new recruits that took up service the next day after: Officer Abraham, Officer Armstrong, Officer Brown, Officer Burns, Officer Celestine, Officer Cumberpatch, Officer Lewis, Officer Looby, Officer Per-

inchief, Officer Symonds Jr., Officer Andy Williams, and Officer Carlton Williams. I am very pleased at the quality of the recruit path and the course that was offered, and I wish them all the best.

I would like to be associated with the congratulations already sent by Minister Gibbons to Robin Spencer-Arscott and Honourable Member Lister to the newly appointed Deputy Commissioner of Police, Paul Wright. We have a very strong leadership team within the Bermuda Police Service right now, and I am sure they will continue on the excellent work that they have been doing.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask this Honourable Chamber to send congratulations to the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Bermuda. I had the pleasure of attending the 2014 CA and CPA graduation. There was a very strong class of Bermudian graduates, of Bermudian CA's, Alexis Barker, Kyle Ferreira and Christopher Lopes; and Bermuda CPA's Kalena Astwood, Lionel Bean, Cleve Davis, Juanita DeShield, Nicholas Dunkle, Janelle Harvey, Bill McClure, Natasha Osborne, Stacey Pitcher, Gregory Rose and Christopher Tucker. Certainly, they are taking up a very necessary profession in Bermuda, and we wish them all the best.

Mr. Speaker, as I try to squeeze this in three minutes, I would like to also take this opportunity to send congratulations to Caron Bermuda and the excellent work that they continue to do. I had the opportunity a couple of days ago to attend their Award of Excellence Night, where they recognised Mr. Brian Duperreault and his wife, Nancy Duperreault, for the excellent work that they have done through the Duperreault Fellowship over the past number of years, certainly a worthy recognition for the work that they have done to help with addiction and the treatment of addiction in our Island home over the last number of years. They should be commended for the work they have done. And Caron should be commended for the work that they do, as well.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, in closing, send congratulations to the St. Paul's AME Church on the Music of Holy Week. I had the opportunity to read a scripture on the Saturday, April 2th, with scriptures being read by the Honourable former Premier Dame Jennifer Smith, the Honourable Opposition Leader Marc Bean, and in your place, your brother kindly read the scripture. I certainly was lifted by the music and the guest artists from overseas—Jarrett O'Neal, Tyler Jacob Hill, and Xavier Durden. Certainly, it was a wonderful performance by those guests and also the St. Paul's AME Choir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Leader of the Opposition, Marc Bean.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the congratulatory remarks for Ms. Aliyyah Ahad. As has been said, she is one of our bright lights that hails out of the Somerset Bridge community, and she is a class act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer condolences to the family of the late Mr. Erin Richardson, who perished as the result of gun violence in the Riviera estate a few weeks ago. I am sure everyone would like to be associated with it, the whole House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also offer some positive remarks to Bermudian athletes who are punching above their weight on the world stage. In particular, Ms. Flora Duffy and Mr. Tyler Butterfield, who are proving to be international in their scope and ability. They have made and continue to make Bermuda proud.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure all the Members would like to be associated, I would like to offer congratulations to the CARIFTA teams, both track and field, and swimming, and, in particular, the young Ms. Emma Harvey. And I stand to be corrected, but I think it is a young lady named Emma Harvey who just swept the Caribbean. I think it was in Aruba. And MP Kim Wilson would like to be associated with it.

And in particular, Ms. Kyrrah Scraders, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first, but the second CARIFTA in a row that the young Ms. Scraders has won a gold medal in the 800-metres. Now, because the CARIFTA is such a high standard, because the Caribbean produces world-class athletes, basically if you are a gold medallist, Mr. Speaker, in the CARIFTA Games, then more than likely you are on the track to become an Olympic gold medallist. So, we have a gem, an absolute diamond in our hands in Ms. Kyrrah Scraders. And I would encourage us as a collective Government and the country to continue to give her the support that she needs, because she obviously has what it takes to do something that no one else has ever done in representing this country.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair recognises the Minister of Tourism, Minister Shawn Crockwell.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge in the House the 2014 VIP Sunshine Awardee, Ms. Aishah Muhammad, who received the acknowledgement in early April of this year for her extraordinary friendliness and the fact that she goes out of her way to assist tourists that come to the Island. Ms. Muhammad is a taxi dispatcher, and she assisted a particular tourist, Maria Gonzalez, when she contacted Ms. Muhammad to inquire about places to go. Ms.

Muhammad, within 24 hours, sent her information about where to eat, what to do, sent her a video of Bermuda, really went out of her way to show the various amenities and activities that we have on the Island. Then there was an incident when this tourist came to the Island, her luggage was delayed. It did not arrive with her when she came here. It must have been left in the States. And Ms. Muhammad gave her a bag of clothing and other items, toiletries, to get her through that time period.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to acknowledge these true ambassadors for Bermuda. We gave her a pin, so no letter is required. Also, we gave her a wonderful certificate. But I would like to acknowledge her in this Honourable House.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like for the House to send a letter of congratulations to Magistrate Juan Wolfe, who is the presiding Magistrate of the Drug Treatment Court. Mr. Speaker, the drug court has been in operation for over 10 years, and it has some fantastic success stories. Mr. Speaker, between 75 per cent and 80 per cent of those who go through this programme graduate, and they only have a 7 per cent recidivism rate, which is outstanding. It is lower than recidivism rates of drug courts in other jurisdictions. Magistrate Juan Wolfe has been in charge of this particular programme all of the last 10 years. And I have appeared before this magistrate. He is a firm, but fair magistrate. He has certainly earned the respect of those participants in his programme and those who come before him.

I actually highlighted this because I have been critical. In the early years of the drug court I was critical because, if you can recall, there was some disorganisation at the time. But it has become a very successful and much-needed programme, and I think that Magistrate Juan Wolfe, who has been there for the majority of the 10 years, deserves credit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the condolences of the passing of the former Premier Sir David Gibbons. I did attend the memorial service. Certainly, he is one of the giants of Bermuda, who did a great deal of great work for Bermuda. Certainly not an uncontroversial figure, but, Mr. Speaker, those individuals, leaders who do things in our community, leaders who are not afraid to go out there and bring about change and do the difficult things quite often will be part of controversy. But I would just like to acknowledge Sir David Gibbons and send my condolences to the family.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

I recognise the Honourable Member, Gordon-Pamplin, Minister Patricia Gordon-Pamplin.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this Honourable House send a letter of condolences to the family of Alvin Brangman. Mr. Brangman, who in the later years of his life was a resident at Matilda Smith Williams [Seniors Residence], was a musician par excellence. And he was actually funeralised amid tributes that were paid by people from the music industry. And one would have seen him at Elbow Beach playing the piano in the lounge. He was an absolutely fabulous individual. And interestingly, on a Sunday afternoon while visiting Matilda Smith Williams where he lived (because my mother was there as well), he would actually have people spellbound with his ability to continue to tickle those ivories. I would just ask that condolences be sent to his family.

I would also like to be associated with the remarks of condolences to Arthur Morris and to the family of the late Sir David Gibbons.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to send congratulations (albeit I will end on a condolence note) to the Director of Parks, Lisa Dawn Johnston, on a successful Agricultural Exhibition, which has just recently concluded. The Honourable Member, Michael Weeks, has asked to be associated as well. But I think that the Department of Parks did itself proud, the Department of Agriculture did itself proud. There was a record number of entrants this year—over 3,500 entrants for competition in various areas. And I believe that Ms. Johnston, who actually lives the ag show . . . and I believe that it showed. The results showed. And I would really like to send congratulations to her.

But I would like to close, Mr. Speaker, in associating myself with the remarks of condolences to the family of Herbert “Chico” Francis. The Honourable Member, Terry Lister, indicated that Chico would be a miss to his family, with Chico’s wife being godmother (I think he said) to himself. But let me say that Herbert “Chico” Francis, as a coach for the Dock Hill Rangerettes, taught me some life-long lessons that I will never, ever forget. Things such as perseverance, things such as striving for excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I started playing softball at the age of about 16 with the Dock Hill Rangerettes. Ultimately, our team was adopted by Social Club and sponsored by Social Club and became the Social Club Jets. But I can tell you that, having gone to training, having made the determination that I would play, and gone to training day after day after day after day, for the first three years of training every day, Chico sat me on the bench. Because he was determined that if you made the field under his managerial skills, you had to prove yourself to be excellent. And, Mr. Speaker, those three . . . Is that my time already?

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Those three years, Mr. Speaker, taught me lessons that I will never forget. I will be ever grateful to Chico for those early

lessons that I learned from the age of 16, ultimately until I was able to join the national team, the Big Blue Machine that he actually ultimately coached, and I will miss him dearly. He is husband to Connie and father to Anthony, and I offer them my heartfelt condolences.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

APOLOGY

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Just before I call on the Premier, I would like to point out that the MP Zane De Silva is absent, has asked to be excused, today. So he will not be at the session today.

I recognise the Honourable Premier.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move now that we break for lunch until 2:05.

The Speaker: Yes, we can do that.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: At 2:05.

The Speaker: The House is now adjourned to 2:05.

[Gavel]

Proceedings suspended at 12:36 pm

Proceedings resumed at 2:05 pm

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

[Gavel]

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

[continuation thereof]

The Speaker: All right, the Chair recognises the Honourable Minister T. E. *[sic]* Moniz.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: T. G. Moniz.

The Speaker: T. G. Moniz. Why do I keep saying T. E.?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you. Mr. T. E. Lister, I think—

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand on my feet today. I have two things. One, which is a sad one and I just want to . . . I do not

know if it was done earlier, but have condolences sent to the family of the victim of the tragic accident in Florida, Dale Boorman.

The Speaker: No, it was not done.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: His parents, or his mother, Colleen (was Colleen Tavares) is my first cousin. His father is Dean Boorman, the son of Clyde Boorman. The Boorman side were historically close to my Grandmother Moniz. And on the mother's side, they are my first cousins. So it was a very tragic death.

He was a very kind and very nice boy. My son, Thomas, is just about his age. My son is 19; Dale was 20. He used to spend many a night at their home, partook of his hospitality. He was obviously very gifted at racing the motocross, and it is very sad to lose someone so young. And, of course, he is not the first young Bermudian who has gone to the US and died. There was another young man who I think died in a Red Bull race on a flat track. This one was on a motocross and it was no fault of his own at all.

I think the Deputy Speaker, Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, would like to be associated as well as the Deputy Premier, Mr. Dunkley, and Dr. Gibbons. It was a very sad thing and I do not think I can say much more than that.

The other one, on a happier note, Mr. Speaker, is that earlier this week I was invited to a meeting of the Bermuda Fruit Growers Association, which is a group that really cuts across a lot of boundaries in a society, particularly in the political category because, of course, one of the big names in that category is Big El James and George Jackson (the past Commissioner of Police). Susan Wilson is big in that. Kim White and all sorts of people. It was such a cross section of people there, it is quite amazing.

They brought in a chap from Florida called, Dr. Richard Campbell, who is the guru particularly on grafting. He came in the first night and gave a lecture and a demonstration on grafting avocado trees. The second night he gave a lecture and demonstration on grafting mango trees. And this young man has travelled the world. He is a Crocodile Dundee sort of character. He goes up into the mountains and jungles of Indonesia finding new varieties and he has done an amazing job.

Mr. Ed Manuel was there, of course, who knows not only this young man but knew his father extremely well. His father was an agriculture inspector in the United States. And Mr. Manuel also knew this young man's grandfather. So you can see a familial connection with Bermuda that we are now cashing in on because he is of great assistance. And while he was here he grafted a tree at Government House that, I think, was planted in the 1880s by King George V (to be, I guess, before he became King). He planted a mango tree there which is still alive and he grafted a couple examples for them.

So he did an amazing job for us here in Bermuda. The members showed him great hospitality. And I would like to get people more involved in backyard growing of produce of whatever type, you know, vegetables, fruit, et cetera. But it is an amazingly rewarding hobby. So I would just like to congratulate them on that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Any other Honourable Member that would care to speak?

The Chair will recognise the Shadow Minister of Finance, MP David Burt.

You have the floor.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, good afternoon to you.

The Speaker: Good afternoon.

Mr. E. David Burt: I would just ask if it could be noted and if the House would send a letter of congratulations to Messrs Wayne and Dwayne Caines who recently published a book called *Double Vision*. It was a forwarded by the Honourable Premier . . . and I see that the Honourable Minister of Tourism Development and Transport is asking to be associated with those remarks.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, the Caines family and my family are very close. I grew up knowing Wayne, Dwayne, Shereen and Travis. And of course, Ms. Caines was my nursery school teacher as she was with many other people. But the book itself (although I have not had a chance to read it) the reviews have been very good and I think that it is excellent that positive people in our society are doing positive things and are setting an example. It is a book that speaks to lessons in life and I think that it should be commended by this House, Mr. Speaker.

I would hope that Members of this House would support it and also that Members of this House would read it and share it as I think it could be a good tool insofar as showing positive black male role models in our society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. E. David Burt: And if I could please associate the Honourable—

The Speaker: Yes, okay.

Mr. E. David Burt: —Kim Wilson with that remark.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Fine. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Thank you very much.

That concludes our . . . the Chair will recognise the Honourable Member—

QUORUM

[Standing Order 8]

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a concern. I know we have just come after a long break, but we are here to do the people's business and while we see a few people . . . certainly more than the two people on the Opposition side, I would like to call a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, well, there is certainly not a quorum in here and so if we are calling a quorum, what that means is that we will have the bell rung and we will give—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: The quorum has been called.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Because there is not a quorum in here.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: The Honourable Member just—

[Inaudible interjections]

An Hon. Member: How long to they have?

The Speaker: Five minutes, yes. So can you ring the bell?

[Crosstalk]

[Ringing of the Bells]

[Pause]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Mr. Speaker, is it possible to call a no confidence vote at the spur of the moment?

[Pause]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Every Member of the PLP is in their seat—every Member. The OBA cannot even fill their own bench. They cannot even fill their front bench.

They cannot even fill their front bench and they are calling a quorum! It is ridiculous. It is ridiculous. All the Members of the PLP are sitting in their seat. Every Member is there. Every Member is accounted for and your guys call a quorum and you

cannot even get all your Ministers here? It is a disgrace. It is a total disgrace! It is disgraceful!

The Speaker: All right, Honourable Members. Yes, Honourable Member Weeks?

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker, is it possible for me to finish my congratulatory . . .

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Yes, we had . . . so I will allow you to do that.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Crosstalk]

The Speaker: Carry on, Honourable Member.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I move on, I know I have got three minutes, but before I do I want to know where their Members are because a quorum was called and all my Members appear to be sitting in their seats. Okay? All my Members.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to first associate myself with the remarks for congratulation to Miss Kyra Scraders on her gold medal at the recent CARIFTA Games and to all the other medalists during those games.

I would like to also be associated with the remarks for Flora Duffy and Tyler Butterfield on their recent accomplishments, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to send out a note of congratulations to Ms. Kimberly Creighton—she is the principal at Elliot Primary School—and her staff for hosting their [fifth] annual 250 Men's Reading Challenge, which was held this morning.

The Speaker: Sorry, I missed that. What was that?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: I would also like to send out a note of congratulations to Ms. Kimberly Creighton who is the principal at the Elliot Primary School and to her staff for hosting this—the [fifth] annual 250 Men's Reading Challenge, that was held at her school this morning. So I have to ask to be excused [for] my tardiness this morning, Mr. Speaker. And where each man took one student and read with them for an hour from eleven to twelve.

Mr. Speaker, I also had the privilege of attending the S4 Honours Assembly at the CedarBridge Academy on April 15th at which time, Mr. Speaker, I was humbled to be honoured with a Community Service Award. And at this point I would like to publicly thank the CedarBridge Academy teachers and their students for this honour.

Still along the lines of education, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if someone already has congratulated the exploits of Ms. Amne Osseyran.

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

[Desk thumping]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Okay, since it has been done already I do not have to—

The Speaker: No, no, you can associate . . . it was done.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: It was done?

The Speaker: Osseyran? Was it now? No? Was it—

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: All right, Mr. Speaker. So Ms. Amne Osseyran (for those that do not know it) is the daughter—

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: —of the Opposition Education Minister—

The Speaker: Oh! Okay. Yes, yes. Sorry.

[Desk thumping]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: She has just received a medical scholarship from the Harvey family, Mr. Speaker.

Amne, who I have known practically all her life, is an exceptional medical student and a mother, Mr. Speaker. She is doing excellent down in the University of the West Indies.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker, I might add that I am elated to note that there are still those in our community who recognise the importance of scholarships—

Some Hon. Members: Yes!

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: —as they are of benefit to those seeking tertiary education, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I need to move on to something less . . . happy. I am moving on to condolences.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off with giving my deepest condolences to the family of the late Alice Maude Richardson nee Francis. She is the sister of Canon Francis who most of us know. She was eulogised on April 12th. I would like to associate my Deputy Leader, Derrick Burgess, my Shadow Finance Minister, Opposition Leader . . . I think all on this side, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Richardson . . . oh, and I would like to associate everyone, Mr. Speaker. Mrs. Richardson was a staunch supporter of mine. She lived right down on Parson's Road. Many credit her with being the first place for the Boulevard Community Club because before it became the Boulevard Community Club everyone used to meet in her garage. She even was a tailor—a seamstress—and she made the jerseys for those players.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to send my condolences out to her family—Mrs. Alice Maude Richardson. I would also like to associate the Shadow Health Minister, now Ms. Kim Wilson.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, I would like to be associated with the condolences sent to the family of Mr. Erin Richardson who was 28 years old. He was shot down outside of his home a few weeks ago. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, this is another young man who has lost his life to gun violence. He was eulogised on May 1, 2014. Mr. Richardson's father, Elvis Richardson, is a long-time employee of Works and Engineering, a person that I have known, again, all my life. He and I were raised in the same neighbourhood.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your time for those remarks.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Any other Honourable Member care to speak on congratulatory?

We now move to the Orders of the Day. And I am told that Orders Nos. 1 and 2 are carried over. Is that correct?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Oh, excuse me. Excuse me.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Notices of Motions?

The Speaker: Yes. Excuse me.

The Chair now recognises for Notices of Motions the Honourable Minister of National Security.

You have the floor.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

CANNABIS REFORM COLLABORATIVE REPORT

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that at the next day of meeting I will move the follow-

ing motion: That this Honourable House take note of the Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report tabled in the House today, on the 9th of May 2014.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Are there any objections to that?

There are none.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The Speaker: We now move to the Orders of the Day and Order No. 1 is carried over, is that correct? Order No. 1 is carried over. Yes.

Order No. 2 in the name of the Shadow Minister of Public Safety, carried over?

So we then move to Order No. 3, and I recognise the Honourable Minister, Minister Dunkley.

MOTION

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move the following motion, notice of which was given on the 21st of March 2014: That this Honourable House take note of the Report of the National Security and Defence Review Committee.

The Speaker: Are there any objections?

Honourable Minister, you carry on.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before this Honourable House this afternoon invites Honourable Members to take note of the Report of the National Security and Defence Review [Committee] towards a more secure Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, the strength of democracy is its flexibility and the latitude provided by the system which enables governments to adjust methods of operation to best suit the changing needs of society. Bermuda's democracy is no different. And one of the areas in which we must consistently stay cutting edge is in National Security. Mr. Speaker, our geographical position demands that we preserve our strong borders and maintain a level of self-sufficiency to meet the requirements of a safe and secure society.

The report before this Honourable House this afternoon is a comprehensive examination of Bermuda's security issues and runs the gamut of traditional forms of security provided by the uniformed services to the recent phenomenon of economic security, business continuity and food security.

Mr. Speaker, it was on 22 May 2013 that His Excellency the Governor appointed the National Security and Defence Review [Committee] in consultation

with the Honourable Premier. Their mandate was to undertake a fundamental review of Bermuda's national security needs, to assess the resources required to meet those needs, and to make recommendations on the structures and organisations required. Mr. Speaker, the Committee was chaired by former Cabinet Secretary, Mr. Leo Mills, and comprised of the late former Honourable Member Ms. Louise Jackson, Major George Jones, Ms. Cheryl-Ann Lister, Mr. Jonathan Smith, and Mr. Ralph Richardson. Honourable Members will recall that when the Committee was appointed, I undertook to table the eventual report in this Honourable House and to do so with the motion in terms of the debate, which we conduct today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to advise Honourable Members now that the review of the recommendations in the report is ongoing and is being led by service chiefs within the department and within the Ministry of National Security and through various government departments. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, our Constitution divides responsibility in the area of national security and, as such, the Governor also is considering how the report might affect areas within his remit.

Mr. Speaker, hard on the heels of the recent Budget Session I am sure Honourable Members will agree with me when I say that security services produce high quality budgets and regularly meet international best practice in their respective areas of responsibility. Lest there be any doubt created by a recommendation at page 3 of the report, Mr. Speaker, Bermuda's security services do provide an appropriate level of public safety, and over successive years international monitors have found this to be the case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this does not mean that there is not room for improvement; but it is important to clearly state that we receive value for money now and that each branch of the security service constantly meets the challenges in providing effective, cost-efficient service in trying circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, before turning to detailed contents of the report, I think it is important to address an issue that has a potential to create some confusion. Honourable Members will recall that the Governor directed the Committee to ignore the proposed elimination of conscription in their deliberations. This arises as a result of the bipartisan support for the Government's clear indication that this policy is set to become the law of the land. For completeness, Mr. Speaker, I would refer Honourable Members to Annexe A of the report found (for anybody who is following) at page 103, which sets out the terms of references. Honourable Members will note that the Committee was mandated to take due account of the Government's intention to end conscription.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak to the rationale, but it is unfortunate that the Committee cites the proposed elimination of conscription (and I quote again)

one “of the threats that has the potential to impact the security and safety of Bermuda’s residents.” Additionally, Mr. Speaker, on page 47 of the report the Committee finds “Maintaining the current Regiment model, or a variant thereof, being mindful of the Committee’s other recommendations, within which conscription remains a component as currently legislated, should nevertheless be considered as the most cost-effective and efficient way to deliver the security and safety services available to the Government and Bermuda as a whole. Again, the Committee acknowledges that the matter of retaining conscription is outside its remit.”

Well, needless to say, Mr. Speaker, on this last point the Government does not accept the Committee’s findings. The Committee’s contention is confusing because it might be taken as a suggestion that the status quo is satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is simply not the case. Men and women of the Regiment—serving and retired—accept that a change to the roles and responsibilities of the Regiment is overdue and, in fact, the report speaks to that very point. The Government’s view is that the redefined role of the Regiment can best be achieved without conscription and with a full-time force supplemented by volunteers. It is important to note at this point, Mr. Speaker, that this goal cannot be achieved at the stroke of a pen and those who promote that idea are, at best, mistaken and, at worst, disingenuous. This change will take time, perhaps money, and it takes planning. And no amount of campaigning to the contrary will make it happen any sooner.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will have had the opportunity to review the report and its recommendations. The breadth of the recommendations makes it appropriate for my ministerial colleagues to address those areas under their remit and so I will expand my general comments and deal with the area specific to the Ministry of National Security.

Mr. Speaker, in considering the report’s recommendation, I invite Honourable Members to bear in mind that much of what is considered is not properly costed and there is little indication that the current fiscal constraints of the public purse and cost-effectiveness, generally, has been factored into these recommendations. In any event, this does not diminish their value, but I must caution Honourable Members and the public as well to be mindful that in some cases cost will dictate the pace of implementation.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of this debate, I will invite particular attention to the following: the revised EMO Mandate and Standing Instructions; the registration and licence of large public events; ensuring the Island’s ongoing ability to respond to outbreaks of public disorder; expansion of the Regiment’s existing Boat Troop capability in an enforcement role to protect the EEZ and to improve internal security; and the establishment of a single emergency call and dispatch centre. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I will go into

specific departments in the Ministry of National Security, such as Corrections, Customs, and Police and the Regiment.

First, Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Measures Organisation [EMO]. The EMO is most closely associated with the facets of hurricane preparation and the management of that in the aftermath. Its mission is wider than hurricanes and extends, certainly, to other critical incidents that can impact Bermuda. The most significant weather-related EMO embodiment in recent years was Hurricane Fabian. And it seems like it was just recent memory, but it was 11 years ago in 2003. While on the 11th of September 2001 terrorist attacks required the EMO to manage the potential fallout from the tragic events of that day.

Mr. Speaker, the EMO has and continues to function effectively. But as the report points out at page 71, there is hope for the EMO (and I quote) “to broaden its remit to include the formulation of plans to mitigate the effects of a far broader set of circumstances.”

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to indicate that the Government supports the report’s recommendation that the Emergency Powers Act 1963 be updated and that the EMO’s Standing Instructions be revised. For those following the report, they can see the full set of recommendations in this area on pages 72 to 74. Mr. Speaker, please allow me a few moments to address some of these—each of these—recommendations in turn.

First, the establishment of a National Disaster Planning Office (NDP). Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that a government of some 77 departments needs another one. The function of disaster planning is critical. And I have asked the service chiefs to examine the best way of using existing resources to effectively deliver on this function. I am satisfied that we have the expertise within security services to perform this role and that minimal resources or expenditure would be required to formalise the delivery of this function as envisioned by the report.

Mr. Speaker, the update of the Emergency Powers Act 1963. As I indicated a few moments ago, this recommendation is fully supported by the Government. A legislative footing for the EMO reflective of constitutional advancement since 1963 is required.

In regard to the update of the EMO Mandate and Standing Instructions, Mr. Speaker, the security services individually and jointly exercise their management of disaster scenarios. The strengthening of the framework around disaster preparedness is a useful recommendation and any organisation’s standing instructions should regularly be reviewed for their relevance and, of course, accuracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to inform you and honourable colleagues this afternoon that the EMO is scheduled to meet on the 21st of May. As part of that agenda we will consider the issue of revising the Standing Instructions. The same applies

to the remaining recommendations which flow from a full review of the Standing Instructions.

The final recommendation in this section, Mr. Speaker, relates to the need to improve communications with other emergency departments. I wish to ensure Honourable Members and the public that there exists a high level of effective inter-agency communication presently and this extends to the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, moving to the registration and licensing of large public events, you will find on page 68 of the report [that] the Committee speaks to the oversight of large public events in Bermuda. Their recommendation is in these terms, Mr. Speaker (and I quote). "Large public events like outdoor concerts do not require a license currently. However, these large gatherings present a significant risk to public safety and to those marshalling crowds. The requirement to register large gatherings and to have effective risk mitigation measures in place prior to the commencement of events is vital."

Mr. Speaker, while the Government does not seek to add any regulatory obstacles in the way of those promoters and entrepreneurs who put on these large public events, they must be organised with more than a passing reference to the issue of public safety. The Ministry's consistent practice is to require organisers to work closely with the Police to ensure all security aspects of their events are planned. I can further advise Honourable Members that Cabinet will shortly be invited to consider options for the management of large scale public events in Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, I think colleagues can recall that recently we celebrated Easter and Good Friday, and on Good Friday there was an event held down at Horseshoe Bay—a traditional event—put on by Chewstick and their associates. They worked very closely with the Police this year and you can see with the large crowds that were there and the beautiful weather, it went off without a hitch. But in spite of that, we do need to make sure that when we hold those large events public safety is covered as much as possible without adding too much bureaucracy. So Cabinet will consider some changes as we move forward.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring the Island's ongoing ability to respond to outbreaks of public disorder. The spectre of public disorder is not confined to countries that we might hear about on the news. As London in 2011 found out, disturbances demonstrated that single flash points can ignite social unrest and the responsibility of security services is to be prepared and, of course, well practiced in appropriate responses to outbreaks of public disorder. Bermuda can be confident that through joint exercise and shared public disorder management techniques both the Bermuda Regiment and the Bermuda Police Service are well trained in this area and will continue to maintain a full fitness for role capability in the area.

In regard to establishing a single emergency call and dispatch centre, Mr. Speaker, at page 68 of

the report it points out that the Island's emergency services operates separate emergency call receptions and first response dispatch operators. The Government agrees that "the establishment of a single emergency call centre and uniformed dispatch centre would both streamline the processing of tasking emergency first responders and improve the situational awareness of separate services for incidents."

Mr. Speaker, the planning for such a one-stop shop is well advanced and the Commissioner of Police and the Chief Fire Officer are working closely together to implement a single emergency call centre.

Mr. Speaker, while not specifically addressed in the report, I do wish to take this opportunity to mention some current policy considerations relating to the provision of ambulance service for Bermuda. Honourable Members will recall on our last day of meeting before the last session closed, a Ministerial ¹Statement was provided by my honourable colleague, the Minister of Health and Environment, in relation to the Lamb Foggo Urgent Care Centre in St. David's. In the course of that statement, the Honourable Member informed colleagues and the public of the early considerations of co-locating ambulances and possibly personnel at the East and West End fire service facilities in an effort to reduce response times to accidents and medical emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, these discussions are ongoing and it is my aim to make a more detailed announcement regarding this plan sometime in the fall. As my colleague had indicated at the time, we are seeking to enhance the delivery of emergency service to both the residents of the East and the West End.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Bermuda Regiment 2014 and beyond, in 2015 the Regiment will celebrate its 50th anniversary. Since 1965 the organisation has gone from strength to strength becoming an iconic institution in our community.

Mr. Speaker, too often we view the need for change with alarm or use it as a weapon to denigrate the thing that needs changing. This is a mistake, generally, and is particularly so in the case of the Bermuda Regiment. Irrespective of one's views on the issue of conscription, I have found near unanimous support for some meaningful change in the roles and responsibilities of the Bermuda Regiment. As the Regiment reaches its half century mark, I can say with confidence that the time for change has come and the Government will usher in a new era of renewed focus and vision for the Bermuda Regiment.

Between pages 32 and 34 of the report, Mr. Speaker, the Committee canvasses various issues relating to the Bermuda Regiment. And I would invite Honourable Members to turn their attention now to page 47 of the Committee's recommendation. In this

¹ *Official Hansard Report*, 21 May 2014, pages [1716-1717](#)

area they focus in on implementing a phased approach to the abolition of conscription.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier in this debate, and as I have said publicly repeatedly, the elimination of conscription will not be done in a haphazard fashion, but will be an orderly transition designed to preserve the strength of the Bermuda Regiment without prejudice to the role and the responsibility it is required to discharge.

In regard to changing the mission and the strategic role of the Regiment as covered on page 32 of the report, “the Regiment’s main responsibilities are to support and provide assistance to the Civil Authority (which includes the security of Bermuda, its people, property, livelihood and interests) in order to maintain normality” through specific tasks including the “Protection for Key Points” and disaster relief.

Mr. Speaker, the value of the Regiment’s performance in this role is seen in the various embodiments of the Regiment in support of the Police. In every situation—from riots to summits for world leaders and joint maritime operations—the Regiment has more than demonstrated that it is certainly equal to the task. The report is correct that the discussion around the Regiment’s increased maritime role is decades old. This Government does not believe that this should be the sole function of the Regiment, but it is certainly one of the key roles that must now be elevated to a main operational tasking. In this regard, the Government’s starting point is a proposal that I took to Cabinet in February 2013. It is outlined at page 43.

The Government is considering transferring inshore maritime patrolling responsibilities to the Regiment’s Boat Troop. A full-time staff of 24 supported by 10 part-time, trained and fully resourced, would cost about \$3.4 million annually, Mr. Speaker. To affect this plan will require some critical legislation and operational changes. And to that end the Commanding Officer and the Ministry are working through the issues and every effort is being made to implement these recommendations as we work through any obstacles.

Mr. Speaker, this challenge will create career opportunities for Bermudians who know the sea professionally or recreationally. The training opportunities will produce well qualified men and women positioned to assume roles in our security services or in other seafaring careers. Additionally, this enhance maritime unit will benefit the interdiction and enforcement activities of other agencies such as Customs, Immigration and Fisheries. And there may come a time when the role is expanded to include offshore capability. But, Mr. Speaker, I say we must walk before we can run in this regard.

Turning to the recommendation to re-role from Light Infantry to Light Engineers, Mr. Speaker, the Government has taken note of the recommendation as regards the Regiment. The spirit of it is to be commended. But such a radical shift in the way the Regi-

ment does business, contrary to its origin, is not something that we fully support.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will note this recommendation on page 47. Where I think a meeting of the minds can occur is to invite the Commanding Officer to reassess the role of support companies which they might play in further increasing disaster preparedness and disaster safety role, which will remain central to the Regiment’s responsibilities. The company is the main support source of all aspects of nuts and bolts disaster relief including chainsaw operations, bridge capability, et cetera.

As part of the useful feedback provided to me by the Defence Board, I am pleased to be able to advise this Honourable House that the chairman has indicated as follows (and I quote from the letter sent to me): “Given the recommendations it is recognised that more emphasis must be given to support company and expanding its role both in terms of manning and equipment. On a proactive basis, the Commanding Officer has already reached out to the Department of Parks to see how the Regiment may work more effectively with them in times of national disaster events.”

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the aim of the Committee’s recommendation in this regard can be achieved without so drastically altering the Regiment’s core value as a Light Infantry Unit.

On page 48, Mr. Speaker, the Committee recommends the development of an effective recruitment strategy. Honourable Members and the public will recall the various campaigns in print, online, and on public service vehicles aimed at increasing volunteer numbers into the Bermuda Regiment. I have discussed these initiatives with the Commanding Officer and we concur that it is indeed important to continue and to enhance the recruitment efforts of the Regiment. There is some evidence that continued enhancement of these efforts can bear improved results.

Honourable Members may recall that this year’s recruit camp in January had the highest number of volunteers in many years, largely based on the attractive incentives offered. Recruiting is and will continue to be a priority as we continue the evolution of the role and the responsibilities of the Regiment.

Mr. Speaker, the Bermuda Regiment adds more value to this society than its very visible ceremonial role. This Government is determined that the dawn of the Regiment’s second half century will be even brighter than its first.

Other Honourable Members will speak to those areas of the report within their remit under the Ministry of National Security framework, Mr. Speaker, but as I move from the Regiment, I would like to address four other areas. And I will start with the Department of Corrections first. These recommendations (for those following) can be found on pages 68 to 70 and have been the subject of recent reviews and form part of the wider plan of implementation which is being led by the Commissioner of Corrections.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for me to focus on two assertions of the report found on page 69. Firstly, there is no “ad hoc approach to security procedures within the Department of Corrections.” Mr. Speaker, security is Corrections’ business, obviously; and the Commissioner has a dedicated Chief of Security and a Head of Intelligence who oversee all aspects of security for the various corrections facilities on our Island. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, as you will know, the Commissioner enforces a zero tolerance approach to any breach of security occasioned through the actions of inmates or officers. Honourable Members will recall stricter regulations passed in this Honourable House to address the issue of contraband in prisons and will have noted the prosecutions that have been the result of this legislation.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in what I believe must have been an oversight, the Committee suggests that there is no contingency plan for the relocation of inmates in the event of an impending disaster. Mr. Speaker, this is not correct. Since April 2009, the Department of Corrections has had in place an evacuation plan which in it considers in some detail the relevant issues around any necessary evacuation of inmates. I can further advise Honourable Members that work will start this year on the upgrade of camera surveillance of prison perimeters and this will continue to reduce contraband entering correctional facilities by these moves.

Mr. Speaker, I turn my attention now to the Bermuda Police Service. Pages 64 to 68 of the report deal with recommendations with regard to the Bermuda Police Service. Reference is made in this report of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of the Constabulary (HMIC) and other strategic reports on the Bermuda Police Service.

Mr. Speaker, the implementation of these reports is largely operational and, as such, it is not properly a matter for this legislature, as you are well aware Mr. Speaker. I will, however, say that the Commissioner is constantly reviewing the administration and operations of the Bermuda Police Service for efficiency. I meet with him regularly and his senior command and their focus is clearly on guns, gangs, drugs and violence. And that focus is fully supported by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of intelligence management is a sensitive one and, by definition, there are limits on what can be said in any debate in this Honourable Chamber. However, in regard to comments in the report, I wish to assure Honourable Members that information sharing, intelligence gathering, the use of both, and operational policing has been successfully deployed in many instances. This Government is not persuaded that the formation of a National Intelligence Agency is the best means by which to break down any remaining silo mentality in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that these are people issues and, as such, I am satisfied that the strong management and clear MOUs and directives will properly fill any gaps in the approach to intelligence gathering, dissemination, and its use.

Mr. Speaker, although not specifically in the section related to the Police, I do wish to comment on a recommendation that can be found at page 3 of the report. And I am sure you are very familiar with this report. The Committee recommends that we continue to implement the recommendations from the Joint Parliamentary Select Committee on the Causes of Violent Crime and Gun Violence in Bermuda. Of course, you chaired that Committee, Mr. Speaker. You will recall that that report, which was produced under your leadership as Chairman, was tabled in ²July 2011.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendations of that report have formed the basis of many of the bipartisan policies that have sought to address the issues of gun violence and gangs in Bermuda. Honourable Members can rest assured that I am very much guided by the recommendations of that report and, further, I can confirm to this Honourable House that many of those recommendations have been implemented. Programmes such as gang mediation, the great programme which is running in our primary schools and goes into the middle schools in the next school year, and an increase of 20 officers by the Bermuda Police Service all stem from the 2011 report recommendations. And those are just a few that I named, Mr. Speaker. I, in fact, was actually surprised at how much has been done when I looked through the report over the last couple of weeks and there are still some programmes that are going to be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I turn my attention now to the Bermuda Fire Service. The Bermuda Fire and Rescue Service is canvassed on pages 74 to 76 (for Members who are following). In that part of the report, reference is made to the review carried out by Sir Ken Knight in 2010. I am pleased to advise this Honourable House that the recommendations of that report are being acted upon. Cabinet will shortly consider a memo which proposes the implementation of the organisational structure recommended by Sir Ken and, moreover, the implementation of this structure will yield much needed flexibility to recruit fire fighters to address the personnel shortages also mentioned in this report. I think honourable colleagues in this House will be gratified to hear that, Mr. Speaker.

In regards to HM Customs, Honourable Members will be aware that HM Customs has been moved within the Ministry of National Security as of April 1, 2014. With the assistance of the Collector of Customs, Mrs. Lucinda Pearman, I have quickly familiarised myself with the breadth of this department’s opera-

² Official Hansard Report, 22 July 2011, page [2391](#)

tions. Honourable Members will find the relevant section on pages 48 to 54.

Mr. Speaker, the findings of this Security and Defence Review Committee must be read with the report of the [SAGE Commission](#) which also recommended that Border Control be part of the Ministry of National Security. I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that this has essentially been achieved as Customs perform the primary immigration function at the Island's borders and are principally responsible for the interdiction effort there also.

Mr. Speaker, the confines of the debate do not allow me to address each of these issues identified in the report and I would run into the risk of descending into detailed operational issues. However, let me broadly say that much of what has been identified does not reflect my experience thus far. Many of the issues identified in the report reflect an expression of diverse opinions on operational priorities. Managers must be left to manage. And in the public service that is done in accordance with the policy direction of the Government. I have undertaken to listen to any concerns about how HM Customs goes about discharging its mandate and in consultation with the Collector will encourage best practice to international standards.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Committee's recommendation at page 54, it is premature for me to express a definite view on them at this stage. I have taken them under advisement pending their full consideration by service chiefs responsible for these areas.

Mr. Speaker, in drawing my comments to a close, the conduct of this review was timely and the Committee performed a very thorough job in pursuit of their terms of reference. Already this report will not join the ranks of those studies that remain unread and unfulfilled. The Government may not agree with every recommendation, but each and every aspect of the report has been considered, discussed with the service chiefs, and assessed for viability and practicality in the local context. Joint exercises involving all branches of security services will involve real time scenarios preparing for those situations that might befall Bermuda. Operationally, Mr. Speaker, we will ensure that the men and women who wear the various uniforms are properly trained and equipped to perform the roles demanded of them.

Mr. Speaker, as I commend this Motion and the content of the report to this Honourable House for debate, I quote from page 20 of the report: "The evolution of the many and varying strategies whereby national security throughout the post-9/11 period might be enhanced highlights the complexity and challenges that all countries face in this new and complex security environment. The events of 9/11 are stark reminders that security is the number one social service that governments must provide to their people."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Minister.

Is there any other Honourable Member who would care to speak?

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Shadow Minister for Public Safety, MP Roban.

MP Roban, you have the floor.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to contribute to this debate bearing in mind that is my first opportunity to give a substantive contribution since the changes in my own side's portfolios. I am not totally unfamiliar with a lot of these areas having been a part of the Government at one point and had some level of responsibility in a substantive way for a short period for many of the departments that the current Minister has. So I have some familiarity, like yourself, with some of what is been here.

I think the Minister has done a good . . . perhaps I can call it an abridged presentation. This is not a criticism in any way; clearly, the Minister focused on the areas of primary focus of his own Ministry and the areas and certainly gave good, I think, informative comment on how the Government sees its own objectives around this particular report.

I may cover a few more areas than the Minister does only because, you know, this report . . . even though the Minister's taking the tack that he had, which I think was healthy, it covers a lot of other areas.

I certainly wish to commend the Committee for the work that they have done. It was obviously important that these sorts of reviews do happen for the importance of the country's interests and for the interest of all of us because public safety certainly is of paramount importance to all those persons who live in Bermuda and it has changed, as the Minister has indicated, over the years as to what is required.

Circumstances have changed from where they were five years ago—the needs that we have for national security and public safety. Although there are some fundamentals, there are some different things that pop up that have to be addressed. And often the models that we relied on from the past, you know, we have a police service that has been in place in Bermuda for, I think, 150 or something years (or something like that)—100-odd years—so it has had the span from a sleepy little agricultural jurisdiction to where we are now. It has had to change.

The same thing with the fire, the same thing with the military—it has changed. It has been changed with time; it has had to move with the needs of the country. So this review having been commissioned was a good step to take.

We on this side do not have any major objection to this review in itself and its substance. In fact, we may share some of the observations that the Minister has already presented in that we noticed that in

the nearly 90 recommendations that there are a number of very interesting observations. Some (perhaps the Minister might not agree with me) seem to be almost anecdotal, they were not certainly backed up by any substantive, sort of, information. They seemed to be like they were just making a comment. But there are others which are interesting. And from our view perhaps may . . . and I am relying on what the Government has said has been its objective since becoming the Government, which is to shrink the size of government and not add departments.

There are some objectives here which would mean . . . some may mean some consolidation. But there are some that are asking (and the Minister may agree with me) to actually create new bureaucracies, which even for us, frankly, may not be necessary due to what is understood about how many of these particular agencies operate.

I did find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, for instance, that in the report time was taken to summarise and make a list of the so-called 80, near 90, recommendations that are listed that have cross departmental and agency concerns, such as the issue of conscription, which (I might say) is an objective that we share with the Government. We have made it very clear that we are interested in the elimination of conscription. I can say that it does appear as if the Government has decided to take a particular approach to it and we look forward to hearing how the Government is going to enter its phased approach to the elimination of conscription.

I can certainly say that the previous administration also had taken steps to move away from conscription, and I can perhaps say that the idea of a phased approach is a sensible one, Mr. Speaker. And there is no way that you can just shut down recruitment of the Regiment tomorrow, bearing in the mind the Regiment's responsibilities and the needs and its priorities. All of those components would have to be revised before you get to the point of actually shutting down.

So if I can use an analogy, it is like before you can close your shop, you have got to get rid of the inventory, you have got to sort out the staff and your compensation. You cannot just necessarily just lock the door and have the closed sign. You have got to do all these other things before you shut the door. And I think that is the logical thing that the Minister and others who support conscription being handled in a sensible way know that there are a lot of steps that have to be taken before you can actually make that substantive change.

But I would also like to bring attention to, Mr. Speaker, the fact that under the Defence Act 1965, if one reads section 4, which I believe accounts for this issue in that the direction that the clause seems to make is that volunteer efforts to get persons should be first and then the conscripting of people, perhaps, should be the last resort. There is a view (and I am

not saying that I share the view) out there amongst many that for many years—it has been flipped—that actually there has been more effort at conscripting than actually pushing for the volunteer side of it. And maybe that can be a part of what the phased programme . . . maybe the Regiment has already taken on that approach in emphasising the volunteer component, as the Minister (I believe) has actually stated in his Statement. And that will be, perhaps, the way to go knowing where the road is taking them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it does appear from what the Minister said and from what can be viewed anecdotally in the community with what has been in the media about the Regiment, they seem to have been emphasising that aspect even more now. And we think that is good.

I, myself, look forward to seeing a more professional service, somewhat like the Police, where many of our personnel are highly trained officers and other personnel where persons can join the Regiment and gain substantive skills in a variety of areas, like mechanical and administration—all types of areas that are essential to running a good military—that I am sure many of them do now and some of the permanent staff do now, but maybe that is where some of the value can be built into the Regiment and the Regiment can be seen as a place where . . . no matter where . . . in no matter what way you go into it, Mr. Speaker, you can come out with skills, whether it be as a heavy equipment operator who can drive certain types of vehicles, to a fully qualified mechanic who can do everything from heavy trucks to other types of vehicles. So that if you go in the Regiment you spend your time there either as a professional or as a semi-professional person, perhaps as a fully engaged volunteer. You can get skills and come out into the workforce of Bermuda. And when you go and make an application to a particular private entity and they see that you were trained up at the Regiment, then there is no question of your competency. I mean, that is the role that the Regiment can play.

Also perhaps the Regiment can be a . . . even in its current form, Mr. Speaker, it can be a pool of opportunity for the other emergency services like Fire, like Police, like even EMTs at the hospital in the BHB. That these are some areas . . . and bear in mind, this may already be going on in some form or the other. I know that when I had some responsibilities in these areas I used to speak to the heads of command about some of these issues that maybe this is where we can, you know, perhaps improve the image of the Regiment.

There was a time when it almost seemed like every young man in the country was trying to run away from the Regiment. You heard about the MPs trying to catch somebody almost on a weekly basis. Maybe if there was more understanding that if you actually go in the Regiment you can get and come out with some skills—whether you are a man or woman—

then that would have been more of an incentive for some of our people to not be so disdainful of the process that exists right now.

So, moving on from that, we support the move away from conscription and we look forward to seeing the Government's plan around that.

Another interesting recommendation (and I am on page[2]) I am just going to try to move through the summary a bit, but I am not going to stick too hard to every particular recommendation, Mr. Speaker. This issue of establishing a National Intelligence Agency—a very interesting recommendation when you look at it where the Committee suggests, “Existing resources and public service personnel can be used to create a multi-agency staffed National Intelligence Agency with the focus of developing an integrated intelligence database.”

The Speaker: Where is that? Where are you reading from?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Page [2], recommendation two, under Recurring Cross Agency Concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that is an interesting recommendation. And in light of the climate internationally, we have heard about intelligence agencies and big government having inordinate power to peer into the phones, like computers and windows of citizens. I suspect that that recommendation would raise the ire of some people because it does suggest creating this huge intelligence service.

Now, if I can put my mind back, there was a time when the name of “Special Branch” kind of meant to many people in this country back in the time when things were a little different and this sort of, you know, secret organisation that handled intelligence. We now have tools like CALEA [Communications Assistant for Law Enforcement Act] and all that sort of thing to do and carry out these activities. It would seem that this recommendation kind of hints to that. And I would perhaps err on the advice that the Minister has taken around this in that our current framework, subject to some modifications that can adapt it to the modern world and using the best technology available that we can afford, that perhaps how we do things now is appropriate.

I do recall that there was even a national security council at one point. I do not know if it still exists and I believe Attorney General was the chair of that group that did exist at one point. I do not know if it exists still, but that in itself . . . I have had an unofficial nod by the Minister that it does not, so that answers that. But I think I would tend to agree with the Minister on this one that let us refine what we have without creating any new national, supra-national bodies that are going to take money from other places and create some intelligence or whatever that people will be wondering what is going on and that type of thing. I do not think that is healthy necessarily now for us to even

look at. So I share the Minister's concern about that. That is not really a road to go down.

The revised EMO Standing Instructions. I found this quite a curious recommendation, Mr. Speaker. I thought, actually, that the EMO body does do a periodic review of its procedures and policies anyway. So I was curious . . . I was kind of . . . it was kind of interesting to see that and perhaps the Minister can confirm because I know that the EMO goes through a . . . Okay, after every major event it goes through a process of looking at things and changing and modifying certain processes. So it would seem as if these Standing Instructions . . . now perhaps it needs to be more in depth or something. But my understanding (having had some experience with the EMO) is that it goes through this process on a regular basis, which is why I think it is a commendable organisation.

When it was set up back, I think, after Hurricane Emily (or around that time, if I am correct), it was a good way to go and it has served the country well. And I think that what we saw come out of [Hurricane] Fabian . . . and you (I believe) were the Minister at the time, Mr. Speaker. You know that EMO process served us well and we were able to get back on our feet and get back going as a country in ways that were very, very commendable. So if the Minister feels this process has to go—great. And maybe there is some more in-depth change, but my understanding is that the EMO goes through this sort of review and it can self-examine automatically anyway. So if it goes on—fine.

Going on to the next one—the Emergency Powers Act 1963—any law that has been in place since 1963 that has not been looked at definitely needs to be looked at. All I will say is that I look forward to the Minister bringing whatever recommendations to this House that he is going to on that because, clearly, it is an Act, if it has not been touched since 1963, that needs to be looked at carefully and made modern.

As for international standards for vetting and hiring of all uniformed services, again, I find that sort of puzzling with the list of services that are here. Okay, our Police Service and others, as the Minister has said . . . some of these have already, just recently, been through substantive reviews. We know that the Police went through an HMS review back in 2003, and I do believe one was done even more recently than that. Customs has gone through a review. I believe that, as has been mentioned, the Fire Service has been through a review. And I remember that one directly because I was acting Minister when the gentleman who came to do the review of the Fire Service came in. I was actually acting at the time for Colonel Burch who was out very ill. I remember, and I received that gentleman here. So I know that that review has been done.

I think it is great that the Minister has said that they are moving forward with those recommendations. So I am under the feeling that we already meet international standards and that these reviews that we have taken on ourselves to have on a regular basis ensure that we stay there. So, you know, I just found that very interesting that that was mentioned knowing . . . and I do not know why the Committee went to this as if our uniformed services do not go through that process. They do; and they have for many years. So whatever has to continue shall continue, in my view, and we should keep to maintaining the international standards that we have become accustomed to following.

Performance indicators—certainly, if we go through reviews, certainly performance indicators must be in place. So I am prepared to believe that those are already there.

Inter-departmental and inter-agency procedures and protocols—again, like Fire, Police and other agencies and, certainly, Customs, these all work together in so many ways. If there needs to be enhancements in that then the inter-departmental agencies and, perhaps, other agencies need to be included in that. Maybe that is what needs to be done, Mr. Speaker.

Disaster preparedness public education. Well, I mean, as far as I know (and the Minister can confirm), that goes on. I mean, there are annual announcements about preparing for hurricanes. Hurricanes, perhaps, and storms are the most significant disasters that we deal with on a regular basis, Mr. Speaker. As far as I know, that has gone on and goes on now to this day and the relevant agencies are . . . in fact, the EMO (I think) prepares a document that is circulated widely for the general public. I have one in my house (I know I have seen it) that I copied some time ago and I refer to it even annually as to things you should do to prepare for the hurricane season once it comes and the essential things you should have in your household.

If there are additional things that should be, perhaps, added to that then, fine. But it certainly goes on, and I am sure the Minister would agree that this does go on. So, again, I am puzzled that the Committee mentioned that as if it does not go on. It seems as if . . . but anyway, I am sure they had their mind as to what they were trying to put over there.

The Minister mentioned about the implementation of the recommendations on the Parliamentary Committee, which I certainly agree with if those things can be properly implemented in whatever way. I am sure the Government will make a commitment to do so.

We have already talked about conscription. Again, costs are always presented, and, like the Minister said, which I did find a little puzzling, and frankly is the one criticism I have of this particular report, is that many of the substantive recommendations that

the Committee made were not costed out. And perhaps they could not have costed everything, but perhaps some of the more significant things they could have actually worked on a hypothetical budget. And I have seen in other reports that were done by bodies that had a government imperative, or at the highest level . . . and let us face it, this particularly had the perhaps one of the highest prerogatives available to it, subject to a royal commission. Perhaps they should have taken some time to do some costing on some of things that they mentioned just to give a perspective on what would be needed.

As it relates to Customs, the Minister did talk about expanding Customs and that the border protection role of Customs has already been expanded. And I do know that the Minister did state that has already been pretty much implemented—the restructuring of that. There may be little here and there things, but essentially that has been done, Mr. Speaker, and whatever refinements need to be done on that that can certainly continue.

Exclusive Economic Zone, as it is referred to in summary on page 5, is one of the . . . around number 20 in the recommendations listed. Certainly that is something new for us a country to consider. How are we going to provide security for our Economic Zone as we begin to discuss how we are going to exploit (and I say “exploit” not in a negative way) the resources and opportunities that the zone has? Because if there are things of value there, we should be protecting them whether [it be] our marine stocks, which are actually of real value to us, whether it be the bluefin tuna, or other marine assets that exist there. And we have certainly international quotas that we could take advantage of if we are going to seriously pursue those opportunities.

Whether it be the issue of mining or whatever it is going to be in the future, Mr. Speaker, we should have the capacity to protect that 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone. And this is one of the areas that certainly out of the fact that it is going to require some planning and some preparation, is going to be expensive because you are expanding what we do from 22 square miles to 200. And it is going to have to be the level of security that at least gives us some comfort that we know what is going on within this very vast area.

It clearly . . . I do not know what the Government intends to do in this area, where the Minister did not get very detailed about, but certainly if our future development, as this side has talked about—our “Blue Economy”—is linked with this area, what we do there matters and what we intend to do will matter. Now it may be that one way to do this, Mr. Speaker, is that as we expand the revenue opportunities of the Economic Zone that offset the expense. So we should not have the value chasing the expense of it. We should not roll-out a huge security network before we are getting the revenue in.

Once we begin to see revenues come in, then we can begin to steadily expand our security framework around it so that we do not bleed ourselves dry trying to watch what is going on in the EEZ and we are making minimal revenue from it as an opportunity. So perhaps that is one way, in the long term, that we can look at it. As we begin to expand the opportunities in the EEZ, we then can roll-out a broader security net in an affordable and sensible way. But I do believe that it is essential that we begin to look at this.

Obviously things like seabed mining are decades, really, away if we are ever going to pursue that in real revenue generation. But things like the longline fishing or other types of marine pursuits are immediate. So we do need to look at this now and see what opportunities and, certainly, the need to provide a security net around those resources are essential.

Obviously, immigration is important. Other than with the on-Island immigration issues the border control perhaps is going to be held under the responsibility of Customs or, perhaps, it will be jointly held. So whatever happens there, that may be more about better technology than anything else, Mr. Speaker, rather than throwing bodies at it. And having the most advanced technology as we see our American friends have—they have retinal scans and all types of other things—that perhaps is what we should be looking at as well. Or moving our passports and other entry documents to being digital and card-reading and other things that, perhaps, lowers the expense but raises the data and information that we can get from border control to manage and know what is happening in and out from an immigration standpoint.

I know that at one point there was a programme to provide all of our work permit holders with . . . rather than carrying the piece of paper they would have a digital card that would have all of their work permit information on it. I do not know whether that programme has moved forward or not, Mr. Speaker, but maybe that is a way to update and modernise our immigration framework as well.

I will move on to Police, Mr. Speaker. Again, it looks like some of the recommendations here are certainly sensible. There is the issue of relocating the Marine Unit to the . . . I know that has always been an issue for the Regiment. And, certainly, jointly running that unit with the Police would make some sense at least until the Regiment has the level of experience and that can ensure that they can operate an effective Marine Unit. And that can be a part of what is used to supervise our EEZ to have an effective Marine Unit that is shared by the Police and also by the Regiment. So those are ways that, perhaps, we can use our current situation to expand and deal with some of the priorities that have been set in this report.

Identifying the Island's Key Points to be protected during an internal security situation. I would be miffed if that is not already in place. I mean, there are some things here that I just was puzzled why they

came up because to think that our Police all this time and our security services do not already have that . . . I just think . . . and I do not understand why the Committee would have brought up some things which . . . I mean, hey, we know . . . and even if you go on to the EMO and the EMO itself, a part of what is the EMO is making sure during those disaster times that certain Key Points are properly protected and available for public safety. So I just find it strange. Some of these recommendations seem to be redundant. But perhaps they felt a need to make sure that this report had a lot of meat in it to make it look like they really did a whole lot of work.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: I am not trying to be mean or cruel here, Mr. Speaker, I am just saying that . . . and I think the Minister himself said that there are some things in here that seem like they were not true. They seem to have not taken time to make sure that certain things are in place and they just added to the number of recommendations when they did not need to be in there.

Anyway, they did say quite a bit about the EMO. I myself saw that they seem to recommend that the EMO framework should be expanded to create a National Disaster Planning office. Again, this is another one of those pieces like the National Intelligence Agency is another bureaucracy. I am not sure that is needed unless there is a definitive (and this particular report did not prove it) that the EMO system has not served us. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that has been proven by this report at all.

Now, do we need to have a full-time National Disaster Coordinator, which would add another salary to the Government coffers? It would create another department. And I am just riding on what the Government has been very clear about for the past 16 months. They are trying to shrink departments; they are not trying to create any new ones. So we are seeing that this would be going in the wrong direction. And I am not so sure myself, in my understanding of things, where having a National Disaster Planning office . . . not to say that national disaster planning is not important, Mr. Speaker, it is. But certainly it may be just a slight modification of the current EMO persons. They can take on that job right now and do it rather than us having a full-time, nine-to-five person who is just sitting around waiting for the next hurricane or the next, I don't know, tsunami, or whatever you want them to sit down and plan for. You know, the things that people might come up and . . . my concern is that you would have somebody there who is just trying to dream up things that we need to plan for rather than just dealing with the fundamentals, which—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: What? To plan for a tsunami that might or might not happen in the next 200 years? I do not know.

But certainly we know that our planning around hurricanes and that is certainly going on as we speak. The EMO and the personnel who work in the BPS who work with the EMO . . . that is their job and they do it. And there are numerous Government departments and personnel and brainpower and manpower involved with that right now. But is there a need to create a dedicated office where somebody is sitting doing this on a regular basis? I am not so sure. I stand [to be] corrected. Maybe somebody out there will refute what I am saying, but I am not so sure.

Moving on to Fire, I was very pleased to note that the recommendations by Sir Ken Knight are being implemented. As I said, I have a sort of first-person experience with this having received Sir Ken Knight when he came in 2010. And so if those recommendations are moving forth . . . and as was understood by myself, he is a highly regarded person when it comes to his work internationally. And we had the benefit of that and we should move as quickly as reasonably possible to implement those recommendations that he himself has provided us.

Moving on to touch on the hospital and the acute care and public health, Mr. Speaker, certainly the hospital is essential to all that we do. There are some interesting recommendations here that I think bear some mention. The Minister did not mention them, but I will endeavour to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Locations for portable mass casualty treatment facilities—there are some recommendations. And if you will allow me to read what is on page 11, Mr. Speaker, “In the event of a mass casualty incident at a remote site, KEMH is likely to establish a hub at the scene to deal with the less serious injuries, with only the most serious incidents transferred to the hospital for treatment.” Now, that certainly makes a case for a West End facility to be established at some point if this recommendation . . . but as we know, anything that is mentioned here about establishing something is going to mean a cost.

I am fully aware . . . and I see the Minister there twisting his head, but I am fully aware of [what] the cost to, perhaps, set up something might be because of my experience in the Ministry of Health. And that would be perhaps in more instances an issue that the Minister of Health would have to deal with, Mr. Speaker.

But that certainly makes the case for what is in the West—I am sorry, the East End—which is the Lamb Foggo Clinic being available and being useful. Even to this day, as we understand it the airport has the Lamb Foggo as a part of their own disaster preparedness strategy. So the Lamb Foggo Clinic is there. It fits. It is already there. It is already invested in. The Government would not have to spend any

more significant money to, perhaps, fit it to fulfil this role, Mr. Speaker.

The only question is what you put in the West End. And certainly the West End deserves some sort of facility, either designated or permanently established, that can fulfil what Lamb Foggo's capabilities are. And I believe Lamb Foggo can fulfil this particular recommendation here now as a location, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, the Oughton Report spoke to this and all reports that have spoken to this, Mr. Speaker. So I do hope the Government takes this particular recommendation . . . the Minister did not talk about it in his particular—

The Speaker: Where is it so I can find it in the report?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: This is on page 11, Mr. Speaker, under Acute Care and Public Health, King Edward VII Memorial Hospital (KEMH). It is the second recommendation down from that title.

I do believe that it is important that that particular recommendation be thought about carefully by the Government. If it does not seek to set up a permanent facility in the West End, that might fulfil this. It can designate a place that can be appropriately refitted to fulfil a mass casualty emergency unit in the time of disaster. And the Lamb Foggo Clinic is certainly already there, already invested in, already paid for, already has the capability and can fulfil . . . and it was designed for that. So the investment has been made and it will not require the Government to put too much more money in to do whatever.

I will stop there and hope that those comments are taken in the manner upon which they have been given.

The Department of Health . . . certainly [in] any issue of security and disaster, public health is essential because as we know when disasters happen there are risks to public health that arise. So the Department of Health in whatever ways that it can be equipped to make sure that it can deal with . . . whether it be something that might be the result of a natural disaster like a hurricane or a storm, or as we are dealing with the issue that the Honourable Minister Moniz was dealing with, because matters like that can often turn into mass public health concerns. That could turn into a disaster if it were not properly checked for some serious public health attention.

There was also the issue of pandemics and being prepared for things like, you know, we have had this huge wave of pandemics that have often (like bird flu and that) moved around the world. We should make sure that we are prepared for that and the public health system should be, obviously, equipped to deal with those things. So I do hope that that can be dealt with.

I saw some things in here about climate change and plans and that. I am not so sure that I need to touch on that.

There is a comment here about PAHO and our medical stocks. We have a great relationship with PAHO, which I believe all Health Ministers, whether on this side or on the other side, can attest to. So I, again, working with PAHO . . . that is sort of redundant. We are working with PAHO every day as I am sure, like former Minister [Gordon-]Pamplin and the current Minister and the other few people on this side (myself, Honourable Member Michael Scott) can attest to. And certainly the former Minister Zane De Silva can attest to. So, again, that sounds a bit redundant.

We work with PAHO every day. All we have to do is get on the phone and call them and this country has the benefit of all of their international expertise and resources in any way that is needed. So that is sort of redundant and whatever quality relationship we have with PAHO should just continue and whatever we need to get from them we can make the appropriate request.

Obviously, the security of our economy is paramount. I do not need to minimise that comment, I think. All the other areas are obviously important, but economic security in this global economy is paramount and having appropriate legislation and resources to deal with cybercrime.

Business continuity—I know that there is a business continuity centre in Devonshire, which is well used by many in the international community. Other things that we can do to deal with telecommunications fraud and the like, we should take on. And I am sure the Minister, with the Financial Intelligence Agency and other agencies, must look at that every day because that is a moving target. Things change. We have viruses that are attacking our computers every day. We have people from all parts of the world trying to take people's money and swindle Bermudians out of their hard-earned money (or maybe not so hard-earned money as well) all the time. So having those levels of security is important. I assume that the Minister will continue the work with the FIA, with the FCU and any international agencies that can help us to make the modifications necessary.

Under the environment, again, economics, the environment . . . the environment is what keeps us alive, Mr. Speaker. People can talk about the economy all they like, but if our natural environment is not up to scratch, like we give the attention to our economy, we will be a dying people. Or we will not be a healthy people and people will not come to places that are unhealthy. We can have all the money in the world we want, but if we do not have quality environment—and we are known for having a quality natural environment—we will not have any tourism, we will not have any international business, we will not have any business because we all will need to go somewhere else to live.

Energy security is important, Mr. Speaker. Looking at alternative energy resources to diversify

our energy platform has been laid out in detail. I am not going to go into great detail about it. It is essential to our survival, not only from the standpoint of security, but also costs. If we can lower the cost of energy, that is better for us as well and diversification will aid in that. So though this is a creature of the Ministry of National Security, perhaps it is a tool to lobby other Ministers to get on the boat—I am sorry, the “road”—of energy diversification because it is a security question. It is not just about costs and cost to the economy, it is security.

Food security—I hope that a national agricultural plan is coming. Certainly the PLP has talked about it, Mr. Speaker, and we do hope the Government is also pursuing that. Food security is essential and I do believe that the protection of our fisheries and also proper use of our on-land resources is also essential. You know, we need to work with our farmers to make sure that they are using the land responsibly that they have. Pesticides and other things which have caused damage to the natural environment should be constantly monitored by the Government because if we begin to poison ourselves, it is over.

That is also a part of security—our own self-governance. Not just threats about outside of things, pests coming inside, but we have to protect ourselves from ourselves. And so food security from that standpoint, making sure that we are moving to more greener and safer and organic methods of pest control, I think, is important so that we can not only be protective and give our farmers more opportunity for growth and provide healthy products, but also we save ourselves from any potential crisis that we might create on our own. And having plans around that, Mr. Speaker, will be good.

Now, in conclusion, I saw there are issues about weather and how we monitor weather. Weather is so important to our own interests and how we protect ourselves. It affects everything from how we can make money as a country to the conditions and the quality of life that we have. So all efforts that can advance the technology around weather monitoring and early warning should be done and invested in. And I know out of [Hurricane] Fabian we had to make some major changes down at the airport. But if there are any other things that we can deploy that can improve monitoring of our weather systems around in our environment, that just helps us to plan better if we have better information and data around the weather around us. And it helps all of us—every individual—because we all wonder what the weather . . . every time we get up in the morning we are wondering about what the weather is going to be today. So the more information and the more clarity we have around that it just makes our day better. So whatever can be done there, Mr. Speaker, we are happy with.

I do not want to go on any further. I may have spoken longer than I need to on this, but I do hope that my contribution has added to this discussion and

debate. We (and I will state it again) have no serious objection to this report in the slightest other than we were mindful of some of the cost implications of some of the key areas which I have mentioned. And I have agreed, I believe, with the Minister on some of them. And I do believe, based on what the Minister has said, that the Ministry and all those whom the Honourable Member is working with will be mindful of what steps they take to implement these things. Those that they can implement easily I hope that they move quickly towards, Mr. Speaker. But also those things that need the careful planning and consideration, and perhaps are going to [take] longer, that they also take time to plan those out so that the country will know where we are going and what the vision is around national security and defence for our country.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke [West], and it is MP Jeanne Atherden.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Jeanne J. Atherden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think all of us who have had the opportunity to read the National Security and Defence Review have been struck by the fact that it is very complete. It has addressed many issues that, perhaps, we would not have thought about and, therefore, the Minister and the Committee that dealt with this are to be complimented.

I am not going to try and go into everything that is here because a lot has been said and will be said. But I do want to concentrate on two areas which are of interest to me. And this relates to the revising the EMO Mandate and the Standing Instructions and the suggestion as it relates to all those other things that come from that. And I look at this particularly because in another life I was quite involved with the Emergency Measures Organisation, first at the hospital, then at the bank. So I know that all of the things that have to come into effect are very important.

So when I start to look at what is being done, I look at the Summary of Recommendations which indicates revising the EMO Mandate and Standing Instructions, dealing with disaster preparedness, and also establishing and coordinating the network, I can understand why and I can see why this has to be looked at. Because whether we realise it or not, there is a tendency for us to just think about a hurricane as the only thing that one needs to prepare for.

If you start to realise . . . and I looked at (I think it was page 70) the plan where the Committee tried to make us focus on different things that might occur in terms of a cruise ship grounding, an aircraft incident, a large scale explosive incident, and I remembered when we were at the hospital. One of our exercises was a plane crashing down at Kindley Field

and what would have to happen. A lot of times people do not realise that this becomes an incident where the world is looking at how we are going to respond and everybody is assuming, in the vernacular of being a first-class country, that we will be able to respond in a way that makes everybody feel very assured that we are doing everything and it is all going to be taken care of.

I also think that when the Committee starts to talk about public education there is a tendency for us to know what you would do in the case of a hurricane and everybody has . . . that happens so often to them now that in some respects we have probably started to become a little blasé. And when the next one really does occur we are going to have to pull out those instructions and try and get ourselves organised. But a lot of people do not realise—and we have to deal with the public education—that all of these other incidents that they are talking about, Mr. Speaker, we will have to be able to respond very quickly and know what needs to be done.

I am mindful of the fact that when we were at the hospital and we were talking about a plane crash, that would have meant that patients would have been discharged. People would have been sent home to their relatives to say, *Sorry, you have to take care of your relative until such time as the hospital can get you back.* And if you do not have people understanding that through the public education, a lot of them would not know how to react. A lot of them would not understand that this is part and parcel of process and, therefore, this is the way Bermuda will react if it occurs.

I am mindful of the fact that when they talked about the public education campaign . . . just imagine the other incident in terms of a large scale explosion. And I am not going to suggest a particular place because I do not want to put my mouth on anything, but just imagine that something happened and all of a sudden we did not have electricity. And all of a sudden we were not going to have electricity for weeks on end. We would have to understand what we were going to do and we would have to be prepared, because if people do not know that there is a plan in place there is a tendency to panic.

Therefore, I think all the recommendations that have been put in this report are saying to us, *planning allows people to make sure that everything is covered.* It makes people react in a way that is orderly and then ensures that the businesses that we have function. And it seems to me that a lot of businesses have understood that. And we, as a country, have to understand that as well. Because if I go to another life in a large global organisation, we concentrated on disaster recovery and business continuity. And we had offices around 13 countries. At that point in time, you had to figure out how you are going to keep your businesses functioning, and that is what we are talk-

ing about in Bermuda. We have to make sure that, whatever happens, Bermuda continues to function.

I must admit when the Member Mr. Roban was talking about different things that could occur, I remembered incidents in one of our offices where there was bird flu in the country and what we had to do. And so sometimes some of these things that you think are very remote do happen and they come home and they have some impact on us.

I think that it is very important that this report and the recommendations have been comprehensive to make us focus on what we need to do, and provided the Minister has the opportunity to put together the right groups, we will be able to come up with a plan. And I am understanding and I support the Minister in the sense that everything that we have to do has to have a cost attached to it and there is going to be some sort of implementation and some sort of prioritisation.

Mr. Speaker, I too agree with what the Minister said with respect to not necessarily needing to have a particular individual, if you will, set up to have—I think it was called the NCP. Let me make sure I have got the right title here. It was the NDP (the National Disaster Planning office) because there are lots of organisations who are doing their own thing within their organisations but not necessarily within a silo. Because I think that is what we are trying to say. We cannot have the silo mentality; we have to have integration across all of these organisations to make sure that what they do is coordinated. But that does not necessarily mean that there is sufficient activity to set up your own separate office. So, Mr. Speaker, I, too, support what the Minister said.

I just want to make two more observations because I do not think that this is something that we want—I think we all support this. I think we are all just trying to sort of highlight particular portions that we believe are important and each one of us will come at it from a different way. I do think that there was a suggestion about the hospital and what could be done there. And there was also the suggestion about the other ends of the Island. And I was intrigued . . . if I can find the portion of it. There was the suggestion as it relates to having different areas and a West End and an East End location. And it was significant that the Minister reminded us that part of something which might come to us soon relates to having ambulances at both ends of the Island.

That would also mean that we would have personnel at the ends of the Island and, therefore, the question of having a place where medicines would be stored and persons can go, this is all something that is very important to be looked at. Because just simply having a bridge go out . . . We always talk about the Causeway Bridge. But you could have a bridge up at the little Somerset Bridge. So I think it is very important that these things have been established. And I think . . . I was looking at page 11, in talking about

establishing locations for portable mass casualty treatment facilities. I think that as we go forward and we start to look at different scenarios, we will start to put together things that operate normally and then when we need it in an emergency, it will function more seamlessly.

And that brings me to the suggestion about seniors because, for me, Mr. Speaker, if we start looking at seniors and making sure that we have something that deals with their need to get around, their need to get to services, then you do not have to turn around and talk about putting something in just as a special thing. It would just be improving something that you already have. So from my perspective, when I saw the reference to the seniors, it just said to me, *Let's deal with improving how we make sure that seniors get their medical treatment and they have some mobility on a regular basis.* Then you do not have to turn around and put something in special just for an emergency.

And last but not least, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that I do recognise that . . . we have lots of things that have been addressed, but for me the most significant aspect of it is that they have all been tried to be tied together by this particular report. Because the idea of the Standing Instructions, the idea of the fact that a large public event could turn into the equivalent of something that results into an emergency, depending on how it happened, and the fact that whether we want to like it or not an outbreak of public disorder could end up with something that results in lots of people needing to be having treatment, lots of people needing to be located in different places, and the Emergency Measures Organisation having to deal with an incident.

And so for me, Mr. Speaker, I just think that I am very much looking forward to seeing how this report gets implemented and I am anticipating that the Minister in working with all of the other agencies that are involved here will be coming back at some point in time to tell us how it will be implemented. And I am sure then we will have greater opportunity to talk about the timing and the cost and the result, and then we will be able to see the benefit to Bermuda.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Would any other Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair recognises the Honourable Minister for Public Works, Minister Gordon-Pamplin.

You have the floor.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to be able to weigh in. I am going to focus primarily on those areas for which I have daily responsibilities.

I think it is important to, first of all, thank the Committee for their efforts. I think that it is important to say that the Committee, obviously, wanted to ensure that this report was comprehensive. Therefore, it is apparent that we might see some things a little bit different from that which the Committee may see. We look at things and we say, *Well, this is already done. This is a natural part of how we do stuff and it is already done.* But I think that the Committee would have received certain oral representations and, as a result, in their efforts to be comprehensive with this report it may appear that some things are perhaps redundant because our knowledge of certain approaches and attitudes . . . we can look at it and say, *Well, this is just the way things are already in place and, therefore, there is no necessity to have them included as recommendations.*

With that said, I think that it does not hurt sometimes to underscore those areas that have been examined and even if not to do something separate, to just act as a reminder and to refresh one's memory.

As the Honourable Member who just took her seat indicated, if you have an extended outage of electricity . . . well, we deal with that. I mean, we had the situation where our parents and grandparents (some of them) actually came up with oil lamps, and to be able to flick on a switch for a light was unheard of. So now that we have become accustomed to the modern approaches to life and the conveniences, many of us would not know how to manage if we had to dip water from a tank with a bucket or to do things that are just outside of our normal comfort zones.

I do not believe that it particularly hurts to highlight those things, notwithstanding that we have some systems and programmes and processes in place that might be able to handle these things. I think the Committee has done a reasonably good job in highlighting those areas that are important.

Let me just say that we recognise that many of the recommendations that are made do require money. And I think that, as the lead Minister has indicated, we obviously cannot adopt some of the ideas, or neither is it efficacious for us to attempt to adopt some of those things that are included in this report. But with that said, I do not believe that there is any harm in their having been highlighted and pointed out. Some of the recommendations are more practical and they can be followed up. And as I said, some of them have already been done.

So let me just go to the area of Public Works, which is the area for which I am particularly responsible. If I go to page 10, there is actually an overview. But I think that they are a little more in detail further into the report, so I will just make brief reference here to from page 10 of the report with the overview of the Department of Works. They spoke to the issue of water security and the possible contamination and how we need to be able to be equipped to handle that aspect. And you know to enhance security at reservoirs,

clearly, you know, contamination can happen either accidentally or intentionally.

I think that it is very important that when we have our plans that are creating water, it is important to know that that water supply is safe. There would be nothing worse than being the central supply for water to find out that that water has contaminants that create harm to the greater portion of the population. So I think that that recommendation that they have spoken to in terms of enhancing security at reservoirs is something that needs to be built in. And to be able to train additional people for the operation of those reservoirs, while it may not be highly specialised, certainly it is not something that the average person may necessarily be able to go down and figure out which switch to turn, which valve to open. So I think it is always important to have that back-up plan.

I just wanted to highlight, also, that the Honourable Member, Mr. Roban, made mention of the EMO and Standing Instructions, and his observation that these Standing Instructions exist. But I think it is important to point out that the significant portion of the plans that we have in place are usually hurricane related because that, historically, has been the area that we have had to deal with as a people.

So if there is a hurricane, it is like the EMO, you have somebody ringing a bell, you cannot go across the Causeway, the winds are too high, there are dangerous situations. And these are the focal points that we have had. But we have look at, as the Honourable Member who just took her seat indicated, what happens if you have another disaster of a different kind that is not related to hurricanes. And we have to look at things like that.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was not very long into my tenure as the Minister of Health that we got an indication that there was an airplane that was limping its way from South America. It was on its way to the UK, a charter flight, Thomas Cook Tours. And there was fire on-board the aircraft. So I got the notification, I came through the airport, and it showed me how well the system worked. So while maybe the members of the Committee might not have had that first-hand experience I was able to see how the hospital was able to mobilise, how the Fire Department was able to mobilise, how emergency services—the Police and the like—were able to mobilise in order to be ready when that plane actually touched down.

Now, one of the things that we have to understand, and I heard the Honourable Member indicate that we have effective medical facilities at the East End and the West End, and we have the one facility that already exists in the Lamb Foggio Clinic. And the question was, *Is there something that this Government is intending to put in the West End that counterbalances that in case there is an emergency challenge and situation that happens in that end of the Island?* And while I appreciate the concern, let me just say that when you have a facility (it is wonderful to

have some place in which your medications are able to be kept in a safe kind of place), what you find . . . and one will look at what happened in Haiti. One will look at what happened in Indonesia and other places, when there are major emergency situations such as what happened there (both in respect to the tsunami and the like). You do not always have the luxury of having a wonderful, perfect building which you can call your hub.

And there are times when necessity creates circumstances where you have to make the best of a bad situation. You might have to set up tents and have a tent city, as happened in Haiti after their earthquake. So we do not necessarily want to get hung up on the niceties—those are things that are nice to have, but they are not necessary to have in order to be able to cope with any type of epidemic with which we might be faced.

Mr. Speaker, Let me just talk about (on page 76 of the report) the Highways Section of the Department of Works and Engineering. And with the Highways Section being the custodian of all of the public highways, it is important that our infrastructure can hold up to stresses that happen.

One of the things that I have working in the insurance industry that, you know, it was something very new when you first went into insurance as I did many, many years ago, you basically knew that you received a premium from somebody, you paid out losses, you might be advised of a loss and you had some reserves to cover those losses that you had not yet paid. And that was kind of how the industry worked. Well, as time has gone on, not only do they have your premium receipts and your losses being paid and your reserves for losses for which you have been advised, there is something called IBNR, which are losses that are incurred but not yet reported. So you found that you had to allow for that.

Then more recently they have even gone further to say that we need to be able to stress the capital of a corporation to ensure that if any of these pandemics, epidemics, disasters happen, whether your company can actually survive through that process. And that is the sort of mindset and readiness that a country has to have in order to be able to address the challenges that will occur as a result of these types of situations and why we would, in fact, need a National Security Review to ensure that we have a robust plan in place in order to be effective.

As we stress capital now, we are required by the Monetary Authority to say, *Well, what happens if . . .* I can remember the first set of stress testing that came to me as an accountant (and I will declare my interest in the insurance industry) when it said, *Okay, these are your results. This is the premium that you are expecting. These are the losses that you are expecting to pay out. But what would your capital be and how solid would your company be if interest rates shifted downward, if exchange had a negative impact*

on your dealings? How would you cope? And then they started to get into specifics. What happens if there is a marine collision and at the same time there may be an aircraft that comes down over a certain area and then you have a pandemic of bird flu outbreak and the like, and what happens if all of these things happen together? And you look at it and you think, *How can I figure this out?* Well, there are actuarial models that work for things such as that.

So when we have a readiness plan within the context of our Island and looking at what is essential, these are the kinds of things, albeit remote . . . because I remember when I got the first set of stress testing I looked at it and I said, *If all of these happened at the same time, it wouldn't matter what the capital of the company would be because we would all be dead if all of these things happened.* So I thought it really did not make any difference. But this is a practical step which the authorities take to ensure that we are ready for such extenuating circumstances. And I think that we have to, as a country, be able to look for that.

Now one of the things that was mentioned here in the report on page 77 was about the Bailey bridge construction. I do believe that the one thing that Bermudians have been able to do over time is be resilient. I think that the concerns showed here were that the building of a Bailey bridge is not something that happens on a regular basis and, as such (because it does not happen on a regular basis), if we were required in the event of a hurricane and it blew out the Causeway and we were not able to access or egress, that because it is not a regular occurrence we may have difficulty.

I am not sure that I quite agree with that because I think that we have engineers within the department and we also have those engineers when working with the Regiment. We have some pretty knowledgeable people. And while I am not suggesting for a second that there is no danger involved, I would imagine that the imminent danger on a large scale basis is perhaps extremely minimal because I think that we have got people who are quite sensible. And when you have got engineers directing a project, a Bailey bridge can be constructed, and we will not be eternally cut off because of our Island and inter-Island link and the structure that we have.

Page 78 of the report spoke to the fact that within the department there is storage of building block and tarps. Well, I think it is important to recognise and understand that we are our brother's keeper when it comes to emergencies. And while this has obtained thus far in terms of hurricanes and the like, we have actually had rather admirable and yeoman response when it comes to neighbour-to-neighbour cooperation. And if we lose that common thread, then I think that the country is in peril. But I believe that as long as we continue to have the interaction of person-to-person, neighbour-to-neighbour, family-to-family

and look out for the seniors who may not be able to look out for themselves (those who may not have family to come and look out for them) if we continue to have that all-embracing love and care and support and concern for each other, then I think that some of the challenges that have been identified here would have been ameliorated, minimised, if not totally eliminated, because we do look out for one another.

Now I want to go back, again, to the issue of the roads and them being the responsibility of the Department of Works and the Highways [Section]. You will know that just this very morning, Mr. Speaker, I gave an update on the situation respecting the road collapse at Palmetto Road. And these are the kinds of things, obviously, that we have the responsibility as the Ministry of Works to ensure that our infrastructure is solid. Obviously, that particular area was very poorly constructed 20, 30, 40 years ago—however long it has been put there. I think when the wall came caving in, one of the things that was observed by the chief engineer was that there were only one or two reinforcing rods in that entire thing. So how it has been able to withstand the test over those many years has been nothing short of miraculous.

So we have to ensure that not only is our infrastructure up to date, but that we are equipping and constructing in an appropriate manner in order to accept and take the stresses. Maybe when that was built, however long ago, we did not . . . in fact when that access road was built we did not have anywhere near the number of vehicles on the road. Neither did we have the weight of vehicles on the road. So as you put those additional stresses on the infrastructure that you have for a situation that was not built to accommodate that, then clearly it is something that, as you look at your national disaster . . . because that situation could have been a major disaster.

You know, if you had vehicles coming, let us say a bus was there at the time. It happened at some odd hour of the day. But thank God that it did, because if you had a bus there, that bus [would have] come tumbling down the bank. How many people [would] get injured? These are all of the things, the knock-on effect of things that create disasters that nobody can necessarily anticipate, but we certainly have to be prepared for if such things happen.

So, you know, when we look at areas such as East Broadway (and I believe the Honourable Member De Silva had pointed out prior too what we have had just because of the manner of the road), we have had an inordinate number of road deaths in a particular spot. It is the responsibility of the Highways [Section] to ensure that we put in systems and situations that help to calm that particular accident spot.

These sorts of things can create unnecessary disasters. Some disasters are natural and some of them are manmade. But we as a people have to look out for how our entire system can cope with not just the natural disasters but those disasters that are

manmade. So we have put up additional signage on East Broadway. We are going to be putting rumble strips as soon as the machine is fixed.

And I go back to the issue of machines because the report speaks to the necessity of ensuring that the machinery—the trucks, or the machines that are required to enhance the infrastructure—is always in good repair. Well, that has not necessarily been the case. There have been some major machines that have been required for significant works that have just been broken. The things have just been broken. And we try to look at how we can enhance the inventory, how we can enhance the processes down at the quarry so that when vehicles come in and they need to be repaired, that those repairs are done in a timely basis. After hurricanes, after incidents, we need to have highway clean-up; we need to have machines that are available and ready. And in that regard, if we do not have them, it is a chink in the armour, if I can put it that way.

The report also spoke to the issue of low-lying areas. And we do have flood modelling that has actually been budgeted for that will be undertaken in very short order. The flood modelling I believe is on page 78 of the report. (I do not know exactly where it is, but somewhere on page 78, I have got it in my notes). It speaks to individuals who reside in low-lying areas close to the Island's coastline who could be at significant risk from storm surges that accompany hurricanes. We also heard in this report concerning tsunamis. And while Bermuda is not known for tsunamis, with the change in global . . . reaction to certain stimuli, we do not know what we are going to get. So it does not hurt to have some kind of preparation system in place.

I believe that once we get the results from the flood modelling, it will give us a little bit more information to be able to determine how best to plan for any negative fallout from any disaster that might occur relating thereto. And I believe that the engineer within the department was approached to ask about whether it made sense to have an early warning device for low-lying coastal areas to help to move people to higher ground.

Now while in the overall scheme of things that might seem overkill in a Bermuda context, if you stop to look at it there are many houses that actually are right on the water side . . . and it might be that they might be on the rocks, but there is coastal erosion. And as a result of coastal erosion if those coasts are particularly hammered in poor weather conditions there is no telling what negative impact that that is likely to have. So it does not hurt us to have a plan. And I think that that is the focus and the thrust of this particular report so that there is something that we can look to, something that we can have not just in the recesses of our minds, but something that can operate on a very practical and real basis as to how we

can be effective and respond to any major disasters that might happen.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to speak to those areas which were specifically relating to the area for which I am responsible, and to basically, once again, thank the members of the Committee.

There was one other recommendation in the overview, and I have to speak to this in that we spoke to cement supplies. I did speak earlier to the issue of the fact that we do maintain cement block and tarpaulin and things like that in a central location in the event of needing them after any type of disaster. But cement supplies, I think that it is important to understand two things: We have one major central cement (or it's not central, but one major cement) silo business, which is at the West End of the Island. And in ensuring that cement is available, should such a necessity arise—there is sort of the earthquake-type environment in which buildings are demolished, they have to be rebuilt—I think the one thing, if I say nothing else, is that it was not actually highlighted in the report, but I believe it is absolutely important. We might have to look at how under certain difficult and disaster-type circumstances there may be, by some unscrupulous people, the tendency for price gouging. And I believe that is something that we need to ensure that we look at so that if there is the necessity to bring effective legislation, that we can do that.

I think that that is something that I would like to see, that is something I will be looking at a little bit closer to see how we can fix that particular problem. Because I think there is nothing worse than knowing that you are down and then somebody is actually stepping on you while you are there and there is nothing you can do about it. So these are the sorts of things that if want to continue to have a wholesome society, a wholesome community, where we continue to look out one for the other, we have to do it not just from an obligatory perspective of what is morally right, but we also have to look at it—how can we legislate it if need be to enable us to protect ourselves from those of us who might choose to be unscrupulous in very difficult circumstances.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me end where I began by basically saying that we recognise that to the extent that funding is required to implement some of the recommendations that have been made, some can be budgeted in the longer term and there are some that will, perhaps, not be budgeted, not be able to be budgeted effectively because it is a question of prioritising those things that must be done in order to ensure that we have a proper disaster plan nationally. And not only that the plan exists, but that it is a part of our mindset as a people to know that our safety is paramount and in order to ensure our safety, then we all have to work at it together.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Minister.

Does any other Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair will recognise now the Deputy Speaker, MP Roberts-Holshouser.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I extend my gratitude to the Minister, Minister Dunkley, for bringing the National Security and Defence Review to this Honourable House so it can be looked at and reviewed and perhaps different perspectives offered other than just certain perspectives.

I say that to begin with and then add, *Good evening and welcome to this evening's AccuWeather report. I am Suzann Roberts-Holshouser.* The reason I say that is as we turn to page—

[Inaudible interjections]

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: That was for 17 years Bermuda heard that! As we turn to page 96—

The Speaker: Yes, you caught me—

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: I did?

The Speaker: You caught me.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: You thought you were—

The Speaker: You knocked me back that time, Honourable Member.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: You thought you were sitting in your living room, didn't you, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: I did not know where I thought I was but—

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: There you were—

The Speaker: —but I did not think I was in the House of Assembly.

[Laughter]

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: But there was a reason for that.

The Speaker: Carry on, Member.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you.

Because as we start off on page 96, one of the areas that was discussed as part of this National Security was, of course, Bermuda Weather Service.

It identified the fact that, of course, [BAS-]Serco is responsible for supplying the information on weather. I am very pleased to see as part of the conclusion that it is suggested or recommended that an investment in second Doppler be looked at. And of course that is important as Bermuda sits in the middle of the Atlantic and we are all aware that one of the biggest threats weather wise, of course, is the threat of hurricanes. I was pleased over the years . . . there was an issue where tropical storms or storm systems were not named.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: And they were not named because it was felt that those individuals travelling from over—

The Speaker: Honourable Members, I cannot hear now. I cannot hear.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Well, that is not good.

But it was thought, initially, that individuals who were planning to travel to Bermuda from overseas, if they saw that there was a storm (because there was a name) there was a tendency to see a reverse in travel. So as a result, it was deemed that there was a change under this normal blanket that we would now not name them. And then we went back to naming them, basically because of the fact that most people pay more attention to a weather system when it has a name. And as a result, it proves to be more of an awareness across the Island.

But one of the reasons that I mentioned "AccuWeather" was because it is most important to understand that while [BAS-]Serco is recognised as supplying Bermuda with the weather service, there is another independent weather . . . because that is exactly what I used to say—*Bermuda's only independent weather forecast*—because there is a conflict. There are two different . . . one of them is [BAS-]Serco, one of them is AccuWeather. Now the reason I highlight this is because AccuWeather, of course, is [heard] by anyone who is listening to the news via the television or anyone who is listening to the news via the radio. Therefore, it is getting out to the population, to those people who are listening to those stations.

Now what has happened, and I had this scenario play out which is what has flagged me. There was a situation. We were in the middle of hurricane season and there was a potential hurricane heading in our direction. Of course, we recognise there is a window of activity in which the Dopplers help us to determine which direction a hurricane or a system will go depending on what is in the upper levels of the at-

mosphere, whether there is a window of opportunity that changes the wind directions and such information as that. However, in this particular scenario what happened was the local weather service said that this hurricane was heading straight for Bermuda. AccuWeather, with their body of meteorologists who do not reside here but have access to top-notch, high-quality information, who use the National Weather Service as their base, were saying that this hurricane was not going to make a direct hit to Bermuda. And of course we understand the importance of whether it will or whether it will not.

Now, what we decided to do on this particular day was to invite the Bermuda Weather Service to the television station. They were given the opportunity to sit down and speak to the people of Bermuda to disclose what one should be aware of *should a hurricane make a direct hit*. And it was very important that I make that clear because we did not want them to say what they were saying in other medias—that it was going to make a direct hit—because we felt that it was not. And as a result, we gave them that opportunity to get the information out there.

However, after that interview, I made it clear that it was through our presentation that that weather system was not going to make a direct hit. So what we have here is a challenge. And I would suggest that while it has not been raised in this report, we take a close look at this group of . . . or separate group, separate entities, that are supplying Bermuda with the information because it can cause some forms of concern. And often—I can tell you because I did it for so long—I would always try to pay attention as to who was right. Because, for me, I wanted to know that the information that I was putting out to the people of Bermuda had more accuracy than the other information that was available to the people of Bermuda.

Now again, I reiterate, as I said before, there is always a window of opportunity. Meteorologists will always review information and see what they believe is going to happen, but we do need to fine tune. We do have to also be clear that there are two different [sources of] weather information coming onto the Island.

Now, when it comes to the Doppler, and I mentioned how it was very, very important . . . it would be interesting to know if individuals are not aware that the Doppler was first created and developed for World War II so they could identify sea craft, enemies coming their way. And what they realised was that it was often interrupted by weather, by rain, because radar information is picked up through a Doppler radar which is . . . they then (meteorologists) realised that this was something that they should develop and, moving forward, they have continued to further develop it.

So I reiterate, having a back-up Doppler is extremely important especially as we continue to sit in

the middle (and we are not going to move anywhere) of hurricane season.

I would also like to point out before I take my seat (which I will do shortly) is that Hurricane Awareness Week is May 27–31, this month. So we look forward to the public receiving more information throughout the month of May prior to the beginning of hurricane season which, of course, is June all the way through November.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Would any other Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from constituency 20, MP Susan Jackson.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Susan E. Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I would like to speak HM Customs. And before I tell my story, I would certainly like to give full credit to the Honourable Minister of National Security, Michael Dunkley, for following through on the recommendation that as of the 1st April, HM Customs would transfer into the Ministry of National Security.

One of my main concerns was put most eloquently by the Minister, that the status quo is just no longer enough. We have got to do better. And my main concern, observation, has been that I noticed that within the first month of the summer season we are already looking at an increase in firearm incidents on the Island. And it is not only myself that noticed that there may be some coincidence that the fair weather on our open seas may have some contribution to the increase in supply of contraband on the Island. A few of my constituents feel quite free to call me and let me know that when they are awake in the early hours of the morning they are able to see on the horizon bright lights, they are able to hear the engines of small boats, and within a few hours the lights then disappear and the engines subside and before we know it there are other coincidences like the discovery of illicit contraband on our beaches. So the constituents on the Island (and not necessarily within my constituency) are observing these coincidences, and it is time for us to up our game.

So with the HM Customs moving into the Ministry of National Security there is the possibility and the potential that enforcement will now become a reality for that service and that it will no longer just be a revenue collecting department. We are hoping and looking forward to more shared information between the agencies, whether that is the Bermuda Police Service, Immigration and HM Customs so that they can share stories and data and information, intelligence and be able to connect dots and make decisions on how to proceed to minimise some of the activity that is going on around our borders.

So I look forward a future of some increased border security and I will certainly keep my eye on that as we move forward.

Thank you.

[Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any Members that would like to speak?

The Chair now recognises the Minister of Transport.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: And Tourism.

The Deputy Speaker: And Tourism.

Thank you, Minister Crockwell.

You have the floor.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to join in the comments today in relation to this report—the National Security and Defence Review. I was surprised when I was reading the letter from the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Leopold Mills, who I would notice in the Chamber and also should be congratulated for this report. But I was surprised to read that this is a groundbreaking report. As a matter of fact, that it is the first time that such a wide ranging and comprehensive assessment of the Island's security capabilities has been carried out. So it is a landmark report, Madam Deputy Speaker, and a very important one. You know the old saying, "an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure," so it is indeed a good report that we can take proactive measures to ensure that we have a modern and a very effective security and other measures to ensure that the Island is going to be safe and it will prosper going forward.

So it is a good thing that we have this. And also I would like to note that this is one of the last contributions of one of our former Members. The [late] former [Member] Honourable Louise Jackson was on this Committee and certainly participated and contributed to the document that we are discussing today. So this is part of her legacy.

But Madam Deputy Speaker, much has been said about it. The Opposition has already articulated their support of the report and spoke to various aspects of the report. I do not intend to be long, but there are certain departments that fall under my remit that were touched on in the report and a few other things that caught my attention that I would like to opine on. And, of course, the areas where my departments—the Department of Marine and Ports (which can be found on page 58 of the report), and the Department of [Airport Operations]—fall under my remit and they are very important.

The [Member] who just took her seat talked about border control. It is paramount. We are an isolated, small Island, Madam Deputy Speaker, and anything that comes into this Island that is deleterious to the people of Bermuda come either via water or come from the air. And so we have to ensure that we monitor, that we ensure that we are having our borders well protected from the importation of illicit substances and most importantly the importation of firearms.

I note that the report talks about the fact that central and east—and I am talking about now the marine—that that is sufficiently protected right now because we have more than enough surveillance, Madam Deputy Speaker, to cover the central and the eastern areas of the Island. I was surprised to read that (and maybe this was just common knowledge, but I was not aware of it) the western end of Bermuda is not that well protected. And so that was highlighted. One of the recommendations was to establish effective marine coverage for the western portion of the Island. And I think that is something that needs to be done forthwith because we know that the western end of the Island is where the cruise ships come in now and so there could . . . if we do not have sufficient surveillance, if we are not monitoring that area effectively, then that opens up the door for untoward activity and for things to be getting into the Island. So I would encourage my colleague, the Minister for Public Safety, to try and ensure that we can follow that recommendation. And I would like to congratulate him for bringing forward this report.

I read in relation to the Department of Airport Operations . . . it is no secret that this Government would like to see the airport redeveloped and improved. Clearly, that was not the focus of this report, but the first impression of our guests and the last impression is through the airport. So we have to make sure that we have a modern facility. But in relation to this particular report, it was talking about increasing security at the LF Wade International Airport.

It states on page 62 that “Increased physical security of the operations, passenger terminals and perimeter of LF Wade International Airport is required.” And I certainly will not take issue with that recommendation, but I would like to just note . . . and the fact that as the Minister of Tourism, I travel. And I go through the airport quite often. Government Ministers are afforded, of course, certain protocols when we travel, but I take note that I have to present my passport approximately five times before I get on the plane. And I just find that to be a bit extraordinary. You know, I present it when I get to the check-in. I present it again when I get to the US Customs area. I present it again the third time when I am going through the US Customs. I present it then when I am putting my luggage through. I present it when I am going through, whether it is American Airlines or the like, and then before I go toward the plane, I present my passport—six times I am being identified.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Sorry?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I have been in the dustbin too, absolutely, when you go through the US areas.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I do think that . . . I do not understand. In fact the last time I travelled, I counted. I said, *Now, it's been six times and I would like to talk to the General Manager to find out exactly why we have to have our passport, our identity, checked that many times.* But the quality of those that are checking the luggage, ensuring that there are no illicit substances, certainly it is important.

Now, there has to be some form of coordination with the United States. We have to meet their standards and so I believe that that was the approach that the Committee took here with this recommendation. And I certainly do not have any issue with the recommendation, but we also have to balance that with the experience of our tourists. And we do not want the last experience to be an unpleasant one. And although, as the Government we outsource the security and we outsource that service, it is not something that is done in-house. But it is very important that what we do it in a way that allows our tourists, and, of course, our locals as well, to have a very positive experience. So it is a balancing act. But I certainly recognise the importance of this recommendation.

We have to get the security and the protection and the monitoring of our borders right. There is no reason why we should have the types of challenges that we do have because we know there are only two ports of entry.

I would like to also go to, with your indulgence Madam Deputy Speaker, page 85. I just found this interesting as well when it was talking about the acute care and public health and particularly focusing on the King Edward VII Memorial Hospital. On page 85, number 5 says, “More ambulances are required due to malfunctioning of the hospital’s current fleet of ambulances.” And it is good to see that “new ambulances for the KEMH will be purchased in the near future.” Of course this has been brought to the attention of Cabinet—some the challenges that the hospital has with this ambulance fleet. But you see under the Committee recommendations, it says to “Develop a sustainable ambulance capability. The mechanical reliability of the BHB ambulance fleet is poor.”

And I just . . . you know, that is unacceptable. Where, you know, it is not until someone is seriously injured or someone is unwell and in need of an ambulance. Twenty minutes may sound like it is short, but if you are in severe pain it may appear to be a lifetime. And if we do not have an ambulance that can get indi-

viduals in need in a timely fashion, in my opinion, especially in a jurisdiction our size, I think that that is unacceptable. So again, that is a recommendation that I would like to be implemented forthwith. And it is good to see that the Committee advises that new ambulances will be purchased in the near future.

Also I would like to highlight the recommendation that the hospital should increase the number of medical personnel on duty during emergencies. And I am not one who is very critical of King Edward Memorial. I have received their services and I can say that they are professional and they do provide an outstanding service. But I think we all have had the experience of either taking a child to the Emergency Department and, you know, going in the morning and not leaving until late at night. It could be a very long, protracted . . . and the actual treatment may be 10 or 15 minutes. So it is important that the hospital is able to provide the services understanding that the Emergency Room can be a very busy and hectic and chaotic environment.

I certainly do not want to be critical of the head of that department. I think Dr. Shultz does an excellent job. But if they need more personnel in Emergency in order to provide more adequate and efficient service, I certainly support their recommendation.

On a lighter note, I just would look at . . . while I am saying it is a lighter note it is a serious note, but I thought it was interesting looking at page 95 of this report where it talked about food security. Very often we take these things for granted, particularly in an environment where there is a lot of waste when it comes to food, Madam Deputy Speaker. But highlighting the reality that if indeed we are unable to import the food that we require, what will Bermuda do? And we have seen instances (as the report highlights) of when we were unable to get our normal importation of produce and the like and there was a shortage on the Island. But the recommendation was . . . well, the discussion is for Bermuda to produce more of its own food. And that is interesting.

For some reason my son has gotten a green thumb. I do not know where he has gotten that from because I have never really been into gardening and the like. But he now plants. If there is soil anywhere . . . he is currently staying with my father at my father's house, and wherever there is a pot of soil or a little lot of soil, he is growing something. Now I told my father, I have given my father a picture of a marijuana plant just so he can make sure that he monitors what is actually being grown.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Exactly.

But he is growing everything from string beans to tomatoes. He has got different types of tomatoes, and carrots. And I have been very impressed

with his enthusiasm, with his passion. Whenever I go to the house now my mother is showing me, *Oh, this is coming from the garden*. But it is something that we should encourage our young people to do. It has been very rewarding for him; he loves it. He is very proud of the produce that he is now providing; it is making the dinner table, which is a great thing for him. The most important thing is it is certainly more healthy and if more people can just take some part of their yard and grow their own . . . their herbs, actual herbs, and other things that they can use in their cooking.

It is economical, Madam Deputy Speaker, and it is healthy and apparently it is quite enjoyable. And you see it from the seedling to the final product. So I told him I am going to have him come to my house and we are going to find a little plot and plant some stuff and see what happens, Madam Deputy Speaker.

So I thought that was interesting. And also it talks about the fishing industry as well. You know, not picking on my son but he is an avid fisherman—avid fisherman. It is just unbelievable. He will go and he will catch the bait. He will go and net fry, he has a throw net and he will get all the little bait that he needs and he will go down to the dock and catch Snappers and Amberjacks—you name it—Hogfish galore! So it is very possible . . . it is very possible for us to feed ourselves and take care of ourselves with the natural environment that we have. That if we—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: My cousin is talking about the fish that he catches off the rocks. But, no, my son is catching fish a little bigger than that.

[Laughter]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: But Madam Deputy Speaker, I do think this is an important document. And even just to . . . from an educational perspective, just to learn of the various departments and the various committees, the things that exist in Bermuda that are important, there are quite a few areas that I was not even aware of. Reading through this document I found very enlightening and very educational. So I would encourage all Bermudians—I cannot state right now where they can find it. It is available online, isn't it?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: On *Bernews* it is available online, so I would encourage individuals to have a look at it.

Congratulations, again, to the Committee who put it together. It is a well drafted, it is a comprehensive document. It is certainly timely. And I just want to say that I support it and I am glad that the Minister saw fit to bring it to the House today.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any other Members that would like to speak?

Thank you.

The Chair recognises Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons Minister of Education.

You now have the floor.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think a lot of my colleagues, and particularly the Minister responsible for National Security, Mr. Dunkley, have essentially covered a number of different areas. But let me start, I think, where others have, and certainly commend the Committee chaired by Mr. Leo Mills for pulling this together. Obviously a lot of work has gone into this and I think it is a very useful inventory of risks across a very broad spectrum of issues that we have to contend with in Bermuda and I think they have done a good job in that. I think by definition, because it is so broad, there are a number of areas that probably have not been gone into in much depth, but I think that is perhaps where some of us come in to add a little bit more. And that is what my honourable colleague, Mr. Dunkley, has asked me to do here.

My understanding is that this report was initially commissioned by the Governor, but obviously supported by the Ministry of National Security. So I do not know if that has come out or not at this point but maybe Mr. Dunkley did it when he introduced it.

So what I would like to do, Madam Deputy Speaker, is talk about a couple of areas that come under the portfolio that I have some responsibility for. So I am going to start on pages 91 and 92. It says "Business Continuity" but where I would really like to focus on is on page 92 is "Information Technology, Data Security and Telecommunications."

Before I get into that I think it is just worth saying that under the Business Continuity category, I think a lot of businesses are much more aware than they perhaps were five or ten years ago about the issue of business interruption. And we have had a couple of instances where businesses have had fires or other areas and where data records of both employee and customers have been lost in that. And I think certainly in hurricanes as well a lot of businesses, particularly those that are regulated. I think insurance companies and banks are now required by the Bermuda Monetary Authority to have a business continuity plan and a back-up plan, not only where they can essentially have separate facilities to restore data, customer lists, financial information, but also where they can sit down and work with customers.

I think insurance companies are particularly tuned into this because after a hurricane or a disaster they need to be able to meet with people who want to put in claims and effectively get money very quickly. They need to be able to do that. So I think that area

has moved along fairly quickly. That is not to say that I think every business has a business continuity [plan] or an alternative place to do that. But I think there has been certainly some real movement in the last few years and some of it obviously coming as a consequence of the regulatory requirements—to be able to demonstrate that to the regulator.

So let me focus a little bit more on this information technology, data security and telecommunications. And I think this is a little bit of a different area. I think most people think of disaster preparedness, but what the Committee has done here is highlight an area that I think is perhaps seen out there as a risk which may not apply as much to Bermuda, but I think that is not the case at all. And that is the broader area of cybercrime. The Committee talks about the fact that "existing laws in Bermuda do not adequately address cybercrime." I think that is probably fair in some respects, but there is a more fundamental practical issue here and that is the broader concern for both government and certainly businesses that this whole issue of cybercrime and cyber security is becoming an increasingly important issue.

Obviously, Bermuda itself is so dependent on different types of business and being able to do business here and being able to do business from here to other places that this broader issue of cyber security is very, very important. So I would like to just take a couple of minutes to sort of define it perhaps a little bit better.

I think all of us now are increasingly reliant both in our homes and certainly in our business on what I guess would be described as a secure and resilient cyber space. I think when a number of us have lost our Internet capacity for a day or two and it is like the end of the world. Well, the networks that I think sustain Bermuda and indeed sustain sophisticated communities and cities these days are much broader and interconnected. They manage powered homes, finances, and run the economy in general. And yet this increase in connectivity, while it is good and it has made life easier and more efficient and better has also resulted in an increasing number of what would be referred to as exposed entry points where highly skilled attackers can get in and can exploit.

I was going to give a couple of examples here, but I think this started out to some degree to be seen more as nations who are involved in perhaps cyber warfare to some degree. I think we are all aware of the Iranian situation and the Stuxnet virus and things of that sort, but it has become much broader and more general here. And I think the degree to which—because of these interconnected networks—we are exposed more broadly to sabotage, infrastructure damage and manipulation of a lot of these control systems is increasingly important and has become increasingly sophisticated.

I think many of us either because we have heard about it or watch sufficient television know that

below the visible net out there is what is known as the “dark web,” and it is very anonymous and there are a lot of things that go in that that we probably do not even want to talk about. But it is out there and it is a very, very different world. And it is becoming increasingly sophisticated and increasingly dangerous as well. So I think we only need to look at a couple of examples of that in the last . . . in fact, the last few weeks.

I think, Madam Deputy Speaker, you will be aware of the Heartbleed virus which looked like it was going to inflict considerable damage.

A couple of years ago (just to give a few other examples) for those who were involved with Sony PlayStation network, a 16-year-old apparently broke into Sony, created absolute havoc in their PlayStation network, and cost the company something on the order of one to two billion dollars and a huge credibility and reputational risk. This is a 16-year-old. When they apparently went to prosecute and charge them, Sony was actually hit by essentially a default of service attack by hundreds or thousands of others out there who all came in—

[Inaudible interjection]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Sorry?

[Inaudible interjection]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Denial of service, thank you. I was looking for the word—denial of service—where a site gets absolutely deluged with people sending messages in retribution for going after the 16-year-old.

I think we saw the issue of Target in December of last year who all of a sudden found themselves on the receiving end of an assault where some 40 million credit and debit card accounts were hacked by a data breach. Neiman Marcus, a number of others, Marriott hotels . . . so these are very sophisticated organisations who have been directly affected in spite of having very secure, I guess from their perspective, firewalls and other ways of preventing ingress.

I had a few security people in my office about a week ago and they said they were talking to a very large sophisticated financial services client of theirs who felt that they were impregnable and they suddenly discovered that somebody had gained access through the swipe card in their parking lot because all these things are interconnected. And so there are very creative people out there, not always with the best of intentions, and I think this is an area that certainly Bermuda and particularly the companies—the large sophisticated companies here—not to mention Government need to be paying more attention to.

Now, I do know that the Committee met with the directive of the E-Commerce Department who made a number of suggestions and recommenda-

tions. And I think from a Government perspective, one of the issues that we need to look at . . . because I do not feel we are as prepared as we should be. In fact, some might say we are not prepared at all because we are not coordinated in the degree we need to be. But there is, I think, ongoing work between E-Commerce, ITO, the Police and others. But I think it is very fair to say that we need to do a better job to protect particularly some of the Government databases—whether they be the Police, BMA, Registrar of Companies—all these are potentially to some degree exposed. If Sony can be broken into and Marriott and others, then I think we have to be concerned about it.

I think some Honourable Members will be aware that the British Virgin Islands. Effectively, their Financial Services Authority database was broken into a couple of years ago and there was a release of hundreds of thousands of bits of information on incorporations there—confidential information—which was a huge embarrassment to the British Virgin Islands. I think it was part of the overall Snowden release of documentation.

So there are people out there . . . we like to think of ourselves as well liked, a nice Island community, but there are clearly people out there that might feel that we are doing things—that perhaps we are a tax haven, we are doing things that we should not, that they do not particularly approve of whether they are right or wrong. People have a perspective on things. So I think some of the things that we need to do going forward is we need to do a much better job in terms of whether you call it inventory or do an assessment of all of our critical infrastructure on which Bermuda relies. And I am going to get on to energy security in a few minutes, but I think that is certainly a place to start.

Other countries which have done a better job of this—and I think of Israel who is consistently under assault—have found that having a working relationship between the government and the private sector so that threats, risk assessments, all that can be shared is something that would I think have great benefit. And I think that is something that we need to do more of here. Individual companies here—particularly larger sophisticated companies—obviously have their own approach, they have their own firewalls and ways to get in. But I think a risk assessment does not just look at the frontal attack, it looks at the many different ways that people can gain access and then use that for either malevolent or rapacious things.

We also need to, I think, do a better job with the broader issue of incident response and coordination. So if there is an assault of some sort how do you deal with it? Who gets involved? And how is that information shared in case it is going to spread to either other businesses or to other Government departments as the case may be? And I think not only it is important to do this internally but we also need to have more international coordination as well. The British

Government, the US Government, and others, obviously, have been spending a lot of time thinking about this and I think there probably are areas that we could use their help to discuss some of these issues with them. But I think the fact of the matter is that while I think we have been aware of it, a lot more needs to be done going forward to make sure that we are better prepared.

The difficulty, of course, is that this all takes money and there is a question of dedicated resources to this and I think it is something that we need to have more discussion [on]. And the question in this area is, How much money do I have to spend to be able to protect myself? And there is no simple answer to that. And the fact of the matter is we know some of these very large companies have spent a lot of money in this area and are still exposed. So I think this whole issue of the risk assessment and getting a better understanding of how the risks and how the assaults or attacks might come is clearly a very important part of that as well.

There is a recommendation in here on page 93 of the report which talks about some of the ongoing fraud right now with respect to telecommunications carriers here. And I think we have all seen the Internet things with phishing things, but what I am talking about is we have had a number of examples (and businesses have been exposed to this as well) where local carriers effectively all of a sudden find themselves as intermediaries where a fraud traffic originating somewhere else—it could be Nigeria, it could be Vietnam, it could be China or wherever—where Verizon or whatever transmits a series of calls going into the PBXs here and then all of a sudden they are hacked and an enormous number of calls go out sometimes over a weekend during a busy period where you can get 10,000 calls happening in this course of 24 hours.

The international carrier then charges the local carrier for that and it can be tens or maybe a hundred thousand dollars and up and the affected company is saying, *Whoa! We didn't make these calls.* The local carrier is saying, *We're being billed by Verizon* (or AT&T or whoever). And I think the suggestion in the report, which is a good one we will look into, is that there is a way to basically perhaps introduce legislation where telecommunications carriers domiciled in Bermuda would not be responsible for any outbound traffic that does not actually originate in Bermuda, where they are coming in and the stuff is going out again and then you have got these huge bills. So that is something I think we need to have a look at because that may provide . . . it will not necessarily stop the hacking, but it may provide some protection in terms of the dollar costs as well.

I am going to shift over, Madam Deputy Speaker, to energy security because I think this is another important area as well. And some of the things that the report highlights are the issue of distributed

generation. We all know that BELCO is effectively concentrated (at least in terms of the generating capacity) over there in Pembroke.

And I think we all remember probably about 10 years ago there was quite a substantial fire over there which put a number of their gensets out of commission, not to mention switching stations, for a while. Sensibly, one of the things the Committee has recommended is more distributed generation. I think that is obviously something that we have been thinking about. I think BELCO has been thinking about it as well because they had made some efforts at one point to try and put a generating facility up at Morgan's Point. That did not work out (that is quite a few years ago now), but I think the whole issue of distributed generation to some degree is going to require some infrastructure changes.

I say that because of the way the BELCO grid works. It is what is called "hub and spoke." And because you have most of your electricity and essentially the heavy duty stuff coming from a central position as you get out farther from Pembroke, the cabling and the switching capacity, or the transformers can handle less and less power. So to put in substantial generating facilities, let us say in St. David's, could be difficult because you would have to run cables back to a substation that would be able to handle that kind of input.

For example, we have been not only talking about but thinking about very actively about having perhaps a solar farm near the airport there on the finger. If you had 20 megawatts that was generating and you had to put it into the St. George's/St. David's grid, it would not be able to handle it. We would have to be able to spend money to take a cable back to a substation that would be able to handle that and then distribute it appropriately. So there are infrastructure issues there as well.

That being said, I think we all need to move toward more distributed generation and as we look at alternative sources of power such as solar and perhaps some of the others that are being looked at, I think all this will help over a period of time to essentially distribute this thing so we will not be dependent entirely on one generating facility over there in Pembroke. But that is going to take a little while to do that.

One of the things that most people think about when they think of energy security is obviously hurricane damage—both to the grid, to the poles, to things of that sort. And my understanding, I guess my feeling is (and I think most people feel this way unless of course it is your house and it has been out for a week) BELCO does a pretty good job and they are pretty used to (at this point) trying to recover from significant windstorm damage.

Obviously [Hurricane] Fabian was a wake-up call to all of us. But since then, I have to say that I have been pretty impressed by the response and the way in which they have handled it. Obviously the most

important area gets dealt with first. And that is strategic facilities and those areas where you have the most homes get dealt with before the more remote areas. So if you are in a remote area then you tend to wait a little bit longer. But they do have an order of restoration and they certainly have both an environmental contingency plan and a restoration plan which I understand they have tested on a regular basis and they actually even have mock exercises as well. So these are some of the things which I think which are important there.

Obviously the issue of undergrounding comes up from time to time but most of the major grid heavy duty lines are now underground. It is the poles that produce most of the problem.

I think there are other areas that we need to think about with BELCO as well (and it is not just BELCO) and that is going back to the cybercrime issue. A lot of the grid now is managed by electronic means and, again, we have to make sure that access to BELCO and somebody either playing with it or having much more malevolent intentions in being able to get in there obviously is something that we need to be more concerned about—there needs to be coordination on that level as well. I think that is something that requires working with Government and others and is something that we need to look into more carefully.

That being said, I think obviously this is an area where the risks are changing and evolving and it is an area that I think the report has done a good job at least of highlighting. Now additional work needs to be done to sort of drill down and look more carefully at some of the detail. I do not think, nor do I think anybody expects, that we remove 100 per cent of the risk; but I think we can do a better job in mitigating some of the risks and having better coordination and better plans in place. I think that is essentially a responsibility of everybody.

I would like to commend the report, the Committee that put it together, commend my honourable colleague, Mr. Dunkley, for bringing it to the House and raising these issues which for as sophisticated a place like Bermuda are critically important ones and ones we need to pay attention to.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any other Members? The Chair now recognises the Minister of Health, the Honourable Trevor G. Moniz.

You have the floor.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I promise not to be too long. I will not be more than half an hour.

[Laughter]

The Deputy Speaker: That is good.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: I want to repeat my colleague's comments that the Committee has certainly done a very good job. And I want to commend them on the report as a whole. In general, I think they have done a marvellous job of addressing a very wide, full gamut of areas. I would just like to address a few of the areas within my remit in Health and Environment.

I want to preface my remarks and say that *the perfect is the enemy of the good*. You know, you can always come up with ideas of things that you should have in place for some hypothetical situation that may happen. We are a small jurisdiction with a limited number of people. We have a very limited financial situation so most of the fixes in here cost money and they cost money that we do not have. So, you know, while some of the ideas may be good ideas we perhaps do not have the money to do them. Some of them are cases of infrastructure that have just deteriorated over the years and have never been upgraded and now the cost is prohibitive. We had that earlier today when I gave a Statement on the sewage disposal system—something that has been there for 75 or 100 years without the necessary upgrades and all of a sudden it is in serious need of replacement and repair.

I would like to start on the report on page 80 with respect to the Office for Occupational Safety and Health. There are a number of issues identified there and as other Members have done I would recommend that interested members of the public go ahead and read the report online. But you know, basically, they are saying that we need more personnel in the Office of Occupational Safety and Health and that we need more legislation and more enforcement. But all of this has to be viewed in a financial situation. We are cutting budgets, we are cutting back on what we are spending. So while I hear what the Committee says, I have a very limited ability to do anything about it in our present financial circumstances. Of course those circumstances are an enormous national debt and a current account deficit which we have to get rid of.

So, while I hear what they say, the issues that we do not have enough personnel . . . you know, some of the things in there saying that offenders are not always brought before the courts, prosecutions for violations are not always successful, those things to some degree are true. We see that we could do a better job and within our limited means we promise to do that. We undertake to do that.

In some cases the Committee is referring to things that we are not exactly sure. They talk about (at page 81 at number three) a mass casualty incident becoming a frightening possibility. I am not exactly sure what they are talking about. There are different things which do represent dangers that we try to keep on top of. And they talk about self-reporting. There is a lot of self . . . we do rely upon people to be good corporate citizens, to do the best thing, not only to

protect the public but to protect themselves and their own workers. But there always needs to be more that can be done particularly in industrial settings where they have dangerous chemicals, gases, et cetera, heavy equipment which could cause problems.

Part of what they talk about are the bridges and structures which are a matter for Public Works which we have pointed out to people. But again, there are very limited finances to pay for it. The Committee was lucky. They did not have to come up with the financing to do any of the things that they recommend.

[Laughter]

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz.: There are some issues here and the difficulty . . . they are talking about the grounding of cruise ships and tankers in the North Channel and what do we do if we have ships offshore. You know, there are some emergencies that if they occurred we have a limited ability to deal with them. That is just a fact of life. There is no magic fix for any of these situations. And as we see these situations all around the world, they are in much larger jurisdictions where they have difficulty coping with them. So Bermuda would have great difficulty coping with some of these situations if they were to occur and there is relatively little that we can do about it.

But generally the recommendations there on page 83 we agree with to strengthen occupational safety and health legislation. They talk about providing safety training, qualifications for marine and ports which obviously is a good idea and we will look at these recommendations. They talk about looking at a long-term plan to build the resources of the office of Occupational Safety and Health over time which we agree with.

They go on to talk about King Edward [Memorial Hospital] at the bottom of page 83. They make certain observations, which I am not sure where they come from. They say communications between the EMO and KEMH is less than satisfactory. Well, I do not know that. It is not really attributed . . . there is no evidence to back up their statements. Obviously they either feel that themselves or someone's opinion who has told them that. It is impossible for me, really, to speak to that.

On page 84 they talk about the Lamb Foggo Urgent Care Centre. They talk about the closure of the Lamb Foggo Urgent Care Centre but in the event of an emergency, whatever happens, there will be provision and we do have fire and rescue service there in the East End which is equipped with emergency medical technicians who can deal with emergency cases. So there is the ability to do that. If Lamb Foggo is closed, that does not mean that there is no ability to deal with emergencies in the East End. We have the fire and rescue people there. Clearly, if there is something that you know is coming, you are going to put people and the ability to deal with it there.

There are contingency plans with respect to an emergency in the airport, et cetera. There is an outdoor area that would be used for triage at the Lamb Foggo Urgent Care Centre in the event of some sort of plane crash or something of that nature at the airport. So these things have been thought out. Likewise, at the new Acute Care Wing of King Edward, there is an area that is designed for mass casualty triage. I do not know if that was not communicated with the Committee or whether they did not ask, but there is a provision to do that.

Now the Committee here is talking about remote areas. Well, in Bermuda there are no remote areas. Remote areas are areas which are over 50 miles from a hospital. There is nowhere in Bermuda over 50 miles from a hospital unless you are away at sea. So there is no such thing as a remote area. There may be areas that are difficult to reach if, for example, the Causeway washes out. But other than that, nothing is particularly remote. At the hospital . . . if we have too many people to take inside, they have provision for triage outside. So they do have provisions for that.

There are provisions here for . . . I mean, they do talk about using large buildings for treatment of serious injuries, but I think there is a provision in a case of hurricanes and emergencies to use school halls for sheltering in the various areas. I know that is true in St. David's and I assume it is true across the Island that these places are designated. Clearly, if you are going to do on-site treatment of less serious injuries, that is where you would do it. In Somerset, for example, we have a clinic building and in St. David's we have the Lamb Foggo [Urgent Care Centre].

It speaks here in particular, on page 85, to malfunctioning in the hospital's current fleet of ambulances. My information is that that situation is being remedied. There is also the discussion which we are studying at the present time of stationing ambulances at the East and West End with emergency staff with a cooperation and coordination between King Edward and the fire and rescue service so that we do achieve better times between accidents at the ends of the Island and getting to the hospital—reducing that time by as much as 20 minutes.

They talk about increasing the numbers of the medical personnel on duty during emergencies. There is a plan for that. It sort of strikes me in some areas that they have not spoken to the people in charge. I am advised that when storms approach the hospital already requires a second shift of staff to come in to the facility. The hospital is then locked down and all staff may stay on-site until the storm has passed. So if people come into the hospital, a double shift, and they sleep there, they stay there. Those plans are in place.

The suggestion in the report about pulling in all of these outside people who are not hospital staff is a little bit far-fetched and problematic. If you are a non-BHB staff member you do not know where any-

thing is, you do not know how it operates and you are not covered by insurance, you do not know the lines of authority. So all of that becomes difficult. It is better to stick with the tried and tested than to try something which is likely to cause more problems than to be a solution to anything.

Going to page 87, it talks about the Department of Health [and] talked about developing appropriate medical equipment maintenance schedule. We are looking at now the introduction of health technology reviews which deals with certificates of entry and license to operate medical equipment which will establish a framework to require regular maintenance schedules, conditions can be attached to the licence to operate, the Department of Health will maintain a register of medical equipment. So some of these items are already in place.

On page 87, the report says to develop a plan to promote increased collaboration within the Department of Health and it goes on to say that there was little evidence of established cross-agency cooperation with other departments. The advice that I have from within the Health Department is that they have no idea where this criticism originated. They certainly had no opportunity to respond to it. The director and managers make serious efforts to ensure that there is good communication and cross-agency cooperation and efforts are made to ensure strong links with other Government departments. It is difficult with some of these assertions. They are so broad that it is difficult to respond to them.

Some of the things they are looking at there, again, on page 87, develop a climate change adaptation plan. Here we are talking about 50 years or 100 years in the future where right now, as I have already said, we have an emergency financial situation we have to deal with in the next two or three years so we are really concentrating on that close area rather than looking at a much longer term plans, although, not to say we are not mindful of them altogether.

There are some comments which are a little bit strange. There is one there about the Somerset Health Clinic (on page 28) talking about it being at risk to flooding. There is no real known flooding in that area. But it is generally not used during weather events. It is not open on a daily basis so we are not sure that that comment carries any particular weight. There is a further comment about working with PAHO, the Pan-American Health Organisation, to increase medicine stocks, and saying PAHO should be made aware of the shortage of some medicines caused by the huge increase in the number of surgical procedures. I have no idea what they are talking about there. That is a complete mystery to myself and to my technical staff.

The only medical supplies which we purchase from PAHO are vaccines—not medicines, but vaccines. Those are purchased. We purchase them because we get them at very reasonable rates. They

purchase them for a number of countries in bulk amounts and they are ordered far in advance. The Department of Health does not supply medication to the hospital for surgical procedures or otherwise.

With respect to the comments in there on food security, we are certainly in the process of reviewing the different agriculture strategies, et cetera. Some of the comments here I thought were not particularly practical. Anyone who knows will know that the first thing a hurricane does is it destroys all the crops. So the suggestion in the report is if you grow more crops you will have more food if there is a hurricane. Well, the hurricane will destroy the crops. So no, that will not help you. That is not the answer to your problem.

Presently there are supplies for three or four weeks. There is a suggestion in the report that if we have a huge population with, you know, thousands and thousands of tourists on the Island that we might only have a two- or three-week supply of food. But it is hard to imagine a situation where we are going to be without an outside source of food for more than say a month. Obviously we are encouraging . . . as I said this morning, I met with the Food Growers Association. We are encouraging people to grow their own food, grow their own supply. There is nothing better or fresher than growing your own supply of food.

The fact is that Bermuda is never going to be in a situation of growing enough food to feed 60,000 people. That is unrealistic. It is dubious if we could feed 10,000 people much less 60,000. So while we have to have contingency plans, they are not going to result from us suddenly growing massive amounts of food.

There are suggestions about fishing, et cetera. But, again, I am a little bit sceptical about some of the talk in the report about if we suddenly have a commercial fishery that would solve our food problems. But certainly we will be looking at the suggestions in the report.

Overall the report is very positive—certainly a lot of (if you will excuse the expression) "food for thought"—and we will be looking more closely at it. There are a lot of very useful ideas there and those are my comments on the subject.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. The Chair recognises the Attorney General, Mr. Mark J. Pettingill.

You have the floor.

Hon. Mark J. Pettingill: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I will not be long. There has been a lot said; a lot of comments in relation to this very thorough and important report that has been presented to the House by the Minister.

The immediate area that falls under my particular ambit in my Ministry is the FIA, or the Financial Intelligence Agency, and also the Financial Crime

Unit, which ties in with that. I do not have direct responsibility for that, of course, but it all comes under the umbrella of economic security. I am very pleased and encouraged with the progress that has been made, Madam Deputy Speaker, in relation to this area.

I get the impression that perhaps that particular section of the report was written at a time when the new amendments to the Proceeds of Crime Act were being put through. So in relation to the areas that the report touches on with regard to the advancement of the recovery of funds, of course, we now have the significant amendments to the Act that have created the Civil Asset Recovery Authority. That is something that we have been recognised for by our colleagues overseas and the manner in which we have put that together.

Last week I was at the Ukrainian forum in London, where I was invited to moderate. It certainly was a testament to the fact that Bermuda is recognised as being at the forefront; a significant player in this area perhaps compared to other jurisdictions who are not on the same page, or not as advanced with regard to their civil asset recovery enforcement provisions or their POCA [Provision of Crime Act] provisions. And the issue there is it is not just a case of having the legislation, the regulations, the authority, but it is also the case of implementation. So I am very pleased with the progress that we are making in this area and I anticipate and I am optimistic that this is going to be a big year with regard to the activities of those particular functioning bodies.

It is important, particularly as we move into an area where in this coming session we will be bringing gaming enabling legislation before the House. We will need to ensure and in fact are ensuring and have been ensuring throughout the process of even being in Government and looking at this that that area is very, very tight because the one thing we cannot afford to have is the activity of grey operators because that does not do any good for the jurisdiction. You know, grey operators, where we have to ensure that people that are not of the right background or have criminal convictions in other jurisdictions are not involved in our gaming industry in Bermuda. That is a big no-no. We have to ensure that we do not have cash operations that are not well regulated that will allow for cash money laundering and so on.

So with the onset of the potential for having resort casinos or resort casino gaming and the regulations that will be involved in that will also come under this umbrella. We will have to have a new advancement of our economic security because when you become the new boys on the block it is every kind of shyster on the planet can be looking to say, *Can we take advantage here?* and we want to have the flag go up very, very early to say no shysters allowed; that our regime is going to be such that you cannot get in here. That will go across the board to cover the whole

of the gaming industry to ensure that we are recognised as having a very strict and responsible industry; that it accords with the very highest of international standards and that our regulations are particularly clear with regard to what can and cannot be done.

Of course, that will all have to be brought into very, very careful play with the regime that currently exists with regard to the Financial Intelligence Agency, asset recovery, our anti-money laundering legislation and the like.

So I guess I am giving a foreshadowing coming out of this report because we know what potentially is coming with regard to what we have been working on for some time. Of course that includes licensing, having an authority that is independent that issues licences and this type of thing to ensure that there is no questionable activity whatsoever by any individuals either here or from other places in the jurisdiction. Certainly, the regime that we will be putting in place that will tie in with that economic security I anticipate is going to be recognised and we intend to have it recognised as right up there with the very best of regulatory regimes in the world. That is in following on from what is recommended in this report, some of it has already been done, it is already in play (I am pleased to say) and the rest is certainly going to come in to line with the very highest of international standards.

So I commend the Minister with regard to the work that is being done. I think this has been an important study for us to review. It is pleasing to hear that we all seem to be *ad idem* with regard to the direction that we need to move in a number of areas that, you know, an ounce of prevention beats a pound of cure. The sensibilities that are obviously brought to play with regard to what our needs are, albeit as a small country. The one thing that I did discover last week was despite the fact that we are small country, we were at that particular forum and can be recognised as a world leader in particular areas with regard to our organisation and how we get things right.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Are there any other Members?

The Chair recognises Mr. Jeffrey—Jefferson C. Sousa from Warwick West.

You have the floor.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Good afternoon, Madam Deputy Speaker. Yes, that is Jefferson Colby Sousa.

[Laughter]

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Thank you.

I, like my colleagues who have spoken before me, wish to congratulate the Committee that has put the National Security and Defence Review together and, of course, the Minister of National Security, Dep-

uty Premier Michael Dunkley, for bringing this to the House.

I would like to touch on a couple of things that I am very familiar with (going to page 5 in the document) under Department of Immigration. I am happy to see here "Develop appropriate mechanisms to monitor visitor lengths of stay in Bermuda. The Department of Immigration must develop appropriate mechanisms to monitor the length of stay of visitors." This is something that I have spoken to the last five Ministers of Home Affairs in regard to.

I do have a suggestion here (which I have mentioned to the Minister), that each person in Bermuda that holds a work permit has a card which would be the size of a licence and it would have all the particulars of what is on their immigration document. There have been examples. I personally know of people, for example, that were working at the Berkeley Institute site that came to me and told me they had been working in Bermuda for three months illegally. Likewise, I know of people who worked at the airport cleaning for three months and at KFC every night illegally. This needs to stop because obviously this affects our people and their positions and jobs. There are situations now where this is going on. I have just reported one myself to the Minister and likewise mentioned it just yesterday to the Chief Immigration Officer, Dr. Ming. I would hope other Honourable Members in this House do the same thing.

Moving on, I would like to touch on Department of Parks on page 10. Hurricanes have and always will threaten our lives. That just comes with the territory of living on this most gorgeous place on earth. It is critical as has been mentioned here that the Department of Parks have on hand the needed trucks and, in particular, chainsaws that will be ready to clear the roadways so that our citizens can move about, tourists can get to the airport and so on. This is critical. Equipment needs to be in a lock-up and not used for anything else other than for a national crisis.

Of course, having been in the trade and being involved with Hurricane Fabian and Hurricane Emily, I know what it is all about. That is critical that that takes place. Of course, the Department of Parks, they are the front line in clearing up our roads. This certainly is a situation where we need to plan ahead, think ahead and be ahead.

Moving on, on page 11, Office of Occupational Safety and Health, here I feel we need more teeth. We need more inspectors that can monitor projects Island-wide. I do feel that the inspectors do a great job with the large projects on the Island, and we all know which ones they are. But when it comes to the medium- to small-size jobs I have great concerns there having been a contractor for the last 30 years myself. There are many situations, as an example, where personnel are not using hardhats on a hardhat job site, alcohol and drug abuse on job sites, working on job sites in the evening with low light with danger-

ous equipment. These are all things that should not be taking place, and it is about protecting the citizens of this country. Of course, we also see cases where you have employers that are forcing certain employees to do jobs that they are not trained to [do] and some of them have left Bermuda in a box. This is sad.

So those are the things that I wanted to touch on today, to add to this debate in the House, and again I would like to thank those for doing this very thorough document.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Are there any other Members that would like to speak to the motion the National Security and Defence Review?

There are no other Members. We will continue.

Are there any other motions being raised today?

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

C.W. Brown, you have carried your motion as well?

Mr. Walton Brown: Yes.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

R. Wayne Scott is not here so we will carry that over as well as he is not present.

[Pause]

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

The Speaker: Members, we have just completed the Motion by Mr. Dunkley, and I have been made to understand that Orders Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are to be carried over. Is that correct?

All right. Then, Mr. Premier?

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move now that we adjourn until May 16th.

The Speaker: Until May 16, yes.

The Chair will recognise first the Member from Sandys [North Central], MP Dennis Lister. You have the floor.

JETGATE

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to my feet this evening (or afternoon . . . yes, evening now) . . . I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance in that the reason I am rising is a matter that I wish I did not have to rise on. In the 25

years that I have sat in this Chamber the issue that I am rising on, Mr. Speaker, is probably what I consider one of the low times in my time here in Parliament.

I rise to speak to the current climate in reference to the extended issue around—and I will use the word that it has been named under—the whole matter of “Jetgate,” Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker, in the time that this matter has been in this Chamber and in public here, I have intentionally stayed out of the matter only because I did not feel it was of the level of interest in the best interest of the country of what the issue of the matter was, Mr. Speaker.

[Crosstalk]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise now because it is time. It is time. It is time, Mr. Speaker, because now it has gone on far, far too long. It has gone far too long because some of the basics of what should have been handled already, should have been responded to early in the stage continue to be ignored.

The matter started in a way where had it simply been disclosed early on where it was brought to the public’s attention or to the attention of this House, we may not even be where we are today with regard to this matter if the individuals who had been involved had simply gotten up and given a clear explanation on what had happened.

The initial understanding of Jetgate was one that individuals—three Members of the Government—took a flight to meet with an individual and took (as we all know by now) a fourth person, who was not a Member of Government, with them. If we had gotten a response from the Government at that time that gave some explanation—it was a new Government, a new Premier, new Members involved—it could have been seen that as new Members it was a simple error in judgment. It could have been taken as a simple error in judgment had we been given a clear explanation right from the beginning and they could have gone to bed by now.

But, Mr. Speaker, it has just dragged and dragged and dragged too long. As I indicated, it started with three Members of this House. But as time goes on, the [matter] is painted with a broader brush as time goes on because the lack of disclosure, the lack of dealing with the matter in the way it should be dealt with now starts to paint other people as part of the picture. The silence that is given to it almost condones it, Mr. Speaker.

When I speak to the silence I speak to the silence of the Government itself in the way in which this has been handled in trying to ignore the issue, trying to dance away from the issue. And as I look

across the floor and look at the Members on the other side, I look at a lot of Members who are first-time Members of Parliament. I look at a new Government, Mr. Speaker, and a new party who campaigned on a slogan of transparency. They are over on that side as Government because their whole campaign and slogan was about transparency. It was about a new breath of fresh air, Mr. Speaker, that would take away any innuendos of wrongdoings as a Government and innuendos of corruption—all those things that we heard coming from that side were in their campaign, Mr. Speaker.

As time goes on we now find ourselves in a situation, Mr. Speaker, where we are painted worse than we were prior to this only because the time was allowed just to drag way too long. Way too long. As I look at those Members over on that side, Mr. Speaker . . . and, unfortunately, I am speaking to an almost empty bench on that side. We had a quorum called earlier today, Mr. Speaker, and all the Members on this side of the House were in their seat. When the quorum was called, Mr. Speaker, I think there were five Members on the frontbench and one Member on the backbench on that side when the quorum was called from that side. Very strange.

We stand here now and we are talking on this matter and I am speaking to an empty Chamber on that side. If I look on this side I see all of my seats, all of my Members but one is in their seat.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Six . . . five Members.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Five of their Members? It is five of their Members here, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for correcting me. Five of their Members—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Six, six, six.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Five of their Members, thank you.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, my point is this—if all of their Members were in their seats, I am prepared to say almost to a man if I went up and down the row back and front and named those Members and asked them, one on one, did they sign up for this type of Government—they signed up for transparency. That is what their whole campaign was, Mr. Speaker. They called for new fresh air because they had painted a former administration in a different light. Their whole campaign, Mr. Speaker, was we are going to be transparent, we are going to be upfront,

we are going to be above board, there is going to be no underhanded dealings—none of those things.

Mr. Speaker, if I had known that they were in their seats, I could call on . . . the only ones I see in the backbenches are Mrs. Susan Jackson, Mr. Sylvan Richardson—

An Hon. Member: Richards.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Richards. And Mrs. Atherden—backbenchers who, I am sure, are all new names, new faces to this Chamber since this election who signed on for a new direction that was going to be given.

An Hon. Member: Good governance.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Good governance—that is the word I was looking for—signing on for good governance and credibility.

Mr. Speaker, as this thing has dragged on the question now becomes Bermuda's credibility, Bermuda's good governance. Bermuda's transparency is being put to question. Mr. Speaker, we cannot fix it on this side of the House. That side of the House has to own up to where they are, where Government has been placed, and decide it has to be fixed.

Each of those Members, Mr. Speaker, when they get up and look in the mirror every day they have to ask themselves, *Is this what I signed up for? Is this what I signed up for?* Because as long as they sit there and quietly let this thing drag on, they are guilty by association—every one of them! It may have started with three Members, Mr. Speaker, but now each one of them are guilty by association because it has dragged far too long and every time we get a little piece here and a little piece there it all contradicts, Mr. Speaker, what we were told previously.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: It is contradicted, Mr. Speaker. We do not know what the real truth is because when we are led to think that this is the truth, the next person who speaks gives us a spin on that.

An Hon. Member: A contrary story.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: They are contradicting each other, Mr. Speaker. The only way to fix that, Mr. Speaker, is for them, in turn, to look at themselves—each Member—and decide, *Is this what I signed up for? Is this the transparency that I campaigned on when I knocked on the doors of all those voters who voted for me?* When they campaigned and told their voters that there was going to be a new day that they had to change the PLP, change the Government because the PLP (as they were trying to paint) had lost its way when it came to good governance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, surely this is not an example of good governance. Surely. The campaign of transparency smells, Mr. Speaker. It smells awful. It has gone to a point where we cannot tolerate the smell anymore. We cannot tolerate it, Mr. Speaker.

I understand from the media that there is a big retreat to take place over the weekend. Mr. Speaker, I would expect that out of that retreat that as a group they would look in the mirror and look at themselves and say, *Where are we as a country having our reputation muddied again because of bad governance?* Muddied again because of lack of transparency. Muddied again because [they] have allowed this thing to drag and drag and drag and drag far too long.

It is time, Mr. Speaker. The only reason I am on my feet is because it is time. It is time. I said when I started that this is uncomfortable for me to get on my feet on this matter. I have stayed out of it for the months and months that this thing had dragged on in the public and in this House but it is time. It is time now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this to go on any further because of Bermuda's best interest. Each of those Members have to look at themselves in the mirror, Mr. Speaker, and realise that the country is bigger than each and every one of them. Nobody over there, Mr. Speaker, is bigger than the country. This issue is above any one of those individuals. It is affecting the country. We have a backbench, Mr. Speaker, a frontbench, Mr. Speaker, who we all understand what Cabinet means—it is collective responsibility.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Collective responsibility. You cannot dance away from this any longer. Each of those Ministers, Mr. Speaker, when they are sitting around Cabinet table have to decide if they are going to be painted as part of this or if they are going to be painted as fixing this. At this point they are painted as being part of it because they have allowed it to drag far too long. Too long. Too long. Too long. Too long!

This is not a situation or a time for them to be silent. This is a time for them to stand up and say, *This is not what we signed up for. We signed up for a new day and new sense of better governance.* This is not an example of that, Mr. Speaker. This is not an example of what the country was expecting when they saw a new Government come in. This is not an example of the campaign, Mr. Speaker, of transparency. It has to be fixed, Mr. Speaker.

It has to be fixed, and each Member over there—each Member—is duly bound to either accept that they are part of this problem by keeping quiet; duly bound to accept that they are part of this problem by allowing it to continue to drag; duly bound to accept that they are part of the problem if they keep accepting these little parts of truth, Mr. Speaker (my words, “little parts of truth”) that keep coming out here and there and then be later contradicted as not being what

we were told was in fact the truth, or the way it actually happened. If the noise of the addressing it comes from this side of the House—as it has been this side—or if the noise comes from the public, their silence is still condoning it.

An Hon. Member: Mm-hmm.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Do not let the noise to fix it continue to come from this side. Do not let the noise to fix it continue to come from the public. They have to look in the mirror, Mr. Speaker, and say, *My silence has now painted me as part of this*. It is not just three Members who were involved with it. It is now every . . . how many are there over there? Seventeen?

An Hon. Member: Nineteen.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Nineteen. It is all 19 of them, Mr. Speaker. All 19 of them are now party to this. All 19 of them are guilty by association.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when crimes happen—I am using that word—when crimes happen sometimes people will find themselves before the court not because they committed the crime but because they are part of the cover up.

An Hon. Member: Accessories!

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: They are part of the cover up. Accessory after the fact.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Yes?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here—

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER
[Imputing improper motives]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Yes, the Honourable Member is starting to impute improper motives to a degree which is not warranted.

[General uproar]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Members, Honourable Members!

Carry on, MP Lister.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very careful to keep this out of being personal and calling any names personally. I have used examples, Mr. Speaker. As you know, Mr. Speaker, if I committed a crime and I allowed you to help me bury that crime or to hide that crime, you, Mr. Speaker, would become guilty by association, or of covering up the event. That is the simple example that I used, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: And Mr. Speaker, I am going to move on.

The Speaker: Yes, just . . . okay, good.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: I am going to move on, Mr. Speaker. I think the point—

The Speaker: You could have used another example, but I understand.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: I will move on.

The Speaker: All right. Carry on, carry on.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker, the issue that I am trying to drive home while on my feet as a senior Member of this House is that this is a low time in our history. It is a low point for me in my 25 years, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: And yes, I am glad you made reference to that.

I am glad that Member made reference to that, Mr. Speaker, because when we had an issue in our party. We stood up on that side and we dealt with it even in this Chamber. We addressed the leader of that day when we felt that it had gone too far. Mr. Speaker, I believe you were part of us who stood up on this floor and addressed it.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: So, it is time, Mr. Speaker. It is time for those now to get that type of backbone and stand up and fix their problem. They have to look in the mirror and say, *Am I going to be guilty by continuing to cover this or am I going to say it is time?* Because the country is going to suffer and continue to suffer if we allow this type of governance—the lack of good governance—bad governance to continue to ramp it through.

It is simply, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity that was lost from day one. They simply could have got up

and said that there was an error of judgment made, as young, new Government Members. *Here is what happened but let us go forward. We were doing what we thought was in the best interest—we went the wrong way and go forward.* But we have not even had that type of real explanation provided. We have had little bits of the story. We had one Member who said this and another Member who went in a public forum and said something totally contrary. And we get between what was said and why this—

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: There you go.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: It is why I try not to go . . . but these guys almost got me there. But no, Mr. Speaker, it was why. And, Mr. Speaker, the gap needs to be closed. The truth needs to come out.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: They need to just put it on the table and admit that there were wrongdoings—

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: —and let us get back on track and go forward. But it can only be done by each and every Member of that side—each and every Member when they go home and they look in that mirror, Mr. Speaker, they have to ask themselves, *Is this what I signed up for?* Because that is not what you campaigned for. You campaigned on a campaign of transparency. You campaigned on a campaign of good governance.

An Hon. Member: Trust.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: It is far different from where that should be, Mr. Speaker. We are totally on the opposite side of that spectrum where we are today. If they honestly, honestly truly deeply within in their hearts believe that they stand for transparency, they stand for good governance then they cannot allow this to continue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke East, MP Roban.

MP Roban, you have the floor.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this seems like it started in the same place it began. It did not start with the group that is constantly tagged with the mess that they inherited.

The Speaker: Do you have the microphone on?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Yes, my microphone is on.

The Speaker: Okay.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: It did not start with the group that the people on the other side constantly label with the mess they inherited. It did not start with the group that was tainted with corruption and lack of good governance and other things that Members on the other side like to associate with Members on this side. It started out there by some citizen who decided that what they learned they did not like. Mr. Speaker, this citizen must have thought it was smelly. Not only is it as wide perhaps the difference between the Honourable Members on that side on this issue is as wide as the river Jordan but it is as smelly as the Ganges.

[Laughter]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: That is what we have seen. But I say, again, it started out there. The information, after a whole year of us being labelled as interfering with the good governance of the country, Mr. Speaker, and as a party that does not want to see them succeed because we are talking about this stuff again . . . somebody out there, independent, brings more information to the eyes of the public, telling us more about the same issue. It was not us, Mr. Speaker! As the song says, it was not me! It was not me! It was not me! It was somebody out there who felt principled enough—

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walter H. Roban: —honourable enough, and enough duty, Mr. Speaker, to tell the country what they were told was going on. That is what brings us here, and what brought my honourable colleague here to raise to his feet—the Honourable Member who has been here since 1989, who successfully represented constituents in Sandys and they brought the Honourable Member here to represent what is right.

The Member got on his feet to talk about what is right and what is right is that this information has been given over to the public. What is wrong is the attitude of the whole other side and how they dealt with it. We have seen inconsistency to inconsistency. Revelations of one thing different from what we have been told by the Honourable Members of this House. That is the seriousness of this matter. At some point, as my honourable colleague has said, somebody has to look in the mirror and decide, *Where are we going?*

Is this what I signed up on and what am I going to do next?

Most of those questions are going to have to be asked by the Members on those benches because this has not been good, Mr. Speaker. It has not been good for this House. It has not been good for the country. And despite all the efforts to go out there and sell Bermuda as a place open for business . . . is this the type of business we are open for? Is this the type of business we are going to be open for, Mr. Speaker? I ask the question because this is not the business anybody in this House, I believe, signed up for.

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, I ask again, is this what Members of this House signed up for—to be constantly presented with revelations of this manner. Inconsistency to inconsistency? One thing said here, something said somewhere else totally different, as around the matters concerning this issue.

I think it is a fair question to ask, Who are we supposed to believe? Because the chain of events as we have seen them and what we constantly hear gets more disturbing with each point. This is not any information that we on this side have decided to cook up. And you know there are some pretty good cooks on this side. But this type of cooking is beyond our capability. First of all, we do not have the control of the strings of Government to make promises to people that cannot be delivered because it seems like some promises were made to people that they could deliver certain things but the delivery may not be able to be made.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: And I am not repeating anything that I made up. This is what has been reported in the public domain.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: So we have to ask some questions. And I agree with the Honourable Member, Dennis Lister. The Members on that side have to ask themselves some real tough questions as to what they signed up for. Is it for this? Is it for all that they have heard over the past year? Is it for the inconsistency of information? I am curious, Mr. Speaker, if any of them will stand up and defend the leadership of the party—their leader—around this.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: That is what I am . . . you know, I think that is what the public is looking for.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Members, let us not be calling Members by their first names or the like. Let us be respectful. You have, you know, you will have an opportunity to speak. You have the forum and let us use the forum that you have if you want to make a point.

Carry on, MP Roban.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued by the silence considering the evidence that has been presented to the wider community and certainly we have heard certain chirping—not only in this House but outside—about the value or the reliability of anonymous sources.

Well, hey, anonymous sources have done some interesting things. They brought down governments. They brought down presidents of the most powerful country in the world. They revealed things like the Pentagon papers. They have done some things that have actually benefitted this world, you know, good governance.

An Hon. Member: Deep Throat.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Deep Throat!

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Anonymous sources have played a real value in making sure that certain things were revealed to the public that was in their interest. So to actually discount them . . . it is fine. But the world of journalism operates on its own rules. Not on the rules of political figures who might be trying to deflect attention to the real issues that are being raised about certain things that have happened and people going to the realm of anonymity because they are trying to protect something because the environment they are in might be so toxic and so dangerous that that is the only way they can get out the truth. Are we not all here to know the truth, Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House? Is the truth not more valuable than anything else?

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, we all should want to know the truth.

An Hon. Member: It will set you free.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: And it is important that Members on that side be prepared to stand for the truth.

An Hon. Member: It will set you free.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Stand for the truth! That is what is important. But over the past year the truth has been lacking around this issue of Jetgate because we keep getting different stories. But the truth ultimately should be revealed.

I hope, ultimately, the truth is out because certainly, as my honourable colleague just before me said, that was the hallmark of the campaign—good governance, transparency, accountability. Just those three words alone seem to crystallise what the then-Opposition, the One Bermuda Alliance, sought to bring to the country because they were arguing that it had been lacking. They have hammered that same argument for the past 14 months. As I said, they keep referring to us as the group they have to clean-up from—the group that left a mess.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems as if another mess has been accumulated. It seems as if there is something else that is dirty and that dirt has nothing to do with the Progressive Labour Party. It seems to be dirt that has been taken by the shovel and thrown right into the House of the One Bermuda Alliance—right on their floor—and they are going to have to clean it up because people keep coming in to the House and asking, *Why is it so dirty?*

[Laughter]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: *What is wrong?* Because every week they hear something else. *When are you going to clean it up? How are you going to clean it up?* I actually believe that your supporters want you to clean it up.

An Hon. Member: Absolutely!

Mr. Walter H. Roban: But it seems like your vacuum, your Hoover or whatever machine you are using, is just not working. Whatever machine you are using . . . you need to go turn it in and get a new one because it is not cleaning very well. The dirt keeps coming back. It keeps coming back out of the filters and coming back and going back on the floor again.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Well, maybe it can, but whether there is the will or the leadership to do it we have yet to see that because this dirt has been accumulating since March of 2013—revealed in May and continued then on.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Well, it may have but that is when we first heard that it was done.

Then we hear it might have started even earlier than that. But all I can say is that I am only going on what I have been seeing. I am just like a member

of the public, Mr. Speaker, I have no special knowledge. I do not know anybody in Maryland. I do not know anybody in any city who knows anything about this. I only know what has been reported here by independent sources outside of the political realm. That is what I know and because I am PLP does not make me special. I am just like every other member of the public wondering what is going on.

When are we going to hear the truth about this? When are the Members on the other side going to decide that they want to stay true to what they told the country they were about—the good governance, accountability, transparency? because this issue titled Jetgate cannot be labelled as the greatest hour of the One Bermuda Alliance. Whether it be the questions of the code of conduct, whether it is getting on a plane for potentially somebody who might want to invest in Bermuda, whether it is whatever might have happened with monies that are suggested in the recent reports—none of it can be seen or said to be the finest hour. Irrespective of your drive to bring in business because a week or so ago we had a march on this House by a group of citizens led by citizens concerned about the country and most of the response that we heard from the Government was, *We are looking to drive the economy so that jobs are created. Bringing investment!*

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: This is what is going to help the country turn around, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I think that there are limits to how you take on this role because if this is an example of the drive, this is driving the country into the ground when it comes to reputation because let us face it, we are living in the Internet world. It is no longer the case where stories are generated by the [Royal] Gazette, buried by the Gazette or any other publication. This is worldwide live! So people out there are reading this. And irrespective of what people want to say, former politicians who want to say that it is all not credible or whatever, guess what? The international world reads what they read and they will take it as they see it and value it on what is said. And value it based on the credibility of the sources that have provided it.

That is what they do and perhaps it is the most purest form of journalism. It is not filtered, it is not inhibited, it is not in any way over managed. And guess what? We all have been victims of it on both sides of this House. And when I say “victims”—information gets out there you have no control over it. It gets out there and people’s perceptions go where it is going to go. There is nothing you can say. You can be prince, potentate, Premier, CEO or whatever. Guess what? It is already done unless you make the steps to clean it up. That is it. But as I have said, the clean-up job for the past year has been insufficient,

Mr. Speaker, and we are still stuck—just days ago—with allegations written with a credible hand.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: In the opinion of many people in this country who expressed their view on this.

An Hon. Member: Boo!

An Hon. Member: Wow!

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: And, of course, the chirping will reflect the denial, but it is not just me. They can say what they want to me, Mr. Speaker, because I am just one person and I am not professing to have any special knowledge here but it is what it is. There are people out there who have looked at this and have decided that they do not like what they see. Not because they do not think it is credible but because they are afraid that it is credible.

[Laughter]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: And they fear that it is credible. And they fear that the behaviour of the One Bermuda Alliance since January of 2013 proves that it is credible because of their lack of listening to the people—doing things that the people are not happy with. Reversing promises—

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member—

The Speaker: Honourable Member?
Please have a seat.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: The Honourable Member is misleading the House to even suggest that the One Bermuda Alliance is not listening to the people of Bermuda.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you Premier.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, over 2,000 people who were counting for equality jobs and justice kind of intimated that might be the case last week.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, but I will not go there too closely because that is not the issue that we are here today. But it is a fact! It is a good fact. It is a real fact, again, they do not have to listen to the 15 people that are sitting over here, Mr. Speaker, which they often do not do anyway—

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: They can—but there are thousands out there who had their own voice and mind and see things for what they are and come to their own judgment. They are not stupid, Mr. Speaker, the thousands out there who we all have to go to talk to and communicate with at some level. They are not stupid. They see what they see. They understand things—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: They know something is fishy—not to insult the fish—or smelly, when it comes by them. And this has been smelling for almost a year, Mr. Speaker.

So I will come to the conclusion of what I am saying following the leadership of my honourable veteran Member of Parliament from the west, Dennis Lister, and the line that he is taking and the strength of his statement today. They need to take a real hard look at themselves, Mr. Speaker, because this is not just about three people who went away on a plane, you know. It is about 19 people who came to this House based on promises, based on a pledge that seems to be crumbling at its foundation. And until they reflect and recognise that that is the case, the problem may continue.

They may be able to salvage it and they can figure that out because I do not profess to be a genius at such things. But it is not genius that takes one to reflect or to come to an understanding and to take a hard look at oneself. That is not genius work. That is human work. They are going to have to do that in the upcoming period if they are going to expunge the stench that this issue continues to permeate on the organisation and the leadership and the Members of Parliament of the One Bermuda Alliance.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke Central, the Shadow Minister for Immigration. MP Walton Brown.

You have the floor.

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon colleagues.

Like my honourable colleague, Dennis Lister, Mr. Speaker, this is my first public comment on what

has been dubbed the Jetgate affair. My comments have been prompted by what I consider to be a very heavy and dense cloud that has descended upon this Island this week.

This cloud hovers precariously over this Government. This cloud came this week in the form of an insightful, detailed and provocative article well researched by a journalist with some 20 years' experience, Mr. Ayo Johnson, through *Think Media*. Mr. Speaker, the details contained in that report are dramatic to say the least. That report should have been widely disseminated throughout this country. The newspaper that deems itself the newspaper of record saw fit not even to cover it. The most profound allegation against the Government the newspaper, which considers itself the newspaper of record, had not one sentence about it.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walton Brown: So I am glad there is a level of consensus on that, Mr. Speaker, because it seems very clear to the case that you cannot be a newspaper which examines issues of great national importance then why should you be considered a newspaper of record.

Now, there have been comments ever since that article was published, Mr. Speaker, by people who are clearly One Bermuda Alliance supporters. And we have heard comments this evening in this Chamber where the first effort, the first attempt, is to discredit the source, to discredit the story. Let us just go a little bit back into history, Mr. Speaker, because there are some who would like to ignore history altogether but history provides the foundation for our greater understanding.

There is a long history, Mr. Speaker, of using anonymous sources in journalism. Journalism is not a court of law where one puts forth evidence that is to be cross-examined and so forth. Journalism is an effort to get at a truth where powerful forces like to conceal. In a Government, in a large corporation, you have very powerful figures who would like to conceal the truth. So it becomes the responsibility of a journalist to get at that truth.

An Hon. Member: That is why you have freedom of the press.

Mr. Walton Brown: So freedom of the press is sacrosanct in democracies. Tin-pan dictators criticise authors and journalists of insightful articles, Mr. Speaker. But when you denigrate the free press, when you denigrate the journalists who are doing their work, what are you saying about your commitment to democracy? Democracy does not just rest in this Parliament, Mr. Speaker! Democracy permeates this Island. The media, before the state, are considered to be an important component of a democratic society and

what we have here of late, Mr. Speaker, is a condemnation of the media because people do not like what is uncomfortable in a story.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the most famous case of political journalism in the last century. That, of course, was Watergate—the Watergate matter juxtaposed with the Jetgate matter. You had two hard-working journalists who worked at the *Washington Post*, Woodward and Bernstein, *All the President's Men*. You know the book; you know the movie. All of you know it. They had an anonymous source who gave detailed information that was corroborated by a number of points that existed in the public domain. And that is what an anonymous source does. You put the dots together.

Deep Throat, who just passed away I think a couple of years ago at age 90, provided information that the public benefitted from because there was corruption going on at the highest level in the United States Government and Deep Throat had a responsibility, an obligation, to ensure that the truth came out. So I look at Ayo Johnson as a Bermudian rendition of Woodward and Bernstein.

It is interesting . . . and you hear all these little comments. I wonder if we are here for a serious debate sometimes because here we are trying to discuss this issue of great national significance and you have these immature comments from Members who clearly have not matured enough to be able to enjoy and engage in a proper debate in Parliament. Ayo Johnson, when he was a reporter for the *Royal Gazette*—

An Hon. Member: We loved him.

Mr. Walton Brown: He used to irritate the PLP Members in Government.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walton Brown: I had Members in Cabinet come to me and say, *What is Ayo's problem? He does not support the PLP?* He was doing his job. He was fundamentally committed to the truth and it mattered not to him whether that truth hurt the PLP, the United Bermuda Party or the One Bermuda Alliance. So let us not criticise the messenger. Let us assess whether or not the information that he has provided is somehow connecting some of these dots that are out there.

We know there are some facts that have been presented to this Parliament, Mr. Speaker. We now have to question whether everything that has been presented to this Parliament has in fact been factual. That is what we have to ask ourselves. I know that a conscience has been pricked among many Members in the One Bermuda Alliance. You can be pompous and put your chest out on the floor of Parliament, of course. I guess that is something that some people consider to be part of the game of politics. But in your

moments of quiet reflection when no one else is around, when you do not need to impress the audience whether here or in the radio land, Mr. Speaker, or anybody else—in your moments of quiet reflection tell me, say to yourself, ask yourself, *Does everything feel about right? Is there a level of credibility in the report put forth by Mr. Johnson?* He has no axe to grind. He has no axe to grind.

To dismiss it just because his sources are anonymous is very dangerous. Very dangerous, because what happens then if the anonymous sources become public? Then what do you say? What do you do? Be careful. Be careful. Do you want to find out what really happened? Or do you want to try to destroy an argument because it is uncomfortable. Or do you want to take on the messenger?

Mr. Speaker, everyone who is elected to this House has an obligation to their constituents and an obligation to the country. We are not here to carry out an agenda that is contrary to the interests of the people. The public has a right to know what transpired with Mr. Landow and the Government. The public has the right to know whether or not everything that has been presented to this Parliament has been accurate because what has been reported in the *Think Media* story is a sharp contrast to what has been presented. One of the rules of thumb for good journalism, investigative journalism, which is very, very new to this country . . . I can assure you, one of the biggest criticisms that I had with the media over the decades is that they did not engage in investigative journalism. It was a very, very rare occurrence. I know it is because of resources. It is a very, very rare occurrence for there to be real investigative journalism in Bermuda. But here you have it—a reporter who flew to DC to interview people. So let us say Mr. Johnson went to DC and fabricated comments from people.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: Is that what you are saying?

An Hon. Member: That is what they are saying.

Mr. Walton Brown: That a reporter with 20 years' experience investigated a story, will go to Washington, DC and fabricate quotes.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Walton Brown: Is that what you are saying? And so the question becomes to what extent do you want to take as truth what he said? Investigative journalists—

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Mr. Walton Brown: —you do not put—

The Speaker: Just a minute, Member. I cannot hear you. People are talking across the floor. I cannot hear you.

Mr. Walton Brown: Very disrespectful.

The Speaker: Yes, exactly. You are making a presentation and I wish Members would just be respectful.

Mr. Walton Brown: We are trying to learn them up. They do not always pay close attention.

The Speaker: Yes. Carry on.

Mr. Walton Brown: But, Mr. Speaker, one of the rules of thumb of investigative journalism is that you have, at the minimum, two distinct sources to verify your comments. If you are going to make an allegation about the Premier of a country or a Government Minister, you better be very sure that you have your stuff factual. So the rule of thumb is to get two independent verifiable sources. There are other pieces that have not been published to date (I understand) because the author has not been able to get double verification. So if and when he does, he will publish that as well. So let us not attack the messenger. Let us assess what is being presented because these are very, very serious allegations.

I would like to hear more from the Premier other than a flat denial of one aspect of the relationship with Mr. Landow. There are a series of other comments made. We have not heard anything substantive from the Premier. But we want to hear from this Party. We want to hear from this Party. I do not want to hear smug indifference. I do not want to hear, *We will dismiss Ayo because he is not credible.* That is not an intelligent and informed debate.

Mr. Speaker, on an issue as important as this, we need to hear from people and I want to hear from those on the other side who in moments of quiet reflection are reconsidering what they are here for, what their purpose is. Now is the time to stand up. Now the time to assess clearly and locally what your purpose is in this Parliament. All of us have a role to play and I can assure you it has not simply to mimic the position taken by any one individual.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable and Learned Member from Sandys [South Central], constituency 34, MP Kim Wilson.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have already heard this evening about the One Bermuda Alliance's platform when they were campaigning prior to the election concerning issues of accountability, integrity, zero tolerance of unethical

behaviour of public officials, clear guidelines and what constitutes corrupt practises by Parliamentarians. They also spoke about the need for full transparency and their willingness to work as a Government to be open for the people to see.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that it is very hard for me (and I am working on it) to distinguish myself insofar as wearing my legal hat when I appear in court and then on the other hand wearing my parliamentarian hat. What do I mean by that? Mr. Speaker, though I may not be appearing before a court of law, we as parliamentarians do appear before the court of public opinion and from where I sit, Mr. Speaker, the public jury have far more questions than answers—this particularly as it relates to the Jetgate.

Mr. Speaker, please allow me to go through the information that is currently in the public domain concerning the Jetgate saga, particularly for the edification of the public jury. We already heard that on March 20th the Premier, the Honourable and Learned Attorney General and the Honourable and Learned Minister of Tourism boarded a privately owned jet owned by Nathan Landow, a Maryland-based casino developer.

This trip (we have also heard) was made without the knowledge of the Cabinet. Only after the press released the above information and questions were raised in this Honourable House some two months later the Honourable Premier decided (and many members of the public jury would say was compelled) to give a statement to both parliament and the country concerning the said trip.

Now you may recall also when being pressed the Premier indicated that the purpose of the meeting was an exchange of information meeting. However, you also may recall, Mr. Speaker, subsequent to this revelation in late March during question and answering time the Learned and Honourable Attorney General admitted to us that the purpose of the meeting was for potential development meetings, so therein lies the contradiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of law there are certain principles that apply for evidential rules and so forth when you are arguing a case and I think, with respect, that these particular principles can be used and can be applied here particularly for, again, the jury of public opinion.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: There is one such rule that they refer to as prior or previous inconsistent statements and basically what that rule provides is that the witness makes a previous inconsistent statement—makes one statement on one day and then makes another statement another day then they are permitted—there are certain rules of evidence that permit them to be cross-examined on those statements. Again, it is called previous inconsistent statements. It

is similar to you asking a child a question and they say, *No, no, no mommy. I did not do that, rah, rah, rah.* And then a couple of days later it slips and there is an inconsistent statement. Well, that rule of law is something that I would think the members of the public or, again, as I like to refer to them, the jurors of public opinion should consider particularly as the events of Jetgate have unravelled.

Then there is another legal principle, Mr. Speaker, that relates to basically a judge's direction and he speaks to the jury. This is when there is evidence or the information (but they call it evidence, of course, in a court of law) is presented and the evidence is inconsistent. So the judge reminds the jury they are allowed to weigh the evidence. *You have heard one person say this and you have heard another person say that and as members of the jury, you are permitted to use your careful analysis based on your own common sense and look at all the factors and you make the determination as to what seems plausible, what seems true and what seems false.*

Now we have already heard some comments today about the whole issue concerning the breach of the code of conduct with respect to section 19.1—the Ministerial Code of Conduct, too, at the time the Learned and Honourable Minister the Attorney General indicated he was not aware of this particular breach. Needless to say we have already spoken about this responsibility and of the Ministerial Code of Conduct. If you would permit me to read it, Mr. Speaker, section 19.1 says, "It is a well established and recognised rule that no Minister or public servant should accept gifts, hospitality or services from anyone which would, or might appear to, place him under any obligation."

Now, I would respectfully submit that, you know, maybe a gift of a coffee mug bearing the title USA . . . Hmm. But a jet ride to Washington, DC, staying in a Four Seasons hotel? That, to me, strikes a "hospitality, gifts and services." But needless to say, Mr. Speaker, we have had that conversation before and I do not want to digress.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: I just wanted to remind the members of the public what the Ministerial Code of Conduct says.

Mr. Speaker, we heard again that on March 13th there was this trip to Washington, DC. Now, during that trip we also heard from the Honourable Premier that that was his first contact Landow was shortly before the March 13th trip. We have heard that. However, herein reveals yet another inconsistency insofar as the evidence for the public jury to consider. As per what we have heard from the article of Ayo Johnson in www.think.bm, it states that the source sometime in the fall of 2012 as Bermuda geared up for the official start of a brutal general elec-

tion campaign, Premier Cannonier approached Landow asking for a campaign donation. The source said that Craig just came to the group and said, *Look, we have a chance to win this election. We are close. We are in favour of gaming. Let us do it.* Landow and his associate obliged wiring \$300,000 to the One Bermuda Alliance—

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson:—within 24 hours.

The Speaker: All right, just—
Honourable Member?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is completely misleading the public—listening audience. It is absolutely imputing—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please sit down, sit down.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier:—and it is unfounded. Completely untrue.

The Speaker: All right, thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Honourable Member, carry on. What I would like to say is to ask Members to please stay . . . we have been going along quite well, and I think we want to stay away from imputing the fact that—yes.

All right, Honourable Member, you carry on.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Excuse me, yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

However, with respect, the objection concerning imputing improper motives, I would certainly disagree with. I am simply reading from—

The Speaker: You can disagree with it as much as you would like, Honourable Member, if that . . . you know, as the Speaker, once I have come to a decision, that is what will stand. But you can continue on. I am asking you to continue on but you need to stay away from that particular point.

So carry on.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Point of clarification?

The Speaker: Yes?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: This is a member of the press, who is also part of the press council, who has re-

ceived his certifications so that he can attend press conferences . . . this is a press release by a member of the press and, as a point of information, I wonder what the difference is between us revealing and speaking about matters of anonymous sources from the *Royal Gazette* as opposed to another source who operates his own press mechanism called *Think [Media]*. With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, as a point of information, if you could provide me with the—

The Speaker: Just carry on.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: When the question was put to the Premier—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Again, members of the public, the jury, must be asking themselves . . . sorry, excuse me. So on March 13th, again, we heard . . . Sorry, Mr. Speaker. In any event, the issue I was at previously was concerning the quote from the . . . from the . . . Think Bermuda *[sic]* indicating the One Bermuda Alliance and the \$300,000 (that is where I was) being wired to an account of the One Bermuda Alliance within 24 hours. Then—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Honourable Member.

Honourable Member, just sit down.

Why are you standing up? Honourable Member, please someone else is standing. If you will—yes?

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: These are allegations and the Member clearly, by reading them, is giving credence to them and imputing improper motives to a Member of this House. I thought you had made a ruling on this, Mr. Speaker. It is really unacceptable.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, let me just—

Honourable Member, just hold a second.

Let me say this. I think it is important that when you speak that it is clearly indicated that this is in fact, you know, it is an unnamed, unknown source and I think

this is important to point out and that this is a matter that is unproven. I think that is important that this matter be made clear. And you can continue on, but it is important that this is understood in that way.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the appeals—the desperate appeals—of Members opposite like Dr. Gibbons who are trying to avoid scrutiny in this Honourable Chamber of what is already in the public domain after a year!

The Speaker: Honourable Member—

An Hon. Member: He is imputing!

The Speaker: Honourable Member—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, a year of questions and disrespecting this Chamber. All my Honourable Member is doing—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, I have just ruled, so please! I have ruled and I have told the Honourable Member how she can continue on. I think I have made it clear how she can carry on. But I think it is important, as I pointed out . . . I think it is important, as I pointed out, that these are in fact matters that are unproven but the Member can carry on. But it is important to understand that.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

So, again, we have heard that on March 13th there was this particular trip and some two months later it was announced in Parliament after revelations from the press and what is also troubling and I am sure the jury of public opinion should be asking themselves: Why did it take some eight months later, namely February 2014, for the Honourable Premier to admit that yet there was a fourth person on this jet—a gentleman by the name of Stephen DaCosta, his close personal friend and manager of his fuel stations? Again, members of the public jury must be asking themselves why it took so long for this revelation to be made.

Mr. Speaker, we also found out that this gentleman, Mr. DaCosta, was a civilian as was revealed during question time in late March by questions posed to the Honourable and Learned Attorney General. Herein lies yet another inconsistency that I ask the members of the public jury to think about. When the question was put to the Honourable Premier his comment was that DaCosta was simply hitching a ride to

the US capital. I can hardly say that without a smile—*hitching a ride to the US capital.*

However, when the Premier was questioned later about whether DaCosta attended the meetings with Landow and his associates the Premier denied this stating, "No, of course not. Of course not."

Now we also know—that is in Hansard—two days later one of my, probably one of my favourite radio talk show personalities, I still call her Sherri J., but on the Sherri Simmons Show we were blessed to have as a guest the Honourable and Learned Minister of Tourism, Shawn Crockwell, who, when asked the same question (whether or not anyone else was present at these meetings with Landow) he admitted that DaCosta was there. Therein lies yet another previous inconsistent statement. We ask the members of the public jury—they have to weigh up the facts.

Needless to say . . . let me continue. On the eve . . . members of the jury of public opinion must review these facts. I have just been brief on a couple of the inconsistencies—there are plenty, plenty more but because I know my time is running short—how much time do I have?

The Speaker: Just over six minutes.

IMPORTANT ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Okay, because my time is running short I am going to leave that area. I think I have done enough.

I would like to take a second tack, so to speak. On the eve of Mother's Day, Mr. Speaker, permit me to speak a few moments about the important role that women vis-à-vis—sorry, mothers vis-à-vis women play in our society. You can call me a sexist. However, please allow me this because women hold up our society and hold up our socially acceptable morals as [per] the Bible.

Now, many jurisdictions throughout the world have often witnessed first-hand the huge benefits and contributions women make particularly in positions of political power. In addition to their contributions to actively promote the benefits of gender balanced politics, when women are empowered whole families are empowered. It benefits the whole society. It is a ripple-down effect and studies also confirm that women in politics are far more collaborative, problem solving, enabling and consultative.

Now I believe that we are surrounded by mothers and women of integrity in this Chamber. My very first summer job at 19, I was employed at the hospital and I worked directly in the office of MP Jeanne Atherden. She was my boss. I have also had an opportunity to work with her in the Senate and I could see first-hand her experience, her intellect, her compassion, and her commitment and honesty.

Minister Pat [Gordon-]Pamplin—I have known her since the late 1980s. I know she is a very strong

woman of faith, a very committed mother (as are all these women). She is a stalwart of St. Paul's Church. We are part of the balcony crew attending church every Sunday looking down—well, not looking down, but from the balcony—and I know particularly she and her family and her roots, that she, too, is a strong woman of character and integrity.

I can also speak the same for MP Susan Jackson. Look at her lineage, her bloodline—her mother and her father both. Again, no question, women of integrity. And I can also say the same for my personal knowledge with respect to MP Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, and, finally, my friend and legal colleague, who I know operates on integrity and fairness and honesty as her guiding principles.

However, there is one rule in politics that applies to both sexes. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that women as the minority percentage of our legislature are held to a higher account of this rule, and that is the rule that action is less important to perception. There is a Pew research that was done. That is a well-regarded US institution on research. They did a survey and they questioned people about eight important traits of leadership. American women ranked higher than men in intelligence, compassion, creativity and honesty.

That said, I am personally imploring my fellow female legislators to set an example and ask some serious internal questions within the caucus of the OBA. The circumstances of Jetgate and the inconsistencies which I have outlined, and the referrals that I have mentioned insofar as the refusal to provide answers to questions, et cetera, need to be challenged. And I am imploring my female colleagues to do just that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Minister Shawn Crockwell.
Minister?

JETGATE

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of my favourite movies is *Groundhog Day* where the actor Bill Murray relives the same day over and over and over. It is quite interesting because he is then able to adjust his behaviour in anticipation of what was to come. But it feels like—in this House, on this issue—*Groundhog Day*. We are having the same debate over and over and over.

You know, the Honourable Member who started this debate said that we on this side are dragging this matter on and on. But the fact of the matter is—and understandably so, because I have been in the Opposition. The Opposition is dragging this matter on and on and on, Mr. Speaker, to the detriment—

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. E. David Burt: The Honourable Minister is misleading the House. The Opposition is not dragging this on. There was an article that was published on Wednesday that has brought this issue to the forefront again.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Carry on, Minister.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member . . . I am going to focus, because we can go to Hansard. I have spoken on many occasions. We can go to Hansard and read my previous comments, and I am going to do my best because I tend to get a bit emotive when I speak, particularly in defence. But I have to take issue with references such as the Honourable Member Mr. Dennis Lister [made] when he was drawing analogies to a crime being committed and a cover up and accessories after the fact and the like.

What I find interesting about that analogy, Mr. Speaker, is that . . . and as well as the Honourable Member that just took her seat, the Honourable and Learned Member. She was referring to juries and referring to the presentation of a case. What is most important if you are going to talk about a crime? What is most important (if you are talking about the presentation to a jury) is evidence! It is evidence! That is what is important. And in your ruling you were right, that the article that is being referred to today lacks any scintilla of evidence.

Let me just say that I do not have any personal issue or beef with Mr. Ayo Johnson. I never have. I have never had an issue with Mr. Johnson. He is a reporter, he is an investigative reporter. And you know what? Normally when you are an investigative journalist you are going to ruffle feathers from time to time. I understand when people have to do their jobs—whether it is Gary Marino or whether it is Ayo Johnson. I have no problem with that. And we have heard today that he has 20 years' experience and the like. And, you know, I think that is important to the discussion because we are not talking about . . . and I heard someone say that he flew to Washington.

My understanding was, when he was asking me questions, that he had these conversations via the phone. If he indeed flew to Washington, Mr. Speaker, I believe that enhances the final product in this. And the questions of the final product is we have an investigative journalist with 20 years' experience who has been working on this story for eight months and what we get is an unnamed source and not one scintilla of

evidence. Nothing to corroborate—not an e-mail, Mr. Speaker; not any additional individual to corroborate the story!

And do you know what? From day one—from day one—we have been hearing, *you have two weeks left; three and a half weeks left*, so forth and what not. No, no. I am being serious. We have been hearing these comments, and I have been sitting there expecting something serious to be revealed.

An Hon. Member: You already know!

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I was looking forward . . . I wanted to read this thing. I have been hearing about this story that has been coming for months that was going to bring the Government down. And I see this report and I am looking for the substance. I am looking for the substance, Mr. Speaker. So, my response is, Mr. Speaker, produce the evidence.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Produce the evidence!

We have been discussing this matter for a year. For a year! March of last year, and whenever it was first discussed in this Honourable House. For a year we have been coming to this Honourable Chamber, we have been hearing from the Opposition time and time again on this issue and we have not seen any evidence.

I am asking today—produce the evidence of wrongdoing so we can move on. If you do not have evidence, then cease and desist!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Cease and desist, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Honourable Member just interpolated *breach of Ministerial Code of Conduct*. We have heard the Honourable Member who just took her seat go back to the fact that the Ministers received gifts and the like. I have addressed this already, and I am going to talk about, again, the trip to Washington, DC.

I forget the date (March 13th I think I heard today). We are going to address it. Because, Mr. Speaker, yes, I was there. Of course, I was there and, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing untoward about that trip, about the meetings that took place with a potential developer—absolutely nothing. Nothing untoward took place.

Government went and met a developer who was interested in developing in Bermuda and he had questions and we had a long discussion with that developer. How is that wrong? Now, I have already said taking a jet there was bad ascetics. We accept that. We accept that.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing different, nothing different at all than [when] the former

Minister of Tourism . . . and we have been through this already—it is in Hansard. And I do not fault the former Minister for receiving a trip paid for by a developer—first class. And I understand that there was an offer of a jet and it was turned down. Been around politics longer than I. But the first-class ticket to Las Vegas was paid for by the developer. That is a gift, Mr. Speaker!

That is a gift, and I am sure the accommodations that the Honourable former Minister of Tourism stayed in were paid for by that developer. No different, Mr. Speaker, and they discussed the potential of development in Bermuda. And I wish that it bore more fruit. I wish that it bore more fruit because that is how we are going to get development in this country. The days of sitting here expecting the developers to come down and say, *Please let me in*, are over. Mr. Speaker, they are over.

That is why we have been declining for 20 years. That is why we have not had a major hotel development in this country for years because we still think that the rest of the world is trying to bang down our door to come here. They are not. And we have to go over there and engage with them and try to persuade them to invest in our country.

So I have no criticism of the former Tourism Minister—none whatsoever—[for] going over to Las Vegas at the expense of the developer saving this Government money. But it is hypocritical to come to this House time and time again and say that our efforts doing the exact same thing, very similar, but yet somehow we are breaching the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: But when . . . the Chairman of the Tourism Board. Okay?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Look, we can have . . . I have no issue. I accept the comments that the Honourable Dennis Lister said in his opening remarks that certain things could have been done differently. No question, Mr. Speaker. But when you focus on the core aspects of this discussion let us move on from the fact that if the Honourable former Minister of Tourism did not breach the Ministerial Code of Conduct then neither did we. You cannot have what you did be acceptable, and we do a similar thing and all of a sudden now all hell breaks loose. So I am confident, Mr. Speaker. I was there. Nothing untoward took place on that trip.

An Hon. Member: Are you sure?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Now, Mr. Speaker, a taxi driver stopped me just a few days ago—in fact, it was

either the same day or the day after this story was published and he came to me and he said, *Mr. Crockwell, I need more business. He said, I am struggling. My business is struggling. It has been struggling for a long time. I need more tourists. I need the season to be extended.*

He said, *Please, can you get your colleagues and the Opposition Members to work together long enough to turn this country around, to get things back to where it needs to be? Then, when you have some spoils to fight over, you can go back to fighting.* Because he is not that interested, Mr. Speaker, in all of this mess.

And do you know what, Mr. Speaker? I believe that. And I have had to live the reality that if you make a mistake you have to pay the price. You have to pay the price. I have lived it. I have lived it. So, if there are mistakes, Mr. Speaker, there are allegations—

[Gavel]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not worried about the Honourable Member. I am not worried about that Honourable Member, you know.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, yes.

What we know is that the Opposition has, from day one, been trying to put a wedge between Members in this Government and Members on this side of the House. I am not distracted by all of that. That has been their single focus from day one. It is 19 to 17, now 19 to whatever it is—15 over there—they are trying to reduce our numbers. I understand that. But what the people of this country . . . and do you know what is interesting? I have been listening to the Sherri Simmons show. Yes, I have been listening. And what is interesting is normally when I listen, you have what I consider to be a situation where it is like the preacher is preaching to the choir. You have all sorts of hallelujah and all sorts of amen and I found it interesting that when I was listening to the show, I found that there was some challenge on this issue because people were calling in saying, *Where is the evidence?* They were calling, they were saying, *Okay, there are allegations but what is collaborating and corroborating these accusations? Do not expect me just to accept and believe that some unnamed source, Otitoju—*

[Laughter]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: *Do not ask me to accept that Otitoju said this and I am going to believe it.*

There is nothing to substantiate it. Nothing!

So, Mr. Speaker, I am saying to the Opposition—because if there are things that I do not know and if you have evidence of wrongdoing—produce the

evidence. Otherwise we need to move on for the good of this country.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from constituency 36, Honourable and Learned Member, MP Michael Scott.

You have the floor.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

It strains the credibility of everyone on this side of the House and anyone that is listening in the public that a Minister who holds a senior post in the Government of this country would stand and declare to this House as a Minister who is all-knowing (because he is a Minister), as a Minister who was present in Washington with the Learned Attorney General—the chief law officer of the country—with the Premier . . . it strains credibility that this level of knowledge on the part of the Minister still finds this Minister of Tourism, the Honourable Member, standing and calling for eyewitness evidence to be presented to him before he says that he accepts [that] the allegations require an explanation in the public life of this country. It strains credibility.

We have heard the Honourable Member from Pembroke. Mr. Brown plainly put the matter. We are not in a court of law. We are in a court of public opinion first and, Mr. Speaker, allegations and unsourced or unrevealed sources have the greatest possible strength. They do not provoke guilt. That happens in the court. They provoke in the constituency of this House where we are accountable and certain Ministers of the Government are accountable to this Parliament.

It provokes the necessity for the Government and its lead Ministers to stand and give an explanation just as, Mr. Lister, the Honourable Member who first spoke on this side of the House, just as his brother in the public domain has said, there is a requirement to come to the country and give an explanation.

Mr. Speaker, there are (and I cite my source) in the *Bermuda Sun*—on the front page of a newspaper that is in the common parlance of our country—very serious allegations. They are about allegations, Mr. Speaker, but they demand an explanation. And for a Minister of the Government who was actually present at the scene of the very allegation—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order.

The Speaker: Honourable Member—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order!

The Speaker: Honourable Member.
Honourable Member, yes, carry on.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member needs to retract that statement.

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Because I was not present at the scene of anything that was untoward.

The Speaker: Right. Thank you. Honourable Member.
I think I can accept the Honourable Member . . . so if you can just—

Hon. Michael J. Scott: I am not sure that my—

The Speaker: Rephrase, rephrase.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: I am not sure that my friend is interpolating properly because I did not put him at the scene of any place untoward.

The Speaker: All right. Okay, fine.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: I said he was present, and it is a matter of wide public knowledge now that the Learned Attorney General and the Chief Law Officer . . . There were three Ministers, one of whom was the top Minister—the Minister of Tourism, the Attorney General and the Premier—that went to a meeting in Washington. And today's revelations, or the revelations of *Think Media* . . . and I am thrilled to stand and put on the record in Hansard—*Think Media* and Ayo Johnson—a journalist of repute who has now revealed fresh information to this country.

It also appears on the front pages (as I was beginning to say) of the *Bermuda Sun*. Here is the allegation, with your permission, Mr. Speaker. This is what should be provoking an explanation. The top Minister, Mr. Premier, has made a response in this paper but these allegations require a response in this House and an explanation in this House. This is exactly what the Honourable Member, Mr. Terry Lister, said because we are here to uphold the public affairs of this country. And here is the evidence . . . you want evidence? You want evidence? It is here, I have it in my hand. You all have it.

"Politica a new media outlet launched by local journalist Ayo Johnson is reporting the Premier allegedly" (*allegedly*, so he is being fair) "misrepresented his dealings with Nathan Landow a wealthy real estate mogul . . . from Maryland." (Later.) "The most controversial part of Mr Johnson's lengthy reportage alleges" (that the Premier) "met with Mr Landow in March 2013" (Mr. Landow owns the Dulles Jet Centre.) And the Premier "asked the businessman to give him \$2

million as 'facilitation money' to market the casino issue."

And then it later goes on to explain that there was a request, and we have heard it said by my colleague, Ms. Wilson, that there was a request also for \$300[,000].

Mr. Speaker, that is enough of an allegation, and however much it pains all of us, that is enough of an allegation—on the front page of a recognised newspaper—for there to be a cry and a howl for standing and explaining . . . denials, whatever. Deny it on the floor of Parliament. If it is found to be true, Mr. Speaker . . . if it is found to be true and your denials are disproven, you have committed a huge offence . . . a huge offence. This is why it is important that we hear from our Government.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the Minister of Tourism, has not been frank with this House in his statements of the last 10 minutes when he said there was nothing untoward. He has admitted on the Sherri J Show that he was completely concerned—I will read it—completely concerned about the presence of Mr. DaCosta, a non-political person, in the meeting. And we all are concerned about that. That is what brought the Opposition to its feet. That is what brought the Opposition to its feet asking reasonable questions in this House. So you were right to be concerned. It was untoward. It was a number of things.

Mr. Speaker, can I give the legal framework here?

An Hon. Member: Please.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: We have had the reference to . . . it was Lord Viscount Cranborne on Lords Hansard who produced in 1997 the proper framework for the general principles by which Ministers must conduct themselves. It is there for good reason. This is what it says. The most important one is that: "It is of paramount importance that Ministers should give accurate and truthful information to Parliament, correcting any inadvertent error at the earliest opportunity. Ministers who knowingly mislead Parliament will be expected to offer their resignations to the Prime Minister (or the Premier in this case);

"Ministers should be as open as possible with Parliament, refusing to provide information only on disclosures that would not be in the public interest."

So the defence of public interest is the only reason why they should not disclose. This is what the Honourable Member Mr. Lister is asking for. This is what . . . and when Mr. Lister asks for it, and when my colleague, Mr. Dennis Lister, asked for it, it is reasonable because we are asking for it on behalf of people who have been asking questions—the court of public opinion (as it was referred to by the Honourable and Learned Shadow Minister for Health, Ms. Wilson).

We are not asking for this to make points or to skate into Government. This is a (as the Honourable

Member Mr. Lister has said) very serious allegation. And so for the first opportunity on that side of the Government benches for Mr. Crockwell to stand [and] be evasive again is most disappointing. Most disappointing. And why is it disappointing? Because, Mr. Speaker, these codes of conduct, in framing the legal context of what we say is the problem and the offence here, the code should be read, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, this is reading the Viscount Cranborne's principles.

The Speaker: Go ahead.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: The code should be read against the background of the overarching—

The Speaker: You are reading from where, Honourable Member?

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Yes, I am reading from the General Principles of the Codes of—

The Speaker: Conduct for Ministers?

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Yes, Conduct for Ministers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The code, Mr. Speaker, "should be read" against "the background of the overarching duty on Ministers to comply with the law" (first point) "including international law and treaty obligations . . . to uphold the administration of justice and to protect the integrity of public life. They are expected to observe the Seven Principles of Public Life set out" in the final report of the Committee's Standards in Public Life. And then we have them and those seven principles have been adopted into our Ministerial Code of Conduct.

And I think that the most poignant one is relevant to what has been happening in this House, in particular focusing on pronouncements that have proceeded from the frontbench of the OBA Government, about inaccuracies, understatements, not being frank with you, Mr. Speaker, this House, Members of the Opposition, and, by extension, the people of this country. We have isolated inconsistencies or inadequate dealings with the truth. They have been economic with the truth in this House and this is wrong. And the principles of Parliamentary Codes of Ministerial Conduct require that we not be.

Here is the other principle that features as relevant to these discussions during this Motion to Adjourn and it is the Parliament Act 1956 [*sic*] and it provides with language that is headed "Acceptance of bribe by members [*is*] an offence." That is the context—

The Speaker: That is our Parliament Act?

Hon. Michael J. Scott: That is your Parliament Act—

The Speaker: [Of] 1957?

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Or our Parliament Act of 1956.

The Speaker: [Is it] 1956 or 1957? It should be 1957.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: [It is] 1957. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Madam Clerk.

The first section 15 provides, "Any member of either House of the Legislature who asks, receives or obtains, or who attempts or agrees to receive or obtain, any bribe, fee, compensation, gift, reward, or other property, or any other benefit of any kind, for himself or for any other person upon the understanding that his vote, opinion, judgment or action upon any question or matter arising or expected or likely to arise in that House or in any legislative committee—(a) is to be influenced thereby; or (b) is to be given in any particular manner; or (c) is to be given in favour of any particular side in any question or matter, or that he should absent himself from that House or legislative committee, commits an offence."

So that is the Parliament Act 1957. "Punishment on summary conviction" (of these offences, the commissions or omissions results in) "a fine of \$50,000" (on a summary conviction) "or to imprisonment for 5 years, or both; and on conviction on indictment: an unlimited fine or imprisonment for 15 years.."

And so when the Honourable Member Mr. Roban used the analogy of criminal behaviour, we were entirely within our remit to refer to offences under this Act, Mr. Speaker—entirely—because this is how serious it is. Ask for any kind of benefit, any fee, any bribe. The article links directly to this section 15. The allegations in the article link directly to there being an allegation that Mr. Landow was requested, was asked for a campaign finance donation, but more grave and egregious for \$2 million to facilitate the casino marketing exercise.

Now this requires an explanation to the people of the country and this is why we stand on this side of the House, not characterising this article from Mr. Ayo Johnson and *Think Media* as a sideshow or a rehash or, as the Minister of Tourism just said, this is a *Groundhog*-type of experience. This is new information. And in any kind of procedure if fresh information comes to bear, it accelerates and requires, certainly in public life and the life of Ministers, a full-blooded explanation.

What is difficult about this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that the observance of section 15 of the Parliamentary Act—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER*[Misleading]*

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: I know the Honourable Member is not attempting to mislead the public concerning this matter when he talks about a response. A response has been given to these allegations and flat outright refuted. He speaks of a full-blooded response—

Hon. Michael J. Scott: In the House.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: —which is a lie that has been propagated and has already been refuted.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Premier.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Yes. My point . . . that was a speech. My point is that this House—this Honourable House—is owed an explanation. We may get it, but this Honourable . . . we should have had it. We should have had it a long time ago. And it should have been a point by point so that—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER*[Misleading]*

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Again—

The Speaker: Honourable Member—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: —the Member is—

The Speaker: —have your seat for a second.
Carry on, Premier

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: —misleading the House.
He quotes from the paper and uses allegations that are in the paper and says there should be a response. He did not make the allegations; the paper is there making the allegation, or the author of these allegations is in the papers making these allegations and it has been replied to.

So maybe he needs to read that.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: He is quoting from the paper.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Carry on now, Member.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Mr. Speaker, what is particularly concerning and unique about these arrangements in this Bermuda context of this most unsavoury issue is that the very person, the top legal advisor of the country, who really by now should have called for a thorough investigation into this . . . that is what I would have done as Attorney General.

Hon. Mark J. Pettingill: With respect, with respect, he would have done that—

The Speaker: Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER*[Misleading]*

Hon. Mark J. Pettingill: That is misleading.

I am going to rise on that because if he were to be Attorney General he could not do that. If there was some question of criminality which he was citing, that would be a matter for the DPP. And on the basis of what the allegation is, nobody would be interested in pursuing that because there is no legal foundation to do so.

The Speaker: All right, thank you.

Hon. Mark J. Pettingill: That would not happen; he could not do it.

The Speaker: Thank you, Attorney General.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: This is a house of politics, and the court of public opinion and politics require what I have just said and urged on the Learned Attorney General. They ought . . . and this is what is difficult. The very person, Mr. Speaker, who ought to be guiding his fellow Ministers and his Premier on any occasion (and certainly on the occasion in March in Washington) about the observance of [Ministerial Code] Section A 1.(v), which I read to you, Mr. Speaker (about being truthful and frank with the House, the very observance of the offence and provisions of section 15 of the Parliamentary Act), he is the very officer who should be guiding his Ministers in these matters of the law. He was the very Minister who was right in the middle of this meeting and so has conflicted himself completely and utterly.

You were in Washington.

He was on the plane, he was in the meeting with Mr. DaCosta, he . . . and I come back to my point. By now people in this country all know that there has to have been a high level of knowledge shared between the Attorney General and Mr. Crockwell, possibly with the entire frontbench of the Cabinet and the Premier of everything that took place. And yet we have had no . . . coming to his feet in this House for

seven . . . 129 days (I have counted ever since) . . . For three months and nine days the Attorney General [has been] standing and assuring the country from a legal—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Yes. Hiding behind *sub judice* does not cut it.

The very person who should be guarding, who is the steward of guiding and managing the risk of breaching our laws was right in the middle of the meeting with the . . . where the laws (the allegation is) were breached.

Is this the reason why we have not heard from the Learned Attorney General? We have heard from Mr. Crockwell, who today was evasive. This is the difficulty; this is the unique problem that we have with this incident. It ties the hands of the top law officer in our country and this also compounds this problem that we have in our country.

When the Premier spoke out a moment ago, what we are asking, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier was that there not be a blanket denial. That is not good enough. This was written for him by Mr. . . . his consultant—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Grearson.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Mr. Grearson.

There needs to be a point by point . . . if there is not an investigation called for, where we will get point by point contradictions or countering of these allegations so that people feel that the matter has been finally put to bed, you can be sure that this matter will droll and drag on until that happens—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Until it happens.

I think I have said my piece. I think those are the matters that I wanted to deal with.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Does any other Member care to speak?

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Junior Minister, Sylvan Richards.

You have the floor.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to see that the Opposition is waiting with bated breath for my comments, Mr. Speaker. It is always nice to know that I am appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the Honourable Member, MP Walton Brown, from constituency—

The Speaker: Do you have your microphone on, Honourable Member? Is your microphone on?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Okay.

The Speaker: Thanks.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: How is that? Is that better? Okay.

I feel compelled to respond to everything that I have heard this evening, Mr. Speaker. In particular to my good friend the Honourable Member, MP Walton Brown, constituency 17, who asked the backbenchers, the MPs, if during our moments of quiet reflection, when we have looked at ourselves in the mirror . . . and I have done that over the last few months since this story broke. I have asked questions and I have received answers. And I can stand in this honourable place in front of this microphone that I know many people in Bermuda are listening to and I can say without reservation that I am at peace with what I have heard from my Premier, from fellow MPs of mine, regarding this whole situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had the pertinent conversations with the individuals to express my displeasure over some of the decisions that have been made. And because of those decisions we find ourselves discussing something that (as the Honourable Member who first spoke said) has been going on far too long. I believe that the majority of Bermudians out there who are struggling to get by in this current economy would much rather have their elected representatives discussing issues that are really important to them and to us as a country. Issues such as how are they going to pay their bills? How are they going to support themselves without a job? How are they going to protect their sons and daughters when they move along the highways and byways of this country? How do we improve our tourism product?

These are the issues that the people who I speak with . . . and I read the blogs every now and then. They want us to deal with the people's business, which leads to this latest report that I knew was coming down the pipe for months. We all knew something was being put together by a very experienced reputable journalist in Bermuda. And I read that report yesterday afternoon. I took some time out and I read the report with a very open mind.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Yes, with a very open mind because I seek truth.

An Hon. Member: All right.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: And if I am going to stand up—

An Hon. Member: Go for it.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.:—and defend anyone, I need to be convinced in my mind that I am being told and am hearing the truth. So I read the report with a bit of trepidation (I might add) because I did not know what it would contain.

I started to read the first page. I got to page five, and I kept reading. When I got to the end it struck me—there is nothing there. There is nothing there! Unnamed, anonymous sources . . . some character named Otitoju I mean, in all honesty, Mr. Speaker, I did not see anything there that would make me lose sleep at night, or question my Premier. It reminded me of that Wendy's commercial from years back where the lady says, *Where's the beef?*

Where's the beef?

There was no beef. So I put that report aside.

Then my mind was cast to why is the Opposition continuing to beat this issue to death? Why are they riding this horse through the desert until it drops dead in the sands? And I know why they are doing it, Mr. Speaker—because that is all they have. That is all they have, Mr. Speaker. This one issue, as a result of what I consider, in my opinion, to be a poor decision to get on a jet. So they do not want this issue to go away.

I understand why they do not want it to go away. If I was in their position, maybe I would use the same tactic that they are using. *We are going to beat this thing to death. We are going to talk about it and talk about it. We're not going to let it go—even though there is nothing to hang our hats on.* There is nothing there!

And it is, Mr. Speaker, a distraction to all of us—not just to the Government. It is a distraction to the Opposition because we are not dealing with the people's business. I am sick of it myself. I am tired of people stopping me on the street (I have said this before) that I do not know asking me for a loan. I am tired of people saying, *My son or my daughter cannot go here and there because they might get shot because they are affiliated with some gang.* These are real issues.

This is not an issue. This is a distraction, a sideshow, and, more importantly, the only thing that the Opposition can attack this Government on.

I went to the people's campaign meeting up at Spice Valley a few weeks ago with my Honourable Member MP Sousa. Reverend Tweed spoke and he said (and I am paraphrasing) something to the effect that the Government and the Opposition need to focus on the people's business, not Jetgate, and not Phonegate.

The Speaker: Phonegate? What is Phonegate?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Well, obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition did not get the memo.

The Speaker: Oh.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: They are going to talk about this thing and talk about this thing. And I know for a fact there will have to be one or two Members sitting across the aisle, across the other side of this red carpet, who are sick of talking about it also. [They] have to be because I know there are good people over on that side that want to get on with the people's business as much as I do, and as much as my fellow MPs want to get on with the people's business.

So I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping . . . I am an optimist by nature, I see the glass as half full. I am hoping that after tonight this issue will be put to bed because there is nothing there. I read the report. There is nothing there. No amount of whatever we are talking about here tonight . . . it is a waste of time! And the people want us to get on with the business of governing. Enough is enough.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not a man who just likes to talk on and on. I think I have made my point. I would encourage and challenge this Honourable House to get on with the people's business. Things are too dire and things are too serious for us to continue this soap opera—in Spanish, a telenovela—that is what this is, it is a telenovela. The only thing that is missing is the dramatic music, Mr. Speaker. It is nonsense.

I would reiterate what the Honourable Tourism Minister said, if you have some real evidence—I mean evidence, like corroborated, like a video tape or an audio tape, something—then bring it forward. If not, you are chasing your own tails.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Devonshire the Shadow Minister for the Environment, MP Glenn Blakeney.

You have the floor.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Thank you and good evening, Mr. Speaker.

I find . . . well, first of all let me state that the breaking of this story, I would like to take the credit on behalf of Magic and Sherri, as I am sure I would like to take credit too. But the story was actually broken by Gary Moreno who I consider to be one of the most credible journalists in this Island. And I find the contribution by the Opposition, the Government Members who have stood to their feet so far this evening to be literally appalling to try to dismiss this as insignificant.

This, in my 10-plus-year tenure in this Honourable House, is the most significant of issues that I have ever had to contribute to as a debater.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: This is even more significant. They talk about the Uighurs. That was a humanitarian situation. This is something that goes to the heart of trust in the Government relative to someone—

The Speaker: Honourable Members—

[Gavel]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —making decisions as the leader of the country in conjunction with two legal attorneys—two attorneys. One the highest legal officer in the country, who obviously did not either understand the consequence of the action relative to the interpretation he has of the Code of Conduct.

And then there are others that want to go down the road of justification by saying if we did it, you did it too, and who is worse? Two wrongs have never made a right. And so if you are going to stand up and talk about principle and transparency and your legacy being the ones that have nothing to hide in the scrutiny of public sunshine, how, then, are you going to adopt the same untoward behaviour you alleged the former Government to be acting in . . . or acting out? How? How can you try to justify a wrong by doing something that is even worse?

And I will tell you something, the manifestation of the consensus of the country was as a result of the people's campaign led by the committee under the stewardship of one who, in the House this evening, the Reverend Tweed, nobly on principle has said we need to be about the country's business. But you cannot do that without the fundamental being based on truth and in truth and all truth.

When we ask questions to get to the heart of the truth and we do not get answers, then, when we do get answers, they are contradicted by a team member of the same party who throws his Leader and the Premier of the country under the bus, publicly, and then they have selective memory, they cannot remember how long an individual who has nothing to do with Government business is inside a Government meeting without civil servants . . . now if that does not get to the heart of integrity as a Government, what does? In the House of Commons in the United States Congress they would not even have to be asked to resign. They would offer and tender their resignation as soon as it was leaked.

[Inaudible interjections]

[Gavel]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: This is serious business. Yes, people are suffering, children are suffering, families are suffering. I can speak personally. So I am up here to be about the people's business, but not with some nefarious allegations that no one wants to speak to with truth, that no one wants to answer with

truth. And they talk about emotive? Of course! That is why the people took to the streets with their feet—because they were emotional, because they did not know what else to do except to show strength in numbers that they are dissatisfied.

We, as an Opposition, took the lead in challenging the Government of the day on all of the policies we did not agree with to bring it to the people so that their hearts could feel, their minds could understand, they could speak with each other to each other and then take action as the people, which we, the Opposition, respect. When we were out at the Town Hall meetings, there were very few—and some meetings none—Government members there. We did not come out shouting to the top of our voices we did not see them and try to denigrate them because it was about the business and just hearing for ourselves what we already knew and stood in this House defending in the interests of the public—in the interests of the public. And that is why I am so glad we have a Reverend who has a social conscience—

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —to have him articulate the sentiments of what he is experiencing in this country via the airways of Magic every Sunday.

Here are a couple of other points. And let us get some clarity. Because if you are going to say there is credibility with the journalists, how could there not be credibility with his message? How?

So let us start here from the report: "A disturbing account has emerged of the Jetgate four's last moments on US soil after meeting with Landow and his associates in March 2013. Take-off was delayed at Dulles Jet Centre" (a Landow-owned facility) "because Cannonier" (our Honourable Premier) "and the developer were engaged in a conversation in a separate room from the rest of the group."

Does that conjure some kind of curious mind to say, *Well, what were you discussing?* Is it true, is it true, Attorney General?

I have something else to ask.—

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Is it true? I will yield. I will yield. Tell me.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, you speak to—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I am speaking to you.

The Speaker: You cannot, you cannot—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I am sorry.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, you cannot ask questions on that for clarity or whether that is so.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I apologise.

The Speaker: You cannot do that. You know that. So, please, carry on.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Okay.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I will yield [for] clarification. I will yield.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I will go on. Okay. Okay, Attorney General, I will go on.

"While Cannonier has denied" (this is another page) "any involvement in Bazarian Landow approach the anonymous source told the reporter that a meeting occurred between Cannonier, Landow, Bazarian and DaCosta shortly after the Jetgate affair."

That is critical information! They left several messages (the reporter and his team of researchers) for Carl Bazarian. He did not return the calls. DaCosta refused to speak to the reporter about the story. But a local source close to DaCosta's business dealings corroborated the information the reporter published. (Which I am now reading.) "that he attended a meeting with Bazarian, Cannonier and Landow in Washington, DC. The reporter agreed to the local source's request for anonymity because he feared a sensitive business relationship with the Government of Bermuda might be jeopardised if his name and identity was revealed."

Is it true? I will yield.

I am just asking a question because an enquiring mind wants to know—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, you—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —on behalf of the people of the country.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes. I will yield for clarification; not an answer, just a clarification. Give me a clarification Attorney General.

Hon. Mark J. Pettingill: Do not pose that question to me. I . . . obviously you know I was not there. I know nothing about that, so do not pose that question to me.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yeah, yeah, yeah, but you know there is collective responsibility. And as a law officer—and the highest one in the country—you would be bound to enquire just for your own sake so that you could protect, if protection was needed, or

say, *You know what? That is out of order and here is what the consequence is going to be. I will resign from Cabinet if you do not adhere to my counsel.*

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: But that is the kind of thing.

Now \$300,000 . . . who is the campaign fundraiser of the OBA? Do you know anything about the \$300,000 that is *alleged* to have been given? And if it has not been received and it was given, where is it? Where is it?

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Not me, you know. I am just a conduit to the people via the airwaves of the Honourable House of Assembly on 105.1 FM, and I am asking for clarity so that the people can have a legitimate question asked, if there is any validity to the question in the first place, which it seems it is because these sources seem to be credible enough for a reporter with 20 years' experience to feel it valid to report and publish *after* consulting with attorneys. Because you know what? He understands you guys being so braggadocios, challenging people under the immunity of the House of Assembly to go public in articulating what they experienced, *allegedly*. And if they do so, you will have no issue with suing. So are you going to sue *Think Media?*

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Are you going . . . I am just asking a question. And if you are not, why?

Why? That is contradictory right there. Why?

So it goes back full circle, 360 degrees, to trust and there is a deficit in the country. People do not feel comfortable with any [of the] 36 politicians, and I take offence to that because of my contribution to my country notwithstanding my personal challenges.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I would not have been elected under the cloud of grey controversy had not the people in my constituency believed that I would represent them to the best of my ability, notwithstanding. And that is why I am emotional. It is not personal except to the 65,000 people in this country, guests, guest workers, and Bermudian residents, whether paper Bermudians or born Bermudians.

Do you know why? Because the collective interest of the country is at stake when you have leadership that is not doing the people's interest that they were elected to do. And then when they are challenged do not have the bravery, the courage, the sense of purpose, the conviction or commitment to

answer questions that everybody wants an answer to—not just the Opposition up here—everybody.

An Hon. Member: Everybody.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Everybody!

So get real and come clean, or do not at your peril, because the people's voices have been heard and will continue to be heard via this Honourable House by the elected Members of the Opposition with integrity and forthrightness.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

And we do not celebrate in the Gallery, to let members know.

Honourable Member Shadow Minister of Finance, MP David Burt.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment the Honourable Member from . . . Is it Devonshire South Central?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. E. David Burt: Devonshire North Central, for that amazing presentation that he just gave.

And do you know what is amazing, Mr. Speaker? It is that there are only two Members of the One Bermuda Alliance in this Chamber right now—

An Hon. Member: Shameful!

Mr. E. David Burt: Shameful. All of them—

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. E. David Burt: And both of them are women, yes.

All of the people who are intimately involved with this situation are missing. And the Members that are here are Members that I hold with the utmost respect and I am expecting them to ask the questions tomorrow when they have their retreat to the Honourable Premier as to what exactly happened. Because, Mr. Speaker, all we have seen is a blanket denial of saying, *Oh, this report on Bermuda is not true.*

Mr. Speaker, if there are just one or two things true in here, then why is not all of it true? You cannot pick and choose what is true . . . just like [what was said by] the Honourable Member who just took his seat.

But now, Mr. Speaker, let me begin with this (and I am quoting) and it says, "Integrity—we will have a zero"—

The Speaker: What are you quoting from?

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from the values section of the One Bermuda Alliance Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I will read it. It says (and I quote), "Integrity." We "will have a zero tolerance policy" towards "the abuse of public" office. "We will ensure that no conflict arises, or could reasonably be perceived to arise, between our public duties and our private interests, financial or otherwise."

The One Bermuda Alliance Constitution, Mr. Speaker, that is what I just read. And any reasonable person on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker (all 19 of them), must admit that—"or could reasonably be perceived to arise, between our public duties and our private interests"—the very presence of a private business partner confirmed not only in the Jetgate meeting but now in another meeting with Landow, the Honourable Premier, Bazarian and Stephen DaCosta. How is this even possible? How do the 19 Members even get up in this House and attempt to defend or say that this is okay, this is acceptable?

I am shocked, Mr. Speaker. I am absolutely shocked that the Honourable Minister of Tourism and the Junior Minister of Home Affairs would defend this behaviour when clearly they were elected under this constitution of their own party, Mr. Speaker. But no, it seems that they just put it out there for show and the rules do not apply to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows the serious allegations made by (to be clear, Mr. Speaker) *named* but protected sources. And, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between a "named" and a "protected source." It is not anonymous, Mr. Speaker, it has been protected because the journalist has agreed to protect the source. It happens all the time, and Members have stated this. So to say that it is anonymous sources . . . No, Mr. Speaker, it is not anonymous sources. These are sources that were vetted by a reporter with 20 years of experience, who is accredited by the Media Council and accredited to attend press conferences by this Government. So do not tell me he does not know what he is doing. This is an editor who has an Emmy, Mr. Speaker. And we are saying that, *No, they are just printing stuff that are lies that they cannot justify for fear of being sued?*

Mr. Speaker, I know how fast the One Bermuda Alliance can slap a lawsuit on people.

[Laughter]

Mr. E. David Burt: I know, Mr. Speaker.

So do you think that those individuals are going to risk their reputations to print falsehoods? Come on, Mr. Speaker, we are not that foolish. We are not. And the people of this country are not that foolish either.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is very, very, very important to note that we have heard all of this talk about evidence. The Honourable Minister of Tourism got up and spoke about evidence. And then we heard the Honourable Junior Minister of Home Affairs say that this is nonsense, that it is a soap opera, that it is not important.

Mr. Speaker, since when is alleged corruption corroborated by multiple sources that have been verified by an Emmy award winning journalist nonsense? Since when does that not warrant the attention of this House? Since when does that not warrant defence of those on the frontbench, of those within the One Bermuda Alliance? Since when does it not? Mr. Speaker, evidence? Really? Is that what we are saying?

So, according to the One Bermuda Alliance, Mr. Speaker, if there is no evidence, if there is no video tape that the reporter who was not there could produce, if there is no audio recording, it did not happen. That is what they say. Mr. Speaker, if that is the standard they are held to when they go knocking on the doors and their constituents say something happened do they say, *Give me the video tape or it didn't happen?* Come on, Mr. Speaker, we are smarter than that. The reporters are smarter than that, Mr. Speaker. And the people of this country are smarter than that, Mr. Speaker.

The fact that we have seen these blanket denials—blanket denials—saying, *I flatly refute the allegations.* Nonsense, Mr. Speaker. You cannot flatly refute the allegations because some of your own Cabinet Ministers are quoted in the story. So do not say you flatly refute the allegations because if you flatly refute the allegations, seeing that this is the Honourable Premier's own motion, I would expect him to stand up and say that the story is incorrect because he, Landow, Bazarian and Stephen DaCosta never met.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker? He is not going to do that, because he is not going to mislead this House again—again. And I said “again” because the Premier has misled this House before. And we know it. And the fact that all of those 19 Members over there put up with it is an indictment on all of them. Every last one of them will have a Leader of this country get up and tell the people of this country that three people went on a plane flight when it was four. When the people who were even on the flight say nothing—shocking—absolutely shocking.

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier when he closes this debate . . . is . . . is he going to . . . if all of this is incorrect, is he then going to say that the One Bermuda Alliance did not receive a \$300,000 donation? Because we understand the donation was sent. I guess the question is, was it received? Maybe the fundraisers can tell us if the money was received. Or did the money go somewhere else? Because these are the questions that one would expect that they would ask, Mr. Speaker. Is the account accurate? Tomorrow when they are having their retreat, are they going to

ask the questions of the Premier and the Minister of Tourism and the Honourable Attorney General and maybe Stephen DaCosta (seeing that he seems to moonlight as an official of the One Bermuda Alliance Government) if the allegations are true that there was a side conversation?

Surely, surely, it would stand to reason that the Minister of Tourism and the Honourable Attorney General were not with the Premier and Mr. DaCosta the entire time of the DC trip unless they are all sleeping in the same room. Surely, it would stand to reason that they cannot say that these things did not take place, so they cannot deny them, Mr. Speaker. They cannot deny they did not take place because they cannot say so.

So we have here, once again, verifiable sources—people who have vetted their work—and we hear denials because there are no video tapes to prove it, Mr. Speaker? Come on. At the very least the Members on that side of the House should be asking the questions instead of accepting the blanket denials.

Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to quickly turn to the substance of the new revelations. And I say “new” because there are new things that we add that were contained in the article (quote) “Selling Bermuda.”

The first one, Mr. Speaker, is that Nathan Landow's plane was in Bermuda several times prior to the now infamous meeting in DC. In Bermuda! It is alleged that the Premier even met with Nathan Landow in Bermuda prior to Jetgate. Meanwhile, he gives a personal explanation to the House that this was the first contact we have had with this development group—the same group that they raised \$300,000 from before the election—but it is our first contact, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I was about to say the “L” word but I caught myself. But misleading Parliament is not acceptable at any point in time, and that is what we have seen here.

The next thing is that we have seen, as I just mentioned, new information contained in this thing that at the request of the now-Honourable Premier, the then-Opposition Leader, the \$300,000 was wired from Landow or his company to support the One Bermuda Alliance's election campaign. So, clearly, there is a pre-existing relationship. Why would the Premier come here and tell us that—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I think the Honourable Member, again, misled . . . has forgotten your initial representation. These are allegations.—

The Speaker: Yes.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: He is presenting them as fact and they are simply allegations—

The Speaker: Exactly, thank you.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Yes.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

And I think that is true, that is true, Honourable Member. I think we need . . . as I said, we need to make this clear in our presentation that they are, indeed, allegations.

Mr. E. David Burt: Understood, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, understood. And as I said at the beginning of this section, these are the new revelations contained in the reporting. And I can quote from the reporting as well where it says that he was so smooth—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. E. David Burt: I am quoting from the article, sir. And it says—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, point of order, again.

The Speaker: Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: The Honourable Member is talking about “revelations.”

The Speaker: Yes.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: These are “allegations” they are not “revelations.”

The Speaker: All right. I think—

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, I will call them “allegations” so the Honourable Member will sit down because when the Honourable Member finds the \$300,000 then maybe he can stand up and tell us what is going on.

[Laughter]

Mr. E. David Burt: But it says he was so smooth—and I quote—“he was so smooth, the guy, very smooth, you have got to hand it to him. Other than the \$300,000 that they raised politically for the OBA, there

was never any talk of money until that fateful meeting in DC.” So the source is telling us that they gave \$300,000 to the One Bermuda Alliance—

The Speaker: Again, again, it is “alleged.”

Mr. E. David Burt: Okay, it is alleged, yes. But the sources . . . that is what the sources say.

Okay. Now, Mr. Speaker, . . . and, as I said, *new revelations*, it is clear the Premier had a pre-existing relationship and the final revelation which is “alleged”—alleged—that the Premier asked Nathan Landow for \$2 million to market the gaming position that the Government was going to adopt to the House. That is . . . those are the allegations that were revealed in this article, Mr. Speaker. Okay?

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, you cannot say some of it is right and some of it is wrong. It is either all of it is right or all of it is wrong. And we know, Mr. Speaker . . . and I believe that it is all correct. The question that we have to ask, Mr. Speaker, is why is the Opposition afraid to ask the questions? We are often accused of putting party before Bermuda. What are they doing now, Mr. Speaker? We heard the Honourable Minister, I mean, the Junior Minister for Home Affairs, talk about the struggles in this country. Could the reason we do not have hotel development be because the Honourable Premier is looking to possibly “allegedly” get his pockets lined before we have hotel development here, Mr. Speaker? Could that be—

The Speaker: Yes, I think—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous!

The Speaker: Honourable Member, I do not think you should go there. Please—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: That is outrageous!

The Speaker: Please, do not go take that line, Honourable Member.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Yes.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, do not—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, he needs to retract that.

The Speaker: —do not . . . that is out of hand.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: That is out of hand, please.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: No, no, no.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, I will retract the statement.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Mr. E. David Burt: I will retract the statement. But the allegation was, as I had just read, that the Honourable Premier asked Nathan Landow for \$2 million—that was the allegation that was made, Mr. Speaker. It is the allegation that has been made.

And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if that type of behaviour is going on, then that can prohibit us a country from moving forward. And it is our right and duty to question it. We must, Mr. Speaker, we must question those things.

So, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite claim to be concerned with reputational harm to Bermuda. What more reputational harm could there be than this? What more reputational harm can we have than that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, we are now talking about . . . we hear chirping of Members who are not there. If the Honourable Shadow . . . if the Honourable Minister for Economic Development wants to talk about persons who are acting as authors for authorised agents, then maybe the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, when he has his chance to speak, can say why he thinks it is okay for Stephen DaCosta to negotiate on behalf of the One Bermuda Alliance Government. Maybe he can say that, because clearly they find it is perfectly okay for him to travel with the Premier and meet with developers and meet with Ministers. He is not on the payroll. Why is he doing this? It is volunteer service, Mr. Speaker? Is it just something he is doing out of the kindness of his heart? *Oh, let me get on the plane with my friend. Let me go to another meeting. Well, I am doing it for free, it is community service. But no, I am not going to talk about community service to the press.*

Come on, Mr. Speaker, come on. This is . . . when we are talking about reputational harm that is what the One Bermuda Alliance is exposing us to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me, and it should be clear to all of the people in this country, that the Premier never intends to come clean. He does not because he has consistently refused to answer questions both in this House and to the media. So his approach to openness and transparency, as is detailed in the One Bermuda Alliance Constitution, is very clear—it does not apply to him.

His belief in the Ministerial Code of Conduct (which I read) “Ministers should be as open as possible with Parliament and the public, refusing to provide information only when the disclosure would not be in the public interest. A determination of whether or not disclosure is in the public interest will be made in accordance with the relevant legislation, and the Gov-

ernment’s Code of Practice and Access to Government Information.”

I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have any Bills on our books that say the Premier cannot tell us who was in a meeting with him. But that is what we have seen in this House.

Mr. Speaker, what we have to wonder is why do the 19 or the 18 other Members elected under the One Bermuda Alliance accept this behaviour? Why do they think that it is okay? Why does the Honourable Minister of Public Works, who says that she will stand by her integrity at all points in time, believe that coming to Parliament and giving different answers on different days and giving different answers on different days to the media and changing the story about something that should be really simple . . . I mean, it should not be that hard to remember the four people you flew on a plane with, or how many people were on the plane, or who was in the meeting. It should not be that hard, Mr. Speaker. Why [do] they feel it is acceptable that the Honourable Premier will not level with the people of this country?

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. The One Bermuda Alliance—the 18 Members—have a chance to act. They have a retreat tomorrow to discuss party business. And it is my hope that in that retreat, Mr. Speaker, they might remember the constitution of their party. Because Mr. Speaker, failure to act means that they condone the behaviour.

Failure to act means that they believe it is okay for the Premier to give false information to Parliament. Failure to act means that you condone the actions that have brought this country into disrepute. Failure to act means that you think it is fine for the Premier to have his private business partner (undisclosed to Parliament) negotiate on behalf of the Government. Failure to act makes the public believe that you think it is okay for the Leader of this country to give not only the One Bermuda Alliance, not only your Cabinet, not only your caucus, not only your voters but every single person in this country different answers to the same question on a different day.

Failure to act, Mr. Speaker, will tell the Bermudian public that the One Bermuda Alliance cares more about their political image than the reputation and integrity of the Government of Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, the Members have to ask themselves how their silence is helping Bermuda. They have to ask themselves, how are [we] helping the people who entrusted [us] with Government? How does this action of silence—of condoning behaviours which are clearly against the constitution of your very own party . . . how do they help kids get educated? How do they help streets stay safe? How do they help create jobs for Bermudians, Mr. Speaker? They do not.

So it is left to them, Mr. Speaker, the Members of Cabinet and the Government Backbench to do the right thing and to stay true to their core values.

Mr. Speaker, it is left to them to consider tomorrow during their retreat what is more important—their own personal integrity or their party. We often hear, Mr. Speaker, that the PLP puts party before country. Well, Mr. Speaker, what about them? What does their silence say?

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this. If our criticism warrants the indictment that we put party before country, then surely their silence on this matter convicts them that they put party before country.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Community, Wayne Scott.

Minister Scott, you have the floor.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And, you know, I was just going to sit here and listen tonight. And, you know, I am sitting here thinking, right? You see some of the most egregious acts happen in our current affairs around the world, like these young girls getting kidnapped. And the terrorists will call other people *terrorists*. When you have someone who is prolific at being dishonest, the first thing they will do is jump up and call someone else dishonest. The liar calls someone else a liar. I am sure that the Opposition is just loving the distraction of, *Let's just talk about anything other than the people's business*. They are experts at practicing the politics of deception and distraction.

You know, the Premier has answered these allegations. The Premier has said on the floor of this House that, in hindsight, he would not have got on that jet. I would hope that the Premier is out meeting people who have means and have done developments in other places. I would hope that 10 out of 10 times—10 out of 10 times—he is having a conversation with people and asking, *How do we get jobs back on this Island that were lost and pushed out of this Island by the previous Government? How do we get these things back?* I would hope he is having those conversations, because that is what the Premier of this country is supposed to be doing. Right?

I would encourage . . . and I take the point about, you know, alleged campaign finances. I think it is great! Let us see the campaign contributors for the last decade or so to the Progressive Labour Party! It is insanity. Come on! Come on!

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Come on! Come on!

Yes, I see the former Leader of the United Bermuda Party may have some information on the United Bermuda Party, certainly would not have any information on the One Bermuda Alliance, which is a

different entity, but you know what? Since this Government was elected, [he] comes up with a series of tricks, manoeuvres, ploys, scams, anything to make the Premier and this One Bermuda Alliance look bad!

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Just a minute, Honourable Member. Just a minute. I cannot . . . Just hold it a second.

Let us settle down, Members, please.

Carry on, Minister.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Just about every plan, Mr. Speaker, policy, proposal, appropriate Government business, [he] finds a way to try to make it look bad.

You are mastering the politics of deception and distraction.

But, you know, Bermudians are tired and are smart enough to know when people are kind of distracting, trying to talk about something different to . . . As my colleague in the backbench said, *The people in Bermuda are concerned about how do they get to work? How do they take care of their household expenses?* People are hurting. And I think that the focus should be on the concerns of Bermuda, and let us take this debate to those important topics to get on to things that are of the national interest.

What I would think the Opposition would be concerned about is embracing and supporting a public relations officer who advocates gun violence and hatred to foreigners—

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order.

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. E. David Burt: The Honourable Member is misleading the House because he is saying that the Progressive Labour Party is embracing—

The Speaker: Yes, right.

Mr. E. David Burt: That member has resigned. Do not say that!

The Speaker: I think . . . Right. Honourable Member, I think you should withdraw that.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: I understand that. I understand that. Because, I mean, things like that, from my understanding, would put people, like especially with the United States, on a terrorist watch list! I would love to see the Opposition Leader just flatly dismiss those

claims and commit to this House that that person will *never* work for that party again and would never do—

The Speaker: But, Honourable Member, that member did resign. So . . .

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, I know that member did resign. That member resigned. But you cannot—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: This week, this week. Because that member has resigned from the former party that your Shadow Minister . . . Honourable Member, what are you the Shadow Minister of? It used to be the Shadow Minister of Tourism. I do not even know what it is now. But, you know, that former member resigned from there. That former member has resigned from a bunch of places. So, for this week, yes, he has resigned.

But what I am saying is that, you know, when we are talking about that type of inciting violence and inciting that type of nefarious behaviour, I mean, that is the stuff that all of this should be distracting against, and we should be getting up here and saying unequivocally that we are not going to continue doing actions that already caused a whole lot of companies and everything to leave this Island, because one of the former Ministers was like, *Well, if you do not like it, you can get out!* And we are suffering from that today!

That is why our Premier is talking to people. I will give him my round of applause *[clapping]*! He should be doing that more. We need to get this stuff back on-Island.

An Hon. Member: Inconvenient truth.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: And that is the inconvenient truth.

You know, we say we are doing things different. But yet, we have got Members that are taking it to another whole level and advocating violence. I mean, what a . . . what a, I guess . . . When you look at just all the hurt and anguish that our Bermudian families have been through because of those types of actions, and we are going to advocate, you know, *going and shooting foreigners in the head?* I hope he is on a stop list, because that is a terrorist action, according to the United States, when I start to look at our policies for that. But anyway, you know, it is kind of . . . When you start to look at these things . . . and these things were not condemned. These things were not condemned by the Member that is smiling over there at me right now, chewing his gum.

It is funny that you heard chirping over there about stuff. Why do we not talk about some of the things that have actually . . . We talk about allegations. What about the allegations of a former MP's car

being stopped with drugs in it by someone who actually also resigned as a candidate?

An Hon. Member: Whoa!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: What about that? That was swept under the carpet!

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: That was swept under . . . I mean, come on, man! We have got people that are hurting in this country!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker!

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please sit.
Yes?

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order.

We have no idea who he is referring to. Right? But this is the same Member that stood up the previous session and accused one of us of money laundering.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: And you forced him to retract his statement.

I suggest that . . . I ask you, Mr. Speaker, that you ask the Minister to govern himself accordingly. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.
Carry on, Honourable Minister.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, because there is nothing that I have said that is not correct on the floor of this House. Right? Right?

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: And, you know, I think that the Progressive Labour Party has stated categorically that they intend to bring this Government down. As a matter of fact, the person that they are talking about, Ayo Johnson, who wrote this article, has said in public that he is working for the Progressive Labour Party. His number one goal is to bring down the Premier, bring down this Government—

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: I have heard that myself!

The Speaker: Yes. Honourable Member, yes.
That is not true?

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is misleading. Not only is the Honourable Member misleading the House, he is also impugning the integrity of a member of the press. Now, if that is what the Government wants to do, that is fine. But it is completely inaccurate to say that Ayo Johnson is working for the Progressive Labour Party.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
Honourable Member, Minister, carry on. You heard the Member.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes. As I said, Mr. Speaker, that is stuff that I have heard myself. So I guess, is that an anonymous source. Or is that a legend? Or is that the reality of what, you know, I have heard that person say with my own ears?

But that is cool. But that is cool. Because, you know, again, let us look at what we are talking about. Right? We are talking about alleged campaign contributions. Like, really? Really?

You know, this is . . . We have got to get on with the people's business. We keep talking about . . . And I hear the Honourable Opposition Leader saying very passionately, multiple times, that we are going to conduct things differently. *Let us get on with the people's business.* But yet, we are going to talk about like a whole bunch of alleged he said, she said stuff. Come on, man! Come on!

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: What did I say that does the same thing? Yes, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I can get into some details if you would like, because we know what Member I was talking about whose vehicle that was.

The Speaker: Honourable Member! Honourable Member! Minister!

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: All right, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

The Speaker: Minister, speak to the Speaker.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: But, you know, let us connect the dots from the fact from the fiction. Right? The PLP, and the PLP alone, put the economy where it is today. Right?

The PLP, and the PLP alone, is the reason why so many Bermudians are out of work, that we are

trying to so firmly leave the PLP out. I am sorry, former Leader of the United Bermuda Party, now Shadow Member of the Progressive Labour Party.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, remember! Speak, speak, speak!

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: I am apologising, Mr. Speaker, to that Member through you.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: But, you know, look, Bermuda. Enough is enough. Like enough is enough! It is like we are taking the steps to get Bermuda on track to bring investment, to get people back on-Island. We have to move this country forward. Right?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: And the Member talks about, we have . . . I have an idea. I will stay on the same track as your PRO [Public Relations Officer]. *Let us just shoot people!*

Come on, man! That is insanity! That is insanity.

And, you know, Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, remember that that member is no longer a member. So, please, stay away from that.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand that. But let me say, you do not have the ability, when you are that close, to then be, *Oh, okay! Well, that is just my opinion and I just . . . No. Let me move away from that.* That speaks to the consistency of what we hear all the time in the back rooms. But whatever it takes, whatever it takes, whereas what we should be doing is figuring out a way together to get this country back on track, together.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, whatever.

And, you know, the Honourable Opposition Leader . . . I actually feel sorry for you, man. I feel sorry for you.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Honourable Member.

I feel sorry for that Honourable Member! Because that Honourable Member—

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Mr. Speaker, I digress.

But listen. Mr. Speaker, as I said, in my view, the Premier of this country has addressed the alleged points that have any relevance. And I accept that. The Premier has stated on the floor of this House that, in hindsight, maybe being on a jet was not the best thing to do. But, you know, I think also that we would hope, as citizens of this country, is that our Premier is out there talking to people who have been through and know how to do some of the things that we need to do in this country.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: And I think that we keep talking about nefarious actions and trying to put this Carl Bazarian person on us. That is your guy! That is your guy! That is your guy! Keep him. Keep him. Because we are not going to be announcing imminent opening of hotels and blow up a building, and a decade later there is nothing there. We are not going to be spending \$40 million, \$46 million on a piece of property—that is probably not even worth \$20 million on a good day, right?—in the Grand Atlantic.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: But we are working . . . You should be thanking your lucky stars that we are here! You should thank your lucky stars that we are cleaning up your mess! And if I were you, I would just put my head down and be quiet.

And on that, Mr. Speaker, I think I will take my seat.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Deputy Leader from constituency 5.

MP Derrick Burgess, you have the floor.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you know, in Bermuda, we have in some circles some behaviour problems. And listening to the last speaker, I was a bit dismayed at his presentation. You know, we must . . . That is a Minister of the Government. And we must raise the level of debate in this House. We are supposed to be leading this country. And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be about three minutes flat. And that is what we need to raise the debate.

Mr. Speaker, some serious allegations have been made against the Government. And the public wants to know. They want an explanation from the Government. Mr. Speaker, if those allegations had been made against us, the Progressive Labour Party, they would have been in the *Royal Gazette* 40 days and 40 nights, covering the first five pages. I need not say any more, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this before I sit down. All the Leader of this country [should have done], the Premier, [when] those allegations [were] made, [was he] should have called a press conference yesterday and allowed the press to ask questions and [he should have] come to this House this morning with a Government Statement. That would have dealt with the whole situation. Because we know about allegations. We know about anonymous allegations against us. We had it from the other side. That is fine. But the Government did not deal with these allegations in the proper way.

Let me repeat: All he had to do, what he should have done . . . he was compelled to have a press conference, an open press conference. And what I call “an open press conference,” the press can ask the questions. Then come to this House . . . I repeat, then come to this House this morning and give a Statement. We would not be having this debate now.

We have the duty as the loyal Opposition, under the Westminster system, when these types of situations occur, to carry on the way we are [with] this debate. We could be home right now, Mr. Speaker. But because the Premier, the Government, failed to do the proper thing yesterday and this morning, we are here right now debating this situation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Any other Members care to speak?

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I recognise.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good evening.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good evening to my honourable colleagues. Good evening to the listening audience.

Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleagues have done an excellent job highlighting the inconsistencies, the contradictions, the misleading statements, and overall the poor level of governance. In fact, let me qualify it—the worst form and standard of governance in maybe our 405-year history, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Because, you know, Mr. Speaker, if I was to list out, if I was to name all the actions of mis-governance, or poor governance, then they would be jumping up on their feet screaming, *Point of order, Mr. Speaker! Oh, Mr. Speaker!* That is what they do. But it is the worst level of governance that we are seeing. And Jetgate is just one example, just one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if anyone on that side of the House was going to stand on their feet

and defend the indefensible. And you had two backbenchers, I consider, and one Minister. The Minister is Minister Crockwell. I am not sure why he got up, because he is one of the chief offenders. So I am not sure how anything he would have contributed would have helped their cause. But then we heard the Junior Minister Sylvan Richards, and then Minister Wayne Yay-yo Scott . . . That is your new nickname, Yay-yo Scott.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, no!

That is not . . . Please! Please withdraw that. We are not going to have that, Honourable Member. We are not going to. Please, please.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: I want to do a point of order, because, Mr. Speaker, when I was talking about the “liar” calling somebody a liar—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please! Have a . . . Honourable Member, sit!

[Pause]

The Speaker: Honourable Member! Member!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I withdraw that statement, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

[Laughter]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: You should not have point-of-ordered me, then.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Mr. Speaker!

The Speaker: Honourable Members! One second. One second, Honourable Member.

Honourable Member, let us get through the night. Let us get through the night.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ayo Johnson is a first-class journalist. And those of us on our side, as has already been alluded to, have actually been on the receiving end of his professionalism. It was just the other day, maybe about a year ago, that we gave a statement, a press conference. This was when Ayo was working for the *Royal Gazette*. And I alluded to the fact of . . . I think it could have been gaming or one moral issue that I said, *Some people take the position that the church should not involve themselves in the political realm*. I said, *Some people take that position*. But it was printed, it came out as if, *Marc Bean says the church should shut up and stay and mind their own business*. That is how it came out!

Now, lo and behold, I was just giving an example of some people’s thinking. Two weeks later, our Learned Attorney General jumped up and told the same persons that if they do not like his views on something, Kool-Aid drinkers, then they should get up and leave Bermuda. He reiterated my point. But Ayo printed it in a manner as if I said it. And guess what? Even though I did not, I have to bear it. He is a professional journalist. Maybe he made an error. But I cannot discredit Ayo Johnson. You cannot discredit him now about when he was at the *RG* he was an excellent reporter. You cannot pick it piecemeal.

So, now Mr. Johnson has provided a report, which you all knew was coming (the OBA). That is why you see this Jamahl Simmons issue coming out of nowhere. It is similar to two days after myself and Shadow Minister Burt got up in this Honourable House and, through my personal explanation, alleged certain words said by the Premier. Two days later on the Monday, you did not see anything by Gareth Finighan in the *Royal Gazette* on the most serious allegations made in this House for some time. What you saw was another manufactured scandal, just like the Jamahl Simmons’ punches his Twitter account and makes a big deal over it. You saw a manufactured scandal through one of their Members of Parliament and myself. Manufactured.

Some Hon. Members: What?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Now it is, *What?* Now it is, *What?*

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: See?

So we understand the game. See, because, as the Opposition, we have been loyal to our people who put us up in this Honourable Chamber, Mr. Speaker. And in return for holding the One Bermuda Alliance to account we have had to have not only the attempted set-up of the Opposition Leader, the tape recording of the Opposition Leader to be used as a distraction six, seven months later, you had motivated, politically motivated attacks on private businesses. Right? All of this . . . You had lawsuits that have been thrown out there—not to challenge, but to silence! To silence!

But, thank the Lord, what is hidden in the dark shall be revealed in the light. And the other day was the light! The light shone on the One Bermuda Alliance.

An Hon. Member: Lightning.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: It is not just light, yes, it is lightning! It was like a lightning bolt! That is why not one of our One Bermuda Alliance Members have got-

ten up and given a credible, rational justification for this irrational behaviour! Not one!

For a long time, I was looking in this Chamber, and I was saying, *Well, who is there to support the Honourable Premier?* And until we made mention of it, the rest of you fled like weak hearts! Like you did not have the courage to defend the indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer to the One Bermuda Alliance website. A statement, January the 13th, 2012, *On Good Governance Reform, Actions Make the Difference*. Not words—actions make the difference. Mr. Speaker, in quote—

The Speaker: It is from where?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: From the One Bermuda Alliance website, www.oba.bm, it is one of their statements. It says, *On Good Governance Reform, Actions Make the Difference*.

The Speaker: All right.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: “Any move toward stronger rules to root out and prevent corrupt practices in government should be welcomed.

“The One Bermuda Alliance made better governance a centre piece of its plans for Bermuda, outlining a broad range of reform to bring the highest levels [of] accountability and transparency to the business of government.

“Our programme was developed in the context of a troubling history in which public concerns about corruption within government formed over a series of scandals from the Bermuda Housing Corporation, pay-to-play fundraising, untendered contracts and project cost overruns that cost taxpayers untold millions . . .

“The OBA saw the need for stronger governance on two basic levels:” Not advanced, but basic.

“1) Accountability, to ensure public officials are held accountable for their actions. To that end, the OBA committed to:

- Integrity in Public Office legislation, with minimum standards for disclosure by Parliamentarians as it relates to financial dealings with the government
- Full support for the work of the Auditor General . . .
- Zero tolerance of unethical behaviour”—not *il-legal*, unethical behaviour, right?—“for public officials
- Clear guidelines on what constitutes corrupt practices whether by Parliamentarians or civil servants . . .

“2) Transparency, to ensure the work of government is open for the people to see. To that end, the OBA is committed to:

- Implementing Freedom of Information and whistleblower legislation . . .

Some Hon. Members: Whoa!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Wait a minute. What is a whistle-blower? Is not a whistle-blower an anonymous source? Were they not purporting that, in order to have transparency, we would pass whistle-blower legislation? To protect who? Protect who from whom?

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason why people speak anonymously. There is a history in this country that, in speaking out, you could have your mortgages pulled, Mr. Speaker. You could lose employment. And when you are dealing with the people who have economic power, it is a real risk! That is why there is a call for whistle-blower legislation.

OBA, Dr. Grant Gibbons, where is the whistle-blower legislation? Where is it? Where is it, Mr. Speaker? A whistle-blower is anonymous.

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

An Hon. Member: No, no, no.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker . . . boy, I tell you. Mr. Speaker, after 13 months of doing our job, regardless of the deflection by all these social commentators and apologists in this community who try to deflect inside and outside this House, from grasping or seeking the truth, holding the Government to account and being transparent . . . after all of that, after 13 months, we are now asking questions, not for our benefit. Whatever you say to us today, we could care less, because we already crossed that bridge. We heard week after week misleading statements, not only to this House, but to the people of this country.

So we are asking the questions now today for the edification of the people who put you here! Now, tell me something. How in good conscience can you walk in the byways and highways of this country and knock on people’s doors and ask for their vote or their permission to serve their interests in this Honourable Chamber? Tell me something. Is this foolishness the interests of the voters who put you here? I dare you get up and say so! I dare you! Because you know you cannot because you are not carrying out your responsibility that has been vouchsafed to you by the people who put you here! Okay? You have failed in your remit!

Now, I have to ask the question. Because it is up, first and foremost, before the people of this country deal with you democratically, where is the conscience within the membership and support base of the One Bermuda Alliance/United Bermuda Party? Where is that voice of the conscience, Mr. Speaker? Because silence in this case is consent. It is either consent or it is cowardice based on fear.

Something is going on, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the people, the Members of the One Bermuda Alliance. I look in the Gallery, and . . . well, there was one or two, but they probably fled, too, Mr. Speaker. How, in good conscience, can you sign up with something that is diabolically the opposite of what has been purported in this document I just read? How could you sign up and go along with an institution that says one thing and does the complete opposite?

Now, I could describe the spirit that emanates from that type of behaviour. Mr. Speaker, I already described it. I have already described it. I have already described it. I described it in the beginning. And now it is starting to manifest. It is starting to manifest. And so I wonder, where is the conscience of Learned Member, Trevor Moniz, who I know plays up a straight bat? Some people might not like him, but I respect him because he plays up a straight bat. Okay? Where is the integrity of Pat Gordon—Gordon—

The Speaker: The Honourable Minister.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable Minister!

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: And Queen Bee, Pat Gordon—

The Speaker: Not *Queen Bee*. The Honourable Minister!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes, yes, yes, the Honourable Minister. And she makes some good cake, too, for me. Yes, yes, yes.

Mr. Speaker, where is the conscience of a Mirrors graduate, a Mirrors volunteer, who knows what it means to stand in the space of integrity?

My sister, the Honourable Member Susan Jackson . . . where is the voice of conscience from the backbenches? I am not talking about Richards and Scott and all that, but where, outside of congrats and obits, where is the contribution? What do you really say to each other in caucus? Because I could tell you what happens in our caucus. We get held to account. Ain't no skinning up in the Progressive Labour Party. Okay? It ain't no blind followers in the Progressive Labour Party.

In fact, you all know for a fact that it does not take much to get someone inside the PLP to create division. It happened for the whole 14 years of our Government. But yet, we do not see any sort of action from the One Bermuda Alliance membership and support base. So the question is, is it a top-down organisation, or is it a bottom-up organisation? I think the answer is self-evident. Everything trickles down, and people just accept it blindly, to their own detriment, Mr. Speaker.

Promises have been made, promises have been broken for 12 months. Questions have been asked, and we have received misleading statements week in, week out. To be honest, Mr. Speaker, you would not catch me standing on the corner of White Hill with any of the One Bermuda Alliance now. You will not catch me standing there! It is that much of a risk. That is how they lack street smarts. They do things that seem absolutely silly! Like where do you get your political training from? What made you think that? What made you do that?

Because, you know, when we are in the Opposition, everything put forth by the One Bermuda Alliance, we have to then put ourselves in their shoes and say, *Well, what is their intention?* Because if we can relate to their intent, we usually will go along with it. But in this case, we cannot even relate. We cannot even put ourselves in their shoes, Mr. Speaker, because it is something that is unfathomable. What is going through the minds of some of you guys, some of the Honourable Members' minds, Mr. Speaker?

The people in this country marched up on this Honourable House last week—2,000-odd.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Hey, they probably were PLP supporters! It could have been some OBA supporters, too. But I tell you what, if it was OBA supporters, you would never know. You would never know, because they are not going to tell you.

But, Mr. Speaker, 2,000 people marched up on this House. You know why they marched? You know why they marched? Because they are tired. They marched because they are tired. They are suffering. All right? They see people living in an ivory tower making decisions that, even in the first instance, do not even serve their interest. It does not even serve the people's interests! The people are tired.

Now, people are talking about how Jamahl Simmons made a statement, this and that, on Twitter. Well, any PLP MP would tell you that when you go and canvass and you walk the highways and byways of this country you hear that type of talk every day in the street. And we ignore it—I said *we, we, we*. We ignore it at our peril. We ignore it at our peril, Mr. Speaker. Okay? We ignore it.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Now, I heard some chirping. Do I criticise it? I accepted a resignation. But, Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, you heard the Deputy Premier of this country on a microphone—an open microphone, right?—disrespecting, in this House, not only the Speaker, but disrespecting citizens of this country who were protesting the fact that they robbed the people of this country of their democratic right when it comes to the referendum. He dissed them! He

used curse language! Has anyone asked for a resignation of Deputy Leader Michael Dunkley? Has the *Royal Gazette* printed anything on that? No! Yet you have got the audacity to see Michael Dunkley, the Honourable Member, the Honourable Member, the Minister, giving commentary about Jamahl Simmons? But yet, he is the chief offender. What type of . . .

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: *Duplicity?* That is the word? That is the word? Right. The One Bermuda Alliance is based on duplicity, the UBP/OBA/UBP/OBA.

So I understand the nature, Mr. Speaker. When will you call on your Deputy Premier to resign? Okay? Because I have had a Minister of this Government when we were Government who resigned over a planning application! Your OBA has done more foolishness in the last 15 months, right, that you can expect some type of resignation! But, Mr. Speaker, the One Bermuda Alliance is not going to do it because they are morally bankrupt!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: They are morally bankrupt!

No, it is not because we want you to do it! Because if you have a clear conscience, and if you obey your conscience, you will do it anyway.

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

The Speaker: Carry on, Member.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Carry on? Okay. All right. Cool.

Mr. Speaker, then we have Minister Shawn Crockwell get up. Right? Shawn Crockwell gets up and talks about, well, he has seen nothing untoward in this case. He did not see anything untoward in this issue. But yet in the back—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: What?

The Speaker: Please, Honourable Member. Yes?

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I said that there was nothing untoward on that trip that I observed.

The Speaker: Right. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: But yet, Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Please! Please sit down. Sit down.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member needs to be clear.

The Speaker: All right. Carry on.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: But, Mr. Speaker, you look at the same report, where the only person in the OBA who is speaking in that report to Ayo Johnson is Shawn Crockwell. Okay? And everything that is said in that report asks—

The Speaker: Do not forget! That is the Minister. That is the Minister.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable Minister, the Honourable and Learned Minister.

But everything that is said in that report contradicts what the Honourable Minister just said. And he is one of the sources for the report! I wonder who their OBA insider is that is giving all that information to make it seem like the Honourable Minister had his hands clean!

[Laughter]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Have you all asked that question? Of course you have not.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, today in the newspaper the Premier is quoted as saying that in this upcoming session they will be bringing gaming legislation in addition to other initiatives. What type of arrogance is that? How on earth under these circumstances—

The Speaker: All right, Honourable Member. That is your time.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: —can you bring gaming legislation?

[Gavel]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: There will be no hotel development!

The Speaker: That is your time, Honourable Member.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Morally bankrupt.

The Speaker: Thank you.

An Hon. Member: Where is the evidence?

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, the Chair now recognises the Premier. Premier?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will start off, really, by the last comment that was made that probably is the most telling thing we have heard all night, that the Opposition and the Opposition Leader would say, *There will be no hotel development.*

An Hon. Member: Under these circumstances.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: You know, Mr. Speaker, we cannot move forward under chaos and confusion. And I have heard accusations of, *Where does this political training come from?* But if we simply look over the last year and a half, we have heard those who—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Members, let us give respect to the Premier.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: I did not say a word while you were speaking, brother. Not a word.

Political training . . . I have seen experienced politicians this evening spend the evening focusing on accusation and innuendoes and attack. No evidence, Mr. Speaker. The fiction is the accusations and the innuendoes. Yes, it is weak, very weak.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Members, let us . . . Let us . . . Let us . . .

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yet over a decade-plus, not one hotel was built, Mr. Speaker. And, you know, I am hearing interpolation. I am hearing interpolation that . . . I am hearing accusations, *Weak.* Well, you know what? In the face of the facts that are going on within this country and where we see this country headed, facts, Mr. Speaker, we know that this country is moving in the right direction.

I know that this may cause some angst to Opposition Members, and some concern. Because I go back to the very last thing that was said, and that was, *There will be no hotel development.* And that, *The PLP is doing their job.* Well, we spent a lot of time not talking about what is going to put food on the table, what is going to get another job to the unemployed, what is going to get Johnny off the street, what is going to help that family member who has just lost their job, been laid off, to find another job. We have spent

hours today—hours—talking about accusations, innuendoes and the likes!

Today we discussed some good stuff during our session with National Security. Yet, we have spent more time . . . yes, we have spent more time on accusations and innuendoes, unnamed sources. Yes, this is a battle, Mr. Speaker. But this is not a battle against each other. We are in a battle against getting jobs on the table and food on the table and moving this country in the right direction.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, come on, come on. Come on! Let us stop.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: And so, we hear the interpolations all of the time of the Don Grearson's and all these kinds of things. And, yes, that is right, Honourable Member, Mr. Blakeney. You continue to move on, brother. Because I have heard nothing from you that has made any sense this evening. Nothing whatsoever except for foolishness and accusations. Founded on what?

So I am not going to entertain all of this. I am not going to entertain it at all, because that is exactly what they want me to do. They want me to get riled up and excited and preaching and shouting, as I have heard coming across the floor. That is what we have heard tonight, a lot of emotion. I listened very carefully to everything that was said.

What we must be concerned about is moving this country to where it needs to go—forward—and not spending all of our time on accusations.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, to tell you the truth, you know, if we want to talk about accusations, we can go all around this room about accusations, Mr. Speaker! We can go all around this room on accusations, Mr. Speaker!

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: We can!

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member. Yes? Yes, Honourable Member?

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Yes. The Honourable Premier is imputing improper motives suggesting that there is some type of improper conduct by Members of this House. It is certainly imputing my character and that of many other Members that have acted with integrity.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Carry on, Premier.

[Crosstalk]

The Speaker: Carry on, Premier.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: So, Mr. Speaker . . . and I take to heart exactly the Honourable Member as she has spoken to object to what I just had to say. But I will draw her back, basically (the Honourable Member) to her comments in relying on the sisterhood to support herself this evening. I found that rather remarkable.

An Hon. Member: What?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: In her exhortation this evening, appealing to the sisterhood and integrity, almost as if to say that there is not integrity in this room amongst other Members.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Hmm, yes. Most definitely. And so, what I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, really, is the runaway train that we have attached ourselves to.

[Crosstalk]

[Gavel]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: It has nothing to do with all of these accusations. And, quite frankly, I will boil it down to foolishness, really and truly. Because I know, Mr. Speaker, that I have operated out of integrity and a desire to want to get jobs back on this table, a zeal to want to move forward and ensure that Bermuda moves in the right direction. And so, I am not going to waste my time this evening, Mr. Speaker, in trying to get all excited about all of what is being accused here.

Why do we not spend some more time on the issues that concern this country? And if there is any wrongdoing, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the *Who's Who* in that area will ensure that if any wrong was done it will be brought to justice. But what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is spending our time in this House of Assembly as if it is a court and you are the judge sitting up there. And we are waxing back and forth over accusations and what we think might be done and what we thought might have been said. And, *You need to explain this!* And, *You need to explain that!* Rather than addressing the concerns of the people!

This is not a concern of the people!

An Hon. Member: What?

An Hon. Member: It is not a concern of the people?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Mr. Speaker, this is not a concern. They want to know, *Where is the job coming from?*

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: So, yes. Stay tuned for gaming.

So anyhow, Mr. Speaker, we spent a lot of time with a whole lot of *whole lot of*. And there is no need for me to get up here and to wax eloquent and to try to outdo some Member on the other side of the House and how they waxed eloquently this evening. I have done that many times before in this House. No need tonight. We need to get back to the business of this country and improving our standard of living and ensuring that we move this country in this right direction.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Good night.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Thank you, Premier.

Members, the House is adjourned to Friday, May the 16th.

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Thank you for letting me home before midnight.

[Laughter]

[At 8:47 pm, the House stood adjourned until 10:00 am, Friday, 16 May 2014.]

BERMUDA HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT****16 MAY 2014****10:01 AM***Sitting Number 20 of the 2013/14 Session**[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]***PRAYERS***[Prayers read by Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker]***MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF
HONOURABLE F. JOHN BARRITT
FORMER SPEAKER
OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

The Speaker: Members, just before we take our seats, I would like to ask that we bow our heads for a moment of silence in honour of our former Speaker, the Honourable F. John Barritt, who passed recently.

[Pause]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Members.

**CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
9 May 2014**

The Speaker: We have, Members, confirmation of the Minutes of the 9th of May 2014. All Members should have received the Minutes.

If there are no objections, then the Minutes will be approved. Are there any objections to the Minutes of May 9th, 2014?

There are no objections. So the Minutes are approved.

*[Minutes of 9 May 2014 approved.]***MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR**

The Speaker: There are none.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER
OR MEMBER PRESIDING****APOLOGY**

The Speaker: I would like to announce, first of all, that I have had a notification from Junior Minister Leah Scott, who will not . . . was held up, I believe, because of weather and could not catch a flight.

HOUSE VISITORS

The Speaker: Also, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome in our midst five members from Washington, DC, from the Washington Leadership Group, who are involved in fostering positive relationships through Jesus with politicians in the United States and also around the world. Mr. Fred I. Hine and his wife Jackie; Ms. Janie Jeffers; and Mr. David Michael, and his wife, Renee.

We would like to welcome them to our Parliament.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Also, I would like to point out that we do have a former Minister in the Gallery as well in the person of the Honourable Arthur Hodgson. So, welcome back to this place, Mr. Hodgson.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: My former running mate, I might add.

*[Laughter]***MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE**

The Speaker: There are no messages from the Senate.

**PAPERS AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS TO THE HOUSE**

The Speaker: The Chair will recognise the Honourable Minister for Public Safety, Minister Michael Dunkley. Minister Dunkley, you have the floor.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues.

The Speaker: Good morning.

**NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL MASTER PLAN AND
ACTION PLAN FOR 2013 THROUGH 2017**

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to attach this morning and submit for the information of the Honourable House of Assembly the

National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan for 2013 through 2017. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
Are there any objections to that?
Thank you. There are no further papers.

PETITIONS

The Speaker: There are none.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS AND JUNIOR MINISTERS

The Speaker: The Chair will first recognise again the Minister for Public Safety, Minister Michael Dunkley. Minister Dunkley, you have the floor.

NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL MASTER PLAN AND ACTION PLAN 2013–2017

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the release of the National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013–2017, which represents the second national strategy on drugs. Honourable Members and the public will recall that during the debate on the Department of National Drug Control Act 2014, I undertook to table this plan for the information of the House. Today, I am pleased to fulfil that promise.

Mr. Speaker, the National Drug Control Plan is based on an extensive stakeholder and community-wide needs assessment, continues with an integrated and balanced approach to reducing both drug supply and drug demand established in the 2007–2011 plan, and is Bermuda's plan to implement policies and programmes that will reduce the harms caused by alcohol and other drug use.

Mr. Speaker, the plan supports a comprehensive focus on the approaches that address drug-use prevention, drug abuse treatment, research, legislation, institutional frameworks, law enforcement and interdiction, protection of the borders, drug supply reduction, international cooperation, and monitoring and evaluation. The master plan and action plan will serve as an instrument to be used—

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Honourable Member!
It is early in the morning, Honourable Member.
Carry on, please, Minister.

[Laughter]

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, the master plan and action plan will serve as an instrument to be

used to monitor and evaluate the desired national outcomes to be accomplished over the next four years; it summarises authoritatively the key national goals; it defines implementation priorities; and allocates responsibilities and resources for the national drug control efforts. The plan acts both as a director and a directory of this country's policies and programmes aimed at diminishing the negative impact of drug misuse, abuse and illicit trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, the three main goals of the 2013–2017 National Drug Control Master Plan are as follows:

1. reduce drug-related harms by recognising the drug problem as a major public health threat to the nation;
2. minimise the immediate concerns to the citizens in the context of the principal harms of drug use and abuse such as crime, public nuisance, drug-related violence, physical and mental health problems, social costs and community degradation; and
3. respect [for] human rights, local judicial norms, and cultural attitudes toward alcohol and drug use.

Key objectives of the master plan, Mr. Speaker, are:

1. provide effective coordination and oversight of the National Drug Control Master Plan;
2. ensure appropriate resources for drug-related programmes are available;
3. implement a balanced multi-disciplinary approach to substance abuse prevention and treatment;
4. educate the public about risks and methods for preventing engagement in inappropriate use of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs;
5. expand the implementation of research-based prevention programming to effectively reduce drug use amongst our youth;
6. develop community partnerships that will promote prevention activities that address environmental change;
7. improve access to treatment services;
8. improve the quality of treatment and rehabilitation services;
9. educate the public on the health risks associated with substance use and abuse;
10. develop measures to reduce drunk driving;
11. have a coordinated approach between the Bermuda Police Service and HM Customs;
12. increase HM Customs' capability to target and dismantle drug importation rings;
13. have an amalgamated intelligence function/arm;
14. establish a code of conduct or professional standards for interdiction personnel (across the justice system);

15. gather information that will facilitate evidence-based decision-making for substance abuse prevention and treatment programmes;
16. provide an evaluation framework to assess the management, coordination and implementation of the national drug control initiatives and the strategies outlined in the plan;
17. provide evidence to support the establishment of laws and policies that foster healthy individuals and communities; and finally
18. facilitate, coordinate, and manage the Bermuda Drug Information Network [BerDIN].

Mr. Speaker, the management of the master plan is intended to be driven by a coordinating body, or steering committee. This coordinating body will decide on the priorities of the national plan annually and will manage the general order of business to ensure the implementation of this plan over the next four years.

Mr. Speaker, as stewards of the National Drug Control Master Plan, the Department for National Drug Control [DNDC] is responsible for the management, coordination, and evaluation and monitoring of this plan. While the DNDC plays a major role in driving the plan, the department and its functions are just a very small part of the National Drug Control Strategy; actions need to be taken by Government, non-government entities and community members alike.

Mr. Speaker, the harms resulting from illicit drugs in our country are consistently identified as contributing to the social ills. It is my belief that as we work to implement the National Drug Control Plan for 2013–2017, we need to be united in our vision for a healthy and drug-free community, with each sector of the community playing its role.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Department for National Drug Control, its strategic partners, and the members of the community for their input and unparalleled support in expertly informing, planning, and drafting of this national plan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Tourism, the Honourable and Learned Minister Shawn Crockwell. You have the floor.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

OPENING OF BERMUDA REGISTRY OF SHIPPING LONDON OFFICE

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, this Statement comes from the Ministry of Transport.

I am extremely pleased to inform this Honourable House of a reception that was held at the Bermuda London Office on Wednesday evening, the 14th of May, to officially launch the opening of the London satellite office of the Department of Maritime Administration [DMA], commonly referred to as the Bermuda Registry of Shipping.

Mr. Speaker, understanding the importance and value of having an office in London, the Government made it a priority to get this office established and operational. Therefore, the opening reception was a significant milestone towards achieving our objectives to enhance the level of services provided and the expansion of the registry.

Mr. Speaker, Bermuda has been operating a shipping registry since 1789; that is 225 years in the business. During early years, Bermuda played a strategic role in the safety and security of the British ships transiting the Atlantic Ocean, and the registry has evolved, expanding its role and services to ships covering all the oceans of the globe.

The Bermuda Shipping Registry is a Category One [Cat 1] member of the prestigious Red Ensign Group of Registries (known as REG), and the registry takes pride in the high standards of its ships and the world-class service it provides to its clients. As a REG Cat 1 shipping registry, Bermuda can register ships of any type, age or size, subject to meeting the standards required for flagging-in to Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, the current Bermuda fleet consists of large cruise ships; oil, gas and chemical tankers; container ships; bulk carriers; offshore vessels [FPSOs, FSOs, Oil Rigs]; and code vessels under the Passenger and Commercial Yacht Code. The administration has extensive experience with large cruise ships, especially with the new generation of passenger ships embracing the *Safe Return to Port* concept. The latest addition to the Bermuda fleet is the most modern large passenger ship, *Regal Princess*, currently being delivered at Fincantieri shipyard in Italy.

Mr. Speaker, as Members will know, the Merchant Shipping Act 2002 provides the primary legislation, and the Merchant Shipping (Registration of Ships) Regulations 2003 provide for registration of ships in Bermuda. Schedule 1 of the Merchant Shipping Act 2002 provides the private law provisions relating to the title of ownership and mortgages over the ships on the register. Under the Bermuda laws, the title of a ship is divided into 64 shares, and a share can be owned by five joint owners representing that share. The law also provides for nonqualified interests to register a ship as minority shareholders of a Bermuda ship.

In addition to the main registration, Bermuda also provides for the Demise (Bareboat) Charter Registration, both for *Demise In* and *Demise Out* registration. This registration process has been of immense assistance to some of our ship owners to achieve profitable and gainful employment of their ships in this

difficult economic climate. A further registration service Bermuda provides is the *Registration of Ships Under Construction*, which has gained popularity in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, subject to a ship complying with the statutory survey and certification requirements, and the ship owner providing the relevant declarations and documents, the Bermuda registration process can be completed within the day of receiving the application. The Registrar of Shipping and the registry staff are available during the normal business hours, and they are also available by prearrangement at any time when required for urgent registration transactions.

Mr. Speaker, we will undertake and complete some of the registration functions through the new London office to take advantage of the time difference between UK, Europe and Bermuda. In this regard, this office will be able to accept registration and mortgage documentation for immediate registration, and this is a value-added service for which the shipping and financial community had been hoping for. Ultimately, the primary aim with the establishment of the DMA satellite office in London is to provide efficient and cost-effective ship survey, certification and registration services to ship owners and ship operators in a timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, Bermuda's Shipping Registry has a large number of ships operating internationally that require frequent surveyor attendance for conducting statutory surveys, audits and inspections. It has been the practice of Bermuda to send its in-house surveyors to conduct the mandatory flag state surveys and audits on ships, wherever they are, at a cost to the ship owners. It is the aim of the DMA, by having a team of surveyors based in London, to reduce the costs of the surveys substantially, particularly for those ships operating in and around the UK and European waters. The London-based survey team will also service Bermuda ships calling into the Middle East, the Indian Subcontinent, the Far East and Australasia, providing surveyor availability at short notice.

Mr. Speaker, the reception was attended by representatives of over 25 companies and business entities that are either clients or work on behalf of clients of the Bermuda Registry. Some of the companies and businesses represented included Anglo Eastern, Carnival UK, Concordia Maritime, Hapag Lloyd, the MCA and Burgess Yachts, to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge and thank the Chief Surveyor, Captain Pat Nawaratne, at the Registrar of Shipping; Mr. Edward Robinson; and all of the DMA team for their hard work and efforts towards establishing the London office, as all of the clients in attendance provided complimentary comments on the service provided by our registry.

I would also like to thank the Director of the London office, Ms. Kimberly Durrant, and her colleagues for their assistance in organising the reception that was enjoyed by all in attendance.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister of Public Works, Minister Patricia Gordon-Pamplin. You have the floor.

GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this morning to announce that the Caribbean-based hospitality, tourism and leisure consultancy firm, MacLellan & Associates, has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding [MOU] with the Bermuda Government to upgrade and re-position the Grand Atlantic residential development on South Shore into a tourism product.

MacLellan & Associates is a full-service consultancy and appraisals practice established in 1997, which specializes in the hospitality, tourism and leisure sectors in the Caribbean and Atlantic. A member of the Caribbean Hotel and Tourism Association (CHTA), MacLellan & Associates is the largest consultancy group based in the region, comprising a team of experts that have in-depth knowledge of the Caribbean countries.

The proposed redevelopment of the Grand Atlantic site will create a condo hotel which will make use of existing construction and bring a new all-suite tourism product to Bermuda that is very popular in other jurisdictions. It is expected that the project will provide jobs and tourism opportunities for the wider sector of Bermuda.

OBMI and Coldwell Banker Bermuda Realty have been named as the local associates that will work with MacLellan & Associates to assist in the re-purposing of the Grand Atlantic development into a new tourism development product to be known as the *Bermudiana Beach Resort*.

Mr. Speaker, OBMI is a global leader in architectural design, with an experienced team of professionals both in Bermuda and internationally. Founded in Bermuda in 1936 (as OBM), OBMI is a co-author of the Bermuda National Tourism Master Plan and uniquely positioned to assist with the revitalisation of the Bermuda tourism industry. The OBMI principal for this project is a Mr. Colin Campbell.

Bermuda Realty Company Limited is one of the largest local real estate offices and offers services in residential and commercial real estate sales and rentals, land and valuation surveying, residential and commercial property management, vacation services and auctioneering. Bermuda Realty has been affiliated with the global entity of Coldwell Banker since 1998. The principal for this project is Mr. Brian Madeiros.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. MacLellan and his principals were on-Island recently to discuss, among other things, timelines for completion of major works to

transfer the Grand Atlantic development into a tourism entity, overseas investors' interest in Bermuda and opportunities for future growth in Bermuda.

In the hospitality industry, a condo hotel is defined as a development which is legally a condominium, but which is operated as a resort, offering short-term rentals of hotel suites, with a front desk and resort leisure facilities. It is anticipated that the units at Grand Atlantic will be sold as a combination of investment and vacation homes.

Mr. Speaker, when owners are not in residence, they can leverage the marketing and management provided by the hotel operator to rent and manage the condo unit as it would any other hotel room. This will be a welcome addition to Bermuda's current hotel inventory and a completely unique product for our market.

The MOU has an exclusivity clause until late summer, which will enable MacLellan & Associates and their local industry partners to finance the acquisition and associated development costs of the project.

MacLellan & Associates have been fully briefed on the public concerns expressed regarding the cliff face. They have studied the existing engineers' reports, have consulted with their own engineers, and during the period of exclusivity, will have the opportunity to liaise further with their own engineers on this matter if they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, currently, MacLellan & Associates is working to finalise the financing arrangements for significant design changes, incorporating resort amenities and identifying a hotel operator that is willing to partner with investors in the opportunity presented by this development for a new tourism product in Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will be aware that two of the units at the Grand Atlantic had been sold to private individuals. In order to ensure vacant possession for the new developers, the Bermuda Housing Corporation has already relocated one of the purchasers and is working on transferring the remaining resident family located in the development to another suitable property.

I am confident that this project will prove to be financially beneficial to Bermuda, as well as one that creates employment and has a positive social impact.

Thank you Mr. Speaker

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Minister for Education and Economic Development, Minister Dr. Grant Gibbons. Dr. Gibbons, you have the floor.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.

The Speaker: Good morning.

LAUNCH OF AFRICAN RISK CAPACITY INSURANCE COMPANY

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce to Honourable Members that Bermuda has been selected as the jurisdiction of choice to host the first-ever African catastrophe insurance pool. This insurance facility has been launched by an organisation called the African Risk Capacity (otherwise known as ARC), a specialised agency set up by the African Union to help member states become more financially resilient to extreme weather events and to protect insecure food populations. ARC Insurance Company Limited [ARC Limited] will be domiciled in Bermuda. I am pleased to say that Bermuda was selected over Switzerland as the best jurisdiction to locate this mutual insurance company, after careful due diligence by a number of international agencies. It is possible that at some point in the future, the company may consider re-domiciling to Africa, depending on the wishes of the members and directors.

The ARC Agency was created as a hybrid mutual insurance company, ARC Insurance Company Limited, to issue policies to a group of African governments initially comprising Kenya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger and Senegal. Germany and the United Kingdom contributed the initial capital and are also founding members of the mutual. The aim of the ARC catastrophe insurance pool is to reduce African governments' reliance on external emergency aid. Currently, international assistance is secured through an appeals system and then allocated on a largely *ad hoc* basis once a disaster strikes. Consequently, African governments affected by disasters can be forced to reallocate funds from essential development projects to crisis responses, exacerbating problems in other areas of their economies.

Mr. Speaker, Bermuda's participation in this cooperative approach to assisting African countries is a strong vote of confidence for our country. Not only will ARC Insurance Company be domiciled here, but our involvement in the development of mutual insurance to assist African countries will provide targeted responses to disasters in a more timely, cost-effective and transparent manner. We are at the forefront in the formation of a fund that facilitates financial stability in instances where other insurance options are not available.

Over the past year and a half, representatives from ARC and other agencies have visited Bermuda on a number of occasions and have met with myself and officers of the Bermuda Monetary Authority [BMA]. The BMA has provided significant technical support and advice. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the substantial contributions of our local private sector partners, including Marsh IAS, the insurance manager in Bermuda; Willis Group as reinsurance broker; as well as Appleby Bermuda, who

assisted with ARC Limited's incorporation and start-up.

In addition to the reputational benefit for Bermuda as host jurisdiction, we believe there may be future opportunities for commercial business and jobs. Africa represents one of the fastest growing economies, and there is clearly a potential for other insurance business being located in Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, the insurance policies issued this month by ARC Limited will provide a total of approximately US \$135 million in drought insurance coverage tailored to the specific requirements of the insured countries. In addition to its own capital, ARC Limited has secured \$55 million (US) of capacity from the international reinsurance and weather risk markets in order to cover the risks it is taking on from the participating countries.

ARC Limited utilises a new software application called Africa RiskView deployed by the UN World Food Programme to estimate crop losses and drought response costs before a season begins, and as it progresses, triggering insurance pay-outs at or before harvest time if the rains have been poor. ARC's cost/benefit analysis estimates that spending \$1.00 on early intervention through ARC could reduce ultimate economic impact by as much as \$4.50.

As stated by Dr. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Chair of the ARC Agency Board and Nigeria's Minister of Finance (and I quote), "The creation of the first ever African catastrophe insurance pool is a transformative moment in our efforts to take ownership and use aid more effectively. It is an unprecedented way of organising ourselves with our partners, with Africa taking the lead—taking our collective destiny into our own hands, rather than relying on the international community for bailouts."

Mr. Speaker, I believe all Honourable Members can be proud that Bermuda and our on-Island expertise have played such a key role in this important international initiative.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Health, the Honourable and Learned Member, Minister T. G. Moniz. You have the floor.

LIONFISH CONTROL PLAN COMPLETED

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Statement I have today is on the completion of the Lionfish Control Plan.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform this Honourable House, Mr. Speaker, that a control plan for the invasive lionfish has been completed. The plan was developed in a collaborative effort between the Government, NGOs, and concerned citizens through a group known as the Lionfish Taskforce.

Mr. Speaker, as Members may be aware, lionfish pose a significant threat to Bermuda's reef fish stocks and, ultimately, the reef ecosystem, as they feed heavily on local fish and invertebrates and have no natural predators here. Their presence also presents a risk to public health due to the painful stings that they can inflict.

Lionfish were first reported in Bermuda in 1999. As their numbers grew and information was obtained regarding the threat that they posed, efforts were made to hunt them and kill them. However, unlike other areas in the western Atlantic and Caribbean which are also being impacted by the lionfish invasion, relatively few lionfish were found in Bermuda's shallow inshore waters.

It was not until commercial lobster fishermen started catching lionfish more frequently in their offshore traps in the late 2000s and Triangle Diving personnel began seeing numbers of them on deep dives that we realised that they were increasing here, primarily in depths greater than 150 feet.

Mr. Speaker, we also realised that we knew very little about how large the population was and how they were impacting local fish populations, and that this was important information to obtain in order to develop effective control strategies. This, combined with the realisation that no one organisation had the resources to handle this problem by itself, became the impetus for collaboration.

In October 2012, the Ocean Support Foundation, in partnership with the Bermuda Aquarium, Museum and Zoo [BAMZ], organised and hosted a workshop designed to help Bermuda start to create a plan to gather the necessary information and develop control strategies for this invasive pest. Dr. James Morris of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and Mr. Lad Akins of the Reef Environmental Education Foundation (REEF), two of the top authorities on the lionfish invasion in the western Atlantic, facilitated the workshop.

The Lionfish Taskforce was established during this workshop with a mandate from workshop participants to oversee the creation of this plan.

A number of individuals from various organisations contributed to the resulting Control Plan, namely:

- Ms. Kaitlin Baird of the Bermuda Institute of Ocean Sciences (BIOS);
- Ms. Leah Cunningham, Ocean Support Foundation (OSF);
- Mr. Corey Eddy, OSF;
- Mr. Chris Flook, Director of Bermuda Blue Halo;
- Dr. Gretchen Goodbody-Gringley, BIOS;
- Mr. Gil Nolan, Bermuda Zoological Society [BZS];
- Mr. Tim Noyes of BIOS;
- Dr. Joanna Pitt of the Department of Environmental Protection;
- Mr. Gordon Shaw, Bermuda Lionfish Culler;

- Dr. Robbie Smith of BAMZ and the Department of Conservation Services;
- Dr. Tammy Trott, Department of Environmental Protection;
- Mr. Weldon Wade of Bermuda Ocean Explorers; and
- Dr. Ian Walker, BAMZ/Department of Conservation Services.

Mr. Jim Gleason, former TaskForce Chair and OSF Executive Director, and Ms. Helen Gullick, OSF Board member and Vice President of Contract Wordings at Ironshore Insurance Ltd., edited the plan.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges of managing the lionfish invasion are complex. Lionfish are the first marine invasive reef fish to plague the western Atlantic region, so there are no previous experiences on which to draw. That is why this Lionfish Control Plan is so important. It provides a guide and cohesive long-term plan on how to tackle this problem based on experiences had so far in Bermuda and in the region.

Mr. Speaker, the plan focuses on five priorities:

1. education, outreach and training;
2. research and assessment;
3. detection and removal;
4. monitoring and data gathering; and
5. data management.

Although the plan has just been completed this year, taskforce partners have been far from idle during its development. In early 2013, the taskforce initiated the submission of a Darwin Plus: Overseas Territories Environment and Climate Fund Project application to fund some of the main research components that had been identified early on. A grant of just under £170,000 was subsequently awarded jointly to the Bermuda Institute of Ocean Sciences, the Ocean Support Foundation, the Bermuda Government Department of Environmental Protection and the Bermuda Aquarium, Museum and Zoo in April 2013.

Mr. Speaker, with this funding, research activities were able to commence, and these include lionfish and prey fish surveys, age and reproduction studies, and a feeding ecology study. A lionfish trapping experiment was also initiated. Other control plan initiatives that were implemented during the last year include:

1. the addition of over 300 individuals to the lionfish culling permit programme, which allows a person to use a three-prong spear to capture lionfish on scuba or snorkel anywhere around the Island;
2. the launch of a lionfish sighting and capture reporting programme, which includes online reporting, drop-off sites for lionfish and an online database; and
3. several education and outreach activities such as the BUEI [Bermuda Underwater Explora-

tion Institute] lionfish exhibit, the BAMZ lionfish tank exhibit, a lionfish documentary and the Groundswell Lionfish Tournament.

Mr. Speaker, the control plan is a working document and will evolve over time as new information is discovered, various strategies are tested and more resources become available. The plan represents the first stage of the overall control strategy and will provide a reference for anyone who is actively engaged in learning about lionfish and developing local control tactics.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Ministry of Health and Environment, I would like to thank all those who had a hand in preparing this Lionfish Control Plan. We would especially like to thank Mr. Jim Gleason for all the work that he did as taskforce chair to pull the plan together, and we would also like to welcome onboard the new co-chairs, Mr. Kirk Kitson and Mr. Paul Van-Pelt, who will help guide the implementation of the plan.

The Ministry encourages anyone involved or wishing to get involved in the lionfish control work to download the plan from the Government portal (www.gov.bm) or the Lionfish Taskforce website (www.lionfish.bm). Upcoming opportunities for public participation in this effort will be advertised as widely as possible, and members of the public can contact the Lionfish Taskforce at info@lionfish.bm with any questions or comments.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
That completes the Statements.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The Speaker: There are no reports of committees.

QUESTION PERIOD

The Speaker: That takes us to our Question Period.

The first Statement by Minister Dunkley, we have some questions. I recognise first the Honourable Member from Pembroke [Central], MP Walton Brown. You have the floor.

QUESTION 1: NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL MASTER PLAN AND ACTION PLAN 2013–2017

Mr. Walton Brown: Good morning, Mr. Speaker, and good morning, colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member, Minister Dunkley, spoke about the importance of a comprehensive approach to dealing with drug use and interdiction.

My question relates to the quality of the data on which policy is derived. In light of the fact that the Minister tabled in this House a report ostensibly of

student drug use, yet only surveyed public school students as opposed to the other half of the student population, private schools, in light of the fact that there is a current media campaign—

The Speaker: Question? Question?

Mr. Walton Brown: Yes? This is all part of the question.

The Speaker: Yes. Not a speech.

Mr. Walton Brown: Well, I have not finished the sentence yet, Mr. Speaker. It is one question.

In light of the fact that there is a current media campaign going on about drug use and alcohol use that is based on false information (i.e., the legal age of consumption), what assurance can the Minister give this House that the information that will be used to develop the policy will be both well researched and reliable, in light of the track record?

The Speaker: Thanks.

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right.
Minister?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have a more thorough discussion with the Honourable Member about this. I am not sure which policy he is talking about developing. I have tabled the Department of National Drug Control Master and Action Plans here today. And so, I think it is more appropriate that we have an offline discussion to understand his concern so I can answer the question in an appropriate way.

The Speaker: All right. MP Brown? Go ahead. Do you want a supplementary?

Mr. Walton Brown: I am happy with that comment, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Okay. All right. Thank you.

[Crosstalk]

The Speaker: Honourable Members, can we stop talking across the floor? Honourable Members? Both sides of the floor, let us not be speaking across the floor. Thank you.

I recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke [East], as well, MP Walton Brown—MP Walter Roban. MP Roban.

- [Laughter]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a little joke in my head, but I will not say it.

The Speaker: Okay.

QUESTION 1: NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL MASTER PLAN AND ACTION PLAN 2013–2017

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is as follows: In light of the tabling of this report, the National Drug Control Master Plan of 2013–2017, and following on from last week's tabling of the Cabinet's Review Committee report, how is the Minister going to reconcile those two different reports and their objectives? I would like to know if he can give us some indication of that at this point. Thank you.

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank the Honourable Member.

It is our intention to have the *Take Note* debate on that cannabis reform advisory document next week. And then listen to what Honourable Members have to say in this House, and then take a look at some of the potential opportunities for change, going forward, such as medical uses and things like that.

This National Plan, remember, was put en train well before we had these discussions. And it is appropriate. There is still much work in it that can be accomplished, so it is still appropriate to move forward. And of course, as with any document, it is a living and breathing document. You can tweak and change it as you deem necessary as you move through it.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Roban?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Second question, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 2: NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL MASTER PLAN AND ACTION PLAN 2013–2017

Mr. Walter H. Roban: As the Minister indicated in his Statement, this is a succession plan in a previous master plan, which was put forth by a previous administration. What I would like to know is, can the Minister give us some idea as to the success of some of the goals that were set originally with the plan? Since this is supposed to be a succession of that plan, can the Minister perhaps give a preliminary view, as I suspect will come up in debate, of some of the accomplishments that have already been made through the master plan process?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member said it will come up in the debate. This plan is not tabled for debate. It is tabled for the House. Somebody can put it down for debate.

The current plan goes off the 2007–2011 plan and carries on with stuff that has not been accomplished. I think great strides have been made with the original plan, and you will see by the document some of the reference made to it as we move forward.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Thank you, MP Roban.

Any other Members with questions for Minister Dunkley?

We move now to the second Statement with reference to the registry of shipping. And it is Minister Crockwell's Statement.

The Chair will recognise MP Lister.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: OPENING OF BERMUDA REGISTRY OF SHIPPING LONDON OFFICE

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister is, In light of the agreement with the police service in Southampton, which we discussed here in this House not too long ago, and in light of the fact that the centre of activity is in Southampton, which we know, why not open the office in Southampton rather than in London?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know we had this discussion, I believe, during the Budget Debate. The benefit and the efficacy of having the office in London is that we already have a London office there. So we are just occupying space within the Bermuda London office. So it is not an additional expense for the Government.

We recognise the importance of being more in the hub in Southampton, which is the ultimate goal in the future, but right now, for cost reasons, we are staying in the London office.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Supplementary?

The Speaker: Supplementary, yes?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: What on-the-ground costs are we incurring in Southampton? What on-the-ground operations are we going to have in Southampton on an ongoing basis?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I would have to seek the answer to that and get back to the Honourable Member.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Second question, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: MP Lister, yes.

QUESTION 2: OPENING OF BERMUDA REGISTRY OF SHIPPING LONDON OFFICE

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Will the existence of this office, having chosen it to be in London, assist us in the process of hiring surveyors as opposed to continuing the process or the procedure of contracting in surveyors, as obviously this is a major problem for us? We have been ticked out for it. We have been written up for it. We have promised to act on it. Will this assist?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes. Yes, Honourable Member.

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Clearly, a poorly worded question.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Yes or no does it.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: It works.

The Speaker: Your words.

[Laughter]

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, the next question I have, the supplemental coming out of that is, What actions are going to be taken? What specific actions are we looking at with regard to either, or both, the hiring and training of Bermuda surveyors to operate out of that

office to assist us in changing this ratio, which is not acceptable?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: To further expand on the Honourable Member's collection of questions, we believe that by having the office in London, it will be more attractive to surveyors to be actually stationed there, my understanding is that we will have in-house surveyors there providing statutory surveys to our various clients.

I am trying to remember your last question. Oh, the training of Bermudians. We understand one of the impediments is that the salaries provided locally were not competitive, as far as the surveying. We want to get Bermudians involved in that and Bermudians being interested in that area. So we have some work to do in terms of marketing. But we also have to augment the remuneration that we offer in that field.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: My last question, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Supplemental. Can you tell us the actual staff complements of the office, Mr. Minister, the staff complements of the office?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I can tell that 13, I believe, is the number. But in terms of the . . . because we just took on a few surveyors recently as a result of the audit that was carried out. So, we are now compliant. I made a Ministerial Statement some months ago, very pleased that we have gotten a clean bill of health. So we are up to 13, with additional surveyors. Bermudians are being trained in various departments, various areas. And I can actually break down the various activities. But I know there are 13 members.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Leader of the Opposition. I recognise MP Marc Bean.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: OPENING OF BERMUDA REGISTRY OF SHIPPING LONDON OFFICE

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Honourable colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Learned Honourable Minister, What is the Government's position regarding the SAGE recommendations that posit that the Department of Maritime Administration is earmarked for privatisation?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: We are looking at the Department of Maritime Administration, as well as the Department of Civil Aviation potentially to become like a quango. We are looking at the various options. Because these departments generate significant revenue for the Government, we do not want to lose that revenue. But we do want to make it more effective and more efficient. And by being in Government, sometimes they can slow up the process. So we are looking at various options. But complete privatisation I do not think is our primary option at the moment.

The Speaker: Okay. I recognise now MP Walter Roban. MP Roban.

QUESTION 1: OPENING OF BERMUDA REGISTRY OF SHIPPING LONDON OFFICE

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of questions for the Minister on this particular Statement. The Minister did mention on page 3 that the ships on our registry operate in UK and European waters and Asia and the Middle East. Can the Minister perhaps give us some indication of the exact percentage our ships that are based in UK, European waters, Middle East and Asia?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: That would be difficult for me to provide off the top of my head. I can say that in the last three years, there has been a 10 [per cent] to 15 per cent increase of registrations. But to break down which regions they are coming from, I will have to get that information and provide it to the Honourable Member.

The Speaker: Thank you.
MP Roban?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Yes, second question, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 2: OPENING OF BERMUDA REGISTRY OF SHIPPING LONDON OFFICE

Mr. Walter H. Roban: In light of the fact that, I think if one does do a little bit of research, you will note that there is a lot of—most of the shipping activity in refer-

ence to building is going on in Asia. And since this is a move to create a satellite office, is there perhaps some long-term goal to set up a satellite office in Asia where all of our competitors are, as well as most of the building activity of new shipping is actually going on?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you. I think the Honourable Member makes a valid point. I have heard in discussions the desire to be in those areas. I think right now, based on financial constraints, we are not. But because we have the facility in London and, of course, that makes us much closer to these areas, at present that is our best option.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Thank you. No other further questions?

Oh, yes, I do recognise MP Lawrence Scott has a question. Yes.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition Leader actually asked my question.

The Speaker: Okay. All right. Thank you.

We now move to the third Ministerial Statement, by Minister Gordon-Pamplin, with reference to the Grand Atlantic. And the Chair will recognise first MP Weeks.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Good morning, honourable colleagues. Good morning, Minister.

Minister, my first question for you on this comes from page 3. I see where MacLellan & Associates have been fully briefed by the engineers. And they have their own engineers. And so, it looks to me they have decided to go ahead and practice. So then we are saying that they are satisfied of the safety of the Grand Atlantic property.

The Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: The question is, Have you sufficiently satisfied the potential investors on the safety of the Grand Atlantic property?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The MacLellan & Associates have been fully apprised

of the concerns. They have looked at the existing engineering reports. They have consulted with their own engineers. And a part of their proposal is, in fact, to make an access down to the beach from the upper level, which will include ensuring that the cliff base is fully supported and that there are not likely to be any further problems. So the answer is, yes, they have been fully apprised. We wanted to be completely open to ensure that there were no surprises coming out at the back end.

The Speaker: Yes, thank you.

You have a supplementary?

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Yes, I do.

The Speaker: MP Weeks has the floor. MP Weeks, you are giving way?

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Yes, yes.

The Speaker: All right. I recognise now MP Zane De Silva. MP De Silva, you have a supplementary, do you, on this?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, in light of what the Minister just said, would she agree that all the pre-election noise from the OBA was nothing but electioneering?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak to the pre-election comment or the electioneering, because the previous Government actually had access to the engineering reports that existed. And if there was information that was put out that was inaccurate, they had the opportunity to table that.

But I do wish to apologise to the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, for this Government making attempts to make lemonade out of the lemons that they left us with.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

I recognise . . . You have a supplementary?

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: A supplementary.

The Speaker: All right. Yes, carry on.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Minister mentioned about access to the beach. Currently, the access to the beach is through the tribe road that is there, and now the access has been denied to the public and the residents of constituency 24.

When will the Minister reopen or re-allow access by the public through that tribe road?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the tribe road access has some challenges. It is not safe. And it is for that reason that access has been denied. However, the entire project will be looked at. I do not know the specific answer in terms of when it may be reopened for the public. But certainly, this Government is not wanting to encourage something which has previously been accessible to now become inaccessible. But from a safety perspective, we want to ensure that nobody making access to the beach is going to have any personal danger.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
You have a second supplementary?

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: The second supplementary is, Will the Minister ensure that the tribe road will be made safe so that access can be reissued to the public and the residents of constituency 24?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: We will certainly ensure that safety procedures are looked at, taken into consideration and acted upon. We are very, very concerned to ensure that people are not putting themselves in harm's way by attempting to get to the beach.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
I recognise MP . . . You have a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Minister, with regard to the safety work that needs to be done, is there a timeline that has been established when the works will be complete, in light of [the fact that] the summer is now upon us and most of the residents of Warwick will surely, I am sure, would like to have access for the summer period?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that that tribe road access has been closed off for years. So I do not know that it is likely to be done this summer. It is not something that I have seen on the schedule of works. But I believe it is prudent to ensure that access is restricted to ensure that there is no danger.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will recognise the Deputy Speaker.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Carry on.

QUESTION 1: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Would the Minister be able to advise us how long this multi-million dollar project has been empty? Thank you.

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I am not sure if the exact time, but certainly since its construction. There was one unit actually sold and one other unit occupied. Outside of that, it has been empty since its construction. I believe it has been three, four years perhaps—three years?

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
I recognise MP Weeks.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Before I ask my other question, can I clarify something that I just heard?

The Speaker: Honourable Member, this is a question period for you. You only can ask questions.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: I want to give an answer and say that the place was occupied.

The Speaker: It is only questions, Honourable Member!

QUESTION 2: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Minister, how much has the Government sold this project for?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: The property has not been sold. There is a Memorandum of Understanding. And it is during this period of exclusivity for the Memorandum of Understanding that those details will be worked out. If it comes down to a point of contract, then this Honourable House will be updated in terms of the actual monies involved.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

MP, do you have another supplementary on that? Yes?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Actually, Mr. Speaker, I was looking to do a supplementary for previous questions to the Minister, but I missed—

The Speaker: All right. If the question has been asked, then you can ask a supplementary on it.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, Are the principals involved at this MOU secure in their own mind with the status of the cliff?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I believe that they are secure knowing that they will be able to revisit it in terms of creating the access down to the beach. So I believe the answer is yes.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I am not really concerned about access.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: But, Mr. Speaker, I would now ask another supplementary to the Minister. Is she and the One Bermuda Government now secure with the status of the cliff?

The Speaker: Thank you.
Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Mr. Speaker, I am well versed in a lot of things. But, unfortunately, engineering is not one of them. So what I can do is to take advice on that particular issue and then I would be able to give the Honourable Member a more definitive response.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, to a previous question, the Minister—supplementary.

The Speaker: Okay. To another, because you have had your supplementaries on that question.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Two supplementaries on it?

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Okay, fine. I will defer and wait till my own question.

The Speaker: Okay.

You have a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. E. David Burt: Yes, yes, Mr. Speaker.

My supplementary to the Minister would be, she said that she takes advice. What advice has she received from her technical officers regarding the status of the cliff? Because one would assume that they would not pull out an RFP if it was not safe. So what advice has she gotten?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: The information that I have is that as long as the cliff is maintained, if there are roots coming down that are causing the sand, the sandy bits, actually, causing the erosion, and as long as that is properly maintained, then that issue will go away. But it will be shored up when you go into that cliff face to make that access. There would be additional requirements to ensure that it is properly shored up.

The Speaker: All right.

Yes, MP, you have another supplementary?

Mr. E. David Burt: Just as a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

So is the Minister now saying that her Government is completely certain that the cliff face, unlike what was said before, that it was dangerous, that they believe that it is safe?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I think the preliminary indications are that, for the moment, they are fine. I will take full . . . And I am quite happy to report to this Honourable House. You know, I take full responsibility for those things that I am responsible for, and I am quite happy to share that information as soon as I have it.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

I recognise MP Furbert. Is this a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes.

So, if the Minister is happy to be putting our tourists there, is she not happy that our locals can go in the same location?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I am sorry. If the Honourable Member would like to ask that question again?

The Speaker: MP Furbert?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: If the Minister is happy that our tourists can go in that location, is she happy that the locals could have gone there also?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: The locals do go to that beach.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Let me clarify that.

The Speaker: You have another supplementary?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: No, just changing—clarification.

The Speaker: Just ask the question.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes. A supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Supplementary is, If the Minister is happy that tourists can stay in that location in the Atlantic, in the units, is she happy that locals could have stayed also in those units?

The Speaker: Oh, okay.
Carry on. Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I think that is a fair question. And I do not know that I can answer it because I do not know what the challenges that the Honourable Member is referring to that . . . You know, he is asking, Was I satisfied that locals could have stayed in the units as opposed to, am I satisfied that tourists can stay in the units?

If the units are deemed to be safe once they are ultimately occupied, then obviously it is safe either way.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. All right. Thank you.

I recognise the MP Walter Roban.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary question.

Would the Minister declare to this House who actually built the cliff fortification that is currently in place?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I would imagine that the contractor who built the building. But I honestly do not know. I can find out the answer, and I will be happy to bring that information to the House.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Yes, MP Roban, you have another supplementary?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Supplementary, yes.

Would the Minister agree that it was the developer and that developer was Mr. Lopes, who was a private developer who actually built the cliff face fortifications, and it was not the actual, the Government that built it?

The Speaker: Thank you.
Minister.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I would imagine so. I do not think that the Government did any of the building. The building was done by the developer of that particular project.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Thank you, Minister.

MP, you have a supplementary?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes, sir.

The Speaker: Yes. Carry on.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Minister, assuming that a full disclosure was made during the course of negotiations regarding the concerns of the Government and the cliff face, what concerns in response were expressed by the principals?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: The principals did have their own engineers go in and look, because we wanted to ensure that we were up front to say that

there had been concerns. They had their own engineers go in and have a look. And they also know that there is going to be access to the beach and that whatever challenges may have existed would be ameliorated if there has to be additional construction going down to that particular beachfront.

The Speaker: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: So the Minister will—

The Speaker: Another supplementary?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Another supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The Minister would then agree with me that, as of now—

The Speaker: Question, question, question.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —the Government—

The Speaker: Question, Honourable Member.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The Government and the principals are satisfied that the cliff is absolutely safe?

The Speaker: Ask—just ask a question.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I asked—

The Speaker: Is the—is it safe?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I am asking if she would agree with me that the cliff, as far as the Government and the principals are concerned, as it stands right now, is absolutely safe?

The Speaker: Okay. That is fine. Yes.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I would not say “absolutely,” but I think that I can agree with you that the cliff face is safe for right now.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I would not say *absolutely*.

Some Hon. Members: Ooh!

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.
I recognise—yes.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Minister be able to tell us approximately how many jobs will be created by the redevelopment of this property? Thank you.

The Speaker: Yes, that is not connected to . . . That is not really connected.

QUESTION 2: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Okay. Thank you.

Then, Mr. Speaker, if I could ask another question then. Is the Minister aware of who might be financing any funds that would be incurred by the re-shoring of the cliff? Would it be the developers, or would it be the Government? Thank you.

The Speaker: Minister?

[Crosstalk]

The Speaker: Yes, Minister.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Because we are still in the Memorandum of Understanding and a discovery period for the project, if it comes to contract, then the contract would specify who would be responsible for what aspects. It would be my belief at this point, though, that the Government would not be taking on any further responsibility relating to that project. We have already spent some \$40-odd million on the project. And at best, it is going to be about probably around 50 per cent of that value.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
The Chair recognises the—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: My last supplementary.

The Speaker: MP De Silva. I am sorry. I think you have already asked two.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: No, I only asked one, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Two supplementaries.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Only one, Mr. Speaker, one supplementary.

[Pause]

The Speaker: Go ahead.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Minister tell us, Mr. Speaker, in light of the vociferous concerns by Stuart Hayward and BEST [Bermuda Environmental Sustainability Task-force], have they been consulted by the Minister and the new group with regard to the cliff face now being safe?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I have not consulted with BEST.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Thank you, Honourable Member.

Honourable Member, you had a supplementary?

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Mr. Speaker, considering the acknowledgement that the cliff face is now indeed safe, what can be attributable to the change of heart on this issue on the other side of the floor, by the Government, from three years ago?

The Speaker: Minister? Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: The comfort that further shoring up will be made possible when that cliff face needs to be accessed in order to allow access to the beach gives me comfort on that.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

MP, do you have a third question?

QUESTION 3: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Minister, keeping in mind that the units were originally sold below market to low income people, what I am asking is, in order to buy those units back, did you sell these units, did you pay market rates or premium rates in order to get the two people that were there to move out?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: My Statement indicated actually that there were two purchasers. But in fact, there was only one. I will have to get you the

actual amount that was used as a settlement for that one family as against what they would have paid for it. That I will have to find out. I do not know the answer to that.

The Speaker: The Chair recognises the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you. The response, I was not clear with the response of the previous answer from the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: But, Mr. Speaker, it says in the Statement that one of the families has already relocated, relocated. Can the Minister indicate to this Honourable Chamber not the exact address, but in terms of the fair market value of this transaction, where were they relocated?

The Speaker: Okay, that is your question.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Was it within the VAT stock?

The Speaker: That is your question.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes. That is a supplementary to Minister Weeks. Was it in the VAT stock?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I will have to find out, because the information that came to me was that they were satisfied that they were moved to another location that was of equal—

The Speaker: Just a minute! Just a minute!

Members are standing! Wait until the Honourable Member finishes, gentlemen! One should not . . . should not. Let the Honourable Member finish, and then you jump up.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the family that was moved—the purchasers—were moved to an acceptable alternate location.

The Speaker: All right. All right.

I recognise MP Wayne Furbert.

QUESTION 1: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as Ministers, does not the Minister or Ministers ask their Permanent Secretaries and

directors questions about more detail when they are doing a Statement?

The Speaker: I think that is . . . Minister, you can reply to that if you like, please.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: It is difficult to answer such a ridiculous question.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please, I would like for you to withdraw that. Honourable Member, withdraw that, and just answer the question.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I withdraw the comment if it was offensive. But I will not answer that question.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
The Chair will recognise the MP Blakeney.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
In the Statement it says that two are occupied, one was the proprietary interest holder.

The Speaker: Member, you are asking a supplementary on—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes.

The Speaker: But right now you are not asking a new question.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: It is not a new question. It is a supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: So what I would like to know is, under what criteria was the other apartment that was not sold made available, and did that extend to anyone else that met the criteria that was in need of a home and would have loved to have lived in those particular units?

The Speaker: Minister? Yes, Minister.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I do not have the answer to that, but I will find it out and bring the answer to this Honourable House.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.
Yes, one question. You have a question, yes.

QUESTION 1: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Minister, what role did the Tourism Authority in general, and in particular the Chairman, Mr. David Dodwell, have in making this Memorandum of Understanding with Government come to fruition?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: The Memorandum of Understanding was under negotiation even before the Tourism Authority was formed. So there would have been no involvement by the Tourism Authority. The Memorandum of Understanding was in negotiations before the formation of the Tourism Authority.

An Hon. Member: Really?

[Laughter]

An Hon. Member: What?

The Speaker: Thank you.
MP Scott.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Yes, this is a question.

The Speaker: Your question. Yes?

QUESTION 1: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Will the Minister uphold the promise made by her predecessor and hold a town hall meeting for the residents of constituency 24 to inform and listen to their concerns?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Yes.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: When will this town hall meeting take place?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: We are in an exclusivity period for a Memorandum of Understanding. Once that exclusivity period has expired, once there is a determination as to exactly what the ultimate outcome will be, then we will be in a position to make

sure that everybody is brought into the loop, that everybody is aware of what is happening.

The Speaker: Thank you.
Yes. Another question?

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: This is another question.

The Speaker: Okay.

QUESTION 2: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: What impact will the reallocation of the purpose of the Grand Atlantic have on the immediate area residents?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: It is a new question, yes. It is another question.
Have you got it, Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: No, I think I have the question. You were asking about the reallocation—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: Stand up, Honourable Member, and make it clear for her.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Sorry. Just for clarification. Going from selling them as condos for residents to the (I will call it) a boutique hotel, what impact, the changing in allocation from residency to a hotel, will that have on the immediate residents in the area?

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Well, I would imagine that the first positive impact would be the contribution to the economy that would be on an ongoing basis by people coming in, paying hotel fees rather than, you know, the mortgages that might be salting away to the bank. I imagine that new people coming on-Island with visitors, that there are amenities, there are businesses in the general environs of this particular development that would benefit from that. And I think generally, more tourists on-Island would help to have a positive impact on the economy.

The Speaker: Yes.
You have a supplementary on that? Okay.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister, in response to my previ-

ous question, When did the negotiations for this MOU begin?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I will have to get the exact date, and I am quite happy to do that. But the MOU, there was an RFP that was put out the early part of, or maybe the middle part of . . . the earlier part of last year. I will have to find the exact date and see when that Ministerial Statement was made.

I believe it was somewhere around this time last year that there was an RFP that was put out, and then my understanding from all of my knowledge from that RFP was that the responses came back in. And from those responses, there were three people in the running. And the first lot, which is the Steve MacLellan group, were the successful ones considered by the Housing Corporation and the Government at the time, and that if that does not pan out, then there are two more people in the works, sort of in succession.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
You have—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Just for clarity, so the Minister is stating that Coldwell, OBMI and MacLellan were selected, based on an RFP—

The Speaker: Is the Minister stating that?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes, on an RFP process that commenced prior to the Tourism Authority coming into existence? Thank you.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Yes. I can reconfirm the date of the Tourism Authority coming into existence, because I certainly do not wish to mislead this Honourable House. But I do know that they responded to an RFP and that the Tourism Authority was not involved in that process at that time.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and that is it.

The Speaker: I think you have had your supplementaries—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Actually, no—

The Speaker: On your own question.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: On my question, I asked one supplementary. And then MP Scott—

The Speaker: Go ahead.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, is one of the principals of MacLellan & Associates the former em-

ployee of the Chairman of the Tourism Authority, Mr. David Dodwell?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I do not know that. I can certainly find out.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

I have a question from MP Burt. Do you want to yield?

All right, then. MP Roban.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, I would like to do a supplementary to MP Scott's question if I might be allowed?

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: In light of—

The Speaker: On the impact to the residents, that one?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Yes, the impact on the area and the residents.

In light of the Minister's response to MP Scott's question, how does this new development affect the plans that there were to build a hotel adjacent to the Grand Atlantic as part of the plans of the private owner of the land to Grand Atlantic, who also developed the Grand Atlantic site, Mr. Lopes?

The Speaker: Minister.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: That answer I really do not know. I do not believe that there was ever a real hotel development that was going to go there. The condos were going to be put [there]. There was a part of that arrangement that there would be condos first that were sold, and then there would be a hotel. We saw that at Palmetto Bay. The condos went in; there was no hotel.

I do not believe that Grand Atlantic was any different. But with that said, I am not sure that the owner of the adjacent parcel is in fact intending to construct another hotel on that site.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is incorrect. That is incorrect information.

The Speaker: You have a point of order?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes, sir.

The Speaker: Yes. What is that?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The contingency upon which the condos were being built was that there would definitely be a hotel built and the condos would fuel the revenue for the hotel to be built.

The Speaker: Yes. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: That is a fact.

The Speaker: Thank you. All right. Thank you, Honourable Member. Thank you for that.

You have a supplementary again?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Yes, I have a supplementary.

Would the Minister at least undertake to clarify the details of that original arrangement around the Grand Atlantic and the private developer around the hotel and bring it back to the House or at least give it to myself at some point?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I absolutely will bring that information back to the House.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Because I believe it is important. I know, as I said earlier, that it was intended that there would be condos that would be built and sold, and the revenue from that would go to building a hotel.

Well, we have seen that the property has been there forever, four years, I think, since the completion of its construction. And there has been no attempt, because the buildings, the condos could not be sold. So there was no hotel. There is no hotel. And the developer has been paid for what he did in putting up the units. So whether he is going to take that money that he was paid to put it into building another hotel, we have not been informed of that as of now. But I will certainly be happy to do some more research on that and to bring that particular information back to the Honourable House.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise MP David Burt, the Shadow Minister of Finance. MP David Burt.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time is left in Question Period?

The Speaker: Yes, 16 minutes and 50 seconds.

QUESTION 1: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister if she would clarify to this House how many companies or

organisations responded to the Request for Proposal or Request for Information?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I think there were five in total, and three were short-listed.

The Speaker: MP Burt, you have a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Could the Minister please inform this Honourable House how the submissions were judged? How was one given priority over the other? What was the Government looking for, the criteria?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Since that was not a part of the Statement, Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to research that information and bring that back to the Honourable Members and bring it back to the House.

The Speaker: If you would, that would be appreciated.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Yes, I would be happy to do that.

The Speaker: MP Burt?

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders, seeing the Minister has said that she will provide information, I would just like to note and reserve the right to ask the question at the next Question Period?

The Speaker: Yes. Once she brings the information, yes.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
MP De Silva, you have a question?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I do. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Carry on.

QUESTION 1: GRAND ATLANTIC PROJECT UPDATE

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Minister, on the first page, you had mentioned OBMI and Coldwell Banker Realty have been named as the local associates that will

work with MacLellan & Associates to assist in the purposing of the Grand Atlantic development.

My question is, What is the cost to the Government for the services that are going to be rendered by these two companies?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: None.

The Speaker: Minister, thank you.

All right. Thank you, Honourable Members.

If there is nothing further, we will now move to the fourth Statement. That was a Statement by the Minister for Education and Economic Development. The Chair will recognise the Shadow Minister of Finance, MP David Burt. You have the first question.

QUESTION 1: LAUNCH OF THE AFRICAN RISK CAPACITY INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I note the Minister's statement regarding the launch of the African Risk Capacity Insurance Company. Could the Honourable Minister please inform this Honourable House how many jobs he expects to come about as a result of this company formation?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is unclear at the present time how many jobs will occur. I think there are probably two parts of that. One is it is being managed locally by Marsh, so there would be jobs potentially involved there. I am not sure how much additional capacity they will need to take on.

The second issue, which I think is perhaps more interesting in the longer run, is the potential it brings for other African business. The BMA [Bermuda Monetary Authority] has been asked to provide some additional advice and support to some African nations. I think there is a conference a little later on this year. Mr. Jeremy Cox is going to that.

But I think the issue here is Bermuda has been given what I would affectionately call a "Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval." And I believe that there could be other business stemming from the credibility and the reputation that Bermuda will have as a consequence of helping to facilitate this particular mutual business.

So it is difficult to say, but I think certainly there is potential here of additional sources of insurance business, particularly.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Burt?

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I would say is that—

The Speaker: Question?

Mr. E. David Burt: Yes. Getting there, Mr. Speaker.

In a follow-up to the Minister's [answer], is the Minister saying that there is no—

The Speaker: This is supplementary?

Mr. E. David Burt: Yes.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: That there are no actual jobs themselves tied to the new company, African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, that is being managed by another firm already existing?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I answered that. Marsh is managing it here. I have not asked them directly whether they will have to take on additional capacity or whether they will be able to handle it in-house. So it is difficult to say off the top of my head whether there will be additional jobs directly as a consequence of the incorporation of this company here. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you.
MP—

QUESTION 2: LAUNCH OF THE AFRICAN RISK CAPACITY INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my second question is, I note that the Minister recognises the importance of the African market, and I understand that when the Progressive Labour Party was in Government, we pursued business opportunities there as well.

What additional steps will the Government be taking to foster additional economic activities with the Continent of Africa?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in answer to a previous question, we have an opportunity, I believe, because I believe it is Jeremy Cox, or it could be somebody else

at a senior level at the BMA, who has been invited to go to a conference to assist and talk a little bit more about this area, the mutual hybrid structure which has been set up here.

But I believe because of that opportunity, there will be additional possible approaches. But I think it would be fair to say that I think this is a good start. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you.

You have a supplementary, Leader of the Opposition?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I would like to ask the Minister, so it is a BMA initiative for Bermuda to engage in potential opportunities with the African Continent, and not the One Bermuda Alliance?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: No.

The Speaker: Thank you.
MP Burt?

Mr. E. David Burt: My third question.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 3: LAUNCH OF THE AFRICAN RISK CAPACITY INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. E. David Burt: In referring to the Minister's Statement on page 4, the Minister refers to the Nigerian Minister of Finance. I am asking if the Honourable Minister is aware of the relationships that were fostered under the Progressive Labour Party's time between the Government and the current Minister of Finance from Nigeria.

The Speaker: Yes, Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: No.

The Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

All right. Thank you.
Honourable Member Cole Simons, you have a question?

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 1: LAUNCH OF THE AFRICAN RISK CAPACITY INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Would the Minister share with this House as to why the principals of African Risk Capacity Insurance Company chose Bermuda over Switzerland?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we were told that it revolved around a number of issues. But I think at the end of the day, it was the reputation, flexibility and efficiency of Bermuda as an insurance jurisdiction that actually convinced the ARC member states to locate it here.

I think it is interesting because I know that Switzerland (I have heard anecdotally) went all out on this and was actually interested in providing financial support as well. One of the interesting things about Bermuda as a jurisdiction is that a company can re-domicile out of here without a lot—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: I cannot, I cannot, I cannot—please, please, please, Honourable Members.

[Gavel]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: One of the interesting things about Bermuda is that an insurance company, or indeed other companies, can re-domicile out of Bermuda to an approved jurisdiction. And I think that was one of the issues that was certainly in the minds of those that did diligence. Because, as I said in the Statement, I think both for issues of pride and for issues of economic development, there is an expressed interest that at some point this company may actually re-domicile to an African country. But there is no predetermined time.

An Hon. Member: Mauritius.

The Honourable Member mentions Mauritius. It was not just Switzerland that we were up against. There were probably about a half a dozen other countries, as I understand it. Mauritius was one of them; South Africa was another. So there was an extensive look at various potential jurisdictions, some of them within Africa or close to Africa as well. And I think at the end of the day, we should all be very proud, Mr. Speaker, that it ended up in Bermuda.

Thank you.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister. Yes, second supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes, second supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Minister, because in his Statement, he says that Germany and the United Kingdom contributed the initial capital and also our foreign members of the mutual. So was this German and UK-based capital the decision-makers as to where they would domicile instead of the African Governments, as mentioned in the Statement?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to that is no, as far as I understand it.

The Speaker: All right.

MP Simons, you have a second question?

QUESTION 2: LAUNCH OF THE AFRICAN RISK CAPACITY INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Yes. My second question is, What support did Government give to bring this new company to fruition?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: If the Honourable Member is asking about financial support, Bermuda provided no financial support.

I have to commend, though, some of the local services providers, as mentioned, because they did do a lot of what I will call “pro bono work” to help establish this here. But I think at the end of the day, Bermuda Government and certainly the Bermuda Monetary Authority, as the regulator, were very willing to make those who were looking into various jurisdictions feel welcome here, to understand the depth of the Bermuda market and understand the kind of assistance and support we could bring as a first-class insurance centre.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.

We now move to the final Statement, by the Learned Minister T. G. Moniz, with reference to lionfish. I will recognise the Leader of the Opposition. You had a question on that?

QUESTION 1: LIONFISH CONTROL PLAN COMPLETED

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On page 4, the Honourable and Learned Minister mentions that “a lionfish trapping experiment was also initiated.” It is the bottom paragraph of page 4.

The Speaker: Page 4.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: My question is, Was this lionfish trapping experiment done via local lobster fisherman, lobster trap fisherman?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that these, the whole project was collaborative. But I cannot speak to the details. I know that the trapping part of it has been problematic. I am aware of that. But I do not think I can elucidate any further.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
Leader?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: So I guess he answered—

The Speaker: Supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes. The Honourable Learned Minister answered part of my first supplementary question, which is, What are the preliminary results of this trapping initiative?

The Speaker: Minister?

[Gavel]

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Yes, you did not make it, Premier.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, if I remember the question correctly, I do not think . . . The preliminary results indicate that there is no answer yet. I mean, it is problematic in the sense that when you are attempting to catch one species, you do not want to catch another species by mistake. So they have not really reached a solution with a trap that is going to trap only lionfish, particularly when you are trapping at great depths, you know, down to 150 [feet], down to even deeper depths. Whatever you bring up is going to be dead when you bring it up. So you do not want to be killing the wrong species.

So they are still working on it. That is my understanding.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
Leader of the Opposition, you have another question?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes.

The Speaker: Yes. Second question.

QUESTION 2: LIONFISH CONTROL PLAN COMPLETED

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Will the Honourable and Learned Minister agree that the challenge with the trapping is not the fact of taking other types of fish, but more so the construction of the trap itself, which has openings, or slits, for the lionfish to actually escape? So there is a modification to the traps which are actually not on the same specifications as the normal fish trap or lobster trap?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Member is correct. There are special modifications that need to be made. But I do not think they have found an answer yet.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Listen to the fishes. Listen to the fishes.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.
That is it?

All right, Honourable Members. That brings to an end the Question Period.

[Pause]

The Speaker: Members, we now move to . . . You are very learned.

[Laughter]

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: Honourable Members, before we start, I would just like to recognise a former Senator of the House, Reverend Dr. Santucci, who is here with us.

[Desk thumping]

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

The Speaker: I have decided today, during this obituary and congratulatory speeches, because he is a former Speaker, to speak to the passing of the Honourable F. John Barritt, CBE, who served the people of Bermuda from 1968 to 1989, and who was the Speaker of this House from 1979 until 1989.

I want to offer condolences to his son, John, who was a Member of this House, and the rest of his family. I would just like to say that the Speaker was a man who earned the respect and admiration of both Houses of the House and the many Commonwealth

Speakers, as a man who was knowledgeable, gracious, even-tempered, and fair.

The Honourable former Speaker's reach was far beyond the Bermuda Parliament, to attendance at CPA [Commonwealth Parliamentary Association] conferences and Commonwealth Presiding Officers Conferences, and through his being a prime mover of the Leadership Prayer Breakfast Group in Bermuda and the relationships that they were able to build with the Washington Leadership Group, some members of whom are here today, who know the Honourable John Barritt very well.

I myself remember the Honourable, Mr. Barritt, the Honourable John Barritt. I did not meet him that many times, but when I did meet him, I remember him as being a very kind, thoughtful gentleman and a man of integrity. I have never seen a man I met who always seemed to be so calm.

Honourable Members of the House, this man, to me, was certainly a kind and thoughtful gentleman and a man of integrity. And we wish him well as he moves into the Kingdom. Thank you.

The Chair will recognise the Premier.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to continue to echo those same sentiments coming from yourself on the passing of the Honourable Frederick John Barritt, who was the Speaker for some time in these Honourable Chambers. And so, to the family we send out our condolences during their time of bereavement.

I would also like to speak to the unfortunate circumstance we had about two weeks ago where we had the Canadian visitors here, the Grange family. I had the opportunity, with the Deputy, of going up to speak to the family. So, just simply, during this time where they are extremely concerned about the whereabouts of their husband and father, I would just like them to know that Bermuda is with them.

And I wanted to also say that the family thought of and was giving congrats to Bermuda on the way that they finally have conducted, in helping them feel the support from the Bermuda family here in their search. So again, to the Grange family, we send out deepest heartfelt feelings toward them as they continue to deal with this situation.

I would also like to congratulate the Police Inspector Mark Clarke, who led and has led this search as well.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity and I want to congratulate all the nurses of Bermuda. They have been celebrating Nurse Month. I had the opportunity to go to the hospital and to do a tour of the hospital and to see the many good works that the nurses in Bermuda are doing. The only regret I have is the fact that we do not have enough Bermudians in that field. Certainly, there is a shortage in the world of nurses, and during the recessionary period of time, they always had a job. So we need to

encourage those nurses that are out there, especially the Bermudian ones, who can help sell that profession in getting more Bermudians involved.

In addition to that, I also had the opportunity, and I want to congratulate the Bermuda College on their ceremony yesterday, which took place, the commencement ceremony of our graduates here in Bermuda at the Bermuda College. There were about 110 graduates. And again, we want to congratulate the staff there for doing a fantastic job, because the students continue to rave about the great work that they had done.

Also in attendance was the Deputy; Education Minister, Dr. Gibbons. We also had Walton Brown, the Honourable Member; the Honourable Lovitta Foggo was there as well.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes, I am coming, I am coming. The Honourable Pat Gordon-Pamplin, and Senator Alexis Swan that I know were there in an official capacity. You were there as well, Weeks? Okay, cheers.

Great opportunity to see our young people moving through the ranks. And it was very interesting to listen to the student, Eron Woods, who completely—he gave a great speech. But what I wanted to say was that he gave great accolades to the teachers. So, on behalf of this Government—I am sure the whole House—we want to congratulate Bermuda College and those graduates.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The Chair recognises now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. MP Marc Bean, you have the floor.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise on behalf of the Progressive Labour Party to extend our condolences to the family of the late Speaker of the House, Mr. John Barritt.

Although many of us here today will not be able to speak from personal experience, I can say, Mr. Speaker, that apples obviously do not fall too far from the tree. And our previous colleague, Mr. John Barritt, Jr., is regarded by those of us on this side of the House as being one of the supremely talented and utmost honest and integrated politicians that we have had the experience of working with.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: And so we rate Mr. John Barritt, Jr., very highly. And I think that it is justification or indication just how highly his father was [regarded] in his service to Bermuda. So on behalf of the Progressive Labour Party, we would like to extend our heart-

felt condolences to Mr. John Barritt, Jr., and the entire Barritt family.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Deputy Premier, the Minister for National Security. Minister Dunkley, you have the floor.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to join in the condolences just expressed by the Honourable Premier and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition towards former Speaker of this House, F. John Barritt.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Barritt. I will be straight-up and tell you that I had the pleasure to vote for Mr. Barritt. And I hope he voted for me when he had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker. And the Opposition Leader is correct; apples do not fall far from the tree. Certainly, a lot that I see in John, and I know John better than his siblings. I am acquainted with the other siblings, but I know John much better than his siblings because I obviously ran with the former Honourable Member of this House. I can see the stamp in John that his father and mother had ingrained in him.

And it was clear to me that the former Speaker of the House was also a man of great faith. And what I admired most about the former Speaker was he was a man who would speak when it was important to speak, and he would not speak longer than it was necessary to speak. But when he spoke, you got the message.

And, Mr. Speaker, that was the same with his faith. He was a man of great faith, but he would not espouse it on everybody else around him. If it was appropriate, he would take that opportunity.

I certainly saw him, Mr. Speaker, as a man of tremendous family values. And you can see that in the family that he has. I certainly enjoyed the opportunities when I later canvassed his house and had the chance to sit down with him and his wife and other people there to listen to the conversation. And I just saw how strong that family is. And that is ingrained in John and the grandchildren today. And those are important values that we need to reflect on and remember as a community.

Mr. Speaker, he certainly was a businessperson. I did not know him as a businessperson, but I hear stories about how fair he was as a businessperson, but how shrewd he could be when it came to doing business. I knew him as a politician more than I knew him as a businessperson. And when I got to know him as a politician, I had just come back from university. So I knew him as the Speaker of the House. And I saw him as a very firm and fair Speaker.

And as the Honourable Opposition Leader has said, F. John Barritt was a person who crossed all party lines in Bermuda. And if there is anything we can remember about the former Honourable Member

and Speaker of this House here today, it is we need more people like that. He could walk into any circumstance and feel comfortable.

Some of the best times I had sharing with the Honourable Member were in recent Cup Matches. Mr. Speaker, as you know, being an ardent Somerset fan, I always try to get a spot in Somerset, St. George's. And when the former Speaker was going through his senior years and wanted a place to go to get away from the crowd so he could watch the game, John, his son, would always contact me and say, *Do you have space in your spot?* And the former Speaker would come to the spot, and he would sit there and we would talk cricket. And I enjoyed the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to sit with such a man of integrity, such a man of character, and have some time to spend and just talk about cricket and whatever was going on in life.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing I will say is in two parts. The accolades that we will hear here today and that we have heard in the last week speak to the measure of the man. I do not think anybody needs to add anything else. The final thing I will say is that we should be proud of Bermudians like that and acknowledge their service. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, MP Derrick Burgess. You have the floor.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the remarks concerning the former Speaker of the House, Mr. John Barritt.

Mr. Speaker, also I would like for this House to send condolences to the family of Ms. Brenell Henry, who was one of the—in fact, probably *the* last original member of the council of the PLP. I would like to associate this whole, entire side of the House with those remarks.

[Desk thumping]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: A great lady of the party, a hard worker within the party.

Mr. Speaker, also I would like for this House to send congratulations to one of my cousins, the Nurse of the Year, Ms. Gloria Burgess. She is the wife of Pastor Milton Burgess from St. Luke's AME Church. She was voted the Nurse of the Year.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like for this House to acknowledge the work that the principal at the best school in the universe—

An Hon. Member: Southampton Glebe?

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: No, not Southampton Glebe, Francis Patton. In fact, this year they celebrated their annual Leadership Day, and this year's theme was, *Watch Me Lead*. In fact, this programme began about three years ago, and they used the *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* for the young children. And they implemented that habit throughout the school, not only for the children, but for the teachers also.

Mr. Speaker, you probably know Ms. Codrington, and she is very enthusiastic. She is positive thinking a dynamic principal. Mr. Speaker, also at that day, she acknowledged the work of the wider community. In fact, one of the ladies I remember is Ms. Darrell, Owen's mother, former teacher. She volunteers twice a week to go in and teach French and also acknowledged the donations that they receive from ACE Insurance.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Transport and Tourism. Minister the Learned Member Shawn Crockwell, you have the floor.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to be associated with the remarks of condolence to the family of F. John Barritt, former Speaker of this Honourable House. I had the pleasure of meeting him in his later years through his son, John, at various functions, but obviously did not get to know him that well. But I got to know him through his son, John, because I had the pleasure of, of course, being in the House of Assembly with him. I consider him to be one of my political mentors, particularly in the arena of debating. You always wanted to aspire to be as thorough and as compelling as John. And I also had the pleasure of working with him as an attorney at Mello Jones and Martin, now MJM Limited.

So you can imagine—in fact, our offices were just divided by a wall. So we quite often spent quite a bit of time discussing politics and talking. And what was extremely evident was his love, respect and admiration for his father. That was clear, and he took care of his father. He was there for him. And I am sure that this is a very difficult time for him and the rest of the family. And I just would like to extend my condolences to him personally and let him know that he and his family will be in my prayers. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Sandys, Sandys South, MP T. E. Lister.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all join in the condolences to the Barritt family. Mr. F. John Barritt made a tremendous contribution, which we are all aware of. And I believe Bermuda loses a soldier at this time. We need not add any more about his son, whose performance in this House and in this country is outstanding, and clearly he has gained it from his relationship with his father.

I talked with John on Tuesday. We were supposed to get together later in the week, and he said, *Terry, I am not sure if I can do this because I really need to put some time with my father*. And so we talked back and forth about that, how important the relationship with your father is. And then the very next morning he sent me an e-mail saying his father had died overnight. So it took me by surprise. I was not expecting that; I do not think he was expecting that. And I and he, both, appreciated the changes that we had that very day.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to offer congratulations to my stepdaughter, Carla Zuill. Carla Zuill, as you know, on Channel 82, has *Straight Talk*. In fact, her guest last week, Wednesday, in a pre-liminary to last week Thursday's (what is it called, *Selling Bermuda?*) was Ayo Johnson, who I believe was here just a little while ago. Carla has created this out of her own mind. And it is really a wonderful programme for those who want to learn about what is going on in the community. And as she says in *Straight Talk*, she does not hold back. She says what she feels and pulls it out of you. If you are uncomfortable being interviewed, you do not want Gary Marino to interview you, do not do Carla's show. You will not enjoy it. But if you are willing to share, that is a good place to go.

I also would like to enjoin the Honourable Michael Weeks and the Honourable Member, Mr. Bascome, on the other side, and the Honourable Kim Wilson.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to offer congratulations to Mr. Anthony Richardson, well-known to us, who along with colleagues has formed Cedar Aviation and purchased the ASB [Aircraft Services Bermuda] business from BAS [Bermuda Aviation Services]. This is a tremendous investment on their part. It has tremendous potential down at the airport, and I want to offer him our support and encouragement.

Mr. Speaker, last week Sunday, I had the pleasure of attending at Mt. Zion, *Walk Together Children*, put on by Ruth Thomas and Company. As you know, when Ruth Thomas and Company put on a performance, it is standing room only. It was just that again on this occasion. It was a wonderful time of sharing back and forth, looking at yesterday, today and getting a feel for what made us and what makes us the Bermudians that we are.

The last thing, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I want to express condolences to the Dowling Smith family, who have had a double loss in the last

week. Ruth Ann Smith passed away, I believe last week Monday and was buried on Saturday. And then just two nights ago, her aunt, Helen Dowling, who you remember is Dr. Dowling's sister—they lived together for many years—she has just passed away as well and will be funeralised in the next couple of days.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Minister of Finance. Minister Bob Richards, you have the floor.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the condolences to the family of the late John Barritt, Sr. I guess, Mr. Speaker, I am old enough to have known Mr. Barritt, Sr., before I knew Mr. Barritt, Jr. The Honourable former Speaker was a friend and colleague of my father. And as a young man, I remember being introduced to him by my dad and got to know him over a number of years. Of course, eventually, Mr. Barritt became my constituent in Devonshire. I remember even by that time he was getting on in years, we were still able to have interesting conversations.

Mr. Barritt, Sr., was a dignified, thoughtful, quiet and sincere man, who really loved Bermuda. And I think, as other Member have indicated, he inculcated many of those values into his son, our former colleague, John Barritt, Jr. I think that people like Mr. Barritt, Sr., do not come along that often, people who see Bermuda in a way that is sincere, in a way where he always wanted people to be together. Quite frankly, his life was long enough in a way that he spanned generations. His whole journey through life really was a stride of a few generations in Bermuda. So you can connect Bermuda's present to the past through the careers of the former Speaker.

So I would like to be associated with the condolences to John and to the rest of the Barritt family, who I think will miss John Barritt, Sr., very much. Thank you.

The Speaker: The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke [Central]. MP Walton Brown, you have the floor.

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to be associated with the congratulatory remarks to Bermuda College and the Bermuda College students. Mr. Speaker, it is always a wonderful experience to watch students after two, four or more years of hard work, walk up to the podium and receive their degrees or associate's degrees. Yesterday was exactly that experience. What was interesting, though, Mr. Speaker, is that there were a number of mature students getting their qualifications.

And that speaks to the retooling and reskilling of some of our residents today in light of the changing economic circumstances.

We did have two very powerful speeches by individuals, very powerful. It is important to recognise this, Mr. Speaker, because those people came up to the podium yesterday, ones who are in need of support, and they will become our future leaders in a variety of areas. So it is very important to recognise them.

Also, Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, I attended a prayer vigil. Yes. It was a prayer vigil organised at the Evening Light Pentecostal Church. My colleagues present were MP Sousa [and] MP Weeks. And it really was to highlight the need for international support for the *Bring Back Our Girls* momentum in Nigeria. Yes, we all know, Mr. Speaker, approximately 300 girls have been kidnapped, and there is now an international campaign to help to reinforce the need for their release. Mr. Speaker, as a colonial territory, we do not have a voice internationally. But I would encourage the Premier to offer some statement of support for this global undertaking. It was just nice to see a number of different Christian denominations come together to support an undertaking for a resolution, a timely resolution to this really global tragedy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister of Community, Culture and Sports, Minister Wayne Scott. You have the floor.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to associate myself with the condolences to the family of the late F. John Barritt.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to send congratulations to one of our Paralympians, Jessica Lewis, who just competed in the Desert Challenge in Mesa, Arizona, last weekend and won four medals. Ms. Lewis won a gold, two silvers and a bronze, actually, in the 100 metre, 200, 400 and 800 metres successively.

I would also like to offer congratulations to Andre Pacheco, who just recently sat the FIFA [Fédération Internationale de Football Association] Player Agents exam that was actually administered here in Bermuda. As a result, he has been named Bermuda's first FIFA licensed player agent. So of course, under this title, Mr. Pacheco has the right and authority under FIFA regulations to represent any local or worldwide player who seeks a professional playing career in football, which I am sure you would be very interested in, Mr. Speaker. I would like to associate my Shadow Minister Weeks with both of those comments.

Also, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Department of Community Affairs hosted a book launch for *Take This Journey With Me*. Not only is this a welcome addition to the collection of Bermudian writings, Mr.

Speaker, but you have got stories that are humorous and sometimes painful reflections of 16 writers. I would like to applaud those writers whose work appears in this book. Of course, it takes great bravery to put one's lived experiences under the microscope in a community as small as Bermuda.

I would also like to offer my sincere appreciation to the editor of this publication, none other than the award-winning author, Ms. Rachel Manley, who you would know is the granddaughter of [Premier] Norman Manley, and the daughter of Prime Minister Michael Manley. I also would like to thank our Folklife Officer, Dr. Kim Dismont Robinson, for taking the lead on this project, and also just to mention to this House, of course, Dr. Robinson was recently named Mother of the Year.

So we do have some good things going on in community affairs, as well as sports, and just like to put those acknowledgments out there. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises MP Roban, from Pembroke [East].

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly would like to be associated with the condolences to the family of our John Barritt, Sr. I definitely would like to be associated with the condolences to the family member of Helen Dowling and the other family member who passed away. Ms. Dowling and her brother, Dr. Dowling, were my constituents, so I knew them. And the irony of this is that Doc, who was taking care of his sister, Helen, passed before her. So he was a caregiver to her in a serious way, and it was shocking that he passed away, leaving her here. But she has gone to her reward as well.

The other constituent I would like to be associated with is Ms. Brennell Henry. My history in the PLP as a member is associated with Ms. Henry. She was one of the first people I met, and all of us on this side know Ms. Henry well. Not only that, Ms. Henry was one of the originals. If there can be something associated with certain people in the PLP, she was one of the originals. She was in the original Central Committee. She was Membership Secretary in the PLP for many years, so had first-hand knowledge of the pioneers of the PLP and many of the members up until her time of serving the party.

She, unfortunately, was incapacitated in recent years, so we did not have the benefit of her vivaciousness, her beauty and her energy that she brought to the party. And you, Mr. Speaker, would have great memory of that, as do many Members here in this House. She was my constituent, and I always enjoyed visiting her and her family. She had a very strong family. Although she originates from Warwick (I believe her origins, and persons like Cole Simons would know of her from being a Warwick per-

son), but her life was lived in Pembroke and part of the Devonshire/Pembroke PLP family. She helped groom that family to the strength that it is today, as does her own family continue to do that. So, condolences, I would like to be associated with her.

I would like to also congratulate the Grace Methodist Church on a 114th anniversary concert they had a couple of weeks ago, which highlighted a litany of Bermudian musical talent, including Wanda Raynor, who sang as a part of the congregation, and other young and old Bermudian musicians. I do hope that at some point in the future, many members of the community get to see those persons in performance.

I would also like to be associated with the congratulations to the Bermuda College graduates, as well, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Minister for Education and Economic Development. Dr. Gibbons, you have the floor.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to be associated with your condolences to John Barritt and the family of the late Speaker, Mr. F. John Barritt. I think your words were right on point. I never actually had the pleasure of being in the House with Mr. Barritt when he was Speaker, but certainly through his son and through a number of occasions had the pleasure of meeting him. And I think *kind, gracious, thoughtful* and certainly *a person of integrity* would be most appropriate in terms of describing the former Speaker.

I think he was soft-spoken as well, but I suspect that if you were on the other end of the gavel from him from time to time, that may have changed. But certainly I want to add my condolences to John and the rest of the family. And I hope that some of the longevity, at 98, passes on to his children as well. I think that is quite a good innings, Mr. Speaker.

While I am on my feet, I would also like to be associated with the congratulations to the graduates of Bermuda College. It is always a happy event up there. I think as other Honourable Members have said, we had some very interesting speakers. Mr. Paul Telford, who was a graduate of the class of 1997, who is actually at Rosewood Tucker's Point right now, described a very interesting career at some very illustrious five-star hotels, both in the US and more recently in Mexico, where he had to learn Spanish. But he talked about persistence. The Honourable Member, Mr. Brown, referred to one of the observations that there were quite a few mature students. I was talking afterwards with one of them, who had gotten some of the loudest clapping and cheers. Apparently, the lady had been up there for 11 years to get her degree. So I think that is persistence, Mr. Speaker.

The student graduate address of Mr. Eron Woods was also very interesting. And it was nice to see somebody who is humble and self-effacing, but obviously had a very clear sense of what you had to do to move forward. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass on my congratulations to the President, certainly the board and, of course, the graduates. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Dr. Gibbons. Thank you very much.

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Member from Sandys [South Central], constituency 34, the Honourable and Learned Member, MP Kim Wilson.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon to you and colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I would also like to be associated with the condolences that have already been shared this afternoon to the Barritt family. At the time when the Honourable Barritt was the Speaker of the House, I was actually serving as the school counsellor of Whitney Institute, which at that time was . . . It was before we had the—

The Speaker: It was a high school.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Right, a high school. But it was before there was a middle school.

But needless to say, so oftentimes, as the school counsellor, I would use it as an excuse to bring some of my children up to the House so that they could see the Legislature first-hand and in action, particularly to augment their civics lessons. So on several occasions, we would come up to the House and we would observe the House in action.

And what was completely obvious and what inspired me and oftentimes my children, my student children often would comment on the fact that, in addition to the Speaker being extremely knowledgeable—he knew his rules like the back of his hand, and he always presided in a very calm and dignified manner, and he oozed integrity—was the fact that his impartiality was great. In fact, I recall some of my students afterwards, they would always question. They would say, *But he is part of the Government. But yet, he seems to be* (knowing, insofar as him being a member, having been elected to the UBP at the time) . . . *but yet he seems to be just as hard on that side as he is on the other side.* So they observed this.

And this is like S1s and S2s, whatever they called it back then (sorry), year 1s and 2s. So they were very observant, 12- and 13-year-olds recognising the importance of the Speaker's impartiality, and they observed it first-hand. In addition to impressing them, I think it left an indelible mark on them, because some of them, I know, are venturing into areas such as law and so forth and perhaps will one day join us in

the ranks of politics. So they do recognise that it is important to represent the best interests of all persons.

But needless to say, I certainly would like to extend my condolences to the Barritt family, to their entire family.

I would also like to extend my condolences to the Henry family. When I look back and think of people like Ms. Henry and Ms. Burch and Ms. Webb, they were the backbone of the Progressive Labour Party with respect to the women. And though they may not have stood for election, they assisted tremendously in getting the likes of Dame Lois Browne-Evans elected, and they were the backbone of our party. I was saddened to hear of her passing. I knew that she had been in ill health for some time. But I had an opportunity to see her last year when there was an event honouring some of the 50 individuals who were very involved in the Progressive Labour Party, and I saw her then and hugged her. I do not think she recalled me, but it was great to just see her in her presence with her family. So I would like to be associated, Mr. Speaker, with those condolences.

Also, on a brighter note, if I could also be associated, Mr. Speaker, with the congratulatory remarks for the some 95 young adults who graduated from the Bermuda College yesterday. I too had an opportunity to be present at that ceremony. In addition to the observation that has already been made, Mr. Speaker, from the Honourable Walton Brown concerning the number of mature students who seem to have returned to tertiary education to retrain, I also observed and had an opportunity to speak to one young lady in particular who returned to school despite working full-time and singlehandedly raising a child. There were a number of persons who were in that same position.

What impressed me the most about this individual was that her circumstances were not . . . She was not prepared to permit her circumstances of being a teenage mother and having to work and go to school at the same time—her circumstances did not define her. And she was prepared to put in the hard work and dedication so that she could cross the stage and graduate. So not only could she make a better life for herself, but she can set an example and make a better life for her child.

So if I can just be permitted to say with respect to . . . I know my 10 minutes is not up already.

The Speaker: It is only three minutes.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Oh, okay!

[Laughter]

The Speaker: If you have one quick point to make, then you can.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Oblige me, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

But just in closing, if I could just use her as an example, particularly for all the other persons that are out there that do not let your circumstances define you. Particularly if you wish to go back to school and your circumstances include having children and the like, it can be done. And she was a testament to that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Deputy Speaker. Mrs. Roberts-Holshouser, you have the floor.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think very few people will actually recognise the challenges that the seat that you now command actually bear with it. I stand to my feet today to add my voice to the condolences being sent to the family of Mr. F. John Barritt. As a child, I remember sitting in church and Mr. Barritt himself being one of the lay readers as I sat in the choir stalls. He then to me was a man of quiet solitude, who commanded when he spoke. And I think well of the gentleman who raised his family to be similar to him, but in a godly way. He was god-fearing. That, I believe, was the staple behind who he was as an individual. So I am pleased to be able to have the opportunity to send my condolences to the family.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to, perhaps maybe 24 hours in advance, but I would like to send a letter of congratulations to the St. David's Historical Society, who once again has put together their efforts to salute our heritage by way of having an Onion Day tomorrow. The event starts at 10:00 am and goes to 4:00 pm in the afternoon.

It is recognised that onions played a very strong historical . . . is part of our history by way of that was one of the first items that we actually exported. If it was not for the likes of the parts of the world like Texas, who decided that they wanted to be part of the sweet growing fruit of the earth of being onions, we probably would still be exporting onions. So my hats off to, again, the St. David's Historical Society. I would encourage all individuals to make their way to the Island of St. David's, joined by a bridge, and participate in this wonderful event. If individuals would like to taste some of the onion soup, there is a small charge. But please do make your way to St. David's tomorrow.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from St. David's, from constituency 3.

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give congratulatory remarks to one, and to be associated with Mrs. Gloria Burgess. I do on occasion attend St. Luke's Church. I find her to be a very polite, very unassuming person and one who is very much deserving of her, I guess, award.

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to be associated with the remarks regarding Garita Coddington. I can brag that Garita did serve under me when I was running the science department at CedarBridge Academy, and I would like to think that I had some play in her development as a leader in the realm of education. Garita is a very no-nonsense, very meticulous person, and is definitely dedicated to ensuring a quality education to the young people that she oversees.

Mr. Speaker, congratulatory remarks for CedarBridge Academy, which had an inaugural public speaking competition, in-house competition, which saw at least six competitors who wish to engage in public speaking. I think this serves as a great preparation for those young individuals, especially if they choose to one day pursue some type of career in public speaking. It was well attended, and the students themselves played a key role in the whole development of that competition.

Mr. Speaker, association—I wish an association with the congratulatory remarks for the Bermuda College graduates. Mr. Speaker, again, there were close to 100 graduates from all walks of life. And it definitely is reflective of the changes that we see here locally, and of course, globally. But in terms of people finding themselves, being challenged by globalisation and technology, having to retrain, re-professionalise, it shows that our Bermudians here are determined to ensure that they secure their rightful places in the workplace here in Bermuda.

And a special congratulatory remark for the valedictorian, Mr. Eron Woods, who did a superb job when he spoke at his commencement ceremony, as well as having done quite well in terms of the degree that he acquired.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one remark regarding condolences, and I was remiss in not doing this last week, for Mr. Pacheco, who was a resident in St. David's, and to the Pacheco family. He lived most of his life here. He was an Azorean. And he lived here from a young boy and also died here. He gave much service to this community. In fact, I am sure that Mr. Dunkley wants to be associated with this because he worked for many years at Dunkley's Dairy.

So, Mr. Speaker, on that note, I will take my seat.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister, MP Glen Smith.

Mr. Glen Smith: Yes, good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon, colleagues.

I too would like to join in with the condolences sent to the Barritt family in reference to Frederick John Barritt. Mr. Speaker, your words, nobody could match what you said today because integrity, kindness, thoughtfulness were what John Barritt was all about. However, I will share a little story with you of when I first met John Barritt.

It was the campaign of 1983, February, that Mr. Barritt, whom I did not know at the time, and Mr. Bill Cox trotted up to my mother's front door, where I was living. I had no idea who these gentlemen were and what they were looking to do. But anyhow, I opened the door, and they told me what they were there for, and they ushered themselves into the house. And I remember Mr. Barritt kindly saying to my mother, *Could you go make Bill a scotch while I sit down here and have a chat with Glen?*

[Laughter]

Mr. Glen Smith: And he explained to me the role of voting and so forth and the importance. And he was also very interested in myself with my business plan with my first horse and carriage business. And then the election came, and I am happy to stand here today to say that I did put my "X" next to Mr. Barritt's name.

During the campaign of 2012, as I have said today that apples do not fall far from the tree, as John Junior came out with me once or twice up to Cedar Park. I have to honestly tell you, Mr. Speaker, they were more interested in Mr. John Barritt, Sr., than John Junior and, of course, myself. So it clearly shows he fully was a man of integrity, trust, and people loved him.

I would also like to send condolences to one of my constituents today, the family of Sylvia Pike. It is a loss to the Purvis Park community. She was a lady of great religious belief. She one time worked as a housekeeper, cleaning up at VSB. But whenever I came to her home, once again it appears to a lot of my constituents, the Bible would always come out and we would have a discussion on what was read. She was also a strong member of the Church of God on North Shore in Pembroke, and her funeral will be tomorrow.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your time.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Hamilton Parish. MP Wayne Furbert, you have the floor.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman that we are all talking about this morning, the Honourable John Barritt, who has now passed on to a better place, we should refer to the Gallery. At least the individuals should know that the gentleman we are talking about is [shown] sitting

in the picture there, above the Honourable Terry Lister, a gentleman of high regard.

I do not consider Mr. Barritt a politician. I consider him really a statesman, Mr. Speaker. I fortunately, the gentleman who has been around for awhile, had an opportunity to sit in caucus with Mr. Barritt. He always reminded me . . . He always had this deep voice, a gentleman who was kind of stern. But he stood for something. I think because we have talked about a gentleman who had a spiritual connection, it really helped make him who he really was. And you could always rely on the Honourable Mr. Barritt to give the right answers.

There has never been an individual who has received the "Sir" as far as being a Speaker. If there was ever a gentleman who should have been knighted for that, it was Mr. Barritt. And there are individuals, because of their first time, that could have. So it will be for a long time that Mr. Barritt will always be on our mind and in our presence because he sits above us and watches us from time to time. So by the time he gets across to that side, Mr. Speaker, you know that many of us will not be in this room.

So, again, I send condolences to the Honourable John Barritt, who again, as many Members have said, has picked up the [mantle] from his father. And we send condolences, and I am hoping that many Members in this Honourable House will go to the funeral, which I believe is taking place on Tuesday. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member Cole Simons.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I met Mr. Barritt in the 1970s. His second son, Mark, and I went to school in Canada together, and we were in the same class.

Mr. Speaker, what struck me most about Mr. Barritt the first time that I met him was that when you spoke to Mr. Barritt, he was truly present. When you spoke to him, you knew that he was listening to every word that you were saying. And he measured every word that he was saying to come up with an answer that was so deep, you said, *This is truly a man of wisdom*. So I remember the first time that I met him and the first time and the impact that he had on me.

On the political side, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Barritt had a social conscience, and he was a champion of social justice. Mr. Speaker, during his time, he knew that segregation in this country was wrong. And he did his bit to eliminate segregation and introduce integration.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the House, many people have told me that he brought dignity to this House. He was calm, and he was able to do his job as Speaker in a very competent and measured

fashion. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will just say Mr. Barritt loved his family. He loved Bermuda. He loved Bermuda's people. And he loved Bermuda's culture.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also associate myself with the comments made in regards to Brennell Henry. Now, Ms. Henry was a cousin of mine. As everybody has said and you have seen in the media, she was a staunch PLP supporter. I salute her for her contributions to Bermuda's political landscape. But I would let you know that when we had family gatherings, they were fiery. We respected our differences, and we never gave in, and in the end we always thought our parties were the better of the two options for this country. But despite everything, Mr. Speaker, she pursued and tried to get me to cross the floor. And in fact, she and the late Dame Lois Browne-Evans were a tight cohort. And Dame Lois Browne-Evans said, *Cole, I am going to get you across this floor sooner or later.* I said, *My friend, Dame Lois, not in your lifetime.*

The Speaker: You are across the floor now.

[Laughter]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, we had a very close relationship. She was family. And I will say that in the end, Brennell knew that her job was done and passed to the next universe ready and at peace with herself.

I would like to also congratulate the graduates of the Bermuda College for their hard work and their dedication and their success.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

All right. It is 12:30, but if we are only going to have these two Members . . . Is it three? Okay. Then I think we will take lunch, if that is the case.

So I recognise the Honourable Premier.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move now that we break for lunch until 2:00 pm.

The Speaker: Members, we will adjourn now until 2:00 pm.

Proceedings suspended at 12:32 pm

Proceedings resumed at 2:01 pm

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

The Speaker: All right. We will continue with the Congratulatory and Obituary Speeches, and the Chair recognises MP Michael Weeks.

MP Weeks you have the floor.

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

[Continuation of]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good afternoon.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker I would like to first start off with remarks for John Barritt Sr.

The Speaker: Is your microphone on?

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: No.

I would like to echo the remarks of my party leader who said that if it is any indication by looking at John Barritt, Jr. then I am of the view that John Barritt, Sr. was just as well a man of integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to be associated with the remarks on Ms. Brennell Henry. I knew her most of my life, Mr. Speaker, and I came up with some of her children. I knew her to be a strong PLP candidate and she was always there to give advice when needed.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to offer . . . have this Honourable House send a letter of congratulations to two young Bermudian men and entrepreneurs—one Dominique Nanette and Daniel Woods. They are two young men who have the entrepreneurial spirit and they have acquired the sole distribution rights to sell Nahki Wells football jersey from Huddersfield United. As a matter of fact last Tuesday there was a press conference, Mr. Speaker, out at the great and distinguished Western Stars Sports club—the home of Dandy Town Hornets and where Nahki Wells started his career. The Honourable Premier was there and so was the Minister of Sport as jerseys were donated to the Premier and to myself and to the Minister of Sport.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like a letter to go out to Evening Light Pentecostal. But first of all I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my honourable colleague MP Brown. Mr. Speaker, the Pastor at Evening Light—Pastor Lambe and his wife Marilyn—are strong people in our community and they are always doing things to help to enhance our community. On Monday, Mr. Speaker, they had the prayer vigil along with some other pastors from the area to pray for the safe return of those young ladies over in Nigeria. So I would take great pleasure in associating myself with those remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Sandys [North Central], MP Lister from constituency 35.

You have the floor.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, since we are still on the condolences and congratulations, I figured I would associate my name with some of the earlier comments that were given, particularly as most Members in this House today have gotten up to give remarks to the family of the late Speaker Barritt. Even though I did not sit in this Chamber with him, we actually share one thing in that he retired the year I came to this House. So it was that election—

[Inaudible interjection and laughter]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: We will leave that one alone, Mr. Speaker. I will not take that one on.

But I did spend time in this Chamber with his son and it out of respect for his son really that I am rising to give condolences to the family because I hold his son in great esteem. I think he was one of those Members who was extremely fair in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I can only . . . having heard the accolades of other Members today attest to it that it has to be from the blood line that he shared with his father. So I would like to be associated with those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, also I would like to be associated with the remarks that have been expressed to the Henry family on the passing of their mother. And as has been said already, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Henry was a stalwart in our party. As you know, it takes a lot of folks behind the scenes to make the political machinery work and Ms. Henry was one of those most powerful machines behind the scenes to continue to keep us on the forefront . . . in the frontline on our toes, Mr. Speaker. And her absence from the party has been felt in the last few years as she was sickly and our thoughts are surely with her family upon her passing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to be associated with the remarks that were expressed on the passing of Ruth Smith and her aunt, Ms. Dowling. They mentioned that Ms. Dowling's family was part of Dr. Dowling's family and everybody associated with that part of the family. But I would particularly like to speak to Ruth herself and the passing of Ruth, Mr. Speaker. And I attended the funeral over the weekend and, Mr. Speaker, for those who do not know, Ruth was one of those who were challenged at birth. She had health issues and was not expected to live out her childhood. She was hearing impaired and lived onto the age of 57, Mr. Speaker. But the funeral was a true testament to the impact that she had in spite of her challenges, Mr. Speaker. It was a testament to the impact that she had on all those around her, on all those who knew her, Mr. Speaker, from her employment, from her church, [and] from the general community. You would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that you were attending the funeral of a dignitary by the attendance that was

out there and the remarks that were expressed on her life and the impact that she had on others in spite of her challenge. So I think it is fitting that we do duly recognise her passing.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Would any other Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Minister for Health *[sic]*, Patricia Gordon-Pamplin.

You have the floor.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Public Works, sir.

The Speaker: Works and Engineering, excuse me, you changed.

The Minister for Works—

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Minister of many hats.

The Speaker: —Public Works, yes.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to ask to be associated with the remarks of condolences being offered to the family of the late F. John Barritt. As the Honourable Member who just took his seat indicated, [while] we may not have had the opportunity to sit in this Honourable House at the same time, it is important to note that his legacy—the demeanour that he carried while a Member of this House, the influence that he had over the calmness of this House—is one that we should all aspire toward. And I think that the example that he set obviously has permeated through his genes to his son, John, with whom I sat in this Honourable House and for whom I have tremendous regard and respect. So I would like to be associated with those remarks of condolences.

In addition [I would like to be associated with] the remarks of condolences to the family of Brennell Henry. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that Ms. Henry was a stalwart and a very, very firm supporter—strong supporter, front line—for the Progressive Labour Party, she was one—

[Timer beeps]

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Is that mine?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: She was one who would never hesitate to give good advice irrespective of the individual to whom she was speaking. She did not allow the political divide to get in the way of what

was good sage advice. And from woman to woman, that was always deeply appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the remarks of congratulations to the graduates of Bermuda College. I always find graduating ceremonies to be quite a touching and heartfelt affair, and yesterday at the Bermuda College was no different. I think that the graduates have acquitted themselves well. They have a lot for which they should be proud. And I would like to associate myself with the congratulations to them.

In addition, I would also like to congratulate the 20 graduates from the New England Institute of Technology who graduated last week—the 20 Bermudian graduates—they were 20 out of a number of about 1,150 graduates. And our Bermudians were able to walk very proudly with degrees from associates to bachelors as well. We did not have any masters but there were some . . . there is one young lady who is studying to attain that height and hopefully next year she will be successful.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, the attitude, the atmosphere of that graduation ceremony was one of which each and every one of us can be proud to know that we have our young people—many of whom were sponsored by the Department of Workforce Development; many of whom have worked during their summers with the department, with the Ministry of Works—in fact, had the opportunity to parade across that stage and to be tremendously proud of themselves for their accomplishment. So I would like to extend my congratulations to each and every one of them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Any Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair recognises the Honourable and Learned Minister for Health, T. G. Moniz.

You have the floor.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am just going to be very brief to ask to be associated with the condolences being sent to the family of John Barritt, Sr. He was a very fine gentleman. As you say, he was very patient with everyone; he was an excellent Speaker. Likewise, I never served with him but he was a great example. And, obviously, the Barritt family have made a profound contribution to the public life in Bermuda not only through John, Sr., but through Robert (Bobby) Barritt, as well as through John Barritt, Jr. And they are all fine examples to Bermudians as a whole.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise the Honourable and Learned Member from Sandys North, MP Michael Scott.

You have the floor.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, certainly, I rise to be associated with the primary condolences related today to the former Honourable Speaker to our House and to our stalwart member, Ms. Henry.

First, in relation to Mr. Barritt, a dignified and noble statesman of our country, I [ask to] be associated with the condolences offered to John and to his brother, Robert Barritt; to his children, Jennifer and Mark Barritt; and Mr. Robert Barritt, his brother.

I thank Honourable Members on my side of the House who have stood and paid homage to Ms. Brennell Henry—such a warm and loving spirited member of the Progressive Labour Party. And I extend my condolences to her children, particularly to LaNeane, with whom I was in school with at Berkeley. And I ask this House to extend these condolences to these two noble citizens of our country.

The Minister of Sport indicated his congratulations with which I wish to be associated to the Book Launch yesterday. And I wish to be associated with extending congratulations to both our Folklife Officer, Dr. Dismont, and to her partner in this particular enterprise, our sister from Jamaica, Ms. Rachel Manley. It was such a touching—there were readings yesterday . . . there were couplets of readings yesterday by Mrs. Florenz Maxwell and Mrs. (Lucy) Lucinda Spurling. They took the topic of pregnancy (and I commend this book to members of the public) . . . both Mrs. Maxwell's story—these were all non-fictional writers in our country—and so they tell . . . they reveal a part of themselves very, very, very, very emotionally and dramatically. And you just in the end feel this is the wonderful thing about art in a society, I felt immediately closer to Michael Jones and his wife, Liz Jones, Mrs. Maxwell and Mrs. Spurling as a consequence of their having the courage to expose themselves in their writings.

So I commend these 16 authors to our reading, but the [three] that I particularly liked were Mrs. Maxwell's story, Mrs. Spurling's story, and Mr. and Mrs. Jones who took the . . . and both of them spoke of their childhood as part of these non-fictional biographical—or autobiographical stories. But all of the stories, I am sure . . . there was a young lady Ms. Townsend, just a young, mature writer who is also someone to take particular note of. So I join the Minister in congratulating both Ms. [Rachel] Manley with guiding this project and our Folklife Officer, Dr. [Kim] Dismont [Robinson].

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Warwick West, MP Jeff Sousa.

You have the floor.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Good afternoon.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: —and to those in the listening audience.

I likewise would like to associate myself with the condolences that have been heard in the House of Assembly today for the former Speaker of the House, John Barritt. And I do send condolences, of course, to his family. I have known John for a number of years. I did meet his father. I was fortunate enough to have talked the game of cricket with him at Cup Match in the past, and we have all . . . and, of course, following the great team of Somerset.

And also I would like to be associated with the comments delivered earlier by MP Brown in reference to the prayer vigil that was held this past Monday night. It was an awesome experience to be there because this is taking place all over the world and I certainly salute them for doing this.

And last, but not least, I would like to be associated with the congratulations extended to the graduates of the Bermuda College.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Any other Honourable Member who would care to speak?

The Chair recognises the Honourable Shadow Minister of Finance, MP David Burt.

You have the floor.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to be associated with the congratulations that have been sent to the graduates of the Bermuda College.

I also rise to send a special note of congratulations to one of my constituents who received an award yesterday, Ms. Allison Russell, as the most outstanding business [management] student and she graduated with her Bachelor's of Business from Mt. St. Vincent University. So I just wanted to acknowledge that and to acknowledge her achievement as being the most outstanding business student—as a mature student as well—a hard-working civil servant who did what was necessary to upgrade her skills. So now she has an award and a bachelor's degree. So I want to send congratulations to her, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Any other Honourable Member care to speak?

All right. No other Members care to speak so that concludes our Congratulatory and our Obituary Speeches.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: Just before we move on to the next item, I want to just recognise in the Gallery, there is a young man in the Gallery I am seeing for the first time in about 50-odd years, who I graduated with at college, at Culham College. He graduated with me, and the first time I saw him was two days ago at Grotto Bay after 50-some years. And he is Clive Hallett, a former Parliamentary principal, and his lovely wife.

[Desk thumping]

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: It is easy to look younger than me.

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE

The Speaker: There are none.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

The Speaker: There are none.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

The Speaker: There are none.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

The Speaker: There are none.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

The Speaker: There are none.

OPPOSITION BILL

The Speaker: I will recognise the Honourable Member Walton Brown.

FIRST READING

BERMUDA IMMIGRATION AND PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT 2014

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to [Standing] Order 28 and I hereby move that . . . I move for leave actually to introduce and read a Bill for the first time by its title only, the Bill entitled the [Bermuda Immigration and Protection Amendment Act 2014](#).

And Mr. Speaker, pursuant to [Standing] Order 28(6) I would like to offer just a very brief explanation.

The Speaker: Very, very quickly, yes.

Mr. Walton Brown: The purpose of the Bill is simply to bring legislation in line with what has been Government policy since 1989, i.e., that there be no further discretionary grants of Bermuda status.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

This should have been . . . Mr. Fox, do we have copies of that? That should be . . .

[Crosstalk]

Mr. Walton Brown: Mr. Speaker, if I may?

There are copies printed. But in order to be somewhat more [conversational], we intend to distribute it electronically. It is a very short Bill.

The Speaker: Yes, all right. Okay. I appreciate that, Honourable Member. Glad that you are helping the environment.

All right.

There are no objections to that so carry on, Honourable Member, introduce the Bill.

Carry on.

Mr. Walton Brown: I have introduced the Bill.

The Speaker: Oh, okay, all right.

NOTICE OF MOTION

The Speaker: Sorry, we should be now moving to Notice of Motions, which is why I think the Honourable Member was standing.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO LOSS AND DIS- POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND RECOMMEN- DATIONS FOR VICTIMS OF WRONGFUL ACTION

Mr. Walton Brown: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that at the next day of meeting I propose to move the following motion:

That this Honourable House take note of the historic losses in Bermuda of citizens' property through theft of property, dis-possession of property and adverse possession claims; and be it resolved that this Honourable House calls on His Excellency the Governor to establish a Commission of Inquiry into all such known claims and to determine, where possible, the viability of any such claims and to make recommendations for any victims of wrongful action to receive compensation and justice.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Are there any objections to that?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The Speaker: We now move to Orders of the Day.

In Orders of the Day I have been made to understand that Order Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 are carried over.

And we move to Order No. 5 in the name of the Honourable Member from Smith's [South], MP N. H. C. Simons, the Leader of the House for the Opposition—the Government Whip.

An Hon. Member: Opposition?

The Speaker: The Government Whip.

[Inaudible interjection]

MOTION

REPORT OF THE PARLIAMENTARY JOINT SE- LECT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY GOV- ERNANCE AND REFORM

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

I move the following motion, notice of which was given on 14 March 2014: That this Honourable House approves the Report of the [Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance and Reform](#) together with the appendices tabled 5 March 2014.

The Speaker: Carry on, Member.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Mr. Speaker, before I get into the report proper, I would like to make a few comments.

First of all, I am delighted to stand here to present and secure the approval of this House of this Joint Report. Today with the ushering in of the approval of this report, we today in this House will be

marking a substantive milestone in the annals of Bermuda's Parliamentary—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: —300 year history, Mr. Speaker.

As you are aware, the objective of the Joint Select Committee was to examine and make recommendations and report to this House its findings on the Legislature, the management structure and governance.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee examined three areas: organisation of the Legislature, functions of the Legislature, and values of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of which Bermuda is a member has published a set of internationally recognised benchmarks.

A key finding was that our Legislature did not measure up in the area of organisational effectiveness, Mr. Speaker. In light of the above, the Committee focused on performance benchmarks and improving Parliamentary services to the people of Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, we recognise that an effective Parliament is an independent Parliament which has robust Parliamentary services together with a sound accountability framework.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the objective of this Joint Select Committee was to examine and make recommendations and report to the House its findings on the Legislature's management structure and governance.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the Committee examined three areas: organisation of the Legislature, functions of the Legislature, and the value of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, now I am going to—oh, Mrs. Deputy Speaker.

[Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair]

The Deputy Speaker: Yes, please, proceed.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Now I shall move on to the report proper.

Terms of reference. Madam Deputy Speaker, the Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance and Reform was established upon the unanimous adoption of the following motion moved by myself on 19 July 2013. The motion was as follows:

"In an effort to ensure that Bermuda's Legislature meets the standards prescribed in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association benchmarks for democratic legislatures; be it resolved that this Honourable House establish a Joint Select Committee. The Committee's mandate is to examine, make recommendations and report to this House its findings on

the Legislature's management structure and governance in order to provide an efficient and effective Parliamentary service to the people of Bermuda."

Madam Deputy Speaker, the following Members were appointed to the Committee: Lovitta Foggo JP MP; Mrs. Jeanne Atherden JP MP; Senator Jeff Baron JP; Senator Diallo Rabain JP; the Hon. Terry Lister (who subsequently retired from the Committee); Senator James Jardine JP (who replaced the Hon. Terry Lister); the Hon. Kenny Bascome JP MP; and Ms. Shernette Wolffe acted as the Clerk to Committee.

SUBMISSIONS TO THE COMMITTEE

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Madam Deputy Speaker, shortly after the Committee's first meeting on 15 August 2013, the Committee Members agreed to break out into groups to gather information and make recommendations on the following themes (as I said before, the themes were)—Organisation of the Legislature, Functions of the Legislature, and the Values and Ethics of the Legislature. Their findings and recommendations form an integral part of this report.

The Committee also invited the public, through advertisements in the *Royal Gazette*, to make written submissions via e-mail. In addition, they also extended personal invitations to various community leaders and retired statesmen, who have keen interest in Parliamentary Governance, to make a verbal submission.

In response to these invitations, the Committee hosted three meetings in November and December. These meetings each lasted for three to four hours. All were held in the House of Assembly's library.

There were a total of six presentations. The presentations covered a wide spectrum and included contributions made by the current Speaker of the House, a retired Speaker of the House, a former Premier and former Deputy Speaker of the House, a former Cabinet Minister, Opposition Leader in the House and former Opposition Whip, a former Opposition Leader and a retired Clerk to the House.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Committee was generally impressed by the dedication, care, effort and research undertaken by the presenters and has carefully sought to do justice and summarise their thoughts and recommendations for future reference. While not all recommendations were taken up by the Committee, we believe that they were worthy of highlighting since they represent the breadth and depth of the challenges which currently exist in our Parliamentary system.

Madam Deputy Speaker, many of the ideas and solutions advanced represent a list of best practices in Parliamentary systems which may well find favour at some point in the future should the resources—financial, technological and human—be

available. Accordingly, we have included in appendices 1, 2, and 3 of this report verbatim copies of the various presentations which will give the reader an idea of the volume of material which the Committee entertained and examined. A number of in-camera meetings were held and during these meetings Committee members also gave written submissions.

PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNANCE TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Madam Deputy Speaker, the practice of Parliamentary (Legislature) Governance in various jurisdictions throughout the world has evolved over time as legislatures adopt, adapt and assume new practices and standards to improve the effectiveness and their legitimacy. The Committee went through the process of measuring themselves against these benchmarks. This exercise allowed members to see that Bermuda's Parliament was not meeting internationally recommended standards; in other words, our Parliament *was not up to scratch*.

Bermuda's Parliament needs to be strengthened so that it is positioned to effectively deal with the current trends and best practices. This includes promoting and defending democracy and the rule of law as well as adopting what are considered to be best practices. We have made gradual steps to reach the ultimate goal. Our Parliament should also adjust and manage the realities of globalisation and, as a consequence, create capacity to assume a more active role in relation to international cooperation and multilateral institutions.

Further, it should be noted that with rapidly developing knowledge-based and technology-driven societies legislatures have been placed under intense scrutiny in the areas of transparency, accountability, effectiveness and fairness. These . . . the same applies to Bermuda and it is now evident that the governance structure of Bermuda's Legislature is out of date. Our Parliament must adjust itself to be effective and efficient in providing Parliamentary services in today's information age society.

In light of the above, the Committee believes that Bermuda's Legislature should embark upon its own path to meet prescribed internationally defined benchmarks and to provide efficient and effective Parliamentary service to the people of Bermuda. In addition, our Legislature must articulate and respond effectively to the needs of our people as well as making the Legislature more accessible by enabling citizens to interact with Members via websites, television and radio. Educating Bermudians on exactly what Parliament does and how they go about fulfilling their obligations to the electorate is vital.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Bermuda has to move forward in line with the current practices as mentioned above.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in light of the above, the Committee recognised that a complete review of our Parliament's governance structure was needed, and it was necessary to examine the following themes (as I said): Functions of Parliament, Ethical Governance and the Structure of Parliament. Now I will drill down in each of these three sections, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Structure. The first question for legislators is: How can we create and maintain a Parliamentary service that is capable of achieving services required by Parliament together with maximum productivity and minimum expense? Secondly, what are the challenges to achieve this result?

After much examination it is the Joint Select Committee's belief that if Bermuda's Parliamentary system is to achieve these prescribed objectives there must be independence from Government (the Executive branch) and the resulting autonomy in the service. Certainly this is largely the case in the UK and is part of the legislation in Barbados.

Madam Deputy Speaker, while on this matter, one retired Speaker of Bermuda's House of Assembly robustly emphasised that in many countries the independence of Parliament is enshrined in law via a Parliamentary Administration Act. The former Speaker went on to state that this independence is protected—no one outside person or organisation including the Executive branch of Government or its civil servants, and their senior executives or officers of Government, can direct Parliament in its deliberations, or can they influence the manner in which Parliament runs its affairs.

In light of the above, Madam Deputy Speaker, many Parliaments around the Commonwealth have established a Parliamentary Commission and/or a Parliamentary Management Board. The establishment of these commissions or boards was done through a legislative instrument and the instrument, basically, is responsible for providing details on the administration of the Legislature. These are corporate entities.

Here it should be noted that the Barbados Parliament, the Canadian Parliament, the Trinidadian Parliament, and the UK Parliament and a few other Parliaments have addressed this issue by also creating a Management Commission of Parliament, and in the case of the United Kingdom, a further subsidiary board known as the Management Board.

In Barbados, Madam Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Management Commission consists of:

- a) the Speaker of the House of Assembly, (who acts as the Chairman);
- b) the President of the Senate (ex officio);
- c) the Prime Minister (ex officio);
- d) the Leader of the House of Assembly (ex officio);
- e) the Leader of the Senate (ex officio);
- f) the Leader of the Opposition (ex officio); and

- g) four Members of the House of Assembly appointed by the House of Assembly, and none of those Members can be Cabinet Ministers.

In the United Kingdom, similarly, there is House of Commons Commission which is comprised of:

- a) the Speaker of the House of Assembly, (who acts as the Chairman);
b) the Leader of the House;
c) the Shadow Leader of the House; and
d) three other members of the House of Commons appointed by the House of Commons, none of whom shall be a Minister of the Crown.
e)

Madam Deputy Speaker, Governance for Framework. here it should also be noted while considering the appointment of the Members to the Board of the Management Commission, during the Commission's public meetings, a discussion and debate ensued around appointing two or three independent business leaders just to bring more business talent to the management and administration of the board.

In addition, there was discussion of inviting Members of the broader Commonwealth Parliamentary Association branch here in Bermuda to consider being members of the Commission. But in the end, it was agreed by the Joint Select Committee that at this point in time we would adhere to current convention, and basically go with sitting Members of Parliament. Having said that, as we said, we will examine other options sometime in the future.

However, it is important to note that all persons who made submissions to the Committee were of the same mind that only Parliamentarians should serve on the Management Commission.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the "CPA (Commonwealth Parliamentary Association) Benchmarks for Democratic Legislatures," a CPA Study Group Report of 2006, has this to say:

"The Legislature, rather than the executive branch, shall control the parliamentary service and determine the terms of employment. The Legislature must have authority over its staff in order to ensure its independence."

It further stated that adequate non-partisan professional staff is a prerequisite for the well-functioning of the Legislature. Under the heading Parliamentary Staff—Recruitment; it stated that:

"The Legislature shall have adequate resources to recruit staff sufficient to fulfil its responsibilities. The rates of pay shall be broadly comparable to those in the Public Service."

The effective and efficient running of a modern Parliament behooves the developers of policy to ensure that the Clerk, or whosoever is designated as CEO, has adequate resources in order to recruit staff sufficient to fulfil Parliament's needs. It is critical that

the Clerk has around him or her, a highly skilled management team, in the following key areas, namely:

- Editorial and reporting;
- Security;
- Library;
- Chamber and Committee services support;
- Independent Legal support;
- Accounting support;
- Training and HR (Human Resource) support;
- IT (Information Technology) support; and
- Facilities support and maintenance.

The Legislature must employ qualified and skilled personnel in order to create the ideal platform for the transformation of the services rendered by Parliament.

At this point, I will just touch some of the areas that we felt Parliament should, basically, provide more support to. I am not going to go through all of them as I just went through the list of some of the areas and I am just going to pick up a few of them because my colleagues will examine these in more detail later on in the debate.

Editorial and Reporting. This is one of the core functions of the Parliamentary service, and one upon which the service should be measured. Equally, this has been the core function that has been subjected to the rapidly changing technological landscape.

At a glance, the Hansard allows for a clearer recording of the debates which should lead to accurate reporting and production of debates. The further improvement of the digital architecture presents the opportunity to stream debates for archiving and for what is known in the sporting arena as "real time replay." This latter feature is extremely useful to presiding officers in their rulings. This digital architectural platform also allows for the greater recording of debates of members on DVDs and for the storage of these debates.

Security. In the area of security, Government Security guards/Police/Regiment should perform this function, under the intended supervision of Parliament through the Sergeant-at-Arms. This is done in other jurisdictions and it is a matter of course.

Nevertheless, in the era of ever-increasing security concerns, this area now assumes greater importance and urgency. The need for greater security must be attended by a sensitivity to ensure that people still have a right to access their Parliament and access their Parliamentary representatives. Therefore what is required is to strike a balance between increased security and access of the people of this country to their Parliament.

Madam Deputy Speaker, these important twin concerns have to be managed by a well-trained security service that answers directly to the new Management Commission of Parliament.

Library and Research. Politicians on both sides of the House are settled in the view that

Members and staff of the Legislature should have access to sufficient research, library and IT facilities. These components are essential to the delivery of optimum Parliamentary service. In the UK and Barbados, for example, adequate research or secretarial support is provided to all members. Not only will such support allow members to meaningfully participate in debates before the House, but it will also enhance the quality of debates and Committee deliberations.

Independent Legal Support. In the UK, the Speaker has an independent counsel who advises him on matters strictly independent of the Executive branch. Further, such counsel are also available to other management personnel within the Legislature to advise on a variety of matters such as freedom of information, health and safety, contractual issues, employment. It is also useful in helping the Speaker in his rulings when it comes to Parliamentary protocols.

Training and Resources. Parliaments are a critical component of a country's governance system. Because they oversee the Executive Arm of the Government, they represent the electorate and enact legislation. To perform these functions, strong, Parliamentary strengthening training programmes that will produce proactive, professional and responsible personnel [should be in place.]

Continuous training and retraining are critical if Parliamentary staff are to provide excellent service to Parliament and Parliamentarians.

Facilities Support. For efficiency and security purposes, Bermuda's Parliament should be housed in a purpose-built building on one precinct, under one Sessions House. The building should house no other Government departments. The Upper and Lower Houses should jointly be housed in these buildings. These buildings should also include a fit for purpose Parliamentary library, committee rooms and archives facilities.

It is important that Parliament should make available to its staff a robust protocol and public relations team to arrange and organise visits of overseas Parliamentarians from other Commonwealth Parliaments and other Parliamentary conferences and seminars.

So as far as the organisational structure of the Legislature, the recommendations of the Board of the Joint Select Committee are as follows, and I am just going to summarise the recommendations when it comes to the structural organisation of the Legislature. The Joint Select Committee recommends:

1. An independent body known as the Management Commission, responsible for the administration of the Legislature, should be established.
2. The Joint Select Committee recommends that the Commission appoint the following members:
 - a. The Speaker as the Chairman;
 - b. The President of the Senate;

- c. The Premier (ex officio);
- d. The Leader of the Opposition (ex officio);
- e. Four members from the House of Assembly appointed by the House of Assembly, none of whom shall be Ministers or Junior Ministers;
- f. One member of the Senate; and
- g. The Clerk of the House of Assembly.

So these are the people that we recommend be appointed to the Board of the Parliamentary Management Commission.

3. We also recommend that specific terms of reference for this Committee should be developed to include, term of office, quorum requirements, responsibilities and powers for the provision of adequate support services for Parliament, including the recruitment and management of Parliamentary staff, determination of an annual budget to be approved by Parliament and the monitoring of such annual budget as approved by the Legislature. As is the case in the United Kingdom Legislature, the actual day-to-day management of the Parliamentary service should be delegated to the Clerk of the House of Assembly. He or she will constitute an Administration Committee which will meet on a monthly basis. A monthly report will be generated by the Clerk to be presented to the Management Commission where issues of concern will be raised and dealt with during the Commission's monthly meeting.
4. The following House Committees should meet on a regular basis or as needed and prepare a written report for the Management Commission. These committees include but are not limited to:
 - a. The Regulations Committee;
 - b. The Public Accounts Committee;
 - c. The Committee of the Auditor General;
 - d. The House and Grounds Committee;
 - e. The Register of Members' Interests Committee;
 - f. The Joint Select Committee on Private Bills; and
 - g. The Standing Orders Committee.
5. The Management Commission shall have authority to constitute any other committee that it considers necessary in order to fulfil its duties and responsibilities.
6. The present situation whereby the Senate Chamber is located in a different building from the House of Assembly and the staff of the Legislature is inefficient and costly. The Legis-

lature should be contained “under one roof” as a matter of urgency.

7. The structure and enforceability of all House committees should be regularly reviewed and amendments made as necessary.

Again, under Supporting Staff:

1. The Management Commission should have the authority (rather than the Executive branch) for the employment of sufficient adequately qualified staff in order to support the Legislature and fulfil its responsibilities.
2. An annual budget for the Legislature should be prepared and approved by the Management Commission for ultimate approval and adoption by Parliament.
3. The Management Commission through the delegated responsibilities of the Clerk of the House of Assembly, should determine the number and qualification of such staff as it considers necessary to support the Legislature in the following specific areas (and again, I have mentioned them): Editorial, Security, Library and so forth.

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: And you can find this on page 19 of the report, Mr. Speaker. This is another change. Mr. Speaker, the functions of Bermuda’s Parliament proceeds from its role as the supreme representative of the Bermudian people and from that of the single legislative authority of the country.

Our Constitution has adopted a Parliamentary system of Government more commonly understood or known as “The Westminster model.” Under such a system, there is an “interesting” mixture of the legislative and executive organs of the state. Thus, while the Executive is the main driving force in terms of developing legislation to implement its programmes and stated Government agenda, it is necessary to ensure accountability and control of the Executive within the Legislature.

The main functions of Parliament are:

1. Oversight of the Executive. A very significant function of Parliament is to exercise its oversight and control of the Executive by way of holding it responsible for its acts and omissions. Parliament exercises this control by asking questions of the Ministers through its Members, by raising adjournment motions, cut motions, censure motions or debates. More importantly, Parliament can pass a vote of no confidence against the Executive which compels it to resign collectively. Thus Parliament holds Ministers responsible individually and collectively. This critical function of the Parliament ensures a responsive and responsible Government.

2. Legislation. Developing and passing legislation is the primary function of any Legislature.
3. Controlling Finances. Parliament exercises substantial control in the domain of finance. The Legislature of any responsible system of Government must ensure that public funds are raised and spent with its consent and control. The Government of Bermuda has no authority to spend any money on its own and must obtain the approval of the Parliament. Every financial year, the budget prepared by the Finance Minister is presented in Parliament for its approval. Any proposal for levying new taxes or any proposal, for expenditure needs the sanction of Parliament. To support this, there are also two very important Committees of Parliament known in Bermuda as the Public Accounts Committee and the Committee of the Auditor General.
4. Raising Deliberations. As an organ of information, Parliament has an important role to play. All the important administrative policies are discussed on the floors of the Parliament. So not only the Cabinet obtains the advice of Parliament, and learns about its lapses, but the country as a whole is enlightened about serious matters of public importance. This undoubtedly contributes to the growth of a political conscience on the part of the people of Bermuda.
5. Constitutional Functions. Parliament is the only body under the Constitution, which can initiate any proposal for amendment of the Constitution. A proposal for amendment can be initiated in either House of Parliament. The bulk of such proposals are approved finally when passed by both the Chambers with a special majority of two-thirds of its members.
6. Electoral Functions. Parliament also has some electoral functions to perform. It takes part in the election of the presiding officers, such as the President and Vice President of the Senate, and the Speaker and Deputy Speaker of the House of Assembly. It also elects various members to its committees.
7. Source for the Formation of Government. Parliaments also provide the source for the formation of Government, as the Premier must have the support of the majority of members of the House before he or she can be appointed. In addition, the Governor, with the advice of the Premier, appoints Cabinet Ministers which are drawn from the Members of the House of Assembly and the Senate.
8. Constituent Relations. Elected Members of Parliament have a duty and responsibility to those within their constituencies to provide an opportunity for constituents to meet with their

elected Members of the House of Assembly to raise matters of concern to them.

9. Parliamentary Networking and Diplomacy. The Legislature also has a responsibility to assist other legislatures where possible as well as seeking advice from such legislative bodies as it considers necessary to assist in the development of its own Legislature.
10. Parliamentary Calendars. The 2011 Recommended Benchmarks for the CPA Caribbean, Americas, and Atlantic Region in Section 2.4.6 of its report said:

“There shall be an annual parliamentary calendar to promote transparency and planning by Members as well as those outside of the House who are required to provide services to the Legislature, with provisional dates for formal recesses and long adjournments.”

This is vital to ensure the smooth running of Parliamentary sessions as well as ensuring that Members have ample notice of session dates for planning purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to interject here that we, the OBA, are pleased to report that just recently we have instituted a Parliamentary Calendar. It was circulated for the first time about a month ago to all Members, and we have already met this objective and this will be an ongoing protocol that will be adopted by Parliaments to come.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, when it comes to functions, the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee are as follows:

1. The Legislature should provide each elected Member with adequate and appropriate resources within his/her constituency to enable him/her to fulfil their representational functions.
2. Members and staff of Parliament must have the authority to receive technical and advisory assistance from legitimate and reputable institutions or organisations. They should also have the ability to network and exchange experience with individuals from other Legislatures.
3. The Legislature should provide adequate mechanisms to encourage wider consultations and public submissions on Bills introduced. (This is on page 3 of the report, Mr. Speaker.)
4. Historically, from a community outreach perspective, Bermuda’s Parliament is somewhat stoic and detached from the community. This must change. Going forward, Bermuda’s Parliament must be an integral part of the community, and this Committee wants the community to fully understand the role of Parliament and what Parliament is doing for them. Parliament must use all forms of media to achieve this endeavour.

5. The Committee believes that information must be provided to the public in a timely manner regarding matters under consideration by the Legislature.
6. The Legislature must have mechanisms in place to obtain information from the executive branch sufficient to exercise its oversight function in a meaningful and timely manner.
7. The oversight authority of the Legislature must include:
 - Meaningful and timely oversight of state-owned enterprises;
 - Meaningful and timely oversight of compliance with international treaties and obligations;
 - Meaningful and timely oversight of accountability institutions, such as Elections Commissions, Human Rights Commission, Anti-corruption Commissions, the Ombudsman, and the Auditor General’s office.
8. These oversight committees must provide meaningful opportunities for minority or Opposition Members or Independent Members to engage in effective oversight of government expenditures. The Public Accounts Committee and other oversight committees should be chaired by a Member of the Opposition or an Independent.
9. Oversight committees should have access to financial records and related documentation sufficient to be able to meaningfully review the accuracy of the Executive branch reporting on its revenues and expenditures.
10. As I said earlier, there should be a Parliamentary Calendar, so we can tick that off because Bermuda already has a Parliamentary Calendar.
11. And the next item, the Standing Orders Committee should continually review and make recommendations on improving our services through the Standing Orders, which is the document used to run Parliament.

Ethical Governance of Parliament. (on page 23 of the report), Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the electorate to have confidence that the elected parliamentarians practice ethical governance is a very important requirement for any elected body. As stated in the 2011 CPA Report entitled, “Recommended Benchmarks for the CPA Caribbean, Americas, and Atlantic Region Democratic Legislators.” (And this is in Appendix 6 of the report):

“Members should maintain high standards of accountability, transparency and responsibility in the conduct of all public and parliamentary matters.

"The Legislature shall approve and enforce a code of conduct, including rules on conflicts of interest and the acceptance of gifts."

It is important to develop a Code of Conduct that clearly outlines what is expected of Members. Once a Code of Conduct has been developed, documents expanding on and explaining the various stipulations can be developed further.

Based on research into various Commonwealth Parliaments, the UK Code of Conduct for Members of Parliament appears to be as comprehensive as needed and can be easily adapted or modified to suit Bermuda. The document includes the following:

- Definition/purpose of the Code of Conduct;
- The scope of the Code of Conduct;
- Expected responsibilities or duties of the Members;
- General standards and principles of conduct;
- Rules of Conduct expected of Members;
- Maintaining the Code of Disciplinary Procedures.

With the above as a precursor, the areas summarised above are of sufficient details and they will be presented again in further detail by others who will join in on this debate.

Now, I just went through some of the areas that the Code of Conduct will basically present. And as I said, I just touched on the areas because more information will be coming based on [input from] other Members who participated in the Joint Select Committee.

Definition of the Code of Conduct. The Code of Conduct must cover, and assist Members in the discharging of their obligations to Parliament, their constituents and the public at large. The Code of Conduct should cover:

- a) Standards and principles of conduct expected of all Members;
- b) Setting rules to support the standards and principles to which all Members shall adhere;
- c) Ensuring that public confidence in the Code of Conduct and that all Members are aware of such Code and their commitment to uphold the rules.

The Code of Conduct shall be applied to all Members. The Code shall relate to Members' conduct within the discharge of their duties as a Member. It should not regulate Members' private or personal lives unless this conduct harms the integrity and the reputation of the Legislature. This Code is complementary to the Rules of both Houses. It also complementary to the rulings of the Speaker and the President of the Senate and to the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

Mr. Speaker, Members have the duty to uphold Bermuda's laws and other international laws where applicable.

Mr. Speaker, Members have the duty to act in the interests of the country as a whole and also a special duty to act in the interests of their constituents.

Members should be above reproach and act in accordance with the public trust placed in them, including the use of public resources.

General Standards and Principles of Code of Conduct. As paraphrased by the UK Code of Conduct for Members of Parliament, the general principles of a Code of Conduct should include for consideration the following items:

- a) Selflessness;
- b) Integrity;
- c) Objectivity;
- d) Accountability;
- e) Openness;
- f) Honesty and Transparency;
- g) Leadership.

Rules of Conduct expected of Members. We have to ensure that the Code has adequate disciplinary procedures.

In addition, we must establish an Ethics Committee. An Ethics Committee is made up of Members from all political parties, including Independents, and from both Houses. They should oversee the implementation and application of the General Code of Conduct.

Members will be required to fully comply with any requests from the Ethics Committee when an investigation into a Member's conduct is undertaken.

The Committee must include findings and recommendations to be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

The House may impose a sanction to a Member where it considers it necessary.

So going forward, the Joint Select Committee makes the following recommendations when it comes to ethical governance in Parliament (and this is on page [26]). Our recommendations are as follows:

1. An Ethics Committee should be established consisting of Members from all parties and Independents.
2. A Code of Conduct to be adhered to by all Members of the Legislature should be developed and implemented by the Ethics Committee and approved by the Legislature.
3. The Code of Conduct should encompass the six areas mentioned above.

Conclusion. Mr. Speaker, Parliament must be an autonomous body. Autonomy is needed for Parliament to function freely. Modernisation in Bermuda cannot be complete without autonomy of Bermuda Government's Parliament. Our Parliament should, as I said earlier, seek administrative autonomy, institutional autonomy, political autonomy, and financial autonomy. A weak, feeble and subservient Parliament is a

threat to democracy. So we must address these as a priority.

Mr. Speaker, as I said during my Parliamentary caucus, we recognise that we are going through some difficult economic times and as a consequence the Joint Committee does not expect for the recommendations of this report to be implemented immediately. The issues will be prioritised and implemented accordingly.

Having made this clear, it should be noted that the Joint Committee is of the opinion that the Management Committee should be completed and embodied immediately. This should cost the Government almost nothing.

Again, thank you. I want to thank the members of the Joint Select Committee for their contributions, and I look forward to the approval of this document as we all will form a part of the milestone in Bermuda Parliament's rich history.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I welcome further debate.
Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you very much, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from constituency 3, St. David's, MP Lovitta Foggo the Opposition Whip and the Shadow Minister for Education.

You have the floor.

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to participate in this motion. I think it is ever so important. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to get it right in terms of democracy we must get it right here in Parliament first.

So Mr. Speaker, having said that, let me just thank—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: Honourable Member, if you . . . I wanted to do something before you got up and I did not do it. I just wanted to recognise that there is a former Senator in the House. Former Senator Neville Tyrrell is present. So we want to welcome you to the House.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Please excuse me, Ms. Foggo.

[continuation of debate on Report of the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance and Reform]

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: That is fine, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was just about to thank my honourable colleague who just took his seat who did, indeed, chair this Committee—this ever so important Committee. And I want to thank him for giving a comprehensive report because then I think he makes the job much easier for those of us who are now following him as we lend our thoughts in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that was highlighted in our report is the fact that Parliament must be responsive to the changes which have taken place within its society and here in Bermuda within our society. With all the changes—technological changes—all of that impacts the way in which we do our jobs as parliamentarians. And so we must be responsive so that we ensure that Parliament, its structure, and the way in which we function is reflective of these changes if we are to meet the current demands that society places upon us as legislators.

And so Mr. Speaker, having said that let me just read this quote. It says: “that with rapidly developing knowledge based on technology driven societies, legislatures have been placed under intense scrutiny in the areas of transparency, accountability, effectiveness and fairness. The same applies to Bermuda and it is now evident that the Governance structure for Bermuda's Legislature is outdated. Our Parliament must adjust itself to be effective and efficient in providing parliamentary services in today's information age society.”

Nothing can be more true than that. If we are to get it right then we must get it right here first, Mr. Speaker. And in continuing on that train of thought, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read this quote. Before I read the quote when Parliaments seem to be out of step with society one can appreciate how that might raise the scepticism of the public in terms of how we go about doing our business because of the fact that it does not seem to be aligned with what is going on in our society. So if we are not responsive in making the necessary changes, for instance, in our legislation as well as first in the Legislature, then no wonder people sometimes question the effectiveness and the . . . I suppose you can say even productivity of Parliament. And so Mr. Speaker, having said that let me just read—and that is not something that is just happening here in Bermuda. This scepticism is international.

The Speaker: Where is the quote coming from?

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: The quote is coming from (believe it or not) CPA Headquarters in their book entitled, *Democracy, Parliament and Electoral Systems*. The author is Griffith-Traversy. It says: “In many parts of the world there persists no shortage of scepticism about the merits of democratic governance.” “This scepticism lies deep within the thoughts of many fields and is fuelled . . .” Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, the next part is my quote from the dissertation that I did,

"This scepticism lies deep within thoughts of many and is fuelled by actions of politicians, good or bad, honest or corrupt, and it is the impetus which incepts change. Such change can be internal party reform, electoral reform and even morph into government overthrow." And we have seen that happen in recent times, Mr. Speaker, because of the scepticism of some, I guess, who with the government that was then installed.

"Democracy and the quest to ensure its fairness and practicality both for democracy and the level of representation for all motivate man to engage in many gestures." And one such gesture, or one such action, is what we who made up the Joint Select Committee on Parliament governance tried to bring about.

Through research we tried to assess our current status and then tried to come up with what we thought was the best way forward in order to align our Parliament with modern day Bermuda because as you know, Mr. Speaker, Parliament in Bermuda has been in existence since 1620 and it has gone through some transformation, but when you look at the overall picture very little has changed in the way in which we go about doing our duties here in Bermuda.

When you compare our Legislature with other countries around the world—small and large—you can see basically in many areas where we fall short of reaching the established CPA Benchmarks both for the entire Commonwealth Parliaments as well as in our Regional Parliaments, which is the Caribbean, Atlantic, Americas region.

I can say when we introduced Hansard that was one big plus in carrying forward, (1) our initiatives; and (2) in bringing it into alignment with many of the parliaments that sit because by introducing Hansard it helped to address the issue of transparency and openness. And it definitely holds many of us parliamentarians to account because everything that we say here on the floor of the House in this Honourable Chamber is cast in stone, if you will, forever. It becomes a part of a record. It is irrefutable and the people who have access to this—and people do have access . . . I think many Bermudians still do not realise that they have direct access to this through the Government portal. They can go in and see whether or not we as parliamentarians are, (1) responding to their concerns; and (2) whether or not we are being true to our word.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that let me move forward and say this. We looked at the structure of Parliament here and we found it crucial to establish the independence of Parliament where the Clerk would sit as, I guess you could say, the CEO of the Legislature. And this is, indeed, the case in many parliaments, most, around the world. The Legislature is an independent body because it should never, ever be subjected to any influences of any Ministry, Cabinet

. . . it should be able to operate independently to ensure that democracy is held at the highest standard.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support many of the objectives that were shared from our report in that we need to be effective as parliamentarians, we need to ensure that we are well versed with the legislation that we do in fact deal with here in the House. And to do that Parliament itself must have the proper staffing in place, the proper tools in place, things like research librarians to ensure that when we as Honourable Members stand to our feet we do so from an informed point of view.

One of the criticisms from the public domain is that often when we get to our feet to debate much of what is said has little to do with the intricacies of the legislation that we are dealing with, and often we fail as parliamentarians to (I guess you can say) highlight and outline the importance of why legislation is being amended, or created, and to make it relevant to the public.

I think, Mr. Speaker, often we fail to do that because of the fact that we do not have the necessary tools and equipment that should be afforded to all parliamentarians. In order to, I guess, enjoy the confidence of the public we need to demonstrate that we are well versed with the legislation that we deal with up here. And all too often you hear outcries where it seems like people are talking more about personal things and making personal commentary than actually dealing with legislation.

And yes, Mr. Speaker, let me say up front it is important that we bring that to our debates because it does make things relevant to the people at times when we can give personal experience so that people understand why legislation is being put in place or why legislation is being opposed. And the only way to be able to do that is to be able to make effective arguments on the floor of the House. And let me just reiterate that in order to do that it requires that staffing at every level—whether you are talking about human resources, when you are talking about technological tools, when you are talking about having access to research materials, all of those things—should be on hand. We should not have to rely . . . we should not have to, even though we may, we should not have to rely on outside sources in order to get the information that we need to do a proper job of presenting legislation up here in the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me just . . . (I am in the wrong document. Let me just switch up.) . That pretty much speaks to the Governance Structure of Parliament and the support services. And I do not want to go into specific point-by-point detail, as I said before, the former Member who took his seat did that very eloquently and I think I do not want to either take the public or those who sit in the Gallery or fellow Members for granted in assuming that they did not understand what was said by making what I say too repetitive.

Mr. Speaker, looking at the functions of Parliament—and I think this is extremely important because I think this is where most parliamentarians themselves get it wrong. Parliament is sacrosanct. Parliament's job is to ensure that the people's money and legislation is being crafted in response to, I would say, their will and for the betterment of Bermuda and its people. And Parliament's job first and foremost, in my opinion, is to hold the executive to account. The executive, yes, their job is to look at Government and see how it can better service its people and craft legislation that it believes will lead to better service for its people.

That legislation comes to this House for our review and scrutiny to ensure that, indeed, it is legislation that is, (1) responsive to the trends and changes that all societies go through; [and] (2) that it is going to promote a better society (I am speaking in generalities) and that it is benefitting the people. And in so doing that the monies that are being spent to bring about such changes in accordance with the legislation has the proper oversight in place to ensure that those monies that are being dispensed are being done so properly and, I guess, to the benefit of the people and it is not being squandered and the like. And you definitely do not want the people thinking that.

Mr. Speaker, I said that it seems often that parliamentarians themselves get it wrong because all too often . . . and this is perhaps due to lack of suitable education, even beginning in the classroom setting. Our public must understand that it is the Executive's job to oversee Government, but it is Parliament's job to oversee the Executive and to make sure that they are doing what they are supposed to be doing because quite often people believe that it is the Executive who controls everything and comes and dictates to Parliament. That should never be the case because then I would have to say that it is understandable that those in the public domain sometimes harbour the scepticism that they do because if there seem to be no appropriate checks and balances in place, then it would make one wonder, *Well, why . . . you know, just let people do what they want to do because they are doing it anyway.*

I know that all of us at one time or another have heard such utterances, even when they are unfounded. But our job is to secure the confidence of the people so that they know that when they elect us we are up here doing their bidding on their behalf and in response to their volitions. And I guess they first express that when they put their tick on that ballot box.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that I also highlight the fact that first and foremost Parliament is to hold the Executive to account. Again, even some of us parliamentarians forget that we are elected by the people and we have a responsibility to bring forward the concerns, et cetera, of the people. That may not always mean that, for instance, if my constituents want something to be "B" and it ends up being

"C", that it can be "C" because they are my constituents and I am up here voting. My job also as a parliamentarian is to do what is in the best interest of the constituents and . . . but first and foremost, I am answerable to my constituents because, after all, they are my boss.

I think the way in which we operate up here we should always be mindful of that and in respect of that. Again, because the people wish to know that I and my fellow colleagues are all up here representing their interests. And let us face it, Mr. Speaker, when the people believe we have not done that, normally what happens is that we get voted out. And so we have to ensure that we are up here doing the people's will in their best interests, that we are not just responding to people's personal wishes but that what we are doing is in the best interests of the people.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, to highlight the fact that I think it is important that constituency allowances be implemented for Members of Parliament to assist in taking care of constituency needs. After all, the constituents elected us to do that. And all too often it is felt by many who vote us in here that we forget that they voted us in here and that we use our position (and I know that my fellow parliamentarians have heard this) to build our power and impose our own will over the people who put us here in the first place. And that should never be the purpose for being up here in the House of Assembly. We should be up here wholly and solely to do the people's business for the betterment of our society and its people.

So, Mr. Speaker, one of the things, I guess, or a few of the things that will allow us to be able to better carry out those duties is by transforming Parliament where if we do . . . and the Honourable Member, Mr. Cole Simons, did highlight the fact that we have put (though it is not cast in stone) a Parliamentary Calendar in place. That is crucial so that even we as parliamentarians can build our personal schedules around our political schedules because that is our first job, and so that the two do not ever have to be in conflict. And it allows, more importantly, for those who are here to support us—and that is the Clerk, Deputy Clerk and the staff of the Legislature—to ensure that we are effective in our jobs, and allows them to have a Calendar in place. Mr. Speaker, then they can cater to the needs of the parliamentary group and in so doing allow us to be more effective at our jobs because they are there to, if you will, supplement our needs. And to be an effective Parliament such things have to be in place.

Parliament should also mirror society in terms of even gender balance, Mr. Speaker. Now, you cannot dictate to constituents who they wish to vote in place, but I can say within the House itself, as many Parliaments do, we should have the set-up that is gender balanced. For example, I am not saying that those are the things that we in this group said must be installed here, but I have to put it out there. In many

Parliaments you have young women who have young children, babies and what have you, and their Parliaments are set up where they may have a nursing room because often times we as parliamentarians are pulled away for many hours from our family setting. And to ensure that there is, I guess, as little disruption as is humanly possible many Parliaments are set up to respond to the needs of young female parliamentarians who have to nurture their babies.

If we are going to say, I suppose, be a society where we believe in equality for all, again—

[Inaudible interjection]

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: I said “if”—again, sometimes by example it says it all. So things like that, though they may not be possible, they certainly should be considered and looked at in terms of how we continue to evolve our Parliament.

It is my belief, and I think the belief of many political scientists and the like, that democracy is an evolutionary entity. And I think that in looking at that up here we should always be reflecting democracy at its best level. And so we, too, must continue to evolve our Parliament so that by demonstration we can show the people that we are first and foremost about enhancing the democratic process and about getting it right for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say anything about [that which] encompasses electoral reform on a wider level, because I do not think that this is what we actually formed for. But I suppose you can say that even in some of our functions here there is some reform that should take place in the way in which we do go about developing legislation. And I would say specifically when it comes to the involvement of particularly the backbench . . . and I think you may have led that charge, Mr. Speaker, a few years back when you got up on the floor of the House and stated that you felt that Parliamentary committees should be exercised more often. And it is important because it involves many of us who are backbenchers more intimately in the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I can say, having worked on several joint select committees, that it has been extremely rewarding. It has been very much a learning process, and it has enabled me as a parliamentarian to be able to make very informed statements on the issues that were presented. And in some jurisdictions, Mr. Speaker, before legislation even gets drafted, committees form to, I guess, do research and look at proposals for legislation. And before a Minister gets legislation drafted those proposals go to the Minister so it can help the Minister look at all of the research, and it helps inform them in terms of the best way forward in terms of drafting legislation. And by operating in that manner, Mr. Speaker, there is more buy-in from those of us who sit, particularly on the backbench and, again, it creates a more in-depth knowledge base for

those of us who sit on the backbench when we do get up and speak on any legislation because we have had intimate involvement with it.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to securing the confidence of the public, there is no better way of doing that than when you can stand to your feet and speak in a manner that assures everyone that you do know what you are speaking about, that you do understand the ramifications of the legislation that is being implemented—whether you are speaking for or against—that you are providing cogent arguments for consideration. And in so doing hopefully the result is that the people have more confidence in what we do as legislators up here in the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about us representing the interests of our voters. So what I would do is move to the area of Ethical Governance of Parliament and say, first, Mr. Speaker, that I think all of us understand that we have not got a Code of Conduct, but a set of rules called the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly. And there are many who believe that on top of having a document like this, which governs how we operate up here in the House, it needs to be supplemented by a Code of Conduct because in some instances it is believed that the Standing Orders do not go far enough.

But I wanted to highlight for the public, in particular, in case they are not aware, that we do not just come up here and get up and speak willy-nilly. We do have a set of rules that govern how we operate up here in the House of Assembly and further to that we have the Constitution, which does dictate, in essence, I suppose you can say, from the onset whether or not we even qualify to be up here. And then once up here, with the Constitution in mind and the Standing Orders, we need to operate within those parameters so that we are not violating, first and foremost, these governing principles.

Mr. Speaker, again, let me say this: I guess you can say that we are the ambassadors of law in that our primary role is to make law in this country. I think it is of paramount importance that we always be seen as law abiding citizens first and foremost because I, as a teacher, I always said that first of all . . . I always . . . I commanded the respect of my students first of all, and when there were those who, I guess, felt that respect was not needed, I demanded it because I firmly believe that people do not tend to learn from individuals they do not respect. And in all of my 25 years of teaching here in Bermuda, I have witnessed time and again situations where when there was no respect, then there was no learning that was taking place.

It is important that I enjoy the respect of my constituents and I think by being a law abiding citizen, by being a member who operates within the parameters of the Standing Orders and operates within the parameters of the Constitution, I hopefully do enjoy the respect of my constituents and all fellow Bermudi-

ans, and that they trust that I will be up here doing the job that I was elected to do. And they have no fear of me ever, I suppose you can say, misrepresenting them and falling short of glory (so to speak) so that my representation becomes questionable.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly advocate for the implementation of a Code of Conduct which further highlights the way in which we operate here in the House of Assembly. And I would dare say that if, indeed, we are going to implement such an item that we need to make sure that there are, I suppose . . . and I do not like ever taking a negative position, but let me just say that there are consequences (because I do not want to say penalties, that is negative). There are consequences that will be implemented if we fall short of the Code of Conduct because otherwise I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is a fruitless exercise.

Having said that, I would dare say that for the most part we are, indeed, all Honourable Members, and we do adhere to the Standing Orders and the Constitution. But because, again, it is important that we enjoy the confidence of the people who put us here, I think that there needs to be a document, such as a Code of Conduct, that highlights in specific detail how we operate. And indeed I suppose it is . . . I do not even need to say it, Mr. Speaker, but indeed that document must be aligned with the Standing Orders and in keeping with best practices that are operational throughout most of the parliaments in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that much haste is implemented in trying to bring about what we see as fundamental to getting it right and that is establishing the Legislature as an independent entity and in so doing also ensuring that all of the necessary resources are in place so that we can get about doing the people's work.

But I think if we are going to be responsive to the changes in society, if we are going to, I suppose you can say, be aligned with best practices that are in operation in various regimes then we have to, Mr. Speaker, begin this process yesterday and we have to first get the foundation right and that is getting Parliament and its infrastructure set up so that we can do the job that we must do and need to do for the betterment of Bermuda and its people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now—and just before I do, Honourable Minister, I just want to recognise the Senator from the other House, Senator Rabain who is in the House—Senator Diallo Rabain.

[continuation of debate on Report of the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance and Reform]

The Speaker: Minister, you may carry on.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And we were not about to allow the debate to die on the vine as it were. I know it has been a quiet debate so far. Hopefully we can spice it up a little bit.

An Hon. Member: Spice it up?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: I think, perhaps, just a little bit.

And, you know, I guess in one sense, Mr. Speaker, I will play my usual role of a reality check on all of this. And I have spoken with the Honourable Member and my colleague, Mr. Cole Simons, who chaired the Committee with respect to my views.

Of course, the aims of the Committee are altogether laudable. They are fine aims and many of the recommendations they have put, of course, I am sure will have the full support of all of the Members of this House. But there are a couple of things that we always have to remember here. One is that we are after all a very small jurisdiction; we are a minute jurisdiction with 60,000 people. When you tell people from overseas—the US or Canada or the UK—they eventually say, *Well, how many people do you represent, how big is your Bermuda?* And you say it is 60,000 people and they say, *Oh, that is tiny; that is miniscule.* And it is, and we in many respects fight above our weight and we do extremely well for ourselves.

But we should not get overly grandiose ideas of who we are. And so everything that we do must be scaled to fit who we are. And so when we look at what other countries do, you have to look at whether what they do is scalable to a community as small as this one is. You know, and it is like when you go to a small town and someone says, *Well, I'm the mayor, I'm the police chief, I'm the fire chief, I'm the magistrate, [and] I'm the coroner,* because you have a very small community and people have to fulfil multiple roles.

Some of the dangers, as we have seen in some smaller communities in particular when they get independence, is you quickly form this political elite who say we need all of these positions, we are going to need all of these positions and we are going to have to have all of this support. And I remember one Member of this House saying to me, *Well, you know, I love when I head to some jurisdiction down south (and I do not know which one it was, but this particular Member said) they always had a car ready for me and they had a chauffeur in the car, and they had a bodyguard there for me and I didn't have to go through the line at the airport.*

I am saying all of that to say that, you know, we want to keep it real here in Bermuda particularly in

light of the financial constraints that we presently face. And I do not want to get into a debate of those constraints, but we have an enormous national debt for a community of our size. We have an unsustainable deficit on our current account, the SAGE Committee are regularly pulling us up on it and I know the SAGE Committee's view is that this Government is not doing enough in terms of what is happening out there on many occasions. And I think the Chairman has taken to some public meetings with some ideas of his own as to where we should be going on the revenue side and how to raise revenue in order to help the country on the other side to cutting our expenditure.

I say all of that, Mr. Speaker, to try to put into context who we are and what we are doing here. And often it is a statement (I usually hear it from John Barritt, Jr.) *perfect [is] the enemy of the good*, saying, well, it is easy to form a shopping list of all the things you would like to have, but I guess then you have to form a list of all of things you really need, and then you have to shorten that list to things you can actually afford. And those are the concerns that we need to have.

Now, obviously, some of the recommendations on this list are items which do not necessarily cost anything at all—like a Code of Conduct. And those ones I am particularly fond of; they have no price tag attached to them, so at least on a first glance they are attractive. Can we afford them? Yes, we can afford them. Now, should we have them and what form should they take? And the report recommends to us the United Kingdom Code of Conduct, which, they say that we can use that and it will suit our purposes. I have not looked at it in detail myself but you know we need to know that it fits our jurisdiction.

There are Members who have put in a lot of work on some of the modernisation that has happened with this House, in particular the Honourable Member who spoke before me—Lovitta Foggo—spoke to the Standing Orders of the House, which were done under a Committee really run by Dame Jennifer Smith and John Barritt. I think John Barritt was the one who did the initial draft of the new Standing Orders and we obviously owe him a huge debt, as well as Dame Jennifer for doing those new Standing Orders. They did that on the basis of no extra pay or anything. They put in the extra time because they were dedicated to the job that needed to be done.

In my own . . . you know, I am one of the more long-standing Members of this House of over 20 years. In my day I did the Register of Members' Interests which had bipartisan support but was not easy. It took quite a long period of time over that 1998/99 period, and at that time was modelled on some of the reforms that were being recommended in the United Kingdom by the Nolan Commission in the UK and it lagged behind. In the UK they had gone past a Register of Members' Interests Committee and they had gone to having a Parliamentary Commission. Of

course, what that did was add another layer of bureaucracy and people who were salaried and getting paid and getting all sorts of benefits, which I thought then and feel now that we in this community would not be able to afford to support, and it would just be another person probably doing multiple jobs.

One of the problems that we face . . . and let me just go to other advances because the Honourable Member, Lovitta Foggo, mentioned, in particular, and I think it has been a great step forward, the Hansard that this House has. I think it has done extremely well and has improved a great deal since it first commenced and also having it on the website. And I think it is on www.parliament.bm. She mentioned the Government portal, but that can be sometimes a confusing portal to use to try and find something. But I think if you go on www.parliament.bm you will be able to find all the legislation, the Hansard, et cetera, which is very helpful for members of the public who are interested in following in more detail what we do in this place.

There are recommendations within this report for a Management Commission, for an Ethics Committee, et cetera, and I am just very mindful of adding additional layers of bureaucracy and committees. We already have . . . and I am not in disagreement with the Honourable Member's statement (either Member, including the Honourable Member Mr. Simons), you know, saying that we are desperately in need of modernisation. I mean, most of us know that we are all going blind in this place, so the light in here is terrible and—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Yes everything is . . . I do not want to go into the details of all of the things that make this place unattractive because I do not want to put off anyone who is thinking of joining us up here on the basis they think how wonderful it is!

[Laughter]

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: They think how wonderful life is here. But you do unsociable hours. You know, we end up sitting one day a week so you have to get stuff done. You sit overnight, and we all are friendly with each other tomorrow morning having breakfast.

But one of the reasons for that is cost, and it is because it is a part time job. If you ended up sitting two or three days a week, it would make it impossible for most Members to have another job whereas as it presently stands most Members do have another job, not all Members, but most Members have another job which sometimes is a full-time job which they somehow manage, or it is a part-time job. And if it does not, then you become full time. Then people start saying, *We need more money. We cannot do it for this amount of money.* And then we go back to the old

thing were we cannot afford 36 Members, let us go down to 12 Members, et cetera. So you end up reinventing the wheel which I do not think is in anyone's particular best interest.

At the moment as we stand, unfortunately, there are many aspects of Parliament and its structure which do not work well. I agree with the Members when they say, you know . . . I mean, the truth is, the best of all possible worlds, the Senate would be in one building, and the House of Assembly would be in another, and the Executive would be in another. But the fact of the matter is that we have to cut our cloth according to our budget and our budget is a negative budget. And one of the things is that . . . what I think needs to be done with the output of this report is to look at prioritising things which we can put in sooner rather than later and things which cost less rather than more.

For my part, as Minister of Public Works last year I tried to rejig the building a bit to get Court Number Two out of the top story of this building and have that moved elsewhere. I immediately ran into a roadblock with the Chief Justice who said, *Well, if you move that, then where are you going to put this? And I won't agree to that until you agree to this.* Which was within his rights, but it shows some of the complexity of getting the different parts of the machinery working together because no one is happy with what they have got and we have enormous budgetary constraints on all of us.

We already know that with respect to many of the parts of our committee system in that they do not really work well now. We have things like the Regulations Committee which I presume is meant to look at regulations, which they do not do presently. Regulations are tabled in this House without going before any committee. And presumably that was done for purposes of just practicality. It was not practicable to have the full operation of a Regulations Committee. But if one even looks at a committee as important as the Public Accounts Committee, they do not seem to meet on a regular basis or to do very much at the moment. And that is one of our major committees, which is not meeting and not fulfilling its function. So it is kind of hard to say we need more committees when the committees you already have are not working, for one reason or another. And that is concerning.

We have a lot of machinery around here that is not working to its full potential. Certainly within Government there has been a lot of comment on the Auditor General who has, you know, promised four or five special reports about three years ago and they have never appeared anywhere, and people are wondering whether they got lost or she got lost or what happened with all those special reports.

So it gets people very concerned that some of these things already do not work and we are not sure . . . and what we are really saying is, do you want to create more committees that do not work? So I guess

the assurance . . . I am looking at this from the point of view of the members of the public, *Please assure me that, all right, you have all these committees now that do not seem to work at any highly efficient rate, persuade me that these new committees are going to somehow improve the process.*

How are they going to improve the process? I think the electorate out there sent a signal at the last general election that they were weary of Government as it was. They wanted a change. And they got the change and they have now put a weight on the new Government to say well, we want you to serve us, so we want you to cut your cloth to fit. They want to see us . . . I am sorry to say it, Mr. Speaker. The electorate (or at least some of them) want to see us suffering. They want to say, *Good you are suffering. Good you don't have this or you don't have that.* They are very interested in what emoluments and perks people get, whether in politics as politicians or whether they are civil servants.

Some people out there keep a very eagle eye on: *How many trips they are taking? Do they have a Government car? What are they doing? Why do have that money, I do not even have a job.* If you have a member of the public . . . so many people are unemployed. We have a group out there now running around wanting jobs and equity, all of which things we are working very hard to produce. But what they will say is, *If you do all of that is it going to improve the economy? Is it going to produce jobs?* So those are the concerns that we have to be mindful of in this House.

Again, one of the things which was done was the Parliamentary Calendar. It will be very interesting to see whether we can stick to the division that is there because, of course, the nature of this House is that things come up and you have to deal with them when they come up and you do not always know in advance. But at least you have a plan of action out there.

I am mindful of that fact of what the Honourable Member who spoke just before me, Ms. Foggo, said with respect to young mothers. If there are any (I know at least one in this House) young mothers who are desperate to do this job . . . we need to make it as doable as possible but I am not sure it is ever going to be a particularly sociable job. I have a feeling it is always going to be an unsociable job. The nature of the system is that you are going to take a lot of criticism. You need a pretty thick hide, and there are a limited number of people.

A lot of the people want what they see as the good parts of your job, which are relatively, few like a parking spot or something—*Oh, I want your parking spot but I wouldn't be willing to go through what you go through for any of that.*

So I say all of that to say that I think Members in general, I think the public will support the recommendations in the Report of the Parliamentary Joint

Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance provided we can convince the public that it is going to improve *their* life and to explain to them how it is going to improve their life, how it is going to improve governance in our community, that it is not going to cost them more money and that is going to produce them a better result at the end of the day. And on that basis if the members of the public support it, then all Members of this House should likewise support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Minister.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: Just before we go forward we want to recognise that we have in our midst Dame Jennifer—

[Desk thumping]

[continuation of debate on Report of the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance and Reform]

The Speaker: I recognise now the Honourable Member, MP Walton Brown.

You have the floor.

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first commend the Joint Select Committee for producing this report. It is a very thoughtful document and it does propose a number of changes to how we operate that I think will actually enhance our effectiveness. So I know they put in a lot of time and effort so they should be commended for it.

There is, however, Mr. Speaker, a real challenge with regard to Parliament and the public because the public for the most part question the way we do our business, they question the tactics we sometimes utilise, they question the language and conduct. So there is almost a divide, if you will, Mr. Speaker, between what we are meant to be accomplishing as parliamentarians and what the public think of the work that we do. And that divide needs to be filled. We need to eradicate that divide, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully we will get to it at some point.

Now, I am in full support of having a Parliament which is much more independent. I think it needs to have far better resources to do its work. I fully understand, of course, that in this present climate there is unlikely to be any additional funds given to Parliament. If we cannot give more money for scholarships, Mr. Speaker, I doubt that we will see more money given to Parliament in this current session. But it is aspirational. It is aspirational. And so we hope that

some point in a better climate we will be able to properly fund Parliament so that we can do the people's business far more effectively.

There are some interim measures we could take that would make us more efficient. I find it absolutely incredible that we use up so much paper. Every single week we see reams and reams of paper being utilised when it is probably much more cost-effective to have these tablets and have all of our information sent electronically rather than printing. So those are relatively minor matters which can quite easily and readily be addressed.

At some point we should have cameras in Parliament and that will see parliamentarians conducting themselves in a much more effective manner, Mr. Speaker, because when you are on TV everyone sits up properly. It is likely to be much more orderly and it would likely enhance the debate. I cannot guarantee it, Mr. Speaker, but it could possibly enhance the level, the nature and level, of debate in Parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Honourable Member Cole Simons talk about the importance of ethics. Ethics are fundamental to who we are as parliamentarians. We are meant to be the leaders of a country, despite our constitutional status, we are meant to be leaders of a country, and therefore we are meant to convey ourselves in a manner that is consistent with the highest ethical standard. We sometimes fall from that standard, Mr. Speaker, and we have seen evidence of that. I have not once though (and some can correct me) I do not think we have ever had a Member of Parliament resign based on ethical misconduct.

I see the Honourable former Premier here and perhaps she will be able to say if that is true or not. I cannot recall anyone ever resigning based on misconduct on the basis of ethics. And so that speaks to, I think, the challenge that we face when we say we want to adhere to international best practices and CPA best practices yet our conduct does not reflect it. And maybe when we mature, we will see more of that.

I heard my honourable colleague, Ms. Foggo, speak about gender and the notion of gender balance in Parliament. Well, at least I am happy to hear someone talk about gender differences in this country because I have not seen any concrete action on any level to address the gender divide in my political life in this country, Mr. Speaker. It is a fundamental issue and Parliament can help to set some standards to address the historic discrimination against women at least on the Parliamentary level. And maybe that might be an example for the corporate sector and society as a whole because that is an issue that has never really been addressed, but it is fundamental.

Equally fundamental, Mr. Speaker, is the notion of respect for religious differences. We say we are a mature democracy. We say we respect people's right to believe irrespective of their faith even if they have none, but yet our very practice in Parliament

contradicts that. We begin our proceedings as if there is only one religion to be recognised in this country. So if we are truly committed to respect for religious differences, then we should have that reflected in our practices. So I would hope that this Joint Select Committee would have given that some attention if we are truly meant to honour what we say we wish to aspire to.

Now, I just have two other points to make, Mr. Speaker. I heard my colleagues talk about the supremacy of Parliament. And we like to say that Parliament is supreme. We like to say it, but if we actually believe it, then we are deluding ourselves. Parliament is not supreme. That too may be aspirational. But consider the notion of the power of the Executive. The Executive really has all the power in this Parliamentary system, especially given our size. You have a large Cabinet *vis-à-vis* the parliamentary group. Cabinet decide on policy matters, they persuade caucus that this is the position to be adopted, and they come to Parliament. And it works irrespective of which party is in power. What the Cabinet decides it brings to caucus, what caucus approves is what gets approved in Parliament. So who really does have the power? It clearly is the Executive.

But, Mr. Speaker, if anyone wants to change that, we need to think very long and very hard about what system you want to replace it with. I hear all kinds of talk about the system is messed up; we need a new system. The system is corrupt. There are a lot of problems with this system, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to know which one is better. I would like to know which one is better. At least in this system the people who win the popular vote, get to enact policy and legislation, and we should respect that. The people who win the popular vote get to enact policy and legislation, but make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, Parliament is not supreme. The Executive has the power.

The final point I will make, Mr. Speaker, relates to our constitutional status. The Honourable and Learned Minister Moniz, I do not know why he needed to make that point at the beginning that those countries that have gotten independence somehow have aspirations to grandeur. It was a comment which need not have been made, Mr. Speaker, because the reality is that almost every country in the world is independent. The Honourable Minister spoke as if it was the exceptional country that sought to govern itself, and then intimated levels of ineptitude with respect to these countries.

The Parliamentary Joint Select Committee looked at ways to improve Parliament to deliver better service and legislation to this country, but you cannot look at Parliament becoming more effective when Parliament does not have full authority to decide on matters that are truly important to this country. And just to repeat for the sake of those who are listening, Mr. Speaker (because of course every Member of this House knows it), we do not have responsibility for ex-

ternal affairs, we do not have responsibility for defence, nor do we have responsibility for internal security. So how on earth can Parliament be seeing itself as the body to provide full and proper governance if we do not have full and proper control?

So if we are serious about reforming Parliament so that it becomes a more effective entity, then Parliament needs to truly work on ways in which it can get full authority. Anything less is window dressing and it might make for good reports and interesting debates, but it would not achieve the desired objective of a more effective Parliament.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke [West], MP Jeanne Atherden.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Jeanne J. Atherden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I want to sort of start off by recognising that the Committee of which I was a member was tasked with trying to improve the Parliamentary Governance of the people of Bermuda, and as such we actually had three functions that we looked at. The first one related to the Governance Structure, the Function of Parliament, and then the Ethical Governance of Parliament. And if I look at it, I would actually sort of recognise that some of the things that we have talked about and some of the things that we are going to consider—some of them I call transformational, others I call aspirational.

From my perspective, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to try and go through the entire report because people can read. And I believe it is an opportunity for me to highlight things that I believe that are important so that later on when we decide to move forward with some of these things at least I have presented what I believe is relevant to the people of Bermuda and important.

So from my perspective, I am not going to get into discussions about the type of ethics that we should put into place because I believe that if we go ahead with this, that there will be a group of people that will be able to work on that and develop an appropriate system of ethics; therefore, to try and go through all of the various possibilities is something that is going to take up time that I do not want to deal with at the moment.

I also want to make reference to the fact that with respect to, if you will, how Parliament is set up—the governance structure. I believe that that is where we have one of the greatest opportunities to do something different. I know the previous speaker talked about some other things that we could look at, but I am saying that right now there is an opportunity to improve, and I am going to deal with what is on the

table. So from my perspective, I want to spend just a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, and talk about which things I believe are transformational and which things are aspirational. Because Mr. Speaker, everything that we do, I think, has to be put in the context of how we are going to improve and make all of us more effective Members of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I am minded of the fact that—or Madam Deputy Speaker—

[Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair]

Mrs. Jeanne J. Atherden: I am reminded of the fact that when the new MPs became Members of Parliament, we were given a document which said “10 Measures of Success for Being an Effective MP.” And to me, Madam Deputy Speaker, this was a very critical and crucial document which all of us should have taken to heart because it helps us understand how we are going to improve our behaviour and how we can be better as it relates to Members of Parliament coming up here and performing, being responsible and responsive to our constituents. So I want to relate a couple of the things that are in this particular document to the conduct that all of us are supposed to achieve—whether it be as new MPs or seasoned MPs—because in the end once you have been here long enough your code of conduct and your behaviour should all be the same.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to focus on one or two things and show why the recommendations were put in because I do think that if you start to look at where you are and where you want to go, you have to take it in the concept of what you are hoping to achieve and why you are actually making some of these things because as the Honourable Member Cole Simons indicated, some of these things are going to have to be looked at in the context of what we can do now, what it is going to cost, and how it can actually be affected.

So as I say, some of them are transformational. And for me, transformational is something that looks at something that we have now, the opportunity to change it and improve it. And the aspirational are the ones where you know where you want to go, but you cannot get there right now and, therefore, you have to understand how you are going to move along and actually what we are going to do to progress it.

Madam Deputy Speaker, when I start to look at the suggestion (and I am looking at the report on pages 10 and 11) this is talking about the setting up of the hiring of support staff and the provision of a variety of services. I think the Committee recommended . . . understood two things: the Government, per se, has at its disposal a core of civil servants, a core of secretaries, permanent secretaries, et cetera, that provides them with lots of information to help them formulate

the policies that come here for us to look at and vote on.

But the Members of Parliament who are either in the Opposition or the backbench, they do not have those facilities, which means in order for them to do their job, they have to then start to rely on their own individual resources. And that reminded me that that is why some of these recommendations were made because if I look at one of the “Measures of Success for Being an Effective MP” one of them (item 4) says “Know where to seek information and legislative assistance.” And Madam Deputy Speaker, I will indicate to you that this orientation handbook was prepared by the South African Development Community Parliamentary Reform group and, therefore, it has some basis of use in other places, and obviously it was given to us and I think it is very relevant.

So if you are looking at this suggestion that to “know where to seek information and legislative assistance” you have got to recognise as it says here, “MPs cannot be experts in everything and thus should work on topics in their particular areas of interest.” It also says, “In searching for information, solicit the help of various interest groups and parliamentary staff.” Now, that assumes that you are operating in an environment where there is parliamentary staff. And I say to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that our staff are already busy doing their jobs just necessarily taking care of the normal functions of Parliament.

So that is why the recommendation has been put that we should look at hiring additional staff. And I am not saying that is going to happen today or tomorrow, but this is something that I call “aspirational”, that we should look at hiring additional staff because that can help us to do some of the things.

Now we have done things like putting Hansard, we have made the Internet available to us, we are trying to do different things to help us, but this acknowledges that in a more controlled way, in a more organised way that getting information to help the Members of Parliament who are not part of the Government would help us be more effective and more efficient.

Also, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is reminding us that it not only helps us, but it also means that when we are looking at information, when we are doing research, and when we are going to support things that come to us, we are in a better position to be able to stand up and talk about it. But equally, if we happen to be not just the Opposition, but Members on the Government side we are in a better position to also make suggestions, raise questions, and make sure that what is being put forward has been at least subject to some additional scrutiny, some additional input, and that has always got to be good for the Bermudian populace because we want to put forward recommendations that are going to work.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I also want to sort of highlight . . . and if you look at this page 10, which is

talking about provision of research assistants for Members, there was a suggestion (and I firmly believe that it has some merit) that the Members of Parliament should also be given provision for some place for them, if you will, meet their constituents and then deal with them as it relates to coming here, talking about what is happening in the House, being able to turn around and provide information to them. This is embodied in some of the type of suggestions that talk about support for training and talking about implementation of leading technology advances.

And also when we talk about support of committees of Parliament, that also is an extension because there are a lot of standing committees that we all sit on and we are allocated to these committees when we come here, but that means that the current staff have to turn around and try and help the various committees to get their information, get their reports out, and once again do their research. And in some cases, yes, we have supplemented that by hiring, whether it be recording staff or other individuals. But I think what we are trying to say is that in most other places you have a situation where they have something much more organised and, therefore, they make sure that the support that is given to the Members helps them perform their job and their task.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, I also want to sort of make persons understand that it is not just about coming up here and voting. It is also coming up here and talking about making the speeches and also about developing our ability to be able to have open relationships with our constituents and, therefore, by making sure that we have a much more organised space for our Parliamentarians that helps us also make sure that we maintain an open relationship with our constituents, which was one of the other suggestions that you have to do to be an effective Member of Parliament. We keep forgetting that our constituents are not just listening to us on the radio; our constituents expect to ask questions of us, they expect to be able to get information, they expect to be able for us to be able to talk to them about what is going on, so that the idea of having support staff for Parliamentarians goes a long way to make sure that this happens.

And when there is a suggestion of a library, including research capabilities, talking about committees, support services in terms of minute taking, dissemination of information to committee members, and also independent legal support, I think those are the type of things that people have to recognise that going forward that would help the Members of Parliament, whether they be on the Opposition or on the Government side, it would help them—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, if you would just take your seat for a moment because the chorus of noise is . . . getting louder and louder.

So Members, Members, thank you. I would just like to be able to hear the speaker.

Thank you very much. Just keep it down to a quieter hum. Thanks.

Please continue.

Mrs. Jeanne J. Atherden: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

At one stage I thought it was deliberate and by design, but I am sure it was very accidental.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to just also reiterate the fact that I think that when we look at all of these we have to go on the basis that everything that was put here was suggested to make all of us collectively perform better as Members of Parliament.

And some of these things can be done by expanding some of the services. Some of the other things can be done by, if you will, looking at them and working towards that. And that is why when I wanted to move off to the second part of the function, which relates to the Function of Parliament, that is where I think we start getting into some of the things that I call truly aspirational.

The reason I say that is because I have to remind myself that we operate in the Westminster system, which means that you have an Opposition, you have the Government and then you have the backbench. But you also have a situation that says—We talked about oversight of the Executive. I think we all believe that it is very important to have the Executive put forward a budget and we all believe that we want to make sure that what is actually in the budget reflects the best programmes for Bermuda and is going to have the best value for money. But I also believe that it is not just the job of the Opposition to be able to ask questions about the budget. I believe it is also the job of the backbenchers.

But one must recognise that the way the Westminster system works, the backbenchers have their opportunity by making sure that when the programmes are being developed that you get the information and you have the opportunity to try and influence what is being presented. And that is why, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is very important that everybody have access to the research, everybody have access to the information which talks about . . . you know, what is being put forward, how much it is going to cost, et cetera, and that is why I say it is aspirational because right now that type of system is a work in progress. But I do believe that we all want that to happen and so when we talked about, on page 19, “A very significant function of Parliament is to exercise its oversight and control of the Executive by way of holding it responsible for its acts of omission and commission.” And then talking about “asking questions of the ministers through its members, by raising adjournment motions . . . censure motions,” et cetera.

As you know, Madam Deputy Speaker, the way our system works, by and large the questions that tended to be raised are by the Members of the Opposition, but Members of the backbench also have ques-

tions. And sometimes asking questions does not necessarily mean that you are questioning something and therefore you do not believe in it. Sometimes asking questions makes sure that the information is further disseminated so everybody understands where it is going and why it is going.

I think as we go forward that the concept of making sure that you have the oversight, if it is exercised in a way that says, I am not going to try and ask a question which is a 'gotcha', but I am going to try and ask a question that explains why it is being done, what you hope to achieve, then I think we will perhaps, Madam Deputy Speaker, move oversight of the Executive to the type of level that I think Bermuda wants. I think Bermuda wants us to see the Executive coming up with good policies, providing us with information, and the Members in the Parliament here asking questions about why it is going, what it is doing, and making sure that when it is done we are all satisfied that it is going to be in the best interests of Bermuda.

I do not think that they want us suddenly doing what I call the ping-pong match that says, *Oh, got you on that one.* And, *Oh, I am going to come back with you on that one.* That, to me, Madam Deputy Speaker, is the waste of time that Bermuda does not want.

I also say Madam Deputy Speaker, that when we talk . . . and it brings me back to something which was another suggestion about having, what I call, an effective MP, is the fact of managing your time well. And if we are going to manage our time well up here, we have to make sure that what we bring forward is well researched. We have to make sure that when we look at it we examine it as it relates to Bermuda and how it is going to deliver. And we do not get into what I call all of this discussion about who did it and who did not do it, et cetera.

So Madam Deputy Speaker, I am saying to us that some of this is aspirational and it will get back later to talk about codes of conduct and how we work and committees, et cetera. But I also think, Madam Deputy Speaker, that if we look at some of this and, as I said, I am not going to talk long because I do believe at some point in time once we have actually adopted this motion, that there will be all the time to start to get into what I call the Devil is in the details. And as you know, this is laying a framework and there will be lots of opportunity later on for us to start to look at what we can do, what we can do with the resources that we have (whether those resources be human or financial), and if we play it properly we will be able to put together a timeline and a framework that will help us deal with the organisation—whether it be the staffing, whether it be utilising the staffing that we have now, whether it be the opportunity of transferring stuff from some other location. I know we talked about whether we would be in another place and all sorts of infrastructure issues.

Anything that we come up with I know is going to take some planning and it is also going to result in some sort of cost. But I do think that as it relates to how we operate, as it relates to our mindset, as it relates to a commitment to say that we are going to operate in a better manner, as it relates to researching, as it relates to asking questions. That does not cost money. And I think we have to start, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have to start putting, if you will, the way we operate, the way we behave . . . we have to start doing those things that do not cost us anything but make us look so much better and make the people of Bermuda really believe that they have value for money. That when we are up here that we are actually dealing with the people's business, we are actually asking questions which are designed to produce a good result.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am just going to say two other things. That for me sitting on this Committee created an opportunity to try and look at what was done elsewhere. It created also a dilemma as it relates to sort of saying *reach and put forward everything that we believe in* and recognising that not everything could be done right now. But I do think the idea of making sure that the Executive does their job, but all the rest of us do our jobs as it relates to asking the questions because, you know, I said at one point in time, Parliamentary questions are supposed to be getting answers—whether they be written or oral—to make sure that we get the information. The research will help us ask the right questions.

Going forward the budget debate time is not just a time to sort of play, *Well, am I going to give you an hour and twenty minutes or two minutes.* It is all supposed to be designed to say that we all want to make sure that we bring different areas of expertise and we want to ask the right questions so that everybody can be assured that the right information is being done and it is not just about making sure that your voice is heard and late at night someone sort of saying, *Well, he ranted and raved or she did whatever else.*

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to say that for me it was a good opportunity. We have some things to look at. The functions of Parliament especially as it relates to controlling finances will always be there for us and we have the opportunity. And I would like to think that as we go forward the other Members of the House, will treat it as something that we can weigh in as a potential roadmap for us to improve the functioning and how we operate. And over time we will come back again and the Devil will be in the detail and we will sort it out.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any other Members that would like to speak to the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance?

The Chair recognises the Member from Sandys South, constituency 33, Mr. T. E. Lister.

You have the floor.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

It is interesting. The Honourable Member Mrs. Atherden ended with exactly what I was going to start with, saying that this is a roadmap—a good roadmap. I think the Committee did good work; they produced a good report.

I like to think that we have a pretty spiffy Parliament. However, despite that there is opportunity for modernisation nonetheless. In the 20 years that I have been here, I have seen a lot that has happened. There is no question about the benefit of the Hansard. There is no question about the benefit of having the message go out over the radio. I believe in due course, though not in the report, we should be looking at televising proceedings. That too will raise the standard just as putting it on the radio has raised the standard.

However, I am a little sorry that the report is being presented in 2014 and not in 2006 or 2007 or something like that when we had lots of money. The things in this report could have been taken on board and dealt with one time. However, when we—Mrs. Atherden and myself—use the term “roadmap” what we are really saying is you know where you are today, let us put this up on the wall, let us get a flowchart, let us see how it works in terms of our pocketbook and our priorities and we go through time and get this report implemented fully, but through time.

The idea of having a Management Committee that is going to run the House, so to speak, is a very good one. The committee and the suggested people on the committee—not people but officers—are such that we would really be responsible for what goes on from a financial point of view and otherwise here in the House, without the external power of Cabinet right now. Cabinet sets a budget that has a huge impact on what the Parliament can and cannot do. And so if Parliament itself, through this committee, organised its own budget and then went and sought it as opposed to being given a sum of money and then trying to work it, you would see a very different situation.

One of the recommendations that I am 100 per cent in favour of is having both Houses of the Legislature in this building. When the Dame Lois building was built I thought that anything that looked like, smelled like, and acted like a lawyer or a judge would be found in the Dame Lois building. I certainly did not expect that major cases would stay over here. This is where the major cases take place. And we come up here days and we find this place surrounded by police and security. And so that was not the deal. Surely that was not the deal.

So, as Government is now going through its process of trying to organise all the buildings it has

inherited, determining which ones are being used most effectively, which ones are sitting vacant, who we are paying a rent to on the external market (so to speak) and looking at all of that, I would like Government to be thinking also of how to get the courts out of this building into Dame Lois where they belong and then getting the Senate into this building.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as you know in many modern Parliaments there are all sorts of rooms—set committee rooms, there are meeting rooms, there are restrooms, places where MPs can go and relax for a while. It is not uncommon to have a restaurant or a bar or something like that on the premises.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Terry E. Lister: I have to admit that all the Members got interested in my speech as soon as I said “bar.” No one was paying me attention before. That is okay. But in all seriousness there is a lot that is actually missing from the building because we do not have full control of the building. And so if we could do that that could be a good thing and that might not come at a very big price if there is a place for the courts to go.

As I read the report and I thought about some of the support staff needs, in some cases it will require new budget money and so that pushes it back maybe. In some cases it is a reallocation and doing what we need done out of the same money only bringing it over. As a for instance, when you come to this building there is a police officer outside providing security for us. There is really no reason why we could not get that budgeted sum of money and hire security people to work here—same money—it comes out of the Police budget and comes into the budget of the House of Assembly. And that only requires the Minister of Finance to agree and to move the money across and it is done. No new money.

On the other hand, the idea of having research officers and committee support staff—things which I support 100 per cent, especially now—those things cost money. And so we have to put them in through time and see how we can fit them in.

I am always a little concerned when people say we need legal support. I am not the biggest fan of lawyers. I do not know why, but I will admit it. And I tend to think that lawyers have the ability to spin the smallest issue into the biggest issue being paid by the word. If you practice that way, if that is what you do, the more words you write the more money you make, you cannot stop it. Right? That is how it works. And so the idea of having a legal officer on board does not really turn me on, but in the report itself it was suggested that maybe in future the Clerk could have a requirement to be a legal officer. And so, again, it is a future event. And at the retirement of the present Clerk we may well add that into the requirements and

get a lawyer to be the Clerk. That could be a good thing.

If you are getting someone who is going to run the House of Parliament, more than likely they are a veteran—an experienced person—someone, at their youngest, in their mid-40s, more likely in their mid-50s, so they would bring lots of really good legal experience when they come to the House. And so I would support that.

Staff training—staff training is tremendously important. And it is so much better and so much easier to get a good bang for your buck by bringing people in to train the staff collectively. We have not done a lot of that, but I would encourage it. I believe in it. But at the same time, my dad used to say, *Iron sharpens iron*. And so here, while it costs a bit more money, there is a lot of value to sending our staff abroad to training sessions throughout the Commonwealth wherever they are taking place so that they can meet and interact with their colleagues. They can learn what is being taught in the classrooms, but during the breaks and the evenings they can learn so much more and come back and enrich us through that process. And so I am going to support the staff training—both locally and internationally—again, looking to see where our budget can carry us.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, the part that really made me wish this was in 2006 and not 2014 is when we come to resources for MPs. I believe it would be brilliant if we could have constituency offices all up and down the country where we had one member of staff who was full time who dealt with our constituency issues, who prepared letters for us that we could sign, scratch up and have them retype and then sign them and send them out, who could deal with the issues that come up in the community, prepare the notes for us and we can take it on. But with their experience, you know, if you have got somebody who is right hand who knows what is going on, they could address some of the issues and simply give you a report saying this happened, I dealt with it this way, away we go. There is so much benefit to that. And one might say, *Well, we are a small community*. Yes, we are a small community and so we are not asking for it today, but if it were 2006, I would really be banging the table asking for it. It is a double-edged sword.

Those who are familiar with politics will know that in Canada in the last year they have had four Senators who have been up and investigated for fiddling funds. You will know that in the UK they found that over 300 Members of Parliament had fiddled their funds—300 is a pretty big number. I know there are 600 Members, but 300 is a pretty big number. By the time they worked their way through and did all the reports that they needed to do, eight Members of the UK Parliament became (in a Bermuda context) guests at Westgate—they were sent to jail—because of the foolishness they did. So there is always the risk that we could move down that path and a fine, intel-

ligent, elected Member of Parliament stops coming here on Fridays and goes to Westgate every day because they were foolish. So we take that risk at the same time getting something that is going to benefit not only MPs but their constituents—that community point where they are touching base and having their problems addressed.

So Madam Deputy Speaker, as I said, I think it is a great report, a lot of good ideas. The timing of the implementation is the key, and we have to do it concert with the funding and priorities of the Government. We cannot expect that everything in this report would get done, especially at this time when people will say, *There they go again—the Members of Parliament taking care of themselves and not taking care of the people*.

And so I would encourage the Government to, yes, take care of the people, but also find a way to move us forward to the next level.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

Are there any other individuals that would like to speak to the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance presented today?

There are no other Members.

We will continue to move along our agenda.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: I do not believe that we are actually voting on this motion. It was a motion that was presented.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: We are going to continue to move on the agenda.

Do we have the second reading?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: No, there is no vote.

But I am glad to know that there has been an overall—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Then that would be perfect.

Are there any Members that would . . . are Members in approval of the motion that has been put before us today and presented?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

The Deputy Speaker: Motion approved.

[Gavel]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much.
No objections?
No objections.

[Motion carried: The Report of the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Governance and Reform, together with appendices, approved.]

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any other motions on the paper that are going to be discussed today?
There are no other motions. Thank you.
If there are no other motions, I call on the Premier.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I move now that we adjourn until May 23, 2014.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Quangos, *[sic]* if that is still . . . Sandys North Central, constituency 35, the Honourable Dennis P. Lister.

You have the floor.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is actually Shadow Minister of Works and Engineering now.

The Deputy Speaker: I thought that had changed. The paperwork has not, though.

Thank you.

JETGATE

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: No problem. No problem, my dear, no problem at all.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise on my feet hopefully to be ever so brief. But I want to follow on the fact that I rose on my feet last week first, and I just want to acknowledge some things that have taken place this week. Last week, Madam Deputy Speaker, I rose to challenge the other side in the sense of the current climate that we find ourselves in and the fact that it has gone too long.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe if you remember correctly my words were that it was time—it was time now for this matter to be addressed. And from that point of view, Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to acknowledge the fact that the Executive, at least the Chairman of the OBA, has recognised indeed it is time. And it is time, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the matter is put in the context where investigation should take place to find out where the real crux of this matter is that has dragged on far, far too long.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am standing to acknowledge the fact that at least that member of that

party, the Chairman of the party, had the backbone—Oh, Mr. Speaker is now in the Chair—

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: —had the backbone, Mr. Speaker, to take a position to have the party commit to do an internal investigation.

My concern though, Mr. Speaker, in acknowledging that the party, the Chairman at least, has come to the position that it is time. And Mr. Speaker, my new concern or my concern when I read the article in the newspaper account of that position, is that the newspaper expressed from their sources that there was some concern within their ranks, and the indication given that maybe the Chairman did not have full support that that was the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stand on my feet and say to the organisation, as I said to the Members on that side last week, that it is time. It is time and support needs to be given to that Executive officer to allow him to go ahead in full disclosure and do the type of investigation that is needed.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out the fact that this matter had gotten beyond just the three individuals that are involved, and it involved all 19 Members across the floor from me in that as it goes on and is not allowed to be addressed, the implication is that there is a process of covering what was done. And at that point, Mr. Speaker, all Members are now associated with that.

I would almost want to ask today, Mr. Speaker, that if there is some inkling that the Chairman of the party does not have full support for the action that he is taking, where are the numbers in this Chamber? Are they in support of the action that was taken by the Chairman?

Are they in support of recognising that it is timely that the investigation is done . . . overdue in fact? Or are there some of those who are opposed to what the Chairman has done (if you follow the story that is in the paper)? giving concern to the fact that the Chairman did not have full support for taking that position.

So it would be interesting to find out where are the other Members in regard to that. Are they supportive of their Chairman is seeing this matter go to an investigative stage? Mr. Speaker, as the week has progressed, I think more questions have been raised than answers.

Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman commits himself to an internal investigation, key questions are coming up just by the information that is being disclosed this week, that has been disclosed this week, and I think particularly of one question that came right to mind just looking at the headlines on today's paper, in that the Chairman in his press conference confirmed that funds—this \$300,000 that is in question—was never received by the party, the OBA. And then

we have the person who was responsible for having the money forwarded or coming up with the money, the developer, confirming that in fact the money was sent to Bermuda and it was sent to an organisation called the Bermuda Political Action Club.

Mr. Speaker, I think I got taken by surprise, like everybody else in this country. I think we have never heard of a Bermuda Political Action Club. And it will be interesting, Mr. Speaker, as this investigation goes forward to find out just who the Political Action Club is. Who do they represent? Who are the members? Who was authorised to receive this money? Who was authorised to spend that money? I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that those funds were placed in an account, in a bank account somewhere rather than just sitting on someone's desk. I would want to think it went into a bank account. The question arises who are the signatures to that account? Who authorised, who opened that account? Who manages that account?

As we go on, Mr. Speaker, if this is the type of stuff that is being disclosed, I think it is extremely, extremely important that the investigation does take place . . . and that full disclosure—full transparency—is given to the information and the facts that are found in them.

Mr. Speaker, another question that has arisen in covering of the recent events (and I direct this to one of the Members here, the Minister of Tourism) . . . in a response which appears in the print media is the question, I am paraphrasing . . . but the question was in response to the contact that the Minister had with the developer in question here. And the Minister's response, as printed, is that the only other contact that he has had since the Jetgate flight that brought this all to light was that he flew overseas to the developer to inform him that he was not successful in his RFP attempt or successful in . . . and I stand to be corrected—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister:—and that is why I am addressing it here. So I will yield to your point of order.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member is incorrect. I do not know if he is quoting it. If he can produce the quote of what is said—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, I would prefer if you read it, Honourable Member.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will gladly read it, Mr. Speaker, let me just turn to that page. Mr. Speaker, this is from page 6 of the *Selling Bermuda*. It says that "Crockwell, the lead Minister of the Government gambling initiative, said his only contact with Landow since the Jetgate affair was a trip last year to inform him of Government's tendering process on the ClubMed site."

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: And that is correct. And I was accompanied by the Permanent Secretary.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Here is my question. I am glad that the Minister . . . and the Minister has admitted it. We all in here heard that what I read was correct. It is correct. The Minister has admitted that it was correct.

Here is what leads to the next questions, Mr. Speaker, every time someone is turned down for an RFP or a bid to Bermuda, a Minister is going to get on a plane to fly up there to inform him that they were not successful?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, just . . . Honourable Member please take your seat.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member just read it.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: We travelled to lay out the RFP process to the developers that we knew were interested at the time. We were not informing anyone that they had been denied. Read the statement again Honourable Member—

The Speaker: All right. Okay. Thank you.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: We went there to lay out the RFP process. He was not the only developer that we did that with.

The Speaker: Thanks, Minister.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Minister, that is what I was going after—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: We had not made a decision yet.

The Speaker: Thanks.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Minister, that is what I was going at. I purposely twisted my response the way I did to get the correct answer from you. What I wanted you to say was whether you were going to see just this developer or whether you were going to do a presentation to a group of people who were interested in developing in Bermuda. That was what I was finding out, because if you are going to see just—

The Speaker: Please, please, speak . . . Honourable Member, let us try and get to speaking through the Speaker.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: The concern is if you had gone to see just this one developer . . . my question is a simple question Minister. [For] any developer who is interested in developing anything in Bermuda, is the common practice now that the Minister and a civil servant will fly on a plane to go up and see that developer to say, *Here is the process for tendering?*

The Speaker: Honourable Member, you don't . . . we are not going—

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: I won't . . . I will address you.

The Speaker: —to be going—

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: The Minister can respond—

The Speaker: —back and forth having—

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: The Minister can respond later—

The Speaker: You know, this is not how this debate will go on—

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: The Minister can respond later. Because, Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: So you make your points, Honourable Member, yes.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker, in this day and age of technology, e-mail, telephone calls, forwarding information, I would have thought that that was more of an economical approach to getting information out there. Not that whenever someone is interested a Minister is going to get on a plane and sit in front of that one developer and say, *Here is the process*. I just cannot fathom that as being the best practice, and that is what I am asking.

Now, one can take that in a lot of other directions. I am not going to take it in that direction. I am just going to put it there. I just do not think that is the most practical way for us to be doing it. It will imply,

Mr. Speaker, that maybe that developer is getting preferential treatment. And I . . . and—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes?

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I have already stated that there was more than just that one developer that we met with.

The Speaker: He did say it was . . . he did say that.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: I accepted that, Mr. Speaker. I accepted that. I accepted that.

But those are the type of questions that need to be clarified as we clear the air that goes on because of the flap out there. Without clarification, it implies, or the implication, Minister, is that there were things that were questionable in the process. So that is all . . . that is here as it is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to where I am going in regard to that. And I am glad that that Minister was prepared to get on his feet and clarify that. Because we have seen that Minister, Mr. Speaker, put himself in another circle and try and clarify some questions that were originally put on this floor and put in the public and it is one of those questions that is still yet to be clarified. That is why I am glad the Minister was able to get on his feet and clarify that matter.

It would be nice to see him do the same as this process goes on, Mr. Speaker, in that there was an original question in reference to the question that was put to the number of persons and who the persons were that travelled on the original Jetgate. We were told on this floor, we were told publicly, that there were three Ministers—or the Premier and two Ministers—who travelled. We all accepted that because it was given to us by the Premier himself. It was told to us publicly in this Chamber. It was told to us in this Chamber and repeated publicly.

Sometime later the Minister who just rose to his feet went to the airwaves on a particular talk show and clearly said that the gentleman who was . . . in fact, let me step back a little further, back up a bit, Mr. Speaker, because at first it was told that it was just the three individuals from Parliament who were on the flight. Then sometime later we found out there was a fourth person, a private citizen, who was on the flight. When that was questioned, Mr. Speaker, we were informed, again in this Chamber and in the public, that the gentleman was just hitching a ride. Hitching a ride.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: I know the Honourable Member is not attempting to mislead the House. However, the statement stated that it was our first time travelling on there, and I mentioned the Ministers going to see the particular individual, which was Landow. To insinuate that we were trying to leave someone out is misleading.

The Speaker: Thank you, Premier.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: The Members that were going for the meeting, was what was given in the statement. There was no question asked.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
Carry on.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker, I will move on from there and just continue where I was going. I will accept that fact.

When the information was disclosed, that the private citizen was actually on the plane, he took a ride to the US—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: On your own Member?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: On my own Member, yes, point of order.

[Inaudible]

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable Member is certainly misleading the House and so is the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's personal explanation, which he had—

The Speaker: You are making . . . you are making a point of order on what that Honourable . . . what *this* Honourable Member said? What this Honourable Member said?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, but what that—

The Speaker: That is the only thing you can stand up right now and make an order on. Okay?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Okay. I will get it.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: You will have your turn, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, when the question of the private citizen came up the first response that was put out was that he was only hitching a ride. We accepted that because it came from the Premier.

The Minister who just responded to me on his feet later went on the public airways, on a talk show, and said, in fact, the gentleman was in the meetings. He was not asked to give up that information. He voluntarily gave up the information, just as he did just now come to clarify the position that I started on, Mr. Speaker. He openly gave the correct . . . gave a response. Let us put it that way.

The Speaker: Yes, because you asked the question—

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: He gave a response. Right.

The Speaker: —which I probably would . . . yes.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Just . . . just Mr. Speaker, just as he gave the response to me just now on my earlier question to help clarify the air on the matter that I raised first.

The question here, Mr. Speaker, is since those two positions were this wide apart, (1) that the gentleman only took a ride; (2) that the gentleman sat in the meetings . . . too much time has passed without the clarification. See how easy it was for the Minister to rise on his feet just now and provide clarification to the first question I put to him? It was very—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.
Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Isn't there a rule against repetition? I mean, we have been over this so many times.

The Speaker: Yes.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, it is the same issue. It is the same issue of who was on the plane—

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —and I think honestly—

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

There is no question . . . there is no question that . . . you know, one allows a certain amount of repetition but we have to be reminded that . . . it is quite correct that a Member should mention that.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker, I will respond to Dr. Gibbons in this way. I will respond to Dr. Gibbons simply in this way. The question regarding the two statements—the position that was given by the Premier and the position that was given by the Minister—have been out there waiting to be clarified for so long. Had it been clarified, I would not be asking the question today.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: I would not be asking the question—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Because it has not been clarified; because it simply has not been clarified.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, speak . . . speak to—

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister Gibbons does not want to hear this question over and over and over, why does he not simply ask the Members who are involved to provide the clarification?

Mr. Crockwell was quite quick to respond just now in reference to my earlier question.

The Speaker: Well, I think we . . . Honourable Member, if I may say—

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Go ahead.

The Speaker: In terms of my understanding, what I do know now is that there was a fourth person who actually went on, which was not revealed initially, but we found out that a fourth person was on . . . and, in fact, that person did go into meetings. So we do know that.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that.

We have come to that conclusion. The question then arises around why was the initial position put out by the Premier exclusive of that information? Why? That was an important piece of information, Mr. Speaker, very important, very vital.

We stood here and listened to the Premier, gave the Premier the respect that he is the Premier of the country and what he would bring to this floor would be . . . I am looking for the right word I want to

say. Well, yes, truthful. It would be truthful. It would be something that we could stand on and hold to. I would expect that from any Premier who is addressing this House, your House. Your House, because we are under your guidance, Mr. Speaker.

And I think it is disrespectful, Mr. Speaker, to you and this House, to each and every one of us and to this country when a position is put to us that we are willing to accept and then we find out contrary, completely . . . the real position was completely contrary to what was presented to us and then no explanation is provided. What the country is simply asking for is some type of explanation as to why the position presented that was not a completely true disclosure of what took place. That is why the matter keeps surfacing. It keeps surfacing.

And Mr. Speaker, when questions are not answered and clarity [given] to it all, it puts persons in the mindset to think that there are other matters that are untoward that took place. And it just finds a life of its own. And this could have long been settled had the clarification been provided.

I actually am pleased that Minister Crockwell rose to his feet earlier on that first question. I was hoping he would provide that type of clarification. I am pleased that he did it. Now, it would be more pleasing to see that we finally get some clarification on the other matters because, Mr. Speaker, it is not rocket science to say this is what I said initially, but this is what the other Minister said. We now accept that the other Minister was in fact . . . the sentiment is that the Minister was correct.

The Speaker: It is not the sentiment. That is what the reality is, from what I understand.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, you are helping me again.

The reality is that the Minister is correct and the Premier's position was incorrect?

The Speaker: I think you are . . . you are . . . that is not—

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: I am not going to help you make your speech, Honourable Member.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Mr. Speaker, no, no, you do not have to help me make my speech. I am trying to find the right word because, Mr. Speaker, there is a word that I could have used that I do not think is acceptable in this House. It begins with an "L" and I do not want to use that word. I am trying to be polite, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to be polite here because we were led down a road—the wrong road—the first time around. And I am simply asking for—

[Timer beeps]

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: —clarification—

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: —such as the Minister who rose to his feet the first time.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

[Gavel]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Hamilton Parish, MP Wayne Furbert.

You have the floor.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have been around for a while, most people will know that.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: And I heard the Honourable Grant Gibbons chirping over there, *Some would say too long*. And I will say that he has been around too long also.

Mr. Speaker, to be honest, I have never seen a circumstance like we find ourselves in today. I have never. I have been around party politics for a long time and I can tell you that over the years we have had some honourable people—honourable people. This House, Mr. Speaker, we call ourselves “honourable” because there is some decorum or there is supposed to be some type of honesty within these Chambers.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Grant Gibbons keeps chirping over there. And I understand that at the end of the day . . . I understand, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, he has to protect an establishment. So I understand that. I understand that. He does. Mr. Speaker, we understand. And I am an accountant. And being an accountant we have certain rules of decorum or even protocol that we shall abide by. And if we get ourselves in trouble, then at the end of the day we get ourselves in trouble.

An Hon. Member: Ethics.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Ethics, that is what I am talking about.

My friend (and I still consider him a friend) the Honourable Shawn Crockwell, and the Honourable

Mark Pettingill are lawyers. And I am expecting these two honourable gentlemen to somewhere, somehow disclose exactly what took place during this trip. I expect it. And no hiding behind closed doors. But I expected something to take place because even while the Premier made an announcement way back in March 31, 2012, I would have thought that these two honourable gentlemen would have at least said something within—and they may have—Cabinet (which is not supposed to come out in the public), to correct some of the things that the Honourable Premier at least informed the public all about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to a time called September the 12th, 2011, which was recorded in *Bernews* that the Honourable Bob Richards said this: “There are many life lessons in sports. In Bermuda cricket, it doesn’t matter if you are a dashing young batsman with the handsomest of strokes, and have made plenty of runs for St. Davids or Baileys Bay or Willow Cuts; in Cup Match, if you are a colt, you’re never going to be captain. That’s because, as a colt, you have no experience on the big stage.”

I do not know if the public realised how true a statement the Honourable Bob Richards made at the time. [What] he was talking about at that time [was] that the Premier that was being elected by the OBA [was] like a colt coming in at Cup Match—that is what he was referring to. And there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the batsman—the Honourable Premier—has made some serious colt mistakes during this whole year. And there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Premier has been caught out in slate. There is no doubt—

The Speaker: It sounds like a cricket conversation.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: One second, Honourable Member. Thanks.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Yes. What is your point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. Everybody knows that a colt is only a colt once in his first year. The Premier now has been in politics for three years, so that analogy does not apply.

The Speaker: Okay. Thank you, thank you. All right. Thank you.

Carry on, Member.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, he says the Honourable Premier has been around for three years. Well, they were elected 2012—December—if I recall. That is what I recall because it is talking about leadership. He was talking about leadership, Mr. Speaker. And the actual event took place in February—sorry, no, March.

An Hon. Member: Five months after that.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Five months after that. And during that time, Mr. Speaker, before they were involved in getting up to the election, they were guided by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Green, their consultant. So while Mr. Premier Craig Cannonier was out playing with the consultant, the Honourable Grant Gibbons was playing with the real consultants from New York. The real consultants from New York—the Bloomberg group.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: They were the consultants from the—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I do not know where this gentleman is getting this from, but he is way off . . . way off track. There is no truth in that.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I can understand that there is some denial, but at the end of the day, they are clearly aware that there was more than one consultant in the OBA during the election time.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, that, again, is untrue.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, they are clearly aware that there was more than one consultant during the political lead up to the campaign. They are quite aware of that, Mr. Speaker. They can deny it as much as they want, but there was more than one consultant . . . of Mr. Green, I can tell you right now, and they know it.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am surprised at, when we have credible and experienced politicians such as the Honourable Grant Gibbons who keep on chirping over there and the Honourable Trevor Moniz and the Honourable Bob Richards and the Honourable Patricia Pamplin-Gordon—

The Speaker: Gordon-Pamplin.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Gordon-Pamplin—sorry.

And the Honourable Michael Dunkley, [is that they] would allow such things to come out without checking the facts.

We were told by this Honourable House way back in March about the Jetgate and, as I recall, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Grant Gibbons said he did not know anything about it; it was not discussed in Cabinet. The Honourable Bob Richards said, *I didn't know anything about this thing*. So on one dark night the Honourable Premier sneaks out—he and his two Ministers—with the gentleman by the name of Mr. DaCosta. And I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there was one other person that missed the flight. I understand there was one other person that missed the flight.

Now, maybe the Premier can reveal who that person was, but I understand it was, and he sits in the Senate.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I understand he sits in the Senate, Mr. Speaker.

But Mr. Speaker, why would the Premier—and that is why I am talking about honesty—come to this House without disclosing the full facts? And then he tells this Honourable House, *Oh, I heard on the public, that the reason why Mr. DaCosta went . . . well, he was bumming a ride*. He was bumming a ride.

Mr. Speaker, who do you know that goes down to the airport and bums a ride on a plane?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, I mean, to be honest, who goes to the airport at that hour at night and bums a ride?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, Premier.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I am not sure where he is getting all of this information about in the middle of the night and sensationalising this here, but he is well aware in the House that we explained how he got on the plane.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, yes.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Mr. E. David Burt: The Honourable Premier is misleading at the House. At no point in time has he disclosed anything about the fourth person on a jet flight to this Parliament and he is misleading the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: We . . . yes, we do know that. We do know—

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

The Speaker: Honourable Members, Honourable Members, Honourable Members, let me just say this here. It is knowledgeable. All Members of this House know that there was a fourth person on the plane. The question asked by the Honourable Member MP Furbert was fine when he asked why . . . why that information wasn't given at first. That is a fair enough question. But the fact that everybody knows this now, I think we are . . . we are really chewing it up a little bit too much.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: We will bring . . . you know, what we have to do is to bring new information. We cannot just continue—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I respect what you are saying.

The Speaker: Yes, okay.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: But because we know somebody shot somebody does not mean that we do not bring up the question of why he got shot.

The Speaker: Yes, well, you asked that question, that is fine. I said that was okay to ask that question—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr.—

The Speaker: What I am saying is—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to you, and I respect you, is that the Honourable Premier never disclosed outrightly and made it clear to the Honourable House. We sat . . . you would know it, Mr. Speaker, we sat here and asked many questions over and over and over again until . . . I mean, the last time we asked questions the Honourable Premier denied and refused any answers. And then the Honourable Mark Pettingill, the Attorney General, answered like that. It quieted the whole House down.

But the question, Mr. Speaker, is why does the Premier continuously stand on his feet and deny certain things? If you believe, Mr. Speaker . . . and Mr. Speaker, the last time I saw the poll for the Premier it was about 30 per cent.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, if he took a poll today, if he took a poll today there is no doubt he would be at an all-time low.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the majority of Bermudians believe that the Premier is misleading this country on many facets. All he had to answer in March 2012 was two things—Mr. DaCosta was on the flight, he happened to go into the room—problem solved. But because he continued to deny over and over and over the problem from this Honourable House on this side asked—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: I know the Honourable Member does not want to mislead the House, but again, there was no denying of anything.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Premier.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Okay. Maybe I should say the Honourable Premier refused to answer questions, maybe I will say that. Now he can get up in the House and say that, you know, as he said, he took the Fifth many times.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: *I take the Fifth.* I refuse to answer. That is not right, Mr. Speaker, when we are trying to get to the bottom of certain things. If he had just told the truth from the very beginning, or at least disclosed as mentioned from the very beginning, we would not be here today. We would not be here today.

So I am going to ask the Premier these questions, maybe he will get up and answer these questions.

Mr. Speaker, did the Honourable Premier ever meet with Landow before the Jetgate meeting? And not answer right now, you can answer later on. Did he ever meet with Mr. Landow before? Was he introduced to Mr. Landow by his political consultant Mr. Green, better known as “Bow-tie man”? All right? Somebody . . . I hope somebody is taking notes over there. You like . . . and we can play it back.

Would he tell the truth why his general manager of the gas station was on the plane and in that meeting? This is what they said, Mr. Speaker, *He was there to talk about golf.* And I remember that very clearly.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Well, what does Mr. Landow say?

Mr. Landow says (and I quote from the [BermudaSun](#) of today), “‘We didn’t know Steve,’ he said. ‘Didn’t know who he was. We took for granted he was involved in the campaign in some way.’”

Then it says, “Was it ever clear what Mr DeCosta was doing there? ‘No, we didn’t ask.’”

Were you talking about golf? Come on—be truthful once and for . . . Mr. Speaker, let the Premier stand up for once and tell us the truth. No one else believes that he—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: —once again—

The Speaker: Mr. Premier, just a minute. I think, I think—

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: —the Member is implying that I lied somewhere—

The Speaker: Premier, I think what you should do—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: I have not told any lies about anything. Come on now!

The Speaker: Right.

Honourable Member what you need to . . . you need to rephrase that and just say, you know, *Why does the Premier not answer the question?* You cannot say . . . you know, I think it is better because you are impugning that he . . . he is not . . . So just rephrase. You can take the language and use it a little different.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Premier did say that the reason why he was in the meeting was because he was talking about golf. That was the decision. I guess they all met to decide why he was in the meeting. They had to find a reason why he was at the meeting. Because we asked if he bummed a ride to the States, did he bum a ride from the hotel to the meeting? Was he in the lobby? And two lawyers cannot tell us how long he was in that meeting? How long was he in the meeting? No one would ever tell us. Did he ever leave the room? Did he enter the meeting and sit in the lobby and he called him in to talk only about golf?

Mr. Speaker, you expect me to believe that? No one in this House believes it. Nobody in Cabinet believes it, and no one in the public ever believed that story.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has a duty to apologise to my Leader for, first of all, taking a law suit—a dumb law suit—no one believes him on that story. He has a duty to pull whatever he is going to pull and then get his Attorney General to make some suggestions to him to . . . a law suit against my good friend the Honourable David Burt. He has a duty to tell his Cabinet that the reason why he cancelled the referendum had nothing to do with the PLP. The Cabinet has the right to ask those dumb questions: Why, Premier, did you cancel the referendum? Because the PLP was going to boycott a referendum? No one believes that story, not even them.

What does the Premier have over them to hypnotise them and do something that is crazy? Yes, causing the referendum to be dropped because you said the PLP . . . and accused the Leader—our Leader—for having a meeting . . . and you heard something in your mind that we were going to boycott the . . . and then my good friend, Shawn Crockwell, the Honourable—

The Speaker: The Honourable Minister.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: —and Learned Member, said that he heard it on the radio from my cousin, Guilden Gilbert. Come on! Where are we going? That is what I am talking about, a cult.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: A gentleman who . . . the Honourable Bob Richards takes over the position—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, let's be careful how we use these names.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: All right.

The Speaker: Now, I do not want to have to . . . I want to refer to the [Standing] Orders—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes, I am.

The Speaker:—which state that we should not . . . if you speak to a Minister, call the Minister by his name.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: He is an Honourable Member. He is honourable. I told the Honourable Member—and he lost by I think it was nine . . . six votes. I trust you. You have votes. Election day you will . . . I do not think the Premier got one vote.

But Mr. Premier . . . so he should apologise.

Now we talk about . . . about . . . I mean, last week we stood in this Honourable House and said, *He refutes everything*. I refute . . . he got up on his feet and I start crying.

[Laughter]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Because I said . . . something, something, we made a mistake. I mean, I had to believe him because [he is] the Honourable Premier. You know, he believed the Ten Commandments, "Thou shalt not lie." That is what the Ten Commandments said. He says, all of these do this but do not keep the commandments. So I thought at least he was keeping that one. That is what we learned in church.

But the Honourable Premier said, *I refute*. And then all of a sudden . . . I knew something was wrong when the Chairman of the OBA came out and said, *Hold on. I did not receive . . . we did not receive the \$300,000*. Not only that. *The Premier lied to me too*. That is what he said. He said . . . and I did not say he was lying, Mr. Premier. I said the Chairman said that. And then not only that, *We're going to have an investigation*.

I said, as the song says, *It's over*. The time's over. That means that things are closing in. How do I know, Mr. Premier? I have been there. I have been there. When they start to close in on you and have meetings that you never knew a meeting was taking place. Those meetings are taking place and you are not in the meeting.

Ask myself, ask Kim Swan, ask my good friend's sister, ask Sir John Swan and ask Grant Gibbons.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes, I was. I am not going to deny it. I have been in a few of them, so that is why I know how it works.

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Mr. Speaker, they say this. Mr. Speaker, this is what they say. The meetings take place . . . Mr. Speaker, the meeting takes place and then all of a sudden a person gives you a call. They give you a call and then all of a sudden not only one person shows up at a meeting a whole . . . enough to get their vote.

[Timer beeps]

The Speaker: All right. Honourable Member, thank you.

[Gavel]

The Speaker: The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Pembroke [East], MP Walter Roban.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is very interesting how my honourable colleague ended because he mentioned about being in these meetings, and the chirping of the side says *guilty as charged*. Well, one thing we know about the OBA/UBP—they are used to taking each other out and cannibalising each other at every fell swoop because they all participate in taking each other out around here.

There are about three people in this House who have been leaders of their party in some rendition and they have all taken each other out. It is a form of self-mutilation that they seem to be used to and it seems like they are going through the process once again.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Taking each other out.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: It is systematic in the history of the OBA/UBP paradigm—taking each other out—BDA whatever you want to call it. And there are three people in this Chamber who can attest to having the experience—at least three. Right? At least three as we discuss the issue that we have today.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I am not too sure why I have been here most of today. Or perhaps I really do why I have been here. But there is one thing that has been very clear to me, Mr. Speaker, we have sat for two sessions and we have not seen a Bill yet tabled by this Government.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Two, after a significant break where they did . . . they had free days from the House, free days from legislative work on which they could have been concentrating night and day, since they say they work so hard. And some people on their side in their camp suggest they work harder than we did. But I have not seen a Bill.

We have not seen a Bill tabled to address all those important issues that the Premier got up on his feet—the Honourable Member—and talked about . . . what the people want, what the people need, what they say they want the Government to do. Where are the Bills? Where are the policy statements? Where are the motions that deal with those issues? We have had two sessions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can be accused of perhaps having a memory lapse, but I do not remember, in the Progressive Labour Party, anyway—

An Hon. Member: I do.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: —coming to this House without any Bill within a two-week period. I do not remember but—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: They will have to prove it. I am just raising the question, Mr. Speaker. I know what I have experienced in this session—two weeks, not a Bill mentioned.

The Premier has reiterated out there in the community what he expects his Government to be dealing with, but we have seen nothing in this Chamber, where it really matters, being tabled for us to consider because perhaps that would take up more of our time. And some of the other things that the Premier and his Members are so nervous about we would not have to talk about or would not have the time to talk about, Mr. Speaker.

But because there is less to do we have more time to deal with other concerns that the people have raised. And I will bring a statement of fact here which I mentioned last time. The gravity of these issues that we are dealing with today are not because the PLP has decided that they are [grave], Mr. Speaker. Let us make it clear. The PLP has not manufactured this particular issue that we discuss and that has been raised on the Motion to Adjourn these last two sessions. It has come from outside of the political realm in the media—that is where it has come from. Everything from the so-called secret report created in the Ministry of Tourism about what to do about a referendum—that was revealed by the media.

The issue of the fact that Members of the One Bermuda Alliance Government, three Members in par-

ticular . . . perhaps somebody missed the plane (as an Honourable Member just mentioned), and as we later were told a fourth private citizen went on this flight in March 2013—all of this stuff came from outside of this House, outside of the political realm, into the eyes of the public and us. That is where all these things are from, whether it be political articles, whether it is reports on ZBM, this is where this stuff has come from. So they can sit . . . stand up here and chirp and accuse us and get up and accuse certain journalists of being on the payroll of the PLP—that does not deflect from the truth because that is not the truth.

And they are only going to be vindicated, Mr. Speaker, if they tell the truth around this. The problem is for the past year Members of the Government have refused to answer questions around this, clearly. Deny, refuse, just outright refused to answer questions put in this House. And then when it comes out in the media, then . . . and there are a pair of chicks [who] call the people who produced that stuff liars and everything else. That is what they have done, Mr. Speaker.

So is there any reason why we are here raising it today because of the lack of disclosure, the lack of transparency, the lack of clarity from Members of this House, from the very top of the OBA administration—the Cannonier Government, if you want to call it that—from the very top? Questions not answered, refusal to answer questions. We have personal statements in this House, Mr. Speaker, which say certain things. And we know that those personal statements did not disclose information that was later revealed elsewhere, and that others have contradicted what the Premier said in personal statements. We know that.

His own Minister went out into the public realm and made certain statements that contradicted exactly what the Premier said in this House—the one concerning a certain private citizen that was on the plane and why they were there—we know that. These are the facts. The Premier did not disclose that private citizen in the House. His Minister went on public radio and disclosed that person was there and went there to talk about golf. The Premier did not disclose that information—we know that. And there are little bits and pieces of information, Mr. Speaker, which over the past year have made this into an accumulation of some very murky, smelly stuff.

I mean, we can even refer perhaps back to the Premier's statements very early in his career as a colt leader of the country—I mean, admittedly, now he has gone through a year so he is no longer a colt leader—in his reference to . . . when the question of gaming because this all centres around the issue of gaming and how . . . *well, you know, we said certain things about certain things in the election that we might not necessarily deal with the same way when we are the Government.* It starts from there.

Then we hear, at least according to the report, Mr. Speaker, published in *Politica*, that a certain de-

veloper was trying to encourage the Premier very early on to walk away from the referenda. And then, Mr. Speaker, that was very early on and that was in an interview on television. And it is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, it seems as if this sage starts murky and then almost ends murky. Then we come to December 2013 where the Premier went, again, to the public realm and made a statement about my Honourable Leader which we considered to be false about his role in conspiring to sabotage the proposed referendum that the Government had committed itself to for months prior to that.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Again, I recognise the Honourable Member is trying to put his point across. I had never accused the Opposition Leader of the said . . . never.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Never.

The Speaker: Thank you very much.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Never.
Show the quote. Show it where I said it.

The Speaker: Thank you, Premier.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, the—

The Speaker: Carry on.

[Inaudible interjections]

An Hon. Member: Show the statement.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the public record of his press conference in December 2013 will make it clear what the Premier said.

It made reference to an effort by the Opposition following a conversation that he had with the Leader of the Opposition where he would conspire against the success of the referendum as planned. That is what the Premier alluded to in his statement in December 2013. It might have been the 14th of December (might have been the date), and I am sure that it can be clarified. That was done down at his office, down at the Cabinet Office, Mr. Speaker.

I do not think the Premier can deny that because he did have a press conference down there and he did speak about the referendum and why they

were withdrawing from it, and alluded and made statements about the PLP and conversations he had with the Leader of the PLP, which I am not going to get into detail because my Honourable Leader has already stood in this House and clarified what he felt was said.

So I say, and I go back to the main thrust of my argument. We have seen from the beginning of this issue murkiness right down to December 2013, and even to this day it still remains murky because of the lack of willingness of certain Members of this House to be clear. And part of the problem that we have, Mr. Speaker, is that, yes, we consider the whole 19 to be culpable in this effort because, guess what, they all sat down there in December and participated in the statement and represented the statement that the Premier made that was false about my Leader and about our role of trying to do something to the referenda.

So we have seen, unfortunately, all Members of the Government participate in these activities until now because these facts have been dancing around for about a year and at no time during the year did Members of the Government really say much in contradiction to what was being alluded to. We have heard a few people. We heard the Honourable Grant Gibbons say he was not aware of the flight, he was not aware of what was going on, and, fine, that is for the record. But we have not heard many more, Mr. Speaker.

So I am not going to spend much more time, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure there are others who have things to say. But today's paper, or today's, again, publication had nothing to do with the Opposition, [but] out there the legitimate media have produced more interesting telltale facts or commentary because, you know, we heard Ministers get up in this House last week, Mr. Speaker, and say this is like *Groundhog Day*, it keeps coming back again and again and again and again. Right? Well, guess what? It is not *Groundhog Day* that the Minister should be concerned about, it is Judgment Day. That is the day that they might have to be concerned with.

I do not know when it is coming. I am not a prophet. I am not a seer. I do not have any gifts like that. Maybe somebody will put out a Ouija board or maybe throw some dice or some bones and let us know what is going to happen because, you know, people have skills like that. But I do not. I cannot tell the future. All right? I cannot tell the future. And there are other Members chirping over there who have always said that they have a crystal ball, so maybe they can tell me when that day will come. The crystal ball. Anybody got it? Anybody got a crystal ball?

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the future. But Judgment Day may be coming. *Groundhog Day* is actually not important—it is actually Judgment Day. And these facts and these occurrences which, frankly, [cause] damage to our country's reputation, are dam-

aging the effectiveness of the Government because we need the Government to be effective, Mr. Speaker, let us make it clear. We need an effective Government to govern our country through this particular era, this particular period of our history that many countries of the world are going through—the economic turbulence, the unsettledness, the uncertainty, the fear of many people—we need a Government that can represent effectively and has the confidence and a Leader that has the confidence and a Cabinet that has the confidence that is not caught up in things that cause the confidence to be shattered, Mr. Speaker.

But we do not have that right now, Mr. Speaker. We have a shattered Government where confidence has been shattered, where public trust has been violated, where some people feel a betrayal and outright theft of their rights. And silence from even those who do not have the positions on the frontbench.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in different parties they have their groups. And you would know, Mr. Speaker, in the Conservative party they have what they call the 1922 Committee. In other parties they have very well organised backbench organisations that organise to ensure that the Cabinet is kept in check. As I said, in the Conservative party it is usually called the 1922 group. And usually when things get really antsy at the top, they have what they call the “Grey Suits” to make a visit. And those grey suits go and have talks with people.

I do hope that there is courage enough from the backbench of the OBA to have the conversation—maybe they had it this past weekend, Mr. Speaker—the conversation that is filled with the courage that is required by those who sit on the frontbench who should know things, who should have been informed of things, and who should be handling the country’s affairs with care, with sensitivity and with consideration of whose interests they actually represent. But I think that [from] some of what we have seen over the last few weeks . . . that may be lacking.

I do not know much about the inner workings of the One Bermuda Alliance, but I can only present the questions, Mr. Speaker. That is all I can do. As I said, I have no skills of sight or perception that allows me to see or be a fly on the wall of their meetings—I do not have that. I do not have that. So we will have to see what happens.

But I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, Judgment Day will come at some point. *Groundhog Day* should not be of interest to anyone. And the OBA and its leadership and its Members and its caucus have before them a serious situation; a situation that their own chairman has said has validity, despite the protestations, denials, refusals, and outright closing of eyes of certain leading members of the OBA to what has been put out there already. And if it is not true, they have not done a very effective job with convincing the public that it is not, Mr. Speaker.

So we will see what happens from here, Mr. Speaker. As I said, I have no sight on the future. All I can say is what I see now is a broken situation, a party in disarray, scurrying in disunity, a Leader who refuses to be clear to the public on the issue at hand despite trying to almost manufacture something else that the country is in a certain state of mind. But people are wondering about this situation. Despite what people may try to say, this is important. The integrity and honesty and clarity from their leadership is important to citizens of this country and they want that from the elected Government of the day for however long they are allowed to last because ultimately they, like every other party before them, will have to face the people’s decision. And they can only hope that at that point in time that the future may be kind to them. But I suspect we may get a surprise just like all of the surprises we have seen over the last 72 hours.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Minister for Education and Economic Development.

And Minister just before you start, I want to just recognise another Senator who has just come into the House. Senator Renee Ming is in the House.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Minister, would you please carry on.

[Adjournment, continuation of debate thereon—JETGATE]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking that Honourable Member for his obvious concern over the One Bermuda Alliance Government. It is certainly very palpable that he is concerned about our well-being and the rest of it. I would like to assure that Honourable Member that, far from being shattered or distracted, this party continues to move forward. I do take his point about a lack of Bills. But, as my honourable colleague sitting next to me reminded me, I think there were a number of occasions under his Government when we were out of here by noon on a Friday.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, as you will know, having been in Cabinet, sometimes legislation comes and goes and it does not always come when you want it to. But I am going to assure that Honourable Member—my cousin—over there as well, that there is plenty, plenty of legislation coming from . . . certainly from my portfolio and I am sure he will be entranced by amendments to the Companies Act and trust legisla-

tion and all the rest of it, not to mention Education at some point as well. So he will have plenty to chew on in due course.

And, certainly, I guess I am getting a little tired of the Judgment Day. I think that Honourable Member is probably smarting from December 2012. Certainly, that was Judgment Day. And I think it is fair to say that all parties, all governments, have their Judgment Day. Whether they are sooner or later, I think, obviously is out, in many respects, of their hands. But I will take a cue from the Honourable Member who just sat down, and that is that I would like to move in a different direction, because I think he is absolutely right. I think the public and certainly many people are getting very, very tired of this repetition over and over and over again. I am not sure it is helping the Opposition either because I am sure their voters would like them to get on with the people's business and I am not sure this is really doing anything to create jobs or put more assets on the table, or certainly solve any of the broader problems we have here when we repeat week after week after week the same stuff over the same material again and again and again.

SUZE ORMAN

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: So I would like to go in a different direction. I would like to talk about two things, both of them because . . . well, in the first instance because I think it might be helpful. And I will certainly declare my interest on the first one because otherwise my honourable colleague over there, Mr. De Silva, will be jumping to his feet. And that is I would like to go back, Mr. Speaker, and talk a little bit about some of the messages from an invited speaker that came in last Saturday and that is Suze Orman.

My declaration is that, obviously, I have a connection, a fairly serious connection, with Colonial Insurance and it is Colonial Insurance that brought Suze Orman in. As I think Gina Spence said (who opened the session), it is pretty unusual to be able to get out 800 people on a Saturday afternoon. It was Colonial Pensions that brought Suze Orman in.

She gave some very interesting common-sense prescriptions. And I am not going to in any way to be able to do justice with the way she delivered them or the forthrightness with which she said she does not speak for any company or anything else, so she was pretty clear up front that, as she put it, she was going to be like Switzerland—completely neutral. She says in the United States companies—she does not speak for companies, but here she was prepared to make an exception because she thought Bermuda was an interesting place—and she had some interesting observations about it.

But she went on to give what I thought were some very interesting recommendations. Some of them are pretty common sense because one of the first things she did was she asked those in the room

who had credit card debt to stand up and it was quite an extraordinary number in the room who did that. And she went on to tell them one of the first things you need to do is you have got to get rid of your credit card debt because when you have an 18 per cent or a 22 per cent interest rate it is going to bury you sooner or later.

And she then went on to talk about what I think is interesting, because a lot of us have this issue—the difference in our personal financial planning between needs and wants. She said there is a very clear difference between wanting something, which you may not need, and needing something like putting food on the table. And she said a lot of us in this day and age have not quite figured out the difference between needs and wants. And one of the ways to start to remove some of that credit card debt is to have a very clear sense of what is important, something you need—like paying the rent, paying for food on the table—and what you want—like buying that pair of shoes or that motorbike or whatever else it may be.

So that was one of the prescriptions which, I think, people understood pretty clearly in the room. The other thing she started to talk about was the importance of starting at a very young age to start to put money aside. And she gave some very interesting analyses of starting at age 18 versus starting at age 25 and the difference—because we were talking about pensions to some degree—the difference in the amount of money that you would have when you retired at 65 even in that very short period of time. Because she was talking about the compounding of interest and just putting aside money and essentially having an investment return on that particular money. It was quite extraordinary the difference. I think it was about \$500,000 difference between starting to put money aside at 18 versus even waiting until you were 25.

She was very complimentary, Mr. Speaker, about Bermuda's occupational pension scheme. And I will take a little bit of credit for that because it was actually under my portfolio that went through first of all in 1998. Obviously, the PLP Government then amended the legislation and put it into effect. I think it was about 2001. But she said it is an extraordinarily powerful thing. And it was something that I had not really thought about very much, but a lot of people put money in savings accounts and we all know that the return on that these days (even my colleague, Mr. Richards, has pointed that out) is very, very low.

But she said that in the occupational pension scheme, if you want to save money it is a very good way to do it. And what she was talking about, Mr. Speaker, was the voluntary contribution because she had done her homework and she said, *Look, the money that goes in as your required contribution (which as we all know is 5 per cent from the employee and 5 per cent from the employer) is one thing. But anybody can start to put in additional money on a vol-*

untary contribution basis. It does not have to be very much, it can be basically \$25.00 or whatever.

But she said that money then goes in and you can get it out at any time. It is unlike the other money which you have to put in—the 5 per cent and the 5 per cent—that money, that voluntary money, then can be put in, it can build, the fee level on most of these plans is very low and it has the benefit of all the investing power of whatever your pension scheme is invested in, but you can take it out. So unlike a savings account or unlike (I am probably killing a few banks here) a certificate of deposit, you get the full investment returned on that voluntary money. You can leave it in for a year, you can leave it in for five years, but if you need it you can take it out at any time.

I thought it was a very useful observation and a very good savings tool. And I think it is something that may come out. I do not know how well the actual conference was covered, but I think it is something that we commend to everybody because she said repeatedly all of us need to put more money aside not only for our retirement but also for emergency money. She said if you can put aside eight months worth of emergency money that is going to be really important in terms of problems that may come up, medical bills, unemployment, things of that sort. And she said this is a very useful way to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, those were a few very basic issues. She was not very pleased about life insurance which Colonial also sells. She said do not go into whole life and things of that sort, so I am cutting my own throat here, but she did say that term insurance was something where it is not an investment product where you are basically covering your family in the event that the principal breadwinner dies. She did say that was a very good thing. And obviously a lot of insurance companies provide that as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought some of those might be useful in terms of providing others who are listening out there with another way to possibly put aside money, either for retirement or to save money to get a real investment return which they may not be getting in other products as well.

GORHAM'S SOLAR PANELS

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I would like to switch gears for a second here and go into a very, very different area. And that is a number of Honourable Members may have seen the piece in today's paper . . . and I am referring specifically to a story about Gorham's which is expanding the investment that they are making in solar panels on their roof. And they have got about 200 kilowatts right now up there and they are going up to essentially 500 kilowatts over a period of time.

It was quite extraordinary, the savings that they were saying. They were saying it was forty cents per kilowatt hour, that the amount of energy they were

generating was close to \$200,000 worth of energy every year. And I think most of us know what our BELCO bills are like.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is the future. I guess part of what I wanted to say here is that this is certainly something that the Department of Energy is trying to move toward. We have been quite successful in the last couple of years in terms of the uptake on residential systems. There are probably about 170, close to 200 residential systems out there right now, and people are making very good savings on that. And about a megawatt, actually; it is still not material.

But when you start to get into these larger systems, and I know some of my colleagues have said, *Let's start to look at Government buildings*—and we will—but what I would like to do is assure people that there are a couple of issues we need to do here. One of them is to start to get in place more of a stronger regulatory system because, much as in telecommunications, and I think the Regulatory Authority has done a good job on this, we need to have a referee to work between the existing utility, BELCO, and some of these more commercial systems.

There are other engineering issues that need to be sorted out as well with some large solar installations. But there needs to be a very fair and equitable what is known as a "power purchase agreement," where somebody like Gorham's can basically sell the additional power they are generating which they are not using in-house, to be able to sell it back to the grid. But that rate needs to be set at a level which does not disadvantage the utility, where other users are going to be subsidising it, but also is sufficient incentive that it is a fair rate for somebody who is generating this and they get a decent rate of return on their photovoltaic cells as well.

So maybe this is a little bit of a preview. This is certainly an area that the Department of Energy is working on. We intend to bring legislation before the end of this session, if we can manage, that will deal with some of these issues, putting in place a more robust regulatory system, putting it under the existing Regulatory Authority, but also working out some of these issues such as power purchase agreement. And we have got an internal working group on that, which I have spoken about in the House before, Mr. Speaker, the Bermuda Energy Working Group, which has both members from the utility on that, BELCO, as well as some of the alternate energy suppliers.

So we are working forward on this. It is not moving as fast, I think, as any of us would like. But we are going to get there, Mr. Speaker, and I think we are going to have a much more secure energy future as a consequence of that. Solar is the future. It makes a lot of sense here. But I think we have to do it in a way which is both responsible and fair to everyone.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Warwick [South East], MP Lawrence Scott. MP Scott, you have the floor.

JETGATE

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the last time I stood to my feet, which was prior to the last break, I suggested that during our time off and during our time (as my colleague referred to it last week) of quiet moments and time to reflect, that we look at the way we do business in this Honourable House. And it seems that, you know, I felt at the time that everybody listened and everybody took things to heart, because the Government Members applauded me and complimented me on my speech, even after the session.

[Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: But yet, when we come back to this Honourable House, Madam Deputy Speaker, the same Government that agreed that we needed to be more upstanding and do more things in the better interest of this country, as a whole, seems to be the same Government that is embroiled in the allegations and reports of just—I do not want to say the “C” word, but I cannot think of anything else—just I will say “corruption.”

The Deputy Speaker: How about *hearsay*?

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Okay, *hearsay*. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

It seems that the only people that took my suggestions to heart would be my honourable colleagues on this side, because it seems as though since the break, we as the Opposition have introduced more Bills than the Government.

So for me, Madam Deputy Speaker, it just . . . And it is funny how when I start talking about how much work the Opposition is doing now, Members from the Government are trying to say what they did last year. But we are talking about what they did last year, which was . . . I do not want to even say the name, but once again, it is there, it is “Jetgate.” Therefore, the work that they did last year is the gift that keeps on giving, Madam Deputy Speaker.

But you know what, Madam Deputy Speaker? I digress. Madam Deputy Speaker, there is a saying that life imitates art or art imitates life. And the saying seems to ring true for the current political climate that we are in with the climate that the OBA Government has put us in. I was just listening to some music in my home the other day, and a song came on. And I listened to the chorus. It is a song by—being as though

the Honourable Member Nandi Outerbridge is not here, I am now the youngest Member in the House right now. Therefore, I do not know if you guys will know who Jay-Z and Kanye West are. But they have a song out—

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Well, yes. Just letting you know.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, that is why we have the young Members in the House.

[Laughter]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I mean, sorry. I digress. The song is called, *[No] Church in the Wild*. The chorus is made up of four questions. What’s a man to a mob? *[sic]* “What’s a mob to a king? What’s a king to a god? What’s a god to a non-believer? Who don’t believe in anything?”

So, now, Madam Deputy Speaker, let us just stick a pin in that, and I will show you how I relate this to the current political climate that we are in. Because if you look at the Cabinet Office, the Cabinet Office manual, the Cabinet’s collective responsibility is defined in two parts. The first part is (and I quote), “Collective responsibility is the constitutional convention in governments using the Westminster system,” which we fall under, “that members of the Cabinet must publicly support all governmental decisions made in Cabinet, even if they do not privately agree with them. This support includes voting for the Government in the legislature.”

So now, let me go back to the song, *No Church in the Wild*. And I just want to break this down as an example. So, *What’s a man to a mob?* Now, if we have to pick out any one man, I would say, was not Minister Fahy, the OBA, the One Bermuda Alliance (I say that because of the last conversation we had about my abbreviations for OBA, and I did not make that response)—

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: No problem.

The One Bermuda Alliance. Minister Fahy was the One Bermuda Alliance 2012 Campaign Chairman. So, Minister Fahy was the man that got the mob elected.

Now, when I say “mob,” just for clarification, a group of individuals or a group of people. I am not trying to say anything—

The Deputy Speaker: You are trying to relate it to the words used in the song.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Exactly. Thank you very much.

The Deputy Speaker: Be very careful where you are going with that.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: I know, because I know people have told me that I have a very witty vernacular. All right?

So, therefore, Minister Fahy was the man that got the mob elected. So now, if Minister Fahy was the campaign chairman, he would be the one person who *shoulda, coulda, woulda* had his finger on the pulse on any and everything that went on in the OBA's campaign. I feel as though that is a very fair statement to make.

Therefore, if he had his finger on the pulse, what role does Minister Fahy play in the transfer of \$300,000 as reported in the local media? Now, let us keep that fact in mind. And keeping that fact in mind, why has Minister Fahy not come out to either confirm or deny the \$300,000 as the campaign chairman, because it was a campaign donation?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: It was? Yes. Well, that is what is being reported, that it was a campaign donation.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, Minister Fahy was not the only man that was in this situation from the beginning. If you remember, during the Budget Debate, I asked Minister Crockwell the question of, *What was the scope of Mr. Derrick Green's involvement when it comes to the facilitation of the meeting with Lindow and Lindow Industries?* Now, that answer was never given; there was not even a response.

I am one who, with all of this coming out now, I would have thought that it almost seems as though silence is acceptance, that there was a role played by Mr. Derrick Green in the facilitation of the meeting. So now, if Mr. Derrick Green helped facilitate the meeting, did he help facilitate the transfer of the \$300,000 as well? I mean, Madam Deputy Speaker, you know, I just want to . . . I wonder if we have these two men who were part of the meeting facilitation, the campaign as a whole, and it was a campaign donation, could it possibly be? I mean, the word on the street, the public opinion is seemingly growing that it would seem that maybe Minister Fahy might have been one that opened a bank account, being as though he was the campaign director?

The Deputy Speaker: Member, I just would draw your attention to one of the [Standing Orders]. And that is not to impute improper motive. So just—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Deputy Speaker: If I can continue speaking to the Member who is on his feet.

I am just bringing to your attention and reminding you. That is simply all. I am just making sure you stay on the right path. You are on a good path. You are on a good wicket. I just want to bring it to your attention.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: All right. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I mean, well, I am not [imputing] improper motive, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am just asking the question. And the reason I bring this up, Madam Deputy Speaker, is because when I say "public opinion" and "the word on the street," I am actually here to represent the members of constituency 24. It was a member of constituency 24 that came to me and asked, *Is Minister Fahy the one that opened the account?* But I do not want to say that he did, because that would be [imputing] improper motive.

So I will ask the question. So I will ask the question. Is it a possibility that, being as though he was the campaign chairman, that he was the one that could have possibly opened the account?

Now . . . but I do not want to digress. But the second line in the chorus, Madam Deputy Speaker, is, *What's a mob to a king?* And I ask the Cabinet Members that question. What role does the current Members of the OBA, One Bermuda Alliance, Cabinet play? Aren't the Cabinet Members the ones that are supposed to be the ones, or the mob, the group of people, that hold the king, the Premier, accountable for all actions? And if they are the ones to hold him accountable for all actions, why have they not done so? Because this is not putting a good light on the Government as a whole, the party as a whole, the country as a whole. Therefore, one of our first lines of defence is the Cabinet Members. They should have said, *No, this is not the way we do business. This is not the way we go.*

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, the next question is, *What's a king to a god?* Now, the Premier may be the leader of his party. But he answers to the people of this country. And we all know that faith is the key to religion, and so therefore, what is a king and a god if there's no one that has faith in them?

I then go on to the next question, which is the real question that I really want to get to. And I am trying to keep it brief so that my other colleagues can go. *What is a god to a non-believer?* Madam Deputy Speaker, with all that is going on, how does this country move forward? How do we move forward without hope? How do we move forward with a Government that cannot inspire hope? How can we move forward with a Government that does not have the faith from the people for them to do what they need to do as a Government, which is to inspire hope?

I want to actually quote one of the Ministers, the Honourable Minister of Finance, who repeatedly states that, *A Government's role is not to create a job, but to create an environment in which job creation—and he is referring to the private sector—is favourable.* So now, how is the private sector or even the international business community supposed to feel when they see that if we send a private jet, if somebody donates \$300,000, they get contracts or they get a seat at the table, at least? If I am a company that cannot afford to do that, but yet I could provide a good product, a good service at a good price, I am not going to even put the money or the capital forward to try to get the job.

Therefore, that means there are more people out of business. It is the loss of opportunity that we have. And you know what, Madam Deputy Speaker? I do not want to [impute] improper motive. But I will even go out on a very, very big limb and say that everything that is being reported is false. Let us just even go by that and say everything that is reported in every media outlet in this country in this nation has got it all wrong. It still does not make a difference, Madam Deputy Speaker, because it is all about perception. Perception is truth. That is the truth.

So therefore, it is not what you say; it is how I perceive what I perceive you to be. If I do not perceive that you are telling the truth, then you may as well . . . you are lying, regardless of the facts. Therefore, the dark cloud that this whole ordeal has put on this country, it is setting us back, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The thing is that . . . And I had to explain to my residents and my constituents that, *Well, why are you spending so much time on this? There are more things to be done, there are more things to be done.* You know, and Madam Deputy Speaker, [it is] as I have to explain to them that, one, the Government has not brought any Bills for us to debate; and the reason they have not brought any Bills for us to debate is because they are dealing with this. And the reason that they are dealing with this is that because they did not just come forward and come clean all at once. Or just to be in the clear, seemingly they did not come clean all at once. And the public perception is that there is more to be found.

And every time the Honourable Minister Grant Gibbons talks about *we keep rehashing this*—because every time we bring it up, something new comes out of it. You know? First it was just three people. Then it was four people. Then there were donations. And now there are Ministers that sit in another place and private citizens. It is like a virus, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is just spreading.

Now, how do you cure the virus? What is the cure for it? We have doctors. Well, for me personally, the only real cure that I can think of . . . But yet, remember, I am one of the younger Members here. The only reason is to go back to the polls and put in a new Government. But you know what? I know the Honour-

able Premier says that is what we [the opposition] want. No, that is not what we want. We want the Government to tell the truth and shame the devil. That is what we want out of here, because we are the Progressive Labour Party, Madam Deputy Speaker. Labour is in our name. People are not—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: He is impugning, [by imputing] that he has not been getting the truth. You have been getting information. You cannot say that the information is false.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Madam Deputy Speaker, remember what I said, because it seems like the Honourable Premier is not listening to the words that I am saying. It seems that he is not listening to the words that I am saying. Because I said the truth is perception.

The Deputy Speaker: You did.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: But when we sit here in this Honourable House during Question Period, and we ask questions, and the Honourable Premier says, *I will not impugn myself or not perjure myself*, or something to that motion, and not answer, or *sub judice*, come up with every excuse or reason and not answers, that gives people the impression that he is not telling the truth and that he has got something to hide.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, he could be . . . And I said he could be telling the truth. But the Honourable Premier could be telling the truth. But we as the Opposition, and even, furthermore, we as the people of Bermuda, do not believe him! Nor do we believe the collective voice of the Government anymore.

So therefore, they have lost the faith of the people. And how do you inspire and motivate people to do better, to be better, for job creation if we cannot believe you? Because remember, as the Honourable Finance Minister said, the Government's responsibility is not to create a job. It is to create the environment in which job creation is favourable. They cannot do that, Madam Deputy Speaker, without faith!

So once again, I will go back to them. How do they plan on getting the faith of the people [in the Government] back? Because the thing is that we . . . Let me just clarify something. If the Government's role, the Government's responsibility is to create an environment in which job creation is favourable, our role is to make sure that they think of everything and they do everything according to plan or according to

what they said. We are here to hold them accountable. We are not here to argue. We are not here to just nitpick. As I said before, we are here to critique, not criticise.

But yet, there comes a point when we cannot do anything but just focus on what they are doing wrong, because we have no other Bills, Madam Deputy Speaker. The only Bill that we have to debate in the near future is the one we brought! I do not know where else in the Westminster system that that happens!

Right now, this Opposition is very much like Bermuda as a whole. Seemingly, Bermuda is a Colony of the UK. But yet, we introduce and pass our own laws without needing the approval. So we act as though we are independent. All right? But yet, this Opposition is filling the role of a Government. So we are doing the Government's role. We are acting like a Government when we should be just acting like an Opposition. But we do not want this country to fail. And if the Government cannot do it, we will!

And on that note, I will take my seat, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair now recognises the Member from constituency 19, Pembroke West. Mrs. Jeanne J. Atherden, you have the floor.

GOVERNMENT TRAINING PROGRAMMES AVAILABLE

Mrs. Jeanne J. Atherden: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

It seems to me that the constituents out there want to know what is happening with respect to many things. And some of the things that are very important to them are things which can help them get a job and get ahead. So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to talk to you about some of the things that my constituents have been talking to me about and which I decided that, going forward, every time I had the opportunity, I was going to let people not just in my constituency, but in Bermuda, know what is being done to help them.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in talking to constituents, I was reminded that the Minister of Home Affairs, awhile back, had a press conference where he was talking about training, and he was talking about scholarships. And what struck me forcefully, because I had to talk to some of my constituents about it, was the number of training opportunities, the number of scholarships, the number of opportunities for Bermudians to get out there and learn another trade, which were not being taken up.

And that disturbed me, Madam Deputy Speaker, because my feeling is that my job is to listen to my constituents. I have to discuss it with my colleagues and then ensure that the electorate is aware

of what we are doing. So if I have the Minister of Home Affairs saying that Bermudians are not taking advantage of the opportunities, then it means we are not getting the bang for our buck. We are wasting money, and we are not allowing Bermudians to get on the path to turn around and have jobs and take their rightful place in the economic mainstream.

I just want to draw your attention to a couple of things, Madam Deputy Speaker. In that statement, the Minister noted that there were a couple of categories, and he was talking about nursing, he was talking about accounting, and he was talking about teacher certification. And he was indicating that \$700,000 had been spent at the Bermuda College for persons to take advantage of these particular categories.

For me, Madam Deputy Speaker, I know that there are lots of accountants out there, and I know that there are lots of individuals that, with the proper training, could go into those jobs. And these persons are out there looking for jobs. They are looking for opportunities. If the Government is making that available to them and they are not taking advantage of it, then we are wasting something.

So for me, Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe that part of my role is to make people aware of how the Government is helping them. It is not just about bringing legislation to this House. It is about programmes. It is about going out and helping Bermudians become trained to go into new categories so that they can turn around and, when the economy turns around, they can be there to take over jobs.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I undertook, and I will do it every time I have the opportunity, to talk and remind people about what their Government is doing to help them get ahead. So from the perspective, I know that there is a global shortage of nurses. But I know that we put together a programme, because a couple of years ago, we had the whole discussion in here about how it was going to work and how many people would take advantage of it. And when you have four candidates enrolled in it, you then have to turn around and say, *We have to get more people involved in these things.*

I am not going to belabour each one of the categories. But I must admit, when the Minister said, as part of his press conference, that getting more people to take advantage of it was something that he was sorry was not happening, I believe we all have a role to play in making sure that we encourage our young persons, we encourage persons who are out of jobs, looking for new jobs, to go and take advantage. Because if the money is there and if the programmes are there and Bermudians do not take advantage of that, that means that there is a waste. Because there are jobs. People can go to the Bermuda College. The scholarships are there to go to the college so that it does not matter—it does not matter where the scholarships are. If the money is at the Bermuda College, there are opportunities. And if those persons are not

taking advantage of it, it means that they are not using the facilities.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have been on lots of committees where persons have come forward and they have not had what I call “the finances.” Also, what we are not thinking of is that lots of the private sector, because they know that they should not have to rely on Government to take care of everything, the private sector has done a lot in terms of coming forward and increasing their grants, increasing their scholarships and putting much more emphasis on—

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Point of order, Mr. Speaker [sic].

The Deputy Speaker: Madam Deputy. Yes? Point of order?

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Madam Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Government had cut the scholarship monies. If there are some monies available, then she needs to tell the public—

The Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member, the Honourable Member.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: —because there is none available. They have cut it. So do not mislead the House, Member.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
Member?

Mrs. Jeanne J. Atherden: Madam Deputy Speaker, I did not say that the Government had scholarships. I said that the Government has put money for training so that persons can go to the Bermuda College. And they can go to the Bermuda College, and they have educational opportunities to the tune of \$700,000 for persons to take programmes in terms of accounting, nursing and teaching.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, what I did say afterwards was that a lot of what I call “the private sector,” in recognition that Government was reducing their scholarships, then had started to put forward other programmes which looked at financial need so that that allowed, if you will, some of the void to be filled.

But the more important thing that I was trying to focus on here, Madam Deputy Speaker, was the fact that there were programmes that Government was putting out there, and if the Bermudians were not taking advantage of it, then that money is wasted. Madam Deputy Speaker, it just made me think about other areas where the Government is doing things,

spending money to help the people of Bermuda get ahead, and it is being wasted.

The reason it really came to my attention, Madam Deputy Speaker, was that I recently had an article that I read just at the lunchtime. And this was relating to a headline that says, *Born bad? Exploring the morality of babies*. And it actually was a study that was done in Montreal, at McGill, which was talking about children between the ages of birth and three. They were starting to realise now that they were actually being influenced, that morality issues were starting to surface as it relates to children at that early age, and they were starting now to investigate the impact and what should be done.

And that made me think, Madam Deputy Speaker, about the Child Development Programme. It made me think about a programme which Government has been putting out to try and help us understand the development of children between [the ages] two and four, which is underutilised, where we do not have people taking advantage of that, and where in certain cases we have the Bermudians not utilising the tools, not going out and using what I call the training materials. And I thought, *Why is it that we do not have people taking advantage of things that can help them get ahead?*

And you know what, Madam Deputy Speaker? I think part of that is because we do not often enough go out and remind people about some of the good opportunities that are out there. We do not sometimes, Madam Deputy Speaker, remind them that if you do not take advantage of something, then it is a waste. So for me, Madam Deputy Speaker, every time I have the opportunity, if there are programmes that are there, I am going to tell my constituents, I am going to tell their family members. I am going to tell anybody that I can, because the Government has come up with these programmes.

We have a tendency to come here, and we debate the budget. And then we do not go around and talk about, *How is it going?* And we try and make sure that the money is well spent and make sure that it delivers. So from my perspective, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am going to make sure that when we talk, and I have the opportunity, I will make sure, because people are out there listening to us. They do not want to just listen to us talking back and forth about a particular subject. They want us to deal with a range of things. And getting a job or being trained to get a job is something that is important to them. It is important to my constituents; it is important to lots of people.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to make sure that, as we go forward, I also want to throw a challenge out to everybody in this House. Look at the programmes that are going. Encourage your constituents to take advantage of these things. That is the best service that you can do for them. Let them know that Government has put in programmes. It does not matter that you were not the Government that put

them in place—the Government. Anything that happens that benefits Bermuda, if our people can take advantage of it, encourage them.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, I also want to put the challenge out to all of our civil servants as well, because as we go and do different things, if they can be creative and utilise the funds that the Government is giving them and us, then if we can be more productive, then we can actually turn around and go make sure that things go further. Because productivity is just the same as, has a similar effect as cost reduction. We do not always remember that. But if you can do something, if you can be more productive in what you are doing and get more out of it, it is just the same as if you turned around and reduced the cost.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to say there are some good programmes. Let us make sure that they are utilised, because the people of Bermuda—that is where you are going to go and get your jobs.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any other Members? The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Economic and Social Development.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The Environment.

The Deputy Speaker: The Environment. Thank you. (I have to change this sheet.) Devonshire North Central, constituency 13. Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney, you have the floor.

JETGATE

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Last week, I got a bit emotional. This week, I am going to try to be just a bit more measured, because I believe the people of this country understand that we are here to be about their business. They are here because right now one of the most important things in their minds is how we are going to get our economy working and how we are going to create that environment to create jobs, which goes to the heart of the biggest concern today in this country, which is the integrity of the Government of the day as a whole.

It really amazes me that the opportunity presenting itself, based on new revelations and corroborations of what was being attempted to be blown away or thrown under the carpet as being totally insignificant, no validation, nothing on merit, et cetera, that no Member has got up in this Honourable Chamber to substantively defend the mistruths, the misrepresentations that have been uttered by contradicting comments in this Chamber and publicly, where there have been juxtaposed comments by a Minister who is a lawyer against his Leader, and an Attorney General who, it appears, did not know a Code of Ministerial

Conduct existed, because if he did, there would be no Jetgate.

And if there was a Jetgate, because of his political integrity, he would have had the courage and the [bravery] to say, *I'm out of here. I'm resigning from this Cabinet, Honourable Premier, because I cannot be seen to be supporting or condoning what we're about to do.* And then, to add insult to injury, there is a fourth person, who everybody conveniently ignored when asked about it. After an explanation was given, that person did not exist, because they were not mentioned. It just behoves me . . . Who on that side of the House has any degree of political integrity left in the minds of the people, particularly in this country, who voted for them? when they won by the slimmest of political margins under single seats, two majority at the polls.

The questions that are coming fast and furious to me on a daily basis (and [I am] declaring my interest, to my radio station talk show personality) are incredible, which confirms that the people in this country are not politically naïve. And they are concerned, because the decisions that they want made in their best interest, they felt at the polls would be made and delivered by the people they marked an "X" by in the ballot box. They have been betrayed!

There is no one that can contradict that statement. When you look at a turnaround on the promises that the One Bermuda Alliance has made, not only based on their platforms, but subsequent to being elected, and then flip-flopped on, there is a trust deficit!

So for us to go forward, talking about what is in the interest of the country and what we intend to do is null and void until we can regain the trust! There is no one that can trust you! They are going to start saying and repeating the old adages such as, *the proof is in the pudding.* Let us see! Because right now, we feel; and what we are feeling is not making us very comfortable or very confident in *you!*

Madam Deputy Speaker, we heard from Mr. Landow that there was indeed a meeting and that there was the fourth person in the meeting. But, as a result of selective memory, no one that was in that meeting from the Government bench and the Cabinet, including the Premier, could recall how long. They did not say how long definitively that individual was in the meeting.

I will yield, and you can give me the clarification, as well as the country, right now.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Now we find out that there was not just Mr. Landow who contributed to a political campaign. He says there were four or five other people!

Well, now, that begs the curiosity in my mind to want to know who they are and what due diligence

is being applied to determine their validity with regard to the kind of credibility that we require as a pristine jurisdiction of business providing financial services and everything else dealing with finance. Are they worthy of being invited to donate to a campaign? I want to know! Because there is always something new being revealed.

Now, what if Mr. Landow has so conveniently withdrawn himself and said, *I am no longer interested in Bermuda*, after contradicting that by saying, *We donated to the political campaign because we want to help your country?* But it is so easy for you now to say, *Well, you know what? Your country does not mean diddly-squat anymore!*

Why?

Could it be, Madam Deputy Speaker, that one or some of the others that allegedly donated a percentage that equated to somewhere around \$40,000 each has now formed another entity and they are coming in blindsided? And [is] Mr. Landow is what they call a silent proprietary vested principal? What is going on? What is going on?

What is going on? No one wants to speak to simple questions, clear questions, some questions even *yes* and *no* that the Honourable Speaker could not even encourage . . . Well, he encouraged, but he could not even get the Premier to answer under a cloud of what he would describe as close to being a Fifth Amendment that does not even have any relevance in this country or in this House! That was, in my humble opinion, contemptuous in the highest regard, based on the Code of Conduct!

And one part of that Code of Conduct says, one . . . Let me just get the right one, if you will give me . . . is that, "Ministers who knowingly"—another word for *knowingly* could be stretched to say *deliberately* in the context upon which we speak and are concerned—"mislead Parliament will be expected"—*will be expected*—"to offer their resignations to the Premier."

But what if the main culprit of the alleged allegations is the Premier himself?

And then you have the executive of the political institution saying, by way of their chairman, that an investigation internally is warranted. But then there does not seem to be . . . what would I say? There does not seem to be an agreement among all the executives, based on another report, that he acted on his own. Who and what do the people—not the Opposition, not the loyal Opposition, but the people—of this country believe when they have been deliberately misled?

And there seems to be a condoning that makes every Member of the Government conspicuous by their silence and association, because someone has to have the moral fibre politically, based on the oaths that they took—particularly on the front benches—that they would serve with integrity and with truth. And we are asking questions that are being

asked to us, and our constituents are saying, *But you are up there. You are in the Opposition. You should know!* And we say, we are asking the same questions because we want to know, too!

So, thank God, and we glory in the spirit of Mr. Ayo Johnson and Mr. Gary Mareno and Sherri Simmons and, particularly with regard to *Think Media*, the young charges that Mr. Ayo Johnson has working as researchers, training them up with regard to the level of respect, political integrity and journalistic integrity that precedes his reputation.

It reminds me of what we tried to do in my small, fledgling broadcasting business with our internship programme, paid internship, because there are levels of commitment that do not just give you an opportunity to provide lip service, but to do the deed and follow-up the promise. That is what the people are looking for in this country, because they have heard the promises. But they have not seen the action, that speaks volumes, that they believe would be forthcoming. The action that they have seen is the deceit, the misrepresentation, the mistruths, the deliberate mistruths.

Now, there seems to be collusion and collaboration between the players locally and internationally to get the story right, and for one to endorse the other. Because not to do so would, or could, make them culpable to answer in their own jurisdiction. So now you have what would be appropriately described as an attempted cover-up. But the more you peel the layers off that Bermuda onion—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, I just want to say you are not speaking to the Gallery. You are actually speaking to me.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Madam Deputy Speaker, I am speaking to everybody, including those that are listening to me by way of the airwaves. And without disrespecting you, I take your point.

But peeling off those layers of Bermudian onions, you know what? There are more tears coming. No matter how sweet, with the right ingredients it could taste and would taste, had there not been the skulduggery going on among Members of the One Bermuda Alliance!

I do not think there is much alliance right now, because looking at their faces on those benches, I see looks of concern and discomfort, because you know what? Madam Deputy Speaker, there are people on those benches that have a conscience. But through their perception of what could happen which could go to the heart of the power they now hold in the seats they are occupying, [it] is unfathomable and untenable for them to deal with. So it is like, *Oop! We are going to turn a blind eye and just leave well-enough alone and hope you guys are, you know, telling us what is really the truth so that, you know, with us taking this hit . . .* Not just from us up here [from]

the loyal Opposition, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is their own constituents, their core constituents!

The former President of the Chamber of Commerce articulated extremely well his sentiments, after going to defend the party he supports because of giving the benefit of doubt, which the people that went to the polls did, giving them the opportunity and the privilege to serve with dignity. And [he] now feels betrayed himself and endorses the investigation!

But Caesar investigating Caesar? Come on, Bermuda! You put your feet in the streets on something that is very dear to your hearts with regard to jobs, justice and equality! Well, how can you get that, trusting people that deliberately miss-tell, mislead, misinform? How do you give benefit of doubt? And what are you going to do now?

You talk about *people power*? Well, guess what? Unless there is some fundamental, catastrophic dilemma that awakens the earthquake that rose above the shores in this Atlantic Ocean, this Honourable Chamber on the Hill will be here next week, and God willing, the weeks following. What will you do? What will *you* do? We, the Opposition, the loyal Opposition, are doing in our individual and collective ability what we are charged to do in getting to the truth when there is controversy, because it is a distraction. It is a deflection. And what we did was ask questions, basic questions that could have been answered, and that can be answered!

But will the answer be at your peril? That is the \$40,000 question. And this whole situation with Jetgate is the elephant in the room. It is the elephant in the room. And people deserve to hear truth from somebody on the Government benches, particularly the front benches. Have some courage! We had Ministers resign from Cabinet because they did not agree with what was substantiated as a humanitarian act, which in the minds of a number of people was wrong! They did not agree with it, and they resigned and held their heads high and gave reasons why.

So I want to know. I see the Honourable Pat Gordon-Pamplin; Bob Richards, the Honourable Member; the Honourable Member, Mr. Michael Dunkley; Mr. Jeff Sousa; Mr. Glen Smith; one I admire, Ms. Jeanne Atherden, as a female upstanding Member of the Chamber here; the Honourable Member, Ms. Susan Jackson. And I am saying, What is going on? What is going on? You have to have a conscience!

You have to have had a knock-down drop-out dialogue, because the same questions we asked, you do not know. You know why? Because your Chairman did not know! That is the most embarrassing thing. And some chairpersons, because of that, would have resigned and said, *That is why. I am not going to be blindsided and then have to defend the indefensible when I have no knowledge.* That is what he said!

And so, it seems there are allegations that appear to be valid, which warrants, now, me taking

the lead, notwithstanding the portion of my executive that will not or does not agree. I go in public, because I have got integrity. So you have got to give credit where credit is due. I do not think it is too little too late, either. Because I think this thing will go on, because the people in this country, as much as they want jobs, cannot go and listen to Suze Orman, because they do not have \$25.00 to put into a pension fund without being employed! They have got to use it to put onions on the table!

The Deputy Speaker: Member, please, refer to the Chair. Thank you.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: You know? It really, really begs the question: In whose interest does the One Bermuda Alliance really serve and truly govern? In whose interest? Because, Madam Deputy Speaker, if they are truly interested in direct foreign investment, this is one of the situations that will completely turn the country on its head, and there would be no hope to get direct foreign investment in this country with this kind of a scandal still hanging over Bermuda's head.

[Desk thumping]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

Are there any other Members that would like to speak?

The Chair recognises the Honourable Member, Sylvan Richards. You have the floor.

JOHN SMITH'S BAY BATHROOMS

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, there are some good things happening in Bermuda. I am going to speak to some of the good things that are happening in my lovely constituency, number 7, of Hamilton South.

Prior to the election, when I spoke to the residents in the constituency, I noticed that John Smith's Bay was a very vital part of that community used by locals. There are people down in that beautiful area who get up at six o'clock every morning and go to John Smith's Bay to swim. It is a very well-used local beach by the tourists, especially during the summer months.

Madam Deputy Speaker, many minibuses that bring the tourists off the cruise ships, when they make their route to this beautiful Island, always make a point to stop by John Smith's Bay. And it became very clear that the issue with John Smith's Bay was that there were no restrooms on the beach. There was one porta-potty, which was a shame, because it is a beautiful beach and it needed a restroom.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Deputy Speaker: Members.

Would you like to take a seat, please, just for a quick second?

While I understand that there are opinions, I will by all means recognise the Member next. So, if you would like to be able to hold off those horses from running until you stand to your feet, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

Member, please.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Yes, I would like to call a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Please. Go ahead, yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. There were toilets at John Smith's Beach before he even got into politics. They were knocked down during a hurricane. So it is not the first time.

The Deputy Speaker: Right. Perfect. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Member?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

That Honourable Member must have pre-read my comments, because I was going to get to that point, that the bathrooms that were there before were damaged in Hurricane Fabian 11 years ago. And there was a lack of proper bathrooms at that beach ever since.

So, once I was elected, I made a promise to the residents that they would have proper bathrooms built on that beach. That was a personal commitment that I made to my constituents.

And you know, it was a real learning experience for me, Madam Deputy Speaker. We inherited a Government that does not have a lot of funds. There were other beaches in Bermuda that probably needed upgrading to their restroom facilities.

An Hon. Member: Warwick Long Bay.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Yes, Warwick Long Bay is one. But I made a commitment that those restrooms would be built.

And I am pleased to say that if you drive by John Smith's Bay right now, up on the hill when you are facing the beach, to the left you will see a beautiful new structure going up that is going to provide those facilities to the residents of that community—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Please take a seat.—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The honourable gentleman—

The Deputy Speaker: Wait just a second.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The honourable gentleman may be misleading the House unintentionally. But if he would check, he would discover that those bathrooms were in the works before he was even elected.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member. Member?

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not know why there is such hostility coming from the Opposition benches over this issue.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Is this a point of order or a clarification?

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: No, misleading the House. Because I do not know who he is referring to. Could he say who he is referring to? Because I did not get up contentiously; I just made a point of order and corrected him on a wrong.

The Deputy Speaker: It was a clarification, I believe, right?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: It was a correction.

The Deputy Speaker: A correction. Thank you. Member?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I would acknowledge the Honourable Member that, yes, those funds were set aside for that bathroom. Now, I have been here, elected, since December 2012. All I know is that over the last 11 years those bathrooms were not built. So regardless of how long the money was there, the bathrooms were not built!

So now the bathrooms are being built, and I am going to take full credit for it.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Madam Deputy Speaker, I was pushing to have those bathrooms up and running by the 24th of May, but we are not going to make that deadline. The bathrooms will be open by mid-June, and I, for one, am going to be very pleased. The residents are going to be very pleased. And our tourists are going to be pleased once they come to that beach, especially the return visitors, and see those bathrooms up on the hill.

So I am looking forward to seeing the final product, and we can work on another project down in that wonderful constituency.

SUMMERHAVEN AND CLAIRE ANN MOORE MARATHON FOR BERMUDA DAY DERBY

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: I would like to draw attention to another constituent of mine, a Ms. Claire Ann Moore, whom some of you may know. She is participating in the upcoming Bermuda Day Derby.

Now, Ms. Moore, a very lovely young lady, is a resident of Summerhaven. And she is participating in the derby because Summerhaven needs a new van. And the van is very expensive. It is over \$100,000 for the van. So they have a fund-raising programme going on right now. And Claire Ann is going to be participating in the 24th of May marathon. It is going to be a relay format. There are a number of runners who are going to be pushing Claire Ann in a wheelchair along the route, and the donations that she raises will be used towards the purchase of the new van.

I heard one of the local radio stations a few weeks ago promoting the event, and I would just like to encourage everyone who is listening out there to support Summerhaven and Claire Ann Moore as she participates in the Bermuda Day Derby. And I will be out there in my usual spot, watching the runners come through. And I will be saluting her as she comes through.

So, thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

The Chair now recognises the Member from Southampton East, constituency 29, Mr. Zane J. S. De Silva. You have the floor.

JETGATE

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I am going to have to work really, really hard to keep our Members in the House and our listening audience awake after that presentation.

The Deputy Speaker: “Awake” did you say?

[Laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Madam Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member, Dr. Grant Gibbons, got up and gave one of my colleagues a point of order earlier. And he talked about the repetition with regard to Jetgate. Week after week, week after week, same old story. Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, the *Bermuda Sun* reports today that the OBA top brass were surprised by the chairman’s announcement that there will be an investigation.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, every week it is something else that is added to Jetgate! It is every week there seems to be another surprise, just like you may have been surprised, Madam Deputy Speaker, just like the rest of the OBA/UBP may have been surprised, just like the people of Bermuda are surprised.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, I just want to remind you that if you are referring to the Government of the day, it is the One Bermuda Alliance or the OBA. Thank you. Just please proceed.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I got your point. I got you. I got you.

But, Madam Deputy Speaker, it seems like every week, every day almost, there is another surprise, another revelation, another fact, another . . . I cannot say that word “lie,” so I will not say it.

But, Madam Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member, Dr. Grant Gibbons, talked about *repeat, repeat, repeat*. I got some more important things I want to talk about tonight. But I remember when we were Government, the Honourable Member Grant Gibbons, in particular, every week it was, *What is the CEO’s wages at the hospital? What is the chief of staff’s wages? What about FutureCare? Let’s talk about cedar beams* (that didn’t exist). *Let’s talk about corruption in the PLP*. Every week! Week after week after week! They have been Government for a year and a half. Why have we not seen one former Progressive Labour Party Minister pulled up before the courts because they were corrupt? Why?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I hope so. Let us go. Yes! Soon come. Soon come. Why? Why? It begs the question, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, if we would not have seen the skulduggery that we have seen over the last year, Jetgate would not even exist. But it does exist! And the people of this country want to know the answers to the questions that we, as the Opposition, have been asking for the last year and a half. And every week there are more questions that have to be

answered, every week! We will continue, Madam Deputy Speaker, to ask the questions. We will continue until the answers are forthcoming from the people that have the knowledge, and the people that are aware of a lot of the skulduggery that took place, come forth, come here and man up, or woman up.

When you have blatant contradictory statements made by the Premier of this country, time and time again, time and time again, I am sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker, this will have to be repeated.

I will give you some of those, because the Premier said earlier, *I have not told any lies. I have told the truth.* And of course, colleagues on this side have said, *You have not answered questions.* But some things he has said, and they have been recorded. The Honourable Premier . . . let us back up a little bit.

First of all, usually the OBA are quick to come up, sit in front of a camera or come to this House with a Ministerial Statement when they, in their eyes—and I give them their due—have done some good things for the country. I would have thought that if the Premier and two Ministers and some colleagues and some friends, and maybe a third Minister (that missed the flight, I understand, right?) . . . I would have thought, I would have thought, I would have thought, Madam Deputy Speaker, that if this was for jobs and our people and our country and hotel development and whatnot, we would have had a Statement read out by the Premier or one of his Ministers on their return.

But do you know when they gave us the information that they thought we should have? It was after we brought it light the trip that their colleagues, their Cabinet colleagues did not even know they took. We brought it to light. Their own Cabinet colleagues did not know that they took this trip! And now you talk about mistruths (I am not going to say “lies”). But the Premier—the *Premier*—said that Cabinet knew. The Honourable Member, Dr. Grant Gibbons, said, *We did not know.* That is the type of thing that I am talking about, Madam Deputy Speaker!

Refute that!

We have got that in black and white. It is in Hansard. It is in the newspapers.

I have not heard Dr. Grant Gibbons refute that. I have not heard the Premier refute it. You cannot! Because he said that Cabinet knew. The Honourable Grant Gibbons said, *We did not know. We were not aware of this trip.* So what is going on?

So that is one. That is one.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Premier gave a Personal Statement in the House after some of these things were brought to light. And I will quote from his statement. “¹A date was set and a delegation, including myself, the Tourism Minister, and the Attorney General flew to . . . the meeting.”

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have got Hansard. We have got the Personal Statement right here. I do not see anything about a fourth person. So is that saying I am not lying? I am not telling the truth? Maybe not. Let the people of the country decide. Let the OBA Members that sit in the room with the Premier on a Wednesday night, let them make that decision. Yes.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, that is yet another case, another case of misinformation being put out to the public.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we were told that the fourth person was bumming a ride. Did he bum a ride in the car when they got to the airport? Did he happen to bum a hotel room as well when he was there for two days? You tell me. Inquiring minds want to know. You tell me.

We have heard that this, I do not know if you want to call him a consultant, Madam Deputy Speaker, was called into the meeting to discuss golf. He was called in to discuss golf. Yet today, in the *Bermuda Sun*, Mr. Landow says it was never clear what Mr. DaCosta was doing there. And he says, “No, we didn’t ask” what he was doing there. “It was irrelevant to us.”

Now, who, Madam Deputy Speaker . . . Does that not boggle one’s mind? Does that not boggle the mind, that he just happened to be in the hotel and he was called into a meeting because there was a question about golf? But the developer they went to see says that they do not know what he was doing there; it was irrelevant. Madam Deputy Speaker, you know, one can be lost for words. One can be lost for words.

The other question I have, Madam Deputy Speaker . . . Mr. Landow also said that Mr. DaCosta was present for at least one meeting. Now, we have been told that there has only been one meeting. So where were the others? And was he part of two? Three? Did Mr. Landow meet with the Ministers and the Premier two or three or four more times? I mean, Mr. Landow would need . . . Maybe the Premier can answer that question. It just begs too many questions, Madam Deputy Speaker, too many questions.

Madam Deputy Speaker, no one on the other side today seems to want to talk about this \$300,000—\$300,000, Madam Deputy Speaker! Mr. Landow says he was told it was for campaign contributions—his words! Nothing new—people donate money to parties all over the world all the time, nothing new. But what begs the question is, the OBA chairman says he did not receive it! Now . . . so where is the money? Where is the \$300,000 donation? The chairman says he did not receive it. So who received it? Maybe that is something the . . . Maybe even Mr. Johnson might be able to get Mr. Landow to give him that information. But where did it go?

You know, my colleague talked earlier about it. What is the name of it? Some political action group that this cheque went to. Political action group? Well,

¹ *Official Hansard Report*, [31 May 2013](#), page 1205

let us see. Let us try to connect some dots. Premier, Ministers go to meeting, they meet a potential developer in Bermuda, they take . . . Well, he just bummed a ride. They take a fourth person with them.

[Laughter]

The Deputy Speaker: Member, if you take a seat just for a quick second.

I am just hoping that the Member beside you (and I will not mention names)—thank you. For review? You might be reviewing it for a statement for later?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Yes, I apologise Madam Deputy Speaker. I was just going to help my friend with the quote “Bermuda Political Action Club.”

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Oh! Okay.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Teamwork there.
Sorry, you have the floor.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: So, let us go back to connecting these dots, Madam Deputy Speaker. Okay. Premier goes on jet, takes Ministers on jet with business colleague, meets potential future developer for Bermuda, who, developer says, is irrelevant, does not know why he was there, even though he was called in a meeting to talk about golf.

[Laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: So, now all of a sudden, \$300,000 shows up in Bermuda.

Well, Mr. Michael Fahy did not make the trip. Someone said earlier that Mr. Fahy maybe opened the account. It was alleged that he opened the account. So, let us look at the dots here. We take a trip. We go up. We have a conversation, or two or three or four or five. The Premier said at the time it was a three-hour meeting, but he stayed there for two days because he was tired.

[Laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: That is in Hansard. Okay? He was tired. He stayed there for two days. And I said at the time, if you remember, Ewart Brown went to China and back in 46 hours, I think it was. But anyway, be that as it may.

So let us look at these dots. So, the \$300,000 comes from the same fellow that they had a meeting with. But it did not go to the OBA coffers. Where did it go? Where is the \$300,000? Who got it?

[Inaudible interjections]

An Hon. Member: What was it used for?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Landow thought it was for campaign funds, as far as he was concerned, to help an underground effort, whatever that meant.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have just connected those little dots. But guess what? I still do not have an answer. And there are more questions than answers in that little scenario right there. Right there! The chairman of the OBA announced this week there is going to be an investigation because *we never received \$300,000*. Well, you know what? That led me to another question. If the chairman says he did not receive \$300,000, what is he going to investigate? What is he going to investigate? Three hundred thousand dollars . . . It is just . . . You know, that is another big question. That is another big question.

Now, another question. And this is why, Madam Deputy Speaker, you know, the Honourable Dr. Grant Gibbons, who is not in his seat, unfortunately . . . but you know, he talked about us repeating, repeating, repeating every week. And here comes another question that just surfaced today. Mr. Landow said he, along with a group of about a half-dozen people . . . they were real estate developers, builders and entrepreneurs who gave \$300,000.

Now, my question is, that RFP, the RFP that went out, I wonder if it went to all those five? Well, we know that Mr. Landow missed the deadline. Well, a billionaire businessman misses a deadline.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Come on, now. Any of us here ever bid on a job? Any of us ever had an RFP? You pick it up, you look at it. And look, I can understand it if you said, *I looked at it and I threw it in the trash. I am not interested*. He missed the deadline!

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: And as the Honourable Member, Deputy Leader Burgess, just said, you could have easily extended the date, which everyone in this room that ever bid on a contract knows that if you are serious about a contract, you contact the client. If you are running a little [late], if for whatever reason you have had some challenges, you contact the client. You contact Government, because Government does it all the time in Bermuda. They extend . . . Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, you will know. You will know just from our relationship on the House and Grounds, we extended a bid not long ago, did we not?

The Deputy Speaker: Mm-hmm.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes! So things happen.

So, for a billionaire, a multi-millionaire [who] has all the experience in the world with developing

and whatnot, to miss a deadline, inquiring minds want to know.

The question begs, Who were the other five developers, builders, entrepreneurs that donated part of this \$300,000? Who were they? Who were they? I think that those questions need to be answered. And we will ask those questions every week until they are answered. Every week until they are answered.

How much time do I have left, Madam Deputy Speaker?

The Deputy Speaker: Two minutes and 49 seconds, 48, 47.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Oh, my dear. Okay.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as representatives in this Honourable House, we are given one of these when we come. It is called a "Ministerial Code of Conduct." Section A, General Principles, which apply to Cabinet Ministers. Cabinet Ministers. [Rule] A 1. (v): "It is of paramount importance that Ministers give accurate and truthful information to Parliament, correcting any inadvertent errors at the earliest opportunity. Ministers who knowingly mislead Parliament will be expected to offer their resignations to the Premier."

Madam Deputy Speaker, we know what happened. We have the facts. What are the OBA Government going to do? What are they going to do? You know! You know!

Also, Madam Deputy Speaker, [Rule] A 1. (ix), "Ministers should avoid accepting any gifts or offers of hospitality which might, or might reasonably appear to, compromise their judgement or place them under an improper obligation."

Free jet trip, free ride, free hotels. Talking to a developer that wants to develop in Bermuda. Madam Deputy Speaker—

An Hon. Member: And give them money!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: And give them \$300,000 at the end—\$300,000.

So my question is, Doesn't this Ministerial Code of Conduct mean anything to anybody on that side of the House? Do the OBA Members that accompanied the Ministers, do the Ministers that were not involved, did they all agree to what took place? And they will have a chance to talk, and I will gladly take my seat and listen.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

The Chair now recognises the Finance Minister. Minister Richards, you have the floor.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I missed the opportunity to hear this last week because I was travelling. So I guess I am not as bored with this subject as some of my colleagues are. Let me say one or two things briefly, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I am less interested in private jets than I am interested in what the Public Accounts Committee [PAC] has been doing since we have been the Government. We have been in Government almost 18 months now, and we have heard nothing from the Public Accounts Committee. Unfortunately, the chair just vacated the Chamber. But just for the public's edification, the Opposition spokesman for Finance generally chairs the Public Accounts Committee, and, in fact, the Opposition spokesman for Finance chairs the PAC on this occasion, as I did for five years when I was over that side.

We had a lot of work to do as a committee during the time that I was on that committee. But the work was not done. A lot of work was not done. I know that we have Members who were on that committee then who are on that committee now. And you know, it would be really interesting to know what the Public Accounts Committee has been doing. You know? How many times have they met? There are a lot of outstanding matters that were of great interest to the public as it relates to the functioning of the Government.

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I am wondering, now that . . . Mr. Speaker, you are back in the chair.

I am wondering, the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee are basically called by the chairman. He is the one who is . . . that is his job. To schedule meetings; to also schedule and to specify a direction in which the Public Accounts Committee does its work. In other words, it is an investigative committee. So it is his job to basically try to show some leadership as to what the committee actually investigates.

Seeing that in almost the year and a half that we have been Government we have heard nothing from the Public Accounts Committee, one wonders if the current chair does not have the stomach to investigate what essentially are the machinations of his own party when they were the Government. Because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when I was the Chair of the PAC, we had a lot of work to do. And my tenure there came to an end with a pretty interesting and sizeable backlog of issues to investigate, reports to investigate and other matters, Government overruns, et cetera, to investigate. When I left, we still had a lot of things outstanding, even though we had a very busy schedule.

So I am very curious as to what has been happening over there. I know that the way the system works, the Opposition gets the opportunity to quiz

Ministers as to what they have been doing. But this is my opportunity to quiz the Shadow Minister about what he has been doing. All right?

I would like to know, and I think the public would like to know, what has happened as it relates to the Public Accounts Committee investigation of what went on at Port Royal. What were they investigating as it relates to what happens to the Dockyard over-run? Right? What has happened to that?

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member who just took his—

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Can [there be] a point of order if I am asking a question?

[Laughter]

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Okay. Honourable Member, please take your seat.

Mr. E. David Burt: I was attempting . . . I was attempting—

The Speaker: Just a minute! I did not ask you to speak yet. I was getting that Member to sit down.

Mr. E. David Burt: Sorry.

The Speaker: Now you can carry on. Yes?

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, because, as I am sure the Honourable Member would be clear and know, the Public Accounts Committee deals with things that are referred to the Public Accounts Committee. And there has been no referral of any report dealing with the Port Royal or the docks.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you. Honourable Member? Minister, carry on.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, I have a short answer to that. That is sheer nonsense! When I was Chair of the Public Accounts Committee, we did what we thought was important. We did not wait for something to come from the Auditor General. We got stuff from the Auditor General, that was fine. But if it was something that we thought was necessary for

investigation, we investigated it. So the answer that gentleman gave was just sheer nonsense.

Now, let me say something. I was just about to point out that the Honourable Member, Mr. De Silva, asked the rhetorical question (I think it was rhetorical; maybe it was not) about, *Where is the \$300,000?* Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, let us get some sense of scale and priority here. What the Bermudian public want to know is, what happened to the \$30 million at Dockyard?

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: No, \$30 [million] to \$35 million that sort of—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please just speak to the Chair.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am getting a little carried away.

The Speaker: Yes. Do not get carried away.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I missed last week, so I have got some pent-up feelings here.

So, you know, I think it is more important to the people of Bermuda as to what happened to the \$30 [million] to \$35 million of taxpayers' money—not some billionaire's money, taxpayers' money! What happened to that money?

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Honourable Minister, please take your seat.

Yes, MP Burgess?

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: That Honourable Member is misleading the House.

The contract for Dockyard, Heritage Wharf, was around about \$50 million, or somewhere in that area. It was not \$30 million. That was the original bid. The drawings had changed. If they checked their drawings, they would understand that. Right?

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: And that particular project was audited. The books were shown to the auditor. No \$30 million there. You should not be misleading the House.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, MP Burgess.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: It is amazing how quick you turn from offense to defence, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

JETGATE

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Now, you know, so the Honourable Members on the other side have spent a lot of time . . . and they unabashedly say they are going to keep baying about this Jetgate thing *ad infinitum*. But I would like to know why we do not hear the same concentrated fire power on subjects that are still outstanding. The millions are still outstanding. Why do we not hear the same enthusiasm to find out what happened to missing taxpayers' money during their administration?

I suspect, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order. Point of order, Mr. Speaker!

The Speaker: Please.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Member, carry on.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Minister is obviously misleading the House. That is the narrative that has been put out since they were the United Bermuda Party, that there is \$800-odd million missing. And still we have not seen any evidence of it. So he knows he is misleading the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, thank you. Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, you see, there is so much money gone missing, he is talking about the wrong missing money!

[Laughter]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Point of order, Mr. Speaker! Point of order, Mr. Speaker!

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: He has got the wrong missing money!

The Speaker: Minister, please. Minister, Minister. Yes.

MP Burgess?

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is again misleading the House. What he is doing, he is casting aspersions on civil servants. As you know, being a former Minister, Ministers do not handle any money, any payment or anything. And he needs to stop! He needs to stop casting aspersions on civil servants.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Minister?

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Casting aspersions? Now, that sounds somewhat familiar, Mr. Speaker!

Does that not sound familiar to you, colleagues? *Casting aspersions?*

We have had aspersions cast every week for the last three months! I do not know about casting aspersions. There is one thing about being the caster and the castee! So when you are the caster, someone is going to cast, you do not like it!

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Point of order, Mr. Speaker! Point of order! Point of order!

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. That indeed is casting aspersions. They flip-flopped on a referendum!

The Speaker: All right. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: No aspersions! It is a fact!

The Speaker: Thank you, Member.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: These are facts that we are bringing to the attention of the Government—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —as to their promises versus their failure!

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. Honourable Member, thank you.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Minister, carry on.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Yes. So, it is very interesting that we have this . . . What is happening here, Mr. Speaker, is just a series of casting of aspersions for political expediency. And the fact that we have heard nothing from the Public Accounts Committee to date kind of indicates that—

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, again.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: If he would look in the 1998 Audit Report, the auditor says *late reporting by civil servants*, you cannot hold the politicians responsible. That is what it said in the audit report! That is in the audit report!

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Member. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Well, there you go, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Thanks for that.

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Honourable Members, we want one Member speaking at a time.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: There you go, Mr. Speaker. You cannot hold the politicians responsible. You know? Give me a break! We are being accused of X-Y-Z and A-B-C, yet the Honourable Member can get up in this House and say you cannot hold politicians responsible; it is all the civil servants' fault!

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order, Mr. Speaker!

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Respectfully, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General wrote that, not us!

The Speaker: Right. I heard you, and I take your point, Honourable Member.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Thank you.

The Speaker: Carry on, Minister. Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I would like to reflect briefly on some of the things that have happened in the last few days as well—

An Hon. Member: Last few days?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Yes, well, some of the reports in the last few days. I find them to be interesting. I have to say, when I read articles in the press, particularly articles that question people's integrity and character, I think that the source of the information for those articles should be released. It is just not fair for anyone who holds public office to be impugned from sources that are anonymous, unknown sources.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, this latest report that I am talking about, this is not a Woodward and Bernstein Deep Throat-type situation. I mean, those famous reporters, when they had their sources they were working for *The Washington Post*—one of the most respected newspapers on Planet Earth! That is not what we have here. That is not what we have here.

Some Hon. Members: What do we have here?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: What we have is a report by an individual who was not employed by any kind of recognised news agency—

Some Hon. Members: Ooh!

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: And does not have that kind of credibility at all.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Point of order, Mr. Speaker!

The Speaker: What is your point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: It is the most denigrating comment that I have ever heard in this House against a professional journalist who does have 20 years' experience, is qualified, has worked for the daily newspaper and other publications!

The Speaker: All right, Member. I hear you. I hear you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: How dare he take the credibility of that member of this community to task!

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: An upstanding member!

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.
Minister, carry on.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I find that to be really interesting. On both sides of the House, when the PLP were the Government, and now we are the Government, we sit here (and stand up sometimes). We argue back and forth. We make laws. We take it on the chin; take it in the stomach all the time. Right? And I guess it is our job to try to run this country and take the flak in the process.

But somehow, reporters are beyond criticism. Well, that is nonsense! That is total nonsense! Nobody is beyond criticism! Nobody is beyond criticism!

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Point of order. Point of order, point of order!

The Speaker: Yes. Just one second.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: He is misleading the House with regard to his previous comments, notwithstanding the fact that he selectively ignored that there is an Emmy award winning editor that was a part of that report and proofed it and made sure that the report was of the utmost journalistic integrity.

The Speaker: Carry on. Carry on.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, the other side have been criticising reporters since the beginning of time. Any reporter that worked for the *Royal Gazette*, they criticised. I mean, you cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, I find part of that article very interesting. Part of the article recounts a meeting, a conversation between the Honourable Premier and Mr. Landow. And they said . . . They basically worded it to this effect, that there was a meeting between these two gentlemen; they were alone in this meeting, and somehow, in the article, we get a report of what was said in that meeting.

Now, I do not know how somebody could know what was said in that meeting other than the Premier and Mr. Landow if they were the only two in the room having that meeting. Yet the source in this article purports to know what happened in this meeting.

Now, the question I ask . . . The Honourable Member who took his seat had lots of questions. So, here is one question I ask: Was the room bugged somehow, that they knew what took place in that meeting? Was the room bugged?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I think the Honourable Member may be mistakenly misleading the House. He is saying that the Premier met with this developer, just the two of them alone. But that is not true. There were several people in that room.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, you are talking about another situation.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Oh, no. You did not read that article properly. You did not read that article properly.

The Speaker: No, I think . . . carry on. Carry on, Minister.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, thank you.

So, I am asking the question again. I am asking the question, Was the room bugged?

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Members, everyone will have a chance. Some of you have spoken already. You had plenty of time to express your opinions. All right? Everybody has had plenty of chance to vent.

Honourable Member, carry on.

Mr. Walton Brown: Point of clarification.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: So, was the room bugged?

The Speaker: Speak to the Speaker.

Mr. Walton Brown: Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Speak to the Speaker.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Walton Brown: Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Walton Brown: A point of clarification.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I have not said anything yet!

The Speaker: Your point of clarification?

Mr. Walton Brown: Yes.

The Speaker: Yes?

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

Mr. Walton Brown: If the Member will yield to a point of clarification?

The Honourable Minister spoke about who listened in on that conversation. If you read the news report prepared by Mr. Johnson, what it states is that Mr. Landow spoke to his colleagues after the meeting and reported what he believed the Premier had said, as opposed to anyone else being there during that conversation.

The Speaker: Carry on.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I did not get that part of the story, but I can say that Mr. Landow—

Some Hon. Members: You did not read it? You did not read it! You did not read it!

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Landow, today, has refuted the story! That is a fact.

And I am saying to myself, you know, if the room was not bugged, then maybe the bug was a fly on the wall. Mr. Speaker, maybe the bug was a fly on the wall. And the reporter spoke to the fly on the wall afterwards and got the story. So if the reporter spoke to the fly on the wall, I guess that makes him Dr. Doolittle, because he can speak to the animals. He can speak Fly.

[Laughter]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: But the fact is that Mr. Landow says that what was in that article was not true. The Premier says that what was in that article about that meeting was not true. So somehow, the fly on the wall says that it was true.

The Speaker: What is your point of order, Member?

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: The Honourable Member is misleading this House. Mr. Landow said that they did pay the \$300,000.

The Speaker: Carry on, carry on.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: We are not talking about that, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: What are you talking about?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: We are talking about the fact that—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: If you just listen to what is being said.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: We are talking about the fact that the article claims that the Premier was asking for \$2 million. Right. That is what we are talking about.

So, I guess the reporter got this \$2 million from the fly that was on the wall, and the problem is that the fly did not understand English, so he misinterpreted what was taking place in that meeting.

Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, the thing that is unfortunate about all of this is that this Government is being hammered about matters that have nothing to do with the real agenda of the Bermudian people. Nothing whatsoever! The real agenda being to re-establish the global brand that is Bermuda, a brand that was tarnished by their 14 years in Government, to re-establish the economic growth in this country, to control out-of-control Government spending that they engaged in when they were the Government, to arrest the slide in property values of Bermudians who owe mortgages. And, of course, the mortgage does not decline with the property values. But the property value has slid. It is our job to arrest that decline.

Also, to stop the growth in public debt and to increase the number of jobs, ultimately, available to a whole corps of Bermudians who are out of work today.

[Timer beeps]

An Hon. Member: Sit down.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: That is fine. I have said most of what I wanted to say anyway. Thank you.

The Speaker: Yes. All right. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

People in the Gallery need to know that they do not engage in what is happening in here! And the Gallery needs to sit and watch and not react in any way to what is happening in this House if they want to sit in the Gallery and stay there.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: Just before you take your seat, the Chair would take the opportunity to recognise the Senator, Senator Daniels, Senator Marc Daniels, who is in the audience.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: The Chair will now recognise the MP Weeks.

[Adjournment, continuation of debate thereon—JETGATE]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I rise to make my contribution on the Motion to Adjourn, we have been going over this here for quite some time now. Mr. Speaker, as I go on the doorstep and I talk to my constituents and listen to them, and we talk about this thing called Jetgate . . . Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said over and over when he has been questioned, he has been evasive. He has talked about *sub judice*, and *no comment* on occasion, and outright just would not answer.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to remind the Honourable Premier and other Members that it is one thing about the court. But the court of public opinion is where we stand and who we have to represent. When we are out there, when we talk to our constituents and listen to our constituents, it is the court of public opinion. And this issue of Jetgate has been going on because the Premier has not been clear to the people of Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012 I remember the then-Opposition OBA's platform about transparency, honesty, involving the people, integrity. But one of the first things that they did when they became Government was a backtrack on the gaming referendum. We will put a pin in that, because I will get back to that.

Mr. Speaker, I have been reading reports and have heard different commentary. My initial reaction, Mr. Speaker, was *Whoa! Whoa!* This \$300,000 has become an issue. I see a Member leaving the Chamber, and I want to ask him, because I remember in 2012, Mr. Speaker, or January 2013, the new Finance Minister got up in this Honourable House and talked about how he looked under the hood. He has not revealed to us what he found under the hood. But I want the Finance Minister, Mr. Speaker, to look under his hood. He got up for 20 minutes, and he has not addressed that \$300,000. Is he afraid of to look under that hood, or has he looked under that hood? Because he has not addressed it.

An Hon. Member: But it is not under the hood. It is under somebody else's hood!

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: I know it is not under the hood, but I need him to say that.

An Hon. Member: They do not know which hood it is!

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: They know the hood.

[Laughter and crosstalk]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Yes, they know where it is, Mr. Speaker.

So, for these very serious allegations about this \$300,000, last week I sat here and I said I was not going to speak on it because my honourable colleagues on this side do a fine job. And the question was not answered then, and now again these questions are not being answered. So I am appalled, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the reason that the gaming referendum that pulled may have been about this conversation that we hear only two people were a part of, that \$2 million conversation. Some say it happened; some say it did not happen.

But again, I am asking the Premier to get up and tell the people! Get up and tell the people, because we are going back and forth here and politicising this here. Every day Mr. and Mrs. Bermuda want to see the Premier, want to see him get up on TV, get in front of a microphone and explain this Jetgate debacle. Explain it. I do not want to have to go and touch on every point, because my colleagues have done all that. But simply, I am calling on the Premier and those others that were involved in this Jetgate affair to come clean.

Every time I hear a different Member talk, it is a different story. And Mr. and Mrs. Bermuda have seen it. And the more you lie, the more you have to tell a lie. And I am not impugning anybody's integrity.

The Speaker: Come on, let us withdraw! Withdraw! Withdraw that language!

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker, if I may—

The Speaker: Withdraw that language!

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: If I put it a different way. I was always told that if you tell the truth from the beginning, you do not have to keep on going back at it. I am just talking about how I was raised, Mr. Speaker, me personally. I was told that if I tell an untruth, I will tell another untruth to cover it up, and so forth and so forth and so forth. So I am speaking about my own upbringing, Mr. Speaker.

And based on my upbringing, I have also learned that we have to deal with certain things straight up because they are not going to go away. And yes, Mr. Speaker, I too agree and understand that our country and our people are hungry. They need jobs. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. I hear that every day. But is the Government saying that they are willing to do things by any means necessary? Do not

sit there and tell me or tell the people, *Do not worry about the \$300,000, because we are working on jobs.*

I was also told, Mr. Speaker, that if you build a house on sand, it will not stand. And it has got to be built on sand because nobody has the integrity—Mr. Speaker, let me withdraw that.

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker, we need the Government, the Premier, the Minister of Tourism and the Attorney General who were on this Jetgate affair to once and for all come clean. Come clean, Mr. Speaker! Do not impugn my integrity by saying, *Why are we not talking about jobs?* I know what we need in this country, Mr. Speaker. But our people demand integrity from all of us. They demand honesty from all of us and truth from all of us. And I for one refuse to take the explanation, *We are not going to talk about that \$300,000 because we are here to create jobs.* But tell me that it is not so that you are willing to build it or create jobs by any means necessary. I am not going to accept that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to keep reiterating what others have talked about, but I am going to push on now to the bathroom issue, because I have to address that after the former Minister.

The Speaker: You said what? I am sorry. To the what?

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: The bathrooms.

The Speaker: Oh, oh.

JOHN SMITH'S BAY BATHROOMS

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: John Smith's Bay. I cannot take my seat without addressing that, Mr. Speaker.

I heard the Honourable Member (pretty good man, Honourable Member) talking about the bathrooms down at John Smith's Bay and how his Government has done it in these 12 months since they have been in office.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Well, the impression was that it was their baby.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker, to one and all, that as the former Minister, I took over from my Honourable Deputy Leader the plans for the bathrooms were well entrained. And anybody who has ever sat in a Ministerial seat [knows that] plans will not be drawn and go through Planning and have the bathrooms built in a year. So, the whole process of the bathrooms and I'm not even going with St. David's, Shelly Bay, Clearwater, Horseshoe Bay even—all those plans were well entrain under this Government. So we knew

what we were supposed to do. But I am glad that you have taken up the baton, OBA Government, and finished off what we had started.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Yes. So, Mr. Speaker, I am really out of ideas when I come to talk to my constituents as to how we can get a straight answer from this OBA Government. So, they believe, or I believe that there is a certain amount of, should I say, deception going on? So, if we keep coming up over and over, not addressing the issue of this Jetgate affair, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be here . . . And I call on the people of Bermuda to march up here and ask the Premier and his Cabinet to come clean.

An Hon. Member: Demand!

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: And demand that they come clean. The blogs, the radio station, yes, I heard Honourable Members say we like marching. Yes, that is my history, yes.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Honourable Member Richards, Sylvan Richards, has said that we like to march. Yes, yes. Marching is a part of our culture, Mr. Speaker. And I call on our people to march, to show resistance, to show that they are tired of listening, listening to all of this deception. Yes. You don't necessarily need thick soles in your boots, you just need to believe in something and get up to do what you have got to do. Because as you know, I too was a marcher way back in the day. And I still believe in it, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: That is why we can go to the theatre and sit where we want to sit, and the churches, from marching.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: So, Mr. Speaker, as I am going to take my seat because I have not much more to say about this Jetgate affair, other than I want the Premier to come clean. The Premier, the Tourism Minister, the Attorney General, who is quiet—

An Hon. Member: Fahy.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Fahy. The Finance Minister—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, we do not have anyone in this House in that regard. So we cannot be asking that *we want someone* when the Member is not in this House.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker, I will put it a different way. Those that were involved, I am asking

them to come clean on what happened concerning Jetgate.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Mr. Speaker, I heard that Honourable Member still chirping about marching and whatnot, but I am going to go on from that.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to say that the people of Bermuda, Mr. and Mrs. Smith, who are listening, they want once and for all for us to get to the bottom of this debacle—\$300,000 just does not disappear in the air. When your chairman does not know where it is, when your Finance Minister, who championed looking under the hood . . . I implore him, the Finance Minister, to look under the hood of the OBA and find out where that \$300,000 is and let Mr. and Mrs. Bermuda know once and for all. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Would any other Member care to speak?

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke [South East], MP Rolfe Commissiong. You have the floor.

JETGATE

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say hello to all the listeners out there in Radio Land who will be listening to this discussion, this debate, in the great House of Assembly, including my lovely wife and family.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I can fully well understand now why during the leadership contest on the other side of the aisle for the UBA—OBA, I should say—

[Laughter]

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: —that Mr. Bob Richards, the Honourable Finance Minister, described his opponent as a cult! Certainly, we can see why Mr. Richards can be a worthy opponent, with significant political experience. Although I will say that he was way off base in trying to come with what I would characterise as the Don Grearson talking points, talking about the economy and the need to ensure that we are going to provide jobs, when the fact of the matter is that our ability to attract inward investment is going to be seriously impaired by the reputational risk which has been engendered by the Jetgate affair.

What reasonable investor, after seeing the facts of this sordid matter, would want to invest in Bermuda? Mr. Speaker, when I coined the term *Jetgate* during our discussion and consideration of this matter back in December in this very Chamber, I

could not anticipate the ongoing travails that would accompany the issue and cause such emerging and substantial trauma throughout the community. For despite the efforts on the part of our opponents to deflect, to obfuscate, to prevaricate and to dissemble on the issue, particularly with respect to our Premier, the issue is not going away.

A recent report suggests that, actually, the amount of money that was actually sent to the OBA was not \$300,000, but rather \$350,000. So more news is providing more information even as we speak in this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, last week, we witnessed the spectacle of the Junior Minister, Minister Sylvan Richards, repeatedly saying—*ad nauseam*, I might add—that there was nothing there. There is no *there* there. He said it over and over again. Yet only 72 hours later, Mr. Speaker, his own party chairman said, *No. There is something there. There is some validity to the report* that he denigrated on the floor of this House!

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Take a seat, please.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: That Honourable Member is misleading the House. The party chairman said nothing of the sort. He said he would look into the matter, basically.

The Speaker: Thank you.
Carry on.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is indeed misleading the House, because his own party chairman said that the report had validity. He used the term “validity.” He used the term “validity.”

The Speaker: All right! Speak to the Speaker.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: So, again, only 72 hours after we had Mr. Richards say that there is nothing there, his own party chairman confirmed that there is something there, and the party is embarked upon an internal investigation! So perhaps with respect to Mr. Richards, if he does not care to put any credence to the report by Mr. Ayo Johnson and his fine team—

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please take your seat.

Just a minute. All right.

Yes, MP Richards?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That gentleman is putting words in my mouth.

The Speaker: The Honourable Member.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: The Honourable Member is putting words in my mouth. I said last week there was nothing there. I repeat it again: There is nothing there. I stand by my words.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: And, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat again that if they are not prepared to believe the sterling job done by Mr. Ayo Johnson and his team at *Think Media, Politica*, then maybe they would accept the word of their own party chairman! Is there not an investigation going on right now?

Would Mr. Richards . . . I can yield if he is telling me that I am off base here.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Now, also last week, the same Junior Minister and others (again it must have been the Don Grearson school of political talking points), including the Premier, implored us to focus on the people's business! Mr. Speaker, the Bermudian people and their own party, again, by way of their chairman, has said that this too represents the people's interest.

The same Member, Mr. Speaker, also, of course, used the tired old political cliché from the 1970s, *Where is the beef?* Again, I would implore him to go call his party chairman. Mr. Speaker, I have appeared to respond by asking him the same question that the OBA is now asking: Where is the \$300,000? Now that has been confirmed it was sent by Mr. Nathan Landow and his colleagues.

Where is it? And what was it used for? Was it used to fund some sort of dirty-tricks campaign that occurred during the last election?

With respect to that, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the May 16th edition of the [Bermuda Sun](#), where Mr. Landow says as follows, on the issue of the use of that contribution, which as I said, is now up to \$350,000 and may be climbing even as we speak:

"Mr. Landow said the political contributions were made after an OBA political consultant" (who we now know is Mr. Derrick Green) "solicited him for the donations through a Maryland-based lobbyist. After

that solicitation, Mr Cannonier flew to the US to meet with Mr Landow and make a pro-jobs, pro-investment pitch, Mr Landow told us.

"We didn't know OBA from the WPA,' [he] said."

He goes on, Mr. Speaker, still quoting from the same article: "The money was not wired directly to the OBA campaign, he said. It was wired to a group called the Bermuda Political Action Club." (And apparently, their own party chairman did not even know about this.) "It's unclear," he [the writer of the article] adds, "who is behind . . ." (The story goes on to say), "It's unclear who is behind that organization or how the money was spent. The OBA would go on to defeat the PLP in the December 2012 election."

Now, finally, it says here on this matter, "We were told that it was campaign contributions and it was what you might say an underground campaign for getting out the vote, getting people to the polls,' Mr. Landow said.

" . . . We had absolutely no knowledge of anything or where the money was going to go other than it was campaign contributions and this was some sort of underground . . ."—his words, Mr. Speaker—*underground campaign*.

You know, in American political parties . . . can we refer to this as the creation of a slush fund? Money that can be used to prey on, politically speaking, the vulnerable and marginalised economically in our society to get them to come out and vote for the One Bermuda Alliance? Is this why you want to have the institutional party with hands-off, you know, not directly involved in this? Is that why the chairman of the party did not know what his left hand was doing? Because maybe, Mr. Speaker (I pose in terms of a question) the type of dirty tricks that were being used during that campaign would have brought disrepute to the party itself. We had to have the chairman, obviously, be able to claim plausible deniability.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to say this here. The quality of our Government is certainly in part a reflection of its leadership. And that leadership at the highest level of the Premier has been found wanting repeatedly. That is what he has made in terms of his own bed that he is now being forced to lay in. Why? Because as I said, he has indulged in prevarication. He has disassembled. He has obfuscated. He has cast this issue into darkness and not into the light of public scrutiny, where it deserves to be.

There has been a desperate, desperate attempt to keep this issue from being seen for what it is, Mr. Speaker. We have seen a level of desperation on the part of the Premier himself that has been astonishing, even to the extent, Mr. Speaker, of veiled and not-so-veiled threats being directed to Members on this side of the aisle by the Premier! *We have information on all of you! So be careful!* Not said behind the scenes, Mr. Speaker, but said through that micro-

phone during the last session that we had before the Christmas break.

An Hon. Member: We were shaking in our boots!

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Mr. Speaker, we have Members on this side, as a matter of fact, who have heard the same threats privately outside the Chamber! This, coming from the Premier of Bermuda!

An Hon. Member: Yes!

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: All in an effort to save his own political life, his own political power at the expense of what is good and what is right for this country!

An Hon. Member: If it is not so, point-of-order that!

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: No, he cannot do that! Because it is on the microphone; it is in Hansard!

Mr. Speaker, we speak about a trust deficit. This issue reveals that there has also been and continues to be a growing ethical deficit, which is besmirching the reputation of this country and bringing this House into disrepute!

An Hon. Member: Yes, more than ever before!

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: As I said, Mr. Speaker, the crude attempt at intimidation on the part of the Premier must be condemned, and it must be condemned by all right-thinking Members on both sides!

Mr. Speaker, I will take my seat now, but I will just say this here. This House, this country, deserves far better than the leadership being provided by the Government of the One Bermuda Alliance, and especially by its current Leader, the Honourable Craig Cannonier! I would hope that he would do the right thing. But, bearing in mind what we have seen in the last few weeks, I would not hold your breath.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from constituency 36, the Honourable and Learned Member, MP Michael Scott. You have the floor.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this Progressive Labour Party Opposition recently, from the perspective of sitting Ministers and holders of the position of Government in this great country of ours, steep, if I may put it that highly, Mr. Speaker, but certainly respectful of the traditions of how Ministers should conduct the affairs of Government. This is the perspective that we bring to this call, this baying, that we have

been hearing, that we should stop, Mr. Speaker, this debate on what has become Jetgate.

What has been ignored, what has not been brought to bear on this whole question is the role of the civil servant, and the relationship of the civil servant to the Minister. Mr. Speaker, this is our perspective. We were a new Government. We became good students, may I submit, good students of adhering to the use of technical advisors. To stop us from what, Mr. Speaker? To stop us from the very incident of the unsavoury discussion we are being forced to have and have been forced to have over the last how many sessions of this Honourable House? This is the reason, this is the interest of the Progressive Labour Party.

Mr. Speaker, use of civil servants during an overseas meeting to discuss Government business seems rote, seems basic. When the PLP held seats as Ministers, it was obvious that the unsavoury outcome that we are now being called upon, forced, constrained, Mr. Speaker, to deal with, will have been avoided. And so, I deplore, I resent this call, this attack on the Opposition that we are pushing a dead horse; sit, and stop talking about this issue.

No, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker, this issue is a perfect example of the failure on the part of the OBA Government to deploy the most basic wisdom in the conduct of their affairs. And the reason we are staying with it is because we respect, and continue to respect, and will respect once returned to Government . . . we will respect these practices. So, we are not doing this to do it just out of punishing and delivering punishing attacks on the Government.

What is so absolutely clear in the analysis is that there was gross, gross taking the eye-off-the-ball on these meetings in Washington. Recognition of the value and wisdom of having a technical advisor in place on an overseas meeting to discuss something as critical to our national interests as the development of tourism in our country, so that you had in the room the conscience of a technical advisor—it would have avoided a Minister of Tourism and an Attorney General, and a Premier, no less, getting involved in what has now been confirmed, admitted to by the Premier, that a donation was received of \$300,000, confirmed now by the donor himself, Mr. Landow, that a donation of \$300,000 was given.

And so there was this unsavoury mixing of Government business with the political party's machinery and needs. And this is what is so offensive. This is what is so concerning to the Opposition. This would have been avoided if a technical officer had been in your presence! It would not have happened. You would have felt constrained not to raise it. The technical officer . . . I can see Bobby, Robert Horton, Permanent Secretary too, myself, saying, *No, Minister. This is not acceptable.*

And so, we are students of that tradition. Yet, nobody has really pinned that tail on the proverbial donkey and said, *This is what this is about*. We are talking about the use of technical advisors in these contexts because what does it result in? It results in our not doing damnable injury to our international reputation. It protects us from doing all that the Premier, the Minister of Finance, every Minister on the front bench has been urging us to do. Let us get on with the business of this country and the needs of the agenda of this country!

Well, all of that is put at complete risk! All of that is completely risked, destroyed, by these unwise practices of going overseas, getting yourself into this dreadful mess that you have gotten yourself into, that is now blasted on the front pages week after week of the media. It would have been avoided for these reasons.

And we are not here to take the Government to the woodshed. We are here to say that you have committed a very serious, grave error, because they have now put on the agenda of this country risk to inbound investment looking at us seriously as a mature jurisdiction. They have put at risk what my honourable colleague, Mr. Roban, has said has not so far happened in two weeks of sitting in this House, the prosecution of a reasonable agenda of getting on with the Government's business because of this distraction.

And you dare tell us that we should stop?
No!

It has been such a grim dropping of the ball that it deserves the firmest of repetition. It deserves the firmest critique. It deserves the most serious censure of everyone involved! Why? So that it does not happen again!

There is too much at stake in 2014, with the economy in need of the recovery that the Minister of Finance has just talked about. There is far too much at stake in the homes and dining room tables and kitchen tables of our people for us not to deal with this distraction and to ensure that it does not happen again, and for the Opposition to absolutely bring it to the attention of the public of this country and call for censure, call for the most serious critique and sanction for this mess!

I am sick of it! Don't you ever say that we should get on! You cannot ask us to carry on with business as usual in this context! It has happened. The cat is out of the bag. The cat is out of the bag. There has been serious reputational damage done. And we need and must have consequences flowing from these mistakes. That is what should happen. Do not ask me to stop talking about this matter until there has been resolution. There has to be resolution.

I cannot in good conscience say that I repose the confidence, myself as a politician, or even as a private citizen, in persons who carry on like this, because it is too risky. We live in one of the best risk

management capitals of the world. We understand risk management. You do not do this. You do not concede continuing responsibility to those who have demonstrated their complete and utter incapacity to manage responsibility. Let us get on with dealing with what is required on this front, and we will be happy . . . we will be happy to hold hands and sing "Kumbaya" and cooperate with the agenda going forward. But we cannot continue to entrust it to those who are not worthy of the trust.

So reputational risk . . . The list can go on. Every time there is a news article in the respected media of this country it poses more questions than answers. This is the difficulty. It is a classic case of the air not being cleared and of the incapacity of this Opposition and Members of the Opposition bench being able to assign continued confidence in the Government to do what they are asking us to do—back off and let them get on with things.

No, that cannot happen, not in the light of what has already transpired and what has been confirmed as very, very serious breaches that have led to breaches of the code, breaches that may well breach the Parliament Act 1957 or the Criminal Code. These matters are a cloud too great for us to say, *We concur in business as usual*. It will not happen. It cannot happen. Mr. Speaker, until the air is cleared, the matter will be debated. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke [West Central], the Shadow Finance Minister. MP David Burt, you have the floor.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and good evening to you.

The Speaker: Thank you. Good evening to you.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, before I begin on my substantive remarks, I would like to just say that I am very happy that the Minister of Finance brought up the Public Accounts Committee, and I am happy to inform that same Honourable Minister that just yesterday, it just so turns out, I sent a schedule of 11 additional meetings for the Public Accounts Committee that will take place between now and when we come back here in November.

So I am happy that he has taken an interest in our work, and I will be happy to forward that meeting agenda to him. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we will even be tabling a report next week. If not, it will certainly be tabled the week after. But I am happy that the Minister of Finance has taken such an interest in our work, and I am looking forward to debating our reports when they come to this House.

JETGATE

Mr. E. David Burt: But, Mr. Speaker, his attempts to deflect from the issues of the day were good, and they were laudable. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that he sits next to the Honourable Premier, who on numerous occasions—they seem to mount every single week—there is something else we find out where the Premier has not told the truth, on numerous occasions has misled this country, and has not once even made an admission of his misleading or his falsehoods, not once has attempted to correct the records.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I would say to the Minister of Finance, who has taken such keen interest in the accounts and the work of the Public Accounts Committee, I hope that when his Parliamentary colleagues meet tomorrow—because I hear that there is an OBA meeting tomorrow with all the executives and all the MPs—I would hope that when he does that, they would talk about what everyone is talking about in this country. And that is not how many times the Public Accounts Committee has met. It is how many times the Premier will lie to this country, Mr. Speaker. That is what the public wants to know.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, let us withdraw that “lie.” Not “lie.” Just, there has been misinformation given. That is not . . . I am not going to accept that in this House!

Mr. E. David Burt: I understand that, Mr. Speaker. I retract that, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. E. David Burt: I am sorry that Members are offended by the word, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker . . . can I say “fib”? Is that fine, Mr. Speaker? Is that not good?

The Speaker: No. It is the same word, but—

Mr. E. David Burt: I will say “falsehood,” Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: —falsehood sounds—

Mr. E. David Burt: Repeated falsehoods. So they want to know how many times the Premier has told falsehoods to the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is we know that the Premier has told falsehoods. I mean, everyone knows that the Premier has told falsehoods! It seems the only person who does not know the Premier has told falsehoods is the Premier himself! How is that possible, Mr. Speaker? I think that even his own parliamentary colleagues, all 18 of them who sit next to him, know that he has told falsehoods. His own chairman

of his party got on television and said that [the Premier] has told him falsehoods!

So I think what we need to discuss is that, Mr. Speaker. I think that is—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. E. David Burt: No, we will not get a point of order! We will not get a point of order, because my things . . . Mr. Speaker, I am with you—

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Point of order!

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I saw the television report, and the chairman of our party did not say the Premier of this country told falsehoods.

The Speaker: Right. Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. E. David Burt: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am so happy for that point of order, because it allows me to read verbatim what the Chairman of the One Bermuda Alliance said, and I quote!

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

Mr. E. David Burt: On Wednesday, May 14th, just two days ago, he said, when asked about the presence of Stephen DaCosta on this Jetgate trip, the Chairman of the One Bermuda Alliance said the following—

The Speaker: Where are you reading from?

Mr. E. David Burt: I am quoting from his press conference. I have it verbatim. He says, “I have been told by the Premier that he was there because he was taking a break. A seat was available, and he went up and spent a couple of days. Then I heard via talk radio that he actually attended the meeting to talk about golf. That is what is open to the public. We are investigating further.”

So, basically, the chairman of the party is admitting that his own Leader of the party gave him false information, false and incorrect information. So, Mr. Speaker, they can point-of-order as much as they want. But that is the record. That is the record, Mr. Speaker.

So allow me to continue, Mr. Speaker, because I know the truth hurts sometimes. But I think the people of this country have seen what falsehoods [have been] put forward by the Premier, and the stories do not add up. Because, Mr. Speaker, this whole situation that we are here discussing and debating . . . it would be much better to be discussing legislation that is going to move Bermuda forward. But there is

no legislation that has come from this Government! This is the second week in a row that we thought we were going to get something. But it was withdrawn and mysteriously not tabled. The Opposition has tabled more legislation than the Government. When have you seen that, Mr. Speaker? That is what is going on right now.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the reason is. Could it be that the Honourable Attorney General is too busy preparing for the next place he is going to? Or could it be the Government is too busy trying to cover up the numerous scandals which they have, for which another shoe seems to drop every week?

What are we going to be discussing next week, Mr. Speaker? This week it is \$300,000 that has gone missing, and accounts that are made to shadowy groups that no one has heard of before. What are we going to be discussing next week, Mr. Speaker? I have some ideas. But this is a very sad and a very sorry situation, Mr. Speaker, that we are discussing that again.

It seems as if the 18 other Members who sit in the One Bermuda Alliance caucus are okay with the falsehoods, they are okay with the changing stories, they are okay with being tagged with the stench and the look of, *We can tell a different story or give a different answer a different day*. That is the level that they seem that it is okay to accept. Or, Mr. Speaker, they are happy to be silent about it, because not one of them has gotten up and said that, *We do not approve of the falsehoods of which have been told to Parliament by this Premier*.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are big issues to deal with in this country. But we cannot deal with the big issues in this country if we cannot deal with the simple, fundamental basis that the people of this country, and especially, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Parliament, should be able to trust the words that come out of the mouth of the Leader of this country. And that trust, Mr. Speaker, has been thrown into question on numerous occasions, and was thrown into question once more today by courtesy of the *Bermuda Sun*.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only today do we find out that the OBA operates shadowy groups. And they may not even operate it, because their chairman and most of the people in their party do not seem to know about it. So we do not even know what type of group it is. Maybe it is just a little side group. But we will get there later. But we found out about another falsehood and confirmed it now that the Premier told to Parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go to the record. And I am quoting from the Premier's Personal Explanation on May 31st, 2013, to this House. And I quote, Mr. Speaker: "A few months ago I was contacted by a wealthy individual from Maryland who stated that he had an investment group that wanted to meet with the new Government of Bermuda and to discuss current

economic conditions in Bermuda." [*Official Hansard Report*, 31 May 2013, page 1205]

Later in this statement, the Honourable Premier says, "This was our first contact with this group." [Ibid]

My, my, my. Oh, really? Okay. So, that is what the Premier said to the House, Mr. Speaker. Now, let us find out what the wealthy individual from Maryland said.

He said, this is quoting from today's *Bermuda Sun*, "Mr Landow said the political contributions were made after an OBA political consultant solicited him for the donations through a Maryland-based lobbyist. After that solicitation, Mr Cannonier flew to the US to meet with Mr. Landow . . ."

So, in May it was the "first contact," but in 2012, they had met. Falsehoods to Parliament, Mr. Speaker. The Ministerial Code of Conduct is very clear.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Honourable Member. Premier?

POINT OF ORDER [Misleading]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: The Honourable Member is obviously misleading the House. If you read the Statement, it exactly says as he said. This was our first time meeting, *our* first time. The group that we took together meeting with the group that was with Landow—*our* first time.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. E. David Burt: My, my, my. It depends . . . It depends . . . Well, what is interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that Mr. Landow, the—

The Speaker: Just a minute.

We are going to stop because people who are sitting in the audience need to understand that they make *no* . . . I do not want to see people reacting to what is going on on the floor of this House! Otherwise, I will ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to help you outside. You sit there, watch what is going on, listen to what is going on and that is it.

Honourable Member.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that the Premier's defence is that he meant *our* and not *my*. Amazing! But yet it is not surprising!

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. E. David Burt: I am wondering . . . I am wondering . . . It is no surprise where he got it from, because it just so happens that Mr. Nathan Landow was involved in the Monica Lewinsky scandal with Bill Clinton! And remember the famous thing that was coined there? *It depends on what the definition of "is" is.*

But what we have found now, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier is splitting hairs, because he is saying, *No, it was our first contact.* He never told this Parliament that he had met with Mr. Landow before. And every single time he has had the occasion, he denies it. But let me go on, Mr. Speaker, because there is plenty more.

Now, we have seen the Premier's explanation and, as they call it, *half-truth.* Well, Mr. Speaker, you know what happens when you type in *omission of fact* inside of Google? The first word that comes up in the search . . . I will let the people at home do that for themselves, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me go on, because in the May 14th . . . Sorry. But in Parliament, and I brought this up before, the people's representatives—us—are not the only people who are on the receiving end of the Premier's falsehoods. As I said before, it is his own chairman who also has been given half-truths, not the complete information, different stories that call into [question] the trust of what has been said by the Premier. But, Mr. Speaker, because of a point of order, I do not have to go to that.

But what I will say is let us move to the next point of half-truths and falsehoods which have been exposed [concerning] the Premier. Because last week, the Premier said, and I quote, "I flatly refute the allegation that I requested any monies from U.S. developer, Mr. Nathan Landow," end quote. [[Royal Gazette](#)]

Last week Friday, in Parliament, he said, and I quote, "The fiction is the accusations and innuendoes," end quote. [[Official Hansard Report, 9 May 2014](#), page 1962]

Fictions, Mr. Speaker! Today, even today, on ZBM News, he said, "I didn't request any money."

But today, today, we hear, as I said before, that after that solicitation, Mr. Cannonier flew to the United States to meet with Mr. Landow for a fundraising meeting. And then, after that, money was given to the Bermuda Political Action Club. But he never requested any money? I mean, they just came there and telepathically they said, *Oh, we're going to give \$300,000 to this account!*" No one is going to say what account it came from; it is just magically going to show up in an account.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Again, the Honourable—

The Speaker: Just a minute, Premier. Okay. All right. Carry on.

POINT OF ORDER

[*Misleading*]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I can categorically say I asked for *no monies* while we were away. No monies in any meeting!

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

[*Inaudible interjections*]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Period!

The Speaker: Carry on.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier's ability to magically create \$300,000 in an account in Bermuda is such that he does not need to ask for it and it shows up, then I will expect him to magically create 2,000 jobs tomorrow. But I do not believe that is going to happen, Mr. Speaker.

If the Honourable Premier is really going to get up and try to convince us that after flying to . . . The developer has already said that it was part of a fundraising trip. The person has admitted it! And now he is going to say that *we did not ask for the money?* It is no surprise, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Premier is standing up on that side alone!

But now, Mr. Speaker, what I will say to the Honourable Members on that side is, silence, absolute silence about the claims, silence about the falsehoods, silence about the changing stories and silence about the incorrect information given to this Parliament that never once has the Honourable Premier had the decency and respect to correct the record for this Parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, people have said it before. Once is a mistake. Twice is a coincidence. And three times is a pattern. Mr. Speaker, the people have seen this pattern. And it is clear for all to see.

Mr. Speaker, is it not interesting that today, all of a sudden, Mr. Landow comes out of the woodwork trying to clean up the mess, trying to set it okay, trying to cover it all up and say this? And it is no coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier's very own version of Olivia Pope, Mr. Derrick Green in his fancy bow-ties, is here on the Island all of a sudden!

An Hon. Member: Whoa!

Mr. E. David Burt: And now Mr. Landow, who cannot be found, all of a sudden appears and starts cleaning up the stuff. *No, the Premier never asked for money. No, that never happened.* We get this nice little corroboration.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you something. The people of this country are not buying it. And, Mr. Speaker, I know that there are Members on that side that are not buying it either! Because it strains credibil-

ity to believe that we would have \$300,000 that the Premier never asked for magically appear in an account that was opened by the Minister of Home Affairs, the Honourable Michael Fahy (who sits in another place), and controlled by Derrick Green, the Premier's political consultant, and Mr. Stephen DaCosta, the Premier's business partner, all of a sudden just shows up in this account!

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker!

The Speaker: Honourable Member.
Premier?

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Again, misleading the House. Stephen DaCosta is not my business partner.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea who Stephen DaCosta is. And you know why I do not know who Stephen DaCosta is, Mr. Speaker? Because every time the Premier has had the chance to clarify who Mr. Stephen DaCosta is, he pleads the Fifth. He refuses to answer the question. So it is very nice that he can stand up on a point of order. But seeing that this is his motion, Mr. Speaker, maybe [he] will clear the record for everyone.

Now, he may say that Mr. Stephen DaCosta is not his business partner. But let me quote the *Think [Media]* Bermuda article. And it says, and I quote, "DaCosta's role is unclear. But [the source] insists that he travelled with the Premier to Washington, D.C., on a number of occasions before the Jetgate trip and has been there since. Steve is everywhere. In this country, we call him *the bagman*."

So, I will now refer to Mr. Stephen DaCosta as the Premier's bagman, seeing that I cannot call him his business partner. And now, Mr. Speaker, for those who do not know, the *Oxford [English] Dictionary* definition of "bagman" is, and I quote, "an agent who collects or distributes the proceeds of [illegal] activities."

An Hon. Member: What?!

Mr. E. David Burt: That is how he is known in the United States, Mr. Speaker.

Now, how is this man just showing up? How does he control an account that is supposedly getting money donations from a contributor to the One Bermuda Alliance campaign, which comes here?

And it is even better, Mr. Speaker. It is even better. An account that the chairman of the party does not know about! How is that possible, Mr. Speaker?

And—and, Mr. Speaker—that tonight ZBM News is reporting that Mr. DaCosta got most of the \$300,000 for, and I quote, "work on the 2012 election campaign."

Well, Mr. Speaker, you can buy a lot of gas for \$300,000, let me tell you.

Some Hon. Members: Whoa!

[Desk thumping and inaudible interjections]

Mr. E. David Burt: A whole lot of gas.

So, Mr. Speaker . . . can you tell me how much time I have left, please, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Three minutes.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, with this investigation that is going on, it is amazing because, as Honourable Members have said before, what are you investigating? The chairman called an investigation, which we have heard caught most of the Members of the OBA by surprise. I mean, I guess it is good that it seems that somebody in the One Bermuda Alliance says, and as he says, he gives . . . there is some validity to the story from *Think Media*. The chairman believes so, and the chairman is following up.

Clearly, the fact that monies [which] were donated to the One Bermuda Alliance ended up in the name of a Political Action Club, which cannot really exist in Bermuda, Mr. Speaker . . . You can barely go down the street and open an account. They ask you for all forms of identification. I am certain no one opened an account in [the name of] Bermuda Political Action Club. It had to be opened in someone's name. When you send an international wire transfer, you do not just send it to accounts. You have got to put an account name on it, and it has to match.

So I am quite certain that it was not sent to the Bermuda Political Action Club. It was sent to somebody. And the Premier knows who it was sent to. And I am certain that the [interim] Chairman of the One Bermuda Alliance election campaign, Mr. Michael Fahy, knows who it was sent to (the Senator who sits in another place). But I am certain that there are a lot of Members on that side do not know who it was sent to. So I hope tomorrow when they meet, Mr. Speaker, they will ask the question—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Again, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. He is making an assumption that monies went to a particular individual. That is an assumption!

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: All right. All right, Premier. Thank you.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I will continue. Because the monies . . . Here is what we do know: Three hundred thousand dollars were transferred to Bermuda. Here is what we do know. What we do know is that the account was controlled by the Premier's bagman and the Premier's political consultant. That is what we do know. So the Premier can say whatever he likes. But those are the facts. That is what we know. But what we do not know is what the money was used for and why it was sent.

So now, Mr. Speaker, let me close with this. And I am going to quote the Premier, because we have heard the denials before. And this is the Premier from February 19th. And he said, and I quote, "You've had much to keep you busy recently, with the number of allegations being hurled at my colleagues and me, allegations which I have already condemned unequivocally as completely untrue . . .

"Bermuda you know who I am. You know my faith in the Lord. You know my family. You know Craig Cannonier. I urge you to reason with yourself and do not let the headlines and allegations change what you know." [[Bermuda Sun](#), 19 February 2014]

Mr. Speaker, the headlines are clear, and the people now know that this Premier cannot be trusted.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MP Marc Bean, you have the floor.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good evening.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good evening to my honourable colleagues, and good evening to the people of Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, today is the most shameful of days in the political life of our country.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: With Jetgate and the sulphur attached to its manifestation, I held out a minute,

meagre morsel of hope that at least one, just one, of the 19 elected representatives of our current One Bermuda Alliance Government—just one, not two, just one—would have the courage to hold their own to account. Just one. Alas, Mr. Speaker, to my eternal disappointment, our hopes have been dashed.

Mr. Speaker, instead, what we have heard from those who had the gumption to take to their feet and speak on this Motion to Adjourn was nothing short of childish, arrogant and ignorant, a trifecta of self-destructive characteristics—a trifecta, Mr. Speaker.

Surely, everyone who has heard this debate and followed this saga, surely after today with the silence and/or ignorance, childishness and arrogance displayed from the Government benches . . . surely the people will say, *Wow. There exists no courage in our Government.* In fact, what we have witnessed is the antithesis of courage. What we have witnessed is cowardice, nothing but cowardice.

Mr. Speaker, all this has led from a culture of dishonesty and deceit. The Psalmist, as contained in the Holy Writ, waxed lyrical when he said, *Unless the Lord builds the house, the very builders will toil in vain.* It is nothing about self-righteousness, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Let me show you something. Rest assured, rest assured, rest assured, Bermuda, rest assured, Minister (or former Minister) Sylvan Richards, that this is merely the tip of the iceberg. But you would not know even if it was looking at your face. Rest assured this is only the tip of the iceberg! Unfortunately. Mr. Speaker, we will hope that we will be able to put this dark chapter, of political shenanigans and skulduggery—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I have been listening here very patiently.

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: That Honourable Member is [imputing] improper motives. He is way out of line on a lot of what he is saying.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: He knows that he has a history of it, and he should retract some of that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member. Right.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, yes. Let us be—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I am on the off stump!

The Speaker: Yes. You are on the off stump, but make sure that you use the correct language.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I am on the off stump. They chose the bat, Mr. Speaker. And the wicket is taking spin, bunts, turn, and seam. It is taking it all, Mr. Speaker. And I am sticking to the off stump.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Honourable Dr. Gibbons stood to his feet. I just said that this is merely the tip of the iceberg. Unfortunately for our country, if this is not sorted out forthwith, then it is double trouble right round the corner! And again, this is not manufactured by the Progressive Labour Party. As with Jetgate, all information that comes to this House about the lack of good governance from the One Bermuda Alliance emanates from within the One Bermuda Alliance.

Mr. Speaker, rest assured the Waterfront—or Watergate—is 100 times worse than Jetgate.

An Hon. Member: Harbourgate.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Harbourgate, Watergate, Corporationgate—it is 100 times worse than Jetgate. And I know there are a few Members, a handful of Members, on that side who know exactly what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just Jetgate or Watergate that they have to contend with internally. But there are other items, other issues that are emanating from within the One Bermuda Alliance that indicate that the very Minister that jumped to his feet with a point of order, who jumped to his feet to say, *Look, we are tired of all this rehashing!* is going to soon have to look in the mirror himself.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I am just saying, this is coming from . . . this is information from anonymous sources in the One Bermuda Alliance.

[Laughter]

An Hon. Member: Whoa!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: And credible anonymous sources, too. And my Deputy Premier . . . his absence . . . is conspicuous by his absence! But my Deputy Premier, again, it is going to be a case of *Mirror, mirror on the wall*. This is merely the tip of the iceberg. I wonder if there will be any courage from that side of the aisle to put an end to the worst example of governance we have experienced in our entire history.

[Inaudible interjections]

An Hon. Member: Absolute nonsense!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, you know, one thing I have noticed over these last two weeks is that our Learned Attorney General, who is one of the most vociferous and, I would say, skilled debaters in this House, has sat in humble silence. I am going to ask the Attorney General a simple question, because, again, anonymous sources—

The Speaker: This is not . . . this is not . . . this is not Question Period.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: It is not questions, but I will yield, Mr. Speaker, because rumours have been spreading. And I want to clear the rumours because I do not like to talk around people's backs. But the word coming from the One Bermuda Alliance benches is that our Learned Attorney General has accepted a job at Clarien Bank.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: No point of order?

Nothing?

Silence?

Maybe they did not hear me. The word on the street (borrowing Ray Charlton's favourite phrase, the WEDCO Chairman) is that our Learned Attorney General has accepted a job—accepted, not will accept, or has been offered, but has accepted—a job at Clarien Bank.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Well, my honourable . . . It is interesting because that raises some questions. But then when we know other anonymous sources, especially those that are talking in this Ayo Johnson report, again from those sides of the aisle, Ministers of Government saying similar things, it makes me wonder what degree of loyalty exists. How is it that ones could jump on the plane, go to Four Seasons and carry on this skulduggery for a whole year, and then want to bail out and jump ship?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The honourable Robert Nesta Marley just sprung to mind, *Running, running, running away. But you cannot run away from yourself.* Mr. Speaker, something is afoot.

So let me sum it up. Let me sum it up. One Bermuda Alliance, Honourable Premier Craig Cannonier and his entire Cabinet, you have been found guilty of destroying—destroying—trampling upon the Ministerial Code of Conduct. Guilty as charged. And the prosecution witnesses are your own people.

The sentence that the Code demands is resignations forthwith! Not next week, not next year, right now, right now!

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: No! That is not what I say. That is what the Ministerial Code of Conduct says. But obviously no one, even a year ago, realised that the Ministerial Code existed. Why? Because there is this culture of making rules to break rules. It is a culture to use rules for your own political expediency. But there does not exist a culture of abiding by the rule of law within the One Bermuda Alliance. So you are guilty as charged! And the Code demands you to tender your resignations.

What integrity, what little integrity that exists or is left, I hope—I hope—springs forth and encourages people to do the right thing. Next week, we expect to see internal action to cleanse the sulphuric blood that permeates the OBA/UBP body politic. A blood cleanser—burdock root, dandelion root, something!—because the whole body is contaminated, Mr. Speaker. Nothing less is acceptable for our part. Rest assured, for our part, we will carry out our constitutional responsibilities to the fullest extent. We will take all steps necessary to ensure that the code of conduct is upheld and the integrity of this Honourable Chamber is enhanced or rebuilt. We will do everything necessary if we do not see action from what appears to be a haven of cowardice.

We are not going to wait. I do not think the people are going to wait, Mr. Speaker. Someone or some group will be held to account. Rest assured of that. And this is no pontificating. This is not shadow-boxing. This is the real deal. Rest assured. We are not going any further with this issue, Mr. Speaker. It is either they act, or the people will act. They put us here, they will remove us, Mr. Speaker.

For our part, we will carry out our mandate by those who put us here, who have trust in us to carry out and support their interests. And we will not rest if this high degree of cowardice, this high degree of cowardice continues to subjugate courage. We will not rest for one minute.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member. Mr. Premier? The Premier has the floor.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, we have certainly heard some colourful things this evening, Mr. Speaker. And I think, as I have listened this evening, of the analogy of living in a box. Just going around in the box, Mr. Speaker. Cannot think of anything else to say. Same repetitive message over and over and over.

Yes. When all I have to do is do a bit of research, Mr. Speaker. I can go back to February the 1st in 2012 when the then-Premier was asked to answer some questions about taxpayers' money, when the Auditor General's report came out, only to read through the report, refused to answer questions!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: And then to hear from Honourable Members in this House, who also during that same time, the then-Senator Burt replied on Monday evening, quote, "The Premier has already addressed this issue." The question back was, well, ". . . it was pointed out to him [her statement] did not address the specific points raised in the questions." [Royal Gazette](#), 1 February 2012]

An Hon. Member: Was my name in the report?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Actually, he was. One of them, just one of them. He was only one of them.

Now, at that time, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was not the only Cabinet Minister who failed to respond to questions! The article continues on to say that "PLP backbencher . . ." and I listened very closely to the Honourable Member Dennis Lister refuse to answer questions! And he was the chairman of the BLDC! This is quoted right out of the article. And then to say this is offensive.

Then I read on, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: There were other Honourable Members, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Premier—

The Speaker: Member.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, the Premier, I think unintentionally, is misleading the House. It is not possible for a backbencher, by virtue of being a chairman of a quango, to answer Parliamentary Questions in Parliament. That is for the remit of the Minis-

ter, unless he is speaking of something outside of Parliament. And if that is the case, it is not relevant.

The Speaker: Okay. Thank you.
Carry on, Premier.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: We spin on.

I continue on, Mr. Speaker. "Government Estates Minister Michael Scott," (Honourable Member) "who was the Attorney General during the period . . ." of this time refused to answer questions when contacted! [Ibid]

The Speaker: Premier, what are you referring to?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: I am referring to an article from February the 1st, 2012.

The Speaker: In?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: In the *Royal Gazette*.

The Speaker: Okay.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: And so, I go back to this analogy of the pot attempting to call the kettle black. We are talking about a plane ride that was taken and, quite frankly, this is about taxpayers' money. Okay? This article is about taxpayers' money, that the public wanted to have answers on where the money had gone. No answers! Questions asked repeatedly, over and over—no answers! From a report on the taxpayers' money!

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can be accused of being very zealous about wanting to get a hotel built in this country. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, not to the expense of what I have heard this evening. [I] took a private jet plane ride, yes. Not at the taxpayers' expense. But yet, Mr. Speaker, there was a plane ride back some time ago, and the then-Premier said it was a humanitarian act. And we brought people back that took jobs that Bermudians would have had.

An Hon. Member: That's poor.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes, you can say it's poor.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: And when I heard from the Premier, the Honourable Member at that time, that this was a humanitarian act, I accepted that. Yes. *It was a humanitarian act.* But when questions were asked, *Well, who was on the plane?*, we never got any answers to this day.

An Hon. Member: What?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yep! Questions were asked. *Who was on the plane?* No one answered.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, what about the humanitarian act of seeking out to get investment into this country, to get our hotel built, because we know that that is something that Bermuda at this point in time could use to bring valuable jobs to the table? And so we have seen all the knives being thrown and the drive to cause this perception, Mr. Speaker, avoiding the fact that we have got to get on with the business of this country.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: I am continuing to hear the repetitiveness, Mr. Speaker.

[Gavel]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: We heard about this colt and taking the opportunity to throw up stuff from the past and the history. But yet they do not like when I bring up some of the same history.

Some Hon. Members: Go right ahead!

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. Bringing up about a colt. Well, I want to remind the Honourable Member, especially the Honourable Member Blakeney, because he continues on to go on, *Well, you just won by two seats and by four votes*, he said this evening. I wrote it down exactly as he was speaking. And I know it is a tough pill to swallow in losing that election. But I want to remind them that the very colt that he keeps talking about is the one who won the election over him and took nine seats to win the election!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: So this call about integrity and all of these kinds of things, yet all I have to do is just go in and Google. Where were the Members then when this Auditor General's report came out, who were standing up? No! Everyone was running and hiding and saying, *I am not going to answer any questions! I am not going to answer any questions!* And there are Honourable Members in this House who were there during that time, and there are more names in here who refused to answer questions.

But yet, we sit here and we want to cast a shadow on the integrity of this country.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, where was the integrity of this country? Where was the integrity of this country when the former Government drove away business, Mr. Speaker, from this country? Thousands of people left this country! So we inherit a car, Mr. Speaker—

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: —no fuel in it. No oil in it. No gas in it. No, no gas in it. No gas in it, Mr. Speaker! And we look under the hood. And we are continuing after 16 months to help repair the issues this country has.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: The issues that this country has, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Members!

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: And so we continue on to cackle, *Nobody is buying this*. Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that they would love to be able to have an election today. I get that. I get that, Mr. Speaker. But I need to remind them that the people have already spoken. And their opportunity to speak again will be the next election. So we can continue on repeating the same old stuff from week after week, from month after month, Mr. Speaker.

The point is, *We do not want to answer any questions when it comes to taxpayers' money*, and this country has been crying out, *Where has all the money gone? Where has all the money gone?*

An Hon. Member: Look at the infrastructure.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes, and we go back to the infrastructure.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Well, I can tell you there were many questions asked about the building of the infrastructure of this country, but with no questions answered!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Well, I am glad the Honourable Member just said that, because I want to go—

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Are you going to talk about Jetgate? Are you going to talk about Jetgate? You got that off your chest. Now talk about—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Since the Honourable Member Weeks spoke out, he is quoted in the same article as refusing to answer, the exact same article!

So what we need to do, Mr. Speaker, as we have grabbed ahold of this runaway train, and I know—

An Hon. Member: Or runaway jet!

[Laughter]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Not paid by the taxpayers, that is for sure.

The Speaker: Just a minute.
Honourable Members—

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: But the runaway train—

The Speaker: Hold on, Premier, please. Hold on.
Honourable Members, everyone, we have all had a chance to really express ourselves, give our opinions. Let us close out. Give the Premier an opportunity to answer, whether we agree or not.
Premier, carry on.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
This runaway train that we have grabbed ahold of *is* the taxpayers' money that this country is very much concerned about!

[Inaudible interjections]

Some Hon. Members: Where's the \$300[,000]?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: And then they continue on, *Where's the \$300[,000]?* Well, you know what? The Honourable Member Zane . . . I know that he was probably at that time, for the campaign, he was head of the . . . Were you head of the finance for the party?

[Inaudible interjections]

An Hon. Member: None of your business!

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: No? There you go! *None of your business*. There you go. That is the answer right there.

So when it concerns the OBA and donations, *None of your business! None of your business!*

So what we need to do, Mr. Speaker, as we arrest this runaway train, is remind ourselves that there is an upturn in real estate, first quarter of 2014, outperforming the same period in 2013; that there are new international company formations up 21 per cent first quarter of 2014.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes, we have stats that came out about unemployment, where it had gone down a percentage.

An Hon. Member: A percentage?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes, it had gone down a percentage. Payroll tax is up marginally, yes.

An Hon. Member: Payroll tax is up?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Yes. More people are paying into payroll tax.

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Mr. Speaker, our job is to ensure, collectively, that we get investment into this country and that we do it collectively. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.
The House is adjourned to Friday, May the 23rd. Thank you.

[Gavel]

[At 9:06 pm, the House stood adjourned until 10:00 am, Friday, 23 May 2014.]

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. E. David Burt: When the Honourable Premier starts quoting stats which are wrong, I will say he is misleading the House, because he knows that more people are not paying into payroll tax, because there were questions answered by the Minister of Finance which said the exact opposite. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.
Premier?

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that clarification.

Payroll taxes for 2013 are up marginally. Custom duty is up 16 per cent. So, maybe he can swallow that.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to go on. We will continue to fight on behalf of this country to ensure that we get us back on track. That is the goal of this Government, and that is our agenda, to get people back to work. And yes, Mr. Speaker, it is our agenda to get a hotel built. And we will continue to fight for that. And hopefully, there will be good news, Mr. Speaker, very soon, of the hotel potentially getting built.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: Mr. Speaker, I leave us this evening with this message: That the enemy is not within.

An Hon. Member: It is us.

[Laughter]

Hon. L. Craig Cannonier: They are outside.

[Inaudible interjections]

BERMUDA HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT****23 MAY 2014****10:01 AM***Sitting Number 21 of the 2013/14 Session**[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]***PRAYERS***[Prayers read by Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker]***ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER****HOUSE VISITOR****The Speaker:** Good morning, Honourable Members.

Just before we start, I want to take the opportunity to recognise in the Chamber the former Speaker of the House, the Honourable Ernest DeCouto, who is present today.

*[Desk thumping]***CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES****16 May 2014****The Speaker:** We have confirmation of the Minutes of the 16th of May 2014. All Members should have received the Minutes.

Are there any objections or corrections to those Minutes? And if there are none, the Minutes are confirmed.

There are no objections, so the Minutes are confirmed.

*[Minutes of 16 May 2014 confirmed]***MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR****The Speaker:** There are no messages from the Governor.**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER
OR MEMBER PRESIDING****APOLOGIES****The Speaker:** We have some Members absent. Mr. Glen Smith is absent, visiting his son's graduation. Ms. Gordon-Pamplin is at a conference. Ms. Lovitta Foggo and Ms. Jeanne Atherden are at the CWP [Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians] meeting in the Bahamas. Mr. L. Craig Cannonier is absent.

Members, I have here, which I will read, a letter from Mr. John Barritt, which reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. Speaker:

"Re: Former Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Hon. F. John Barritt, CBE, JP.

As "I write on behalf of my family to thank yourself and all Honourable Members of the Assembly for the very kind tribute which you paid to our father last Friday in the House. We are particularly grateful for the gracious and wonderful remarks you made as Speaker, at the outset, in remembrance of our father and the service which he gave the country through the Legislature, particularly during his time in the chair in which you now sit.

"We believe our father would have been honoured and touched by the comments of all Members. I believe he would have also cautioned Members against exaggeration and reminded some not to mix apples with oranges. You will know that he believed good humour was also necessary to running a good House.

"Again, thank you, and we look forward to reading and making copies of all your remarks from Hansard. It will make good memories.

"Yours sincerely, John Barritt", former Member of this House.

*[Pause]***MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE****The Speaker:** There are no messages from the Senate.**PAPERS AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS TO THE HOUSE****The Speaker:** The Chair will first recognise the Honourable Minister for Economic Development and Education, Minister Dr. Grant Gibbons. You have the floor.**Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.**The Speaker:** Good morning.**ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS (REGULATORY
AUTHORITY FEES) REGULATIONS 2014**

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to attach and submit for the consideration of the Honourable House of Assembly the Electronic Communications (Regulatory Authority Fees) Regulations 2014, proposed to be made by the Minister of Education and Economic Development under the provisions of section 44 of the Regulatory Authority Act 2011. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Are there any objections?

Thank you, Minister. It will be laid.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Minister of Finance, Minister Bob Richards. You have the floor.

GOVERNMENT FEES AMENDMENT (NO. 2) REGULATIONS 2014

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with the Governor's recommendation and in accordance with section 36(3) of the Bermuda Constitution, I have the honour to attach and submit for the consideration of the Honourable House of Assembly the Government Fees Amendment (No. 2) Regulations 2014, proposed to be made by myself, the Minister of Finance, under the provision of section 2 of the Government Fees Act 1965.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Are there any objections to that?

There are none.

Thank you.

PETITIONS

The Speaker: There are no petitions.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: Just before we move on to Statements by Ministers, I want to take this opportunity to recognise also in the Gallery two Senators, Senator Jardine and Senator Dillas-Wright.

[Desk thumping]

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS AND JUNIOR MINISTERS

The Speaker: We now move to Statements by Ministers.

The Chair will first recognise the Honourable Premier. Premier Michael Dunkley, you have the floor.

CARF ACCREDITATION OF THE WOMEN'S TREATMENT CENTRE

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Good morning, Mr. Speaker, and good morning, colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that the [Women's Treatment Centre](#) received a three-year International Accreditation award from the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities International (or better known as CARF), and this is the highest level of achievement. This accreditation award is valid through March of 2017, Mr. Speaker.

The Women's Treatment Centre was awarded accreditation for the categories of Community Housing: Alcohol and Other Drugs/Addictions (for Adults) and for Residential Treatment: Alcohol and Other Drugs/Addictions (for Adults). Mr. Speaker, the Community Housing unit is located in Southampton. It has the capacity to house eight women and assists them in re-integration into the community following intensive residential treatment. This programme is a critical element in ensuring sustained success in the recovery of our women. Currently, there are four residents in this community home.

Mr. Speaker, the Residential Treatment programme, located at the Nelson Bascome [Centre] for Substance Abuse Treatment, is a 12- to 18-month intensive programme with the goal of providing quality habilitative and rehabilitative services for women affected by substance use disorders. This is accomplished through comprehensive and holistic substance abuse treatment approaches and the provision of culturally sensitive client-centred and gender-specific services, which promote long-term recovery.

The programme has the capacity to house 12 clients. Currently, there are six residents in-house, with two others in the process for admission. At the same time, there are six clients participating in after-care, Mr. Speaker.

CARF International is an independent non-profit organization focused on advancing the quality of services to meet the needs of persons served and to achieve the best possible outcomes. CARF International provides accreditation services worldwide in the areas of rehabilitation for a disability, treatment for addiction and substance abuse, home and community services, retirement living, and other health and human services.

Mr. Speaker, CARF not only assesses treatment programming, but also assesses the physical environment, governance, leadership, strategic planning and outcome evaluation systems. A service provider such as the Women's Treatment Centre earns accreditation by demonstrating conformance to CARF's standards through documented policies and procedures, as well as by providing proof of processes via a rigorous onsite survey, which includes interviews with persons served and external partners.

Mr. Speaker, in 2009, the Women's Treatment Centre was the first facility in Bermuda to meet the standards of CARF International with an award of accreditation, and this is now the second consecutive time that this facility has been surveyed by external surveyors and granted the *gold seal*, the highest level for quality services, for three years.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that in December 2013, the NDC [National Drug Control] Act was passed in the House, with the requirement that Government treatment facilities be subject to accreditation. This achievement shows Government's commitment to providing quality rehabilitation services to those suffering from drug and alcohol abuse and to returning healthy and productive citizens back to our community. This achievement also supports one of the action plans of the National Drug Control Master Plan 2013–2017.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the staff of the Women's Treatment Centre and its leader, Mrs. Angria Bassett, for this high level of achievement. Their collective passion for assisting women in recovery and their expertise have served to ensure the continued adherence to the highest level and quality of care provided by this programme. I wish to assure Honourable Members and the public that we will continue to support the Department of National Drug Control in its leadership in ensuring the availability of quality substance abuse treatment for the people of Bermuda.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Premier.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Community, [Culture and Sports] Minister R. W. Scott. Minister Scott, you have the floor.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.

The Speaker: Good morning.

BERMUDA DAY 2014

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Mr. Speaker, [Bermuda Day](#) is a special public holiday like no other. It is for that reason that I rise today to encourage my honourable colleagues and the people of Bermuda to take time to celebrate Bermuda Day, which in many ways embodies the essence of Bermudian culture and character, and it is the culmination of a month-long celebration of our heritage.

Mr. Speaker, culture is not static. Although we associate culture with tradition, heritage and history, I would like to remind us that culture is also transformative, because it perpetuates itself through creativity and expression. For example, who could have known that the pulsating Gombey drumbeat, the colourful Bermuda shorts and our beloved Cup Match, which all

had their genesis as a form of expression, would ultimately become iconic symbols of our culture and heritage?

Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that we must also embrace and celebrate our youth, as through their energy and creativity the Bermudian culture of the future will be born. We must strive to understand their expressions of music, art, dress, food and language. As members of an older generation in our society, we owe our youth the freedom of exploring new avenues of cultural expression whilst at the same time valuing what we know and appreciate as traditional aspects of our heritage.

Mr. Speaker, my Ministry, and in particular, the Department of Community and Cultural Affairs, is spearheading the development of a National Cultural Heritage Policy which I plan to share with this Honourable House upon completion later in this fiscal year. The aim of this policy is to encourage a more holistic and multifaceted approach toward incorporating aspects of our heritage into the lives of all Bermudians.

Such a wide-reaching stance will call for collaboration with a number of partners in both the public and private sector, including, but not limited to, other Government Ministries, museums, art galleries, tradition-bearers and artisans of every kind. As a people, we must value our culture, both in the way we celebrate it for ourselves, as well as how we choose to share it with the world.

It is my hope that the policy will engender an even greater appreciation of our culture and heritage than what currently exists, and will motivate our youth to create new modes of cultural expression, some of which, over time, will become new cultural icons.

Mr. Speaker, the theme for Heritage Month 2014 is *Bermuda's Historical Treasures*. This theme was chosen to draw attention to some significant aspects of our collective cultural heritage. Thus, the spotlight is focused on some of our treasures. We know that our unique cultural heritage has in many ways been shaped by our environment—in particular, our connection with the sea—and by our beliefs and practices that have evolved over centuries, as reflected in our people, our architecture, our foods, artistry and our music.

Mr. Speaker, Bermuda Day is about being Bermudian. This year Bermuda Day will be celebrated on Monday, the 26th, as we all know.

The Bermuda Day Parade route will be the same as last year. The parade will begin at 1:30 pm, starting along Marsh Folly Road, and will continue right through to the top of Cedar Avenue. The parade will then make a left turn onto Church Street, followed by a right turn onto Court Street. Thereafter, the parade will move through Front Street and up Queen Street, and disperse following final performances at the City Hall Car Park.

Mr. Speaker, for the safety of the public, as the parade reaches the top of Queen Street, the floats will make a right turn onto Church Street and park in front of City Hall and remain there on display throughout the afternoon. The dance trucks, however, must make a left turn onto Church Street and then a right turn onto Wesley Street, where dancers will disperse at the performance site at the City Hall Car Park, and then continue on through the city via Park Road.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the afternoon Heritage Day Parade, the morning sporting events will start at 8:40 am with the Sinclair Packwood Memorial Cycle Race, which I am proud to say that I myself have won three times, albeit some years ago.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: You are absolutely right.

Mr. Speaker, the Appleby Half Marathon will start at 9:00 am at the junction of Cambridge and Somerset Roads. This event, which has been [a contest] for over 100 years, will see over 900 runners make their way to the finish line at Bernard Park. However, it is expected that before the senior runners reach Hamilton, the Junior Heritage Classic will start at 9:40 am on Front Street.

Mr. Speaker, the Junior Heritage Classic has taken place for the past 16 years and involves junior runners between the ages of 8 to 14 years. This increasingly popular sporting event is organized by the West End Athletic Club and attracts between 60 and 75 participants.

Mr. Speaker, for members of the public who are not able to stand on the sidelines and cheer their favourite participants, I am pleased to inform everyone that CITV will provide live TV coverage, and we will be streaming live coverage of the Heritage Day Parade. The web address is www.citv.gov.bm. Our hosts will be Keevil "the Captain" Burgess and Tina Evans-Caines of CITV.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of the staff at the Department of Community and Cultural Affairs, as well as those in the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation for all of the hard work that they undertake preparing for the Bermuda Day cultural and sporting activities.

As I take my seat, I would like to also take this time to wish all of Bermuda's residents an enjoyable and safe Bermuda Day holiday. I encourage us all to display the courtesy and respect to our fellow residents and visitors that our Island has become so famous for over the years, while enjoying the festive mood and celebrations over the upcoming weekend and holiday.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Finance. Minister Bob Richards, you have the floor.

MOODY'S INVESTOR SERVICES ADJUSTMENT TO BERMUDA'S CREDIT RATING

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will recall that on May 19th, 2014, [Moody's Investors Service](#) downgraded Bermuda's rating from A1 to Aa3 and changed the outlook to *stable* from *negative*.

The Ministry of Finance recognises that continuing Government deficits and weak economic growth could put Bermuda's sovereign rating at risk of a downgrade by one notch. One of the key drivers stated as the reason for the downgrade is the persistent economic recession.

I am somewhat comforted, however, that Moody's has attached a *stable* outlook to the rating. This rating action follows Standard & Poor's action in April this year when they affirmed our AA-/A-1+ long- and short-term issue credit ratings with a *negative* outlook.

Mr. Speaker, while the Moody's rating adjustment is disappointing news, I would like to advise Honourable Members that the adjusted rating remains in the upper medium investment grade. It is important to note that Bermuda continues to receive high ratings from all three major rating agencies and currently holds a credit rating of AA- from Fitch, which is the fourth-highest rating, and AA- from Standard & Poor's, which is also the fourth-highest rating.

Mr. Speaker, Moody's continues to endorse the Island's institutional strength and governance programme for prudent fiscal management, and Government remains optimistic about future prospects for growth and will manage the economy accordingly.

The Moody's press release issued on May 19th stated, "Although Moody's expects real output to return to growth in 2014," which is in line with Government's expectations, "the recovery will be fragile because the reforms the government has implemented over the past year to incentivize the international business and tourism sectors (Bermuda's main drivers of growth) are likely to have a gradual impact over the next five years."

The *stable* outlook was attributed in part to this Government's commitment to deficit reduction, as exemplified by our medium term expenditure framework, also known as MTEF. The Moody's release further stated, and I quote, "The MTEF delineates a clear plan to rein in the fiscal deficit and, if fully implemented, is likely to stabilize the debt-to-GDP and interest payments-to-revenues ratios."

Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to note that Moody's has recognised that we are undertaking a variety of measures aimed at economic revitalisation

and deficit reduction. But as they stated, this will take time.

In closing, I would like to advise Honourable Members that the Government will continue to press ahead with our jobs and economic turnaround plan that strikes a balance between responsible growth and disciplined financial management. As the Minister of Finance, I remain committed to creating an economy that works for everyone, and returning our public finances to a stable position.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable and Learned Member, the Minister for Tourism and Transport. Minister Crockwell, you have the floor.

ST. GEORGE'S TOURISM DEVELOPMENT SITE

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, and good morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to inform and update this Honourable House on the significant progress this Government has made on the [St. George's Tourism Development Site](#).

Mr. Speaker, we have very exciting news to share today that is a testament of our focus and efforts to create an inviting business environment to attract inward investment and private sector jobs for Bermudians.

We are extremely pleased to announce a decision has been made to enter into an exclusive negotiation period with international resort hotel developer, Desarrollos Hotelco Group, to construct a world-class full-service resort on the St. George's tourism development site. Desarrollos is an experienced Venezuelan real estate and hotel development group. The company was founded in 1997, and over the years, Desarrollos has developed many commercial, residential and hospitality real estate projects in Latin America and the Caribbean region.

Mr. Speaker, the exclusive negotiation period will allow the Government and Desarrollos to meet with both internal and external stakeholders, negotiate terms, prepare the relevant documentation to finalise agreements to construct and operate a world-class luxury resort development on the 124-acre St. George's tourism development site.

Mr. Speaker, the selection of Desarrollos resulted from a thorough Request for Proposal [RFP] process that had the stated objective "to provide a high quality tourism development that will complement the St. George's UNESCO World Heritage Site designation and accentuate the historical significance of the area while providing economic opportunities for the people of St. George's and Bermuda."

Mr. Speaker, interest was expressed by over a dozen international development and investment companies, which resulted in five written submissions

being received by the Ministry of Tourism Development and Transport by the March 31st deadline.

Each proposal was thoroughly reviewed and evaluated, incorporating a decision matrix that took into consideration the respondents' international experience in successfully financing, building, owning and operating luxury resort developments and their relationships with renowned hotel brands. From this process, two shortlisted finalists emerged and the finalists were required to make oral presentations to the Economic Development Committee.

Mr. Speaker, by no means was it an easy decision, as both shortlisted finalists submitted impressive proposals that were augmented with very detailed oral presentations that highlighted their desire and enthusiasm for the project, but most importantly, their proven ability to deliver projects was evidenced. Ultimately, Desarrollos was chosen.

Mr. Speaker, in 2002, Desarrollos began focusing on the development of luxury hotels, starting with the development and successful opening of the JW Marriot in Venezuela. After the completion of this successful project, Desarrollos has continued developing high-brand luxury hotels, and their development portfolio includes the Marriott Playa Grande and the Renaissance in Venezuela, and this past December, the company opened the 320-room Ritz Carlton Aruba, which also includes a casino and spa.

The company has also recently announced that a Ritz Carlton and a JW Marriott will be constructed in the Turks and Caicos Islands in 2019 and 2020.

Mr. Speaker, Desarrollos has partnership agreements with renowned high-end luxury hotel brands, and they will partner with a preferred management company for this project. The proposed development includes a 238-room hotel and the renovation of the 18-hole Robert Trent Jones-designed St. George's golf course.

The resort development will also include:

- 16 hotel residences;
- 24 golf villas;
- 16 estate residences consisting of three and four bedrooms;
- spa and fitness centre;
- meeting rooms and ball room located in Fort Victoria;
- casino;
- swimming pools;
- pool bar and grill; and
- a specialty restaurant located in Fort Albert.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is indeed exciting news for Bermuda, as the benefits of this development are significant to the revitalisation of our tourism industry, the St. George's community and Bermuda as a whole.

This development has the potential to spur other developments and provide exponential employ-

ment opportunities. Therefore, I strongly encourage Honourable Members and all Bermudians to collectively work together and do our utmost to ensure the success of this project.

Mr. Speaker, I will ensure Members of this Honourable House are kept fully apprised of our progress. Thank you.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Junior Minister. Junior Minister Sylvan Richards, you have the floor.

BRITISH OVERSEAS TERRITORIES CITIZENS (BOTC) PROPOSAL FOR VISA-FREE ACCESS TO THE SCHENGEN AREA

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to advise this Honourable House of the recent approval by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union [EU] permitting [British Overseas Territories Citizens](#) (or BOTCs) passport holders to travel visa-free to the Schengen countries. The amendment comes under Regulation [EC] No. 539/2001 and includes specific categories of British nationals in the Schengen visa exemption list.

Aligned with the new permissions afforded to BOTCs, the other three categories the UK added to the visa exemption list are British Overseas Citizens (BOC), British Protected Persons (BPP) and British Subjects (BS).

Mr. Speaker, it was determined by the European Parliament and Council that the imposition of the visa requirement on nationals of Dominica, Grenada, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, the United Arab Emirates, and Vanuatu is longer justified.

Equally, it was decided that BOTCs (known as British Dependent Territories citizens prior to February 2002), such as Bermuda, the Falkland Islands and St. Helena, should also be exempt, as such nationals are entitled to right of abode in the UK or for British citizenship.

There are approximately 250,000 BOTC nationals based in 14 Overseas Territories around the world. The decision to move toward an expanded exemption list was based on the fact that the aforementioned countries, including several others, do not present any risk of illegal immigration or a threat to public policy and security for the Union in accordance with the criteria set out in the regulation.

Mr. Speaker, according to the UK Government, the change has removed the anomaly that saw a small number of British nationals requiring a visa to visit the area. The UK Government identified a short summary list of other benefits this change brings. These include:

- border control is more straightforward, as all categories of British nationals will be treated the same;
- the exemption list will pose a negligible risk of irregular migration;
- people-to-people contacts will be encouraged—for example, ease of travel for tourists and greater potential for trade benefits; and
- intra-Caribbean travel will be facilitated, as BOTCs residing in the UK Caribbean Overseas Territories will be able to travel visa-free to other European Union Caribbean Overseas Territories.

Mr. Speaker, there are currently 26 Schengen countries, which include 22 EU countries and four non-EU countries. Travel to the Schengen countries allows for stays for up to 90 days in a 180-day period. With an effective date of June 9, 2014, there is much buzz locally, and for Bermuda this is welcome news, as it will simplify business, tourism and family visits for BOTCs to countries such as France and Monaco, Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain, to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Immigration has had inquiries from the general public already, asking for supporting documentation to assist with travel to Schengen countries. Through dialogue with Government House, I can confirm that the only proof that one requires is a BOTC passport, which will allow for unhindered landing in a Schengen country.

As with any change, sometimes it takes time for key stakeholders to embrace it. To this end, persons who have a need to travel shortly after June 9th, 2014, and who may be concerned with being landed in a Schengen country, the Department of Immigration suggests that such persons print off the information pertaining to the exemption by searching online and typing in “Official Journal of the European Union—L149/67.” Government House has also posted a message on its Facebook page, and the Honorary Consul’s network have been duly informed, and the Bermuda Airlines representative will be similarly apprised.

Mr. Speaker, finally, whilst we are grateful for the work that MP Walton Brown has advised he undertook—

[Desk thumping]

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: —it is important that the Opposition wait for official notices to be released by the Government so that there is no confusion to the general public.

For example, in this instance, the information reportedly attributed to MP Brown advised that the commencement date was June 4th, 2014. We have been advised by Government House, who is the official source, that the commencement date is, in fact, June 9th, 2014, and not June 4th, 2014.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank [you, Minister.]

The Chair will now recognise the Minister for Economic Development and Education, Minister Dr. Grant Gibbons. You have the floor.

CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE EDUCATION ACT 1996

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, parental involvement in children's education is absolutely essential for the improvement of public education in Bermuda and around the world. It is common knowledge that parental involvement makes a difference in the success of the education of children. Parents are their children's first teachers, they watch them grow and are a consistent source of guidance and support throughout their school careers.

Mr. Speaker, there have been growing voices among parents who state that they want more information, more understanding and more say in their children's education. They want to be part of the change that the public education system is making for our children. I have heard the calls of parents and have responded by asking PTAs and their general membership to engage the Ministry of Education and Economic Development in a public consultation process to amend the Education Act 1996.

Mr. Speaker, the consultation on the proposed amendments to the Education Act brings closure to the series of public meetings held during the fall of 2013 and seeks to introduce School Community Councils as a means to increase parental involvement and improve governance in our maintained schools.

The policy proposals and amendments to the Education Act 1996 are intended to provide a sound legislative foundation for growing meaningful parental involvement within our public school system. Community support is also a key aspect of the proposals because we know that public education is in many respects a shared responsibility of an entire community, and we also know that the Ministry and Department of Education cannot do it alone.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this House should note that, as the consultation is rightly focused particularly on parents, I have opted to communicate directly with parents on the introduction of School Community Councils. I will therefore be meeting with PTAs and other parents on Thursday, May 29th, 2014,

at the CedarBridge Academy to share information about the proposals and to listen and hear their views.

The consultation process will conclude on June 9th, 2014, and both parents and members of the community are invited to send written submissions to the Department of Education by this date. I strongly encourage parents and other interested parties to weigh in on the proposals prior to a final decision being made on the way forward.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the Honourable House that the genesis of the proposed policy and amendments to the Education Act stem from the previous consultation process initiated in the fall of 2013, by the former Minister of Education, Senator Nalton Brangman. During that time, the Ministry presented different options for change. We listened to passionate and concerned voices, and the Ministry responded by committing to come back to parents and the community. This follow-up consultation is the fulfilment of that commitment.

And the content of these proposals reflect careful thought and consideration of the questions and recommendations that arose last fall. I hope that all who came out to the public meetings or provided submissions can see the reflection of their questions, views and recommendations in the revised policy proposals.

Mr. Speaker, to expand a bit on the revised proposals, let me share some information about School Community Councils (or SCCs), which I believe represent the balancing of divergent views on the best way to involve parents and the community in schools. The focus is to keep student achievement in mind because we want a system that holds the best interests of children at heart.

School Community Councils are advisory bodies made up of parents, community representatives and school principals. The SCCs will hold school improvement and student achievement at the centre of their functions. They will provide school communities with transparency around school improvement.

SCCs would be made up of parent and community representatives, in addition to school principals. It is proposed that five School Community Councils be established, representing communities of schools; each SCC would consist of four or five maintained primary and middle schools.

Their membership would include elected parents, totalling four or five parents (depending on the number of schools within the SCC), and a corresponding number of Ministerial appointments of community members. School principals would also sit on SCCs, and they would be *ex officio*.

It should be noted that, whilst SCCs are the preferred approach for every maintained school, the Minister responsible for Education would still retain the right under the Act to appoint boards of governors for individual maintained schools in the future. This aspect of the proposals comes directly from parents

who felt that boards for every school might be an unnecessary burden on individual schools and their communities, but could be a viable option for certain schools at a later point.

These proposals would not affect the Cedar-Bridge Academy or aided schools which have existing boards of governors.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted, School Community Councils would hold school improvement and student achievement at the centre of their functions. Their responsibilities would be (and I will give the list):

- First of all, to consider and offer recommendations on the development of school improvement plans for each member school of the SCC to principals prior to submission to the Commissioner of Education.
- They would also monitor progress of the school improvement plans.
- They would review the objectives of the school's draft budget and advise the principal before the budget is submitted to the Commissioner of Education or his or her designate.
- They would consider and offer recommendations on matters of policy concerning schools to the Board of Education.
- They would consider and give advice to the Commissioner of Education on the involuntary transfer of all teachers, including the principals, to the member schools of each SCC.
- They would develop and approve a written school parent and community involvement policy.
- They would support school–community relations and provide support to the member schools of each SCC.

Mr. Speaker, a common theme throughout the earlier consultation was the need for information-sharing about what is happening at the school level. These proposals give SCCs—who would represent wider school communities—the opportunity to participate directly in the budget process, policy development, and would support parent and community involvement and school–community relations.

And SCCs would provide school communities with transparency around school improvement. This is because they would be directly involved in the school improvement process.

- They would give input and also have a clear understanding of how schools are performing and the specific goals regarding student achievement.
- They would gain more insight into what is happening in their children's schools.
- They would be given regular information on specific actions that are being undertaken by school staff to improve student achievement.

- They would have regular access to data about student progress.
- They would help in the evaluation process of the school improvement plan.

Finally, SCCs would have the right to weigh in on involuntary school transfers of teachers and principals; that is, those transfers initiated by the Department of Education. Principals and teachers who want to transfer out of their school would not need to be considered by SCCs.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to highlight the role of PTAs, as some may be wondering what their roles would be if SCCs were instituted. Active PTAs provide great support to schools. The proposed model for SCCs would see them working closely with PTAs to represent the views of parents and the community to support student achievement. I believe SCCs would help to strengthen the roles of PTAs because parents would now be formally represented in the larger governance structure that supports schools and the public education system.

SCCs would allow the Minister of Education to consider their direct representation on the Board of Education, giving them a greater voice on the oversight of the public education system. Maintained schools have generally been underrepresented thus far on the Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I want to share with this Honourable House the Education Department's ongoing efforts to improve parental involvement. The Department of Education has begun to change the way in which it engages parents, who along with children, are our most important stakeholders.

A Parent Team, comprising educators who are also parents, has been established as an early effort in this regard. The work of this team is to provide the department with the perspectives of parents in all aspects of operations. Additionally, the department will begin to use a customer service approach into all of the key areas in which parents interface (that is, areas such as registration, complaints, consultation, and others). Finally, as outlined during the Budget Debate, the Department of Education will introduce a Parent University in October, to better support parents to assist in the education of their children. Parents can expect to see greater attention to their needs going forward.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage all PTA members, parents and members of the community to read the consultation document, which I have here, that lays out in greater detail the proposals to amend the Education Act 1996. The document can be obtained from the department's website at www.moed.bm. That is www.moed.bm.

I also look forward to seeing all PTA members and other parents at next week's Thursday public school consultation meeting, where they will hear

more about the proposals and have the opportunity to give their views.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you very much, Minister.

That concludes the Ministerial Statements.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The Speaker: There are no Reports of Committees, and that takes us to our Question Period.

[Pause]

QUESTION PERIOD

The Speaker: All right, Honourable Members. We will look first at questions for the Honourable and Learned Minister Shawn Crockwell to provide oral responses to Parliamentary Questions from the Honourable Zane De Silva.

I will recognise the Honourable Zane De Silva.

QUESTION 1: MR. RONALD SUTHERLAND

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Honourable Minister please inform this Honourable House the terms of reference for the consultant, Mr. Ronald Sutherland?

QUESTION 2: MR. RONALD SUTHERLAND

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: And would the Honourable Minister also please inform this House as to the remuneration of Mr. Sutherland, what he will or what he has received, including whether or not the terms of employment include payment of any other expenses like travel, accommodations and meals?

The Speaker: I recognise the Honourable Minister.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member asked two questions, so I am not quite sure if I should pause for any supplementaries after the answers.

The Speaker: Yes. He asked both questions.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: He did.

The Speaker: Yes, yes. Well, that is all right.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: That is fine.

The Speaker: If you would, just answer the question.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Sure.

The Speaker: We will do the supplementaries.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: What you might do is do the first question.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes.

The Speaker: Do the first question. We will do supplementaries, and then do the second question.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I am grateful. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Answering the Member's first question, Mr. Sutherland has been hired through the Investment Division of the Bermuda Tourism Authority [BTA] to provide an investment concierge service specifically related to the St. George's development site project. Services include direct marketing of the site to potential developers and intermediary liaising for the RFP process.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, do you have a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Minister just repeat the last bit of that answer, please?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I will repeat the entire answer.

Mr. Sutherland has been hired through the Investment Division, which is a division of the Bermuda Tourism Authority, to provide an investment concierge service specifically related to the St. George's development site project. The services that Mr. Sutherland provides include, but are not limited to, direct marketing of the site to potential developers and intermediary liaising for the RFP process.

The Speaker: Okay? All right.

I recognise now MP David Burt.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary to the Minister's question.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. E. David Burt: The Minister said that Mr. Ronald Sutherland was hired under the Bermuda Tourism

Authority [BTA]. However, I guess when was he hired, given [that] the Bermuda Tourism Authority did not come into place until this year, he was acting for the Government in 2013?

The Speaker: Minister?

¹**Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell:** I cannot recall the exact date that Mr. Sutherland was retained. But he was hired through the BTA, through the Investment Division, to assist with this process.

The Speaker: Yes?

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister please explain to this Honourable House how could someone be hired by an organisation which did not exist, and participate in meetings with Nathan Landow in March of last year, as Mr. Sutherland did?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member is incorrect in that statement.

The Speaker: All right.

Yes, MP, the Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning to you.

The Speaker: Good morning.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Can the Honourable Minister confirm that Mr. Sutherland participated in meetings with Mr. Nathan Landow?

The Speaker: Yes. Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes. The RFP, there were two RFPs, Mr. Speaker. The first one was given to two developers. Then subsequent to that, Mr. Sutherland was hired by the BTA to create a marketing RFP, and, therefore, went out to about 20 developers.

Subsequent to that . . . and I believe that was last summer. I cannot recall the exact time. But Mr. Sutherland had met with every single . . . He was the concierge between all of the developers, so he did have some form of communications with Mr. Landow.

The Speaker: Yes. The Leader of the Opposition?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Honourable Minister confirm the dates that Mr. Sutherland met with Mr. Nathan Landow?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I have no idea when he spoke to either Mr. Landow or [any] of the other applicants.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
Second question.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you.

In answer to the second question, Mr. Sutherland's compensation for services does not include other expenses such as travel, accommodations and meals. And in keeping with the previously stated BTA policy on salaries and remuneration packages of its employees, these details would not be disseminated.

The Speaker: MP? Yes?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Does the Honourable Minister agree that keeping this financial information away from the people of Bermuda is warranted?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, we—I am sorry. I apologise.

The Speaker: Yes, carry on.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, we have had this discussion on different occasions as it relates to the employees of the Tourism Authority. It is the policy of the Tourism Authority not to disclose the employee confidential information that they have there. And that applies to Mr. Sutherland, who is a consultant for the BTA, specifically assisting in this process.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: The Honourable Minister just said they do not disclose wages of employees. Mr. Sutherland is a hired consultant, not an employee.

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: They are utilising the same policy in relation to Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.
You have had two.

¹ See further information at [page 2092](#)

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that it is his responsibility to approve the policies of the Tourism Authority?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I was consulted, and I did not object to that policy, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I will repeat the question. Is it his responsibility to approve the policies of the BTA? Not *consultation*. Is it his responsibility to approve? meaning the buck stops with the Honourable Minister.

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: No. If the Honourable Member would review the legislation, there were various occasions where the Government must provide approval. But in terms of the policies and the management of the BTA, the responsibility is only consultation.

The Speaker: Yes?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm if indeed Mr. Sutherland and his Hemisphere Group, if that was put out to an RFP?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I do not believe it was, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: My second supplementary on this one?

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: So, in other words, Mr. Sutherland and his Hemisphere Group were sole-sourced?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: My understanding is that the BTA hired Mr. Sutherland. I am not familiar with the Hemisphere Group that he is referring to. But I do not believe that there was any tendering process.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Your second one, yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes, thank you.

Can the Honourable Minister confirm that the One Bermuda Alliance Government has no issue with . . . Being that it is taxpayer funds given to the Bermuda Tourism Authority, the One Bermuda Alliance Government has no issue with the lack of transparency as to how taxpayer funds are allocated?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, we debated the Bill that created the Tourism Authority. We were fulsome in our explanations as to why we believe that an independently managed and run Tourism Authority is efficacious to turn around tourism in this country.

The Speaker: Thank you.
I recognise MP Burt.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, can the Honourable Minister please confirm (because I am just a little bit slow on this) that Mr. Ronald Sutherland was never hired by the Government and was only hired by the Tourism Authority?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: That is confirmed.

Mr. E. David Burt: Supplementary?

The Speaker: Yes, you have a second one.

Mr. E. David Burt: Can the—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of clarification, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: As far as my Ministry is concerned, that is confirmed.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: All right.
Carry on.

Mr. E. David Burt: I . . . I—

The Speaker: You have a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: My supplementary now, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable Member defer to any other Ministers of the House who will confirm that Mr. Sutherland has been hired by anyone inside the Government? The reason why I continue to ask this question, Mr. Speaker, is the Tourism Authority did not come into effect until April 1st, 2014. How could a consultant be hired by an authority before an authority came into effect?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member would know that the official commencement date of the Bermuda Tourism Authority was April 1st of this year. But during the transition period, as we explained in this House through a Ministerial Statement and on multiple occasions, there was an Executive Steering Committee [ESC] that was functioning as the board.

Once the Tourism Board was dissolved, once the Bermuda Tourism Act was passed, we had a transition period. So the ESC operated as the board for the proposed Tourism Authority.

Then we had a project management company that also was working to keep the tourism initiative going. So during that time, they had full authority to run tourism, [and] enter into agreements. We still had to enter into marketing agreements and all the other agreements to function as a tourism destination.

So to be able to progress this very important RFP, the chairman and the ESC thought it prudent to retain professional services to ensure that it was done correctly. And, Mr. Speaker, we have had success, as evidenced by my Ministerial Statement today.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Yes, you have one more supplementary.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, my last one. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Minister having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the Minister . . . He just admitted that this firm was hired by the interim board, which was under the Government's control, not the Tourism Authority. So I ask again, now that the Minister has confirmed that this company, this individual was hired now by this interim board that was under his Ministry, not the Tourism Authority, I would like to know what he was paid. What is his compensation package?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, the Tourism Board was dissolved upon the passage of the Tourism Authority Act. It was dissolved. The ESC and the interim authority operated under the guidelines of the Tourism Authority Act. And therefore the policies that they put in place are the policies that apply to their employees and apply to Mr. Sutherland.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, but you have had your two supplementaries.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: But, Mr. Speaker, he is not . . . That is incorrect! That is factually incorrect!

The Speaker: All right. Okay.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: It is factually incorrect!

The Speaker: Thanks. Thanks, Honourable Member.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: That report was under his Ministry, not the Tourism Authority.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: You cannot make it retroactive!

The Speaker: Honourable Member, thank you!

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: It is not retroactive, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member needs to do a little research before he makes those comments.

The Speaker: Thank you.

You have one more supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, one more.

Mr. Speaker, being that the Honourable Minister has presented all this additional information on the interim board and the transition, can the Honourable Minister tell this Honourable House when was Mr. Sutherland retained?

The Speaker: Minister.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I know the time frame was around last summer. I do not know the exact time. It was summer and beyond. I do not know the exact time and month. I was advised that the service was going to be sought to help assist the RFP process. I can easily ascertain when that would have occurred, and I would advise the Honourable House.

The Speaker: Okay. So you will bring the information?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I can certainly make that request.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Honourable Member from Hamilton Parish, MP Wayne Furbert.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Honourable Minister tell us exactly when the Act came into place?

An Hon. Member: That is public information.

The Speaker: What was that? Sorry? What is the question?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: When did the BTA Act come into place is what he asked, Mr. Speaker.

We were all here, I believe. I do not recall the exact date off the top of my head.

The Speaker: Yes, yes, yes.

That is a part of the record, Honourable Member. I cannot even remember that myself right now. But I am not sure. You can easily find that out.

All right, Members. MP Burt, you had one, so you have . . . This will be your second supplementary.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister is . . . The timeline as of May seems to be getting confused. So I am hoping the Honourable Minister can clarify. He is saying that the Tourism Authority, that this person was hired by the Tourism Authority and that he was not hired by the Tourism Board after the Tourism Authority was passed. However, it seems as though the person was hired even before the Tourism Authority Act was passed.

Therefore, I do not understand where the veil of secrecy is coming into place. If he was hired before the Tourism Authority Act, then surely he can tell us, what are the terms of his employment? If this gentleman was at tourism summits acting on behalf of the Government before we even passed the Tourism Authority Act, he cannot hide behind a veil of secrecy! He must be transparent.

The Speaker: Question, question, question?

Mr. E. David Burt: The question is, Why is he saying that he cannot reveal the salary if the person was hired before the Tourism Authority came into place?

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, I answered the question already. My understanding is that Mr. Sutherland was hired post the passage of the BTA Act.

The Speaker: Okay. All right. Thank you.

All right. Thank you, thank you, Honourable Member. You have already had your two supplementaries, yes.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: All right. Honourable Members, please. Honourable Members, Honourable Members.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I have no problem getting the exact date that Mr. Sutherland was retained.

The Speaker: If you could, I think that would be right. If you could bring that to the House on the next occasion. Thank you.

We now have the question from MP T. E. Lister to the Minister of Health and the Environment, who at the time was the Honourable Trevor Moniz. I believe, Minister Moniz, you will answer the questions; correct? If the Honourable Member would pose the question.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

The Speaker: Good morning.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, actually, I was looking around to see where the person answering the question was.

[Laughter]

QUESTION 1: AMBULANCE STATION AT PORT ROYAL FIRE STATION

Hon. Terry E. Lister: But I see him. I was told there was no Deputy Premier, but he is sitting in the Deputy Premier's seat. I do not know what that means.

However, the question I have for the Honourable Member is, Would the Honourable Minister please inform this Honourable House of the costs associated with providing an ambulance station permanently at the Port Royal Fire Station?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are in the early stages of performing a feasibility study for stationing an ambulance in both the east and the west.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: So we know the costs associated with this will include the vehicles, maintenance, equipment, overhead and personnel. But we need the study to be completed, as we need a defined service model in order to better determine total costs.

The Speaker: MP Lister, you have a supplementary? Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: When do you expect the study to be completed? Any idea when we can expect to see a decision and some movement on this?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the Premier, who sits next to me and serves as the Minister of National Security, is as anxious as you are. We are trying to complete this as quickly as possible. There are, I would say, some friction issues between Ministries. It is a little bit of a complex process, more complex than it appears. But we are working on it, and I can discuss it with that Member offline.

But I would expect within the next few months that this would be finalised.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes, second supplemental.

The Speaker: Second supplementary, yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: I realise it is early days. But at this stage, can an estimate be made of the number of additional staff that would be added to the BHB [Bermuda Hospitals Board] to make this ambulance a reality in the West End?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, we are trying to do this without any additional costs, save for there may be additional costs with respect to the vehicles, but not with respect to the personnel. So we are trying to work out a matching-up of the shifts and the personnel between the hospital and the Bermuda Fire and Rescue Service so there is no additional personnel required—no additional personnel required and no personnel lost either. Obviously, we are dealing with

two separate unions, with the BIU [Bermuda Industrial Union] for the personnel at the hospital who serve in the ambulances, and with the fire and rescue union on their part.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, I want to move to my second question.

The Speaker: Yes?

QUESTION 2: AMBULANCE STATION AT PORT ROYAL FIRE STATION

Hon. Terry E. Lister: However, before I do so, I would like to offer my condolences to the family of Mr. Daniel Laubacher, who lost his life yesterday at the Spar Lane on a motorcycle in the west.

And my second question ties with this tragic event in that the question is, Given the number of cruise ship passengers at the Dockyard annually, has the Minister calculated the positive impact in terms of superior emergency response from having an ambulance situated at the Port Royal Fire Station?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, a specific cost/benefit analysis is not being conducted regarding (to quote) “the positive impact in terms of superior emergency response from having an ambulance [stationed in] the Port Royal Fire Station” (close quote). However, locating an ambulance with the appropriate emergency medical technicians at the Port Royal Fire Station and/or the Clearwater Fire Station will provide residents and visitors with faster transportation to the hospital.

If I might be allowed to elaborate on that a little bit, Mr. Speaker, there are other issues here. With respect to the cruise ships, they do have medical personnel on board and some clinical equipment so that they can treat minor [conditions]. Of course, they have to treat them while they are at sea if someone has an accident or some sort of health problem.

One of the challenges with respect to stationing ambulances at east and west is that, with respect to the population, approximately 70 per cent of the ambulance call-outs are in the central parishes, due to the density of the population in the central parishes. So at either end of the Island, you only have approximately 15 per cent of the emergency call-outs. So you have to make sure to balance. You do not want a situation where you have got two call-outs centrally and only one vehicle, and then you again have the problem of moving vehicles from some distance away before they get to the emergency site. So there is a little bit of a logistical challenge there.

I hope that is helpful, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
MP Lister, supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, given the complete and total significance of our cruise passengers to our tourism position today, and knowing the age profile of our cruise guests, would the Minister explain to this House what the tipping point is that would necessitate a West End ambulance? What is that [tipping] point [at which] you say, *We have to do this*?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, the Minister and Premier informs me, of course, that there are services presently provided out of the Port Royal Station of the Bermuda Fire and Rescue Service. They have EMT trained personnel. The only difference is they are not operating in ambulances; they are operating in fire service vehicles. So they are there to serve people.

But the Government agrees that it would be a better state of affairs if we had properly equipped ambulances. And one of the things with ambulances is that being smaller vehicles, they can get into some of the smaller driveways and lanes, et cetera, and provide a better service.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
All right. Yes, MP?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: I have one question, Mr. Speaker, concerning this particular—

The Speaker: Yes.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Could the Honourable Minister please answer this question? Given the fact that the Lamb Foggo Clinic does exist that can service the East End residents, would the Minister confirm that the feasibility study to be completed can be conducted on the west first, so as to provide a further level of security and comfort for those West End residents?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say I appreciate the apparent frustration of the Members. You know, I have similar sort of frustra-

tion with the . . . You know, we would like to be able to do this a bit more quickly.

But the situation is that what we are looking at at the moment is to station those vehicles at the fire stations, both east and west. So it would be at the Port Royal station and the Clearwater station. So we are not differentiating in any way between either end of the Island. And I appreciate the thrust, that if an ambulance is needed at one end, it is needed at the other end. So, you know, at one end we have the airport; at the other end we have the cruise ships. So, you know, I accept the thrust of the argument, that it is equally required at the West End. And we hope to have it done, you know, within a short time in the future.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

We now move to the Ministerial Statements. The first Statement by the Premier, Premier Dunkley. I will recognise first the Honourable and Learned Member from constituency 34. MP Wilson, you have the floor.

QUESTION 1: CARF ACCREDITATION OF THE WOMEN'S TREATMENT CENTRE

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Honourable Premier please indicate to the House what steps are being taken to ensure that the other Government residential treatment facilities will also become CARF accredited?

The Speaker: Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank the Honourable Member for that question.

I will tackle it in two steps to give clarification. Turning Point at MAWI [Mid-Atlantic Wellness Institute] will be surveyed by CARF in August 2014. And the other ones are certainly on the agenda as well. MAWI is currently certified at the gold standard and has a three-year accreditation, which expires shortly.

As the backdrop to the legislation that was passed, Mr. Speaker, licensing and registration has not started as of yet because there are pending regulations that we have to bring to the House. So that will follow shortly as well.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Wilson?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: A supplemental.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Yes. With respect to the residential treatment programme entitled Nelson Bascome Substance Abuse Treatment Facility, could the Honourable Minister and Premier indicate what steps are being taken to ensure that that programme receives CARF accreditation?

The Speaker: Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In my Statement, Honourable Member, it covers the accreditation of the women's treatment. The men's treatment is shortly to follow on the accreditation as well.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: It does not say that.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: I believe it says it in two parts. The community treatment and the Nelson Bascome treatment.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Actually, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why I asked the question, because it is not referred to.

But in any event, my next question is with respect to the . . . just a moment, Mr. Speaker. If the Honourable Minister and Premier could indicate to us concerning the Nelson Bascome treatment programme, what are the . . . excuse me. Just a moment, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, take your time.

[Pause]

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: [What are the] extent of the strategic planning systems that are in place at that particular programme so that we can ensure compliance?

The Speaker: Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I can address the query earlier about not being covered in the Statement, at the top of page 2, I say, Mr. Speaker (and if you will allow me to repeat it), "The Women's Treatment Centre was awarded accreditation for the categories of Community Housing . . ." And that refers to the community housing programme where there are four residents in place at the present time, and also for residential treatment. That refers to the Nelson Bascome.

If you go to page 3, I refer to the residential treatment programme located at the Nelson Bascome Substance Abuse facility.

Could you repeat that question, the second question?

The Speaker: Thanks. Yes.
MP Wilson?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you.

May I ask the Honourable Minister a point of clarification?

The Speaker: Question, yes.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: The Women's Treatment Centre is also a residential programme. And at page 2, it refers to the Women's Treatment Programme concerning the award and accreditation for community housing and for residential treatment. The Statement goes on to speak about the Nelson Bascome Treatment programme, but does not mention any indication about the level of accreditation, whether or not it is even seeking accreditation and what the status is.

And that leads me to my question, What are the strategic planning systems in place at the Nelson Bascome Substance Abuse Treatment facility to ensure compliance with international standards and accreditation?

The Speaker: Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to go through this for the Honourable Member. But the Statement clearly starts out by saying, "I am pleased to announce today that the Women's Treatment Centre received a three-year International Accreditation award from the Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities International, (or better known as CARF) . . . [which is] the highest level of achievement." That refers to the community programme and also to the residential treatment. I cannot be any more clear than that. And the standards follow from that accreditation.

I am happy to give more information to the Honourable Member offline so that there is better understanding of the programme.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Premier.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you. I am asking that question. And perhaps we can discuss offline. But I know that there are a number of residents that are currently at the Nelson Bascome treatment programme that have equal concerns as to the level of accreditation. And when you continue to read the paper, it speaks to the residential treatment of the Women's Treatment Centre.

I am speaking about the one on the West End named after the Honourable and late Nelson Bascome, that particular treatment programme. What steps are being taken to ensure compliance with international standards concerning CARF? And back to my original question, What are the strategic planning systems being implemented with respect to the Nelson Bascome treatment programme?

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For clarity again, the Women's Treatment Centre is part of the Nelson Bascome. The Men's Treatment Centre is also part of that as well. And that is due for accreditation in December of 2014. CARF requires that all these submissions are done every six months throughout three years of accreditation to keep up with the standards that are set.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Premier.

The Chair recognises the Honourable Member from constituency 33. MP T. E. Lister, you have the floor.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the Women's Treatment Centre—

The Speaker: Is this a supplementary on that? Or your question, yes.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: A question. Sorry.

The Speaker: Right, right.

QUESTION 1: CARF ACCREDITATION OF THE WOMEN'S TREATMENT CENTRE

Hon. Terry E. Lister: With regard to the Women's Treatment Centre in Southampton, can the Premier tell us how many dedicated staff are on board there, people who work solely at that location?

The Speaker: Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I cannot. But I will get the information and get it to the Honourable Member today.

The Speaker: MP Lister?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, this programme has been going for some time now. And I was quite surprised in reading the Statement when it was indicated that there were four residents in the programme.

So the question I have for the Minister is, How many successes (i.e., people who have passed through the programme) occurred during 2013?

The Speaker: Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Honourable Member. I will also get that information for you today.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member from constituency 4. MP Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, the Deputy Speaker, you have the floor.

QUESTION 1: CARF ACCREDITATION OF THE WOMEN'S TREATMENT CENTRE

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the Premier and Minister of this portfolio is, We understand the programme has the capacity to house 12 clients. Can the Premier please clarify or inform us, because I think it is extremely important to understand that help is out there, how do women actually have access to this treatment facility? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you. Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thanks to the Honourable Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it can happen in a number of ways. It can be self-referral. It can be referral by family, physicians or other professionals, or it can be assessed through the Bermuda Assessment Referral Centre. The end part of that, all referrals go through BARC [Bermuda Assessment and Referral Centre]. And BARC agrees on the admission or not.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Premier.

So that completes questions to Premier Dunkley on his Statement.

We now move to the second Statement, by Minister Scott. MP Weeks, did you have . . . MP Michael Weeks, you have the floor.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: BERMUDA DAY 2014

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: I took a good look at this Statement, and the only question I do have for the Minister is that he told this Honourable House a few weeks ago that he was participating. Is he still riding that race?

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: The quick answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no. But it does come with a bit of an explanation.

[Inaudible interjection and laughter]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: As the Opposition Shadow Leader put it, I probably would not make it; I think he is actually correct.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have done that race eight times and never been off the podium. So it would be a bit difficult to have the race finish and still be up in Paget or Warwick somewhere. You know, I was going to use Thursday's race speed practice to just see how I can actually do. And I actually made it to the top of Burnt House Hill with the group at full speed. And then everything came unglued from there, Mr. Speaker.

[Laughter]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Well, the wheels were still on, but I was picturing the sirens and the *Danger, Danger!* and the smoke coming out. Yes, it was not pretty. So I figured that it is such a busy day and I know I am going to have a long day. I should just leave that spot to the up-and-coming youth that look forward to participating in that. So, no. It is not going to happen, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

We now move to the Statement by the Minister for Finance, Minister Bob Richards. The Chair recognises MP David Burt, the Shadow Minister of Finance.

QUESTION 1: MOODY'S INVESTOR SERVICES ADJUSTMENT TO BERMUDA'S CREDIT RATING

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Speaker, again.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Minister's Statement on page 2, where he says, "Bermuda continues to receive high ratings from all three major rating agencies and currently holds the ratings of AA- from Fitch, which is the fourth-highest rating, and AA- from Standard & Poor's, which is the fourth-highest rating," can you please inform this Honourable House which level of rating is the new downgrade from Moody's?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Fifth.

The Speaker: Fifth.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So he is saying that the Government is now on the fifth-highest rating.

The next question that I would have is, there are—

The Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. E. David Burt: This is a supplementary, yes.

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: There are other ratings items to come. Does the Minister anticipate further downgrades in the near future?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Well, first let me take some issue with the statement that we are now in the fifth grade, because we have three rating agencies. And we have already been rated by S&P [Standard & Poor's], and we are still at four, still at AA-. We have been rated by Moody's, we have been downgraded one notch. So, as we stand right now, you know, one rating agency has got us at the fourth level, and one rating agency has got us at a notch down from that. So you just cannot say that we are rating on the fifth level, because the two ratings do not agree. They do not align.

We have not met with Fitch yet. But that will come along, I presume, later on this summer.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
Yes, MP Burt? Supplementary?

Mr. E. David Burt: Just as a supplementary.

The Speaker: Supplementary, yes.

Mr. E. David Burt: This is [to clarify] the Minister's last statement. He said that the Ministry has not yet met with Fitch this year? Okay.

The Speaker: You are asking a question.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: I will move on.

The second supplementary, that I have, Mr. Speaker, is, Can the Minister please confirm . . . I guess I did not get an answer to the question I asked. Is he anticipating any further rating downgrades in the near future from the other rating agencies?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Just let me relieve the Honourable Member's confusion. The schedule for rating agencies is not set by the Government. It is set by the rating agencies. So the fact that we have not met with Fitch yet is nothing untoward. It is just that they have not come to see us yet. It is as simple as that.

Insofar as anticipating a downgrade, no, I do not anticipate a downgrade. But anyone who deals with the rating agencies knows that you can anticipate or not anticipate, but you just put the facts out there as best you can, put the story out. What I mean by "the story" is the narrative of how we plan to turn the economy around, as best we can. Each rating agency has a different methodology of coming up with their rating.

For instance, the Moody's tend to be very, very formulaic. I mean, they basically just run the numbers. Other rating agencies put more emphasis on your plans (and "your" meaning the Government's plans) for the future, et cetera. So it is not easy to tell what the rating agency is going to come up with.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.
Yes?

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, I would hate to contradict the Honourable Minister of Finance. But it is my belief and understanding, seeing that I was in a meeting with Fitch rating agencies on April 15th when they visited the Island on April 15th, April 16th and April 17th of this year, that the Government has in fact met with Fitch this year. Because they consult Members of the Opposition, Members of . . . So I did meet with Fitch this year. And the Honourable Minister is saying that Fitch has not been to the Government meetings this year.

So maybe he would like to clarify that to the House.

The Speaker: Thank you.
Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: On this round of meetings, I have not met with Fitch yet.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.
Yes, you have another question?

Mr. E. David Burt: I will move on to my second question, Mr. Speaker, because—

The Speaker: Question, question.

QUESTION 2: MOODY'S INVESTOR SERVICES ADJUSTMENT TO BERMUDA'S CREDIT RATING

Mr. E. David Burt: —I know the people from Fitch said they did meet with . . . I was in the Ministry of Finance meeting with Fitch this month—I mean this year. So I am confused why the Minister keeps on saying that he has not met with Fitch.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I will move on to my second question. My second question is, on page 2 of the Minister's Statement, he quotes Moody's by saying, and I am paraphrasing, but reading from here. It says *the reforms that the Government has implemented to incentivize the tourism sectors*. Can the Minister please clarify what reforms the Government has implemented to incentivize the tourism sectors, which he relayed to Moody's to have them make that statement?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, that would take me at least an hour to relate to the House all the things we have done to try to incentivize the tourism sector. But—

The Speaker: Maybe if you can give us one or two.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Well, all I have to do, Mr. Speaker, is refer to the Statement by my honourable colleague to get new tourism development at the Club Med site.

An Hon. Member: That is one! Give us two or three!

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: The others have to do with the fact that we had a tourism summit, the fact that we have continued to have the concessions for hotels and restaurants. We are doing all kinds of incentives to incentivize the revitalisation of tourism. Perhaps the Honourable Member is sort of acting like what he thinks a good prosecutor is; he asks a question that he already knows the answer to.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, thank you.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: But I believe he does know the answer to this one!

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Thanks, Minister.
You have a supplementary?

Mr. E. David Burt: My second supplementary, and then I will stop because I know we have other questions.

How much time is left in question time, Mr. Speaker?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: No, we have still got about 20 minutes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: Okay, good.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary on that is, I specifically mentioned, it says the reforms that the Government has implemented. The Minister spoke about concessions, which are happening in RFPs, which anyone can issue.

So I am just wondering if he can speak specifically to any reforms that the Government has implemented to incentivize the tourism sector.

The Speaker: Any reforms.

Some Hon. Members: Any reforms.

The Speaker: Okay, Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member is getting caught up in semantics here. You know, the key word is “incentivize,” not “reform.”

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thanks, Minister.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from constituency 33, MP T. E. Lister. Your question?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two questions.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 1: MOODY'S INVESTOR SERVICES ADJUSTMENT TO BERMUDA'S CREDIT RATING

Hon. Terry E. Lister: And they are both clarifications, because I do not understand. In the third line of the first paragraph, the Minister points out that Moody's had changed their outlook to *stable* from *negative*. And then the third line of the second paragraph, he says, “I am somewhat [comforted] . . . that Moody's has attached a *stable* outlook on the rating.” Now, which is it? Were they always negative? Are they always stable? I am a little bit confused.

The Speaker: Minister? Thanks.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We had been downgraded one notch by Moody's; that is the negative part. All right? But we had been on a higher level with a *negative* outlook. All right? We had been at a higher *rating level* prior to this assessment, but we had that level with a *negative* outlook. Right? We have been downgraded one notch

with a *stable* outlook. So there are two things. It is the rating grade, plus the outlook assessment. Okay?

The Speaker: Yes. Thank you, Minister.
MP Lister?

QUESTION 2: MOODY'S INVESTOR SERVICES ADJUSTMENT TO BERMUDA'S CREDIT RATING

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, I think what I heard, which we would like to understand, would be if we were playing football in the first division near the bottom, they would say we were negative. But if we got relegated to the second division, we might be one of the stars. So I think that is what the Minister just told me. Okay. I am okay if that is what you mean. That is how I understand it.

Now, my second question is [about what is] at the bottom of page 2, he says that “The Moody's release further stated . . . the MTEF delineates a clear plan to rein in the fiscal deficit and, if fully implemented”—those are the magic three words—if *fully implemented*, “is likely to stabilise the debt-to-GDP and interest payments-to-revenues ratios.”

Minister, can you tell me what steps have been taken so far, other than the budget, which we dealt with last month, to move us along in this plan towards full implementation?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Again, Mr. Speaker, this could call for another hour's lecture, which I will spare the Honourable Member of.

But I will recall, and the Honourable Member will recall, a good deal of the Budget Speech was devoted to plans to rein in the cost of Government, as opposed to what the dollar figure would be. You will recall that I said that we have to do some things which include outsourcing, which include reform of the civil service, a number of things that were stated, recommendations that were stated in the SAGE Commission report.

Those are part and parcel of the plans to continue to rein in the Government deficit, and therefore rein in the growth in debt. So we fully apprised all of the credit rating agencies of our plans for those things. And that is what Moody's is referring to here.

The Speaker: Thank you.
You have a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Given that we are existing in the bright sunshine of openness and transparency and all of that, and given that we, as the Minister just said, are basing some of these reforms and tidying up the current ac-

count and the budget on SAGE recommendations and SAGE reform, and given that SAGE tabled their report six months ago, can the Minister explain to us why the public has not been informed of any direction, any movement that is being taken with regard to SAGE implementation?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that the direction in which Government is moving as it relates to some of the SAGE recommendations were highlighted in my Budget Statement. But in addition to that, perhaps the Honourable Member is referring to town hall-type meetings. What we have been working on in the Ministry is to have a draft Bill available to the public that could be circulated before we have a town hall meeting on this, so people could have something to chew on.

The circulation of that draft Bill is imminent. And we will have some town hall meetings relating to this thereafter, shortly thereafter.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
Yes, MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: I think this is my last question.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 3: MOODY'S INVESTOR SERVICES ADJUSTMENT TO BERMUDA'S CREDIT RATING

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, I have sat and listened as intently as I could. Draft Bill? "Consult" is a funny little term. Sometimes, when we consult, we sit down and we listen to people talking to us.

The Speaker: Question, question, question.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Sometimes, consult is we tell them what we are going to do.

In this case, Minister, do you think we are really consulting if we prepare the Bill and tell people to come to the meeting, as opposed to having simply finished SAGE, six months ago, and bringing people in to talk about SAGE and unveiling our thoughts about a Bill?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have already . . . I have already conveyed a number of my thoughts on this to this House and to the public and to anybody who would listen. What people are looking for is some idea of proposed plans. The Honourable Member will remember, because it just happened a few second ago, that I said a "draft" Bill, not a Bill. But we thought it was important to have

a draft Bill for the Public Bodies Reform Act, which is something that I stated in this House that we intended to go forward with.

Unfortunately, and as those Members on that side know who were Ministers, it is very frustrating sometimes to get from A to B, and I have been frustrated out of my mind with this one. But it has been bouncing back and forth while various very highly trained people opine on what should be and what should not be in there.

But I think we have got it at least down to a stage now where I am comfortable to disseminate it to the public, and the unions in particular that have a particular interest in it because they are going to be involved with the process on an ongoing basis anyway. So . . .

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister. Thank you.

That completes the questions to Minister Richards.

We move now to questions to Minister Crockwell, and I will first of all recognise MP Zane De Silva. You have the floor.

QUESTION 1: ST. GEORGE'S TOURISM DEVELOPMENT SITE

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Minister, with regard to your Statement vis à vis the St. George's tourism development site, as you are calling it—most people would know it as the former Club Med site—my question is, in your third paragraph you are saying that a decision has been made to enter into an exclusive negotiation period.

Can you give me and this Honourable House the dates that refer to this statement?

The Speaker: Thanks, MP De Silva.
Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I would like to clarify the questions previously in relation to those particular dates for Mr. Sutherland, since I have had that information. I gave an undertaking to give it to the Honourable House.

An Hon. Member: No, no, no!

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I was speaking to you, Mr. Speaker. Then I will answer the question.

The Speaker: Yes, yes. No, no. I think that if it is for the information of the House, it is important that we have the correct information.

[Reverting to Question on Mr. Sutherland]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Tourism Authority Act was debated and passed in this Honourable House on the 27th of September 2013. It received the Governor's assent on the 7th of October 2013, and my understanding is that the contract with Mr. Sutherland is dated in mid-December of 2013. So that is your timeline.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Now, in answer to the Honourable Member—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Ah! Ah! Ah! Ah!

The Speaker: Okay. Just, please take your seat.
You had a question on that?

[Laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, I do.

The Speaker: And I will allow that.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question, now with the Minister having clarified that, actually it was not on the 27th. It was on the 28th at five o'clock in the morning. But anyway, it is a little, just to be clear.

But, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, does he now withdraw his statement that the company in question . . . he said that it was signed last summer. Does he withdraw that now?

The Speaker: Yes. Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, I clearly said I did not know.

The Speaker: Yes. Right.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I said that the Act was passed last summer. And it was, the arrangement with Mr. Sutherland was either the summer or thereafter. I do not know; I was not involved in it. But it was clearly after the Act was passed.

The Speaker: Right. Okay. And so that has been clarified now. Thank you. Thank you.

All right. Now, your question that you just placed now, if you can please, Minister, get to that question.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes. Over the past month, the EDC [Economic Development Committee], the past four weeks, the EDC received oral presenta-

tions from the two finalists. I cannot recall the exact dates of the oral presentations. And then, the committee that was responsible for reviewing the various submissions gave a presentation to the EDC this past Monday. And the Cabinet made a decision on Tuesday.

The Speaker: MP De Silva, you have a supplementary on that?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, Mr. Speaker.
No. I think he misunderstood my question.

The Speaker: Okay. Go ahead.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Let me be a little more clear.

The Speaker: Go ahead.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: The exclusive negotiation period, can the Minister give us the dates of that period?

The Speaker: Dates of the exclusive period.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Once the decision is made, then there is a 120-day period to negotiate.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: So the decision was made on Tuesday.

The Speaker: Tuesday. So 120 days from Tuesday?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thereabouts, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
MP De Silva?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Who are the principals of Desarrollos Hotelco Group?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I would have to provide that to the Honourable House, so I could get all the precise names.

The Speaker: All right. Okay.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I know that it is the . . . I will provide it to the Honourable House.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: My gracious, Mr. Speaker! I am sure the public are just as disappointed as I.

The Speaker: We will make sure that the Minister gets that information.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: An announcement of this magnitude—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of clarification, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: It is a family, a Venezuelan family, the Stipas. I just cannot remember all their first names. But it is the Stipa family.

The Speaker: Who is that? The what?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Stipas, S-t-i-p-a, father, son and others. So I can provide their exact names, but they are the principals of the Desarrollos company.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Thank you.
MP De Silva.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Supplementary.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Dr. Gibbons. Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Minister said that there was a short list of two. Can the Honourable Minister tell us who the other company was that was shortlisted and was unsuccessful?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I am not prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: MP?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Just trying to clear my head with that statement, Mr. Speaker. Give me a moment, please!

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, I think it is prudent to be in contact with that other finalist. They may not want their names to be revealed as not being the chosen developer. Okay?

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I will contact them. If they have no problem with that, I will disclose that name.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: The secrecy continues, Mr. Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

QUESTION 2: ST. GEORGE'S TOURISM DEVELOPMENT SITE

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, my second question. I hope this does not call for another secret answer.

Mr. Speaker, Minister, on your third page, you state that the resort development will also include a casino. My question to the Minister is, I thought that during the public meetings and in this Honourable House, the Minister has said that no casino licences will be given, or the only casino licences that will be given will be given by an independent authority. Can the Minister explain to us why this particular group has included a casino in their proposal?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that was part of their proposal. This is something that they would like to have at this site. It is not critical to the success of the site. They have been advised that, once the Gaming Commission is established, they would have to put in an application to have a licence. So, this was part of their proposal. And I outlined what the development would look like in the event that certain permissions are granted.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
MP De Silva?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, can you confirm how much time is left?

The Speaker: Yes. We have got about nine minutes left.

QUESTION 3: ST. GEORGE'S TOURISM DEVELOPMENT SITE

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Nine minutes. Okay. Last question.

Would the Honourable Minister now confirm, with this casino being included in this development and what he just said, will he now confirm that the statement that was made by the OBA, just recently with regard to them withdrawing the referendum because there was a threat from the PLP, was false?

The Speaker: Yes. I do not know . . .

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I do not understand the question, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, the question should be specifically to the Statement.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: And, Mr. Speaker, it is. With the casino inclusiveness, what the Minister just said—

The Speaker: Yes? Yes?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: —my answer is—

The Speaker: Your question.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: My question, and I am hoping the answer will be coming from the Minister. My question is, Will the referendum now be coming back to this House for approval by the people of Bermuda by voting on casino gaming in Bermuda?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: It is not relevant to the Statement, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member. Yes, you have a question? Yes, absolutely.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must preface this question by saying that this entire Statement seems to lack a moral barometer. Mr. Speaker—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Member! Honourable Member! Now, please!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: No! And the reason why it leads . . . My question is based on my—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please! Please! Honourable Member!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, my question—

The Speaker: Honourable Member.

Some Hon. Members: Withdraw that!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I am withdrawing nothing.

The Speaker: Honourable Member! Honourable Member! Honourable Member, please.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Take your seat, please, Honourable Member.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Just take your seat one second!

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is [imputing] improper motives on myself and this Government.

The Speaker: Yes, yes, yes.
Honourable Member, if you could—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I have not asked my question.

The Speaker: Right. Ask the question. Please do not impute] . . . so that earlier, the first—

QUESTION 1: ST. GEORGE'S TOURISM DEVELOPMENT SITE

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, I am not [imputing] improper motive.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent events in which the Minister is intimately involved, namely Jet-gate—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: Honourable Member!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: —would he not agree that this Statement is ill-advised at this time?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Follow up.

Would the Minister agree, in light of the Jet-gate debacle, that this RFP process for this site is compromised?

The Speaker: Honourable Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
Yes, second supplementary?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Supplementary. No. This will be my last question.

The Speaker: Oh, okay.

QUESTION 2: ST. GEORGE'S TOURISM DEVELOPMENT SITE

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes, no problem.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us and the public who actually conducted the RFP process?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, there was a committee comprised of my Permanent Secretary, Mr. Francis Richardson; Ms. Aideen Rattary Pryse; and the Tourism Authority Chairman, Mr. David Dodwell. And they utilised Mr. Ronald Sutherland as their consultant.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Supplementary.

The Speaker: Supplementary on that?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: So, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that the Office of Procurement and Project Management is no longer active in the RFP processes of this Government?

The Speaker: Yes?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Of course, the procurement process and the Procurement Department is very involved in these processes.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you.
You have a supplementary?

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Yes.

The Speaker: Yes, MP Rolfe Commissiong.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Mr. Speaker, the Government stated that there would be three casino licences issued. Is that still the position of the Government?

The Speaker: Honourable Member, yes. Please.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, that statement is incorrect. And I have clarified that statement on numerous occasions.

I have said time and time again that the economic study that was done, and the advice that was provided to the Government, was that we can only sustain a maximum of three casino licences.

We have never said that we are going to issue three, one or two. But the advice we received was, based on our current economic structure, the tourism arrivals and our population, we can only sustain a maximum of three.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Minister.

Yes, you have a supplementary? I am sorry. Just a minute.

MP Commissiong.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Mr. Speaker, so is it fair to say now that the Government still has not arrived at a definite limit with respect to the number of casino licences that may be available?

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I think this is stretching the Statement a bit—

The Speaker: Yes, go ahead. Answer the question.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: —but we will listen to and adhere to the professional advice that we received. But we are not going to . . . And I defer to the Attorney General in the drafting of the legislation. But I do not think we are going to prescribe that number in legislation. But that is under consideration.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

You have a question? A supplementary, yes?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. Supplementary.

The Speaker: Good morning.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Could the Minister please explain why he would not see a conflict of interest, given the proprietary interests that the Chairman of the Bermuda Tourism Authority has in a hotel property, of being involved in the tendering process? Would you explain why you see no rationale for a conflict?

The Speaker: Yes. All right.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: No, I do not think that there was a conflict in that process.

The Speaker: Thank you.

I now recognise . . . Is it MP Burt? Did you have a question? I have you down here.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Oh, you want to do the next one. Yes.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: He did not answer. I asked him to explain why he did not see. He said he did not. I need an explanation: Why?

The Speaker: Why—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —does he not see there being a conflict of a proprietor of a hotel being involved in the tendering process of a new developer applying to have a hotel licence?

The Speaker: He answered no. He answered that no, Honourable Member.

Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Minister of Tourism and Transport kindly advise if funding has been made available so Bermuda is not going to be held by a tight noose around our necks pending whether there is money or whether they have to find money? So to clarify the question, can the Minister advise us whether financing for this hotel, which is extremely important for St. George's, is in place? Thank you.

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Honourable Member.

The Cabinet was satisfied with the information and the financial information provided by this finalist.

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you very much.

We will now move to the next . . . Members! Members!

[Gavel]

The Speaker: We now move to the Statement by [the Junior Minister] Richards, and I go to MP Brown.

QUESTION 1: BOTC PROPOSAL FOR VISA-FREE ACCESS TO THE SCHENGEN AREA

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning, colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Junior Minister can answer the following question: Can he tell us why Bermuda was put on the visa control list in the first place?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: I do not know the answer to that question.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Member not aware that the British Government misinformed the European Union about our right of abode in the UK, and because of that, we were put on the visa control list?

The Speaker: Minister?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: I appreciate the Honourable Member schooling me on the topic.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
MP?

Mr. Walton Brown: Was the Minister briefed before he read his Statement?

The Speaker: Honourable Member, thank you. Thank you.

An Hon. Member: That is not a question!

Mr. Walton Brown: I have not finished my question.

The Speaker: Thank you. Yes, what is your question?

QUESTION 2: BOTC PROPOSAL FOR VISA-FREE ACCESS TO THE SCHENGEN AREA

Mr. Walton Brown: The second question has to do with the issue of the European Union making that decision. By what standard is this a matter for the Government House and/or the Ministry to issue a Statement about it, as opposed to anyone else who actually has access to this information?

The Speaker: Minister?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: The Member is asking a question that deals with, I guess, Government House protocol. And I cannot answer that. We are not an independent country.

Mr. Walton Brown: And my final question, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 3: BOTC PROPOSAL FOR VISA-FREE ACCESS TO THE SCHENGEN AREA

Mr. Walton Brown: Would the Honourable Junior Minister not agree that, by sending out a Twitter message this morning, taking credit for the United Kingdom Government working with the Overseas Territory to achieve this objective, the Governor is in fact misleading the country?

The Speaker: Minister?

We certainly . . . Honourable Member, we cannot bring the Governor into that kind of question on the floor of this House. Yes. Yes.

I think we will move to the next. I am going to recognise the Honourable Member D. V. Burgess. I think he has a question for . . .

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Education, sir.

The Speaker: Education. (It is almost time.)

QUESTION 1: CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE EDUCATION ACT 1996

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the Statement by the Honourable Minister of Education . . . I will just read the line if you will permit me. "The focus is to keep student achievement in mind because we want a system that holds the best interests of children at heart."

The question is, Honourable Minister, why are children age four not allowed to start P1 when they have been tested by the Board of Education and the tests reveal that they are P1 rated?

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how that actually relates to the Statement I made here. But I am happy to get the information for the Honourable Member and come back to him. I think there is a policy issue within the Ministry relating to when children can commence.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Mr. Speaker, supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: If this policy is adhered to, then you will have children starting school after they are five. Why are we holding children back? This Statement is quite clear. And the question is appropriate according to your Statement, Mr. Minister.

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think I answered that question. It does not relate to the Statement. But I am happy to find the information for the Honourable Member. The policy, as I understand it, has been in place for many, many years. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member. Are there any other questions? That brings Question Period to a close.

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

The Speaker: We now move to the obituary and congratulatory speeches.

The Chair also just saw, I think we saw Senator Marc Daniels is here. So we recognise Senator Marc Daniels.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: The Chair recognises the MP Zane De Silva.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this Honourable House to send a note of congratulations to Mr. John Jefferis at the Coco Reef. Just recently, TripAdvisor awarded Coco Reef its Certificate of Excellence. And the Honourable Member Walter . . . All those on

this side, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that they would like to be associated, along with our friend on this side, the Honourable Cole Simons.

So, Mr. Speaker, just a little bit more important than that, Mr. Jefferis was also voted and given the award for the Caribbean Entrepreneur of the Year. Mr. Jefferis has been named by the International Caribbean World Awards as the Entrepreneur of the Year for his exceptional contribution to the travel and tourism industry, and also for his innovative and creative business skills. Along with owning the operation, Mr. Speaker, Coco Reef in Bermuda, he also runs Coco Reef in Tobago, Panama, and he also has a range of other related business interests in the Caribbean.

My disappointment, Mr. Speaker, is that this man, who continues to get these accolades year in and year out, is not on the Tourism Authority in Bermuda. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, MP De Silva.

The Chair will now recognise Minister Wayne Scott. Minister Scott, you have the floor.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, with the talk earlier about the accreditation of the Nelson Bascome centre, it gives me pleasure to congratulate the following human service providers for receiving the Bermuda National Standards Committee [BNSC] Certification for Accreditation, and those were the Employee Assistance Programme for Bermuda and the Cross-Ministry Intervention Team (or CMIT); for re-accreditation, Foster Care Services and Child Protection Services; and as a charity, the Bermuda Cancer and Health Centre.

You know, with that accreditation, especially for the Department of Child and Family Services, that is now the only Government department that has all of its areas fully accredited by the BNSC. So we would definitely like to congratulate them.

Also, on another note, I would like to, once again, congratulate or have congratulations sent to Roy-Allan Burch, who just recently got a gold medal in a 4x100 free relay at the Charlotte Grand Prix meet on the 16th of May. What is great about that, of course, is that most of us know or would know about Michael Phelps. Of course, he is the most decorated Olympic athlete. And he was making his comeback at the same meet, so he and Ryan Lochte were there at this meet. So what this shows is that we have got some athletes that are competing at a very high level.

I would like to associate my Shadow Minister, MP Weeks, with that as well. And, of course, Roy-Allan Burch, who was swimming the third leg, in his preparation for the Glasgow Commonwealth Games, held off the Canada A team to do that. I would also like to associate . . . I will just associate most of the House. Certainly, we would appreciate our athletes who are doing well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable and Learned Member from Sandys [North], constituency 36.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this Honourable House, on a sad note, to send condolences to two families. The first is to the family of the late Arnold Leroy "Dash" Simmons, to his mother, Aunt Marie. I wish to associate all of the West End and all of the Opposition and Members of the Government with these condolences to the family. Mr. Speaker, I know that you know this family well. He leaves his mother, Mrs. Marie Simmons, his brothers, Kennedy and Craig and Clyde, and his children, Marcus and Makiba.

There is another Somerset family . . . I may be treading on the toes of one of my Lister colleagues. But I know that Jean Roberts, whom I grew up with, with my dear friend Allan Trew, has passed. I would like this House to also send condolences to the family of the late Mrs. Jean Roberts, her son Steven. Again, as I associated the . . .

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Yes. Yes.

So, Members of the Opposition, the Opposition Leader, and Mr. Dennis Lister, Mr. Terry Lister, certainly the MP for that particular constituent, Ms. Kim Wilson. Sir, thank you for the condolences offered to that family.

On a brighter note, may I ask this House to send congratulations to the Green family on the launch of 1609.

[Desk thumping]

Hon. Michael J. Scott: We had the great delight in the presence of many Members, certainly with the Premier there, the new Premier, and the Shadow Minister of Tourism, Mr. De Silva, and many Members of the Opposition, to watch the roof wetting of this iconic restaurant that is practically out in the . . . There was a stiff breeze yesterday, so it is always going to be cool there. So it represents a real transformation of that point, Mr. Speaker. The Greens' commitment to that investment at that hotel cannot be understated. So I would like to issue, on behalf of this House, to send warm congratulations to Mr. Peter Green, Alexander Green, Andrew Green and that family. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises Dr. Gibbons, the Minister for Education and Economic Development.

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, and I am sure most Members on this side of the House, as well, would like to be associated with the congratulations to the Green family. The Premier was there yesterday and made some very complimentary remarks. I think it is tremendous what they have done down there, Mr. Speaker. I am sure you have seen it. I think they should be complimented on what I think is a terrific use of that western end of the property.

I have to confess I had not actually seen that area before. But that 1609 restaurant, the way it sits there, I think it is going to be a tremendous asset, not only to the Fairmont Hamilton Princess, but certainly to tourism as well. I think we are moving in the right direction with tourism, and certainly we ought to commend the Green family for their investment and their efforts to improve our overall tourism product.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I would also ask that congratulations be sent to the Bermuda Electric Light Company. They have now received approval from the Energy Commission for their tiered facilities charge, which is going to reduce the burden on low-[income] users of electricity. I think it is something that they have been working very hard on, as we were with grocers, to try and essentially lower the burden on lower-income and low-income residents.

Thank you.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Hamilton West. MP Wayne Furbert.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had to stand to congratulate the Greens for the roof wetting yesterday. It is a facility that I believe that all Bermudians will visit. This project began under the Progressive Labour Party. So we had the foresight to at least move this project ahead. I see the Honourable Member shaking his head, but the project began under the Progressive Labour Party. I remember being in the room when we met with the former owner and having the discussion going on. The next project will begin in September, so we look forward, and we appreciate what the Greens are doing at 1609, the bar and restaurant.

So I would encourage all Bermudians on Saturday, the official opening, as far as we can, to go there and have a lunch or dinner. It is open at ten o'clock in the morning to ten at night, I believe, or eleven in the morning. So I believe it will be the place to hang out on Friday evenings. So get over there and give respect to a family which has bought into a vision and sees where Bermuda can go ahead.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member David Burt.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I stand to my feet today to ask that this Honourable House send a letter of condolence to the family of one of my constituents, who passed away last week. Nathan Paul Odai Richardson was a young man of 39 years of age. He was a constituent of mine, a former President of the Western Stars Sports Club, a well-liked and beloved figure in the community and someone whom you never saw without a smile on his face.

He left us, he left this earth [too] soon. He leaves three children and a very big space inside of the West Park community and those people in Pembroke. I went to the Dandy Town Sports Club on Saturday, and there was not a dry eye in sight. I do not believe there will be a funeral big enough to commemorate and celebrate his life, but the best thing that we can do, Mr. Speaker, is remember that he was good to all people. I can say that I would not have been right here if it was not for the encouragement that he gave me to run for Parliament in that area. So I am grateful to him.

I would like to associate all the Members of this side of the House—

[Desk thumping]

Mr. E. David Burt: —specifically with Mr. Michael Weeks, who I know served with him at the Western Stars Sports Club, and also, of course, my Honourable Leader Marc Bean. So it is with great sadness; he leaves a family that we know, and three young and not-so-young children. And he will be greatly missed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Member Jeff Sousa.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and to those in the listening audience.

I rise today to ask the Honourable House to send congratulations to Nicky Gurret, who designed the garden that won the bronze medal at the prestigious Chelsea Flower Show in the United Kingdom, actually in London, recently, that was held by the Royal Horticultural Society. Dr. Grant Gibbons would like to be associated with the comments as well.

The theme of the garden was *A Bermuda Double Fantasy Garden*. Award-winning floral artist and architect, Nicky Gurret, who created this garden, had all the best that Bermuda had to offer on show, from our Island's vibrant landscape to our very unique pink sands. I personally know Nicky Gurret, as she was a classmate of mine at Warwick Academy. And I

really take my hat off to her because, for many years, she had participated as an individual in this Chelsea Flower Show. Now to see her at this level, now winning bronze medals, is awesome.

The display also [pays] homage to the Fairmont Hamilton Princess Hotel, which celebrates their 130th anniversary next year. Of course, the hotel is named after Princess Louise, and Nicky was actually dressed as Princess Louise this past Monday. Of course, this ties in great with the fact that we see all the great things that the Green family are doing in Bermuda with this prestigious landmark hotel that we have here, actually Bermuda's oldest.

Also, the garden did honour John Lennon, another very famous Brit that did spend time here and fell in love with Bermuda. It actually was after his visit here in 1980 that he created his last album, which was called *Double Fantasy*, which actually was named after a freesia that he had seen in our own botanical gardens.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Freesia, the flower. Yes, that is right. (That was for the Minister of Finance.)

Also, I would like to congratulate Bermudian author Joanne Ball-Burgess for the release last night, the launch last night of her e-book, *The Lizard and the Rock: A Fable of Discovery*. This is going to be available on 200 sites, www.amazon.com, www.barnesandnoble.com and www.applestore.com. So, that obviously means that it will be available worldwide. Last night at the Bermuda library, National Library, I did enjoy comments made by MP Walton Brown, who was asked to speak. In this case, I must say I agreed with everything that he had to say, very positive stuff.

[Laughter]

Mr. Jeff Sousa: And of course, MP Lawrence Scott was in attendance, and also MP Kim Wilson.

I am always proud when I do see young Bermudians like Joanne doing awesome things like this in Bermuda. And as MP Walton Brown said, we need to encourage more Bermudians to put things together like that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Pembroke [East Central]. MP Michael Weeks, you have the floor.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise this morning to associate myself with the remarks by the Honourable Shadow Finance Minister David Burt. Nathan Richardson not only served with me at Western Stars on the executive, but his family is known intimately to me for many years. So my heart

really goes out to his mother, Madree, his brothers Mark and Nigel. On behalf of the Western Stars family, we want to send our love out to his family, especially to his children, because we have truly lost a community man, who really had not only Western Stars in his heart, but the betterment of our youth. So my heart really goes out. And on behalf of the executive and membership of the Western Stars, I want the love heard from us to his family. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Any other Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair recognises the Honourable Member from Sandys [North Central], constituency 35. MP Dennis Lister, you have the floor.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to ask this Honourable House to join me in sending condolences to the family of a young man who passed earlier this week, and I speak specifically of Mr. Carl Raynor. I would like the House to send condolences to his family. I have been asked by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Bean, to associate himself, and Mr. Zane De Silva.

Mr. Horton, as you know, Mr. Raynor was actually one of your constituents. I am sure you would want to be associated with those as well. But I am mindful at this time of the loss that this is to his wife Claire-Anne, and the family, and the impact that it will have on them and his extended family as well, Mr. Speaker. I always found Mr. Raynor to be one of those really nice gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. I got to meet him later in life, so to speak, in recent years. Whenever I called on Mr. Raynor for assistance I may have needed for a project, he was more than willing, Mr. Speaker, to give 110 per cent of himself to resolve whatever the issue or challenge was that was put to him to try and repair in that regard.

I was totally shocked to pick up the paper and see that he was listed in the obituaries, Mr. Speaker. I spoke to his wife and passed on my condolences to her personally and felt the sorrow and pain that she is feeling on this loss, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to have her recognised at this time. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member, Junior Minister Sylvan Richards. You have the floor.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like this House to offer congratulations to two very talented young sports-persons in Bermuda, Mr. Gavin Manders and Ms. Kayla Cross, for being named Champions of the Men's and Ladies 2014 William Way Memorial Tour-

nament held at the W. E. R. Joell Tennis Stadium on 17th of May. Young Mr. Manders is the son of a well-known cricketer, Arnold Manders, whom I went to primary school with. He is well known in cricketing circles. And I remember watching his son play tennis a few years back at Pomander Gate Tennis Club. And I did not know it was Arnold's son. But as soon as I saw his face, he was stamped. And this young man was playing some excellent tennis. So Arnold and I stood there together and had a good conversation about this young man. So I just want to congratulate him. He suffered a foot injury, Mr. Speaker, I believe a year ago. And he had to battle back from this injury, Mr. Speaker. Now he is once again number one in Bermuda.

I want to associate our MP De Silva, MP Weeks,—

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: —the whole House. So we would just like to send congratulations to these two outstanding young athletes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, MP Marc Bean. You have the floor.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I too would like to be associated with the condolences to “Mama” Roberts of Sound View Road. Mama Roberts is the mother of well-known sportsman and now youth coach, Mr. Karl Roberts. And Karl and I are very close, so it came as a shock to look in the paper today to see that she had passed away. So I would like to be associated with those condolences.

Likewise, I would be remiss if I did not stand to my feet to be associated with the condolences to Mr. Nate “Dog” Richardson. His oldest son played football with my son at Dandy Town. And his youngest son, Members will not probably realise, is the grandson of former Senator, Mr. Neville Tyrrell. And so, Nate was not only the archetype of a community servant and community worker and youth development mentor, but Nate was also very much consciously involved with the political process. And not only did he give inspiration to MP David Burt, he gave inspiration to all of us.

So, as we go through this tumultuous period, rest assured that our spirit is right with Nate. And we ask Nate, *What would you do in this situation?* And rest assured, we will not let Nate down. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Deputy Speaker. MP Roberts-Holshouser, you have the floor.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like a letter of condolences to be sent to Mr. Peter Adams. You know, when we grow up, we hear names from our parents, we constantly hear. And these were their friends. For me, the Adams family was always, of course, Mr. and Mrs. Adams. Peter Adams was married to his wife, who passed away, Jean Adams for almost 71 years. I cannot even begin to fathom that. She passed away just prior to her 90th birthday. She leaves behind two sons, daughters-in-law and many, many grandchildren.

But she was the epitome of what I would consider the older generation, where . . . And I am not saying that the younger generation do not put their family first. I am saying that there was a difference. Normally, the women were the organisers and the caregivers, and they were the ones who had the food ready. Even up to last summer, when not feeling very well, I went to visit. And while their meals were slightly earlier in the day, there was the home cooked meal.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know she will be greatly missed by not only her husband, Peter, but her family. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise MP Kenneth Bascome, from constituency 1.

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: I would like to be associated with the congratulations to Mr. Manders. This is a young man that I have known for many years. He and his father used to come to that facility that my wife and I had the privilege to operate out in St. George's. So I know Gavin quite well.

I would also like for a letter of congratulations to be written to the St. David's County Cricket Club.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: I happen to be the Manager of the St. David's Cricket Club football team, so I have not gone anywhere, Mr. Burt.

They did not play that well, Mr. Speaker! And being a cricketer and a sportsman, you know a team drops seven catches and still wins.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: They dropped seven catches! And you could hear people around the field shouting, *My grandmother could have caught that!*

[Laughter]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: But I would like to ask that a letter be sent to the St. David's County Cricket Club for the outstanding victory over those folks from the West End. And Mr. Weeks would like to be associated with those.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Smith's [South]. MP Cole Simons, you have the floor.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, continuing on the trend of success in the tourism industry, with the 1609, Green family and development in St. George's, I would like to send congratulatory remarks out to the Elbow Beach. They have a new manager, and the management company is the Burns Group—again, another testament to the confidence that they have in tourism in Bermuda. And we, the Government of Bermuda, stand poised to support them with any help that we can give. So again, to Elbow Beach, congratulations! A job well done.

I would also like to associate myself with the comments made in regards to John Jefferis, Arnold Dash Simmons, Jean Roberts, Nicky Gurret. Ms. Gurret, as was said by my colleague, has participated in the Chelsea Flower Show for the past four years, and she has won her second gold medal, and she has also won two silver medals. Again, a testament to the talent that we have in Bermuda and that she is carrying the Flag Bermuda in the horticultural industry. Again, we provide world-class Bermudians with world-class talents. Thank you.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Warwick [South East]. MP Lawrence Scott, you have the floor.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Good morning, Mr. Speaker, and thank you.

The Speaker: Good morning.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: I just would like to be associated with the congratulations that both MP Sousa made to Ms. Ball-Burgess and her e-book signing. She is a constituent of mine, and we have a mutual friend in Kenya, where she is currently residing. It was a wonderful thing to be there. I encourage everybody to go out and buy the e-book. It is very Bermudian. It is amazing that she is able to infuse multiple cultures, but yet still keep that Bermuda flavour. I also would like to, while I am on my feet, just extend the best wishes to her cartoon which she is currently working

on. I look forward to seeing the finished product shortly.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair would now recognise the Honourable Premier. Minister Dunkley, Premier Dunkley, you have the floor.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like this Honourable House to send condolences to the family of Cyril "Hooks" Cooper, who died last night. I think many individuals are well aware of what a true Bermudian Hooks Cooper was. If you had to sit around and have a conversation about true Bermudians, the character that he was, the style that he lived and how he loved life were certainly appropriate.

In fact, I was just going to say his boat at one time was called *Full Hot*. I am not sure if that described the captain or the crew.

[Laughter]

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: But certainly, he was the type of Bermudian that reached out to everybody, ran the Rosemont property for many years. I would like to send condolences and associate colleagues, all colleagues in this House, with those condolences, and send the condolences to his wife, Karen, and his two children.

Mr. Speaker, on a brighter note, I would like to be associated with the congratulations sent to the Green family on the opening of 1609. I was impressed during the construction to see just how efficiently they moved along, with local labour, local craftsmen. I was really impressed last night to see just the beauty of the site and the quality of the work that had been done and the quality of the finished product.

I had the opportunity to tour the two wings where they had renovated the rooms and refurbished the rooms. Certainly, I think it shows now that Bermuda is really getting serious about where we are going, as far as our tourism product. The Green family's vision, supported by the previous Government, and certainly this Government, is one of forward-thinking and of quality and style that befits Bermuda. Everything about the site there has a Bermudian charm. So we wish them all the best with the significant investment they have given, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Western Police Action Team, community action team. I had the pleasure yesterday morning of going to Somerset Primary and presenting certificates of graduation to 41 young students from Somerset Primary and the West End Primary on the completion of the great programme in the schools.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, we have had great graduations at Somerset Primary, West End Primary, Victor Scott School, Prospect Primary, and

Elliott to come. Certainly, this programme has been very positive to help our young people stay away from antisocial, negative, bullying type of behaviour. I have not only been really gratified to see the building of our young people and what they have learned, but just as importantly, the relationships they are building with the Bermuda Police Service. Those are the types of relationships that build a strong community going forward. So, congratulations not only to the students, but to the Bermuda Police Service for the work that they do.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the St. John's Ambulance, who at the end of March honoured 20 graduates, 12 new advanced medical first responders and eight re-certification advanced medical first responders. Congratulations to all those individuals who stepped forward and served as volunteers in the community for something that is very important.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to send congratulations to the Bermuda Hospitality Institute and associate my colleague, the Minister of Tourism, on a wonderful event, the *Plates of Passion*, that was held a couple of weeks ago, where 10 chefs from throughout the Island linked up with 10 culinary students and provided a full-course meal at an event that was a lovely event, not only for fundraising, but for teaching our young people how to get involved in something. Congratulations to the *Plates of Passion* and Bermuda Hospitality Institute! I was blessed to have the opportunity to be served the food from Ascots, which is one of my favourite restaurants. And the young Jelani Smith was the young student who participated as far as the junior chef there. First-class job!

Mr. Speaker, if I could take this time to move that we adjourn for lunch?

The Speaker: Thank you.

It has been moved by the Honourable Premier that we adjourn for lunch. We will return at 2:00 pm.

[Gavel]

Proceedings suspended at 12:32 pm

Proceedings resumed at 2:02 pm

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

The Speaker: All right. Members, we have just completed the Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches.

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE

The Speaker: There are none.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

The Speaker: There are none.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

The Speaker: There are none.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

The Speaker: The Chair recognises Dr. the Hon. E. G. Gibbons.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

FIRST READING

LIFE INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT 2014

COMPANIES AMENDMENT (NO. 2) ACT 2014

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce at the next day of sitting . . . do you want me to do them both together or—

The Speaker: You can.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Okay.

Two Government Bills: The first is the Life Insurance Amendment Act 2014 and the second is the Companies Amendment (No. 2) Act 2014. I ask for leave that they be put on the Order paper at the next day of sitting.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any objections to that?

There are none.

OPPOSITION BILLS

The Speaker: There are none.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

The Speaker: There are none.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

The Speaker: There are none.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The Speaker: We move now to our Orders of the day.

And the first Order of the day is Order No. 2— is it? Order No. 2 in the name—

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Yes, I think [Order] No. 1 is carried over.

The Speaker: [Order] No. 1 is carried over.

Order No. 2 is consideration of the Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014 in the name of the Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs, the Learned Minister Trevor Moniz.

You have the floor.

REGULATION

PROCEEDS OF CRIME (ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING AND ANTI-TERRORIST FINANCING) AMENDMENT REGULATIONS 2014

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So I am moving for consideration of the Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014 by the House.

The Speaker: Are there any objections to that?

Carry on, please, Minister.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Initially this was a matter which we were not expecting to deal with today but it is necessary that it be dealt with today to keep in sync with the improvements to the legislation. I have spoken to my Opposite Members about this. I think the Honourable Member, Ms. Wilson, is dealing with this matter. She has a copy of my brief. So we are working *ad idem* on this.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby present to this House for its consideration the regulations entitled the Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014.

These regulations seek to make minor amendments to the Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Regulations 2008, known as POCA Regulations.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this legislative initiative is being brought forward to this Honourable House as part of Bermuda's ongoing work to ensure that our domestic anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing framework has a high level of compliance with international standards. Such matters will also be addressed within the timeframe for deadlines set by the reviewing bodies and in furtherance of Bermuda's initiatives in relation to our removal from the Caribbean Financial Taskforce's follow-up process.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the amendments will assist in completing the process of updating Bermuda's regime to combat money-laundering, terrorist financing, and the financing of proliferation. This will be in accordance with the recommendations made by the assessors in the Bermuda 2007 Mutual Evaluation

Report issued by the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will recall that regulations have been put into place to ensure appropriate implementation of AML/CFT systems and controls by regulated entities. Additionally, the scope of these regulations have been broadened to include an expanded range of financial institutions, including trusts and corporate service providers, as well as professional lawyers and accountants.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and with the indulgence of the Members of the House, I will now outline the content of these amendment regulations.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the POCA Regulation consist of amendments to regulation 7 and regulation 15(5A).

Regulation 7 has been enhanced to meet the obligation to examine and investigate the background of any complex, unusually large or unusual pattern of transactions and document those findings in writing.

The amendment to regulation 15(5A) strengthens the obligations of record keeping by ensuring that documents and findings are kept for five years and are available to competent authorities and auditors.

With these introductory remarks, Mr. Speaker, I now welcome the participation of Honourable Members in this second reading of the Regulations entitled the Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

And the Chair will now recognise the Honourable Learned Member from constituency 34, MP Kim Wilson.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

The Speaker: Good afternoon.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: And first and foremost I would certainly like to thank the Honourable and Learned Attorney General for sharing the brief with us so that we are in a position to better follow as he reads out the rationale behind the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, from our side we certainly agree with this piece of legislation. It actually is in furtherance of some legislative provisions that were conducted and completed under the PLP Government ensuring that we were compliant with international standards concerning money-laundering and terrorist financing activities.

In fact, this legislation also supports in addition to what the Learned and Honourable Attorney

General mentioned concerning the international obligations, but anywhere where we see legislation that increases the level of due diligence required on regulated companies (as per the legislation) and ensuring not only that they are providing the requisite level of scrutiny and due diligence, but we are seeing that the legislation will allow for the ongoing monitoring to be more diligent, moving it up from a mere scrutiny to an elevated level of an investigation of the transactions.

So for all those short brief comments, Mr. Speaker, we are again obliged to the Government for furthering this piece of legislation and he does have the support of the Opposition thereto.

Thank you.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Any other Honourable Member care to speak? The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member from Smith's [South], MP Cole Simons. You have the floor.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as a practitioner in this industry, I thought I would add my contribution.

Mr. Speaker, in essence, this is the continuation of the ever-changing financial industry landscape worldwide.

If you will refer to [clause 2], in 7(2)(a), they talk about "transactions undertaken throughout the course of the relationship"—RMs, trust officers—do this now. They have to monitor their relationships. They have to understand where the funds originate. They have to examine where the funds are going to. So if any trust company or any bank is making a payment overseas, they—those institutions—are obliged to make sure that their companies or foundations or individuals receiving those funds are legitimate, clean, and that there is no connection to any terrorist financing or anti-money laundering issues.

So, as I said earlier, this is just codifying what is already done in industry. And, in fact, the RMs, the trust officers, are personally held liable if they are not on top of these transactions.

So, as I said, this is a standard—a norm—now. It occurs in Switzerland, it occurs in London . . . last month I was in Europe and I was speaking to a number of senior relationship managers on this issue and their legislation is going through as well. And so I am pleased to say that Bermuda is on the cutting edge and is competitive with other financial service industries. And I commend the Ministry and the PLP for trying to keep this AML book in order so that Bermuda remains competitive. And Bermuda is . . . has a reputation that is almost second to none when it comes to this trust business and financial services.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be more selective on the quality of clients that we have passing through our shores and in doing this type of investigation—the

ongoing monitoring, the examination of complex large transactions—in fact, I know that a lot of RMs are charged with going to visit clients internationally to make sure that they have a better appreciation of each of their client's business, and I think by doing that we can ensure ourselves that no nefarious activities flow through the business accounts here in Bermuda.

So I support this. It is codifying what already exists in the regulated institutions. And I think, as the PLP said, we must applaud the AML team for bringing this to the House and Government for ensuring that our anti-money laundering standards and the calibre of business and the quality of business that we want to pass through our shores is maintained.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Are there any other Members that would care to speak?

I do recognise now the Honourable and Learned Member from constituency 36, MP Michael Scott.

You have the floor.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to rise and do two things—certainly thank the Minister of Legal Affairs, the Honourable and Learned Member, Mr. Trevor Moniz, and my colleague, the Honourable and Learned Member, Ms. Kim Wilson, whose authority over these matters has been ongoing since she has been the Shadow Minister. But I therefore join and associate myself with her remarks of support and thank the Minister for bringing these regulations which do [accomplish] important things.

This trilogy of increased monitoring on any reading of these regulations speak to levels of . . . that will ensure, Mr. Speaker, that monitoring is enhanced and that we do comply with the whole question of keeping a very firm and steady hand on the movement of money towards terrorists or the movement of money into money-laundering enterprises. It is a wisely drafted and a tightly drafted set of regulations which is fit for purpose and achieves its objectives.

And I associate myself with the support of the Honourable and Learned Member, Ms. Wilson, in bringing the Opposition's support of these regulations.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Are there any other Members who would care to speak?

Minister, back to you.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the House for its bipartisan support of these regulations and I would like to move that these regula-

tions be approved and a message be sent to the Governor.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you very much.

Any objections to that movement?

There are no objections, so the regulations are approved and a message will be sent to the Governor.

Thank you, Minister.

[Motion carried: The Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014 was considered by the House and approved.]

The Speaker: The next Order of the day, Order No. 3, is the Consideration of the Lease Agreement between West End Development Corporation and the National Museum of Bermuda.

LEASE AGREEMENT

BETWEEN WEST END DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF BERMUDA

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that consideration of the Lease Agreement between West End Development Corporation and the National Museum of Bermuda [be given].

The Speaker: Are there any objections?

Minister, please carry on.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: The lease, as Members will recall, has been previously tabled in the House. I have taken the liberty of sharing my brief with the Shadow Minister of Public Works. I know that there is—I hope that there is—bipartisan support, the indications are this is something which is supported across the board.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to provisions of section 20 subsection (1) of the West End Development Corporation Act 1982 I rise seeking the approval of this Honourable House for the granting of a 99-year lease between the West End Development Corporation and the National Museum of Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, this lease will allow for the establishment of the National Museum of Bermuda which will occupy and be responsible for the land, buildings, and monuments totalling 15.73 acres within the Royal Naval Dockyard in Sandys Parish. Specifically the leasehold will incorporate the Keep (including the Commissioner's House), the Northwest Rampart (including the Bastions H and I), the land front fortifications, as well as the three buildings, ground and road of the Casemate Barracks Complex located in the former Royal Naval Dockyard.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will be aware that section 8(3) of the Public Lands Act 1984

requires that the Minister responsible for public lands receive the approval of Cabinet for the conveyance of any Government-owned land for a period of more than 21 years and up to 120 years. And that such conveyance must also receive the approval of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the Museum is requesting a substantial lease of 99 years at a peppercorn rent. As the Minister responsible for public lands I am obligated under the aforementioned Act to obtain the prior approval of Cabinet and the Legislature. Cabinet has given its approval for the new lease as required, and we now seek the necessary approval of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the Keep (which is currently the headquarters of the museum) was a citadel, or great fortress, of the Dockyard defences. It is a 10-acre fort with seven irregular bastions named "A" to "G" designed to protect the Dockyard from enemy attack. The lower grounds of the Keep contain large sea service stores, which in 1857 comprised two bomb-proof magazines for 6,540 barrels of gun powder; a shell store; a filling room; and a shifting house. Lighters (or small boats) were dispatched from the Keep Pond to serve the fleet at anchor in Grassy Bay. Lighters would provide ships with munitions from the Keep's stores or safely remove munitions from ships under repair in the Dockyard.

Mr. Speaker, at the eastern end of Dockyard is the Casemate Barracks. Casemate (the second oldest stone building in Dockyard after the Commissioner's House) was originally built as barracks for the Royal Marine's Light Infantry that was stationed at the Royal Naval Base for fear of retribution by the United States after the War of 1812. In 1951, when the Dockyard lost its significance as a Royal Naval Base and the British Navy left the Island, the building was left vacant until it was developed into Bermuda's maximum security prison in 1963.

It remained as the main prison for decades until 1994 when a new prison, the Westgate Correctional Facility, was built on Pender Road just outside the Dockyard. Since then the Casemate facility has been lying idle and vacant and waiting for a new purpose.

Mr. Speaker, since 2007 much work has been undertaken by the Museum using individual volunteers and corporation groups on days of giving to do pre-restoration work on the Casemate area to ensure that these historically important buildings were not lost to neglect.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will be aware of the accomplishment and reputation of the Bermuda Maritime Museum—now the National Museum of Bermuda—as not only a world renowned museum but as caretakers of the Island's most visited historic tourist attractions. With 65,000 visitors annually, it has the highest paying attendance after the Gov-

ernment's Bermuda Aquarium, Museum and Zoo, and is the Island's most visited museum attraction.

Mr. Speaker, the museum is a nongovernmental, not-for-profit charity—Bermuda Charity No. 136—meaning the institution depends on private and corporate donations, membership dues, admissions, and events rentals. The museum has consistently proven to be a leader in the preservation of Bermuda's built heritage and a steward of our cultural heritage.

I offer to you the following extract from the Bermuda Maritime Museum Amendment Act 2013, which in addition to changing the name of the institution to the National Museum of Bermuda set the following goals:

“(a) To promote the preservation for the benefit of Bermuda of artifacts related to Bermuda of all periods and to act as custodian thereof;

“(b) To promote the preservation of the historical buildings and gun emplacements and other structures within the area leased by the Museum at Ireland Island North within the Parish of Sandys and elsewhere in these Islands;

“(c) To maintain, promote and manage the premises of the Museum as a museum for the enjoyment and education of the public; and

“(d) To conduct, facilitate and promote scholarly research and fieldwork in the heritage, archaeology and history of Bermuda.”

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubting the enormous contributions that the Museum has made to the preservation and promotion of Bermuda's built heritage and to the overall promotion of the archaeology and history of these islands, as well as issuing a string of major publications that make all of that more accessible to the public.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of exhibits alone the Museum has been the first institution in Bermuda to have permanent displays on the African slave trade and Bermudians related thereto; on Bermuda and the Azores; on the Island's military commands (such as the Bermuda Militia Artillery, the Bermuda Volunteer Rifle Corps and the successor corps the Bermuda Regiment); as well as exhibits on Bermuda's coinage and notes partnered with the Bermuda Monetary Authority; and on our relationship with the British and American forces on the Island. And there is also a very important exhibit on the West Indies.

One must also, of course, mention the outstanding mural in the Commissioner's House on five centuries of our history among other major exhibition and restoration works. The national—indeed, international—scope of the Museum speaks for itself in those exhibits and the splendidly restored grounds and gun ramparts—all the results of 39 years of work by donors, volunteers, staff and trustees.

Mr. Speaker, this lease will provide the Museum the opportunity to raise capital to undertake resto-

ration works in an effort to return the associated buildings to their original state, which in turn will allow for a very considerable expansion in the range of exhibits, augment their educational programmes, as well as provide additional outreach opportunities of the present institution.

Mr. Speaker, Dockyard is already a major destination for Bermudians and residents alike. In all, the visitor will have some 12 acres of grounds to view along with nine major buildings of outstanding historical importance—six of which the Museum has already restored to date through donations from the public, with some Government grants.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this section, I would like to extend the thanks of Government to our colleagues in the Opposition who have supported the concept of the National Museum at Dockyard, and I thank them in advance for their support today.

Mr. Speaker, the granting of this lease will not only build on the great successes of that world-renowned institution, it will safeguard the Island's cultural heritage for future generations and provide an improved and expanded cultural heritage destination for our tourism market.

Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I seek the Honourable Members' support for this 99-year lease at a peppercorn rent of \$1.00 per year in the National Museum of Bermuda.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would just add at this time that I am acting at this point as the Acting Minister of Public Works, as the substantive Minister is away. But I have been heavily involved . . . I was for 20 years a trustee of the Museum as well as its Chairman, and very closely involved in seeking the Government's approval for the idea of a lease, which I think was approved some years ago when the Opposition was in Government . . . it was approved, and sometimes these things go slowly and it has taken until today for it to come before the House. And I appreciate all Members' support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Minister.

Any other Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair recognises the Honourable Member from constituency 35, MP Dennis Lister.

You have the floor.

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will begin, I guess, where the Minister actually ended in that he acknowledged the fact of two points: (1) that the Opposition is in support of this, Mr. Speaker and (2) that he acknowledged that it actually began when we were Government. So it has been a long process, Mr. Speaker, but one that this side was fully supportive of and encouraged when we were Government. So naturally we will continue that support of it as the Opposition.

One piece I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, in regard to that is that as the Museum continues to develop and go forward, I am one who has always enjoyed the visits I have had to the Museum and the displays are very nicely done, very informative. And I would like to encourage the Museum to continue its outreach, particularly, to our schools, to try and get our schools more involved in programmes so that they could come and see part of our history in a live sense, Mr. Speaker, right there in front of them that were taking place. And I think it would only [be a] benefit to have our young people being exposed to that at an early age so they can appreciate the value of continuing that piece of history that you will find in our museums, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out for clarification, Minister, in the brief it does refer to the fact that the lease will be at a peppercorn rent—at a peppercorn rent—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: —and I hear the Member from St. George's say we are copying off of him. And that is just the point that I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, because, Minister, if we look at the lease, the lease actually refers to a "cannonball"—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Dennis P. Lister: —and I think when we discussed it when we were Government, we were trying to do it as a cannonball so it would not be copying off those folks in the East End. And I will ask that clarification be made on that point that, in fact, it is a cannonball and not the peppercorn.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, yes we do support it.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Member Roban.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to follow my honourable colleague, Mr. Lister, in supporting this lease. I can remember one of the first matters, I think, that was dealt with when I joined the PLP Cabinet in 2009 was this measure, and it was enthusiastically supported then by the Government and we were committed to seeing it happen because we saw it as a natural evolution for the Dockyard and the work that was being done with the Maritime Museum so that it could take on a greater role as the custodian of the history of our country.

And I do think that the work of Dr. Harris and others there . . . and there have been a number of Bermudians involved with the work of the National Museum; it is shaping and evolving in that way. And there are some other . . . and this is going to open the

door for some other opportunities of a more international significance, hopefully, with the work of the National Museum in that there is work with some other international partners in the academic world to develop an Atlantic Institute where the Museum can potentially become a headquarters for the study, not only of Bermuda's history in the Atlantic, but of our neighbours in the Atlantic.

And I think this is an exciting possibility because it is a story that has not been, perhaps, told in its fullness. In particular, our historical connection with the Bahamas which some people know, but the depth of it is not truly understood by Bermudians of this era, as well as the Turks, and also the importance that Bermuda played in the development, particularly pre-revolutionary war, with the development of the settlement of the whole Eastern Seaboard of the United States. That is a story that people like Michael Jarvis and Dr. Clarence Maxwell have been working on, which I do hope that this particular . . . that this institute, which will be a part of the Museum, can take on and provide to the world as well as our own people, so that people in Bermuda will know that Bermuda has historically, in the development of the whole Atlantic area, played a great significance well above our size. And we have shaped much of the development of this region in our own way.

And so I look forward to the work we have done here, [which] is just a step, but it will open a door for other opportunities. It may even open a door for some other Bermudians who are interested in this research to become Fellows and for themselves to become experts in our history. We have persons like Dr. Harris and Dr. Maxwell and Dr. Dismont-Robinson, to name a few, but there are many others who I hope in the future—because this is about the future—who will become a part of this process. And not only will the West End benefit, but even the East End with Carter House and St. George's and the like. There is no reason why all of this work that is being done by the National Museum cannot benefit all of the institutions Island-wide that are dedicated to this particular discipline of our history.

So I look forward to seeing that. I credit the current Government for carrying it through. It did start with the PLP Government, but this is one of those things that is beyond politics, really, and is about the development of our country to ultimately be a place that we all are proud of.

Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

[Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Are there any other Members that would like to speak to the Consideration of the Lease Agreement

between West End Development Corporation [and the National Museum of Bermuda]?

The Chair recognises Mr. Kenneth L. Bascome from St. George's North, constituency 1.

You have the floor.

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: Yes. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

First of all, I would like to say thank you to the former Government for instituting this. I want to say congrats to the One Bermuda Alliance in taking it to a conclusion.

Madam Deputy Speaker, you will be aware when it comes to the history of this Island, I have a passion, and I hope that this is not just looking to [be a] highlight for the visitors coming to the Island, but it also will be taken to the schools to cause our school children to realise the [valuable role] that this little Island played during the second World War.

You will be aware that I led a group to Williamsburg and Jamestown earlier this year in an attempt to cause the people of the East End to realise the value of the little community in which we live.

So, Mr. Minister, I applaud you. I applaud the Government for taking the initiative. I am just hopeful that it is put into the schools to cause our young people to realise the value of this little place out in the middle of the Atlantic.

And with those words I will take my seat.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any other Members?

The Chair recognises the Member from Pembroke South West, constituency 20, Ms. Susan E. Jackson.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Susan E. Jackson: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I just want to express my support for the lease. As a volunteer and someone who spends a considerable amount of time in Dockyard, I would just like to say how inspiring and also haunting it is to be a volunteer up on the site lifting heavy rock and stone and doing one's best to contribute to the restoration and the cleaning up of some of the historical buildings in Dockyard.

And with this lease I believe that it will assist those hands that are up there doing their best (one by one) to clean up the sites, that this may encourage considerable more support so that we can see the full renovation of the buildings and have a full historical experience. And certainly for our tourists it is one of those experiences where people are walking around and seeing buildings that are unfinished. And I know that the National Museum would very much like to see these buildings completed. And with a 99-year lease they can now feel free that their efforts and their labour and the community's labour that will go into the

evolution of this historical site will be something that will have sustainability and longevity for the community to enjoy and that it will remain an historical site for some time.

So I support this lease and thank the Ministry for bringing this forward.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any other Members that would like to speak to the consideration of the Lease Agreement between West End Development Corporation [and the National Museum of Bermuda]?

There are no other Members.

Minister, you have the floor.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Madam Deputy Speaker, yes, it is an interesting story because Dr. Harris started working on the Casemate Barracks back in around 2008 on his own and with the permission of the CEO of WEDCO, stripping away the prison aspects of it, and putting back the historical aspect of the Barracks. And it was at that time that I said to him, *Well, why don't you make a proposal to Government that you get a lease on this in addition to the rest?* And at that time, for some reason, he was feeling very negative about it and said, *Oh, there is no point in doing that.* And I urged him and urged him to do that, and [when] he made the submission it was originally approved and today we see the fruition of that.

So I say all of that to people so that when you feel that there is no hope, you know, you should still persevere and persist, and good things will happen in time.

So I thank all Members for their support. I move that the lease—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: It is a cannonball and that was . . . and the previous lease was a cannonball. And I think what happened was the (and I hate to say it) but the Attorney General's Chambers got involved and put in a peppercorn—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: —and then it was taken back out and cannonball was put back in. So it is a cannonball.

So I ask that the . . . I move that this be approved and that a message be sent to the Governor stating the House's approval of the lease according to section 8(3) of the Public Lands Act 1984.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any Members that disagree with the motion as proposed?

There are no Members that disagree.

Agreed to then.

[Gavel]

[Motion carried: *The Lease Agreement between West End Development Corporation and the National Museum of Bermuda was considered by the House and approved.*]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The next on the Order paper I believe is [Order No.] 4. Is that correct?

Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Premier and Minister of Public Safety.

You have the floor.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: That motion is carried over, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Please proceed.

The next on the Order paper is [Order No.] 5. Second reading for the Decriminalisation of Cannabis Act 2014 by the Shadow Minister, but I believe that that was carried over.

Bermuda Immigration and Protection Amendment Act [2014], is that carried over . . . the second reading?

Carried over.

Everything else is carried over? Thank you.

Premier?

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Madam Deputy Speaker, sorry, I was . . . I move that the House now adjourn until May 30th.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, it has been moved that the House adjourn until May 30th.

The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Education, Mr. C. Walton D. Brown, Pembroke Central, constituency 17.

You have the floor.

VISA FREE ACCESS TO THE SCHENGEN AREA OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I was all set for the debate on the Cannabis Reform Committee, but we will have to wait until another time.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think it is appropriate to relate to this House and, therefore, to the people of Bermuda, the processes that were involved in the eventual achievement of visa free access to the Schengen Area of the European Union.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the British once had a vast empire and they used that empire to achieve a

great deal for themselves. And sometimes in order to justify the existence of the empire they used the Bible, they used access to resources and cheap material, cheap labour, and they engaged in a wide series of justifications, Madam Deputy Speaker. And what we see in this situation today is a series of misrepresentations by the British Government aided and abetted by the Governor in not being fully open about the process that transpired. So I am just going to relate it for the benefit of the people of this country and for the record, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, up until 1981 all Bermudians were British citizens. We had full British citizenship and a right of abode in the UK. Look at your passports before 1981 and it would say "British subject—United Kingdom and Colonies." In 1981 the British Government passed the British Nationalities Act. That Act was passed and it created three tiers of citizenship: the British overseas citizen, the British citizen, and the British dependent territories citizen.

Bermudians became British dependent territory citizens in 1981. We were no longer full British citizens. That was done, Madam Deputy Speaker, because in 1997 Hong Kong was going to be returned to the United Kingdom and Britain did not want to countenance giving seven million Hong Kong British Chinese citizens the right of abode in the UK. So they changed the law and actually took away the citizenship that we had up until 1981.

In 2002 the British Government passed the British Overseas Territories Act. And that Act gave citizenship back to us, the overseas territory people, because by then the transfer of Hong Kong back to China had taken place and there was no great uprising by the Chinese people who were denied their British citizenship, and so Britain decided to give back the British citizenship.

Now up until this point, Madam Deputy Speaker, we had access to the European Union. We could travel pretty much throughout Europe—Western Europe at least, because of course the Berlin wall had not come down and so forth until 1989—so we had access. And then in 2006 when the European Union was creating its visa policy for the Schengen Area . . . the Schengen Area, you should know, are those 26 countries now that comprise an area where there is no passport control among those 26 countries. So basically you enter one country and you can travel freely throughout.

In 2006 the European Union Visa section posed a question to the United Kingdom. And they said, *Do the British overseas territory citizens have the right of abode in the UK?* The United Kingdom informed the European Union that we did not. It was untrue. It was untrue. And it is because of that we were put on the Visa Control list in 2006.

So under the leadership of Premier Brown, I was able to approach the British first and then the European Union about getting that visa free status reas-

serted. The issue was that the British claimed we did not have the right of abode in the UK. So I went to London accompanied by the then-Chief Immigration Officer, Dr. Martin Brewer. We met with the FC officials and they said, *Are you British?* Well, I said, *You passed a law in 2002 to make us British.* Their position was that we needed to have a British passport to say that we were British. I had to just refer them to their own legislation—that we are British whether we have a British passport or not. And because of that they accepted that we had the automatic right of abode in the UK.

With that established by the FCO [Foreign and Commonwealth Office], Madam Deputy Speaker, the next simple step was to say, why not allow us to have the *right of abode* stamp on our passport? Because if we had the *right of abode* stamp on our passport, we would not need a visa to enter the European Union. So the British said yes. But, again, in typical British fashion they made it so difficult for anyone to apply for that *right of abode* stamp that no one would ever do it. Which they said . . . well, I said, *Why can't we have the Department of Immigration just put the stamp in our passport? We have British passports now that we issue. Why could we not just get the stamp?*

They expressed concern that it was a security matter, but we have never lost a British passport, while they on the other hand (the British) lost a whole truckload of passports in the late 2000s. So they did not want us to have that stamp on our passports. They said you had to go and apply to the New York office, the New York Consulate, send all this paperwork and wait about six months. No Bermudian is going to be without their passport for six months applying for a stamp to get put into their passport. So they effectively derailed that effort.

So I sought permission to talk directly to the European Union because I knew that the only reason why we were on the Visa Control list was because they were misinformed by the UK. So they, [the British], were not very happy about that idea.

So after we met with the FCO officials, Dr. Brewer and I went to Brussels. We met with the British representatives there and we sought permission to go and talk to the European Union about this matter, or for them to accompany us to talk about this matter. So the representatives in Brussels said, *Well, didn't the British just tell you that you could get the right of abode stamp in your passport? Why do you need to bother with this?* So they basically were not going to help at all.

They were not intending to help in any way because the British Government have long had a policy of trying to encourage Bermudians (and other overseas territory citizens) to go [ahead] and get a British passport. They want to see all of us get British passports (and that is for reasons that we will discuss at another time). But the point is that they offered no

assistance whatsoever. It was only after that lack of assistance by the UK that I, again, sought permission by Premier Brown to go and talk informally to EU [European Union] officials. I was able to do it only because I had a colleague from university who was an ambassador to the EU and he assisted in helping us to talk to people unofficially. But the EU had a series of unofficial talks with us and all we had to do was provide them with the information that Bermudians do not go about seeking . . . we do not engage in illegal immigration (to any significant degree), we are not criminals on a large scale, and we do not engage in visa violations. And that is all that they needed to hear.

So it took a few months to lobby quietly because the EU was so concerned that whatever they did formerly that they had to inform the United Kingdom government. But the UK provided no assistance whatsoever in this regard.

So it was in November 2012 that the . . . my contact at the EU finally said, *Mr. Brown, we have agreement with all the European members, they have agreed to add Bermuda and the other overseas territories to the list of countries that would get visa free status.* That was in November 2012.

If you think Bermuda is bureaucratic, the EU is even more bureaucratic because once they agreed on it, it took them another year to actually produce a document. So in November of 2013, I saw sight of the document that had been written that had all the countries identified which would get that visa free status. And then, I just kept asking, when was it going to be finally voted on. So it was supposed to be voted on in March. It was finally voted on a few weeks ago and now it is in place.

So we have the ability now—Bermudians have the ability now—to travel throughout the Schengen Area visa free. It is something that should never have been in place in the first instance because they were misinformed by the United Kingdom government. And we do not have the authority to address external issues constitutionally, but there is nothing to prevent the Government or anyone else from addressing those issues when they need to be addressed, because our position was marginalised because of the position taken by the United Kingdom Government. This is not a party partisan issue. This is an issue that affects all of us because the writing is on the wall in terms of future relations with the UK if on a matter of such importance to Bermudians the UK Government can misrepresent what actually is the nature of our relationship with them.

And so I was perturbed this morning, Madam Deputy Speaker, when I saw a tweet from the Governor sent out to his followers (and I am one of them) that said basically the UK Government in—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: I follow the Governor's tweets, yes.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: No, no, I follow the Governor's tweets and I follow the tweets of the Overseas Territory Committees. I collect information.

And so, Madam Deputy Speaker—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: —it was quite surprising to read that the Governor is giving the UK Government credit for initiating such a venture when they were the ones who were the impediments.

An Hon. Member: He didn't know that.

Mr. Walton Brown: They were the impediments. And so I would hope the Governor would correct his statement or at least rescind his statement because this was an effort that was initiated under Dr. Brown. Dr. Martin Brewer was the technical advisor and there were some very helpful souls who worked behind the scenes at the European Commission's Office in Brussels.

So it is a great day for all of us. It is a great day for Bermuda. And now we have that privilege that we had up until 2006.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to say that for the record and assure that history will record that this was an internally generated matter, it had nothing to do with the UK being magnanimous and helping us to achieve rights that they took away from us in the first place.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair now recognises the Independent Member from Sandys South, constituency 33, Mr. T. E. Lister.

You have the floor.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in the exchange we had this morning on questions, the Honourable Finance Minister made reference at one point to SAGE.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Let's try not to reflect on something that has already been—

Hon. Terry E. Lister: No, no, no, no, I am going forward.

The Speaker: All right, perfect.

SAGE REPORT

Hon. Terry E. Lister: I wanted to start there. I am just tying it to the fact that he mentioned it.

SAGE has been of great importance, though it has not accomplished much yet. When SAGE was discussed it created fear in the community. Rather than being welcomed it was feared. SAGE reported on an interim basis, [which] created more confusion and fear. The report came, more fear. There was a promise that we would spread information around. In fact, on the last day of sitting here in this House, I was sitting at the computer next door when the Premier came in and started talking to—the *then*-Premier—came in and started talking to me. And I said to him, *You really need to make sure that the people of Bermuda know what is going to happen with this SAGE.* And he assured me that during the seven-week break there would be meetings up and down the country. In fact, he said, *We'll have meetings in all 36 constituencies.* I said, *[There will be] 36 in seven weeks?* He said, *Oh, yes, we will.* I said, *That is pretty amazing; that is quite a feat.*

Well we are here now—seven weeks plus three weeks—10 weeks later, and there has not been an announcement of a meeting—nothing, nothing at all. Instead bits and pieces.

Our situation is serious. It is very serious. And so we really need an overall plan that has to be shared with the people of Bermuda so that they understand what they are supposed to buy in to.

We witnessed not too long ago the people's campaign—marching up to this House and giving a manifesto to the Premier and the Opposition Leader. And what was really driving it more than anything else was a lack of information. Where are we going? What is it the Government plans to do? We have a deficit on the current account of \$275 million. Moody's and the rest of them will continue to downgrade us unless something is done about that \$275 million.

Now Madam Deputy Speaker, you will recall that something was done—not recently—there was an announcement made of the closure of three post offices. Three post offices are going to close. And the Minister very quickly said, *Oh, but no jobs are going to be lost.* Oh, okay. *But we are going to save \$75,000—\$25,000 per post office.* And that is going to make a big dent in the \$275 million we have got to save—unbelievable! Unbelievable. A friend of mine said to me, *Terry, there shouldn't have even been a press conference.* You are going to save \$75,000 against a \$275 million [deficit].

Where is the plan? Give me a plan. Let me know where you are going. We need an overall plan for our buildings. We have some buildings that are falling into disrepair. We have some buildings that are falling into the wrong hands. I am not going to name them today. I am going to come back here with another Parliamentary question and discuss that a couple of

weeks from now. I am concerned about it. The Minister of Works alluded to the fact that we were going to get a plan for buildings—nothing has happened.

What about the plan for the future of our young people? I told you a few years ago I travelled to Spain, a beautiful country. But as far as I know right now and for the last little while, the number one export from Spain is young people. It is the number one export—well educated, University of Madrid and Barcelona and places like this—[there is a] 52 per cent unemployment rate amongst young people. And so either you stay home and do nothing with that great university degree, or you leave town. And they can travel all through the EU, they do not have to go anywhere where they need special passports (as the honourable colleague Mr. Walton Brown, was just talking about). They can just go straight across the border throughout the rest of the EU.

Now with this in mind, Madam Deputy Speaker, Government has seen fit to severely cut scholarships. Why would you do that? Surely that is one of the sacred cows. Surely you would look to help your young people develop. One of the responsibilities of Government beyond fixing things is delivering hope, having you believe that there is a tomorrow, having you believe that it is all going to work out. But if I am a high school student and you take away the university funding, that hope starts to fall away. I cannot really believe that the Government believes in me and my future if you take the bridge between today and the future and remove it.

So I am going to be “loose”—let’s use that as a word. I am going to put all of these failures on the back of the former Premier (because he is the former Premier) and we are going to say that nobody else is responsible. We now have a new Premier and we are going to invite the new Premier to take another look at what was going on for the last 17 months. We are going to say, *Let’s wipe the slate clean. Let’s not say the new Premier is responsible for cutting the funding of education.* No. Let us say the new Premier has an opportunity to make his mark by putting the funding back—easy enough to do—make a mark there.

We are still waiting to know what is going to happen with SAGE. Before the report was even debated it was tabled, and between tabling and debate we heard the now-Premier say, *Oh, DNDC isn’t going anywhere.* The report recommended that it be scrapped. We heard the then-Premier say, *Oh, Culture isn’t going anywhere.* It was recommended that it be scrapped. Last week, Friday, the Minister of Tourism assured us that the Department of Maritime Administration and the Department of Civil Aviation could become quangos.

Well, that is something that has been considered for a number of years. If they move them to quangos and they put it to a vote in this House, the vote will probably be 36 to zero. And I really should not speak for all the Members, but I would suggest

that it would be 36 to zero—no one has a problem with that. And working in the form of a quango, those departments can get a lot more done. But if you turn the conversation to privatisation of those departments, we might find ourselves right back to 19 to 17—Opposition has its say and Government has its way. You know how that works? It would not be in anybody’s best interests. So I hope we are not going to find ourselves there.

JETGATE

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Madam Deputy Speaker, the question hangs over all of us—is Jetgate over? Is it to be discussed any further? I do not know if there is more to come. I will invite the Members on the other side to tell us if there is more to come. Is there more fallout? Is there stuff we still do not know? Is it still going to be exciting reading for Bermudians to get up in the morning at seven o’clock and go to *BerNews* (the first information source in the country) and find out what is going on? Or are we past it?

Madam Deputy Speaker, you know, leading the country is all about honesty and integrity, having people believe that what you say is the truth and that you are going to carry it out. We have been through a horrible period in the last 17 months (or really in the last 14 months) over this mess. And that is all it is—a complete mess. The business of the people of Bermuda has fallen away. The business that has been done has been done under a cloud because so many people think there is something behind it every time. It is not good.

One of the things that the now-Government campaigned on was PATI—openness and transparency. And you have to smile when a Government will campaign on openness and transparency and then become the first government to lose its Premier over some supposed bad behaviour, some allegations. I do not know exactly what happened, what the Premier did, but we never lost a Premier in this way before—against a backdrop of openness and transparency.

You know, we were promised we would see PATI. All we have heard about PATI is that it is being worked on. Consider, Madam Deputy Speaker, we, not too long ago, brought into the country a Commissioner of Education who was supposed to do wonderful things. He is no longer here. And what led to him not being here was the Louisiana version of PATI—that is what it was—his application for the job was picked up by reporters through PATI.

This morning the Honourable Member Zane De Silva asked who the second party on the Club Med applications was. And the Minister said, *Well, I don’t think you should know.* If PATI was in place, we would all know.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not believe the response was: *I don’t think you should know.*

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Terry E. Lister: He can say what he said. I am not going to play with words. He can in fact inform us.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, I made it clear that it would be inappropriate to divulge that before I have a chance to get permission from that development company. There may be an NDA [non-disclosure agreement] in place and that is common for these types of transactions, and I want to make sure that I do not breach any arrangements.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Point of order on that, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Honourable Member did not say that this morning at all, and the Hansard will show that. And I will lay that down for the record to be cleared.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Madam Deputy Speaker, I clearly said that I would need to get permission.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, I did.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Member.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Okay. I needed to get permission from the developer.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: We will—

[Inaudible interjections]

[Gavel]

The Deputy Speaker: We will let it be said [that] once the information is sought and gathered we will hear back in the House. Until that point in time, please, proceed.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the point is if we were under PATI, the Minister would not be able to say anything, the access would be there and every-

one would know it and the Minister would not have a say. And we were promised PATI and we see no real movement.

Now, I want to declare this to be a new day. Whether it is or not is up to the Government. I want to declare it to be a new day; we have got a new Premier. I want to see the Premier—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes? Your point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Madam Deputy Speaker, I think it is important . . . the Honourable Member just said that if there was PATI, that you would have access. I do not believe that PATI will give access to confidential information and information that is covered by nondisclosure agreements.

PATI would not allow access to that.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Member?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Madam Deputy Speaker, as you know, my notes cannot be passed to anybody else once my 20 minutes is up, so I have to move on. However, if the Member had read the PATI Bill and understood it, he would know that this is exactly what would happen. So if he is not aware now, and he is not treading properly, he better tread carefully for when PATI finally does come. That is my suggestion to him.

Now, as I was saying, it is a new day. Remember the song? *It's a new day*. Yes, it's great. This is a new day. It is a new opportunity for us, and it is up to the new Premier to ensure that.

Now here is what I am going to suggest to him. Because of all the stuff surrounding Jetgate, let us go backwards. Let us go back to the referendum and put it back on the table.

A Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Let us give the people of Bermuda the right that both sides of this House promised to them.

[Desk thumping]

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Because the honest truth is, if you poll all of Bermuda there ain't many people that believed that Marc Bean was going to scuttle that referendum—ain't too many people. So let us stop that foolishness.

I am not holding you responsible Mr. Premier, I am giving you a clean slate.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Terry E. Lister: That is okay; a clean slate.

Take it off the table. Move forward, because we never got an explanation that was worth listening to.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, you know, politics does funny things to people. I have stood here or sat here and watched certain Bills come forward, and I watch people who I have great respect for, who I have known for a long time, just take their integrity and park it. Park it! I will give you an example. And again, Mr. Premier, I would like you to think long and hard about this one.

The Corporation of Hamilton did its business independent of the Government for over 200 years—no fuss, no bother. I have watched the Corporation over the last 20 years. I have seen some Mayors that [made me say], *Huh? He's the Mayor? Oh, my gracious!* Nobody jumped up and did anything. He was the Mayor. He did his term. Nobody said a word. The old Government—the former Government—changed the rules a little bit, and not everybody was happy.

So the Government came back here and said, *Here is what we want to do. We want to change the voting process.* And we voted on it. And to be perfectly honest I did not have a problem with that. The current Corporation knows that in May 2015 they will be retired. There is nothing they can do. We changed the rules, and that is that.

However, Madam Deputy Speaker, when we come to a point where we bring legislation that allows a Minister to approve every transaction over \$50,000 of a corporation . . . that is ridiculous. That is ridiculous. When we come back here to this House and we bring legislation—it is all law, it is all legal—that goes backwards and rescinds contracts . . . that is unforgivable. In my 20 years in this House that was one of the darkest days I have ever had in being here. And I looked across at Members who I knew and I watched them just vote in support and I thought, *You have really given away your integrity here today.*

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Madam Deputy Speaker—

The Deputy Speaker: Member?

The Chair recognises—

POINT OF ORDER

[Reflecting on prior debate]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I think the Honourable Member is reflecting on a debate in the last year.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes.

[Inaudible interjections]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Yes.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: No.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: No, it is not—

The Deputy Speaker: No, actually it was—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —a different session, it was—

The Deputy Speaker: —the [session].

No, very good. But you must not . . . just be careful. We cannot reflect on something that was in the same session.

Thank you. I have ruled.

Would you like to continue? You do not want to waste your 20 minutes.

Thank you.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I have no wish to go contrary to a rule, let us get that up front. But I do wish to make the point. And the point is that what was done in this House—that was legal because we make the laws—was totally improper. And I would invite the Premier to take another look and to think about where we want to be. What is it that this Government wants to accomplish? And let's get it right because what happened with City Hall was not right—everybody knows that up and down the country. You cannot have a man win a contract, supposedly carry it out, and then, before you know it, the contract is pulled from underneath him.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I also want to encourage the Government to do what it was elected for, and that is to get on with the business of the people—all of the people—not to allow itself to continue to be accused of being anti-Bermudian (because some of the actions appear to be that), not to be accused of being in the back pocket of big business (because some of the actions appear to be that).

Let me give you an example of one that really bothered me. I myself and the current Minister of Transport struggled to get a breathalyser test law on the books. Yes? Still struggling with it. And we need it. But while that struggle is going on (and it is not here yet) out of nowhere—*Puff!* Throne Speech last fall . . . we are going to sell liquor on Sunday and we are going to have all the stores open on Sunday. Two weeks later we are here with the Bill being tabled, and two weeks later we are passing it.

We cannot get legislation to protect you and I—who are not drinking to excess—from some person who is drunk to excess and is drunk on the road, yet within a blink of an eye we can bring legislation here that puts money into the merchants' pockets (that is

all it is doing) to our detriment—to the detriment—of the average citizen.

So I am going to encourage this Government to take responsibility for taking care of the people of Bermuda—not the merchants, the people of Bermuda. Yes, you talk to the merchants. Yes, you listen to them. You listen to everybody. But do not jump up and down when the merchants tell you to dance to this tune.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I refer to SAGE. To my knowledge, post the debate here, there has been one SAGE meeting—one!—a breakfast meeting at the Chamber of Commerce. They are the only people worthy of being spoken to.

Do you see my point? It does not come across well. It does not reflect well on a Government who, in a time of real trouble, is supposed to be giving hope to the people, [but then] instead actually ignores the people and then speaks to this special group and to act in their [behalf].

So, as I take my seat, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am going to encourage the Government to start afresh; do the things the people need and help us to go forward together.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any other Members that would like to speak?

The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Home Affairs from Pembroke East, constituency 15, Mr. Walter H. Roban.

You have the floor.

BERMUDA/UK RELATIONS

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

You know, I listened to the presentation by my honourable colleague, Mr. Walton Brown, and it was déjà vu, really, because what Mr. Brown was discussing and what he and the work he has done seems to show follows a historical pattern, which I think has been very troubling for this country. Ultimately, it will centre around issues we will have to discuss on how Her Majesty's Government has repeatedly thrown Bermuda under the bus or taken little regard for the interests of Bermudians or Bermuda.

The issue around the visa privileges that have been reinstated basically has to do with the lack of regard that Britain has had for persons in the overseas territories—not only Bermuda, but others—their rights, which, presumably, they are the custodians of.

But I can recall a number of other circumstances where, frankly, the British just have had little regard specifically for Bermuda's interests. And despite the fact that some may proclaim we are a Crown Colony, or we are the largest colony left in what was the long, gone, British Empire, we have such a hal-

lowed position and we are loved by the Royal family and this, that and the other, what you have seen when it comes to the practical relationship is, in many cases, just absolute disregard.

When I think back to the 1990s when we had to face the European Union and the OECD putting us on a black list, or certainly on a list that would have had us targeted as a tax haven, which potentially [could have] negatively impacted the growing of our international business, and how the Bermuda Government had to expend resources and expertise in going over to Brussels and making the case that prevented us from doing so. But it would not stop there. We would have successive episodes of having to go through this process with the EU (the Honourable Finance Minister talks about France, but I believe back in the late 1980s it was the EU) and it started with the work of Dr. Gibbons as Finance Minister, then it was followed by Eugene Cox and, you know, us having to expend resources—time and money—to go over to Europe to make representations to protect our way of life, of which it does not appear the British expended any of their responsibilities for external affairs in our interests.

We have had repeated episodes of this. It even extended to our satellite opportunities which the United Bermuda Party received on our behalf many decades ago, and facing threats from the Isle of Man. Again, that arose because the British gave the Isle of Man certain opportunities which encroached on our own commercial rights. And we had to spend a considerable amount of money getting representation. I do believe that the Honourable Member, Mr. Lister, was a Minister at one episode of that. And we had to go over to the UK and make representations to Her Majesty's Courts and spend a lot of Bermuda's taxpayers' dollars to protect those rights.

That has since gone through a process and we have had some success due to the Isle of Man essentially not fulfilling its own opportunities. And again, we found episodes where, with our Aircraft Registry, the British intervening (if I can say the word) in us pursuing our rights and our commercial opportunities there. Now, I am not saying that some of that was not justified, but one has to wonder, *With friends like that who needs enemies?* Where you have these constant episodes of the UK, the administering power, essentially jeopardising our commercial rights which we as a country (or I should say "territory," I will go there) certainly are pursuing in our own interests.

Let us not forget in 2008 with one of the biggest episodes just after the huge stock market crash and the global recession and the horizon that was coming and how the OECD and the United States and the G20 decided they were going to set up grey lists, white lists, black lists. And Gordon Brown (the then-Prime Minister) and the President of the United States, and others, began to treat islands like Bermuda like we were the pariahs of the global economy,

saying, *Well, you are going to be on a black list unless you go around and sign up all these countries*, for what then became known as TIEAs. So here we are, again, our administering power jacking us up (if I can just use the colloquial language).

I remember those and recite those things to say, you know, when are we going to decide to perhaps change the relationship? And I am not suggesting anything necessarily in the immediate, but we as a country have to do a lot to ensure that our international interests are protected. The fact that we have had to invest in offices in London and in Washington, DC, is another example of how, when it comes to the relationships with other countries (even our administering power), we have had to make sure that we have people on the ground monitoring and representing Bermuda because there are threats looming, when it comes to Bermuda specifically, that the UK Government, frankly, does not even care about.

Even when it comes to the reinsurance industry, you know, London is a competitor to Bermuda. And it is not a rare occasion where you often find it written up in some glossy insurance journal about how wonderful London is and how things are not quite right in Bermuda, or whatever. And it is clear that, you know, certain interests have . . . and like despite there being a relationship between the London reinsurance market and the Bermuda reinsurance market, and Bermuda's prominence in that area, it is like we are fighting our own family member who has a lot more resources.

I must commend those who are tasked with carrying out this battle for us because they have been doing a great job. Our expertise in the Finance Ministry and the Economic Development Ministry . . . these are the people who have over the years been the ones making sure . . . and even in the Premier's office and past Premiers have done the job to fight for Bermuda. But why should we be fighting the UK?

The issue that Mr. Brown described, and the Honourable Junior Minister talked about earlier, is an example of where Britain's lack of care, lack of due care, has put the welfare of our own people in some jeopardy—or at least caused unnecessary expense having to obtain passports and go through the process and everything that people have to go through. And we are still facing the prospect of our passports not even being issued here. So, all I say is that that is something that we as a country have to think about.

JETGATE

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Madam Deputy Speaker, I will move on to another topic. You know, this has been a very interesting week. And yes, the old adage that *a day is a long time in politics* has been lived multiple times in Bermuda in recent days. Every day has been different. You put your head down in the night, when you wake up in the morning you find something much

different than you found before. And I am not talking about the sunrise or the weather; I am talking about some other stuff. And it has been uncharted territory for our country.

I think some people might even wake up and wonder, *Do we have a legitimate Government in place?* because of issues that have gripped the current administration as to the positions of people in the Cabinet, and the things that we have learned through the media, have been shocking. The revelation about Members of this House that we have seen and still continue to see as late as last night on the television, or what one reads online, still continues to keep the questions coming as to whether Members of this House have done the honourable thing or Members of the Legislature have done the honourable thing. And the responsibility there is for Members of the Government to understand their responsibility for the issues around Jetgate that have emerged; that it is not just the three. A whole year of activity has made the whole group culpable.

Now the attention has begun to focus on a few individuals more recently. And information has come to us more recently about a few individuals. We have seen at least two people, certainly, reconsider their positions as Members of the Government and sit on the other benches—the benches in back of the front bench. There may be others who may yet come to the realisation, Madam Deputy Speaker, that it is time to make a step.

Now, I can accept, and I think many people can accept, that political donations are the business of political parties. And most of the activities around that are private business between those who donate and those who receive. But the activities that we have seen emerge around certain activities around donations related to the One Bermuda Alliance have set off a firestorm in our country.

Now, let us sort of look at where this kind of started. It kind of started with gaming and it started with . . . it seemed to be an understanding by most—certainly on both sides of the House—that gaming would be a window of opportunity for our country. Now let us just look at this, Madam Deputy Speaker. Gaming was one of those sacred cows of Bermuda—long sitting on the mantle, not to be touched by many, or some; but thought about by others. A sacred cow. A real sacred cow. But here we are at this point in our history as a country where that sacred cow was beginning to get some attention. And there are a number of sacred cows, but this is the sacred cow that got the attention of the current administration as a window of opportunity to move the country forward. And every step that this Government would make (we were told) would be to make it a reality.

But what has seemed to happen around the activities, particularly of the current Tourism Minister and others, and even another Minister who sits in another place (and this is under the umbrella of gaming

because all of this seems to have been to try and get something going on in Bermuda), they have turned a sacred cow into a decaying carcass; a smelly carcass. The sacred cow which needed a lot of care and attention and to be handled with a delicate hand has turned out to be . . . is getting close to being a dying carcass lying on the grass. And our reputation as a country around this sacred cow is being tarnished because of all the activities that have been revealed that Ministers of Government engaged in in order to bring the sacred cow off the mantle and into the pasture where all could benefit. You know, the carcass has really begun to stink. It has been turned into something that is not, that does not smell quite right.

Now there seems to have been acknowledgement by at least two that their role in perhaps bringing some harm to the carcass merited taking certain steps. But others seem to have had some responsibility around the issues that have emerged because, as we have been told, all of these activities were in order to get gaming into Bermuda in a way that was going to benefit our country.

I would argue that many of our own citizens might have, perhaps, had some open mind to listen. *I am not comfortable with this whole thing, but it looks like the Government is trying to do something to help the economy, get some jobs going, get some brick and mortar in this place, get my uncle, my brother, my friends back to work. I might be able to live with that even though I am not comfortable with gaming. I might be able to live with it.* But all of the trauma, all of the lack of answering questions, the change of stories, even Mr. Landow's story seems to have changed from article to story, from article to story. His own story has changed. The stories of the persons who were a part of the Bermuda delegation changed as well.

I can understand why even those who might have been on the edge might just say, *I don't know about all this now.* That is not even talking about some of the fabrications that were created around the elimination of the referenda, which now, based on what we have seen since then, are proved to have been totally manufactured. They could not be true based on what we have seen in the media since then, since December 14th or 17th (whatever the date was). They cannot be true.

How Ministers could have got up in this House and said that they heard the Opposition Leader say what this, that and . . . it cannot be true now. It cannot possibly be true. And I got up and was quite blunt, Madam Deputy Speaker, and said that unless evidence was brought to this House to prove that the Opposition Leader said those things, I would see it as a lie. Unless I saw the evidence, it was a lie.

Well, I think what we have seen produced since then has proven that that was a lie by those who got up in this House and suggested that the Opposition Leader had said those things.

The Deputy Speaker: Be careful. We do not want to impugn.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: I am not impugning. I have not called anybody's name and—

The Deputy Speaker: I am just saying be careful.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: And I am not going to call. I am saying what was said has now, based on what we have seen in the legitimate public media, been proven to be not true (I will remove that word just for the sake of being respectful to this House—not true), and the successive episodes of truth not being told.

Now, there are the issues within this House of how you deal with that. And there are ways to deal with that. And I think it has been clear that persons have come to this House and not been truthful.

But some of what has become a lot more concerning is what we have seen outside of this House and the stories that have been twisted and turned with the stories from the Honourable Tourism Minister, stories related to a Minister who sits in another place, by the name of Minister Fahy, and the concerns that that has raised.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not believe that we are able to comment on—

The Deputy Speaker: Your point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: My point of order, yes, able to comment on—

The Deputy Speaker: Someone that sits in another place.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Another place. Or someone that sits in the other place.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, please proceed.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: But—

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you.

You know, the Honourable Premier may need to make some decisions about these two individuals—the Tourism Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs who sits in another place.

[Timer beeps]

The Deputy Speaker: Time is up.

Thank you.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: So I think there is a lot to be thought about, there is a lot that needs to be answered, and certain people need to think about doing the honourable thing.

Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

Are there any other Members that would like to speak?

I am going to say I saw that, and I thought, well, you cannot speak twice.

[Laughter]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much.

The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Tourism *[sic]*, the Honourable Wayne L. Furbert, from Hamilton West constituency—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Economic Development, I stand corrected, thank you very much.

Please proceed.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, you know, I am not a person who likes rumours. But you know there are people out there in Bermuda now saying that the United Bermuda Party is back in charge.

An Hon. Member: Well, you know they are right.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I am a bit concerned about why they say that. I mean, it is really awful. Madam Deputy Speaker, you would agree, as a member who formerly sat in the United Bermuda Party, that a body was formed called the One Bermuda Alliance. And I believe, Madam Deputy Speaker, it was formed out of trickery. There is nothing that—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, Member—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Member, yes—

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognises—

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: The Honourable Member is *[imputing]* improper motives.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes, that was clear. Member, you—

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

[Gavel]

The Deputy Speaker: I will not play games. We have a Member that is standing to his feet.

Thank you.

If you would like to continue talking, you may remove yourself from the room and you can have a conversation. But other than that, we have a Member that is standing to his feet.

Member, please do not impugn any misconduct with reference to the creation of a political party. You may proceed.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not know . . . what rule are you quoting? What rule are you quoting?

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

[Gavel]

The Deputy Speaker: I cannot hear. So if everyone would like me to be able to hear the Member who is on his feet, I would be more than happy.

You have my attention.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, I hope you will tell the audience that is listening that you are not slamming that on me.

The Deputy Speaker: That is correct. No, I—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: All right. Please say that.

The Deputy Speaker: To be clear there is a Member who is to his feet. I would like to hear him, and unfortunately, I cannot hear him when everyone else is talking. And I would really like to.

Thank you, Member.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, a party was formed called the One Bermuda Alliance and the whole episode, I believe, was to get us where we are now.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, yes.

An Hon. Member: Explain. I do not understand. Explain.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Every single member of . . . well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am going through some detox. I am going through some rehabilitation right now that I used to belong with that group there.

[Laughter]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I understand that.

An Hon. Member: Yes, you are going through a cleansing.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I am going through some cleansing.

But Madam Deputy Speaker, every member in the Cabinet right now—every member—was either a leader of the United Bermuda Party, Chairman of the United Bermuda Party, Deputy Chairman of the United Bermuda Party, Campaign Chairman of the United Bermuda Party . . . that was two of them, I know two of them, and you ask me how I know.

[Laughter]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: How I know.

An Hon. Member: Yes, how do you know?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Well, I am sure you can also answer that question.

An Hon. Member: Yes, how do you know? Tell us.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: The Honourable Member was a Senator of the United Bermuda Party.

An Hon. Member: Oh!

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: The Honourable Member was a Senator of the United Bermuda Party and a Cabinet Minister of the United Bermuda Party.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Deputy Speaker: Member, do speak to the Chair.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Trust me, I know . . . I am talking about the Honourable Member Bob Richards. So everybody right now is formerly United Bermuda Party, every single one of them. I would have thought that those members who came over thought that they were coming over to a new organisation.

See, Madam Deputy Speaker, I knew that the public out there, when they said that they thought that the United Bermuda Party is back in charge, were misleading this public because they have always been in charge . . . from the very beginning. As a matter of fact, the One Bermuda Alliance started at the former Member Grant Gibbons'—standing up right now.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Madam Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member is misleading the House.

The United Bermuda Party ended a number of years ago. There is a new party right now and this is very disrespectful in terms of the genesis of the One Bermuda Alliance.

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: He knows that too.

The Deputy Speaker: Member. Member!

Member, once everyone is quiet you may proceed.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I understand why the Honourable Member wants to forget what he used to belong to [and what] I used to belong to.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I don't want to forget anything.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: But he knows that the One Bermuda Alliance formation started within his office.

An Hon. Member: Really?

An Hon. Member: Point of order that!

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: The One Bermuda Alliance, Madam Deputy Speaker—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Yes. Point of order on that one.

[Laughter]

The Deputy Speaker: Point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: At the request of the Opposition, the Honourable Member is misleading the House.

[Laughter]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Member.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Well, the Honourable Member can say what he wants. And why do I know that, Madam Deputy Speaker?

A Hon. Member: Why? Tell us.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Because I was invited to some of the meetings.

[Inaudible interjections and uproar]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Your point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Madam Deputy Speaker, I was at the meeting and *meetings* that started this party. That Honourable Member was nowhere to be seen. And it was not in my colleague's office either, it was in my office!

Some Hon. Members: Ooh!

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, I have always said, *There are meetings and there are "meetings."*

The Deputy Speaker: Member, I will just point out. If I could have the ability to acknowledge you, and that way, for those people who are listening, they will know. But no, please stand to your feet, but as the communication or the conversations continue.

Please.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, as I said, there are meetings and there are meetings. But when it first started, that Honourable Member was not around.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: He was around.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: And no, I did not attend any meetings because I refused to attend some of the meetings. I was at that time an Independent Member and invited to the office. And I am sure the former Attorney General maybe will confirm that I was not at that meeting.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Hold on a second. I am feeling completely pushed to the back because I do not know anything about any of this . . . so.

[Laughter]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Anyway, Madam Deputy Speaker, we are at the point now that the whole plan now is where we are at. So I would have thought when I am speaking to certain Members of the House on the other side, particularly who sit on the back-bench—they were once Progressive Labour Party Members or supporters, and now have been brought into something that is different. I would have thought that they would now have second thoughts on where they stand, or where they sit, because what was supposed to be has not come, at least in their minds. But what is is what they had planned. Because if you remember that report—that special report—

An Hon. Member: Oh, yes.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: That special report that was kept quiet by certain Members until some things were leaked. And then a certain individual was supposed to be at least a surrogate—

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I would have thought that would have been part of the whole plan.

So Madam Deputy Speaker, am I happy to see the Honourable former Premier out of his seat? I will be honest with you, I am not. I am not. First of all, because I knew what his real heart was. But at the end of the day he did not know what trap he fell in. So it is all about timing, all about timing for certain individuals. So but now they are where they are.

But we have been through a whole year—a whole year—of going back and forward, Ministers and Members standing up and saying, *Not true, not true, not true*, and coming on certain individual's media [shows], calling their names, not trusted, law suits. But not one Member on that side has stood up and apologised to my Honourable Leader Marc Bean, and my honourable friend, the Shadow Minister David Burt. Not one Member on that side has stood up and apologised to a very good journalist. Not one Member. Not one Member stood up and apologised, because it is all about where they want to go.

But let me just tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, there is a verse in the Bible that says—

The Deputy Speaker: I cannot hear you; there is a person in front of you . . . Can you just talk a little louder or just maybe . . .

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: All I am saying to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that there is a verse in the Bible that says "weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." And all I am saying to you is that you may have got the victory now, but somewhere along the line, whether it is one year or two years, I am telling you right now, you will not be sitting

there. I am sending a message to you right now. And I know some of you will not be . . . not some of you—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: That is right. Some of you will be so frightened you will not be running. You will all be scattering because the whole plan has now fallen apart. And now you are going to go out there and find another new name for the new party because it was born out of deceit and trickery.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Madam Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member, again, is—

The Deputy Speaker: [Imputing].

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —[imputing] improper motives—

The Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —because he is using disrespectful and insulting language. That is against [Standing Order 19](11)(d)—

The Deputy Speaker: Yes—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: And we all know it.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
Member, please continue.

The Chair recognises the Member from constituency—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: There are—

The Deputy Speaker: The Member from constituency 6.

Please proceed.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Parties and organisations are formed for a purpose. If you tell me that the purpose was transparency, it is not true. If the purpose was to balance the budget, it is not true. So what was the purpose of the organisation? The purpose was just to get rid of the Progressive Labour Party.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: The purpose was to get rid of the Progressive Labour Party at all costs necessary—at all costs necessary.

So I am going to go out there and plant these seeds in some of our younger minds and say, *Come over*. Plant our seeds in individuals who are out there that are supporting the Progressive Labour Party—*Don't get . . . don't vote, don't vote!* They know the whole game plan. I say once again, some of you will be sitting back here at least three years from now and if not sooner.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, they know that they have stolen the rights from the people to have a referendum. Every one of them knows that. Every one of them knows that! The Honourable Bob Richards, when I was in the United Bermuda Party, did not support casinos. When I was there, the Honourable Grant Gibbons did not support casinos.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, keep talking to me.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: The Honourable Member Patricia Gordon-Pamplin did not support casinos. But they were tricked on a Tuesday afternoon (or whatever it was) by four individuals . . . by four individuals, by trickery and, once again, deceit, that we would boycott the right for people to have the right to vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker, just by that alone the current Premier (who is out of the room) should, if he had any integrity, say to my Cabinet, *Let's pause*. If I was his political advisor, I would advise him that, because that is what he will score. But he does not know I am standing where I am. I am going to ask you, Cabinet colleagues, to go there on, whatever it is, Tuesday or Wednesday, and say to your Premier that we have to go to the country. Caucus—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, can you please just refer to the Chair?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, I want the caucus to stand up once and for all. A year and a half has gone by and they have been like . . . I have never seen a caucus, a backbench, like that in all my whole born days. Backbench is supposed to be the backbone of the organisation—backbone—holding the front bench to account.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am pleading with Ms. Scott who had the bravery to say what she said. I am pleading with my good friend, Mr. Richards, who once stood in another location as far as his support. I am supporting Ms. Davis who knows her family background. I am supporting . . . I am asking those individuals to ask their Cabinet colleagues where do they stand and why are we heading in that direction. It cannot come here unless caucus and backbenchers support it.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, here is my big concern. We heard that there were four individuals who attended the meeting in Washington, DC. I ask the former Attorney General and the current Minister

of Tourism, Did the consultant Mr. Green attend that meeting?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: He did? Mr. Green the consultant, did he attend that meeting? The meeting in Washington?

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: With respect—

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. The Chair recognises the Member from Warwick North East.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Madam Deputy Speaker, I am not quite sure. I need to be clear about what he was trying to say.

What were you saying? Did he attend the meeting?

[Crosstalk]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Did the Honourable Member—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, take your seat.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: He is not “honourable”—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, take your seat, please—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: But did the consultant—

The Deputy Speaker: Member!

Let me recognise who you are. I just had to get one person to sit so only one person is standing.

You may please stand. The Chair recognises Member Furbert. Please continue.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Now, I am asking the Honourable . . . anyone can answer. If they do not want to answer it is up to them, but was the consultant, or former consultant (because I am not sure whether he is still there), the OBA consultant, Mr. Green, in the meeting in Washington, DC with him, the Premier, the Honourable Shawn Crockwell, and Mr. DaCosta?

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Member from Warwick North East.

You have the floor.

POINT OF ORDER

[Clarification]

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Point of clarification. I am not sure if the Honourable Member is saying that he asked me that some time before, I do not think he did.

But the answer would be unequivocally “no.” But I think he needs to clarify that he never asked me that because he never did—because that would have been my answer: unequivocally, absolutely not.

The Deputy Speaker: Well, actually, Member this is not a question and answer period.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: I realise that but I just—

The Deputy Speaker: And I would like—

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: I hear the rambling going on and it needs to stop.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Honourable Mr. Furbert.

You have the floor.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, how much time do I have left first of all?

The Deputy Speaker: Six minutes and eleven seconds.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: So I asked that question and we have asked questions before and got a “no” before but we will find out whether it comes true or not.

The other thing is the . . . this Mr. Green—

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: I object to that.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: There is something that . . . Object to what?

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: He is imputing improper motive. I was asked—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, take your seat please.

The Chair—

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: I have—

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognises the Member from Warwick North East.

You have the floor.

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: He is imputing improper motives, with great respect. I was asked now for that point of clarification. I have confirmed it. And to say “we will find out now whether that comes true or not” is outrageous. He needs to withdraw that.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognises—

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Interpolation from that Member and to say something like that is imputing improper motives, as well, to instigate something like that from me because [there is] nothing but unequivocal truth here.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Economic Development. Do try and stay . . . you are doing pretty good—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I am.

The Deputy Speaker: And with due respect, continue to refer to me and—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I am.

The Deputy Speaker: —we will be doing fine.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker—

The Deputy Speaker: But right now we have two different . . . would you like to take your seat?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I hope I am getting some time from . . . the Honourable Attorney General is taking my time.

The Deputy Speaker: Please, thank you.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: How much do I have left, another six minutes?

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed.

Please proceed. Your time now is 4 minutes and 54 seconds, so speak quickly.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: So Madam Deputy Speaker, there has to be some clarity in this whole . . . am I speaking to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, or—

[Inaudible interjections]

An Hon. Member: Hello.

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes, but you told me to look at you, so I want to look at you.

[Laughter]

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed. Would you like to take your seat? because I could do that just as quick.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: No, Madam Deputy Speaker, you asked me to look at you—

The Deputy Speaker: Please do. There was a question being asked of me and I was answering it. Please proceed.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, so here is the issue I am asking about. Why . . . this is what we are hearing, that Mr. Green (who we call the bowtie man) was . . . introduced Mr. Landow to the former Premier. I understand he was in Washington, but maybe it was at a different time.

I also asked the question, they tell me . . . and that is what they have to deal with, that Mr. Green was on the bank account of this special funding—him and DaCosta and the Minister Michael Fahy—I find that strange. I mean, that is dumb in itself. But I do not understand why—and I consider Mike, I still consider him, a good friend—the Honourable Shawn Crockwell knew nothing about this.

I just find it quite strange because I know that the Honourable Member Shawn Crockwell and Mr. Green are very good friends. And so . . . as a matter of fact, the Honourable, Shawn Crockwell, introduced Mr. Green to the United Bermuda Party and then on to the BDA. And I am sure that it was negotiated that he had to come with the team. Because I know the Honourable Grant Gibbons would never have taken him because he . . . that is why he went to New York with that group up there.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: So I am . . . I just find it ironic that at the end of the day the former Attorney General and the Minister did not know anything about what was going on. I just find it strange.

So somewhere along the line, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am . . . and I am talking to my . . . I consider a friend . . . is to do what is best for the country. Do what is best for the country, not what is best for the Honourable Michael Dunkley.

And, by the way, if the Honourable Michael Dunkley ever says he is 100 per cent in full support of you—run!

[Laughter]

The Deputy Speaker: Member, Member! That is impugning . . . no, no, no. No, Member, my ruling is that that was impugning.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: But what did I impugn? What did I impugn?

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed. If you . . . please proceed.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: What did I say that was impugning, Madam Deputy Speaker?

The Deputy Speaker: In my judgment you were referring something which I would prefer not to—

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I did not refer anything.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, would you like to continue?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, he told me he supported me 100 per cent one week and the next week I was gone. He told Kim Swan he was in [support of him] 100 per cent and he is gone. The Honourable Craig Cannonier he had his 100 per cent support the day before, and he is gone. He is now telling the Honourable Shawn Crockwell he has 100 per cent [of his] support.

[Laughter and general uproar]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: I have to tell you, my friend . . . tiptoe man, just tiptoe.

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Be careful. Be careful. Be careful. That is all I am saying to you—100 per cent support—if he said 99 per cent, I would be . . . you know, but 100 per cent full support—

An Hon. Member: That is it.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: That is it.
So I am saying before he . . . everybody . . .
Madam Deputy Speaker, my time is up.
Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.
The Chair recognises the Minister of Education and Economic Development, Paget East, constituency 22, Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons.
You have the floor.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I would like to begin by just saying that I remember that Honourable Member saying I had his 100 per cent support and then I was gone.

Some Hon. Members: Ah!

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, point of order.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Madam Deputy Speaker—

The Deputy Speaker: Have a seat.
The Chair recognises the Honourable Wayne L. Furbert.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Madam Deputy Speaker, I am glad the Honourable Member said that because—

The Deputy Speaker: Do you have a point of order?

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Yes, point of order—

The Deputy Speaker: Good.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: —he is misleading this House.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
Member—

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: He is misleading this House; let me say why he is misleading the House now.

The Deputy Speaker: I cannot have two people standing to the floor.
Member, I have got your point of order.

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: He did have my 100 per cent support, but certain Members that now sit in that Cabinet did not, and I got a call that said, *Come to the meeting*.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognises the Honourable Minister of Education and Economic Development.
Please proceed.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I could not sit still any longer after hearing about the “game plan.” And I am not thinking so much about whatever conspiracy theories those Honourable Members may be pushing in our direction, but what I do understand very clearly, because I was in Opposition for many years, was the game plan that is going on on their side. And that is the game plan of basically trying to distract the Government, throwing up all kinds of issues week after week. And I understand that. I was in Opposition. We asked questions as well, when we were in Opposition, I think it is a very, it is a very—

[Inaudible interjection]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, I will take that as a compliment.

I think it is very clear that the Opposition has a role to play in terms of asking questions and holding Government to account, so I do not think anybody in this House has any problems with that.

But the difficulty from my perspective, Madam Deputy Speaker . . . and I refer to [Standing Order] 19(11)(d). That rule says basically, “it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting, or disrespectful language about Members of the House or which tends to bring the House of Assembly into disrepute.”

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have never seen, [as I have seen] over the last three or four months, such disrespectful, insulting language that has been coming from the other side—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —in this particular—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —in this particular—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —series of conversations.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
Member, take your seat.
The Chair recognises the—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable—

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognises the Opposition Leader.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable Member is misleading this House.

We have carried out our responsibilities by asking simple questions to which we never received simple answers.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
The Chair recognises the Minister Gibbons.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I make my case. And I think the public and everybody else—the kinds of comments that I have heard about the language

going on up here, the insulting and disrespectful language that has been coming and aimed at various Members of Government, in particular, has been essentially unprecedented as far as I am concerned.

Now, suffice it to say, when a number of us—and many of us on this side—were in Opposition for quite some time, yes, we did do our best to ask questions. We did, I think, the best we could to try and hold the Government to account. But as we all know, a lot of the things we have been seeing in terms of over the last few months have essentially paled in comparison to some of the issues that were raised about former Members on that side.

I use simply one example, and that was the Uighur situation. Talk about misleading the country, misleading your own Members. And what we have seen on this side has been a Member of our party—the former Premier—who has done what I would say is absolutely the honourable thing. That never happened with any Members, as far as I remember, on that side of the House.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Take your seat.
The Chair recognises the Opposition Leader.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. One example of a resignation was the Honourable Walter Roban—

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Member.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Dale Butler, Terry Lister and many other Ministers have resigned from Cabinet. Thank you.

An Hon. Member: On principle.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: On principle!

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognises Dr. Gibbons.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I take the point that the Honourable Member, Mr. Roban, did the honourable thing. But in many other cases it was for different reasons and, frankly—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —the case I have just cited with Dr. Brown—

The Deputy Speaker: Please take your seat.
Thank you.
The Chair recognises the Opposition Leader.

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: [Imputing] improper motive.

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed, Dr. Gibbons.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

And I think my honourable colleague, the Honourable Craig Cannonier, was very clear in terms of his [statement](#) on his resignation. He said, “Nothing illegal was done, but I accept there was a failure over time to be completely transparent. This is a fundamental component of good governance and a core principle upon which the One Bermuda Alliance was founded.”

And what is so interesting about that, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that I have had a number of calls from international businesses in the last week or so and the interesting question that I have gotten was, *Okay, are things settling down?* But more importantly they have said, *We really don't understand, why did the Premier resign?* And, unfortunately, I had to explain the Westminster system to them. The Honourable Member basically took responsibility for (as he put it) “a failure over time to be completely transparent.” And I think they were astounded, given some of the issues that have gone on in other governments in other parts of the world. And I think it should actually make all of us proud. Certainly, I am very proud of my honourable colleague for doing the right and honourable thing and setting down.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Sorry, if you will take your seat.
The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Human Affairs.
You have the floor.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Madam Deputy Speaker, I think that the Minister is misleading the House somewhat. He refers to the comment about transparency with respect to the former Premier.

The Deputy Speaker: No, he was actually reading a presentation, I believe. You were reading a statement?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: A quote from the statement.

The Deputy Speaker: It was a quote from his statement.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Well, certainly the former Premier misled the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Uh-uh, that was not . . . that is not for debate right now. We were just . . . he was reading from a statement.

Thank you.
The Chair recognises the Honourable Gibbons.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for that clarification, because I was reading a quote from the Honourable Member Craig Cannonier’s resignation speech. And what he said was that he accepted there was a failure over time to be completely transparent. And I think I would like to stand and say that I certainly am proud of what my honourable colleague did in terms of taking responsibility for that.

I think it is disappointing for all of us because I think that Honourable Member absolutely moved this country forward on any number of levels. I think his leadership has clearly resulted in very good progress on a whole series of fronts over the last year and a half on any number of areas from setting the stage for job growth, restoring business confidence, stabilising the country’s finances, restructuring Bermuda’s approach to tourism (and we heard a little bit about that this morning, Madam Deputy Speaker), ensuring care for people in need, and, most importantly, advancing human rights.

So I think the record of that Honourable Member who stepped down as leader, I think, is strong and very positive. But under the Westminster system he has taken responsibility. And I think that, in many respects, is actually a wonderful thing, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I guess I am going to switch gears a little bit now, but I would say the Honourable Member who just took his seat talked about a “game plan.” I think the game plan, Madam Deputy Speaker, has been very clear from the Opposition. They will do whatever they can—whatever they can—to distract and to stop this One Bermuda Alliance Government from carrying out what it started out to do.

And the good news is, Madam Deputy Speaker, my honourable colleague, Craig Cannonier, has said that he will stay in this House and he will make sure that we on this side carry out the things that he and a lot of his colleagues started to put this country back in good shape, to restore proper financial management, and, certainly, to advance the well-being and welfare of Bermudians.

Now I would like to just touch on a couple of other issues while I may. And some of those were raised by the Honourable Member, Mr. Terry Lister. We have heard, obviously, on a number of fronts about the scholarships, and as I have said before and I will say again now, the Committee of the Board of Education—the Scholarship Committee—will be meeting. The funding—and we have certainly said this, it was very clear in the budget—has been cut from \$1.3 [million] last year down to \$1 million this year. There is certainly a fair amount of money in there, but if we can find a way to ease that to provide more scholarships, we will certainly do so.

I would just like to comment, though, on another issue. Madam Deputy Speaker, you will remember this. Going way back into the 1990s when the Honourable Member who just took his seat was in the United Bermuda Party, there was a very strong programme of education loans. In fact, there was some \$4 million that was in there to guarantee student loans. I am not quite sure what happened to that, but clearly over the last 10 or 15 years that programme completely fell apart. I am going to have a look and see whether there is a way to get that programme going again.

I understand that there were issues of administration there, perhaps from the former Government. I do not know quite who is responsible, but that was a tremendous benefit to a lot of students who could find a way to get loans backed by Government (loans from the banks) in order to be able to afford, during their education years or during their college years, a way to get through college. I think that is something that we need to have another look at again, and I am going to go back—I said to the former Premier, actually (the Honourable Member Mr. Cannonier), that I would have a look into that because I think we all understand why the Government is in the position it is in right now in terms of having to reduce that budget in education. There simply is not the amount of money that was there before.

There was also a question as to what is an appropriate amount of money that needs to be put forward for student loans. There are a lot of scholarships out there; they range from the Bermuda Government Scholarship to a lot of company scholarships. What is the right . . . what is the appropriate amount? We all understand that if we had our way in this House we would give as much money as we possibly can. But, as a consequence of where we find ourselves right now, there simply is not enough money to support every student who wants to go to college, as much as we would all like to be able to do that, Madam Deputy Speaker.

So, as I have said, we are going to see what we can do to see if we can find some additional money. But I think possibly this student loan thing is something that we can have a look at and essentially find out if there is a way to get that back on track.

I think, Madam Deputy Speaker, those are the main points that I wanted to make. I think we have heard a lot from the Honourable Member Mr. Terry Lister that we can think a little bit about, but I would just like to say that we are very much moving ahead on part of our plan which is to essentially create jobs. Jobs come from companies and we have done a lot over the last few years not only to increase the number of new registrations—both local and international—but also to put in place incentives for job makers in an amended way to try and effectively create a better bond, particularly between international business and Bermuda. And we have also in the last session (and I do not want to reflect on it) put in place a Corporate Landholding Policy which we feel . . . we have already had some interesting inquiries which we feel will, again, stimulate business, stimulate growth, [and] stimulate a real estate market.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Environment and Infrastructure from Devonshire North Central, constituency 13, Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney.

You have the floor.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I just listened to the Member who took his seat and I am really dumbfounded with the entire Government bench. It is just incredible. They are jumping up howling “improper motive” here, there, and everywhere, based on language. What about improper motive based on behaviour? [We have] the most disrespectful, reprehensible, deplorable, unprecedented actions that we have seen by the Government of Bermuda ever in this House and ever in the history of this country in the modern era. Incredible!

It is not just the Opposition calling for accountability; it is the people of the country, not the least of which are the right-thinking core members of your own party. And you have had to have heard them, and you are still hearing them, because there is still the dust that is yet to settle as a result of the right thing still not happening with the resignation of *all* [those] involved in Jetgate—*all*!

Just for your own self dignity take the example of the Honourable Member Mr. Mark Pettingill, the former Attorney General—albeit as late as it came, it came. The example of the Premier—your leader—who you would not let serve anymore, not the Opposition, not the people of the country, *you*, OBA. Why? Why? There is an investigation going on for several days now. There is no report yet.

I congratulate the new Premier on getting the consensus of his party. But you know the incredible thing about knowing him politically, as I have come to know him being in this Chamber for 10 years plus, I really thought that he would have done what he knew

was the right thing to do and not get up and unequivocally attempt to play down or downplay the seriousness not only of two resignations, but why there is still the incredible concern of the country as to how and why you can justify and clarify that a Member that is yet to resign still sits in your Cabinet who is as culpable as every other person involved in the affair.

An Hon. Member: Guilty!

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: It is like, Madam . . . Mr. Chairperson—

[Laughter]

[Mr. Rolfe Commissiong, Acting Speaker, in the Chair]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —Acting Speaker Commissiong, if I may, the analogy is three people in a car, but forget the fourth person. They drive up to a bank . . . and I will say Clarien.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: One guy gets out, runs inside and attempts to rob the bank. [He] gets a little shaky, a little scared. He comes back out and the other two guys in the car, they all three take off.

Hound dogs get on the trail and find that the guy that was in the bank is caught on video. He is arrested and found to be culpable of his actions. The other two guys—the driver and the other guy—just walk away and say, *Well, which is the next bank we are going to look for? Maybe we can sit outside again and the dummy that we send in will bring something that we can really have and take away and put in our pockets.*

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: What is going on?
How could there not be culpability?
How?

We get a person . . . we look . . . everybody in the equation was very economical with the truth. They spoke mistruths, misrepresentations—everyone.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order.

An Hon. Member: Oh-oh.

The Acting Speaker: There is a point of order.
Member, take your seat.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, point of order. If the Honourable Member is including me in that statement,

I have never misled the House on this issue, or anyone else on this issue.

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: You never led the House—

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —on the truth because you never told the full truth. And if you leave the truth out by selective memory, you leave out the truth which is—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —equivalent to misrepresentation—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order.

The Acting Speaker: Have your seat, Member.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —which is equivalent to misleading.

The Acting Speaker: Member Blakeney, we have a point of order.

What is the point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Acting Speaker, I have never omitted any information to anyone.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: You know what; I am not even going to go there because it is a waste of time. That is why he is still sitting here, because he is going to be defiant to the very end. But it is toast. It is going to pop up, I am telling you. I am going to leave it because if you are going to be that defiant it is not for me to judge. I am just an advocate. It is for the people. And if the people in your constituency do not have the intestinal fortitude, the dignity, the courage, the bravery to tell you what you should do, not just in the interests of now, but in the interest of you reviving your political career . . .

[Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair]

The Deputy Speaker: Member, can you speak to me rather than an individual?

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes, ma'am, no problem.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: It just defies rationale. It defies rationale. And the Premier gets on public TV, Madam Deputy Speaker, and says he is not going to do a two-step with the Opposition.

We are not going to do it even if he invited us to do it. Not under this cloud. No way! There is a line in the sand until you do the right thing. And I am going to tell you, the court of public opinion is going to help you to make that decision. Because if your ear is close to the ground, which I believe it is because you have a level of respect—which is fading away, Madam Deputy Speaker, because of the kind of decision that was made as a first decision . . . as a first decision.

After he is gone, he is leaving, I do not know who cleaned up the Clifton. I do not know who cleaned up the Premier's office, but boy, they must have got some real, real handy warehousemen because that was really done stealthily and done very, very expediently.

If they would move as expediently on legislation being brought to this House and passed in the interests of this country and burying this whole affair with expediency by doing the right thing, we would not have any worries. We would not be talking about this again. But as soon as the decision was made and he was about to go to Government House to be sworn in as the interim Premier (or maybe it was at Government House after being sworn in) the two culprits, before the resignation (the two most culpable people involved in the affair) were right there in the photo op.

Where was the whole OBA team? There must be some people who have got conscience, Madam Deputy Speaker.

And this is very, very serious, you see, because when you bring a piece of information, such as we heard this morning from the Minister of Tourism, getting people excited, or attempting to get them excited—as well we should be when there is forward momentum and movement on any development, not the least of which would be a hotel development that would provide an incredible amount of jobs for people—that is great. But, you know, people are not really that silly and that naïve. It is just a negotiation; it is a process, an exclusive process.

There is nothing in stone yet. That developer could just walk away tomorrow because you do not meet the compromise that he is willing to meet or he does not meet the compromise that you are willing to meet. You have got six months or 120 days to get it right, but there is no guarantee. The guarantee is that they have an exclusive one track to talk and negotiate with each other—that is it! That is it. That is it. So it is a window of opportunity to make something happen.

Good news that something is happening because there is some negotiation going on with a real person, a real entity. But you know what? That is a false sense of security for any member of this community that thinks that it is happening, because it has not [happened] yet.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I know you did not, but that is just my point. We . . . a sensible, prudent person would have waited until there was something that stuck on the wall.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Minister of Tourism.
You have the floor.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: We have received parliamentary questions about the progress of the RFP. So we come here and give the progress and get criticised.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes, thank you, Member.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: He is misleading the House because I said, you know, we love to hear the great news. But you know what? There is always that big “but.” And the “but” comes because there is a trust deficit.

And do you know why there is a big “but”? Do you know why it is a big “but”? Madam Deputy Speaker? Do you know why it is a big “but”? Because when you say to your constituents . . . the country is your constituency, not the PLP constituency, not the OBA, the country. That means the business person and everybody else. Right? When you tell them that, in the interests of democracy, the best way forward is to hold a referendum on a key issue so that the people make the decision, and you turn around and slap them in the face and say, *Get out of here!* . . . and the leader of this new Government, Madam Deputy Speaker, is the chief offender because he was caught on [microphone] telling everybody how he felt about people in this country who vote in this country that have a problem with the referendum being turned back on its head and conjured up the support, thousands of which signed their name on a petition, and then had the nerve to say that it was an f-ing waste of time.

An Hon. Member: In other words, F-gate.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: So, so, so . . . like how do you expect people . . . how do you expect people not to expect the Opposition benches to get up and say, *[clap, clap, clap] Well done, But* (with a capital “B”) . . . How do you not expect them to say that?

It is not the Opposition, you know. We are speaking vicariously, based on the expectations and the directions of our constituents who are calling me every day. And some of them I say, *You know what? You are making such a good point and you are very articulate. You know, would you mind calling someone so that your words of wisdom could be shared simultaneously with anybody that is tuned into a frequency?*

Some would say, *Oh, yes, I have been trying all this time to get in, but nobody answers the phone.*

And I said, *Because the phone is just ringing off the hook. You have just got to be patient.*

And so the momentum is continuing and continuing and continuing. It is not us going out and driving it to the degree that it is not from behind—questions e-mailed, telephone calls where I am saying, *Hey, we have to keep going with this because it is in the public interests and we are a current affairs show.* So anybody that wants to come on, as has the Honourable Minister, the Honourable Premier, at their convenience, we make it available to clarify any misunderstanding, misperception.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Minister of Finance. You have the floor.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: The Honourable Member might like to declare his interest in this discourse.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I will. I speak of none other than—

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —the airwaves on a frequency modulated signal known as 102.7 FM.—

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: And this is now the barometer of the country.

When is the last time you have seen so many people in the public Gallery? Not just this afternoon, but even this morning there were even more people. And these people are gainfully employed (most of them) and they have to go back to work.

But, you know, you are hearing calls of, *Let's put our feet in the street, and march to the beat of demanding what should be done in the interests of us, the country.* Not the interests of the Progressive Labour Party, in the interests of Bermuda, because there is no one on those benches [that] cannot say that this whole saga has tarnished the image of Bermuda and

conjured up more questions than answers. Because if there were more answers than questions, they would not have the questions, we would have the answers and we would help you to share them.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Well, see, if you were able to, you would do the right thing and you would not be sitting there right now. That is the problem. That is the problem, Madam Deputy Speaker.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: That is the problem. See, they are so glib, they are so arrogant. Right?

The Deputy Speaker: Um—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: It is so arrogant, Madam Deputy Speaker—

The Deputy Speaker: Do not, do not—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —it is mind-boggling because these are supposed to be humble servants of the people. Humble servants of the people.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, we just want to be careful not to impugn any . . . that is all.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I am not impugning [anything]. I am just speaking truth and I am expressing what has been expressed to me from various lips around this country on all sides of the political divide.

The Deputy Speaker: I am just reminding you. That is all.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I understand, Madam Deputy Speaker. I understand, Madam Deputy Speaker.

And I know that now that I have spoken that the [Government] front benches, a few of them (even if only the Premier and the Finance Minister) will have to get up, Madam Deputy Speaker, and reply in some way to do some damage control because they have been trying to throw smokescreens and mirrors up all around in the last 72 hours, 48 hours. It is not working and it is not going to work. It is not going to work. And I had a whole lot more expectation when the Premier resigned over this affair and then, with some prodding, with some conversations, with some reflection on the conscience of what was at stake, the former Attorney General resigned.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Sorry.

The Chair recognises the Member Pettingill.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: The Member is, frankly, misleading the House. My resignation had nothing to do with anything that he is saying.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
The Chair—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: And I want to thank you very much—

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognises the Member from Devonshire North Central.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I want to thank him very much because he now confirms the arrogance, the lack of humility and humbleness, the disregard for the people of the country who feel, whether he did or did not, that he did and that he should, and when he did, he gave them a level of respect, Madam Deputy Speaker. But now he just flushed that down the you-know-what. I think they call it “commode.” The load down the commode.

Then it is incredible . . . and you know, I am not trying to be funny. You know, it is not funny. It is not funny. We do have the peoples’ work to do. We do want to get the peoples’ work done. But when you are not bringing legislation that is in the interest of the people, and when you say you are going to bring the legislation in the interests of the people, before it gets here, you turn it around. Or before you take it to the people, instead of bringing it here in the interests of the people, you turn it around. That is why we have got the “buts.”

The “buts” are going to keep coming until, Premier, you really in retrospect reflect on the consequence of a less than appropriate, or prudent (should I say?), decision with that Cabinet Member that still sits there. How do you expect us—any of us in the country—to give benefit of doubt to anything you say you want or will do? How? There is a blemish, there is a cloud of grey, there is doubt, there are question marks. Even the guy—I am sorry, the Chairman of the party—still has not come to a conclusion on an investigation. That means there are still some unanswered questions.

Here is the chronology. It is incredible! The Landow individual is found to be mis-telling truth. He says he never knows Mr. DaCosta. He thinks he is just a part of the entourage. He never said one word. But that is where there is somebody telling something other than the truth, because the Honourable Tourism Minister is on record as saying he [was there] to an-

swer a question about golf and Mr. Landow said he never spoke in the meeting! Well, what is that? What? What is that?

The Deputy Speaker: Member, I am still sitting here.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Madam Deputy Speaker, what is that?

Come on, man. Come clean in the interest of my children, my grandchildren, your children, your grandchildren, in the interests of the children of Bermuda—those we serve first and foremost, those that are responsible for us being here.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, if you do not—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Not that it—

The Deputy Speaker: Member, Member!

If you want to not address me, I can have you take your seat. But you are to speak to the Chair.

Thank you.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: With respect, I apologise and excuse me.

You know, I have peripheral vision but sometimes when there is a little flick over there or something, it tends to make me want to look.

In any case, it is just incredible. It is incredible. And I would hope that the conscience of the One Bermuda Alliance . . . and when I say that, I say it with a broad brush, because it has to come from the people that support the party, those that have a real fundamental issue on the principle of what was done, how it was done more than anything else.

I do not care two hoots if somebody gave you \$300,000 or \$400,000. But then when Mr. DaCosta (who just bummed a ride), who Mr. Cannonier has as his business associate, is also on the Landow payroll, then attempts to open up a bank account, the bank people say, *No, no, no, we need somebody authentic. This just doesn't smell right.* And then Mr. Fahy goes and does the business—Senator Fahy does the business—that stinks all the way around! And you cannot put perfume on manure, Madam Deputy Speaker, to make it smell any different than it naturally does.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much. Your time is up.

The Chair recognises the person who was on his feet the longest, the Shadow Minister of Tourism, Mr. Zane J. S. De Silva.

[Inaudible interjection]

The Deputy Speaker: Good attempt.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, very much.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we have had the Premier of the country resign. We have had the Attorney General resign. My first question is, What about Minister Crockwell? When is he . . . as was articulated very well by Mr. Blakeney, when is he going to do the right thing?

The Deputy Speaker: Member, before you go down this track. I am not going to stop you, if you would just take your seat.

I just want to reflect on [Standing Order] 19(11)(f). And I just want everyone to bear this in mind: "No Member shall impute improper motives to any Member of the House or indulge in personalities, except on a substantive motion moved for that purpose."

Please proceed.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. Thank you very much. That is very . . . that is very helpful.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member Dr. Grant Gibbons made a statement earlier that the Progressive Labour Party would do anything to bring down the OBA. My first comment is the Honourable Member Dr. Gibbons should maybe step away for a moment from Mid Ocean Club, from Tucker's Town, and maybe spend a little time on the street with Mr. and Mrs. Bermuda. Maybe even tune in to HOTT radio, Magic 102.7, I think it is. Tune in to that show.

Madam Deputy Speaker, yesterday that show was extended three hours. Do you know why, Madam Deputy Speaker? The people of this country demanded it, and that is all they talked about.

And the Honourable Member Bascome just said, *It's the same people*. No, no, it is not like the OBA's show. No, no. Do not believe that for a moment. And look, you could turn off HOTT. Turn it off and walk around town and speak to the people of this country. Do not go down to Tucker's Town. Do not go down to the Chamber of Commerce. Spend time with the people of this country. They are vexed. And why are they vexed?

Why are they vexed? And the Honourable Member Dr. Gibbons . . . and I have said this before and I am going to say it again for those that did not hear me, Madam Deputy Speaker. I want the OBA to be successful. I want them . . . I want them . . . and do you know why I say that, Madam Deputy Speaker?

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: That Honourable Member is misleading himself and the country.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Member, you have the floor.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I thought that Honourable Member resigned. I did not realise he was still in the House.

But, Madam Deputy Speaker, let me say this—

The Deputy Speaker: For the sake of clarification, he is sitting in the House and he will continue to sit in the House until he steps down, which will not happen.

Please proceed.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Oh! Personal advisor?

[General uproar]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: She said—

The Deputy Speaker: Going a little too far, yes, I did. Yes, I did.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Can you give clarification for your last comment, [Madam] Deputy [Speaker]?

The Deputy Speaker: You know, I do not want to be eating away at the [Member] who is to speak.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: First up, I would like to have clarification on your last statement, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Okay. Simply, what I said, who is sitting in his seat, who has not stepped down, and I think I said, "and will not" . . . "and will not be stepping down."

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: That is out of order.

The Deputy Speaker: I accept that. I say that I accept that.

And I am sorry that we have just eaten up a little bit of your time, but do proceed.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: No! No! No! Madam Deputy Speaker, I have no problem with you eating up 30 seconds of my time making that statement because Hansard will record it and we will enjoy it later.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, as I was about to say, if we—the Progressive Labour Party—had to

stay on this side of the House for the next 20 years, and all of our people that are unemployed right now continued to work and every business continued to flourish, I would stay over here. I [would] have no problem staying in this Opposition bench if all our people went to work tomorrow and all our businesses flourished and international business came and tourists came here. I would have no problem sitting here.

So, Mr. Grant Gibbons, put that in your book! (The Honourable Member.) Put it in your book because that is me speaking. And I am sure every Member on this side of the House wants our people to go back to work and they want tourists to come to this Island. They want international business to feel welcome. Do not be playing that trickery any more in this House because it is not true.

This Jetgate affair that is really hurting him and his Members . . . the PLP did not get on that jet. We did not cause it, Madam Deputy Speaker. We did not get on it. The Honourable Member, Mr. Pettingill, says we got on 30 other jets. I have told him before that is another misstatement. Prove it! Prove it. And he said there are 30 other jet trips. Prove it.

I will take my seat if the Honourable Member wants to tell this House about those 30 jet trips that were paid for by Government or a developer. I will yield. I will yield. Thirty trips—30 jet trips.

The Honourable Member, former Attorney General, says Yes.

An Hon. Member: That is why he is the former.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: That is why he is a former Attorney General is correct.

But let me re-emphasise: The PLP did not cause this mess. The PLP did not cause this mess. They caused it. We did not mislead the people of Bermuda with all these . . . one statement today, three people today, four people tomorrow, he did not go on this trip, he was bumming a ride, he was in the hotel we called him up to the meeting, and then the Minister says, *Oh, no, he was part of the meeting*. And then the developer says, *He never said a word*. The Minister says, *He was great*.

Who the heck is lying? Who . . . who . . .

Look, Madam, who is not telling the truth in this affair? Who? That is why the people in this country are burning up. You have supposedly Honourable Members in this House and all these revelations are coming out. What is it going to be tomorrow?

Where is the \$350,000? People . . . and you know what? The less the Ministers say, the more people talk. And if you do not like the way the rumours are going up, like, *Where is the \$350,000? Has it gone to this person, has it gone to this Minister, has it gone to this place, is somebody buying this with it, is it buying people's groceries?* You had the developer who said it was underground funding. Underground funding! What is that?

Someone said that it is paying off constituents so they will vote a certain way. Others say it is reimbursing people for money that they spent helping out with the campaign. I do not know what an underground campaign is, Madam Deputy Speaker. I put my hand up. I am fundraising chairman for the PLP. I have never heard of that saying. So what exactly is going on?

Madam Deputy Speaker, you will hear, I am sure very soon from the Premier, and you will hear it from the Finance Minister, maybe a few others. Now that the backbench is a little stronger you might hear it from them too. And I am sure you will hear things like this, *We have had a bit of distraction, but let's forget it*. I think "Deadgate" was a word that was thrown . . . right? So what I am saying to you is you will hear this, I will guarantee you, before the day is done from the Government. You will hear, *We are slowly turning the ship around. We are getting back on track. We won't be distracted by the noise*. Well, the noise is coming from the jet! We did not start it up. We did not catch it. That is where the noise came from.

So if you have difficulty in bringing legislation to this House, if you have difficulty in getting 2,000 jobs that you promised, if you have difficulty dealing with the 1,000 people that lost their jobs last year, if you have difficulty because 261 businesses closed last year, do not look over here. They made all the promises. They are the ones lacking in their duties as elected Members of Government.

In all my years in this House, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have never seen us go three or four weeks without any legislation. Nothing! Nothing! I have been sitting the last seven years. Madam Deputy Speaker, the OBA . . . I will not say UBP again this week because I know you do not like me to say that. So I am going to leave that alone.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Mr. Furbert gave us a very good breakdown of how things have transpired over the last five or six years with regard to the changing of the names of parties—UBP, BDA, OBA—at this rate the alphabet is not going to have enough letters in it for these parties, not going to have enough. Not going to have enough.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Grant Gibbons also talked about the insulting language that has been used in this House over the last several months. I believe he said he talked to some international business people and some other people. The Honourable Member Dr. Grant Gibbons, when he makes that statement, he has a very short memory because I sat in this House as a Government Member, Madam Deputy Speaker, for several years and I listened to that language plus, plus, plus, plus, plus every week.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Every week I listened to that, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Honourable Member Dr. Gibbons says it is nonsense. Oh yeah, it is nonsense—corruption, dishonesty, crooks, thieves, disappearance of funds—you name it, we got it every week.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Madam Deputy Speaker—

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
Member, take your seat.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Point of order.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: What? You have a point of order?

Does he have a point of order?

The Deputy Speaker: Point of order.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Point of order, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I certainly never ever used the word “crooks” or “thieves” in the course of at least my time here.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
Member, you have the floor.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: No, he did not, Madam Deputy Speaker. He used words like “Robin Hood,” I guess. And, you know, things like that. But that is okay, we get it. We get it. And that is a poor point of order but, you know, it is what it is.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to touch on one point because earlier today we had a discussion and the Minister brought some great news, exciting news here. And we talked about . . . we asked, I asked and the Honourable Member Terry Lister also asked a question, I believe, or made a comment about the shortlist of developers that the successful developer was chosen from and it was two in his statement. It was two. I asked the question, *Well, what was the name of the unsuccessful company that put in an RFP?* The Honourable Member Mr. Crockwell got up and said, *I'll have to check.* And he mentioned the words “nondisclosure agreement.”

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have signed hundreds of nondisclosure agreements in my day in my business, and unless this one is one of those one out of a million, I have never seen a nondisclosure agreement that talked about, *Look, I don't want you mentioning my company's name.* I have signed hundreds, talking about specifics, talking about detail, talking about business plans, talked about revenues

the expenses—got it—got it! I think everybody in this House knows what a nondisclosure agreement is. But not as a Government Minister to not just name the company which submitted a bid. I hate to think (I hope I am wrong) it is because it is tied in to somebody that has got all this Jetgate stuff going on. That is what I hope. See we can only assume—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Your point of order, please?

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He is totally off base with those comments. Completely and totally off base. I gave an undertaking to this House that once we contact that company out of respect, then we will, if they will grant permission, release the name.

The Honourable Member should know that as someone who has been in business for many years.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.
Member, you have the floor.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, how is the time going?

The Deputy Speaker: Five minutes and 53 seconds.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Okay.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the OBA campaigned in 2012 on honesty, transparency, integrity (you will know this), inclusiveness and the favourite word after the election, “collaboration.”

[Concerning] the events of the last 14 months, in particular the last 12, and highlighted over the last two weeks, we have questions that continue even today not being answered as the electorate, as the constituents, as the voters, as the taxpayers of this country would like them to be answered.

We asked about the company; we were not told. It was, you know, okay, the Minister is going to get back to us.

We asked about the consultant Mr. Ronald Sutherland—secrecy again—non-transparency. *We are not telling you what we are paying this company. We are not going to tell you that.* We have a CEO for the Tourism Authority paid for by the taxpayer. We have board members that are going to be paid. Or have they been paid? I do not know. But it is in the Act for them to be paid \$20,000 each per year. I bet you every board member that serves or has served wishes they could get some . . . a little pick like that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am sure you served on a couple.

But, Madam Deputy Speaker, what is really unfolding with the OBA is just the opposite of what they campaigned on—not honesty, not transparency, not integrity, not inclusiveness and certainly not collaboration. So I will ask a question to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Crockwell, and I would ask him (and the Premier is not in his seat, but I put this question to both of them, these that were telling so much truth in the last couple of weeks) . . . I have a couple of questions—two questions. And I will take my seat, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, just making sure that you realise this is not question and answer time and they do not have to answer it now. Right?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: That is right. I know that. I am very aware of the rules, Madam Deputy Speaker. Thank you very much.

The first question I have is: What is the relationship, Minister, with Cosmic Consultants? What is your relationship, or the Premier's relationship, with Cosmic Consultants? Number one.

Number two: What is the relationship between J. D. Lewis Group and Jobs Bermuda?

Those are two very important questions, Madam Deputy Speaker. So we have Jetgate, now I have these two questions. And the Honourable Minister has not spoken yet today, so I am hoping that between him and the Premier [they] can answer those two questions.

And on that note, Madam Deputy Speaker, before I take my seat, the Honourable Member Dr. Gibbons said it very eloquently earlier about the things the former Premier did, and he did the honourable thing. What is it? He was saying all these good things about the former Premier and sitting right next to him was the Premier's party. How can you say all these good things and he did the honourable thing and what is he telling the Honourable Member Mr. Crockwell?

An Hon. Member: It is okay.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: It is okay. It is cool. He did the honourable thing. He was not transparent. He was not transparent. But you are okay. Inquiring minds would like to know what the Honourable Member Dr. Grant Gibbons meant by that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I will take this week-end and try to figure it out.

Thank you very much.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much.

The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of Health from Sandys South Central, constituency 34, Ms. Kim N. Wilson.

Learned Member, you have the floor.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Saul Froomkin QC, Walter Maddocks QC, Elliot Mottley QC, the late Dame Lois Browne-Evans, the Honourable Paula Cox.

Madam Deputy Speaker, these were persons who exemplified to me the persona and the principles required to ensure that both the role and the reputation of the highest legal officer of the land—that being the Attorney General—shall not be drawn into question by their actions or their omissions.

The Attorney General represents justice, equality, transparency and integrity. And all of those persons that I just cited, Madam Deputy Speaker, are persons who served as role models for me personally when I was provided with the opportunity to sit as the Attorney General from 2007. And at that time, I took that position very, very seriously. It is a position that is provided for in the most important piece of legislation that we have in Bermuda, and that is our Constitution.

The position of the Attorney General requires a high degree of credibility. The position of the Attorney General requires a high degree of morality. The position of the Attorney General requires a high degree of transparency. And, most importantly, the position of the Attorney General requires a high degree of integrity.

With that I would like to personally congratulate my honourable and learned colleague, Mr. Trevor Moniz, who is certainly one of the most senior members of the Bermuda Bar. I recall that when I returned from law school he was one of those senior members that many of us looked to for counsel, et cetera, because of his years of expertise.

Now, I am not sure how long the Honourable and Learned Trevor Moniz will sit as the Attorney General because I recall just two days ago the former Attorney General indicated the position was going to be made non-political by the end of the year, as per the Constitution. So I am hoping that the Honourable and Learned Attorney General will have an opportunity to get down with some real work in legislation which we have seen a glut of in recent months, but I will return to that in a few moments.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, with the recent events surrounding Jetgate, the role of and the position of the Attorney General has been greatly compromised. Now what do I mean by that? Well, I am not going to be repetitious, but the record—the Hansard record—will show that we had a former Premier who took a jet ride and stayed at an all-expenses paid hotel at the invitation of a potential developer, and the former Premier admitted to us in this House that he received his legal advice from his then Attorney General.

Now, if we back up a couple of weeks prior to that, you may recall that there was a revelation in the *Royal Gazette* when an article was commenced on the former Attorney General who indicated that one of

his wish-list actions that he would do as the Attorney General would be to have a Ministerial Code of Conduct drafted up. Well, it is somewhat a little bit surprising, and you heard me mention this before when we had the former Attorney General indicating that he would like to see a Ministerial Code of Conduct, but yet was unfamiliar of the existence of the Ministerial Code of Conduct as it related specifically to taking gifts and the like when he was providing said legal advice to the Premier of Bermuda. And perhaps had that legal advice been more properly researched and reasoned, we may not be standing here speaking about a Jetgate in the first place, but nonetheless, I digress.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the reputational risk which Bermuda has been drawn into over these past 15 months—based largely on the legal advice of the then top legal advisor to the Government, vis-à-vis the Premier—is what puts us here today. And here we are having a new Attorney General who now has replaced . . . who is replacing by . . . I'm sorry, replaced his predecessor, who, many say, has left the position of the Attorney General under a huge cloud of suspicion.

Now as the Attorney General, in addition to providing legal advice to the Government, providing legal advice to the Government quangos and the other Government departments, is also charged with ensuring that the legislative processes as prescribed by the respective Government's manifesto, as per their mandate, is advanced. The legal processes are advanced by the Attorney General.

Now, due to this whole Jetgate saga, for the last 15 months we see the Government having to be focused on, and too busy deflecting . . . the Government has been too busy not answering questions, the Government has been too busy omitting to be truthful in this House and to the people of Bermuda, and the Government has been too busy trying to avoid further exposure concerning Jetgate that they have failed to pass any meaningful legislation concerning the advancement and the betterment of people here in Bermuda.

Today Madam Deputy Speaker, is the first time this term that we have seen legislation even tabled by the House. Now, I recall when I was the Attorney General that when it was spring break, when the House was in recess, that is when the drafters really got down to work because they had the opportunity of not having to be up in the House and dealing with the legislation that was being tabled and debated in the House. They could sit in their chambers and draft legislation. We used that as an opportunity to crank it out so that when we came back on the return following a recess—bam!—we could lay legislation.

Here it is the third week, the third session of this last session of this legislative year. We first find four Bills that are tabled. And I will let the people decide whether these Bills have anything to do with empowering or bettering the lives of our Bermudians.

The first one is the Companies Amendment Act, which basically allows the company to increase their share capital and alter it. Government Fees Amendment Regulations, that is increasing the fees that are paid by charities—that is a tax increase. Electronic Communications [Regulations], allowing the Regulatory Authority to set a fee—more fees. The Life Insurance Amendment, which allows . . . with respect, this is what we call in legal terms a consequential amendment, nothing substantive. We are just saying that it will be governed by Bermudian law. This is the extent of the legislation that we got today.

So this term we have seen nothing that has come . . . and I submit to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is simply because they spent the last year and a bit trying to duck, dive, and hide around what is going to come out concerning Jetgate. And what scares me the most, what is disturbing to me personally the most, and I know the constituents of Sandys South Central 34 [are concerned about], is that there is more to come. There is much more to come.

We have not even hit the tip of the iceberg. So that worries me, because if they are going to be deflecting and trying to address the issues that are coming down the pipeline, no legislation is going to be done! We are going to do nothing for the people of Bermuda to help empower them and get them into a better situation.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, when I look quickly at the last year—the last 12 months—of this Government in terms of the legislative agenda, and I compare it towards the first 12 months of the legislative agenda in 1999 of the PLP Government, it pales in comparison to the amount of legislation that was tabled to deal with the people's business, to deal with empowerment and encouraging our people. And all this is a matter of public record. You can go online to Bermuda Laws, look up consolidated laws, look up the year you want, and it will say. I am just going to give you a couple of Bills that were passed by this Government when we were the Government in 1999 in our first 12 months.

Abolition of Capital Punishment Act—that speaks for itself.

Bermuda Bar Act—which required lawyers to undergo professional development. Again, that was a legislative provision that allowed for the people to have more confidence in the legal profession and to know that the lawyers had certain responsibilities of ensuring that they continued with professional development.

We passed the Unity and Racial Equality Act. That was establishing a commission to deal with and maintaining the registry of every employer to make sure that there was racial balance with respect to the employers.

We passed the Consumer Protection Act which allowed for the establishment of the Consumer Affairs Board. Again, a provision that helps the people

to make sure that as consumers their rights are protected.

We passed the National Pension Scheme (Occupational Pensions) Act [which] required compulsory pensions so that when we get old the employment that we have had must pay a pension to us in our 65th year.

We passed Residential Care Homes and Nursing Homes Regulations and Acts to make sure that all of the nursing homes and so forth had proper regulations so that our seniors that are housed in these homes can be better provided for because we have regulations that are keeping with international standards.

We passed the Day Care Centre Regulations. Again, a piece of legislation to ensure that our day care facilities, particularly the ones that house our younger children prior to them being able to go into the preschool were regulated so that we would minimise the risk to our children of being in homes that are being . . . where the caregiver is under no regulation.

These are just a few examples that were done in the first year of a PLP Government, despite the fact that we had (what?) four years of mess to clean up. In the first year, this is an example of what we as a PLP Government completed in 1999.

Now let us fast forward 14 years. The extent of the legislation that has come heretofore in the first year of an OBA Government in the first 12 months: The SAGE Commission. Okay. We agreed with a number of the principles there because it was talking about streamlining of Government. But you may also recall, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the SAGE Commission also recommends the privatisation of many Government departments. How does that affect the people? How does that improve the lot of people? The lot of our people?

We have the Incentives for Job Makers Act. Again, we know what that did and that provided further incentives for the business community. And a lot of people that I speak to when I canvas say, *What are you doing for me?* This Government is so consumed with advancing legislation that is going to improve the lot of big business in hopes that (what?) something might trickle down to me? The people are tired. They are tired of waiting for the scraps.

We have the Companies Amendment Act, which, you will recall, Madam Deputy Speaker, allowed for corporate landholdings, so some of our Bermuda is going to now be able to be purchased by corporations.

These are examples of legislation that was passed in the first 12 months by the OBA Government and I ask you this question, as the people of Bermuda are asking, Madam Deputy Speaker: *What's in it for us?*

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, they are asking *What is in it for us?*

We have had a Government that has been consumed by controversy, consumed by Jetgate, consumed by all of the negativity and the international risk that has been bestowed on our country of Bermuda. For what? And as a result of this consumption of them trying to avoid answering questions, avoid making public statements as to where we are and the status, and all of these omissions or acceptance by omission has greatly affected Bermuda's international reputation.

I was pleased to hear the Honourable Minister speak today about the company that is planning on entering into negotiations concerning the Club Med. And my guess is that those negotiations were entered into and signed off on long before they heard about Jetgate, because you know that aspect creates a cloud over Bermuda.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, in summary, the role of the Attorney General is such a critical and vital component to law, order, justice and equality, and it requires elements of integrity, and so forth. And I am pleased that we have an Attorney General who demonstrates all of that and will be able to stand with the likes of the Elliot Mottleys, the Saul Frommkins, the Dame Lois Browne-Evans, and the Paula Coxes.

Thank you.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Shadow Minister of Finance, MP David Burt.

MP Burt, you have the floor.

Mr. E. David Burt: Good evening, or good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

And before I begin my comments, I would like to wish everyone a Happy Bermuda Day holiday when it comes—

The Speaker: Happy Bermuda Day to you too.

Mr. E. David Burt: —and all the listening audience.

Yes. Because it looks that we might be out of here before the sun goes down and that means that we can get our—

The Speaker: You never know.

Mr. E. David Burt: —holiday started early.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. E. David Burt: Oh, well, hold a second. I hear the former Attorney General talking about Swizzle. Mr. former Attorney General, if you see me on the street on Monday you might get some.

But here is what I will tell you; here is what I will say. I will start my remarks by saying I guess a

small measure of congratulations to the Government especially on their announcement, I guess, today of Club Med. But I would caution them to not (how is it?) declare victory before victory is won, because anyone can issue an RFP and anyone can select a vendor. The hard work now begins. The easy work is done.

And what I thought was very interesting was that in the statement that the Tourism Minister gave earlier today it was almost like he was saying, *Now, let's all work together to make sure this is a reality.* You know what I translate that to? *Don't scare away this investor like the Government—then Opposition—scared away Mr. Bazarian.* You know, ruffle the feathers, cause trouble, stir up the pot, say, *Oh no, this is not good for Bermuda. Oh, no, we don't . . .* all that, Mr. Speaker. So that is what we see. If it is good for the goose, it should be good for the gander.

But we are going to stand on what is right for the people of this country, just like the Honourable Shadow Minister of Tourism said earlier when he said it is okay if they (the Government) were doing their job and bringing jobs and taking care of our people. That is what we must be working for.

But Mr. Speaker, that is where my congratulations end, because it is so surprising that the new—and I cannot call him interim Premier. I think he was interim Premier for all of an hour, and then he went down to Cabinet Office and maybe there was a little meeting, and they decided that he had the majority support of the House. Although I do not know if there were 19 people there, but that is a story for another time. He is no longer the interim Premier but the new Premier, having promised an era of transparency saying, *We are going to rebuild trust and confidence in the One Bermuda Alliance.*

On Friday, the Minister of Tourism is now refusing to say how peoples' money is spent.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like the brand-new era of transparency lasted all of three days. That is all! That is it. Because, once again, refusing to answer legitimate questions to Parliament on what taxpayer money is being spent on, Mr. Speaker. Why is it that this One Bermuda Alliance's wall of secrecy continues to happen? Why is that, Mr. Speaker?

I am going to repeat to you precisely what the Premier said at Government House on Tuesday. He said, and I quote,² "It is easy to field the very easy questions but those difficult questions, I will ask my colleagues to step forward to give those answers." The Honourable Premier is not in the House, but I am going to ask him: Does he speak to his Cabinet colleagues? Do they listen to him? Or do they just ignore him like the Honourable Minister of Tourism did earlier today by refusing to answer legitimate questions of Parliament?

That is the question that needs to be asked, Mr. Speaker, because I do not understand how a

Government of transparency, a party of transparency cannot answer simple questions now, Mr. Speaker. And so it leads me to believe that, as I said, this whole new era, this whole switcheroo which we just saw happen this week, it is almost like the shuffling of the deck chairs on the Titanic because nothing has changed, Mr. Speaker. It is not like it is a different ship. It is the same ship, because it is a One Bermuda Alliance that is not committed to their ideals which they talk about. They talk transparency one day and cover up things the next day, Mr. Speaker. And that is the Government that this country faces.

So while we should be discussing matters of state, we are discussing matters of cover-ups, matters of secrecy, matters of . . . who knew what when?

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we have heard in many a scandal (and I think it is fair to say that this scandal is continuing to evolve) it is the crime . . . I'm sorry, it is not the crime, it is the cover-up.

Now we see, Mr. Speaker, this cover-up has caused the former Premier to be gone—leaving on a jet plane and gone somewhere else. We have seen the Attorney General gone. You know, this Jetgate thing has taken quite a few casualties. It has taken two senior Cabinet Ministers. Now . . . now—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable and Learned Member has already given a point of order on the suggestion that he resigned over Jetgate. He said that was not the reason for his resignation.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: He has made that point of order.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.

Mr. E. David Burt: Okay. All right. Well, the honourable former Attorney General is not in this House, but I see his . . . I see, you know, the person . . . I do not want to give nicknames, but I see his Honourable Minister sidekick is there defending his position. But it is the same . . . this is the same—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order.

The Speaker: All right, just—

POINT OF ORDER

² [Royal Gazette](#), 21 May 2014

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: That reference is unnecessary.

The Speaker: Yes. Yes, all right.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable and Learned Member, Mr. Pettingill, is my colleague and he is my friend and I have no problem at all saying that—at all.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Mr. E. David Burt: I think that he is his friend, Mr. Speaker, and that is precisely what I just said. Now he is not here to refute what I am saying, but this is the same Attorney General who, all of a sudden, there are new explanations. I mean, it was in either yesterday's paper or today's paper, we now hear for the first time—almost over a year—that now the former Attorney General, instead of getting his advice or giving his advice from the Ministerial Code of Conduct (that he didn't know existed) now consulted the Foreign and Commonwealth Office? A year later we find this out. A year later!

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. E. David Burt: Oh, sorry, or someone associated—not officially. So it might be kind of hard to check, but that is just what we are saying. And no, didn't resign over Jetgate.

Then we hear . . . you know, the suggestion is made that the former Cabinet Secretary sanctioned the trip. I mean, come on! What? How? Why didn't we hear this before? Why are we just hearing this a year . . . a year—

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member, just . . . Honourable and Learned Member Pettingill.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Just a couple of things there. So we have heard that Honourable Member breaching [Standing Order] 19(11)(f) (I think it is) with regard to misleading the House. And he said three things that are patently inaccurate.

Let me start with Mr. Scott, who is a very good friend of mine. I had cleared that up unequivocally that he did not sanction any trip. I know how it was reported. I know what was said. It is unfair to pull Mr. Scott into that. He is a man of integrity. He was the former Cabinet Secretary to their Premier. So do not do that because that has been addressed.

Number two, with regard, Mr. Speaker, to the Code of Conduct. I am going to ask and challenge my

friend to say specifically what rule he is saying was impeached or infringed and what sections of it. Because the one thing that this Opposition has failed to do is set out to the public exactly what it is they are saying—

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.—

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: —we breached.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: And number three, Mr. Speaker, with regard—

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: If I could finish . . . number three—

The Speaker: Honourable Member. Honourable Member.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Just a minute until I can—

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: No. You do not even know the rules.

An Hon. Member: You didn't know it existed.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Of course, I knew it existed.

[Inaudible interjections and crosstalk]

Mr. E. David Burt: Do I have the floor?

The Speaker: I am waiting for people—

Mr. E. David Burt: Oh, thank you very much.

The Speaker: No, not for you, Honourable Member. No, no, you are doing very well.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much.

The Speaker: You are doing very well.

Mr. E. David Burt: Because—

The Speaker: No, no, I am now recognising the Honourable and Learned Member, MP Kim Wilson. I am just waiting . . . I was waiting for us to settle a bit.

[Inaudible interjection]

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point of order is that the Honourable and Learned former Attorney General is misleading the House in that we did—I did, on several occasions—outline under the Ministerial Code of Conduct [rule] 19.1, which was the section in which we indicated was the breach concerning the acceptance of gifts.

The Speaker: All right.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: The Hansard will record that.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.
And you had a third point you wanted to—

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: I do, and the more expansion on the issue is unequivocally wrong.

But the third position was with regard to the FCO comment. I also clarified that. I did not say it was official. I spoke with someone [*ex post facto*] in—

The Speaker: All right. Thank you—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: It does not matter; someone in relation to that.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: That is all. Be careful of the *Royal Gazette*.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. E. David Burt: I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, that the former Attorney General has decided to get up and say this. But the fact remains that we are finding out about this and his statements and comments to be made about this a year after this happened. And that is the whole [question of] transparency; that is the whole [question of] secrecy; those are the questions that are always asked in any cover-up. What did they know and when did they know it? And why did they not say anything?

It was quoted in the [Royal Gazette](#) yesterday and I quote, “He added” (when talking about the Attorney General) “He added [that] the trip had also been rubber-stamped by the then-Cabinet Secretary, Donald Scott.” That is what it is. I have not heard any clarification from the Attorney General. I do not see anything in today’s paper saying that there is a clarification. That is what was reported.

But we find this out a year later. Why all of a sudden? Do you think, Mr. Speaker, if we had gotten that a year ago that we would be here discussing that today, if the Government was honest and transparent at that time, fully disclosing all information to Parliament, that we would be here? But here is the thing, Mr. Speaker. Once again it is the cover-up. It is the cover-up, and the new Premier now wants to rename Jetgate to “Deadgate.” Sorry, Honourable Premier, that is not going to happen. And do you know the reason why it is not going to happen, Mr. Speaker? Because he Honourable Premier’s Cabinet is still tainted with individuals who by acts of omission or commission have neglected to give Parliament complete and truthful information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go on because I think this is the most (how do you say?) salient point of this entire affair. The question really must be asked, Why is the Government, or the One Bermuda Alliance, so intent to attempt to cover up whatever occurred with this Jetgate situation? Whatever occurred with the honourable former Premier before this money was sent, this \$300,000 that was not asked for but that magically appeared in an account that was controlled by the One Bermuda Alliance’s political consultant, that was controlled by the former Premier’s business partner, which was opened by the One Bermuda Alliance’s campaign chairman (now Government Minister and leader in another place) closing in very, very close to the very centre of the One Bermuda Alliance? How is it that they do not want to talk about what is happening?

Mr. Speaker, we heard from the honourable former Premier last week saying, *It’s none of your business*. Well, it is clearly somebody’s business because the honourable former Premier is not here. And to think that last week some Members of the One Bermuda Alliance seemed to actually find a conscience after the chairman of the party found a conscience. It seems the Junior Minister for Education, the Honourable Leah Scott, decided to say that when you leak . . . I do not remember the quote exactly, but what a web we weave when we try to deceive. She is talking, Mr. Speaker, about her own party.

The revelations that have come out, that the first time members of that party found out about the existence of a secret campaign fund, was last week. Well, I know there are certain people who knew about that fund. And one of them is the Honourable Government Senate Leader who sits in another place.

So how exactly can the Honourable Premier trust and keep somebody in his Cabinet who knows about monies that were given to the party and has not disclosed it to any of his colleagues? If you are not even going to tell the truth to your own party colleagues, how can you be trusted to represent the people’s interests in Parliament or in the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker? So this cannot be “Deadgate.” But the real question must be asked, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Point of order.
Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member is [imputing] improper motives on the Minister that sits in another place. That Honourable Member has never lied to his colleagues on any matter that I am aware of.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member is misleading this House.

The Speaker: And we must be careful in the language that we use.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Carry on.

Mr. E. David Burt: I have never—

The Speaker: Carry on.

Mr. E. David Burt: I at no point said that the Honourable Member, the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, Senator Michael Fahy, who sits in another place . . . I at no point said that he lied to his colleagues. What I said was it was revealed that the first time Members of the One Bermuda Alliance heard about this secret campaign account was last week.

The Speaker: Honourable Member.
Yes, Dr. Gibbons.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Point of order.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: It is my understanding that we are talking about another place and a Member who sits in another place, and it is inappropriate in this House.—

[Inaudible interjections]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: The Honourable Member is not here to defend himself and—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —certainly—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: —we are referring to another—

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Dr. Gibbons.
Carry on.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, I will continue because the question we have to ask is, Why the cover-up? Why the quick, you know, trying to just paper this over all the rest?

Mr. Speaker, why the investigation?

Mr. Speaker, the money—which we do not know \$280[,000] . . . \$300[,000] . . . \$350,000—people do not know. The new issue that I have, Mr. Speaker, is what was done with that \$300,000? That is the question that the people need to know because, Mr. Speaker, I have been made to understand that the monies may have been used in illegal ways. Yes, Mr. Speaker, illegal ways in contravention of the law.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Impugning integrity]

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, that Honourable Member is making allegations which certainly impugn a number of individuals, and I think he should retract that unless he can prove it.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

I think . . . I think . . . Honourable Member, I think the Honourable Member is correct in terms of we must be careful in terms of how we use our words to get our point across. And, certainly, we cannot impugn that someone is doing something—

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, I—

The Speaker: —that is not legal.

Mr. E. David Burt: I appreciate your advice and I will take your advice.

What would happen, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if the Honourable new Premier found out that the monies in this secret campaign account were used

in ways that were contrary to the laws of this country? What would happen? Would the party be fully transparent? Would they tell us what the monies were used for? Would they level up and say we believe that the monies may have been used in contravention of laws that this Parliament has passed? Will that happen, Mr. Speaker? Will we get the full transparency?

Because the information that is coming to us, Mr. Speaker, about the uses of that money go to the very core of having a stable, safe, well-run and respected democracy. And the people have a right to know. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, this incident cannot be Deadgate. It cannot be Deadgate because the people must know that their Government and the Ministers inside of their Government did not engage in anything that could be illegal, that is against the law of this country. That, Mr. Speaker, is the real issue at hand.

So I really hope that when the honourable . . . sorry, the chairman, of the One Bermuda Alliance releases his investigative reports we will find out what that money went to. We will be sure that in no way, shape, or form was any of that money used to violate the laws of this country. Because, Mr. Speaker, if it was, it is clear that there were members of the One Bermuda Alliance Cabinet who had knowledge [of the] existence of those funds. It is clear that there are Members of the One Bermuda Alliance Cabinet who ran the One Bermuda Alliance election campaign. And if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then we cannot say . . . well, it is hard to make the . . . knowing that we did not know what the money was being used for.

Mr. Speaker, once again, it is the cover-up. What did they know and when did they know it? Did they really find out last week? Or could some members have known before and remained silent? That is why this issue, Mr. Speaker, is still alive and is still with us.

Mr. Speaker, my one bit of advice to the new Premier will be, and I will quote from the [Royal Gazette](#) editorial: "For the fact of the matter is that Mr. Cannonier did not act in a vacuum." [22 May 2014] Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Premier wants this to be Deadgate, if he really wants to draw a line in the sand, then there are two people inside of his Cabinet that still need to go so we can get on to the business of this country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

I have to remind members in the audience that they do not react to the speeches that are going on on the floor of the House.

Thank you, Honourable Member Shadow Minister of Finance.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Pembroke [South East], MP Rolfe Commissiong.

You have the floor, sir.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the [BermudaSun](#) published today, May 23rd, page 5, story has the headline, "Jetgate: A story they didn't want told?" It further goes on to say "Pettingill" (that is what how they refer to him here) "among MPs who try to ground JetGate in the House." That is followed by a quote from the Honourable and Learned Member, Shawn Crockwell, who says on March 17, 2014 that, "I am not going to entertain any further questions on this subject."

Mr. Speaker, you will be reminded of the story of the Dutch boy with his finger in the dike, but yet the cracks started appearing and the dam gave way. Deadgate? Far from it.

But let me start here first, Mr. Speaker. I am told that much like in America where the popular phrase "must see TV" is well-known, we here in Bermuda have our own version of that phenomenon. Instead of it being called "must see TV" it is becoming known as "must listen to radio." You see, Mr. Speaker, if you turn on your radio any time during the week on a Monday to Friday over the last few weeks on Magic intercommunication—Inter-Island Communications station, you can hear the host, Ms. Sherri Simmons, entertaining a dialogue with thousands listening that has been riveting in terms of its consideration of this issue.

But there is another programme, Mr. Speaker, that likewise I suspect thousands have tuned into over the last few weeks as well. The host of that programme is none other than you, Mr. Speaker, because—

[Laughter]

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: —right now—

The Speaker: We need a little humour, Honourable Member. We need a little humour.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Right now, as we discuss this issue of major import, Mr. Speaker, we know that from Somerset to St. George's hundreds, if not thousands, are listening in.

You see, Mr. Speaker, Jetgate is still relevant because the new Premier has not cleaned house. There still remain individuals on his Government benches that should not be there, that should have tendered their resignations, that should have done the honourable thing and have not.

As my colleague previous to myself said, back in the 1970s the term "Watergate" became a byword of political corruption and conspiracy of the highest

order. Mr. Speaker, as he mentioned, it was not the third-rate burglary that brought down the presidency of Mr. Richard Nixon. Rather it was the cover-up. But what many people do not realise is that the result of that was a country that remained in turmoil for years. I just hope that our fate is not similar.

Mr. Speaker, we take no delight in the resignation of the former Premier. There is no expression of “schadenfreude,” which is a German expression meaning “taking a delight in the misfortunes of others.” That is not where we are coming from (to borrow a phrase). In some ways what has happened serves as a rebuke to us all and a warning of the danger of hubris, arrogance, and misplaced pride.

After all, this has become somewhat of a human tragedy as well. And note that the last words afforded to us by the former Premier, as my colleague said, were, *It is none of your business*. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the former Premier was wrong about that. The Bermudian people have demonstrated that he was wrong about that. And on our side, Mr. Speaker, we have a sacred responsibility entrusted to us by our voters to demand accountability on the part of the Government in order to seek the good and welfare of our country. So, indeed, we have been doing the people’s business.

Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the [Royal Gazette](#) front page where the Honourable Opposition Leader was quoted as saying, “one down, now two to go.” [21 May 2014] Well, since then we have seen the resignation of Mr. Pettingill, the former Attorney General, the Learned Member. And you would think that it should be two down, one to go. But that is not the case. It still remains . . . now, I should say, rather, it is *two down, two to go*. Because Mr. Speaker, until Mr. Fahy, the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, and the current Minister of Tourism and Transport are held to account, this issue will not go away. We all know that in the failure of the current Premier to address this issue it will prove to be his undoing as it proved to be the undoing of the former Premier. There is no doubt that there are more revelations to come of a serious nature.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: The OBA’s chairman, for example, has since stated that they will divulge the findings of their investigation in the public domain. Certainly, we know from what we have heard so far that what will be eventually put out in the public domain will only raise far more questions.

Mr. Speaker, Minister Fahy, the Home Affairs Minister, and in some ways as more and more evidence comes to light, the Minister turns out to have been, perhaps, the chief enabler. His involvement with that account precedes the election. It was he who presided over the facilitation of both Mr. Derrick Green (a political consultant) and Mr. Stephen DaCosta as

being signatories to the said account. How can Mr. Fahy feign ignorance? How can he remain under the radar screen while putting up a front of being a conscientious and dutiful Minister? How can Ministers, such as Mr. Pettingill, stand down? How can a Premier be disgraced and move on, and yet Mr. Fahy and Mr. Crockwell remain untouched?

But you know, Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is what happens when you have parties (governments) that have slim majorities—slim majorities and a shallow talent pool. You know, what we may be seeing is a matter of expediency. What other choice do they have? The same Members who have been found wanting here provide some of the strongest Members—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: —on their benches.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hold on, Honourable Member.
Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member is [imputing] improper motives. He needs to explain “found wanting.”

The Speaker: Yes, all right. Thank you.

Yes, I think . . . stand up, stand up Honourable Member. Let us be clear on what you—

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Found wanting? Mr. Speaker, in light of what we have seen, in light of the revelations that have come out in various media, “found wanting” could be considered a euphemism.

[Laughter]

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Mr. Crockwell stated that he did not know of the campaign contributions from Mr. Landow. He stated that. As my colleague said (the previous speaker), we need to follow the money. What were those campaign donations used for? Mr. Landow, as he said, stated it was for an underground campaign.

Mr. Speaker, we know that during that last election certain constituencies, as I mentioned or alluded to last week, were targeted. There is strong anecdotal evidence that individuals, particularly in working-class black neighbourhoods, in these targeted constituencies were . . . were—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Just be careful.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: —were trying to—

The Speaker: Just be . . . just be careful, Honourable Member. Just be careful.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: —ensure that they would be able to have certain things taken care of in return for their support in that election.

The Speaker: Come on. Come on, Honourable Member.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: These are the anecdotal evidences—

The Speaker: Honourable—

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, listen, we cannot—

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: No! What was outrageous, was a—

The Speaker: Honourable Member!

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: —dirty trick that was—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, please! Take your seat for me.

All right.

Honourable Member, let us not impugn those kinds of actions. All right? If you . . . carry on, but just—

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: You have to remember, Honourable Members, that if, indeed, at any time you want to impugn the conduct of any Member you can go right ahead and do that, but you have to do it by a substantive motion. All right? So you have got to understand that.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: If you do it by a substantive motion, then a Member has the opportunity to stand to defend himself, or whatever.

So please, just be careful.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Mr. Speaker, all I said was that what is now common knowledge throughout the community is that certain practices were taking place prior to the election. And that certain constituencies—

The Speaker: Continue to be careful.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: —were—

The Speaker: Just continue to be careful.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: —certain constituencies were targeted, and I am contending that that fund played a role in ways that many of us would not care to imagine with respect to what was taking place in those targeted constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, just looking prospectively, the new Premier, Mr. Dunkley, has already again shown the electorate contempt by his pride and refusal to do the right thing and reinstate the referendum on gaming. Certainly, that belies the notion that he is about creating a new direction for this party in Government. Certainly, if he was sincere about charting a new course, one open to transparency and accountability, one which honours its promises to the people of Bermuda, he would certainly make a decision to have the referenda go forward. But no, we do not see that. We see the arrogance continue by, again, the strident refusal to even consider it.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as I said, slim majorities can produce . . . or, as I alluded to, slim majorities can produce strange bedfellows, especially in a Government that has a shallow talent pool. Let us hope that the Premier will do what is right for the country rather than what is right for his party.

The Speaker: Yes. Yes, Doctor.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: I think we are all aware of [Standing Order] 19(11)(d) "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting, or disrespectful language about Members of the House or which tends to bring the House of Assembly into disrepute."

The Speaker: Yes, that is correct.

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: That clearly, "shallow talent pool"—

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, thank you.

Let us . . . again, let us choose our words better so that we do not conflict the rules.

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the . . . certainly if not the interim Premier, the interim party leader of the OBA until the summer election, will do what is right for the country rather than what is right for his party. But based upon the evidence thus far, we have

no cause for optimism in this regard. Our Premier can make a strong effort to re-establish a Government that is shrouded in the cloak of credibility and accountability and he can do so by demanding the resignations of both Minister Fahy and Minister Crockwell. Like I said last week, Mr. Speaker, this House and the Bermudian people deserve no less.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the current Premier has derisively referred to this debacle as “Deadgate.” Far from it, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, for by his inability to do the right thing by demanding the resignations of the aforementioned Ministers he has ensured Jetgate’s survival for the foreseeable future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Warwick [South East], MP Lawrence Scott.

You have the floor.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As it gets close to May 24th, I can only think about the tradition that we have here in the Island—the beginning of summer, Bermuda shorts (which I actually started wearing for the first time since primary school). Some of my colleagues say that I should not wear them, but my female colleagues seem to like it, so I will continue to wear them.

[Laughter]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: But—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Yes. And as you know . . . as you know, we go with the majority around here, Mr. Speaker. So I like that tradition of Bermuda shorts now.

But the thing is, Mr. Speaker, is that when you look up “tradition,” it says that a tradition is a belief or behaviour passed down within a group or a society. So let us say the tradition of May 24th, the May 24th Parade, that is tradition, Somerset winning Cup Match, that is a tradition.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Absolutely! You can continue. You could speak all night now.

[Laughter and inaudible interjections]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Yes.

But the thing is that what also seems to be a tradition . . . Well, let me take a step back before I go to what else seems to be a tradition around here. I

was reading the newspaper earlier this week and it [had an article about] what has been happening in our political climate and in our country when it came to the resignation of a former Premier and the appointment of a new Premier. And, oh, I just got a shiver, Mr. Speaker. It is probably the same shiver that . . . and I can use this as tradition, that Christmas story . . . what is it? *A Christmas Carol* with Ebenezer Scrooge. I think that is the same shiver that Mr. Scrooge got when he was visited by the Ghost of Christmas Past.

But in tying it all together I guess what I got a shiver from and what I saw when I read the newspaper, and it has been sort of reinforced by some of the people that I spoke with, is that we have sort of a Ghost of Christmas Past going on right now, Mr. Speaker. But, I guess, I would say it is more so along the lines of a Ghost of Cabinet’s Past. Because if you go and you look across the Island right now, Mr. Speaker, and you see what I see, I see a Cabinet that looks eerily similar to one of the UBP—a Cabinet that probably, almost to a man, is the same Cabinet that was under former UBP Leader, Kim Swan.

So now that we go into talking about tradition and you look at the UBP’s tradition, Mr. Speaker, you can see that the UBP . . . and I will go back. I know that last week I was talking about how I am the youngest . . . well, no more because the Honourable Member Outerbridge is the youngest in the House right now. But being one of the youngest does not mean that I do not know my history, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the UBP—the former UBP Cabinet—controlled this Island’s economy through Government contracts, through monopolistic marketing practices, and also through controlling political power by controlling the public purse. Now Mr. Speaker, if that is the tradition of the UBP, and traditions are somewhat the standard because, once again, going back to Bermuda shorts, Bermuda shorts are the standard here because they are tradition. So if tradition is standard, then that means the new standard with the current Premier who was a UBP Cabinet Minister—

An Hon. Member: And former Leader.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: And former Leader.

That means the standard has gone back to those days of the UBP.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mean, it is . . . it is sort of hard to wonder about what this country is going to do now because a lot of the people that I speak to in my constituency are worried because these are the same people in my constituency that had to worry about their mortgages being called in because they did not vote the way that the then-UBP Government wanted them to vote. These are the same people that were scared to speak up because they did not want to have repercussions about their jobs from their employers

who happened to be UBP supporters. So now are we going back to that time?

Mr. Speaker, it seems as though Ebenezer Scrooge is not just a *Christmas Carol*. He is alive and well in this country. His spirit, a spirit of fear, a spirit of (how can I say it?) . . . the spirit of Ebenezer Scrooge, where it is all about the bottom line—if it does not make dollars it does not make sense. We saw that in the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, where most of our social programmes got significant cuts. And our social programmes are there to help each other, to help us, to provide tools so that we can be successful even though we have fallen on hard times.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the *Christmas Carol*, I will refer to one of my constituents as Tiny Tim. Mr. Speaker, Tiny Tim is someone who has fallen on hard times. He was gainfully employed up to about . . . let us say six months to a year ago. He had an illness and then was made redundant from his former place of employment.

Now Mr. Speaker, Tiny Tim comes to me and says *MP Scott is there anything that you can do to help me?* And he explains his situation. And his situation is that he is now on financial assistance, all right? And he wants to get off financial assistance because he is not trying to abuse the system. This is a man that goes to church regularly. This is a man that has always been able to do more for others than he does for himself. This is a man who is struggling, not just literally struggling with living—not paycheque to paycheque (because he is on financial assistance), from day to day—trying to find ways to make ends meet. What he wants, Mr. Speaker, is legal representation to be able to get the money that is owed to him from his former employer. But yet he goes to Legal Aid and is told that he does not qualify because he makes too much money because he is on financial aid.

Therefore, Tiny Tim goes and finds a way to have a side hustle. But yet he is trying to be transparent because he knows that is the way to be. Government you can take a hint from Tiny Tim. He is trying to be transparent and goes to financial aid and says, *Financial Aid, I have this course or this job that is going to last me eight weeks and I am going to get paid x amount of dollars and I can use that to help get my name off the books at the credit association.*

Do you know what financial aid told him, Mr. Speaker? *If you pay anything down on your debts that you owe or the arrears that you owe we will take it out of your financial aid.*

Mr. Speaker, that is what is going on in this country while the Government cannot seem to provide any legislation to move us forward. Why? Because they are stuck dealing with and trying to do PR for situations that should not have happened in the first place. And I am trying to stay away from imputing improper motive or anything of the sort, because I want my message to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, Tiny Tim is scared. Tiny Tim was around for the old UBP days. And what Tiny Tim has said is that he does not know how he is going to make it because he sees a change in the Government as a whole. He sees the tradition, or the standard, of the old UBP coming back. Mr. Speaker, if we continue on this path, if we continue on the path of the UBP, Mr. Speaker, I feel as though . . . you know, before I get to what Charles Dickens would call the Ghost of Politics Future, [I will] continue and just focus on the Ghost of Politics Now, I will put it that way.

What we need now, Mr. Speaker, is more of those voices that we heard emanating from the Backbench not too long ago, from the Honourable Member Leah Scott, the Honourable Member Sylvan Richards who stood on their laurels . . . who stood on their morals and their integrity and said, *I will not stand for this. I will not allow not just my name, but my country, to be tarnished by the reputation and the poor decision making of others.*

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the Honourable Member Leah Scott to continue to stand on her morals because you know what, Mr. Speaker, one thing I have learned in politics [is that] it is better to be respected than to be liked. It is better to be respected than to be popular. And my Honourable Members may not always agree with the things that I say, but they respect the words and content [and the way] in which I say them. And that is what creates a strong party, that is what creates a strong opposition, and that is what creates a strong country where we have ways in which we allow our people to voice their pleasure and displeasure. That is something that was not found under the UBP.

So Mr. Speaker, if in moving forward we continue in the ways of the UBP, regardless of what you call yourself now, it is the traditions which you bring forward. You can call yourself the OBA—the One Bermuda Alliance—but if you have the traditions and the standards of the old UBP you are still the UBP.

Mr. Speaker, in moving forward if we continue to move down this road do you know what I believe we will have? We will have a Bermuda that is divided amongst strong, passionate lines. And I am not talking about the racial lines, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the lines that are divided between the haves and the have-nots, Mr. Speaker. And, just for clarification, I am not talking about those who have money and those who do not have money; but those that have faith and do not have faith in this Government. That is worse.

When you have . . . and those . . . let me tell you who will have faith in this Government, Mr. Speaker. Those that have faith in the UBP are those that are of an affluent lifestyle. Those that have faith in the UBP are usually those that tend to be in the international business sector, those that have big name companies. Because if you look at the tradition of the UBP, Mr. Speaker, [there] are companies that if they do not have a family last name like “Gibbons,”

“Dunkley,” Mr. Speaker, there are still big name companies like CellOne, North Rock.

Mr. Speaker, those are the haves, those are the people that would have faith in the UBP Government. But yet, Mr. Speaker . . . and I see those Ministers on the other side chuckling away as I told about the haves and have-nots. I do not find this a funny situation, Mr. Speaker. It is a very troubling one at that. The one reason I will not saying anything more is because one of the Ministers chuckling is my constituent. He may not vote for me, but he is still my constituent, Mr. Speaker, but actually no, that is alleging that he did not vote for me.

Some Hon. Members: Ooh!

[Laughter]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: It is okay, Minister Richards, it is okay Minister.

Mr. Speaker, haves and have-nots—those that have faith in this Government and those that do not have faith. If there is anything that we as Bermudians, as I look into the Gallery, we are all Bermudians in this House, we are all Bermudians in this country, if there is one thing that we should all have [it] should be faith in our Government, because it is not money that makes this country prosperous. It is not the OBA that makes this country successful, nor [is it] the UBP. It is not the PLP that makes things go around. It is faith in our country and in our Government and in ourselves, Mr. Speaker.

And faith is something that we did not have as a country under the UBP, or, as some people would say, under the 40 Thieves. You would not have such nicknames as 40 Thieves if you had faith in them because there is no honour amongst thieves, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I really implore this Government to change the standard, change the status quo of the UBP. It is going to be hard because I know they say that a leopard cannot change its spots, so that is something they have to figure out on how they are going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up too much time. And I hear some Members saying thank you, which means that they do not appreciate the moral context of which I am talking about and those Members came from the Government side of this room. So Mr. Speaker, I implore . . . let us face this head on. And I challenge the Government, and I would like to hear how the Government intends to rebuild the faith, bridge that gap between the haves and the have-nots in this country so that we can all have together and move forward as one.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITOR

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister of Finance Mr. Bob . . . and Minister Richards, just before you start, I just want to do something, because this person is going to be very upset with me, but I just have to do this, because I was the Principal at Warwick Sec.

I see a young lady in here who just received her doctorate recently. She was a Warwick Sec student. Dr. Lana Talbot, I see you in here. So let us give her a—

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Yes.

Minister of Finance, carry on.

[Motion to Adjourn, continuing]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard a lot of sound and fury this afternoon and perhaps that was expected. I have a few comments and one of my notes here says, *How much can you beat a dead horse?* You know, we heard impassioned pleas this afternoon, and it occurred to me that certain Honourable Members of this House would do their level best—in fact, do anything—

The Speaker: Careful.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: —to keep the Jetgate scandal alive. They will do anything.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, we have lost our former Premier, the Honourable Craig Cannonier, and the Honourable and Learned Mr. Pettingill has moved to the backbench (and so has Mr. Cannonier). These are actions that these honourable gentlemen took, and they did the honourable and right thing.

I recall when I was sitting over there, Mr. Speaker, and a certain Premier brought in people in the dead of night to this country, clearly illegally, without informing anybody, without informing his Cabinet, his Deputy—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Point of order. Point of order.

The Speaker: Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: That is an unequivocal misleading of this House. If there was any illegality . . . that was a diplomatic mission—

The Speaker: He did not say it was illegality.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: England, the UK, the Governor would have had a prosecutor and some police officer arresting—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Point of order. He is misleading the House.

The Speaker: Thanks, Honourable Member. Yes, thank you.

The Speaker: Honourable Member.

Carry on.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: No one—

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: And Mr. Speaker, that Honourable Premier was castigated all over this Island. We had marches up on this hill with thousands of people up here.

The Speaker: Just a minute, Member.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

An Hon. Member: Because of the Uighurs.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Yes, misleading the House. They have impeded their own progress and we are responding to the people of the country—

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Yes, because of the Uighurs.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you—

And in spite of that, Mr. Speaker, that particular Premier did not apologise, did not resign—did nothing, all right? Did nothing. So I am very satisfied that my former Leader has done the right thing, and it shows that the ideals of this party are bigger than any individual. Bigger than any individual. We accept that. We accept that. And that we need as (he is not in his chair but) my honourable cousin, the Honourable Terry Lister, has said that, you know, we need to get along with the people's business here.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: That is who we are responding to.

One of the things that I really have to emphasise, Mr. Speaker, is that the Opposition does not want to see us get along with the people's business. They do not want us to prosecute our agenda. They want us to fail even if Bermuda fails. They will be—

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member, thank you.

Minister, carry on.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: What I find to be interesting now that I am like you in former days, Mr. Speaker . . . I am now starting to ball bouncers, all right? So I am going to continue to ball the bouncers, okay?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: They would prefer to have Bermuda fail than to see us succeed.

One thing that I find most interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that the Opposition party in the last . . . certainly this year have been conducting themselves like a pack of wolves after the head of the Premier. And now that his head has rolled all of a sudden they are telling us that, *Oh, we're sorry that he is a victim of some sort of conspiracy.*

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Well to me, Mr. Speaker, that is height of hypocrisy! And everybody can see through that. Let somebody put a point of order to that one!

The Speaker: Honourable Member.

[General uproar]

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Let somebody put a point of order to that one!

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you very much.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: I will give you a point of order to it!

The Honourable Member is misleading the House and imputing improper motive according to [Standing Order] 19 because we do not want the Government to fail; we want them to do their job properly.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Speak to the Speaker, not me.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The height of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: By continuing to focus on this exercise they have managed to impede our Government from prosecuting its agenda.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, do not speak until I have given you permission to speak. Please . . . please.

All right. Now you can speak.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: That is misleading the House.

The Speaker: Yes, but take your time, until you—

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: The hypocrisy is with the actions that the One Bermuda Alliance Government continues to do—

The Speaker: All right.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —that contradict what they say—

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —and what they—

The Speaker: Honourable Member!

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: —promised.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, thank you, thank you, thank you.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: That is not a point of order—

The Speaker: Carry on.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: —although it is your role to say that, Mr. Speaker, before you—

The Speaker: Thank you for saying that.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: —chastise me, yes.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Getting back to my honourable colleague, Mr. Lister, he said some interesting things. And one of the things he said was you know we need to take care of the people of Bermuda. And I agree with him 100 per cent—

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, Honourable Member.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: The question is, How do we do that?

The issue . . . you know if you keep talking about this stuff that that Opposition has been talking about, that is not taking care of the people's business.

You know, if you say well, you know our people are out of work and we need to do something about financial assistance . . . that is not taking care of the people's business. We have got to find solutions. We just . . . there is no point just repeating problems that everybody knows; you have got to find solutions, Mr. Speaker.

And, you know, when it comes to this thing it reminds me of . . . I am sure a familiar question that everybody asked at some point when they were growing up, they asked their mother, *Mom, where do babies come from?* And this is sort of an economic question, *Where does the money come from to help Bermudians?*

Where does that money come from?

Where does the money come from to make the jobs? Where does it come from? It just does not fall like manna from heaven, Mr. Speaker, and that takes me to the point of when somebody says, you know, this party focuses on business. Because whether you like it or not, that is where the money comes from. That is where the jobs come from.

You know, we have had the experiment of the PLP which is to have jobs come from the government. And what has that gotten us? That has gotten us a \$2 billion deficit (a debt, excuse me), all right? That is where that has gotten us, okay. So, you know, if the government wants to hire everybody, fine. But then the question arises, *Where does the Government get the money from to pay all these people?*

Well, I am afraid they get the money from the same place that everybody else does—from businesses in Bermuda.

If we want to take care of people in Bermuda you have got to increase business' ability to hire people. So when you talk about what we are doing for the Bermudian people, you have to increase business activity in Bermuda so that Bermudians can get hired. That is what you have to do. Taking care of the people's business—

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

[Gavel]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I heard a sarcastic remark from one of the Members over there, he said, *Like we didn't know that.*

Well, you know, your record shows that you obviously did not know that! You increased the size of the Civil Service by almost 50 per cent during your tenure and that is why we have this \$200 million deficit per year.

It is your doing!

An Hon. Member: So what are you saying?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: What I am saying is that the problems that we have here are your fault. That is what I am saying.

Some Hon. Members: Whoa!

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Is that clear enough?

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: That is right. That is right. Okay, let us get to the next point. It leads me right into my next point, which is—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I was very interested that my honourable colleague over there, the Shadow Minister, asked my colleague if he thought that the global recession had anything to do with Bermuda's problems. That was last week, all right? And my honourable colleague gave the right answer.

But, you know, it occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that the test of leadership . . . and let us face it, Government is leadership. The test of leadership is not how well you do in good times. The test of leadership is how well you do in challenging times. That is the test. And so when we had a global recession the test of the PLP Government was not how well they did when everything was hunky dory—anybody could do well under those circumstances—the test was how well they could do when there was a challenge.

And Mr. Speaker, I have to say that their record was abysmal when they had to actually do something to solve some problems.

An Hon. Member: And your record is worse.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: You know, first they—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Honourable Minister, please take your seat.

Honourable Member De Silva, yes.

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: The Honourable Member is misleading the House, Mr. Speaker. He said that the Progressive Labour Party's record was abysmal. Between 1998 and 2008 we had our highest, highest level of GDP and every—

The Speaker: Honourable Minister, please take your seat.

Honourable Member De Silva, yes?

POINT OF ORDER
[Misleading]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: The Honourable Member is misleading the House, Mr. Speaker. He said that the Progressive Labour Party's record was abysmal. Between 1998 and 2008 we had our highest—highest—level of GDP, and every company in Bermuda had the most highest . . . most profits than they have ever had in the history of Bermuda!

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, MP De Silva.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: During that period under the PLP Government!

The Speaker: Thank you, MP De Silva!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Including your company!

The Speaker: MP De Silva!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Somehow, the Honourable Member has made my point.

He has made my point! You know? When everything was hunky-dory, it was easy. The test is, what do you do when you have problems? Right? First of all, they denied it. They did not anticipate it, as my good friend and brother . . . I have got my crystal ball over there. Some of us on the other side anticipated it. So they did not. And then they denied it when it was happening. And then they took the incorrect action when they were forced to have to do something. And they took it without prior consultation [from] the biggest industry in this Island!

So, what happened? You know, the mass exodus accelerated. And we lost 5,000 to 7,000 people.

There was a profound loss of confidence in Bermuda under their stewardship. So, you know, you hear a lot of talk from these guys about scandals and stuff. But—

The Speaker: The Honourable Members.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Excuse me, Honourable Members—

The Speaker: The Honourable Members.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: —the Honourable Members of the Opposition—about scandals. But when we are talking about *what are we doing for the Bermudian people*, you have to get down to real dollars and cents. Because how is a Government going to help people? Well, we need money to do that. We need jobs to do that. And that is where this Government has

concentrated its attention—to try to get more business in this country, to try to get more jobs in this country.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: We did not. We did not! We did not.

Let me make a correction here, Mr. Speaker, to that. That data point was taken in August 2013.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: That is right, August 2013. Half of those numbers, if I have any, if there is anything consistent (I do not know), but at least half of the time for that data point, was under their administration.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: What do you mean *not true*? It was year over year, August to August.

The Speaker: Just speak to the Speaker. You will be fine.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Year over year, August to August. The previous August was under your administration!

So, you know, the claim that the OBA Government lost 1,600 jobs is bogus. It is as simple as that. It is bogus.

In any case, the other measure of the employment and unemployment rate shows much more favourable numbers. You have to look at both of those things. But they only want to look at the negative, because, Mr. Speaker, they DO NOT WANT US TO SUCCEED, and will do anything to slow us down!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Point of order, Mr. Speaker!

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Anything!

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

I think MP Blakeney wants to speak in front of you. I think he wants to speak.

Do you want to speak, MP Blakeney? Would you like to speak?

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Well, if you would wait until the Speaker asks you to speak, it would be very much appreciated.

Yes?

I am not talking about like that . . . I am talking about . . . yes. Please.

Right. MP De Silva, you have a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member is misleading the House when he says that the Progressive Labour Party would do anything, *anything*, to see the OBA Government fail. I said earlier in my speech, we will gladly sit on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Right. That is right. I heard you.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, it is important! It is important!

For him to make that statement . . . I said that the Progressive Labour Party wants the OBA to be successful. We want tourism and international business to be successful. And we want our people back to work.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: And if that means they stay in Government, then so be it! But get our people back to work!

The Speaker: Thank you, thank you, thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: That Honourable Member is deliberately wasting my time.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Now, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the protestations of the Opposition, I could tell you without fear of contradiction that the reputation of Bermuda has not suffered because of this. All right? I can tell you that, after 14 years of PLP Government, I can tell you that the global brand that is Bermuda . . . Bermuda is a global brand just like Apple, Coca-Cola, Mercedes-Benz. Brands are powerful things. And we are hopefully getting a branded hotel when we get done on [the former] Club Med. Brands in today's world are very, very powerful things.

You know, the best definition of “a brand” is “a promise,” and the Bermuda promise really got damaged under their administration. One of the outcomes of that damage, Mr. Speaker, was that there was virtually no investment capital coming into Bermuda. Right? Virtually no investment; because if the people do not have confidence in a country, they are not going to invest in it.

Now, the quality of proposals and investors that applied to the RFP for my honourable colleague, Mr. Crockwell, the quality of investors was extremely high. People who had a lot of capital, a lot of experience, a lot of know-how applied to build a hotel in Bermuda. And we think we have made the best choice. But the difference was the quality of people who want to invest in Bermuda. In Finance, these folks come to see us in the Ministry. And I can tell you that there is a great improvement in the confidence of the international community in Bermuda since the One Bermuda Alliance has taken over! I can tell you that for a fact.

And the reputational risk that I am hearing talked about here in this House is in no way reflected outside this room, particularly outside our shores of Bermuda. That is for sure. Right? These countries have these kinds of issues happening all the time, and it does not matter to them.

An Hon. Member: True!

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I have seen some publications in insurance magazines and they are wondering what we are getting so excited about here in Bermuda, right? They are just wondering, because—

[Inaudible interjection]

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Honourable Member! You are going to stand and you are going to withdraw that remark! You are going to withdraw the remark! And the next time you say it, you are going to find the door! You are going to find the door! Enough is enough!

[Inaudible interjections]

[Pause]

The Speaker: Carry on, Honourable Member.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We need to refocus. As a Government, I think we really need to refocus our attention on why we were put here. We have had enough of the beating of the dead horse.

I agree with my cousin, the Honourable Member Lister, that we need to take care of the people's business. We are put here to do a number of things for the people of Bermuda. Where I disagree with him was exactly how we do it. But he is right. We have to focus on the people's business. And the view of this Government is that unless the government itself is going to hire thousands of more Bermudians, we have to find ways for the private sector to hire thousands of Bermudians. That is what we have to do.

And there is no question of *no merchants-versus-workers*, and all that kind of divisive stuff. You know, forget all of that political rhetoric! We have to deal with economic realities. We have to deal with . . . we have to know where our money comes from! We have to know. And we have to concentrate on that and dismiss all this other noise that we have.

The Speaker: Thank you, thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, thank you, Honourable Minister.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from constituency number 5, is it not?

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Five, five.

The Speaker: Constituency 5, MP Derrick Burgess, Hamilton Parish East.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier this week, upon the appointment of the Premier, I had a reason to call him for something. I think it was only proper that I congratulate him and hope that he will do very well for the country.

Mr. Speaker, we have had an Honourable Minister who has moved around three times within 17 months. I think that is the most any Minister in the history of this country has moved. I am just assuming that the Honourable Minister, the Attorney General, is not operating his law firm. I am assuming that the Attorney General's position that he now holds is full-time.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the other stuff, I need to bring this again to the attention of this Government, the way they are treating our regimental full-time staff. Mr. Speaker, these folks have to retire at 55. Unlike the police, unlike the fire department, unlike the prisons, whose folks can go to 60, they have to retire at 55. But the problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is that at 55 they do not get their pension. They cannot get their pension till they go 60.

I have brought it to this House before. And I am asking that this Government address the situation ASAP, because some people . . . In fact, one . . . I had better not give that name. But I tell you, at 55 nobody is going to hire you. Not only they are not getting any pension, but they lose their insurance, Government Employee Health Insurance (GEHI). That is not right. We need not to be discriminating against anybody in this country. And they need to be treated as everybody else.

The thing is, Mr. Speaker, the history of the past Government . . . and I am not talking about the PLP. When you go back to the 1947 [Pensions and

Gratuities (War Service) Act], a lot of the benefits that they should have gotten they did not get, because many of those folks in World War I could not read. It was probably an offence, it was illegal for them to pick up a book and read and that type of thing. And they went and fought in the war and came back home and could not even get a job driving a bus or even be a policeman. So a lot of them drank liquor. It was the only thing to do, I suppose, to try to soothe their mind and say, *What have I done wrong?* And [we] need not, in this present day, treat our regimental people, staff like that.

Mr. Speaker, on May the 1st, my good friends, colleagues, had a march. That was great. Thousands emerged upon this House and gave petitions to the Honourable Premier and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. But on May 4th, a letter was written, a letter to the editor, by Diana Williams—not a fan of the Progressive Labour Party—[which was] very insulting, in my opinion.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, a few lines. She says, “Dear Sir, It never ceases to amaze me.” First of all, the heading says, “They don’t get it.” She says, “It never ceases to amaze me, that a whole group of people, presumably intelligent but deaf. . .” But deaf! Do you know what they sometimes match deaf with? Dumb. Right? I think this is probably what she means.

But then she goes on in another paragraph, if I may, Mr. Speaker. She says (she is talking about the One Bermuda Alliance), “[They] never dreamed in their worst nightmare, that they would find what they found when taking over The Government and opening up, files, drawers, bank statements, financial dealings, over runs on building sites and missing money that could not be accounted for.”

Such nonsense!

Mr. Speaker, is this lady saying . . . Well, she is insinuating that this is the manifesto of the people’s movement, that because people want equality, they *don’t get it?* Equality has to do with the postsecondary education, a lack of funding for that?

[Pause]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in this present budget the Government cut scholarship funding. You know, they gave \$30 million-odd to the Tourism Authority. The Tourism Authority moved out of a Government building into a private building. I am assuming it costs about \$200,000 a year. Just how many of our students could that \$200,000 have assisted? Why move out of a Government building when that has been operating in that building for all these years?

Mr. Speaker, the manifesto also talks about jobs. It says, “Full employment for Bermudians must be a national priority.” It is true! When you have the Minister of Immigration and Labour heading one of his

drafts that they want to hire children of work-permit holders in the summertime when *our* children cannot even get employment or scholarships.

It also says about justice (and I am just picking out some of it), the Government does not own public property, yet this Government wants to farm out jobs in the public sector to the private sector. Privatisation—they can call it “mutualisation” all they want. It is privatisation. You are getting rid of people.

Mr. Speaker, you know, if you take any one of those Government projects, say it has got 40 workers, and they privatise it, that new firm is going to end up with 20 workers. So where are you going to put those Bermudians? On the streets?

Mr. Speaker, in a country this size that has no industry, Government has to be a major player in employment. They have got to be. The old UBP understood it; the Progressive Labour Party understood it. And these folks must understand it, meaning the new Government.

If you do not understand that, you are going to have some problems. We do not want to see a whole lot of people on the streets or up at Financial Assistance. And that is the other thing about Financial Assistance, you know. When you go and get financial assistance, Mr. Speaker, you have got to fill out all these type of forms to see if you qualify and everything else. And I am not knocking that. That is good.

But—and the one that I am talking about, we put it in, but they have not corrected it yet—when the retail market wants the tax exemption on payroll tax, they have just got to request it. They just get it like that. These folks that can afford it . . . but Mrs. Smith who has five children, getting no help, she has got to literally beg and literally go out and go to five people and get them to sign a paper for a job every week in order to qualify. There is nothing right about that, Mr. Speaker, and nothing could ever be right about that!

Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Finance Minister talks about the Uighurs, does he understand international protocol, diplomacy? When those Uighurs were on their way to Bermuda, does he know that the UK Government and the US Government were in agreement? They did not tell the Governor because the Governor was not important in this one here.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Mr. Speaker . . . yes, because I want to talk to you . . . right. But if you have got to take a break, that is fine.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: So, for them to try to castrate Dr. Brown—the best Premier this country has ever had . . . That is right! They do not like it because he would not bow down to them. Right?

Some of them over there are chirping, right? But maybe I need to say to these guys, you know, yes, I heard this. Do you know what Harriett Tubman said? Harriett said, "I freed a thousand slaves; I could have freed a thousand more if only they knew they were slaves." You know, then I heard announcements from all that other side, you know . . . But it is okay. It is okay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Grant Gibbons says he had to clean up some mess they left behind.

The Speaker: The Honourable, the Honourable Dr. Gibbons.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: The Honourable Grant Gibbons. Yes, my apologies. The Honourable Grant Gibbons.

The Speaker: The Honourable Minister.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Yes, the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: You know, when we won in 1998, we inherited a Government, or we won the Government, however you want to put it; you got it. All right? We found an infrastructure that was messed up. We did not complain about it. We went about doing our work getting it fixed. We went about doing our thing.

The Honourable Member Grant Gibbons is over there chirping, you know, *Clarien bailed you out*. They bailed Capital G out, that was in trouble.

Some Hon. Members: Ooh!

An Hon. Member: That was amalgamation.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Yes! So let us not go there, Grant. Don't think . . . The problem with this country—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: I understand.

You know what the problem is with this country? We have two types of treatment. It is an unconscious racial bias that is in this country that is keeping us back, perpetrated by the *Royal Gazette*!

An Hon. Member: Yes. And others.

Mr. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: And others.

Let me tell you the difference in them and us. If that situation that was happening last week, was us, it would have been on the front page of the *Royal Gazette* 40 days and 40 nights.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: And you did not see it with these guys, you know, with you fellows. Ayo Johnson came out with a report in the *Bermuda Sun*, and you castigated him. And you discredited him until . . . And I thought, I said to myself, *Well, Ayo, those are allegations*. And I know what allegations are. And I said, *Well, Ayo has got to play his Benny card*. Well, he did not have to play it; the *Bermuda Sun* played it. They talked to Landow, and Landow said whatever he had to say, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I heard one of the Members on the other side (I think it was the Honourable Member Grant Gibbons) say that somebody resigned and said they did no wrong. Man!

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to get some water.

[Pause]

An Hon. Member: That will make you thirsty.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Yes, it did.

They did no wrong, Mr. Speaker. But the OBA spent over two days last weekend down wherever, fighting, trying to pull each other's eyes out, catching fish, whatever they call it, right? But they had some problems. So, you did no wrong? Why are you going to spend two-plus days discussing this issue?

They had a retreat.

Mr. Speaker, before I go there, right, when I talk about the two types of treatment . . . I did not want to go there so quickly . . . I can remember in the 1998 auditor's report, and it reports some . . .

You guys will mess me up, you know. I want to talk to the Speaker.

The Speaker: I really appreciate that. Would you let everyone else, when they get up to speak?

[Laughter]

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I always look at you when I am speaking to you.

The Speaker: Absolutely. Yes.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Yes. And when somebody disturbs you, I get after them: *What's happening?*

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: And, Mr. Speaker, in the audit report, there was non-reporting, all that type of stuff going on then, and prior to then. Okay. Fine, fine. But if you look in the audit report of 2005 (the only reason I use 2005, I have it right here), you start

seeing words like “fraud,” “misappropriation.” I took three pages today and read these three pages. “Fraud” and “misappropriation,” are there 21 times!

Mr. Speaker, the Government, the Accountant General did not collect \$16.7 million of Government money in 1997/98—\$16.7 [million], nothing . . . because . . . and let me tell you, that was to do with conveyances, most conveyances, transactions from lawyers. What happened is, if a property is worth \$1 million, they will put \$500, so they will pay less taxes to the Government. So I guess the auditor must have said, *Well, I cannot attack my own people, so let me write something nice.* He did not write anything about any fraud or misappropriation.

And do you know what they say? *We cannot go back because there are no records.* Have you ever known the Government to have no records on your collecting of funds for conveyances and stuff like that? Those things have to be recorded with the Registrar. So the money was never collected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the problem with this here, this problem was identified in 1994. And I am not making this up. I have got it right here. This is from the audit report 1998. Yet, it made no disparaging remarks about anyone else.

Berkeley Institute, I have got to go there because they always bring up about how we had these overspends and this here. Berkeley Institute, 83 per cent of it was completed, Mr. Speaker, for \$51 million. They fired (and I shouldn't say *they*), the Government of the then PLP Government, fired the contractors, took on some new contractors, different complexion, and had to complete the 17 per cent. It cost the Government \$60 million to complete 17 per cent.

Now, prior to that, if you took the newspaper up every day, there was a report in the papers, not positive, about the contractors at Berkeley Institute. Every day! You had contractors saying . . . because you know on a job this size there are a lot of subcontractors. And this was confirmed, contractors saying, *I am not going up there and help those guys. If I go, I am going to put a price in that is . . .* In other words (so the listening audience will understand), if the job cost \$50,000, they would put in \$75,000. *Now, if they want to pay, we will go.*

That is the type of, let us say, “cooperation”—the opposite of cooperation, “un-cooperation”—that the contractors up there were getting, because they were the establishment. They were dead set on making those contractors fail.

The other part about it, there was no audit! You spend \$60 million to complete 17 per cent of a project and there was no audit! Now, had that been Island Construction Company firm, or Mr. Blackity-Black's firm, it would have been audited and they would have had a report every day in the *Royal Gazette*. That is the two different worlds we live in here, how we are treated and how the establishment treats themselves, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the meetings that these folks had last weekend—a lot of meetings. It was hot down there, they tell me. The air conditioners broke down.

[Laughter]

Mr. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: So hot, Mr. Speaker.

They had to resume on the next day, on my Sabbath, on Sunday. And you heard some remarks come out from there. And that is okay. That is how politics is sometimes. It gets rough. Whether it is them or us, or the UK Labour Party or whoever! That is how it gets. But do not come here and say that you did no wrong. Because if you did no wrong, you would not have all that rancour in those meetings, Mr. Speaker. That does not happen.

But, Mr. Speaker, you know what happened? It has been said before, and it has got to be repeated. The \$350,000 came to Bermuda. Two fellows went down to the bank trying to open up an account, Mr. Green (Bow-tie Green), and Stephen DaCosta. Will not let them open an account. They went to Fahy. Account opened. Account opened.

Mr. Speaker, Thad Hollis finds out about this here because people are saying . . . Thad said, *Now, I am paid. I am the full-time paid employee, Chairman of this party! I do not know anything about this! We could use that \$350,000.* So he calls for an internal investigation. I knew there were problems then, because if you are going to call for an internal investigation on your Premier, you know there are some problems. That is not trained medicine, Mr. Speaker.

[Timer]

Mr. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Jeez, that is short, yes. Jesus.

The Speaker: Thank you. You are so good, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, MP Marc Bean. You have the floor.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, good afternoon.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good afternoon to honourable colleagues, and good afternoon to the listening public.

Mr. Speaker, sitting here over the last two weeks, I had to refer to the late, great Reggae artist from the wonderful Island of Jamaica, Mr. Peter Tosh, when he says in his song, “Everyone is crying out for peace, yes, None is crying out for justice.”

And you hear *let's have peace, let's have Kumbaya*—all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, it would be remiss of myself and the Opposition to sing *Kumbaya* in a non-*Kumbaya* moment. We have to be honourable. We have to be honest. The times require us to hold the One Bermuda Alliance/United Bermuda Party Government to account. Today has been the continuation of a week, maybe a year, of political expediency. Earlier we heard a Statement on hotel development, which, in my humble opinion, under the circumstances, shows or reveals a high degree of moral bankruptcy within the existing Government.

How could you dare have the audacity to report such a Statement in the midst of all this skulduggery surrounding the same site? Political expediency. Short-term gain for long-term consequences, Mr. Speaker.

Then, I heard one or two Members get up and finally find a voice (I will call no names), but on the Municipalities Act and the referendum and other items that the loyal Opposition has been holding and asking questions about all year, for the last 16 months. But I guess it is better late than never to find your voice, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes, I wonder if people find their voice when they see the tide changing and turning. But what I will say is that integrity has to be consistent. You do not pick and choose when you decide to speak up on an issue. We are elected to speak up on every issue all the time without partiality.

Mr. Speaker, this week our acting Whip was informed by the OBA Whip, Mr. Simons, the Honourable Member, that we will be debating a take-note motion on the Cannabis Reform Collaborative (CRC). And so we prepared for it. We spent time preparing to deal with this take-note motion. Lo and behold, come 2:30, we skip across everything and we are on the motion to adjourn! So I wonder if that information provided by the Whip was meant to distract us, get us focused on something else! So all these hours have been put in by my colleagues to prepare to debate a take-note motion, and it gets carried over, all of a sudden! Again, is it political expediency?

Mr. Speaker, last week I told the One Bermuda Alliance that they need, or we expect, a cleansing of the blood of the UBP/OBA body politic. What did we get in return? Not a cleansing at all, but actually more poisoning of the very same blood! Mr. Speaker, milk is not good for the bloodstream. A blood cleanser is dandelion root or burdock root. But lactose is not good for the bloodstream, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what did we get over this last week? A continuation of the 17 months—in fact, almost three years—of deception, misleading statements, arrogance and deceit. Again, self-destructive characteristics. We have seen the former Premier, and now Member of Parliament, the Honourable Craig Cannonier be forced to resign. And then the chief offenders have the audacity to stand up by the new interim Leader an hour later—the chief offenders! Not

the getaway driver, he got arrested; but the thieves themselves, Mr. Speaker!

The Speaker: Honourable Member. Please.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Well, I take that back.

The Speaker: Please. Yes. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Allegorically, allegorically.

The Speaker: You know. Right. You know how to choose words much better than that, Honourable Member. Yes.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Allegorically, Mr. Speaker.

But they had the audacity to stand beside their new interim Leader.

Mr. Speaker, people could be forgiven if they are thinking that the former Premier was set up! As if it was almost a mid-evening coup in Bermuda on Monday, Mr. Speaker! And you know what? I had opportunity to go up the hill, and I had a question to ask. And the Deputy has just spoken about it. It was a tumultuous occasion over the weekend for the UBP/OBA, Mr. Speaker—infigting, scratching each other's eyes out, making accusations to one another. In the midst of that, with a 19/17 majority, I just wondered . . . within an hour of the resignation, you had the swearing-in of Minister Dunkley as the Premier. I wondered what proof or evidence—

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Minister.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: The Honourable Member is misleading the House.

You have to have a Premier.

The Speaker: Absolutely.

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: The Governor, or an interim Premier. The Honourable Member is obviously off base.

The Speaker: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker! Mr. Speaker!

The Speaker: Honourable Member, the Speaker will run this House! And nobody else!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, an *acting* Premier was appointed, which is normal under the cir-

cumstances. But then, an hour later, you had the announcement that the acting interim Premier was now substantive. And I had to ask the question, What evidence was provided up the hill to say that the new interim Premier commanded the majority of the House? Because, Mr. Speaker—

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: Yes. Yes, yes.
Honourable Member, please.

POINT OF ORDER

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Actually, if the Honourable Member will essentially allow me.

The Speaker: Yes.

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: The Governor asked for evidence that the new acting Premier had the majority of the House, and that was given.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: And I would like to ask the Honourable Member, What was that evidence? because it was not provided to me when I asked for it.

I was referring to what the Honourable Member just said to us. What is that evidence? because you had one person, as far as we know, who was off-Island! Now I know if the shoe was on the other foot, we would have had to provide a list with signatures.

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.
Honourable Member, just give the Honourable Member an opportunity.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: If the Honourable Member will yield.

The Speaker: Yes, okay.

Dr. the Honourable E. Grant Gibbons: The Honourable Member who was off-Island was contacted.

The Speaker: Yes. All right. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: So basically, it was based on one's word. Basically, it was based on one's word, Mr. Speaker.

As far as I am concerned, you know, that creates a sticky situation. Because this is not over. And

there is not . . . forget the facade of unity. There is no unity on that side. So what happens in the future if that decision was made on the basis of political expediency? Oh, my gracious. I do not think the people of this country understand the ramifications of that.

Mr. Speaker, now that the former Premier Craig Cannonier has resigned over transparency, another question that has to be asked is, Why are the rest of the One Bermuda Alliance/United Bermuda Party still here? If it was just over transparency, then everyone should have resigned, because this has been one of the issues over 14 months.

You see, the former Attorney General then, belatedly, resigned. But, as has been confirmed today, it was not over Jetgate! It was over the fact that he had accepted a new job. That tells me that the lesson has not been learned yet. And the lessons still have to be taught. The lessons will be taught, Mr. Speaker!

Right to the very end of that resignation by the learned Member, we had our interim Premier defend him. And similar to another architect of the UBP/OBA, Dr. Gibbons, defended all of them. And then after the defence, they get up and they praised the decision for resigning. Has anyone noticed the doublespeak, the contradictory statements that have been emanating out of the Members opposite this week?

You see, this doublespeak has been consistent ever since the interim Premier sprinted up to Government House to fulfil what appears to be his lifelong endeavour—to finally be the Premier of this country!

Just look at today's media interviews. It makes it seem like the Archangel Michael has appeared in this country. People will be interested to know . . . but let me make this point to the *Royal Gazette* and the other media: No amount of photo ops with schoolchildren on the front page of the *Royal Gazette* to enhance the image of the interim Premier will help you one bit! The people know oh-so-very well who we are dealing with before and after that highly-paid story gets reported.

In fact, I had a vision this week, Mr. Speaker. I had a vision that, as a result of this political expediency, I could see someone going through a similar experience, Dr. Gibbons, as Sir Stafford Sands in the Bahamas in 1968/69. I see it coming! I see it coming, learned Member Crockwell. I will encourage the public to read up on Sir Stafford Sands and to learn of his fate in the Bahamas.

Then we have Ministers Crockwell and Fahy. I am not going to rehash, because I think everything has been said. But I will just add this: Honourable Minister Crockwell, Learned Member, pass this message on also to Minister Fahy. I suggest—I suggest, Mr. Speaker—that they tender their resignations forthwith! Let us not play any games. The three lawyers involved, Fahy, Crockwell and Pettingill . . . in other jurisdictions, I would say that by their behaviour, Mr.

Speaker, they are walking this fine line of being disbarred by the Bar Association in this country! It is a fine line!

The Speaker: Honourable Member, Honourable Member. You are imputing . . . Carry on, but—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, we always have to call these Members and address them by the title “Learned Member.” They are learned by virtue of them being members of the Bermuda Bar.

The Speaker: Absolutely.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: There is no other reason why we would call them Learned. So, there are ramifications contained within the rules of the Bar Association. There are obligations when you are a barrister. And you are not just a barrister one minute or two hours out of the day. You are a barrister 24/7, whether you are in this Chamber or outside this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. And the line that they are on, the path that they are on, I can foresee consequences as disbarment, Mr. Speaker! I can see it!

So I will say this. Hold on to your position at your peril! Hold on at your peril!

Now, I will ask a question to Minister Crockwell, and I will sit down for him to answer.

The Speaker: This is not Question Period, Honourable Member. So you can—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Well, was Minister—

The Speaker: —ask the question.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Sure. Was Minister Fahy scheduled to get on that plane? And why did he not get on that plane?

I am sure you can get up and speak if you like. But why did he not get on that plane?

And also, what happened in the hours after that ill-fated meeting in Washington, DC? What happened for the 48 hours while you were up there after the meeting? Did you go to the Library of Congress to study?

Some Hon. Members: Nooo.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: So what did you do? Should I allow, Minister, for you to tell the public?

The Speaker: Honourable Member, it is not question-and-answer.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I know, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: So you can pose . . . you can carry on the way you need to carry on. But they will not be answered.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Because if it does not come forward, then, trust me, that will remain on the front burner, too. But suffice it to say it was not a visit to a monastery. It was entertainment! Las Vegas/South Beach type of entertainment, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Members.

Honourable Member Blakeney, yes, I am speaking to you! I expect better.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: But yet, Mr. Speaker, the same Members over the last 24 hours have come and approached Members on this side to say, *Listen—begging us—please do not raise this issue because more information is coming out down the pipeline that will crush Craig Cannonier and Stephen DaCosta.* Begging us!

You know what I said? *We are not interested in kicking a man who has already been politically decapitated, bye.* If anything, we are looking to restore Craig Cannonier, help him to redeem himself, Mr. Speaker. We are a forgiving people.

An Hon. Member: That’s right!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: And we are not going to allow any more skulduggery to be put on the former Premier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say this. Next week, because of this continued denial and arrogance, this refusal to face the truth and accept responsibility, I will be tabling a Motion of Censure on the Honourable Members Crockwell and Pettingill. We will get to the bottom of this, Mr. Speaker.

I see you smiling, Premier Dunkley. I see you smiling. And let me address you real quick.

The Speaker: The Honourable Premier.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable Premier.

The Speaker: The Honourable Premier.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The interim Premier.

The Speaker: The Honourable Premier, and I hope you—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable Premier.

The Speaker: Let us respect that position.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I respect it.

The Speaker: You never know who is going to be in that position!

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: You never know.

The Speaker: And, therefore, we should always be respectful of that position. I expect that from every Member.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: No problem, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I know you know. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: No problem.

The Speaker: All right. Carry on.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Three months' time, the Honourable Bob Richards might be our Premier. Who knows? Who knows?

But the entire Government will be held to account. I said it last week, and I will say it this week. The United Bermuda Party has shown its face. They have aided and abetted the Jetgate Four and then pushed one of these Members to the side.

Let me refer to an example on December 13th, [2013], Hansard. And I will quote from our current Premier to show you why they are all complicit in this unscrupulous behaviour. And I quote, ³“Mr. Speaker, one thing is very clear. And I will use one of the words that the Member who just sat down used. One thing that is very clear to me today is that the Opposition is so frustrated because they got outmanoeuvred.”

And then if you read Hansard, you will see that Minister Crockwell got up and said, “Checkmate.” This was over the robbing of democracy, the robbing of the referendum that was promised!

So then, the Honourable Premier said, “The Honourable Members on the other side of the carpet [the red carpet] . . . well, we are going to bring an atmosphere to create those jobs. And that is what gaming will do.

“And while there will be those in the community who will be quite upset with the decision that the Premier and every single person on this side of the red carpet made . . .” *Every single person.* “And I asked the Honourable Member, Mr. Burt, . . . to come in and point out Members who are not standing strong on this side of the House in regard to that ill-fated decision. Come in and point them out. He cannot. He cannot. It is a figment of his imagination. Or would I say that green deer caught in the headlights again?”

“We”—we, collectively, we—“are standing united on this one,” Mr. Speaker.

What happened between then and this week after the resignations were tendered? What happened? Because this is the evidence that you are all in the boat together. And that is why the Government will be held to account, Mr. Speaker. They can try and brush it off all they like. We will be moving as a next step, a Motion of Censure. There are other tools in our toolkit to use, other options. But we will deal with the Motion of Censure, Mr. Speaker.

And let me say this. You want it to be derogated? You know, what is going to come, because you do not want to show humbleness and humility. What will come is Watergate. What will come is Electoralgate. And, God forbid, if just one little piece of information reaches my desk, then I promise you we will have a repeat of the Bahamas in 1968. I promise you that, Mr. Speaker!

[Timer]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise the Minister of Tourism, the Learned Member Crockwell. You have the floor.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand the nature of politics. I have been in politics for a while now. And, Mr. Speaker, what we have heard today and even the tone of it, is concerning, but I understand that it is politics.

You know, I find it interesting that some Members on the other side who have spoken to me privately during this matter expressed a completely different sentiment than they did today when they were on their feet. But I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this is politics.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to utilise all of my time. I have been clear, Mr. Speaker, in this House concerning my involvement in the meetings that took place in Washington, DC, back in March of 2013. Mr. Speaker, I have not misled this House or misled the public at all on this issue. And I have been clear in the information that I was aware of. There have been allegations, Mr. Speaker, of omission. Well, you cannot omit something, Mr. Speaker, that you do not know. So, I understand. I understand that this is politics and that the slim majority that we heard about earlier is certainly fuelling the continuous attacks on this issue.

Then I heard today about things that I find extraordinary, that monies were used to buy votes and all sorts of other things that are coming down the pike. So, as I have always said—I have said it in the House, I said it a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker—if there is evidence of wrongdoing and illegality, I invite the Opposition to bring it! I invite the Opposition to bring it.

³ [Official Hansard Report](#), 13 December 2013, page 588

I will repeat what I have said before in this House, that the meeting I attended in Washington, DC, was conducted professionally. It was with individuals that expressed an interest in investing in Bermuda, who had a plethora of questions that they wanted to have addressed. I thought it was a productive meeting. Nothing that I witnessed and/or observed was unethical or untoward.

Now, there have been statements in the past about, yes, my comments in relation to the presence of a civilian there. And I was concerned about that. There is a difference between being concerned, Mr. Speaker, and there being unethical behaviour. I was concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that there was a civilian there, in the event that the conversations were to mature and evolve.

Now, there is no question . . . I mean, we have had . . . Well, I will let the other side make the argument where that was unethical. But I raised my concerns about it, Mr. Speaker. And I addressed it, in what I thought at the time, was the appropriate way.

Now, I accept without question, Mr. Speaker, that the optics of getting on a private plane to attend this meeting—albeit paid for not by the Government—was poor judgment. But, you know, I find, again, as we said, as others have said today, about the hypocrisy coming from the Opposition on that point. It seems that is the sort of lightning issue here. You hear Honourable Members say, *We didn't get on a private jet!* But, you know, it is interesting . . . someone actually sent me an article dated April 7, 2009, I believe it was BNET, Mr. Speaker. They were talking about the issue back then, which was dubbed the “pay-to-play” issue, where the former Premier, Dr. Ewart Brown, held fundraising events in Washington, DC, and raised money for the party, if we can recall. He said that it was a fundraiser for the PLP, but yet we know that cheques were written out in his name, Mr. Speaker, back at that time.

But what I found really interesting, because I was not really concerned about that . . . let us deal with the campaign contribution. Mr. Speaker, let us make something clear, because I am a former Chairman of the United Bermuda Party, and I know that when they say UBP and all that type of stuff, you know, somehow or the other that is supposed to make me feel dirty or something.

Mr. Speaker, I have no apologies for being the Chairman, the former Chairman, of the United Bermuda Party. None whatsoever. We had some philosophical differences and political differences, Mr. Speaker. But I have never, never, in any of my statements in this House or out of this House, maligned or denigrated anyone in that organisation, ever. I was proud to serve this country when I was in the United Bermuda Party.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: And that does not bother me. I am proud to stand next to my colleagues in this Honourable House. Proud, Mr. Speaker.

And the Honourable Member who likes to throw out these threats all the time and come and whisper things to me as if somehow or the other he is going to make me fearful, I am not afraid of the Opposition Leader, Mr. Speaker. I have said it before.

Now—

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Imputing improper motives]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, come on. “I am not afraid of the Opposition Leader,” like, that is imputing improper motives.

The Speaker: Right.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: It is almost like I have threatened him personally.

The Speaker: You are not anybody to be afraid of, Honourable Member.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: No, not at all! I am a lamb! I am a lamb, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Carry on.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: What I found very interesting in that article was the fact that the former Premier, whose Government retained GlobalHue to be their marketing agent for tourism—

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of information, please, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF INFORMATION

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, specifically, what article is he referring to?

The Speaker: Okay, thanks. Thanks, thanks. Carry on.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I believe I said it was BNET, you know. That's the article. Mr. Speaker, I will pull it up.

[Pause]

The Speaker: Hang on. Where was it? You said BNET?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes. I will pull it back up, Mr. Speaker.

[Pause]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The date is April 7, 2009. I will share the article. It is BNET, Mr. Speaker.

And in this article, they recounted the fact (it is a US publication) that GlobalHue had received this very lucrative contract, a \$13 million contract, and how those monies were spent. Again, I am not taking issue with that. But it was interesting that they highlighted the fact that the boss of GlobalHue was Mr. Don Coleman, who went to university with the former Premier and Tourism Minister, Dr. Ewart Brown.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Absolutely. Absolutely. Went to university together.

But this is what caught my attention, that this company that received this \$13 million marketing contract, Mr. Don Coleman and the former Premier travelled on his private jet to Washington, DC, to attend these functions!

So, a private jet owned by Mr. Don Coleman, who had a \$13 million—a \$13 million—contract with the Government, picked up former Premier Ewart Brown in his private jet and travelled to meetings!

Did Members on the other side—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: The Honourable Member may be mistakenly misleading the House. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, because the former Premier Brown . . . the last time the OBA brought this up he wrote to me and said he only went on one jet trip, and we all know where it was. It was down to the football game, and then to DC. So I would ask him to withdraw that until he gets his information correct.

The Speaker: Okay. Thanks.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem if that matter is clarified. But I am referring to the article. If the article is incorrect, then I will share the article, and I have no problem tabling the article, Mr. Speaker, in this House.

But the fact is the article says that they travelled on his private jet. I do not recall Members on the other side raising issues then about it. I do not recall Members on the other side calling for Dr. Brown to resign then.

An Hon. Member: Because it is not true!

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: So, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting.

So, Zane De Silva gets up and says—

The Speaker: The Honourable Member.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member gets up and says, *I think that the Honourable Member may be misleading*, and then, *It is not true!* But yet, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly, clearly a double standard.

So, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day—

Mr. E. David Burt: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Mr. E. David Burt: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. Because if he is saying that there was a double standard, then that must mean that One Bermuda Alliance either thought that behaviour was appropriate or inappropriate.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Carry on.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the double standard is emanating from the Opposition benches. There is no question about it.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: On this issue, on this issue.

Now, you know, at the end of the day, we have said it. The former Attorney General said it. I am saddened that he has resigned the position as Attorney General. But, Mr. Speaker, again, I accept—I accept—the optics and I accept the criticism. No question about it.

But I know, and I am confident in my role. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that there was absolutely no wrongdoing—none whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. So I understand this is politics.

I have said this before, Mr. Speaker, that we need to get on with the business of this country. But at the end of the day we are going to have to deal with the situation as it comes. And it is just amazing, now, that the former Premier was “set up,” when week after week after week we came here and the Opposition

was crying for his resignation! And now today, "he was set up."

Mr. Speaker, something is not right. But as I said, Mr. Speaker, this is what our politics has become. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Premier. Premier Dunkley, you have the floor.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Yes. Good evening, Mr. Speaker and colleagues.

The Speaker: Good evening.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I have certainly enjoyed the opportunity to listen to this debate this afternoon and early this evening.

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker, I get it. I get what politics is all about. The Opposition has to try to bait and switch, or divide and conquer, do what they want. But let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to get distracted by any of those tactics.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: I hear the Opposition Leader going, *Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah*. I will not even get distracted by the bleating I hear from that.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that up here this afternoon we have not created one job. We have not brought any investment to the Island. And the people of Bermuda feel the same way they did at the end of the day as at the start of the day. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get involved in listening to, "The Premier must resign." We heard that for weeks on end. The Premier resigns. The next thing they focus on, the Honourable Member Mr. Pettingill and the Honourable Member, Mr. Crockwell. Then the Honourable Member, Mr. Pettingill, resigns to look at an opportunity in the private sector, then they focus on Honourable Member, Mr. Crockwell, and Honourable Member in another place, Senator Fahy.

Come on! What is next?

You know, we just keep going, going, going. It is like a broken record. It never sounds any better. It never sounds any better.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few things about the Honourable Member, Mr. Pettingill, the former Attorney General, because he was criticised by Members on that side. Well, that Honourable Member, in the 17, 18 months when he was Attorney General did a good job. And I know that from reports that I have heard when he has travelled overseas, when he attended the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery [AFARII] in Morocco, when he attended the [Ukraine Asset Recovery Forum]. I heard reports from people in very high places about the quality of performance that that Honourable Member put on the world stage. Mr.

Speaker, I even heard it when I went to Government House on Monday night, the Governor talking about reports that he had heard.

So, Mr. Speaker, we need to give credit where credit is due. You cannot just keep knocking people down.

And then, lo and behold, at the next minute, they knock the former Honourable Premier down for weeks in and weeks out. And the Honourable Member on the other side has the audacity to say, *We want to help lift him up!* Now, come on! I was born at night, but it was not last night! No, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry.

The Civil Asset Recovery Bill [Proceeds of Crime Amendment (No. 2) Bill 2013], the Honourable former Attorney General talked about the legislation that the former Government did and compared it to what this Government has done. Civil Asset Recovery Bill was a tremendous piece of legislation we put in here. The Honourable Members on that side nary had a word in debate about it! So who was doing their homework at that time?

Mr. Speaker, you have to be fair when we talk about these things. Colleagues need to be fair and up-front about it. And then they want to come after the Honourable Minister Crockwell.

Look, I have sat in this House for 18 months. I have seen the honourable gentleman pilot through the Tourism Authority legislation. The Tourism Authority has been set up. It is staffed by quality personnel, quality leadership. And they are on the job doing what they have to do. In fact, this week I think they are in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot have it both ways. The honourable gentleman had a tourism summit last year. People from outside came in and told us the nuts and bolts of what we needed to do to try to get back on track. Out of that, we put RFP's through for the Club Med property. We had a number of different RFP's put in. We shortlisted it to two.

And the Honourable Member comes here today and talks about the exciting opportunity when that two get down to one, and we hear the Opposition Leader say, *morally bankrupt for bringing it here today!* Now, come on! Do we want to cut off our own feet? We have an opportunity to create 300 to 400 jobs! And we are going to argue about it before we even go through the process of an MOU? Now, come on, Bermuda. We are better than that!

If you do not like what is happening, at least for a while—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Opposition Leader, if you do not think you like the way that proposal was handled, do not try to scare away the investor before we have an opportunity to get them to sign on the dotted line. That is not right! That is not right!

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Point of order. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

[Misleading]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable Premier is misleading the House. Nothing that we have said indicates that we are trying to scare away investors. We are seeking transparency to avoid long-term consequences.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, that argument is weak, and I am certainly not buying it. Because when you use two words such as “moral bankruptcy,” “morally bankrupt,” it is not acceptable. The Opposition Leader said it about half-an-hour ago. It is not acceptable.

So if you do not agree with what has happened, at least find the details before you are blowing smoke. At least find the details before you are blowing smoke!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The Honourable Member comes to this House and gives a statement and lays out where we are going to go from here. And they want to criticise. That is not acceptable. It just goes to show that at times we need to raise our game where we are going. Because I do not really buy what Honourable Members on that side say when they say, *We want the OBA to succeed.*

The Honourable Member Zane De Silva jumps up week in and week out and says it over and over and over again. Just because you repeat something, I am not going to accept it and believe it. I have to see it. And I saw it today with this exciting new announcement! This is an exciting potential. In fact, the consultant involved in the process came up to us and said, *Honourable Premier, there is no way picking either one of those two that you have much downside.* That is what the consultant said! Because it was such a tough decision. It was such a tough decision.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to get distracted by this stuff. I will deal with it. I will be straight up. I will listen. I will make decisions. But I am not going to get distracted by this stuff.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have been here long enough today. And I want to take the opportunity to wish everybody a happy Bermuda Day. It is time for us to come together and celebrate our heritage. It is

time for us to come together and enjoy each other, Mr. Speaker. It is a day when Bermudians from one end of the Island to the other participate in numerous activities, whether it be watching the race, the runners or bikers, or whether it is dancing with the Gombeyes, as some might try to do, enjoying the Bermuda Day Parade, or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, taking your first swim. It is warm enough to do that.

It is a day that we should enjoy family, friends and people we do not know as well. Or simply, Mr. Speaker, just sit back and immerse ourselves in the culture and the community that we have here. So I want to take this opportunity to wish you and all colleagues, Members on the other side as well, and the people of Bermuda, best wishes and trust that everyone has a safe and fun-filled Bermuda Day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Desk thumping]

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

Like the Premier says, Happy Bermuda Day to all. And we are adjourned now until Friday, May the 30th.

Thank you for letting me go home at a decent hour.

[Laughter]

[At 7:12 pm, the House stood adjourned until 10:00 am Friday, 30 May 2014.]

BERMUDA HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT****30 MAY 2014****10:02 AM***Sitting Number 22 of the 2013/14 Session**[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]***PRAYERS***[Prayers read by Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker]***ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER****HOUSE VISITORS****The Speaker:** Good morning, Members.

Just before we start, I would like to take this opportunity to recognise two Senators in the House, Senator Jardine and Senator Dillas-Wright.

*[Desk thumping]***CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES****23 May 2014****The Speaker:** The Minutes of the 23rd of May are to be deferred.*[Minutes of 23 May 2014 deferred]***MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR****The Speaker:** There are none.**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER
OR MEMBER PRESIDING****SESSIONAL COMMITTEES****The Speaker:** I have to announce some changes in the committees of the House.

First of all, the Standing Orders and Privileges Committee: Premier Michael Dunkley of [Smith's North], constituency 10, will now sit on the Standing Orders and Privileges Committee (in the place of MP Cannonier).

On these next three committees there has to be a replacement for Minister Atherden. On the Public Accounts Committee will be MP Michael Weeks, from Pembroke East Central, constituency 16. For the Office of the Auditor, MP Nandi Outerbridge, from St. George's West, constituency 2. For the Register of

Members' Interest, MP Susan Jackson, from Pembroke South West, constituency 20.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE**The Speaker:** There are no messages from the Senate.**PAPERS AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS TO THE HOUSE****The Speaker:** The Chair will recognise the Honourable Junior Minister, S. D. Richards. You have the floor.**Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.:** Thank you, and good morning, Mr. Speaker.**The Speaker:** Good morning.**REGISTRY GENERAL ANNUAL REPORT YEAR
ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2013****Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.:** To His Honour, the Speaker, I have the honour to attach and submit for the information of the Honourable House of Assembly the Annual Report of the Registry General for the year ended 31st of December 2013. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.**The Speaker:** Thank you, Minister.

Are there any objections to that?

Minister, please, carry on with your next matter.

**DEED OF SURRENDER BETWEEN PAR-LA-VILLE
HOTEL AND RESIDENCES LTD., THE CORPORATION
OF HAMILTON AND MEXICO INFRASTRUCTURE
FINANCE LLC****MORTGAGE DEED BETWEEN MEXICO INFRA-
STRUCTURE FINANCE LLC, PAR-LA-VILLE HO-
TEL AND RESIDENCES LTD., AND THE CORPO-
RATION OF HAMILTON****Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have the honour to attach and submit for the consideration of the Honourable House of Assembly the following documents relating to the Corporation of Hamilton, proposed to be approved under the provisions of sections 20(1A) and 20(1B) of the Municipalities Act 1923:

- Deed of Surrender between Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Tenant”), the Corporation of Hamilton (“the Landlord”) and Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Mortgagee”); and
- Mortgage Deed between Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Lender”), Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Borrower”) and the Corporation of Hamilton (“the Mortgagee”).

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member. Are there any objections to that? Carry on with your next matter.

GUARANTY BY THE CORPORATION OF HAMILTON IN RESPECT OF THE LOAN BY MEXICO INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE LLC TO PAR-LA-VILLE HOTEL AND RESIDENCES LTD.

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have the honour to attach and submit for the consideration of the Honourable House of Assembly the following document relating to the Corporation of Hamilton proposed to be approved under the provisions of sections 20(1A) and 20(1B) and section 37(1) of the Municipalities Act 1923: the Guaranty by the Corporation of Hamilton (“the Guarantor”) in respect of the loan by Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Lender”) to Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Borrower”).

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Are there any objections to that? There are none. Please carry on with your final matter. You have one more?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: Actually, Mr. Speaker, two were combined into one. The Deed of Surrender—

The Speaker: Oh, and the Mortgage Deed?

Mr. Sylvan D. Richards, Jr.: And the Mortgage Deed.

The Speaker: Yes, right. Thank you, thank you.

PETITIONS

The Speaker: There are none.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS AND JUNIOR MINISTERS

The Speaker: We now move on to Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers.

The Chair will first recognise the Honourable Premier. The Honourable Michael Dunkley, you have the floor.

BERMUDA HOSPITALS CHARITABLE TRUST “WHY IT MATTERS” CAMPAIGN

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning, colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to encourage Honourable Members to support the Bermuda Hospitals Charitable Trusts’ [“Why It Matters” Campaign](#) in support of the new acute care wing.

Mr. Speaker, we are less than four months away from opening the new acute care wing of the King Edward VII Memorial Hospital, and less than one month away from the keys being handed over to BHB [Bermuda Hospitals Board]. The key handover is an important marker. It marks substantial completion of the facility and the end of major construction. It is the time when the BHB can start ensuring everything is in place and working to the specifications set out at the start of the project, to make sure any outstanding minor deficiencies are dealt with, to start orientation and training of staff before a final clinical clean takes place and finally, Mr. Speaker, in September, transferring the patients and opening the services to the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would all agree that this is an exciting moment for Bermuda and its health care services. In September, we are going to have access to a wonderful high-quality facility where we will receive our acute care services. Acute care medical and surgical patients will be cared for in single ensuite rooms that minimise the potential spread of infections and provide a private, comfortable place in which to heal. Dialysis patients will no longer be cramped into a too-small facility. Oncology patients will have more privacy and space. Same-day surgical patients will go through registration in a calming atrium before having surgery in a modern high-tech operating room. Emergency patients will have a dedicated entrance and access to diagnostic imaging services, without having to be wheeled through public areas. And people going for CT, MRI and X-ray services will have private waiting areas rather than having to sit in public corridors.

Mr. Speaker, the key handover on the 12th of June is the last major milestone ahead of the opening

of the new wing to the public in September. It is time for us to be excited, but, Mr. Speaker, it is also a reality check. The key handover also marks the point at which payments commence to the private partner, Paget Healthcare Services. As this Honourable House would be aware, the Bermuda Hospitals Charitable Trust has been tirelessly fundraising over the last few years to raise the \$40 million for the down payment.

The "Why It Matters" Campaign, run by the Trust for this purpose, has so far raised over \$30 million. Donors include individuals and companies, local groups and international business. I would like to take this opportunity to thank every single person and company who has made a donation. Mr. Speaker, every dollar counts. But we need to help the Trust, and the hospital, to that final target. The beneficiaries of us reaching that target, after all, Mr. Speaker, are every one of us, our loved ones, our families and our friends.

This is the people's hospital, Mr. Speaker. We will all benefit from the new wing. And our donations today will help ensure that that target is met. So, I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to urge every Member of the House and every member of the community to donate. The support of every Member of this House will show leadership that we have been elected to demonstrate. It is the time for each of us to stand with our hospital and take ownership of the place that we go to in times of illness or after accidents. It is the time for each of us to encourage the entire community to come together and support our hospital.

Mr. Speaker, donations can be made online. In addition, you may wish to purchase a brick to commemorate yourself, your family or a loved one. Or you can contact the Trust directly at 295-2428 to discuss a donation. This is "Why It Matters," Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Junior Minister, Leah Scott. You have the floor.

Ms. Leah K. Scott: Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The Speaker: Good morning.

AUTISM AWARENESS

Ms. Leah K. Scott: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 2nd, 2014 my honourable colleague, Trevor Moniz, Acting Minister of Education, read the official United Nations declaration to mark the seventh annual World [Autism Awareness](#) Day. That day also marked the launch of Autism Awareness Month in Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, you may be aware that Autism Spectrum Disorder (or ASD) involves a group of different symptoms that range from impaired communi-

cation and social interaction to distinctive repetitive behaviours. However, I am pleased to advise that Bermuda, as a community, continues to make great strides in increasing autism awareness.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending two events recently that clearly reflected the concerted efforts that our service providers, the Department of Education and our schools are making to ensure that the needs of our children who are diagnosed with ASD are being addressed. The first event, Mr. Speaker, was an autism training workshop hosted by the Child Development Programme (CDP) on March 27th, 2014. The training was conducted by Dr. Cheryl Klaiman, Assistant Professor in the Division of Autism and Related Disorders within the Department of Pediatrics at Emory University School of Medicine.

One of the key objectives of the workshop was to train the staff at CDP to develop an on-Island diagnosis for our children who may be autistic, as presently, Mr. Speaker, all children in Bermuda under the age of four years who show signs of ASD must be sent overseas to be diagnosed. It is anticipated that the CDP will collaborate with the overseas agency, Communication Crossroads, so that our children are able to benefit from overseas ASD research programmes. This agency specialises in speech and language programmes designed to serve children with ASD and related social learning, and is strongly committed to providing educational workshops for educators, service providers and administrators who are seeking guidelines for implementing therapeutic/educational plans that are grounded in current research. The training workshop was very informative and certainly highlighted the challenge Bermuda faces to obtain a proper diagnosis of autism.

Mr. Speaker, you may also be aware that it was back in September 2011 that the West Pembroke School, with the support of the Department of Education, opened their first autism classroom, taking the initial step to accommodate children with autism into mainstream education. So, it was an honour for me to be given the privilege of opening the Sensory Garden created by the Autism Spectrum Disorder Department at the West Pembroke School. The Sensory Garden provides the students with an exterior location to receive sensory input and promote social interaction with other students.

The West Pembroke students, along with their teachers, Miss Freda Trimm and Miss Zola French, and community volunteers and donors, worked for several months to complete the project, located in the courtyard area at the school. Mr. Speaker, this event clearly demonstrated the ongoing support and commitment that the school has to children with ASD. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the entire ceremony was conducted by children with ASD and included Adonte Martin as the Master of Ceremonies, while Stephen DeShields gave the Welcome. The Opening prayer was delivered by Elon Wainwright, with a vocal performance

given by Michelle Spencer, who sang, "I Believe I Can Fly." The final musical selection was performed by Miss Dawn Fubler, the Art and PE teacher, and Adonte Martin performing drum solos. The ceremony was closed out by Zycieo Glasford, who gave special thanks to attendees and invited guests. Mr. Speaker, the ceremony was absolutely outstanding.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the ASD programme at West Pembroke School, you may recall that Prospect Primary School and Paget Primary School have also established ASD programmes in September 2012 and 2013, respectively. In September 2014, the Department of Education will establish a further two ASD programmes, at the Dellwood Middle School and the Dame Marjorie Bean Hope Academy. The ASD programme at the Dellwood Middle School is intended to address the needs of those students who are transitioning from the primary to middle school, while the ASD programme at the Dame Marjorie Bean Hope Academy will provide a more specialised service to those students with severe and profound exceptionalities on the autism spectrum.

Mr. Speaker, currently, the department serves 21 students in its ASD programmes. An additional 12 students will now be able to be served with the establishment of the two new ASD programmes, which will make for a total of 33 students entered into our ASD programmes.

Mr. Speaker, according to statistics compiled by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, [CDC], there are approximately 1 in 68 American children on the autism spectrum. This represents a 10-fold prevalence in 40 years. Based on preliminary data compiled here in Bermuda, there are approximately 50 students on the Island with some aspect of ASD. With the numbers steadily increasing, we can project that roughly 1 in every 54 students here will be diagnosed with ASD. As such, early intervention is key, with the most important, critical years for assessment taking place from birth to age five.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am pleased to report that in Bermuda, we are taking the necessary steps to assist our children in obtaining an accurate diagnosis of ASD. The ongoing efforts of the Ministry, and particularly our educators of the Child Development Programme, West Pembroke School, Prospect Primary School and Paget Primary School are continuing to promote autism awareness, and they should be highly lauded for their efforts.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister for Economic Development and Education. Minister, Dr. Grant Gibbons, you have the floor.

MIDDLE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to inform this Honourable House of the recent [Middle School Leadership training](#) that was hosted by the Department of Education, from May 13th to May 17th. Honourable Members will be aware that two of the key strategic priorities of the Department of Education are:

- firstly, to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom; and
- secondly, to strengthen and distribute leadership.

Improving teaching and learning in the classroom will happen by building the content knowledge of every teacher; raising expectations; and providing teachers and administrators with coaching, professional development and guidance.

The department will continue to strengthen leadership by working with school leaders to increase their ability to lead change, and improve instruction and everyday operations. This means ensuring that all school leaders know what good instruction looks like and can build capacity for good teaching in their schools.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members may also recall that the 2014/15 Budget for School Improvement and Staff Development was substantially increased by more than 80 per cent in order to place greater emphasis on professional development this school year. As part of this effort, 20 of our middle school leaders were engaged in a four-day practical training programme entitled "Leading for Change in the 21st Century." The training sessions were delivered by a team of professional educators from the Professional Development Division of the firm Pearson Inc., which is based in the United States. This firm has a proven track record of working closely with school administrators and leaders to support teacher development and enhance performance and learning in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership training consisted of two components. Firstly, Instructional Leadership, and this involved middle school principals, deputy principals and teacher instructional leaders receiving training on developing a middle school vision and designing classroom instruction to promote student engagement and learning outcomes. Emphasis was placed on ensuring an effective leadership team and the utilisation of a standards-based instructional framework that promotes rigour and student engagement.

The second component was Observation, Assessment and Feedback. This involved the facilitators visiting each of our five middle school partners to partner with principals and their teacher leaders with walk-throughs to practice their teaching. A lesson observation tool was used outlining effective lesson components. The facilitators performed an assess-

ment of the use of learning tools and instructional methods. The walk-through proved to be extremely beneficial, as the leadership teams from each middle school obtained immediate feedback about their observed performances.

Mr. Speaker, the training also provided the opportunity to incorporate the 16 Characteristics of Effective Middle Schools, as developed by the Association for Middle Level Education (known as the AMLE).

I have been informed, Mr. Speaker, that the overall feedback from the participating educators was very encouraging. One of them commented that he had been (quote) “intellectually stimulated, personally motivated, and systemically encouraged by the wealth of leadership information.”

Mr. Speaker, improving teaching and learning is an area that the Department of Education will continue to focus on during the upcoming academic school year. Professional development will be a key part of our education system, and we are committed to ensuring that this culture is established in all schools and at every level for the benefit of our students. It also directly supports two of the priorities outlined in the “Blueprint for Reform.”

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank the team at the Department of Education for their continued efforts in supporting our educators in the public school system—in particular, Mrs. Terry Cox, Assistant Director for the Eastern Zone of Schools, who organised the professional development training for the middle schools. I would also like to thank the middle school principals and their instructional leader teams for making this a worthwhile initiative for school improvement and student achievement.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister Gibbons.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister of Health, Minister Jeanne Atherden. You have the floor.

STEPS TO A WELL BERMUDA UPDATE

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer an update on the [STEPS to a Well Bermuda](#) survey which is ongoing in our community.

This is an historic survey for Bermuda, and we anticipate that it will provide essential health information about our community. However, we need the help of all in the community to successfully complete the survey and provide this vital information.

Members of this Honourable House will be aware that chronic non-communicable diseases such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease and cancers contribute the greatest proportion of the total burden of disease in Bermuda and are, by far, the leading cause of death.

The tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is that many of these conditions and their complications can be prevented. As we know, effective action to prevent and control these diseases depends upon timely access to accurate and reliable information about the prevalence of these diseases and their associated risk factors.

This information is vital to both informing where resources should best be targeted and also for monitoring and evaluating the impact of any actions taken.

Mr. Speaker, STEPS to a Well Bermuda utilises the Pan American Health Organization’s STEP-wise approach to chronic diseases risk factor surveillance as a simple, standardised method for collecting, analysing and disseminating data for chronic disease risk factors.

The STEPS risk factor surveillance is a sequential process; it starts with the gathering of information on key risk factors, using a questionnaire (which is STEP 1); then moves to a simple physical measurement, such as height, weight, waist circumference and blood pressure (which is STEP 2); and then to the collection of more complex clinical samples for biochemical analysis (STEP 3).

STEPS to a Well Bermuda also incorporates enhanced biochemical analysis for persons with increased risk for diabetes (STEP 3a), and objective assessments of oral health and physical activity (STEPS 4a and 4b).

STEPS to a Well Bermuda builds on previous surveys for Bermuda, which relied only on self-reported information. While these surveys had their benefits, inaccuracy in self-reporting can result in underestimation or overestimation of the prevalence of risk factors, health behaviours and chronic diseases in the population.

Ideally, self-reported data should not be used as the only data source, and the STEPS survey will give Bermuda objective measures to evaluate the health status of the population.

Additionally, because the STEPS methodology is being consistently applied internationally, it will allow Bermuda to benchmark our population health against other countries.

Health surveys such as STEPS to a Well Bermuda, through the use of self-reported information together with a range of objective physical and biochemical measures, will provide important information on the prevalence of various health conditions and physical and biochemical characteristics of our population.

We will also gain insights on the relationship between the risk factors and selected conditions, and social determinants of health.

Mr. Speaker, trained interviewers entered the field in November 2013 with a goal of conducting interviews at 2,656 households. As of [28th] May 2014, 990 households have been reached, with 727 com-

pleted surveys. With continued efforts, it will not be long before we are near the halfway mark!

I would like to publically thank the interviewers for the important work they are doing in the field. It has not been an easy task, but the data collected will help us tackle chronic diseases and their associated risk factors. The importance of this data cannot be underestimated.

For example, preliminary analysis of STEP 3 results indicates that up to 24 per cent of participants had fasting blood glucose levels in the upper normal range of 101 to 125 mg/dl. These persons were referred for further tests in STEP 3a (which is the oral glucose tolerance test), which resulted in the identification of a number of previously undiagnosed diabetics.

Additionally, 11 per cent of the participants during this study period had raised fasting blood glucose levels (over 126 mg/dl), indicative of diabetes, and 40 per cent of the participants had elevated (21 per cent) or high cholesterol (19 per cent).

These preliminary results indicate the need for this survey, as it helps to determine public health priorities in chronic disease prevention.

Mr. Speaker, common, preventable risk factors underlie most chronic diseases.

The basis of chronic disease prevention is the identification of the major common risk factors, as the risk factors of today are the diseases of tomorrow.

A "risk factor" refers to any attribute, characteristic or exposure of an individual which increases the likelihood of developing a chronic non-communicable disease.

The major (modifiable) behavioural risk factors identified by the World Health Organization include tobacco use, harmful alcohol consumption, unhealthy diet (low fruit and vegetable consumption) and physical inactivity.

The major biological risk factors identified are overweight and obesity, elevated blood pressure, raised blood glucose, abnormal blood lipids and its subset, raised total cholesterol.

Surveillance of these core risk factors is necessary, as they have the greatest impact on chronic disease mortality and morbidity.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important for households that have been selected for the survey to participate in STEPS to a Well Bermuda.

Even if you feel you are in good health or had a physical recently, your participation is essential, as it will help to shape the picture of Bermuda's health status.

Mr. Speaker, I implore the public, if one of our interviewers comes to your home, please participate.

Also, if you have been selected, but were previously unable to participate, you can still take part by contacting the STEPS office at 278-4523 or at www.steps@gov.bm.

The results of this study will provide many benefits to the population, including:

- assisting with health services planning;
- determination of public health priorities;
- predicting future caseloads of chronic diseases; and
- implementation, monitoring and evaluation of population-wide interventions.

Mr. Speaker, I have to take a moment to recognise our international partners who are supporting this project, including:

- the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO);
- the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA);
- the University of the West Indies; and
- the University of Cambridge.

Our public health partners include the Bermuda Hospitals Board, Chronic Disease Management Centre and the Bermuda Diabetes Association.

Finally, STEPS to a Well Bermuda is also supported by Bermuda Cancer and Health and the Bermuda Heart Foundation/CORE.

In closing, I would like to thank all of our partners who are working to make this study a success, and also to strongly encourage members of the public to participate if called upon. We need your participation to reach our community goals.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Minister of Community, Culture and Sports. Minister Wayne Scott, you have the floor.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

BERMUDA DAY 2014 REFLECTIONS

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise this morning and inform Honourable Members of this House about the very successful Bermuda Day festivities that were held on Monday, the 26th of May 2014.

Mr. Speaker, staff in two departments in the Ministry of Community, Culture and Sports played important roles in making the recent Bermuda Day Holiday a special and memorable one: the Department of Community and Cultural Affairs and the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation.

Mr. Speaker, our long-standing tradition is that Bermuda Day is the unofficial beginning of summer, a day when Bermudians wake at the crack of dawn on a holiday to either participate in or line the streets from Somerset to Bernard Park to watch and cheer on par-

ticipants in the Sinclair Packwood Memorial Race, the Appleby Bermuda Half Marathon Derby and the Heritage Day Classic Junior Race before settling at their chosen spot to view the start of the long-awaited Bermuda Day Heritage Parade.

Mr. Speaker, this year the Sinclair Packwood Memorial Race, one of the shortest and most prestigious races on the Bermuda cycling calendar, had a total of 76 registered cyclists participating in the 13-mile route from Somerset to Cedar Avenue. The race began promptly at 8:50 am, from the junction of Cambridge Road and Somerset Road, Sandys Parish. Cyclists proceeded quickly along Somerset Road, then onto Middle Road to Burnt House Hill, Warwick. Mr. Speaker, cyclists had to take on the steepness of Burnt House Hill before heading along Harbour Road, towards East Broadway, onto Front Street, up Queen Street, and then right onto Church Street, making a left turn onto Cedar Avenue to the finish line outside of the Leopard's Club.

Mr. Speaker, after many attempts to win the Sinclair Packwood Memorial Race, Shannon Lawrence and Zoenique Williams, who are both constables on the Bermuda Police Service, achieved that goal this year, crossing the finish line in 25 minutes and 41 seconds, and 30 minutes 15 seconds, respectively, taking the title of top male and female cyclist. In the male category, Mark Hatherley completed the course in a time of 25 minutes 44 seconds, which put him in second place, while Matthew Ackland placed third, clocking a time of 26 minutes 12 seconds. Runners-up in the female category were second place winner Nicole Mitchell, who crossed the finished line at 30 minutes 43 seconds, and April Galda-Joyce, taking the third place title with a time of 31 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the junior male and female first-place winners were 17-year-old Justin Ferreira, who finished in 25 minutes 47 seconds and actually crossed the line as third overall as the first junior cyclist (a tremendous feat), and Gabriella Arnold, whose recorded time was 31 minutes 14 seconds. Second-place male and female winners were Shomari Steede, with a time of 26 minutes 25 seconds, and Victoria Davis, finishing at 32 minutes 10 seconds. Matthew Oliviera finished at 26 minutes and 25 seconds, and Erica Hawley completed the route in 35 minutes 48 seconds, to win third place in the junior male and female categories, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, this year, 1,115 participants, including individuals and relay teams, gathered at the start line of the Appleby Bermuda Half Marathon Derby in Somerset for a 9:00 am start, to complete the 13.1-mile course that took a similar direction as the Sinclair Packwood Memorial Race, except that when runners reached Cedar Avenue, they proceeded to Marsh Folly Road, turned right at Marsh Folly Road towards Dutton Avenue, and then right at Dutton Avenue until they crossed the finish line at Bernard Park.

Mr. Speaker, this year, Tyler Butterfield, Bermuda's Male Athlete of the Year, retained his title as male winner of the Appleby Bermuda Half Marathon Derby, completing the course in 1 hour 11 minutes and 18 seconds, almost 4 minutes ahead of his 2013 finishing time, pulling away right from the start. The female first-place winner, Ashley Estwanik, in a time of 1 hour 21 minutes and 24 seconds, won the title for the fourth time after placing second last year.

Mr. Speaker, second-place winners were Chayce Smith, who finished in 1 hour 15 minutes and 25 seconds, and Nikki Butterfield, who completed the course in 1 hour 28 minutes and 53 seconds. Last year's male runner-up Stephen Allen and female title holder Rose-Anna Hoey both claimed third place, finishing in 1 hour 15 minutes and 46 seconds, and 1 hour 31 minutes and 16 seconds, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, 91 runners between the ages of 8 and 15 years old participated in the two-mile Heritage Day Junior Classic that started at 9:45 am on Front Street east of Court Street and finished at Bernard Park.

Mr. Speaker, this year's Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation National Junior Sponsorship recipient Tyler Smith improved from his 2013 second-place title to win first place in the male category, with a time of 10 minutes 58 seconds. Fourteen seconds after Mr. Smith crossed the line, Aaron Jacobs completed the course in 11 minutes 12 seconds, finishing second place. Jayden Ming placed third with a time of 11 minutes 26 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, in a time of 12 minutes 48 seconds, 10-year-old Selah Tuzo placed first in the female category of the Junior Classic and 15th overall. Second-place winner, Jade Johnston, placed 20th overall, finishing in 13 minutes 3 seconds, while Tesyah-Mahle Astwood finished in third place.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Ministry of Community, Culture and Sports, the Bermuda Government and the people of Bermuda, I would like to congratulate all of the winners and participants in the Sinclair Packwood Memorial Race, the Appleby Bermuda Half Marathon Derby and the Heritage Day Junior Classic Race, and encourage them to compete again next year to keep our sporting traditions alive.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a special thank you to Martin Bolton, Fiona Miller and Peter Dunne, Race Directors for the Sinclair Packwood Memorial Race; Bermuda Timing Systems, who provided results for the races; Dr. Gina Tucker, President of the Appleby Bermuda Half Marathon Derby Organising Committee, along with her team; and the numerous volunteers, organisations and companies, at the forefront and behind the scenes, who made these races possible.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Come on, Honourable Members. Let us let the Minister get through his Statement, please.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to venturing to the East End next year to cheer on our many cyclists and runners on Bermuda Day. Whilst we expect that there may be some logistical challenges, we will do our best to support the change of route that was recently announced.

Mr. Speaker, this year's annual Bermuda Day Heritage Parade wound its way through the spectator-lined streets of our city and was enjoyed by thousands of people on what could only be considered a picture perfect day!

This year's Heritage Month theme "Bermuda's Historical Treasures" was an excellent one that succinctly captured our department's emphasis on our history and culture. It also allowed people the freedom to conceptualise, design and create such absolutely beautiful floats on various aspects of our shared cultural heritage. All of the floats could be considered works of art, and they therefore made the judges' work that much more challenging.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my honourable colleagues the floats that were singled out by the judges. The Premier's Award was presented to Mr. Gladwin Smith for his float "Steps in Time."

[Crosstalk]

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: This float also won the J. J. Outerbridge Award for Best Individual Entry. It featured key attractions—

The Speaker: Just a minute, Honourable Members. Whether we like the Statement or not, please.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, point of information.

The Speaker: Yes?

POINT OF INFORMATION

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, according to [Erskine] May, is it not correct that Ministerial Statements are supposed to be read in the House concerning Government policy as well as impending legislation and announcing legislative proposals intended to be debated before this House?

The Speaker: Honourable Member, I am fine with the Statement!

Carry on.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I will point out that this Statement is a reflection of Bermuda Day, which is a national holiday—

The Speaker: Just carry on with the Statement!

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with my honourable colleagues the floats that were singled out by the judges. The Premier's Award was presented to Mr. Gladwin Smith for his float "Steps in Time." This float also won the J. J. Outerbridge Award for the Best Individual Entry. It featured key attractions in St. George's, such as St. Peter's Church and the Ducking Stool. These places of historic significance helped St. George's to attain the singularly important designation as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister's Award (for the Most Original Float) was presented to CedarBridge Academy. It also received the Dame Marjorie Bean Award for the Best Senior School category. This entry's title, "Transportation—the Golden Era of Tourism," gave prominence to an old-fashioned taxi, a horse and buggy carrying a wedding party, and a couple under a moon-gate.

Mr. Speaker, the Ruth Thomas Heritage Award was presented to Sandys Secondary Middle School for its float, which also received the D. J. Williams Award for the Best Middle School. This entry focused on famous Bermudians, with life-sized models of the Talbot Brothers, Teddy Tucker, Tommy Tucker, Johnny Barnes, Gina Swainson, "Sir" Stanley Burgess, Shaun Goater, and Dr. Glen Bascome. These persons were identified and depicted as Bermuda's human historical treasures, reminding us of the importance of celebrating our people. The L.C.C.A. Award (for the best charity organisation) was presented to TROIKA for its float featuring the Unfinished Church in St. George's, as backdrop for a scene from *Beauty and the Beast*, which will be performed this summer. The Bermuda Shriners' Club received second place in the Charity category for its huge depiction of a drum.

The Best Community/Volunteer/Political Award was presented to the Vasco DaGama Club, whose float was a replica of the Portuguese Rock, with the date 1543 inscribed on it, delineating the arrival of the first Portuguese sailor. Transforming Arts Association and Ministries, joined by the Simmons Family and Friends, worked together to produce the float entitled "Spiritual Treasures" that received second place in this category. The scriptural basis for this float was 2 Kings 2:4-14. Open Your Heart Foundation received third place in this category.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that several Government agencies entered floats this year. The first-place recipient for the Best Government Department Award was presented to the Bermuda Police Service, and this department also won the Reggie

Ming Award (for the Most Beautiful float). This float consisted of popular historical sites such as the Stocks and Ducking Stool, the Bird Cage, and a fort and cannon. The Bermuda Police Service were also celebrating 135 years of service to the community, and their presence in the parade is but one of many activities that the police service will be involved in from May through October to bring attention to their service to and work in the community.

The second-place recipient for the Best Government Department Award was the Department of Corrections for their float entitled "Bermuda Is So Much More," which showcased Bermuda's people, businesses, historical events (the Gun Powder Plot) and landmarks as Bermuda's historical treasures.

The Department of Community and Cultural Affairs received third place for its entry, which was a beautiful replica of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to all persons who worked long hours, often into the wee hours of the morning, to produce such stunning floats. I was pleased to note the level of detail, intricacy of design and the use of foliage and other natural products. The creativity and artistry were outstanding. Thanks to all of the float designers and builders!

I also extend my gratitude to our wonderful judges for their work; their task was not easy! Mr. Speaker, the pulsating rhythms of the Gombey troupes, the spectacular performances of the majorettes and other dance groups, and the revelry of the carnival dancers all combined to make the 2014 Bermuda Day Parade a most electrifying and memorable occasion enjoyed by locals as well as our guests. Our sense of being proud to be Bermudian was palpable.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that a picture is worth a thousand words. How true! Throughout Bermuda, one digital image flooded cyberspace soon after the parade ended and captured the essence and spirit of Bermuda Day 2014. It was the scene of thousands of people dancing along Front Street, from the flagpole and as far back as the eye could see! Absolutely awesome! What a scene! What exuberance! Bermudians coming together to celebrate who we are as a people! Thank you, Bermuda! And thank you to Bermuda Aerial Media for capturing that wonderful image.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will just point out that that image is actually on the bottom of this Statement. Thank you.

[Desk thumping]

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister, the Learned Member from Southampton West Central, Minister Shawn Crockwell, Minister of Tourism and Transport. You have the floor.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you and good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

AVIATION POLICY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform this Honourable House of the [Aviation Policy Consultation Conference](#) that I attended with the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Tourism Development and Transport. The invitation to attend the second annual conference was received from the Department for Transport (known as DFT) in the United Kingdom. The conference was held on Tuesday, May 13th at the DFT headquarters in London. His Excellency the Governor also attended as part of his responsibility for oversight of the Department of Civil Aviation.

Mr. Speaker, the UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) is the statutory corporation which regulates and oversees all aspects of civil aviation in the UK. Air Safety Support International (or ASSI) is a wholly owned subsidiary company of CAA, and the company's primary objective is to provide a more unified system of civil aviation safety regulation in the United Kingdom Overseas Territories.

Under ASSI governance arrangements, this conference is held to allow the UK, Overseas Territory (OT) and Crown Dependency (CD) governments to discuss aviation policy issues of mutual interest.

The conference was well attended and had high-level representation, including Governors, Ministers and senior civil servants from Overseas Territories and Crown Dependents.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agenda covered a wide range of aviation items and matters that included Global Market Based Measures, Space Planes and Space Tourism, Airspace and Air Traffic Control Services, Bilateral Air Services Agreements, Airport Development/Extension, Development of Regulatory Competence and Offshore Aircraft Registry Policy.

Mr. Speaker, there was robust discussion and debate on most topics. With regard to the Global Market Based Measures, on the 4th of October 2013, the International Civil Aviation Organisation (known as ICAO) 38th Assembly considered global solutions to address emissions from international aviation and reached agreement to develop a global market based measure (known as MBM). The agreement is considered an historic milestone for air transport and for the role of multilateralism in addressing global climate challenges. By reaching consensus to formulate the MBM agreement, the air transport industry became the only major industry with a multilateral global MBM agreement to govern future greenhouse gas emissions. ICAO member states agreed to finalise a proposal for the MBM scheme for discussion in 2016, with implementation planned for 2020.

Mr. Speaker, Space Planes and Space Tourism are becoming more prominent, and this area of

aviation is being led by *Virgin Galactic*, the world's first commercial space line, which is owned by Sir Richard Branson's Virgin Group. The company will primarily cater to extremely wealthy clients and plans to provide suborbital spaceflights to space tourists, suborbital launches for space science missions and launches of small satellites.

The CAA work on this segment of the industry involves regulations and the safety of travellers, as they will be classified as participants, and not passengers, for space flights. Some of the concerns include medical issues, the impact of space flight on the body and the types of aerodromes that will be required for space planes.

Mr. Speaker, the use and proliferation of Unmanned Aviation Vehicles [UAV], which is a small aircraft with no pilot on board (commonly referred to as a "drone") was raised and highlighted as an area of concern. Most of the UAVs are fitted with cameras; therefore, there are concerns with data protection. And while they are typically small in size, weighing less than two kilograms, the issue of safety will also need to be addressed. The operation of UAVs is unregulated in most jurisdictions; however, Bermuda was pleased to report that the operation and use of UAVs is regulated in Bermuda, and we have offered to assist other Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies with the development of policy in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the UK has confirmed that the Cape Town Treaty will be ratified in the autumn of 2014, and the treaty will be extended to Bermuda as requested. This Honourable House was previously informed of the treaty benefits by the former Minister responsible for Civil Aviation, the Honourable Dr. Grant Gibbons, and how Bermuda is disadvantaged by not being a signatory to this treaty. In essence, the Convention seeks to provide financiers, creditors and lessors in the aviation market greater confidence when granting credit, and in practice it has also had the benefit of lowering cost of financing due to decreased credit risk. The announcement of the UK's timeline for ratification is welcome news for Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Tourism Development and Transport will continue with progressive development of our Aircraft Registry and will keep this Honourable House informed of our progress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister, Minister of Public Works [and Engineering]. Minister Patricia Gordon-Pamplin, you have the floor.

GIBB'S HILL LIGHTHOUSE COMPLETION OF GENERAL RENOVATIONS

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this morning to announce that the [Gibb's Hill Lighthouse](#), one of Bermuda's most historic and recognizable tourist attractions, has for the past few months undergone a major repainting and refurbishment project. The works, which were long overdue, have now been completed, and the Lighthouse has been restored to its former glory and is once again open to the public as our tourism season gets into full swing.

Built in 1844 by the Royal Engineers, the Gibb's Hill Lighthouse is the taller of two lighthouses on Bermuda and one of the first lighthouses in the world to be made of cast iron. This is because, at that time, steel still was not able to be bent. While it is not extremely tall by lighthouse standards, with only 185 steps to the top, the hill on which it stands on is one of the highest on the Island.

Airplanes can see its flashes from over 100 miles (160 km) away. Many a fisherman who has been offshore at night has been comforted by the regular flash of the light letting them know that they were not far from home.

Until 1964, the light was run by hand, but in June of that year, the whole system was automated and has run on electricity ever since.

Mr. Speaker, six contractors were approached and asked to tender for this project, but only two did. The contract was in two parts, with a contractor responsible for the preparation and painting of the main structure, and another contractor responsible for the preparation and painting of the observation deck and guard railings.

The intent was to complete these works over the winter period so that the lighthouse would only be closed for part of the tourism season. However, this is also the worst time of year to do such works, as the winter weather guarantees high winds and rain. Whilst the contract, which started on 6th of January, was planned to be completed by the 31st of March, the weather caused significant delays and the works were finally completed on May 16th. The lighthouse itself was closed, but the public still had access to the restaurant whilst the works were being carried out.

Mr. Speaker, the initial contract for the works was for a total of \$334,211, made up of \$299,691 for the main structure and \$34,520 for the observation deck and railings. There were two subsequent change orders for the project, one for \$9,450 for modifications to the paint for certain areas of the structure, and \$20,655 for clean-up of the site, as there was significantly more dust and debris than expected.

In addition to the works on the structure itself, works to the grounds and car park have been completed, and the only outstanding works are some signage and mobile restrooms with handicap accessibility.

Mr. Speaker, many of you will have seen the rust-stained eyesore that the lighthouse had become, as its maintenance had been neglected for many

years. I would encourage you to go and take a look at it today, as it has really been restored to its former glory and is open and ready for the remainder of the tourist season.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you very much, Minister. That completes Statements by Ministers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The Speaker: The Chair will first recognise the Honourable Member from Sandys South, constituency 33, MP T. E. Lister. You have the floor.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

PARLIAMENTARY JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ADOPTION OF A MANDATORY RANDOM DRUG TESTING POLICY FOR MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 37 of the House of Assembly, I hereby submit for the information of the Honourable House of Assembly the [Report of the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on the Adoption of a Mandatory Random Drug Testing Policy for Members of the Legislature](#), dated the 30th of May 2014. You will note that copies of the report and appendices have been presented to Members on CD.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of comments as we table.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the report on behalf of the committee, which was appointed by yourself in November 2013. Mr. Speaker, the mandate of the committee is to set out [and] to consider and determine the specifics, implementation and monitoring of the mandatory drug testing policy for Members of the Legislature.

To meet its objective, the committee reviewed such research materials as you will see when you study the report and its appendices, and conducted interviews with persons considered expert in the fields of drug testing and drug treatment.

Mr. Speaker, in doing this research, the committee was compelled to consider the purpose of drug testing. In most situations, drug testing is used for one of three principal reasons: pre-employment testing, testing for reasonable cause, and for random testing. With regard to the houses of the Legislature, pre-employment testing was soundly rejected, as there is little point in testing persons who ultimately fail to win seats to Parliament. Testing for reasonable cause, again, did not seem appropriate, as, if a Member was behaving in an unacceptable manner in the House,

the Speaker has the power to remove the Member on that particular occasion.

Lastly, random testing is considered appropriate in these circumstances, especially when one reviews the mandate of the committee to lead by example.

Mr. Speaker, amongst the recommendations that the committee have put forward are:

1. a random drug testing programme be implemented;
2. the drug testing programme be included in the Rules of the House and the Senate;
3. hair sampling be the testing method used;
4. the testing be administered by an independent body; and
5. an annual report be submitted by that independent body.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I am confident this report will generate much discussion in the community around the subjects of integrity and leadership. It is my wish that Members will fully consider their positions as leaders in this community and all that that entails. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member. Any objections to that report being laid? There are none.

QUESTION PERIOD

The Speaker: We now move to the Question Period. We first have the Honourable E. T. Richards. The Minister for Finance is to provide oral responses to Parliamentary questions from MP T. E. Lister. MP Lister?

QUESTION 1: REGISTRY GENERAL ANNUAL REPORT YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2013

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the first question I have for the Minister is, Will the Minister provide this Honourable House with a total amount of money repatriated to other countries as remittances for the fiscal years ended March 31, 2011, 2012 and 2013?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is, I will give the Honourable Member written, after . . . It is that the remittances for 2011 were \$119.4 million. For 2012, they were \$122.7 million. And for 2013, they were \$125.5 million.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: [It was] \$125.5 million.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.
MP Lister?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Given that there were some 11,000 to 12,000 foreign workers here during those three years, it would appear that the annual amount that has been remitted is considerable on an average basis. Realising this, does the payroll tax holiday given to hotels and restaurants extend to the low-paid foreign workers who repatriate a large portion of their pay to their home countries?

In other words, Minister, is this tax holiday subsidising low-paid foreign workers who, in turn, send the savings, so to speak, back to their home countries?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The payroll tax holiday applies to the employers, not the employees.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Thank you.
MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you for that clarification. I really was not sure.

Now, in light of the amount that—

The Speaker: Is this your second supplementary?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes, Mr. Speaker, second supplementary.

In light of these totals, \$119 million up to \$125 million, and given the serious financial challenges that Bermuda is now experiencing, would the Minister be prepared to classify the level of remittances as being harmful to the Bermuda economy?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: No, I would not. These folk are here because (a) the jobs are advertised and Bermudians did not apply for the jobs; (b) it does not matter how much they remit to wherever they came from, they have to live, eat and work in Bermuda and spend that money to do that. So, you cannot take these numbers in isolation.

The numbers have to be framed by the matters I just spoke of: (a) These jobs have to be advertised for Bermudians to have first crack at them; Bermudians did not take up these jobs; (b) Irrespective of what they send home, they still have to live here, eat. Probably, most probably, the type of people you are

talking about pay rent to Bermudians, shop at Bermudian-owned businesses, et cetera. So you have to take these things in that context.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.
MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Second question, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 2: REGISTRY GENERAL ANNUAL REPORT YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2013

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Will the Minister provide this Honourable House with a total amount invested in foreign stocks and bonds for the same three fiscal years, March 31, 2011, 2012 and 2013?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, I was not sure what the Honourable Member was after, so I am giving two sets of answers. He will be familiar with this, and maybe members of the public will not be. But the issue of whether he wanted the flow of funds or the actual stock of investments overseas, so I have given him both, but with a caveat, which I will give at the end.

Insofar as money that is recorded that went out during the period, the acquisition of stocks and bonds for 2011 was \$1.930 billion. I think this is the stock data here; no, this is the flow data here, Honourable Member. In 2012, it was \$1.382 billion, and in 2013, it was \$684.9 million.

The actual number listed in basically portfolios held by residents abroad is \$10.597.5 billion. In 2012, it was \$11.9795 billion. And in 2013, it was \$12.6642 billion.

The caveat I have, Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, I know how these numbers are generated. And I do not have great confidence in these numbers. There is no way for statisticians to know what Bermudians invest or locals invest abroad. I might say, Mr. Speaker, in days of yore, when we had exchange control, you had to get exchange control permission to make such investments. And the Monetary Authority kept track of that so you had accurate data for that. Since the relaxation of exchange control, a Bermudian can walk into a stock broker establishment in New York City, open an account and send money out, and nobody in Bermuda will have a clue. Right? This information comes from local banks. So this is only the information that local banks have. So if you do not use a local bank, then the stats do not pick it up.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Well, LOM would be a local institution. So they would be involved. But if you had E*Trade or something like that, we would have no way to pick up that information. So we have to sort of take these numbers with a grain of salt.

The Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Minister. MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you for that answer. And, you know, the answer is very revealing, very helpful.

Now, at a time when the country is struggling economically locally, if you listen to the answer, the amount that was given that was going out annually was being added to the total almost dollar for dollar, which would indicate that there is very little money coming back.

The Speaker: Question?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes, I was just about to say "would." That is the question.

[Laughter]

QUESTION 3: REGISTRY GENERAL ANNUAL REPORT YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2013

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Would the Minister agree that the continued exporting of Bermuda dollars or Bermuda funds from Bermuda, or Bermuda-based earnings (let us call it that) in this way, at this time, is harmful to the Bermuda economy?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Yes.

The Speaker: Yes, MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for that answer. That is all we needed.

Member De Silva was anticipating the next question, which is, Minister, having established—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, you have already had your two supplementaries.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: No, I have not.

The Speaker: Yes, you have, Honourable Member.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Hang on. Hang on. Let us work this out. I asked question two.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: I asked one supplemental. This is my second supplemental.

The Speaker: You asked about export funds.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes, that was question number two.

The Speaker: And yes, yes, MP Lister, you do have one more.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Having established that these forms of remittances, discussing these two questions, are harmful to the Bermuda economy, though we debate the first one, what plan do you as Minister of Finance have to address this outflow of cash? What is it you want to do about it? Or is it nothing?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, one of the basic rules of finance is that if you try to restrict something, you chase it away. If we try to restrict this, the only thing we would do is guarantee a capital flight.

An Hon. Member: Absolutely.

An Hon. Member: Exactly.

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: That is the first and most important point. I do not believe in these kinds of controls.

The only thing that we can do is try to improve and increase the confidence of Bermudians in Bermuda. And I think our Government has come a long way in that regard, but we still have a way to go. Confidence in Bermuda by Bermudians as a place to invest [is needed]. But again, there is a caveat to that, Mr. Speaker. And that is, if all of this money were invested in Bermuda, we would have the kind of inflationary effect that we had in real estate in Bermuda in the early 2000s. So to some extent, this is an escape valve, a safety valve, because if money is trapped in Bermuda, then you could see one million dollar houses becoming five million dollar houses. So, you have got to have a balance with this thing.

The other thing to remember is that, even though these numbers do not show the money coming back, they do represent foreign exchange reserves for the Island. They represent that. So these are assets that are owned by Bermuda residents, but the assets are not in Bermuda. So if those same people got into difficulty, they could use those assets. So this not like money spent for jam. These are investments. So the people still own these assets. So they are not lost to Bermuda in an absolute sense.

So, that is my answer to the question.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Minister.

Do you have a supplementary?

Mr. Walton Brown: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the first question.

The Speaker: You are a bit late. I will allow it. But you are a little bit late.

Mr. Walton Brown: Well, I was not recognised earlier, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: No, no. You got up on the second question, Honourable Member. You were late for the first question. But I will allow you to ask the question.

Mr. Walton Brown: You are very kind, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Walton Brown: Can the Honourable Minister tell us about the countries where the money, the remittances were repatriated?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information. I can try to get it for the Honourable Member later, but I do not have it here with me.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
MP Brown? Okay.
MP Burt, you had a question?

Mr. E. David Burt: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Well, I mean a supplementary. You cannot ask a question anyway. I just did not say “supplementary question.”

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Your first supplementary.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. E. David Burt: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in his response to the question, the Honourable Minister said that \$366 million was sent away with remittances. The Minister, given that he believes that the second outflow is harmful for the Bermuda economy, does he still not believe that the first outflow in which \$366 million left Bermuda is harmful to the economy?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, there is no mention of . . . I got these things written. There is no mention of \$366 million.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Oh, over the three years? Over three years.

So what is your question again? I am sorry.

The Speaker: Yes.
MP Burt?

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is, In his response to the second question, the Minister said that it was harmful to the economy, the outflows. When asked about the first question, the Minister said that he did not believe that the money leaving the country was a bad thing. Does the Minister still not believe that \$366 million earned by people working in Bermuda, but sent away—not invested, sent away—is harmful to our economy?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, I think by way of illustration, I would give the Honourable Member this analogy. I had Cheerios for breakfast. That box of Cheerios represents money going abroad. Is that harmful to Bermuda? Maybe. But I had to have breakfast, did I not? Any time anybody eats anything in Bermuda except for Bermuda fish that represents money going out of Bermuda. It is a price of living in Bermuda. We do not make anything in Bermuda. All right? So everything that we consume in this country represents money leaving Bermuda for imports.

This money here is representative of, if you like, residue of foreign workers working in Bermuda. We have a system in Bermuda that gives Bermudians preference for those jobs. If Bermudians had applied for those jobs, these people would not be working here. All right? But the service that they provide is required, so they are working here. So you cannot put these numbers in the context in which the Honourable Member is trying to put it.

We are an open economy. Everything we consume comes from abroad, and we have to pay for it in foreign currency—every last thing. You cannot look at this without looking into the fact that, on the other side of the balance of payments, we earn far more foreign currency than we send out. And that is the most important thing. You cannot look at this in isolation.

The Speaker: Thank you.

You have another supplementary, your second supplementary.

Mr. E. David Burt: My supplementary, Mr. Speaker . . . although I thank the Minister for his lesson in economics, we were not talking about imports! We were talking about remittances! Very simple. We understand that we have to import things into this country. And the question—

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr. E. David Burt: The question was remittances. Does the level of \$366 million of remittances that are sent out over the three-year period of which he covered, does the Minister not believe that it would be better if that money remained here?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: That Honourable Member seems to think by asking the same question twice, he is going to get a different answer.

[Laughter]

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I like the word that he used, though. He said, "This is not imports." But, Mr. Speaker, this is an import! This is a result of the import of labour. All right? So that is lesson number two for the Honourable Member.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair recognises MP Roban for a supplementary.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Supplementary.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister would like to reword his answer just slightly because it gives—

The Speaker: Ask the question, please!

[Laughter]

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker . . . I am asking, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Honourable Minister would like to reword—

The Speaker: No, no, no. Ask the question. *Would the Honourable Member change his . . .* You know, ask the Minister a question!

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Well, I have to speak to you, Mr. Speaker, do I not?

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Do I not, Mr. Speaker? I have to speak to you?

The Speaker: *Would the Honourable Member . . .*

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Would the Honourable Member, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: . . . like to reword his answer, because it gives the impression that it is the fault of or blame of Bermudians for workers coming in here. It seems to place the blame of the situation on Bermudians.

The Speaker: Okay. All right. Got the question!

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Perhaps the Honourable Member would agree that that is not the best way to word the answer, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: Mr. Speaker, my answer did not imply that.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
You have a supplementary, MP Bean? Yes.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

The Speaker: Good morning.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: I would like to ask the Honourable Minister, Do you have any data on the inward remittances by Bermudians living abroad sending money to Bermuda?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: I do not believe we have such data. When I used to work running balance of payments stats, I do not remember—that would be a balance of payments item. And I do not think we measured that. I do not think we have the ability to measure that.

The Speaker: Yes?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: One more supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: The Honourable Minister mentioned the last three years of \$300-odd million in

remittances. He also in the second question, you spoke of a balance of payments deficit, which has been continued. Would you agree that these remittances and even the balance of payment deficits have been consistent and par for the course for Bermuda for over a few decades?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. E. T. (Bob) Richards: The Honourable Member misheard. I never said there was a balance of payments deficit.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Thank you very much, Honourable Members.

We now move on to the Statements by Ministers. The first Statement, questions will go out to the first Statement by the Premier, Premier Dunkley.

I recognise first MP De Silva.

QUESTION 1: BERMUDA HOSPITALS CHARITABLE TRUST "WHY IT MATTERS" CAMPAIGN

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Premier, can you confirm who is currently in charge of the "Why it matters" campaign?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The Hospital Charitable Trust, which is headed by Phil Butterfield, and, I believe, Mr. Ralph Richardson has been taken on to assist with the fundraising at this point.

The Speaker: MP De Silva?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: So Ms. Wendy Augustus is no longer there?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: That is what I understand to be the case. Questions on that should be probably best directed right to Phil Butterfield himself.

The Speaker: Yes. I think I got that somewhere, that Wendy Augustus was not there. Yes.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member Walter Roban.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Your question to the Premier?

QUESTION 1: BERMUDA HOSPITALS CHARITABLE TRUST "WHY IT MATTERS" CAMPAIGN

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Would the Premier and Honourable Minister perhaps give us some information on . . . Other than the brick campaign, which you mentioned in your Statement, are there any other schemes that are currently in place for persons to donate in some way to the "Why it matters" campaign that they are actually running?

The Speaker: Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the Honourable Member.

There are a number of different levels that donors can participate in, from the very small to the very large. The brick campaign goes up to having facilities named after you, or you can even have the whole hospital named after you upon giving a sizable donation.

Mr. Speaker, but it is clear in my Statement (and Members should have a copy of that) they can contact the BHB [Bermuda Hospitals Board] directly themselves and find out just where they would like to fit. I think the overarching theme is that, as leaders in the community, no matter how big or small our contribution is, we need to all get behind it to make it work.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Premier.

We now move to the next Statement, by Junior Minister Leah Scott, on Autism Awareness. The Chair recognises MP Foggo, the Whip, the Shadow Minister of Education.

QUESTION 1: AUTISM AWARENESS

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My only question is, with the advances that are being made, has anything been put in place particularly when it comes to providing a transcript to ensure that it reflects, I guess, the particular circumstances of the student? Because all too often, what happens is that such students get linked with the general population and at times endure prejudicial (I guess, if you will) responses from members at large in the community because they are not seen as performing as the rest of the general population.

The Speaker: All right. Yes.

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: So to avoid . . . Do you understand the question, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes. Yes, yes.

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Junior Minister Scott, you have the floor.

Ms. Leah K. Scott: I will have to get that information for you.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
MP T. E. Lister, you have the floor.

QUESTION 1: AUTISM AWARENESS

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on page 2, halfway down, the Statement says, "The training workshop was very informative and certainly highlighted the challenge Bermuda faces to obtain a proper diagnosis of autism."

Can the Minister tell us, What deficits in the present approach were noted during this workshop? In other words, what came out that said that we were facing these challenges identifying autism, given the fact that we have been providing services for a decade or more? You were doing it; I was doing it. So, tell me what we learned that makes us think that there is a real problem that we have got to overcome. What was that problem?

The Speaker: Minister?

Ms. Leah K. Scott: Well, I believe that we do not think that we have the capability to give an early diagnosis. And I think that children with autism have been diagnosed with other deficiencies that are actually autism related, and we have not been able to give an accurate diagnosis. So, the purpose of bringing this woman here is . . . she actually does research with autistic children. And so it was to empower the people at the Child Development Programme to be able to also make an accurate diagnosis. And they are going to be working in partnership with her to assist Bermudians on-Island to be able to make an accurate assessment of our children here.

I can get you more information in terms of what we are lacking on from the Child Development Programme.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
MP Lister? Supplementary?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Minister, would it be fair to say that we feel a need to be at the cutting edge and understand where the state-of-the-art is, as opposed to saying we have great deficits? Because we have been at this for a long time. I am quite happy to agree with

you that we should be at the cutting edge, and this person, being first class, has been brought here to help us get there, as opposed to saying we are in a hole and we want them to pull us out.

Ms. Leah K. Scott: I agree that that is a fair statement.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
Yes, MP Lister, you have another question?

QUESTION 2: AUTISM AWARENESS

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The other question is really sort of like the "parish pumping," I guess, for myself and Member Foggo. I notice that there are three programmes going now, and they are all in the central area. Why have we chosen not to have one in the west and one in the east rather than going straight in the middle, requiring the students to all come to school at primary level in the middle of the Island? Given that there are 33 students, why not have one in the east and one in the west?

Ms. Leah K. Scott: We are developing these programmes, and we will extend the programmes out to other areas of the Island.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.
That completes the questions on Autism Awareness.

We now move to the Statement by the Honourable Minister, Dr. Gibbons, on Middle School Leadership. We have a question from MP Foggo, the Shadow Minister of Education.

QUESTION 1: MIDDLE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I acknowledge the information that was revealed in the Budget regarding the performance of middle schools. However, my question is this: With what is being used to go forward in ensuring that middle schools are enhanced, has any attention been given to ensuring that the instruction, in particular the curricula, are indeed standardised and fluid from one level through to the next level, from the elementary to middle to secondary? Because from the Budget Book and the comments that were there, it was clear that there was a break somewhere, because of the performance of middle schools.

The Speaker: Minister?

Dr. the Hon. E. Grant Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the Honourable Member is referring to vertical alignment of the curriculum. I think that is part of the overall approach of the department, going forward. It certainly comes out of the Hopkins review. It comes out of the "Blueprint" as well. So I cannot speak to it in exactly this particular case. This has more to do with leadership and instructional leadership. But I think certainly that is one of the issues that the department is grappling with, and I think it clearly has been an ongoing issue. And I think there needs to be more consistency from level to level.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

We now move to the next Statements, STEPS to a Well Bermuda, Minister Atherden. The Chair will recognise MP Zane De Silva. You have the floor.

QUESTION 1: STEPS TO A WELL BERMUDA UPDATE

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Minister, on your third page, second paragraph, you talk about the interviewers entering the field in November 2013, and as of this week, 990 households have been reached. That gives us about 141 households per month. On this average, we are looking at one and a half years before it is complete.

In your Statement, you had mentioned how important it is, and we all know how important it is for our people to get healthy and to avoid the leading cause of death, as you outlined. And with us having the highest percentage of diabetes in the OECD [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development], and 65 per cent of our people being overweight, do you not think that we should be looking at increasing the amount of resources so that we could finish the survey earlier?

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: I think that as it relates to the number of households, you cannot totally extrapolate the fact that in four months, we have actually surveyed 990 people. It started in November, and that is May. And it—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: That is seven months.

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: Well, it is six months. But all I am just trying to . . . I am saying to you that you cannot actually extrapolate to say that just because in that time period only 990 households were seen . . . which is why we are reaching out to people. It is not a linear extrapolation. The surveyors are there. They are reaching out to the households. But the households also have to turn around and make themselves come forward. That is why I am urging households to come forward so that the interviewers can get on and deal with more of them.

The Speaker: Yes, MP De Silva? Go ahead. Do you have a supplementary on that?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: So, is the Minister satisfied, based on her Statement, having said that she is satisfied that we have enough people to do the interviews . . . what time frame do you think it will be complete, based on what you just said?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: Mr. Speaker, and Honourable Member De Silva, I do not think that, as I say, I can extrapolate to say that just because we have only done 900 now that I can say categorically when it will be finished. I will say that by us encouraging more people to come forward, and especially those persons who have been contacted and have not made themselves available, we obviously want to accelerate that. I will try and find out what the Ministry feels the extrapolation will be. Thank you.

The Speaker: MP De Silva?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Second supplementary.

The Speaker: Yes?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Based on that, is the Honourable Minister planning on [using] any other media [to promote] awareness with regard to this survey?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: We definitely will be doing more, if you will, letting people know about what we are doing in terms of this particular survey, and others as well.

The Speaker: Thank you.
MP De Silva?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, last question.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Based on what the Minister just said, that she is going to—

The Speaker: Is this a new question?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: New question, new question.

The Speaker: Yes.

QUESTION 2: STEPS TO A WELL BERMUDA UP-DATE

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Based on that, is the Honourable Minister planning to go out to the public in an aggressive manner with regard to this survey?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: I think I need to respond to two things, because it tested in a normal frame. Under normal circumstances, a survey of about 400 would be sufficient for us to be able to turn around and draw our conclusions. We have chosen to try and go out to the 2,600 because we want to get many more people to be able to turn around and get the information.

So, while ideally having them all come and supply the information, that will not deter us from being able to turn around, even with the 700 we have now, we have more than we normally would do. But we definitely are trying to encourage people, which is one of the reasons why I chose to make sure that I did this Statement, because I want to encourage more people to come out and get involved.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Member, MP Walton Brown, the Member from Pembroke Central, constituency 17.

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Honourable Minister answer the question—

The Speaker: This is a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Mr. Walton Brown: Yes, yes.

Is the delay being caused by a refusal of people to participate in the survey? Or is it because the survey is too long, or you do not have enough people in the field?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: I cannot categorically answer that. But I can indicate that some people, obviously, had indicated that they were not able to participate. And we believe by making them understand the benefits that Bermuda will get from [the survey] that we can encourage more of them to come back and join in.

The Speaker: Second supplementary, yes?

Mr. Walton Brown: Why was it decided to have such a large sample size, of over 2,000?

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: The reason this was decided was there was a belief that . . . First of all, the sample size was chosen in conjunction with the Department of Statistics. But the belief was that by increasing our sample, we would be able to get much more information as it relates to some of the, if you will, conditions and risk factors and therefore, having gone from self-reporting and now interviewing, we really wanted to try and tackle this and get much more information.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Any other questions?

Thank you, Members.

We move now to the next Statement, by Minister Scott.

MP Weeks, the Chair recognises MP Michael Weeks, the Honourable Member from Pembroke East Central, constituency 16. You have the floor.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good morning.

QUESTION 1: BERMUDA DAY 2014 REFLECTIONS

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Good morning, colleagues.

My first question to the Honourable Minister is that changing the route from the West down to town from the St. George's to town is good. But has he considered, or can your department consider that, rather than always ending at Bernard Park, we end up at Places from a historical perspective? So just to get back to what it used to be, every now and then we could end at Places Place.

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will say that there has been some discussion about the route of the parade and such. We are looking at a few different options. That is something that I believe we will be looking at. Exactly how that will route, I do not have that information right now. But there has been a lot of discussion based on feedback that we have gotten as far as modifying those. So we are looking at that.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

MP Weeks?

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Thank you for that, Minister.

And as a supplementary, what kind of monetary incentive . . . And I know we are all talking about money being tight. But what kind of monetary incen-

tives do we have, especially for the Bermuda run? Because even though I enjoy that—

The Speaker: That is another question, I would think. Second question.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Another question?

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: I have got another question. But anyway—

The Speaker: Go ahead.

QUESTION 2: BERMUDA DAY 2014 REFLECTIONS

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: What kind of monetary incentives do we have for the Bermuda runners to get more of them involved in the May 24th derby?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes. That would actually at this point be a question that would be best answered by the race directors for that. The Ministry does not actually give any prize money, if you will, for that race. And I think that it would be up to the race directors to decide to do that or look at that.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Minister. Yes, you have a supplementary?

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Yes, I do have a supplementary on the—

The Speaker: Supplementary on?

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: On the route, the routing for next year from St. George's.

The Speaker: Supplementary on the routing. Okay, yes. Go ahead.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Has the Honourable Minister taken into consideration the impact that changing the route coming out of St. George's will have on the airlines and the people and the customers on the airlines?

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, that is a very good question. That is actually . . . In the Statement, I did say that there are some things, some challenges, that we do have to overcome. Certainly when that route was announced—and again, this race historically did come out of St. George's as well—one of the concerns is

that is the only throughway to St. George's, especially the causeway for the airport and such.

I think you have to look at the flight schedules and such, and these are things that there have been some concerns that have been brought forward by the police and such. We are all looking at that to see how it could be best accommodated.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Minister. Yes? MP Weeks, you have another question?

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Well, actually, it is a supplementary.

The Speaker: A supplementary. Yes, you may.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: A supplementary to the question asked about the monetary contribution.

The Speaker: Yes, you may.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: I do recognise, like all of us, that the races are [organised] by the race directors; it is not part of Government. But what I was suggesting is that to help to incentivize the runners, Government can make a small donation to help to encourage other runners to participate, or more Bermudian runners to participate.

The Speaker: All right. And what was the question?

[Laughter]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: The question is, Has the department considered giving a grant to the race organisers?

The Speaker: Okay. Yes.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, thank you. I was wondering what that question was myself.

I think that at this point, the contribution that the Ministry makes is logistically helping to set this up. We actually do sponsor and support a lot of these events. This is a big event for the Ministry with regard to Bermuda Day, and we do provide a lot of financial incentives and the like.

That particular piece has not been looked at, at least while I have been the Minister. And certainly, as every suggestion that I get, I will take back and discuss it and see where we go from there. But I am not going to make that guarantee.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Minister. MP Burt has a question.

QUESTION 1: BERMUDA DAY 2014 REFLECTIONS

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Minister's Statement regarding the Bermuda Day holiday or the Bermuda Day Parade, there were comments on the noticeably less [number of] floats. There were not even enough floats for the individual awards in many particular areas. I guess the question that I have, Mr. Speaker, is, What steps will the Minister take to increase the amount of participation by way of the community organisations or any organisations entering floats into next year's Bermuda Day Parade?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes. That is a good question. I mean, we did notice that we did, obviously, have less floats. The quality of some of the floats was extraordinarily high. That is something that we have to look at, again, as part of our post-Bermuda Day assessment, if you will, just look at what we can do start to keep the participation high.

I mean, certainly we appreciate that groups across the Island are feeling the pinch, and that is one of the reasons why we assume that there was less participation. But I do take the Member's point, and we will be looking at that as well.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Yes, MP Burt, you have a supplementary?

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. E. David Burt: The supplementary would be, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his response when it comes in regard to the floats. I would also accept with [regard to] the quality.

Moving on to another aspect of his portfolio, of course, sports and dealing with sporting clubs, there was also a noticeable—

The Speaker: So, it is a question. Your second question?

Mr. E. David Burt: —noticeable less number of majorette troupes as well. What steps will the Minister take to possibly increase that number as the Bermuda Day holiday and the Bermuda Day Parade, is something that we would like to celebrate and see as much participation from all of our community groups?

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
Minister?

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think that that is very similar to the float question. I think that, you know, we of course have had discussions with a bunch of people that actually have historically partici-

pated very significantly in the dance groups, to have those conversations as well and to figure out how we can work more collaboratively together.

Certainly, I have said that it is the same issue that happened with the floats. It is actually very expensive for the troupes to . . . with their brand-new outfits and such. These are things that are, like carnivals, they are not recycled. It becomes very costly to participate in the Bermuda Day Parade. So we do acknowledge that.

The Speaker: MP, you have a supplementary?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Supplementary, yes.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to either now or at a later date bring back information on the actual dollar value of Government expenditure that goes into the May 24th race and the Bermuda Day activities, specifically?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: I think that is a good question. As a matter of fact, that would be a good Ministerial question, so that I could specifically get that information for you. So, yes. I do not have a problem bringing that back.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
You have a supplementary?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, yes.

The Speaker: Yes?

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Minister, with the Shadow Minister having stated publically this week this is one of our best ever May 24th weekends, are you aware that there is a petition going around to change the date to have it consistently on a Friday? And if you are aware of it, do you plan on acting on that?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Well, that is a good question. Yes, I am aware of that. Let me just say, without prejudice or tying myself to anything, this is a discussion that we have been having within the Ministry anyway. I think that that was raised on multiple occasions over the holiday, to the spectators, just having maybe the fourth Friday of the month so that you ac-

tually have the weekend to recover. I think if you look at absenteeism rates from school the next day and work and such, point taken.

So it is something that we actually have started to have discussions on. I did hear about that petition that was going around, of course, but we have already started to have those discussions.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Minister.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Supplementary. Being as the Honourable Minister gave us a very detailed, lengthy explanation of the Bermuda Day holiday and weekend, can the Honourable Minister tell us who finished 50th in the road race?

The Speaker: Honourable Member, I do not think that is a reasonable question. Nobody knows who comes 50th.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, people only know who come first, second and third.

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

The Speaker: We now move to the next Statement, the Statement by Minister Crockwell on aviation. The Chair will first recognise MP Lawrence Scott, the Shadow Minister of Transport.

QUESTION 1: AVIATION POLICY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Honourable Minister explain how he could state to the international aviation community that drone operations here in Bermuda are regulated if no legislation has been brought to this House?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have been advised that they have been regulated. I can find out which statutory instrument, either legislation and/or regulations, covers that.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: My second question.

The Speaker: Yes?

QUESTION 2: AVIATION POLICY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: If there is no legislation brought to this House or regulations brought to this House, would it not be seen as misleading the international aviation community and industry stating that it is regulated?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: As I said in my first question, I have been advised that there are rules and regulations as it applies to UAVs [unmanned aviation vehicles] in Bermuda. I will undertake to bring what governs that.

The Speaker: Yes. That is fair. That is fair. Yes.

Thank you, Minister.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member, MP Roban.

QUESTION 1: AVIATION POLICY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On page 2 of the Minister's Statement, in the second major paragraph, the Minister speaks to, "Space Planes and Space Tourism are becoming more prominent" in the area of aviation. Can the Minister give us any information at this point on the state of the relationship between the European Space Agency and NASA?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I did not quite hear.

The Speaker: Yes. If you could repeat that, please, MP Roban?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Sure. I will repeat the question. Can the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, give us any information right now on the state of the relationship between the European Space Agency and NASA?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: No, I do not have that information with me right now. This was information that was provided during the conference. There was an update on this growing area of space tourism. It is very limited, as I said in the Statement, to a small group of individuals. But I will take a look at that relationship between the European Union, you said, and NASA?

Mr. Walter H. Roban: European Space Agency and NASA.

The Speaker: Space Agency.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I will look at that. Thank you.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Second question, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Carry on.

QUESTION 2: AVIATION POLICY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Mr. Speaker, perhaps—and this is somewhat following on from my first question, but it is the second individual question.

Is there a prospect of Bermuda getting more opportunities for itself, in light of the mention of Space Planes and Space Tourism in his Statement, in the growing commercial space industry?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes. The short answer is yes. We are looking at exploring that.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

The Chair recognises MP Bean, the Leader of the Opposition.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have one supplemental to MP Scott regarding the UAVs.

The Speaker: Yes. Yes.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Can the Minister give us in this Honourable Chamber a commitment, once he determines whether or not the UAV regulations as stated in this Statement, once you realise that it is either a regulation or a policy, and will you give a commitment that if it is intended to be a regulation that you will bring those regulations to the House for approval?

The Speaker: Yes?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, I agree. I do agree with that request.

The Speaker: Right. Thank you.
Now you have a question?

QUESTION 1: AVIATION POLICY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, yes, my question.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister mentioned the conference agenda, and then he gave detail on about four or five components of that agenda. But one was missing, and that is the Bilateral Air Service Agreements. Can the Minister provide us any information as to the discussions in the conference regarding the bilaterals? And is there any discussion in terms of the extension of any UK Open Skies agreements with other nations being extended to Bermuda and other Overseas Territories?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The development of air services, bilateral air service agreements and foreign operator permits, they were discussed during the conference. The last portion of the Honourable Opposition Leader's question, I do not recall being discussed fulsomely. But they did discuss the various important aspects of these bilateral air service agreements. We understand the importance. We are signatories to the Chicago Convention, and [understand] the importance that we have in ensuring that these agreements are updated and the like.

But it was discussed. But the last portion I do not recall being discussed.

The Speaker: Right.

Any further questions?
MP Lister?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Mr. Speaker, my question—

The Speaker: You have a supplementary?

QUESTION 1: AVIATION POLICY CONSULTATION CONFERENCE

Hon. Terry E. Lister: No, I have a question. It was exactly along the last lines of MP Bean's question, which was the agenda. And one of the items was air space and air traffic control services.

What was dealt with there in that portion of the agenda that relates to us and impacts us as we go forward? Because obviously, we are looking at some changes taking place.

The Speaker: Air traffic control centre, air space and air traffic controlling.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, as you know, this particular conference was specific for

Overseas Territories [OTs] and Crown Dependencies. And various questions were raised for those two entities.

There was a great deal of focus on airport development and the importance of ensuring that the infrastructure is in place in various OTs and Crown Dependencies to support air navigation.

Again, there was not any specific discussion on controllers and the like. We did not get into any specifics on that. But there was a great deal of general conversations on how both Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies can improve the regulations for air navigation.

It was a very long day, so a lot was discussed. But again, I do not remember specifically discussing air traffic controllers.

The Speaker: Yes, you have a supplementary on that?

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, supplementary to MP Lister's question.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Mr. Speaker, you will recall a few weeks ago, maybe, that the Honourable Minister or one of his colleagues announced that the Government would be looking at expanding the air traffic control area around Bermuda. I would like to ask the Minister, Did that initiative come up in discussions at this conference, seeing that it was based on Overseas Dependent Territories and Crown Dependencies, and that Bermuda has signalled that we are one of the first, I would think, who are looking to expand and extend our coverage of air traffic control services?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: It did come up. And we learned what other jurisdictions are doing. We ascertained, I believe, in the Cayman Islands, in particular, they have an authority. And they were explaining how they operate more effectively and more efficiently. So it was a very interesting dialogue in terms of those who still operate under the umbrella of the Government and other jurisdictions that have a more independent body to do their air service navigation and aviation policy. So it definitely came up quite a bit.

Also, hearing from Montserrat, I raise Montserrat, ironically, because the representative was Mr. Charles Kirnon. I do not know if that rings a bell. But he actually said to say hello to both the Opposition Leader and MP Roban.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, thank you, Minister.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes, you have one more.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Can the Honourable Minister indicate [if there was] any feedback at this conference in regard to the Bermuda initiative of expanding our air traffic control service coverage?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: No. There was presentation. Again, I was accompanied by the Permanent Secretary. And he very much articulated where we are and what some of our plans are, going forward. That opened up the conversations, as I said earlier, to hear what other jurisdictions are doing, and looking at some of the salient benefits of moving towards a more private or more autonomous body.

We did not get into what our most recent expansions were in terms of opening up a London office. In fact, we opened up that office the very next day. So this conference took place the day before. But we did not get into specifics of what Bermuda was doing, neither were we questioned on that. But we were exchanging ideas and ascertaining what the best models were for the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.
MP Lister, your second question?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Follow-on from where we were.

The Speaker: Sorry?

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Supplemental.

The Speaker: Supplemental. You have one more on that question.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Would the Minister be willing to actually come to the House with a Statement to tell us and to inform Bermuda where we are and the progress we are making in getting control of our air space?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think we have been quite active in bringing Statements as it relates to civil aviation here, in relation to getting control of our airspace. Right now, the feasibility study is taking place. Once that study is done, we will report to the House the major findings of that study.

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Thank you.

We now move to the final Statement, which was by Minister Gordon-Pamplin. The Chair recognises MP De Silva. MP Zane De Silva from Southampton East[East], constituency [29].

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: [That is] 29.

The Speaker: Yes, 29.

QUESTION 1: GIBB'S HILL LIGHTHOUSE COMPLETION OF GENERAL RENOVATIONS

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Minister, in your Statement, you said six contractors were approached and asked to tender for the project and only two did. Why was not this advertised in the newspaper?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: I cannot answer that. I do not know the answer to that question. I came on board in the Ministry after all of that had been done. But I do not know what went into the process prior to.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: In light of the times that we are in and being that you are the Minister and you made the Statement, do you not think you should have asked that question?

The Speaker: Minister?

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Well, this actually was tendered when the PLP was Government. But I do not know what additional steps. So I was trying to be delicate and not embarrass you for not taking the steps that you are asking me to have taken.

[Laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: You do not have to worry! You will never embarrass me!

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Member! Honourable Member. Yes. Yes.

Carry on, Member. Ask the next question.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can I ask the Honourable Minister to repeat that, please? It was too much noise. I could not hear.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, the question . . . I heard the answer, Honourable Member. Yes.

Are there any other questions?

You have a supplementary?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I guess that is a good thing for you to do, Mr. Speaker, in light of that answer and in light of the former Minister whispering to that Honourable—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, do not talk about how the Speaker is carrying out his responsibilities!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Oh, no, I would not do that, Mr. Speaker, not at all. Never!

[Laughter]

The Speaker: Carry on. Carry on.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, my second question, my second question.

[Timer beeps]

The Speaker: Time is up, Honourable Member.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Okay. Motion to Adjourn.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Members. That concludes our questions.

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

The Speaker: We now move to congratulatory and/or obituary speeches.

I will recognise the Minister for Community, Culture and Sports, Minister Wayne Scott. You have the floor.

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And since I guess I grasped all of the Bermuda Day winners in my Ministerial Statement, I will leave that one to someone else.

I would like to actually congratulate our Bermuda women's football team for their exceptional performances in the inaugural Women's Caribbean Football Union [CFU] Cup. I would like to associate the whole House with that one, of course, our young ladies making us proud. Of course, they had a 2–2 draw against the Cayman Islands, and a 5–0 win against

Turks and Caicos. They won over St. Kitts and Nevis, of course, 3–1. And, of course, the final round of that cup will be in Trinidad in August.

I would also like to just give recognition and congratulations to the Bermuda track and field team. They were recently in the Bahamas, where they were competing in a 4 x 800 metres, in the IAAF [International Association of Athletics Federations] World Relays. And they posted a time of 7:21:87. Our athletes are performing very well all across the world stage, and I would just like to give them some congratulatory kudos, as the Member said.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member, the Honourable Whip.

[Laughter and crosstalk]

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to be associated with the remarks regarding the track and field group that did participate in Barbados, Mr. Speaker—the Bahamas, sorry! Bahamas, Bahamas. And I should have gotten that right, Mr. Speaker, because as you know, and the House knows, I was in the Bahamas. I did get to attend both days of the World Relays. It was phenomenal, and I think the Bermuda team acquitted themselves extremely well. In fact, the whole race event was something to marvel at and is definitely something that Bermuda should be looking at to secure here, because it would speak much for sports tourism. I do hope we are able to get that group to come and participate in Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to likewise associate myself with comments that I believe were made last week in my absence for the BELCO Cup, and St. David's were the champions regarding that. So I cannot let that go without—

The Speaker: Associating yourself.

Ms. Lovitta F. Foggo: —associating myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express condolences for a constituent of St. David's who did pass away during my absence, Ms. Judith Fox, who was a devout AME goer and then became a member of the First Church of God. She was definitely a daughter of the soil and a very colourful individual, who was an ardent supporter of myself as her representative, and indeed of the PLP. So I would like to just send condolences to her family in their time of loss. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member from Devonshire [North West], MP Glen Smith. You have the floor.

Mr. Glen Smith: Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues.

The Speaker: Good afternoon.

Mr. Glen Smith: I would like to send condolences to the family of Mr. Cyril Cooper, better known as “Hooks” Cooper.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: I think that was done last week. So you associate, yes.

Mr. Glen Smith: I apologise. I would like to be associated. Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: That is all right.

Mr. Glen Smith: I was not here last week. That is fine. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member Zane De Silva, from constituency 29. (I got it right this time.)

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Minister Scott with regard to the women's football team's success. Mr. Speaker, you will know, being a former striker, that strikers tend to get most . . . Most strikers tend to get the attention.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: I think the Member—you need to be quiet for this.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: All Members need to be quiet for this.

[Laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, I hope Members opposite are not going to say that I am misleading the House by saying you were one of the great strikers of our country.

The Speaker: Keep speaking. Keep speaking.

[Laughter and crosstalk]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: So, Mr. Speaker, as you will know, strikers tend to get most of the congratulations when teams are victorious on the football pitch.

I would just like to highlight the success and the talent of Ms. Jada Smith, who plays in gold, Mr. Speaker. And she is a very talented young lady and passionate. In fact, she played on the winning Clyde Best team recently against Cyrille Regis after yours truly took a page out of your book, Mr. Speaker, and scored what I was told by “Bunny” Best was one of the best goals he has ever seen at Somerset Cricket Club Field. So that is my short, short lay to fame, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, whilst I am on my feet, I would also like to have this Honourable House send congratulations to BF&M Insurance Company. Why do I say that? Mr. Speaker, BF&M have recently announced that they will be paying their claims online once the paperwork is complete, rather than send it out in the mail. I think that that is great in this present time, and I congratulate Mr. John Wight, the CEO, and BF&M, because the quicker we get money back into our people’s pockets, the better off they will be, Mr. Speaker. So, certainly, I say congrats to them, and hopefully the other insurance companies in Bermuda will soon follow suit. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Warwick [West]. MP Jeff Sousa, you have the floor.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and to those in the listening audience.

The Speaker: Good afternoon.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Earlier today, we heard the Minister of Community and Cultural Affairs, the Honourable Wayne Scott, refer to the awesome Bermuda Day that we had this past Monday. Likewise, the Shadow Minister, Mr. Michael Weeks, earlier in the week had described it as one of the best Bermuda Day Parades ever.

Mr. Speaker, there were many components of the parade that were awesome. And I would like to single out one special gentleman, one special Bermudian, the leader of the soca truck, Jason Sukdeo, known by most Bermudians and people around the world as “D’General.” He actually was sitting in the public Gallery earlier on. The big truck that we saw this last Monday, it started last year. Actually, last year was the first year he had it. And the fact that I have been a judge of the Bermuda Day Parade, sat on the Bermuda Heritage Advisory Committee and participated in the parade, I knew we were onto something special. As we saw with the aerial photos, for people that were not here at the parade, there were thousands of our people on the street. The whole reason that the Bermuda Day Parade started in the first place was to bring our people together.

I am sure Choy Aming has a big smile on his face seeing what this young man has done, the Soca King of Bermuda, because as we saw, Choy Aming tried to bring that carnival aspect into the parade. But it did not have traction. It really did not have traction, and it did not last, as we saw in 2006, when there also was a soca truck, and it sort of petered out. Do your homework. It sort of petered out. Right?

And then what you saw last year was the Bermuda Day Parade, you saw the soca truck just go to entirely another level. So I certainly want to, again, take my hat off to Jason, the Soca King, D’General. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to see how the parade changes in years, as we have seen it change over the years. And this is an example of that. We heard early on talking about the majorettes and floats and so on. The parade will continue to change.

So, I also want to be associated with the female Gombey Warriors, who are doing awesome with their football. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member Lawrence Scott, from Warwick [South East].

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to be associated with the comments from MP Sousa when it comes to the soca truck with D’General, Jason Sukdeo. And I will declare my interest, as JetBlue is one of the sponsors of that truck. One thing is that I would like to congratulate Mr. Sukdeo for a job well done. There have been rumours and murmurs of even branching that soca truck into basically a Bermudian carnival, because of the following that they got, which we would like to see. Because what that truck really did was, it sort of symbolised, as has been said before, what Bermuda Day and the parade are all about, just bringing us all together. We had so many people from so many demographics, all in one place. There was no fighting.

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. W. Lawrence Scott: There was not anything like that. So once again, I would just like to see how we go from strength to strength.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you very much, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable and Learned Member from Southampton West Central, the Minister for Tourism and Transport. Minister Shawn Crockwell, you have the floor.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I would like to deviate from convention and just make a com-

ment on the passing of an icon, an international icon, Dr. Maya Angelou, who had a profound impact on my life through her writings. I have read most of her works, but was most moved by her first memoir, *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings*. Then, my favourite poem is her poem, "Still I Rise." I just found out upon her passing that she was born, she is an Aries. It is interesting how I quite gravitate . . . I am an Aries as well, Mr. Speaker. My favourite artist is Vincent Van Gogh. I realised after I loved his paintings that he was actually born on my birthday. So there is something about that; I do not know.

But Maya Angelou is a person that I have admired. I have read her writings. I have listened to her magnificent speeches that she has given. She gave the poem at Bill Clinton's inauguration. And so inspired have I been over the years by Maya Angelou that I named my daughter after her, Maya.

What is interesting is that she actually created the name Maya. She was born Marguerite, but her sibling called her "my sister Maya." And she changed her name in the 1950s, I believe, when she became an actress and became internationally renowned, and she changed it to Maya. So I would just like to recognise this legend, someone who certainly is in the same class of the great writers of James Baldwin, Langston Hughes and the rest. So may she rest in peace. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, MP Marc Bean. You have the floor.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the last Minister's condolences to one of our greatest playwrights and poets should be associated by the whole House, first and foremost.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to send condolences to two of my fraternal brothers who have passed away this week. One is Mr. Winslowe Dill, from Somerset. And the other is Mr. Kenneth "Smokey" [Thompson], who is a long-serving member of the Manchester Unity Independent Order of Oddfellows.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to send condolences to the family of Mr. Carl Angelo Raynor, who was a resident of [#9 Benny's Bay Road], so he is your constituent, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Right. I think we did that. Actually, we did that last week.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Last week?

The Speaker: Yes. Yes, we did that last week. MP Dennis Lister did that. You can associate yourself.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Okay. I am sorry. Then I would like to be associated.

The Speaker: Absolutely.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Absolutely. So for Brother Winslowe Dill and Brother Kenneth "Smokey" [Thompson] and association for my neighbour, Mr. Raynor. Thank you.

The Speaker: Right. Thank you. Thank you very much, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Minister, the Minister for Public Works, MP Gordon-Pamplin.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this Honourable House send condolences to the family of the late Sinclair Simons. Mr. Simons was a resident down at Matilda Smith Williams, where my mother was also a resident until her death. And Mr. Simons is actually the father to Diane Elliott, who is responsible for our Land Valuation Department. Mr. Simons was quite a mason in his day and became quite a good family friend because he did all of the masonry work that was required in my home, so I have known him quite a long time. He was quite a jolly, jovial gentleman and very—loved the ladies. Even as he sat in Matilda Smith [Williams Senior Residence] on a Sunday, you could see the flirtatious nature that he possessed, and it was really quite a joy to go and visit with him [on] the opportunities that I had to [go there and] visit with my mother. So I would ask condolences to be sent to his family.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of the comments made by my honourable colleague, the Honourable Minister Crockwell, I would like to make reference to not just the passing of Dr. Maya Angelou, but the stellar job that was done by the students at CedarBridge Academy yesterday, who in the 24-hour span between the time of Dr. Maya Angelou's passing and their assembly yesterday morning (not even quite 24 hours) were able to put on an assembly as a tribute to Dr. Maya Angelou. The one thing that I was able to see is the amount of talent that we have in our young people.

There were a couple of ladies who had, in fact, recited as a part of the assembly some of the poems that had been written by Dr. Angelou, but who had also done original pieces. Mr. Speaker, I sat, and I can tell you that by the end of that assembly, it was very difficult for me to contain myself. And very interestingly, being one who always prides myself on being quite stoic, at the point at which the TV cameraman came to say, *I would like to interview you, Minister, for your coming and speaking about the "Phenomenal Woman" poem that was written by Dr. Angelou, and*

asking about my interpretation of who phenomenal women would be, and I found it very difficult to contain myself. All I could say to him was, *Please take the camera out of my face*. And then to go home last night to be absolutely mortified to see tears streaming down my face in the midst of the seven o'clock news.

So, as tough as I thought I was, I really was not. Because I believe that that sensitivity, that legacy that was passed on by Dr. Angelou, has had a profound impact on my life. And I am deeply appreciative. But I certainly want to highlight the efforts of the CedarBridge Academy students and teachers who put on a magnificent assembly in honour of Dr. Maya Angelou. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Sandys South, MP T. E. Lister. You have the floor.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also offer congratulations to the winners of the Junior Classic, Mr. Tyler Smith and Ms. Selah Tuzo, who is winning her second race at age 10. This young lady has great potential, and I am looking forward, as are many, to the times when she will represent Bermuda as a senior athlete.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate Gladwin Smith. Gladwin Smith has been making floats for a number of years. When his children were in school, he made the float for the school they were in. As they moved from primary, he moved to Dellwood. He then moved to CedarBridge. And now he has moved to doing his own float and won the Premier's Award and the J. J. Outerbridge Award for the Best Individual Entry. This is a tremendous accomplishment, and he should be encouraged to continue on.

I would like to offer condolences to the family of Mr. Winslowe "Socks" Dill, his son Dennis and daughter Dorothy. Mr. Dill, as you know, was a policeman. I remember back, my best recollection of Mr. Dill, apart from his cricket, was when he was a policeman back in 1964, when Uncle Allen and my father in the cruiser, and Uncle Allen, with three other policemen, including Socks Dill and my grandfather, James Lister, went out for a fishing expedition and got lost at sea! It was all over the news, and the family was all worried. We did not know what would happen to them. And finally, they were found the next day—sorry, three days later (my brother is pointing out). I forgot how long they were out there. So there was great concern in the family at that time, but they returned safely. The four policemen continued on to serve Bermuda well. And Mr. Dill, as you know, made a great contribution to cricket, as well. So we extend our condolences to his family.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend congratulations to the newly appointed officers in the

Bermuda Prison Service. We have five persons who have been moved up, four to Chief Officer. I want to associate the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. One is to Assistant Commissioner. And just because the prison is in the West End does not mean the leaders have to be from the west.

An Hon. Member: But they are.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: However, four of those—

The Speaker: Or Warwick Secondary School.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: And they are all Warwick Sec.

[Laughter]

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Well, four from Sandys. The former Trojan goalkeeper, Chief Officer Reginald Gomes; another famous Somerset name, Kenneth Cann (Kenny Cann, Sr., of course, was a prison officer, and now his son is the Assistant Commissioner); also, Chief Officer Shaun Bailey; my neighbour, Chief Officer Phillip Downie; and Chief Officer Darynda Caisey-Brown, and she is the fifth, a St. George's lady.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Well, that is good. that is a little balance.

[Inaudible interjections]

[Timer beeps]

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Okay. They are just reminding me that it is Dennis Brown's wife.

So, in fact, it might be necessary there be some sort of investigation, Mr. Speaker.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Member Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, the Deputy Speaker.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to basically, send out a letter of congratulations to Mr. Malcolm Gosling and Gosling's. Marketing is always a very fun and challenging position to be in. It enables one's creativity to grow and blossom. I think pre-empting what I am about to say, I have seen hands of association from Mr. Glen Smith.

The reason why I would like a letter of congratulations to be sent to Malcolm Gosling is because, in their marketing concept of Bermuda's dark rum and

Dark n' Stormy, they have seen outside of the box. And Bermuda, I believe, has been the [beneficiary]. Gosling's have decided to market Bermuda internationally. They recently had, with a competition, over 36,000 entries. They advertised in a golf magazine, which promoted, obviously, their dark rum and their Dark n' Stormy. But Bermuda was the benefactor. After the 36,000 entries, the participants won a trip to Bermuda and a golf competition.

So this is marketing for a product that has gone beside and outside the boundaries of Bermuda. They marketed Bermuda through their advertising concept. And of course, with that advertising externally, internally we had these individuals come to Bermuda, participate on our course. You know, Mr. Speaker, those individuals will go back and say what a wonderful time that they had in Bermuda. I would encourage all companies to utilise this form of marketing, take Bermuda, and take it outside.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, as part of marketing Bermuda, I would also like to not necessarily send a letter of congratulations, but acknowledge your article, Mr. Speaker, in *The Parliamentarian*, which is taking Bermuda outside and internationally.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker—great article. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member, MP Roban.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would certainly like to be associated with the congratulatory remarks given to the new persons promoted in the prison service. It is always good to hear of those persons within our community who are doing well within their careers in this way, particularly in the public service.

I would also like to give an early congratulatory remark and ask the message be sent to Mr. Ricky Spence of Spence's Barber Shop, who is tomorrow holding a Wellness Day and promoting wellness amongst, particularly, men in the community. I would like to associate the whole House with this. In light of the Statement we received from the Honourable Health Minister earlier, I think it is fitting to give this congratulatory message, because one of the important things that you learn from the stance that taking control of our health individually is [you have to be] a part of the process that will lead to improvement. Better knowledge, being proactive about your health on a regular basis, (and not leaving it up just to whatever, not waiting to go to the doctor or waiting to get sick), is part of the key to better wellness for a whole community.

Obviously, this was reported on yesterday in the paper about what Mr. Spence, due to his own personal experience, is doing with others. And so, it is a

great idea that he is actually taking on the wellness message himself by using his business in a community that will very obviously benefit from his helping men and others in the community to take charge of their health and have access to some of the preventative measures that will assist with better health for them all. So I think it is appropriate to send him a congratulatory message. It is in my district, his actual shop. So I think it is appropriate, and I will be supporting his effort tomorrow myself. And I hope other men here and other men in the community do the same. Thank you very much.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

I saw somebody, one other Member. Are you standing, Honourable Member? Are you standing? No. MP Outerbridge? No? All right.

Therefore, I recognise the Honourable Premier. That brings to an end—

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: No, no.

The Speaker: We are going to carry on? Oh, sorry. Sorry, Honourable Premier. Carry on.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask this Honourable House to send congratulations and thank you to Captain Graham Benjamin, who finishes up a 36-year career with the Bermuda Regiment tomorrow. Those who are familiar with the Regiment know that Captain Benjamin was the Quartermaster since 2008 and was actually the Motor Transport Warrant Officer responsible for all the Regiment's fleet of vehicles for the 21 years before that. The Honourable Opposition Leader would like to be associated with that as well.

I would also wish best wishes to the Bermudian Sergeant Major Kenneth Wainwright, who takes over. He will be promoted to captain shortly. And Sergeant Wainwright takes over as Quartermaster, after having served 19 years in the Regiment. And some of those familiar, certainly MP Lawrence Scott might be familiar that Sergeant Major Wainwright formerly worked at American Airlines here in Bermuda. So, congratulations and thank you for a job well done to Captain Graham Benjamin on his dedicated service to the Regiment.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to send congratulations and best wishes to the owners and the partners of the new cafe, The Snug, that opened up a few days ago. Mr. Speaker, obviously, it is always gratifying to see people having confidence in the Bermudian economy and opening up any type of business. And certainly, a restaurant on Front Street certainly will bring some more buzz to the air.

As part of those congratulations, Mr. Speaker, I just want to highlight some of the comments that one

of the partners in the business, Mr. Chris Garland, made in the media earlier last week. And the Honourable Opposition Leader would like to be associated with that as well. And I want to focus on these comments for just a second, Mr. Speaker, because it talks about the leadership that the owners of this company have. Mr. Garland has stated that when they started out at Flanagan's eight years ago, the business employed 16 people. It has grown to 50 people. And of that staff, 12 are on work permits.

He goes on to say that "The number of overseas staff working in Bermuda's hospitality industry represents a missed opportunity for Bermudians . . ." Mr. Garland and his colleagues have done a great job of attracting Bermudians into the industry. Certainly, the Tourism Minister would like to be associated with it. Let me just go on and finish off my comments with this: Mr. Garland says, "We have to get back to the days when people saw the job as a profession. We have a staff who make a very, very good living out of the service industry. That story is not being told enough." So, not only congratulations to those entrepreneurs and the work they have to do, but congratulations for standing up, helping get Bermudians ahead in life and for speaking about it, too. I am happy to lend our support in this Honourable House to what they have to do there. Well done!

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I now ask that we adjourn for lunch and return at two o'clock.

The Speaker: How about 2:05, Minister? It is 25 to 1:00, so we will go—

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, you are in charge. We are at your mercy.

The Speaker: We will come back at 2:05.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: The house is adjourned for lunch until 2:05.

[Gavel]

Proceedings suspended at 12:34 pm

Proceedings resumed at 2:07 pm

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

[Gavel]

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Members.

We have just completed Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches.

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE

The Speaker: There are none.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

The Speaker: There are none.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

The Speaker: There are none.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

The Speaker: The Chair will recognise the Honourable Minister Atherden.

Honourable Minister, you will fill in for Minister Atherden?

Carry on.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

FIRST READING

PROTECTED SPECIES AMENDMENT ACT 2014

Hon. R. Wayne Scott: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I hereby introduce and read for the first time by its title a Bill entitled the Protected Species Amendment Act 2014.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this said Bill be set down on the Order Paper for the next day of meeting.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Are there any objections?

All right. Carry on.

Thank you. There are no other Bills.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

The Speaker: The Chair recognises, first, the Honourable Member T. E. Lister.

MANDATORY RANDOM DRUG TESTING POLICY FOR MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby give notice that on the next day of meeting I propose to move the following motion: That this Honourable House approves the Report of the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on the Adoption of a Mandatory Random Drug Testing Policy for Members of the Legislature.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you very much Honourable Member.

That matter will be placed on the Order Paper.

The Chair will recognise Minister L. K. Scott . . . someone has a motion.

Yes, Honourable Minister Gordon-Pamplin, carry on.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FINANCING POLICY

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the substantive Junior Minister I hereby give notice that at the next day of meeting I propose to move the following motion: That as a measure of good governance, BE IT RESOLVED by this Honourable House that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to examine and review the viability of establishing a national election campaign financing policy, and to report its findings and recommendations to this Honourable House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Minister.

That matter will be placed on the Order Paper.

The Chair will recognise now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I seek your leave to table the following motion.

The Speaker: You really do not need my leave to table it.

CENSURE MOTION

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Okay, Mr. Speaker, no problem, just covering my bases.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that at the next day of meeting I will move the following motion: That this Honourable House censures the Member from Southampton West Central, the Honourable Shawn Crockwell, JP, MP, and the Member for Warwick North East, the Honourable Mark J. Pettingill, JP, MP:

(a) Having had responsibility as Ministers, as Attorney General in the case of the Member for Warwick North East, and as the Minister of Tourism and Transport in the case of the Member for Southampton West Central, failed to respect the Ministerial Code of Conduct and failed to apprehend or acknowledge the seriousness and or gravity of their acts and omissions for breaching the Ministerial Code of Conduct, in two material particulars, namely; [Rule 1] (v) by failing to give accurate and truthful information to Parliament in connection—

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, excuse me.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: I have an objection here. This is not on the Order Paper; we do not have a copy—

The Speaker: It does not have to be on the Order Paper, Honourable Member.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: No, Mr. Speaker, standard practice in this House is for these things—

The Speaker: Honourable Member—

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: —to be on the Order Paper.

The Speaker: Honourable Member, it does not have to be on the Order Paper. It is a motion . . . he is giving a—

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: But we do not have a copy of it so we cannot even—

The Speaker: —notice of a motion.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: We do not even have it to see if we have any objection to the wording or—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, it is only a notice of motion and is not—

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: I understand that, but we may have objection to the wording of the notice of motion. We have had not had the opportunity—

The Speaker: Then the opportunity will come, Honourable Member, when the motion is made. When the motion is made, you will have the opportunity to be able to do that.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: No. My point is that the wording of it may be objectionable to even tabling it, and we have not seen it.

The Speaker: But it is . . . in order for it to come, Honourable Member, it was vetted. I actually vetted the motion to approve that it be able to be tabled.

Hon. Trevor G. Moniz: Then everyone else in the House has the Government at a disadvantage.

The Speaker: It is not . . . Honourable Member, it is not a disadvantage because the motion is merely being tabled, and that is quite within the rules of the House.

Yes, carry on. You were at . . . to the material particulars.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Two material particulars, namely, [Rule 1](v) by failing to give accurate and truthful information to Parliament in connection with the private flight to Washington, DC, on March 20, 2013, the purpose of which said flight was to provide air transport to Washington, DC, in order to meet with a potential hotel and casino developer; and [Rule 1](xvii), accepting the following favours, namely, free air transportation and hotel accommodation from an individual or individuals who are in negotiations with or seeking to enter into contractual propriety or pecuniary relations with the Government of Bermuda.

(b) Failed, as elected Members of the Legislature, to inform this Honourable House of the full nature and extent of their involvement in connection with the above trip at the earliest opportunity, in particular, failed to inform this Honourable House fully as to the involvement of a private citizen on both the flight on March 20, 2013, and the subsequent meeting in Washington, DC, on March 21, 2013, and, in so doing, contributed to the Honourable House being misled on the details of the said flight and the said meeting on March 21, 2013, in Washington, DC.

(c) Failing to appreciate, apprehend or grasp the level of public disquiet that has arisen as a result of their failures in (b) above.

(d) Following the resignation of the Member for Devonshire South Central as Premier, further failing to apprehend public disquiet over the said events and their involvement, and in the case of the Member from Southampton West Central, failure to tender his resignation as Minister as a result of the above.

(e) In the case of the Member for Warwick North East, for the role he played in advising the Premier that the said flight and meeting in Washington, DC, would not constitute a breach of the Ministerial Code cited in (a) above, and for continuing to assert publicly, following the resignation of the Member of Devonshire South Central as Premier.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Dated May 30, 2014.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.
And that will be placed on the Order Paper.
Yes, Honourable Premier?

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: How can we allow a motion to be placed on the Order Paper that refers throughout to the Ministerial Code of Conduct?

I took advice last night, Honourable Speaker, in regard to the Ministerial Code of Conduct. The Ministerial Code of Conduct is answerable by the Premier and the Cabinet Secretary, not to this Honourable Chamber—

The Speaker: Honourable Premier, I have also taken advice.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member?

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, Mr. Speaker, point of clarification, as well.

Mr. Speaker, throughout this motion—the draft motion—it refers to a statement of fact that the Ministerial Code of Conduct was breached. That determination has not been made so—

The Speaker: Honourable Member—

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: —this particular draft is flawed.

The Speaker: No, Honourable Member, it is not flawed. You will have an opportunity once it is . . . Once the matter is debated, you will have an opportunity to clear that completely.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: You will have an opportunity to . . . absolutely—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: No, no, absolutely, I appreciate that.
Thank you, Members.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The Speaker: We move now to the Orders of the Day. Order No. 1 is carried over, I believe. Minister, Order No. 1 is carried over?

Order No. 2 is a motion to be moved by the Honourable Premier, Michael Dunkley.
Premier Dunkley, you have the floor.

MOTION

CANNABIS REFORM COLLABORATIVE REPORT

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following motion, notice of which was given the 9th of May, that this Honourable House take note—

The Speaker: Honourable Members.

Honourable Members! If we could have some order in the House, please.

Carry on, Premier.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: I move that the following motion, notice of which—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Carry on, Premier.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: —was given on May 9, 2014 that this Honourable House take note of the [Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report](#) tabled in the House.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any objections to that?

Premier, please carry on.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before this Honourable House invites Honourable Members to take note of the Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report.

On its face, Mr. Speaker, this is a simple motion in support of another report. However, Mr. Speaker, the debate in this Honourable House this afternoon is one that joins Bermuda with many other countries who have wrestled with the issue of cannabis reform. Even considering this issue has the ability to provoke very strong feelings.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will be affected and influenced by their core values grounded in religious faith, cultural traditions, personal and professional experiences, as well as the societal discomfort that accompanies any potential for change.

[Crosstalk]

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, none of these factors should cause Honourable Members to shy away from a full expression of their views, because it is precisely for this reason—

The Speaker: Premier, just hold it a second, please.

Honourable Members, again, I do not mind Members speaking; but when you are speaking, so that I hear you, it is clear that I am going to be unable to hear the speaker.

I would ask that you please respect that.

Honourable Premier, please carry on.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, none of these factors should cause Honourable Members to shy away from any full expression of their views because it is precisely for these reasons that each of us was elected to this Honourable House. Our constituents expect for us, in representing them, to bring to bear all of our experience and thoughtful consideration to the debate and to consult with them as part of our public service.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is an opportunity to reflect on the research provided and the recommendations made in the report. It is also an opportunity for the people of Bermuda to understand exactly where their representatives stand on some of the thorny issues that surround the reform of our cannabis laws.

Let me just deal with Government's commitment, Mr. Speaker. In the November 2013 Speech from the Throne, the Government signalled the intention to provide some leadership in the public debate on cannabis. The Government promised at that time (and I quote), Mr. Speaker, "In this Session, the Government will produce a public consultation paper on the decriminalisation of marijuana and an examination of its wider uses."

As I have the opportunity to introduce this motion for debate, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that Government has kept its commitment and promise. The report that was tabled in the House two weeks ago is a document that is forged through the hard work of young men and women in the community who engaged the public through various media and whose research stands as a body of work that serves to further the debate on the issue of cannabis law reform.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my Statement to this Honourable House two weeks ago, shortly after the announcement in the Throne Speech, Mr. Stratton Hatfield and Mr. Khomeini Talib-Din approached me individually to express their interest in facilitating and participating in the promised public consultation. I put the two men together and advised them to recruit additional members, with like interest, to form the Cannabis Reform Collaborative (or CRC).

The group began meeting on December 5, 2013, and had as its mandate to produce an advisory document on cannabis policy reform that identifies the benefits and consequences of reclassifying, legalising, or decriminalising cannabis, and to investigate its medicinal uses.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Chair, Mr. Hatfield and Mr. Talib-Din, the CRC comprised Lamar Caines, Jules Van Belen, Cordell Reilly, Dr. Ernest Peets, Robyn Swan, Kyle Bridgewater, Alex Jones, Harry Masters, and Joleesa Simons. Together, the CRC has experience and varying levels of expertise in activism, policy, law, addictions, treatment and drug education. The CRC worked very diligently to engage the public in discussions about Bermuda's current cannabis policies and to canvass the public's views on

reform through town hall style meetings, focus groups and electronic surveys.

Mr. Speaker, while the public debate over the last several months has been very wide ranging, I think it is important to reiterate at this point that Government's public undertaking has related to decriminalisation and any potential wider uses of cannabis. Let me indicate early in this debate, Mr. Speaker, that at this time the Government is not prepared to consider personal cultivation, licences for commercial cultivation, and a sale or blanket legalisation of cannabis. Insofar as the report recommends those things, they do not represent this Government's current intentions.

Mr. Speaker, let me focus a bit on the research. To say that scientific research in the area of cannabis use is divergent would certainly be an understatement. A cursory search of the Internet will reveal praise and vitriol for cannabis use from across the scientific spectrum. Mr. Speaker, this debate will not resolve the scientific questions that surround the use of cannabis, but the divergent views among the respected medical professionals should encourage caution in our approach to any change in our laws and policies.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to rehearse the competing findings of the detailed research that has been done in this field. However, I will indicate that, in my view, unregulated use of cannabis defies the nature of the substance and ignores the effects it has had on communities around the world and in Bermuda as well. It is wrong to yield to a more permissive attitude socially without due regard to the social, economic, and health consequences that hold equal weight in those studies conducted.

Mr. Speaker, inherent in the most liberal approach to cannabis reform is the suggestion that any adverse effects of lessening regulations be regarded as a public health issue. This position admits that there are risks, and it is with these risks in mind that Government must approach legislative change cautiously and with a comprehensive management plan in place.

Mr. Speaker, as the report says in recommendation 5, "A phased approach to Cannabis Reform offers the benefits of assessing, establishing and implementing long term plans that focuses on more efficient prevention initiatives, effective treatment programs that are supported by the Ministry of Health and sensible society guided regulations that our community understands."

Mr. Speaker, I believe this caution is especially important when considering our young people. As a US Department of Justice publication of January 2014 determined, marijuana use among young people is rising as a perception of the risks decreases. That publication stated, (and I quote) "An adolescent's perception of risks associated with substance abuse is an important determinate of whether he or she engages in substance abuse."

When anti-drug attitudes soften, there is a corresponding increase of drug use in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, later in this debate I will turn to Government's views on the issue of cannabis for medical use. However, let me also be very clear that it is not Government's role to take sides in the medical or scientific debate. Any move to promote greater access to cannabis for medical purposes will, by the very definition, be regulated like any other medically prescribed drug. Doctors will do what they have done for centuries—prescribe what they consider is best for their patient. The Government's role as a regulator is to ensure quality control, proper storage, and dispensing protocols.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the recommendations for a few moments. The Committee's recommendations are spread throughout the report. However, the Executive Summary (which can be found on pages 5 through 9) provides a very useful glance at the overall findings of the Committee. The main recommendations are as follows:

1. The age of consent for access and consumption of cannabis and alcohol should both be 21.
2. Companies providing group health insurance must offer insurance coverage to treat alcoholism and drug addiction.
3. Personal possession and personal cultivation should be decriminalised immediately.
4. Immediate action should be taken to enable access to medical cannabis with a prescription to individuals by way of a regulation under the existing legislation, pending the revision of specific policies and ultimate legislation.
5. Increase resources for prevention and educational initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to focus on these five recommendations as they capture the essence of the Committee's views on cannabis reform.

So first, raising the age of consent to 21. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important for me to clearly state that the link between alcohol use and cannabis use, and, therefore, an age of consent being imposed for both, is not a line of thinking that this Government currently supports. There is no plan to sanction or permit the legal use of cannabis by anyone, except in circumstances to which I will turn in due course. Therefore, the suggestion that an age of consent can be even considered is a non-starter.

Honourable Members will recall my previous statement surrounding all that has been done in the community to reduce the harm of alcohol abuse. Mr. Speaker, we certainly have a fairly well developed social and societal set of values that encourage and advocate responsible use of alcohol. To simply add cannabis use into the framework is not best practice and, as such, this recommendation is not supported.

The second recommendation, Mr. Speaker, [is] in regard to companies providing group health insurance coverage to treat alcoholism and drug addiction.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that we must be in the business of lifting people up. Substance abuse has ruined many lives and careers. Sometimes the level of intervention required is expensive and very intense. In order to save our people and to ensure that as many Bermudians who are willing and able to work do so and contribute to this economy, we cannot consign those with substance abuse problems to the ranks of unemployed or unemployable without some effort. A balance must be struck that rewards employers for demanding drug free work places and who go the extra mile to assist those of their employees who fall into the destructive cycle of substance abuse. That balance, Mr. Speaker, must include the ability of employers and employees to rely on insurance coverage for such interventions when reasonably required.

This is one of those items which if not handled correctly can add to the cost of doing business in Bermuda. And I wish to say from the outset that this Government does not propose anything that will add to the burden of local businesses who continue to struggle to keep citizens employed or, Mr. Speaker, which could have an impact on the already high cost of health care without the proper consultation and review.

I believe there is room for discussion in this area and that the Government can lead in devising a means by which to include reasonable substance abuse treatment as part of a group insurance plan in this country.

The third recommendation, Mr. Speaker, [is that] personal possession and personal cultivation should be decriminalised. One of the stated aims of the examination of Bermuda's cannabis laws is to ameliorate the consequences of instances where young people, in particular, are caught with small amounts of cannabis and then they have their travel, education and employment prospects adversely affected—sometimes for life. The decriminalisation for possession of small amounts of cannabis is one means that has been suggested to deal with this issue. However, a closer examination of the laws of both Bermuda and our nearest trading partner, the United States, is required to ensure that we achieve the intended aim.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will recall that for several years the Department of Public Prosecutions has provided guidance to the Bermuda Police Service in circumstances where a form of caution is given where an individual is found to be in possession of cannabis for personal use. The caution policy is canvassed on pages 43 to 47 of the report. And at page 44, Mr. Speaker, the report quotes the Commissioner of Police. And I quote: "There have been 194 cautions for drug possession to local persons and 1

for importation (cruise ship or airport related to an overseas visitor) since December 21st 2010. The original caution authority given to the police by the DPP in 2010 was rescinded in 2012. Cautions now require prior approval from the DPP before they are administered."

Mr. Speaker, in considering whether a caution should be administered the DPP considers several criteria, including the amount of cannabis, the antecedents of the defender, his or her admission of culpability, and any factors that might indicate that the drug is for supply and not personal use. The requirement to consider such criteria means that in some cases, Mr. Speaker, possession of relatively small amounts of cannabis might still occasion an appearance in court and a possible conviction for a drug offence.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise this Honourable House that, with the assistance of the learned former Attorney General and the current Attorney General, we are in discussions with the DPP to revert to the original 2010 position and allow cautions to be given by police. The power of the DPP to institute charges remains in his discretion, but allowing the police to handle cautions in this way will be far more efficient in this area of criminal justice.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore an essential element of this debate that we determine whether the criteria is abandoned in favour of a blanket decriminalisation approach based solely on the amount of drug possessed, or if we use the youthful indiscretion test as a means by which to remove the criminality associated with the first offence possession of cannabis. This is never an easy choice. And in the coming weeks and months this Government will consider this policy point in much detail before returning to this Honourable House with any legislative change.

Mr. Speaker, what is critical in this discussion is the effect of whatever policy we devise on the travel of our citizens to the United States. I am grateful to the Consul General, Mr. Bob Settje, who met with the Committee and who helped . . . helpfully corrected the US position in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the report does admit a significant point with respect to US law. Whether decriminalisation of small amounts of marijuana for personal use would or would not have on-the-stop-list consequences, and how, depends on what is meant by "decriminalisation." I think we should be very clear. If decriminalisation means "de facto legalisation" (i.e., there are no consequences whatsoever for possession), then there would be no conviction under US law. So one who merely possessed marijuana would not be inadmissible for having a drug-related conviction—he or she could still be found inadmissible as a trafficker or an abuser or dependent if the surrounding circumstances indicated that was the case. However, Mr. Speaker, decriminalisation if it carries a penalty of any kind—paying a fine, being on probation, going to drug treatment, performing community

service—whatever it may be, it would be treated as a conviction and it would have stop list consequences. Put simply, if decriminalisation means something more in terms of penalty than legalisation, then there are possible consequences down the road. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must indeed proceed with caution because simply decriminalising possession of small amounts of cannabis is not the only answer to the problems we are, in fact, trying to fix.

Mr. Speaker, this is probably an opportune time for me to address an issue that cuts to the heart of a portion of the report. Honourable Members who have read the report will have noted the report's argument regarding the disproportionate impact of cannabis-related offenses on the black community. These statistics are real and provoke fierce debate themselves.

However, Mr. Speaker, as many authors in the United States have indicated "the case against legal cannabis starts with position that legalisation will not end racism in the criminal justice system." If the report speaks to systemic injustice, then wholesale systemic change is the only solution to the problems identified. Even if we eventually decriminalise the possession of small amounts of cannabis, this will not fix the systemic risk of social, economic and criminal justice issues complained about in the report. If a system is inherently biased against one group, then from an enforcement perspective, the answer is not to wantonly decriminalise otherwise illegal behaviour. The answer is to change the system.

Mr. Speaker, point number 4—immediate action should be taken to enable access to medical cannabis with a prescription to individuals by way of regulation under the existing legislation, pending the revision of specific policies and alternate legislation. (Honourable Members can follow in the report pages 96 to 110, which deals specifically with cannabis as a medicinal substance.) As the report indicates, a study of medical positions on the use of cannabis could fill volumes and is continuing as a subject with much scientific debate.

Recent studies have clearly found that cannabis has brought relief to those suffering from cancer, glaucoma and other diseases that cause chronic pain. There are various means of using cannabis medically, including smoking, by means of vaporiser, oils for topical application and ingesting.

Mr. Speaker, smoking is the least preferred method of medical use as many studies have found that this method can cause harm to one's lungs. In fact, in 2014 the US Department of Justice report I referred to earlier, by Dr. David Murray, formerly the Chief Scientist at the office of National Drug Control noted, "People who smoke marijuana are subject to bacterial infections in the lungs . . . Is this really what a physician who is treating someone with a compromised immune system wants to prescribe?" So

clearly, Mr. Speaker, even with medical use cannabis must be managed very carefully.

A useful case study can be found on page 105 of the report. In the country of Israel they continue to classify cannabis as an illegal substance, but they do have a very robust medical cannabis system affording access to seriously ill patients. And the report sets it out as follows: "Cannabis for medical use has been permitted in Israel for cancer patients and those with pain-related illnesses . . . Patients can smoke the drug, ingest it in liquid form, or apply it to the skin as a balm. The numbers of patients authorised to use Cannabis in Israel in 2012 was over 10,000 a number that has swelled dramatically, up from serving just a few hundred patients in 2005 . . ." (and) "According to reports, Israel has a US\$ 40 million dollar medical cannabis industry."

So, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is potential in that, but it is also very clear that the industry is not without its problems, as the report also indicates that some "15 tons of medicinal cannabis are stolen each year." This is a clear indication of the need to properly regulate all aspects of this permitted use.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is for the Government to come between the needs of any patient and the responsible, professional advice of his or her physician. Where the potential for relief exists in the use of cannabis for medical purposes, the Government's responsibility is to sensitively and prudently regulate that use in the best interests of health care generally, and public safety in particular. The public advocacy in this area has to some degree gotten ahead of the science. Achieving the necessary balance in this area of medical cannabis means ensuring that all necessary scientific protocols are in place and that whatever regulations are developed reflect the best practice generally and the added degree of caution required with a substance like cannabis. Mr. Speaker, this will be done in close consultation with the Ministry of Health, Seniors and Environment.

Recommendation 5—increase resources for prevention and educational initiatives. Mr. Speaker, the old saying is an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Well, clearly, that applies in this area of demand reduction, which is canvassed on pages 66 to 86 of the report.

The Committee's recommendations for an increase in the resources for prevention and educational initiatives must be viewed in their proper context, Mr. Speaker. Honourable Members will know that this area of prevention and treatment is one of thriving charitable sectors in this community. And I say "thriving" because, Mr. Speaker, the number of organisations engaged directly and/or on the margins of prevention is significant. So much so, Mr. Speaker, that the donor community at times can be forgiven some confusion over just what approach to prevention is.

Honourable Members can review a chart on page 75 of the report which purports to present the

Government's budgetary allocation for prevention, treatment and enforcement. Without more, Mr. Speaker, this chart is, in my opinion, misleading. Treatment simply costs more than prevention. I think that is a fact that most people will agree with. A strict comparison of resource allocation without reference to this fact ignores the significant prevention work which is often cost neutral, or relatively inexpensive when compared to treatment requirements. Similarly, enforcement and interdiction is labour intensive. And that labour is often paid for at a premium price.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the report lays out the considerable efforts of several organisations in the area of prevention and their successes are well known in the community. Where we might provide some leadership in the management of resource allocation on the areas of treatment and prevention is to marshal the message to the donor community so that it has a clearer understanding of what areas funds are most needed and for what purposes.

Mr. Speaker, as I draw to a close in my comments, this report certainly forms a very useful backdrop for a topical debate in this Honourable House. The report does not contain all of the answers, but it does stimulate many useful questions. The public discussion that has arisen out of the result of the work of the CRC was insightful, and I am grateful to those members of the public who have made their views known.

As I take this opportunity to commend this Motion to the Honourable House for debate, I wish to ensure honourable colleagues and the public that this Government fully appreciates the gravity of any change in our approach to cannabis as a community. The reform of our cannabis laws and policies will be measured and done with the best interests of the country as a whole in mind.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The Chair will now recognise the Shadow Minister for Security, MP Walter Roban.

You have the floor.

Mr. Walter H. Roban: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Honourable Premier and Minister for those introductory remarks. And despite what might be considered to be a short presentation by the Premier, I think it is understood that this is a very big debate as it relates to the wider issue of where we are going to go as a country around the question of cannabis and cannabis reform. And no matter what we do here, this is going to be a very long-standing discussion.

In noting much of what the Honourable Premier and Minister said, the choosing not to get involved with certain details that are in this report, I fully understand. Because to flesh them out, to actually

come to some conclusion around them, is going to take a lot more work in the community and a lot more work around the question of reform. And this report is, perhaps, just the beginning . . . the end of the beginning, if there is even . . . if we have even started with this very important issue.

I am going to focus most of my comments as the opening speaker for the Opposition on the Motion itself and focus on the report. There are other Members of the Opposition benches who I think will find quite a bit to say on this. And this is not a debate that I believe we are here to articulate strictly the policy of the Opposition. We are discussing the report, as such, and I believe the Government is choosing a similar route to highlight some specific areas which they had clear views on. But in no way have they articulated to us their exhaustive final view on cannabis reform. So we are pretty much on the same page as it relates to how we are going to pursue this.

And just for the information of those listening and those in the House, we have been given a wide berth by the Leader in our caucus to discuss. So you are going to find a wide variety of views expressed by Members of the Opposition. Because we are free-thinking in our group, it is appreciated that there are a wide variety of understandings and many Members have different views on this whole question. So there is going to be a very . . . I would say creative presentation coming from the Opposition. And although I am the opening speaker because of the responsibility I have, you will find that many of my honourable colleagues will have very different views on this.

Looking at . . . I would like firstly . . . certainly, I think it is commendable that members of the community were prepared to come forth, Mr. Speaker, and contribute to the putting together of this report. And let us, perhaps, appreciate that dealing with issues of controversy always take a little bit of effort and courage. So perhaps they can be commended for having the courage to come forward and decide that they wanted to take the bull by the horns, as such, and do a report on this issue.

Perhaps it is a generational thing, in that certainly those who represent the leaders of the CRC are of a generation that has, certainly, perhaps a different attitude to older generations about the question of cannabis and feels that they have an opportunity now to assist the country, and not only older generations but generations coming after them to perhaps . . . Let us take a look at this issue of Bermuda and cannabis and how Bermuda has dealt with cannabis, certainly, since the Misuse of Drugs Act 1972 and even earlier than that, with how the issue has evolved and the perception that has evolved since the 1930s when much of the prohibitions that we now have, which became global in perspective, were put in place.

But we have seen globally as well, Mr. Speaker, a change in recent years. You know, we can reflect on what has been happening in North America.

But we can certainly reflect on what has been happening in other parts of the world. And even in this report, if I can just begin to refer to it, we find on pages 10 and 11 that there is a look at the global drug policy and Bermuda. And looking at the UN, which has begun to look at the issue of cannabis, and has for many years had particular conventions and other structures in place which has governed the global attitude towards cannabis.

As we see here on page 11, Social, Economic and Health broken down, looking at the global policy around cannabis, it says, Mr. Speaker, if I can refer to it, that “the UN has publicly drawn attention to the breach of fundamental human rights and freedoms in the pursuit of drug control objectives.” And it then goes to refer to Bermuda and what has happened here and “public perception of cannabis is shifting and more people are in support of reformed policies” and “Cannabis prohibition has had an inequitable racial impact, with blacks in particular bearing a majority of all charges.”

So it makes reference to the UN because there seems to have even been a change at the international level that, perhaps, coming out of an era in the 1970s and 1980s, where the war on drugs became a kind of global movement, the result has not been what we have expected or what was expected when this war started. And certainly the war came to these shores with the Misuse of Drugs Act 1972 and subsequent efforts thereafter in law enforcement and the likes to deal with it. But certainly, globally, what we have found or what seem to be some of the views that have been put out there, is that this war has failed and that it has resulted in a lot of expense.

Perhaps, it has taken on the exact result of most war. War usually, despite the noble objectives of those who start them, ends in destruction, pain and suffering. And change that no one ever anticipated would come. And that change has a lasting effect for generations thereafter. Very few people sit around reminiscing positively about the war that has been fought.

So perhaps that is where we are now, Mr. Speaker. We are now at a place where having globally carried out a war on drugs and the proliferation of cannabis and the use of cannabis and the whole effort around drug interdiction, and it just has not been successful. And we have come to a point globally, as well as in Bermuda, that we need to take a look at this.

On page 11 it goes on further, “There are significant and far reaching negative and costly consequences of implementing the current policies . . . There is an opportunity to redirect saved resources towards prevention and treatment . . . locally earned money are leaving the country with respect to the importation of cannabis.”

Going on with health, “Cannabis has been proven to be less harmful than other legal substances . . . Cannabis is being used to treat many symptoms

and diseases around the world” . . . and in conclusion, “There is a growing global emphasis on addressing addiction from a health approach rather than a criminal justice approach.”

Mr. Speaker, I can say here that I think that is, perhaps, the area that many of us in the community have become most concerned about—this criminal justice impact that the interdiction and enforcement against the use of, particularly, cannabis has brought on our community. It makes reference in this report to the inordinate impact this has had on the black community and young black men being incarcerated for usually small amounts of this substance and finding that despite the small amounts they have experienced a lifelong impact of a negative result. And I am talking about lifelong impact on opportunity, lifelong impact on reaching goals and objectives, lifelong impact as leading lives that can be productive for their families and for the community because of the stigma of having, perhaps at a young age, made a mistake.

I am prepared to say right here . . . you know, I grew up in Bermuda and I experienced everything that young Bermudians of my generation experienced including experimentation with drugs. I did it myself. I am prepared to say it because I am prepared, like many of the people in this country to be upfront and open about how we address the issue of substance abuse and even how we are going to bring some rationality to the experience of our citizens around the use of substances and also being sensible about where we deal with cannabis reform.

You know, I am not going to stand up here as a Member of Parliament and act like I did not live in this country like everybody else and go through the same life experiences anybody of my generation. I did. Right? I am going to be open about it because I think, perhaps, that can help others to be open and honest as well about how they feel, where we should go, and what we need to do as a country. So I put that on the table.

Perhaps others can do the same. I am not asking or saying they should; but I am just living the real life of a young man who grew up in Bermuda. I had the same experience that many of my generation had. And I had to make the choices of many young men. Some, as we know, did not make, perhaps, the proper choices and became victims of those choices. And I know many of them myself personally. But I made certain choices and those choices have been to my benefit.

So let us as a country begin to open the door to look at these things and not necessarily be . . . and I do appreciate the strong views that many people have about cannabis, and about other issues. But to begin the process of really having an open debate and discussion as a country we all should try and come to the table of, you know, *he who hath not sinned* (or she) *cast that first stone*, and do not necessarily act like some of us are holier-than-thou around many is-

sues that we have to face. I say that not to put any of my colleagues or anybody on the spot, but just to be open and honest as to where I think we all can go with some of these issues. And this is not the only one; there are other issues that will come before us in the same way. I say that with the greatest of assistance to this discussion, Mr. Speaker.

Further, on page 12, it talks about what the aims the CRC felt would be for cannabis reform: "Mitigate the long term consequences of cannabis offences, Implement medicinal cannabis access for patients in need, Minimize the use of cannabis in the population, Raise the age of first use of cannabis to the age when brains are mature, Minimise cannabis dependence, and provide support and treatment, Ensure factual and relevant information about cannabis is public, Develop regulations around community consensus."

Now, those are ultimate aims the CRC has felt that reform will bring. Maybe many people would not agree that that will actually be the result of reform, and that is okay. But this is what they feel a step in the reform direction will hopefully bring about. And I am sure these aims will have further debate as we go along.

As it relates to community consultation, Mr. Speaker, there were recommendations from the CRC as to what should happen in the area of community consultation. And I, perhaps, am going to take a slightly more detailed look at the report, not to be overly laborious, but I know that other people in the community are listening. Despite the somewhat abridged presentation of the Premier, I think we are all making some sort of contribution to this debate so I may add . . . because there are people listening who may not have this document in front of them, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to be of assistance to our wider listening public as well as persons in this debate. So I may cover a little bit more on the recommendations than the Premier did where he covered five principal ones. I will look at some of the other ones that are outlined in some of the chapters as a part of my presentation.

Community consultation, and this is coming from the CRC, this is their recommendations to the policy makers:

1. "That the Government continue to consult with the public and stakeholders about cannabis reform;
2. Help the community understand what cannabis is and what reform means."

I think those are sensible recommendations. I think the only way that we are going to move forward is if there is an approach to continue the discussion in the community with all the relevant stakeholders. And in a previous parliamentary question, I did ask the Premier and Minister if there was an objective to take

this discussion and the document into wider consultation with relevant stakeholders.

And as we know, we have a lot of groups and a lot of persons who have been up front in the battle with addiction and the battle with the use of substances, and with the education around the use of substances in this community. We have PRIDE, and we have groups like FOCUS, which are helping people to rid themselves of addiction. And we have an Honourable Member on this side that has had an in-depth background as a professional counsellor, the Honourable Michael Weeks. He is to this day still up front and close to the results of certain activities that bring about a result with addictive people.

I am not suggesting that cannabis is, in all cases, an addictive substance. It is not. I think we know that. But there are some people who as a result of using cannabis do find themselves in a state of addiction. And that, certainly, cannot be denied.

So there are people in the community who are dealing daily with persons on these issues and I am sure it is very important and I do not know . . . I cannot recall whether the CRC said that they spoke in-depth to these groups, but maybe . . . perhaps they did. But I am sure that now that this report has been finally crafted, whoever is going to be tasked with sort of shaping the results of this document will go back to those groups and get their view, now that it has been crafted, so that their feelings around what is proposed is clearly understood. And I think that is an important thing to do. So these recommendations here on page 22 are sensible and certainly I do hope that all concerned, those who have a concern about this particular document and what it is proposing, do just that.

Now the next section is Cannabis—Then & Now. It talks about culturally, medically, and sort of looking at the history and [the legality] of cannabis internationally. Frankly, this was quite educational. Despite my having some understanding of the history, this did go into greater depths about what has been the history around cannabis and its evolution to becoming a prohibited substance. Just over a hundred years ago it was not necessarily treated that way by all persons, and the internationalisation of it becoming a prohibited substance only started really in the early 20th century.

There are some people who argue that, *Oh, cannabis is this terrible thing that hurts people*. And that was not necessarily the reason for that, but there were certain economic and socio-political factors that played, and certain interests were trying to limit others' economic opportunity around cannabis. That is just one of the arguments. And then that is where you evolve this internationalisation of its prohibition to remove the opportunity that some people were finding with it as an economic commodity.

So with all that history, certainly, Cannabis—Then & Now, as a section, looks at that and the path that it has taken to the evolution of drug laws, and

even goes into some of the racial dynamics as it relates to who has been impacted the greatest by those laws. And I think it has already been made very clear that the population of African descent has perhaps been the one most negatively impacted by these laws as they have been carried out.

And that is something to think about because I, like many black men growing up in this country as young men, did see my friends and people that I knew sometimes held up by the police for small amounts. I can admit I was never in that situation, but I did see friends who found themselves in that situation, and I even have friends who went to jail for handling small substances.

I had friends who saw their economic opportunity, educational opportunity, and family life damaged by, usually, their confrontation with the law around, not being a huge importer or a drug dealer, but being somebody who was a recreational user. And so one has to think and . . . you know, this has not gone past me, how far was I from being in that situation? How far was I from being . . . you know a result of such prohibitive laws and would that have . . . if I had just made one different decision, would I have ended up at Westgate (or Casemate as it probably would have been)? And maybe if there was a more progressive approach to how we dealt with these then maybe some of my friends would have been able to go off to school and receive their education or get better economic opportunities, if they had not had that confrontation over a joint or a bag or whatever you want to call the substance that was being held at the time.

So I have to think about that. I cannot be dismissed from that and I have thought about that. And if we know that this has been the result in our community, then perhaps it is time that we do take a look in order to ensure that this does not become the history of young men and women going forth for the next two or three generations. I think even that little piece of this—even if people do not agree with some other aspects of looking at reform—Mr. Speaker, I think if that small piece can be addressed that is, in itself, a credible reason to look at reform, just that component alone.

Even if people have other moral issues and there are some people who do not even like the idea of using alternative substances to stimulate themselves, because some people do not want to even drink coffee, or they do not want to take aspirin, so they are not going to smoke a joint. They are not going to have a stimulant in any way because they want to live a certain type of lifestyle—and that is okay. So they would not want to see any legalisation of any sort of substance that brings about certain types of impacts and effects on people. But if the change is going to bring about, potentially, a more positive life experience for generations to come it is worth the examination, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker.

So on page 38 there are recommendations to:

1. provide factual education around cannabis history and its uses;
2. ending racial profiling with the criminal justice system;
3. expunge all convictions related to cannabis only;
4. if cannabis is legalised, ensure equal opportunities to enter the industry.

Perhaps number four is going quite far for some people, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps one, two and three are worth all of us taking a look at because certainly education, ending racial profiling, and expunging the stain that many of our citizens have had on their life's record that might allow them to even just go for a simple vacation somewhere . . . that might be worthwhile. [Do that] by expunging everyone who has had a conviction at a certain level, going back the last 30 or so years, because now that amount that they got convicted for is no longer illegal.

Now, I do not know how the law would work on that, but I am sure that the legal minds who are in this House, Mr. Speaker, can actually speak to how that might work and whether that is even possible. I do not know. But that would give relief to a whole lot of people who have . . . perhaps because they did something at 16 or 17. They are now 46, 56 and are still experiencing struggles with just getting on a plane and going to New York to go shopping. Or they have to constantly go through the exhausting process of engaging the US Consulate to get a waiver because of something they did, or a mistake that they made as a youth 40 or 50 years ago.

If we could change law . . . now if they are on the US list (and whatever that list is) we cannot impact that list, as we all know. We know what the realities are around that list. But going forward we can relieve Bermudians of being exposed to that experience. If there is a way I think that should be looked at. I am not saying that we are even going to come to a conclusion as to if it can be done or not, but let us look at the things that are going to provide our citizens with the greatest benefit and the greatest opportunity and with the greatest possibility, I should say, of having a healthy quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I see on page 40 that this document does go into great detail as it relates to looking at current legislative framework and proposals. It has a quite exhaustive list here (and I am not going to go through all of these) as to what the Minister may issue as an order applying to such restrictions to the drug which we are discussing, which is cannabis (or the substance which is cannabis), sections 14 to 24 of the Misuse of Drugs Act (I believe it is) and what the Minister can do. And it goes through a number of things that the Minister has the power to do. So even without any necessarily huge legislative change, Mr. Speaker, there are things that the Minister can actually decide

to do right now which might provide certain reformative (if I can call it) approaches.

Certainly the document makes it very clear, and I think this has been very helpful because many of our citizens have found themselves wondering what is going on and did not know what these powers were. And having them condensed in this way and clear can be helpful to some persons. I do hope that persons in the public take the opportunity to read them. I am not going to read them because it is much too laborious and I think that at some point, perhaps as the debate goes on, maybe other members will read them.

What I will do is I will just read about two or three of them at the beginning so that others can later . . . “Power to make regulations that appear to him necessary and expedient for preventing the misuse [4] of controlled drugs; Power to regulate the importation of controlled drugs;” (and third) “Power to require precautions be taken for the safe custody of controlled drugs.” That is just three of a number of powers that the Minister does have available right now to actually deal with certain aspects of drug policy.

Mr. Speaker, the document goes into more talking about key points related to the UN framework which might impact Bermuda. I am not going to go through and read all those, but, again, this document gives quite an exhaustive presentation of the international aspects of the whole issue of handling drugs and how Bermuda fits into these.

Also on page 58, Mr. Speaker, are further recommendations by the CRC, “That the Minister use the statutory powers to proactively enact reform without taking the topic to the House of Assembly.”

As I said, it does list in this document certain powers the Minister already has which can have some reformative effects, perhaps. But again, that will be up for debate. And the Government has made no commitment as to that direction so that ultimately will be part of the discussion going forward. It also talks about:

“Decriminalise personal possession and personal cultivation immediately.

“Develop a phased approach to cannabis reform and policies that limit potential of Bermudians being denied access to the United States (Stop List)—as we know—and conduct further discussions with the US Consulate.

“Introduce a less punitive warning system . . . civic penalties and harm.” And the Minister has spoken to that about [how] they are actually looking at reverting back to the 2010 policy of cautions.

“The Department of National Drug Control be placed under the Ministry of Health and a greater emphasis on demand reduction with a focus on prevention and treatment be the overall focus of drug policy in Bermuda.”

And lastly, “Confirmation of any obligations and level of autonomy with respect to policy reform, as a British Overseas Territory.”

So they outline a number of directions they are recommending. The Minister has actually spoken to a few of those already in his presentation. And, of course, perhaps those will provide at least an initial reformative approach reverting back to where the police can give cautions (and thus no one person is under a clear discretion that is still held by the DPP), they can be not exposed to the justice system, which has a ripple effect in itself.

Mr. Speaker, on page 87 there are further recommendations as it relates to cannabis reform from a social and health perspective:

“Increase resources for prevention and educational initiatives;

“Indicative Prevention—resources (funding) should be targeted to those who are at high risk for addiction and/or directed towards those who have been identified as persons manifesting symptoms/problems regarding addiction; rather than addressing prevention from a universal point of view;

“Ensure the new master DNDC plan” (this is the National Drug Policy Plan, which I believe the Minister tabled a couple of sessions ago) “focuses on managing substance use from a health centred approach;”

“Age of consent” which the Minister has spoken to, of which he has expressed a sort of rejection of. And perhaps I can agree with the Minister’s view on that at this point.

“Treatment continuum should create cannabis specific services to assist those with dependence;

“Companies providing group health insurance must offer insurance coverage to treat alcoholism and drug addiction;

“Government continue to consult with employers, unions, and insurance companies regarding a substantial change in law and policy to protect workers rights.”

Most of those recommendations, Mr. Speaker, will come about, I would say, after other steps in this discussion would have gone on. And those recommendations are on page 87. But they are going to come after a whole lot of other steps, I believe, are taken in this discussion and we will have gone long to have made substantial steps already. Well, we will have gone long as a country at some point in the future to have made other steps before those actual steps in those recommendations can be pursued. They are not going to be pursued before certain very key, clear steps are made in any sort of cannabis reform.

Now, there are some issues here around economics. I am not really going to touch on those. I am going to move away from those because I am not somebody who has a great deal of view, at this point, on some of the economic benefits to cannabis reform. I will leave that to those who are more economically minded in their thinking and issues. Perhaps our

Shadow Minister for Finance or Economic opportunity can speak to those.

Mr. Speaker, page 111 relates to cannabis as a medicinal substance, which is an area that I do believe has had much discussion of late, particularly in the wider international media with what is happening in the United States and what has happened, as the Minister talked about, what goes on in Israel. There are two or three states in the United States which have moved forward to make cannabis available for regulated, recreational use. And some have made steps for wider medicinal use. That is a discussion that I believe we can potentially engage in as a country if the science around these issues which seems to be developing . . . there is some clear indication that there are certain varieties of cannabis [that] do actually provide some relief for people who have certain forms of epilepsy, as well as certain levels of pain affliction and even with hunger.

Even in my own discussions with physicians [they] say it has been long understood that cannabis does provide some relief, particularly for those people who are going through quite extensive cancer treatment or treatment that very much affects their physiology, that it provides some appetite assistance for those who lose [their] appetite and thus has an impact on their overall nutrition, that it can provide them with some help.

So if there is an opportunity where good science can be applied to looking at these areas and we as a country can benefit from the progress of those studies, we should be prepared to look at them. If it means the Health Council along with other members of the medical community getting together to pursue looking at it so that some definitive decision or advice can be given from the local medical community along with the Health Council to the Government and to us legislators, then that should be looked at. It should not be shunned away from. So if we can provide help to some of our citizens who are within these particular areas of needing a certain type of relief due to cancer treatment, due to epilepsy, or other known conditions where the use of cannabis in some specific form—just like some other prescribed medicines—can provide help it is fair to look at them, Mr. Speaker. And I am not going to stand here and try and suggest that that is not something that can be credibly looked at.

I will move on to page 16. I may have already spoken about this. Now, it does make a point here about Bermuda becoming a global leader in cannabis policy. Now I am not so sure that that is necessary for us to be the ones who sort of jump off the cliff before anybody else does. I am not so sure that that is a good idea. I think that we should benefit from all the exhaustive work that is being done globally on this and make steps that do not put our country at risk in any way, or our citizens at risk. It is of no value to become a leader and then you are the only one standing in the wilderness and no one is there to provide you

with the support and assistance that you require. So I say let us be guided by those who are doing the work in this area in credible ways and let us make our steps following that good research and that good advice. There is no need to be a leader in everything. We are a leader in some other things, but let us not be a leader in areas that put a risk to our citizens in ways that we cannot yet surmise.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to stop there because I do believe that there are others who have something to say. Certainly, from page 117 to page 122 there are policy recommendations that are made by the actual group as to where they think we should go and what they think will be the result of taking those steps. I do not profess to believe that necessarily all their recommendations are worth us taking on full hard, but I do appreciate the value that this particular report has brought to the discussion. I do believe that it has highlighted areas that we as a country can continue to discuss.

I will say, again, that I think it is also important that those of us who have to be a part of the discussion be honest. Take an honest and open approach to it. Do not have a close-minded approach, because whatever steps we can make in this discussion that is going to provide some better opportunities for our citizens in the future, it is going to relieve some of the pain and suffering many citizens have had around the issue of cannabis in the past and chart a course forward that will ensure that our citizens will not have negative exposure to the issue of cannabis in the future or around the use of substances, or like addiction or whether it be with the criminal justice system. That will be a step worth taking.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you very much, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable and Learned Member from Warwick [North East], MP Mark Pettingill.

You have the floor.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon colleagues and to the listening public.

Mr. Speaker, in my not-so-distant previous life I spent a fair bit of time looking at and reviewing this particular topic. I think Members may recall that I was correctly quoted on the front page of the daily over a year ago saying that the time for the debate was now, to have a real conversation around this issue of marijuana, its legalisation, its decriminalisation, its medical use and all of the factors, including health, that the topic raises.

As a result of that, I ended up doing considerable research in the area. And I should say that that is not practical research, Mr. Speaker. I ended up doing a lot of reading in the area, you know, I did not need

to venture with regard to that. I know what the law of the land is, whether I agree or disagree.

And you know the liberal in me, Mr. Speaker, has always been of the view that people by and large should be able to do whatever they want to do as long as they are not hurting anybody else. And I think my own record and view speaks to that type of approach. But of course no man is an island, and we have to live together in harmony as much as possible. And the law provides a framework for how we do that.

This particular topic then becomes one of the biggest conundrums that faces us in our community today. And I would not go as far as saying the community is necessarily divided on the issue. There are certainly the polar views. There are those that would take the view that marijuana should be legal. There are those who take the view that all drugs should be legal. And indeed there are jurisdictions that have done that and people do whatever they want to do. There are those that take the view that we should have increased penalties for drugs and we should have absolutely zero tolerance. Those tend to be the extreme views by different factions, and we see extreme views expressed all the time by people that hold fast to what their views, for whatever reasons, are.

And then there is a large portion of people, Mr. Speaker, that fall into the middle category with some degree of objective thinking that are prepared to at least look at the facts, do some research, get some education into a particular issue and come down with a reasoned conclusion as opposed to just, you know, here is a version and I will support that do or die. And I think that this is a topic that warrants that type of critical thinking approach. And that has been something that we do not always see in our community, which is overall critical thinking on topics that are raised.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak for very long, but I do not want to sound as if I am all over the place because I am not going to come down on a particular side. What I am going to come down on is the view that I have developed with regard to the research that I have done, the listening that I have done, and that research (if you will). And the conundrum for me continues. I do not think we are going to be in a position of being able to be decisive about exactly where we are on this particular topic and I will expand on that somewhat.

I will say this. I take the view that the drug war, particularly on marijuana, has failed and is failing. The drug war, particularly on marijuana, [has failed] and is failing. And the amount of time, energy, and money and resources that go into that war and the ultimate results . . . one has to arrive at the position that it continues and that the war is not being won. And on that one I arrive much at the same position as with regard to US prohibition many years ago. That when you make something illegal, something that is wanted by many people, you just drive it underground.

And then you put the control of that particular vice or thing that people want in the hands of a criminal element. And that is the problem we have with marijuana.

Marijuana supply, distribution and profit are totally in the hands of a criminal element in this country. And this is the scary part—that any (and I am sure that many of us will view ourselves in this manner) law abiding citizen that participates currently in the use of marijuana is complicit in the criminal enterprise. And shock! Horror! People are going to be sitting there going *What? Not me!* But the fact of the matter is that if one chooses to indulge in the face of what the law currently is then you are complicit because, as I have said many times and have expressed, the only way you can get marijuana currently is as a result of a criminal enterprise.

It is either imported illegally, grown illegally, or supplied illegally. So if it ends up in your mouth or in your tea, you are facilitating that criminal enterprise. And that causes me great concern in a society when we know that many, many people . . . I know what the statistics would be because I do not think you would get . . . you know, if I took a straw poll in the House, how many people would have the courage to say, *I have smoked, or, I do smoke, or, I do indulge in the use of marijuana?* People are not going to be necessarily open about that. So it is difficult to look at what the statistics are. But when you take the view, as has been expressed, that marijuana is a \$100 million a year industry in Bermuda, and that is on the basis of seizures and, you know, a bit of a guesstimate, then you are talking about a lot of people smoking marijuana or using marijuana. So we have to address that and, I think, be realistic in our approach.

So now I get to the stage in my process of thinking of how I feel about it and how I look at it. And I should say this, many years ago when I sat as an acting Magistrate I was one of the first Magistrates to give an absolute discharge to a young man that came before me. He was 18 years old, had no previous criminal record and wanted to go off to school, had a good mitigation. I looked at the law as a judge and gave an absolute discharge and then waited with bated breath to see if it was going to be appealed. And I think, with great sensibility at the time, it was not. And I wondered if well, perhaps, we . . . you know, I had set down something of a (no pun intended) benchmark at that point with regard to how that should be looked at.

And then I think what started was a sensible caution process by the police bearing in mind the reality of the situation, particularly when it came to people in this community—younger people particularly—about issuing cautions with regard to having possession of a minor amount of marijuana and not criminalising an individual. It is a bit of a scary thing, but this is what you have to deal with.

I remember many, many years ago as a defence attorney, Mr. Speaker, calling up the American

authorities at the Consulate and looking to get a young man a waiver to go to school. And I remember saying to the rather officious lady on the other end of the phone that this was not a serious drug matter. To which she replied, *They are all serious drug matters, sir*. Just like that. And I was like, *okay*, and I realised I was not going to get anywhere with her with regard to the debate and the view and the community views on this with regard to the waiver in relation to the young man wanting to go to school.

So right away we became, as a society, I think almost in this push and pull tug of war with our great big brother to the east about the stop list issue and people rightfully making the argument that being nicked here for a small amount of marijuana as a young man had some pretty dire consequences potentially. I mean, potential for your further education to be over, especially if you wanted to go to the US.

And that, then, became a consideration, and the push and pull between decriminalisation and legalisation. And I am always saying, in a sense with regard to minor amounts of possession, we have been decriminalised for a long time because the facts are we do not prosecute every single offence of everybody who was stopped, whether it is the police that make that decision, sensibly, or whether it is the DPP's office that make that decision—we simply do not. So it is a specious argument, with great respect.

I heard the Honourable Member opposite, Mr. Roban, touch on this with regard to people being locked up for possession of minor amounts of marijuana. I do not think so. I really do not. I have not seen that. And I would be interested to see anybody point to me a case in the last 20 years, in the course of my career, where first-time offenders come before the courts with, say, three, four or five grams and have gone to Westgate. I categorically would state that that is just not the case that that has happened.

So that is a fallacy that we are locking people up or have been locking people up for that type of offence. Even if they are a repeat offender with minor amounts, we have not been locking them up on that personal use, personal possession issue.

So the conundrum continues for me, and I think for many others—where do we go? My own research, my conclusion is that alcohol is a far greater gateway drug into the use of serious drugs than marijuana is. My own view based on my research. And I think many would share that. I think people get what is called “Dutch courage” when they are drinking and they are far more inclined to be at a party and use cocaine or something else then when they are smoking marijuana and feeling nice and say, *Let's go, I want to get a buzz now. I will go have a hit of cocaine*. Not necessarily a common (unless you are a complete idiot) transition from one to the other.

But now let us press on with that. Alcohol, marijuana, gateway—this is where I have some valid concerns about what we do and how we do it. When

you get that bottle of elephant or black rum or, as in my case, you know my poison would be a glass of red wine . . . bottle. You know what you are getting, Mr. Speaker, because it is well-regulated when it comes to health and safety and supply and control. And one can see where that is sensible. You know that this particular alcohol has 14 per cent, you know its strength. This particular one has 6 per cent, if it is a beer. This one might have, you know, 30-odd per cent if it is a spirit. And the control and the production and what you are using is clear to you and to anyone else.

So the first step on the consideration of this road to how we address cannabis is that quality control of what the substance is. And I think we could all be in agreement that there are various strengths of, various strains of, various types of marijuana, where it comes from or what it is, what exactly the content of the THC in the marijuana is—the component that, you know, gets you feeling high. As one would be aware of if you had a shot of beer, which is alcohol, or if you had a shot of black rum, which is alcohol—well, you would know right away by just the taste of it—but the content, the alcohol percentage is very clear to you.

So the first conundrum we have if we move down this path is we cannot just say, *Let's legalise marijuana*, because here is the problem, or the problems, with that. Where do we get it from? And what are we getting? And how is it controlled? And what is the specific content of that particular marijuana?

Now I progressed a little further with that and I think that people who are here will be aware that I had two meetings in my time as the Attorney General with the US Attorney General, Eric Holder. And both times we discussed marijuana. The second time, more recently last month when I was in London, we sat down for a good period of time, sat down and discussed this issue. Because at that time I wanted to discuss what I think is a very, very valid argument about the use of medical marijuana and the legalisation of medical marijuana, particularly cannabis oil, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a lot of research that I have read, watched on TV, I have got a number of shows that have been saved now—*Marijuana Inc.* and all these very significant shows—with research, you know, well-documented, particularly in places like Colorado where people seem to be growing what you could call miracle drug marijuana with great affects, lower content THC, and some of the stuff that one could see with regard to . . . I think it was one child was having like 60 epileptic-type fits a day, if not more. A tormented horrible existence. And to see the impact of medical marijuana in this documentary on that child and how that young child's life was improved so dramatically, I mean, the mother was crying when she was talking about how the ability to obtain medical marijuana had saved her child—the quality of this child's life.

And to see that child running around and participating in daily activities, you know, there were be-

fore and after photos because the before photos were not pleasant to watch. The child every few minutes, a few times an hour, was in convulsions. And to look at that and say, *Wow! It's a fact that medical marijuana* (particularly oil in whatever context it was, well-developed as a drug) *did that for that child and other children, [and that] is a wonderful thing.*

So we cannot ignore that there is research. And that is not the only example of that, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of examples. We cannot ignore that there is very valid research that highlights the fact that marijuana in certain strains, certain forms, certain context can be a wonder drug. You cannot ignore that. And, again, we are faced with this conundrum. Right? Well, accepting that, where do we now as Bermuda go with that? And the Premier and I in the past have had meetings on this and looking at our law and where we are at.

This is the problem. When I canvassed this with the US Attorney General, Eric Holder, who was very sympathetic because I was just broaching the subject of the importation of medical marijuana into Bermuda, he was sympathetic, but he said the problem was, *You have this in Colorado . . . the way that the federal law is we cannot get it out of Colorado to Ohio, how are you going to get it out of Colorado to Bermuda on the basis of what the US law is?*

So this brings me to my challenge, or difficulty, with regard to where are we going to get it from? You know, and how—

An Hon. Member: Canada, Israel.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Yes, I know. I hear you. I will come to that too because I am on that page as well. All right, somebody interpolates “Canada, Israel.” There are other sources—

The Speaker: Speak to the Speaker.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: No, no, that is a valid interpolation, Mr. Speaker. I am glad it was raised because what I was about to move into are there other sources of supply.

But the point is we have got to have those sit downs as well. I in my former life had to sit down with the US Attorney General. So that is one kind of box that we have ticked and looked at with problems. Now we have got to look at how we do that internationally with Canada or with Israel or with anybody else that produces a well-defined medical product that we need to get in.

I am not by any means saying we should not do it. I think we should do it. I am not by any means saying it cannot be done. I am just expressing how much is involved in getting to that stage, how much international diplomacy is involved, how much there will be the need for particular types of agreements, how many sit downs will be involved in doing that. The

point is this, Mr. Speaker, we are not at the door of being able to do it. Maybe we need to get there, but these are the types of things that need to be actioned.

Why do I raise this? I raise this as a caution to the people that are out there waving a flag saying, “legalise marijuana.” And I do not have a problem with you raising that flag. I think that is a valid flag to raise especially in whatever . . . whether you want to be recreational or whether it is for medicinal purposes or not. People that are raising or waving that flag just have to be aware as to what is going to be involved. Because when we say, *No man is an island*, one thing is for sure. We are! We are! And we have to jump through the hoops of figuring out how we are going to be able to implement and make that work.

Now, one of my thoughts (I am not advocating on the Government's position because I have seen what is in the very extensive and detailed and sensible report laid by the Premier) had been made a time ago. Let us do this. Let us legalise personal cultivation, which is not on the agenda right now for the Government I accept that. But here, just for debate, let us legalise personal cultivation, 25 square feet or so much at home, with a licence. You cannot supply, you cannot sell, [but only] for personal use. Let us have a look at that. So you are growing, you know, you have to have a licence to do it, it is controlled. If you sell it there would be penalties. If you misused that, there would be penalties and so on and so forth.

Even on that, which, candidly, I think is the only practical way to go with regard to recreational type of use, even on that you have got to figure out what you are doing and how you are impacting on your international relationships, how you are going to get . . . I mean, if you are going to grow the plant you have got to get the seeds from somewhere. And I know what people are going to say, *Well, you get seeds here and there or anywhere.* But there are still issues that arise with regard to that. There are issues with regard to quality. Do you only allow a certain type of seed to be used? You have got to put the seed in the ground and where are you going to get that from? And so do you have a dispensary that allows for the sale of that?

These are all the types of conundrums that have to be figured out and could be, but they have particular complexities to them that are hurdles that have to be jumped over, Mr. Speaker, and jumped through. So it might be, with a lot more research and input, that that type of consideration may be one, down the road, that can be looked at.

As I said to an Honourable Member earlier when we were having a private chat on this, you then have to consider the amount of legislative change you have to have and how you have to make it workable and what the impact of that is with regard to your health administration, in regard to health generally, and that type of extensive research would have to be

done, and analyses has to be done on the proper workable legislative framework.

I can give you an example, Mr. Speaker. When you look at . . . we are so used to it now nobody thinks about what has gone into the development of alcohol laws over the years. You know, fermented and unfermented wort and what you can brew and what you cannot legally brew if you are doing something here; what you can import and what you cannot legally import; what you can sell and what you cannot legally sell; how you can sell it; what licences you need—just with regard to alcohol. Where you get it from, how it is stored, where it is kept; how it is provided for consumption on premises—a whole body of law over a number of Acts that relates to our enjoyment of and sensible use of alcohol. And then a whole body of law that relates to the punitive position with regard to our misuse of alcohol.

So one has to start on a comparative analysis with the body of work as it relates to alcohol and how it is legislated and look at how we begin to apply that to the concept of the legalisation of marijuana. And I come back to this point that I have arrived at—it is not just as easy as saying, *Let's legalise marijuana*. It is just not that easy. It is convoluted and it is complex.

I think the conversation has to carry on and these points have to systematically be addressed. And they have to systematically be addressed by the more liberal legal thinkers (I guess like myself) who have been particularly . . . my drug of choice, Mr. Speaker. But it does not matter because of what my views are with regard to what people should be able to do and how that should be controlled by society. How we address that.

I would encourage to the flag wavers for legalisation to pause for a second and step back and have an appreciation for exactly what will have to happen if we proceed down a certain road with regard to any form of legalisation, any form of cultivation, any form of importation, any form of supply, and any form of health standard in relation to use and how much is involved in that. Get on the bandwagon and engage in this big conversation in coming up with some of the answers to those questions in that conundrum. There is no point on this topic in people being polarised, in people being like, *No way! Can't! We are never going to do that*. That is unrealistic and nonsensical. In people being like, *Well, let's just legalise*—that, with respect, is unrealistic as well.

So I guess my invitation, Mr. Speaker, just before I sit down, is for people to have . . . and this report does that. The report touches on many of these concerns. And the ministerial brief of the Premier touches on those concerns. And in my view it is not polarising. It is saying, *Well, here you have this. You have this concern. You have that concern*. And those are the things we have to begin to formulate a thorough list on and tick the boxes.

But I will warn you on this, everyone. In my respectful view, because I looked at it for the better part of a year and had two of the highest level conversations I think you can have as an Attorney General with the US Attorney General on this topic, who, by the way, I think is a liberal thinker. He is a liberal thinker. One of the first things he ever said to me was, *Hey, we've got to look at this. We've got to have this conversation*.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: Yes, and I know the previous administration met with him as well. So . . . but that was some time ago as well, and look how we have not progressed down the road. I know that there were conversations had by the previous Government.

The Speaker: You have got about three minutes left, Honourable Member.

Mr. Mark J. Pettingill: That is a good time. I can do a lot in three minutes.

Mr. Speaker, so I know. That is how far we are getting down there. We have had those conversations. I am at the point where (and maybe the previous Government arrived at this as well), *Wow, I see that it will be problematic with the US as far as an idea of importing marijuana from places where it is legalised*. Even I see where it is problematic with regard to the medicinal end of it and getting it, not that it cannot be accomplished, but it is problematic.

So I am going to say this out of interest. If there was ever a unified position that both sides of this House could take, it is forming a committee, I guess to really have a good look at how far we need to go, who we need to be talking to, and what we should be doing, perhaps starting on the medicinal element of it. If everybody is prepared to accept, *Hey, there is a real wonder drug here* (on appearance), *and why should we not have that?* If there is a wonder drug out there and it appears there is evidence to support that, why should we not have that in its medicinal form? There is a good starting point that you could get people to buy into the conversation on, in my view. Start there. Start there.

Before you start getting into the idea of the cafes and that type of liberal thinking (and I am not saying I am opposed to that either, but before you get down there), if we start on the basis where we get buy-in from a wider breadth of people, start with that medicinal argument, with that medicinal concept of how we go about legalising and getting that here . . . and that is problematic enough. I mean, we can all get together on that one.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that that has been somewhat, perhaps, helpful and I look forward to more debate. And it should not be a big debate. It should be a discussion—I hope that is what this is going to be all

about—that is generated around the sensibilities that need to be looked at here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

HOUSE VISITORS

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Just before the Chair recognises the Honourable Member (I am going to recognise from Pembroke Central, constituency 17, MP Walton Brown), just before you start I want to take the opportunity to recognise in the Gallery members and representatives from the Young Presidents' Organisation (YPO), in particular the Black YPO. They are here on a yearly retreat.

I am glad you chose Bermuda. And I certainly hope that your few minutes in here will not tarnish your thoughts about Bermuda in any way. But I welcome you to Bermuda and we certainly hope you have a wonderful time while you are here.

[Desk thumping]

[Debate on the Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, continuing]

The Speaker: The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member C. Walton Brown, the Shadow Minister of Immigration and External Affairs.

MP Brown, you have the floor.

Mr. Walton Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Good afternoon everyone.

Convoluting and complex. I am going to start where the Honourable Member, Mr. Pettingill, left off. Dealing with marijuana and marijuana policy is a complex issue and it is oftentimes convoluted.

Let me first of all thank the Cannabis Reform Collaborative for putting together such a comprehensive report. They clearly did a great deal of research, discussion, and analysis and it is reflected, Mr. Speaker, in the expansive nature of the report that we have before us. They have put forward a series of, shall we say, provocative recommendations. And it is incumbent upon each of us who sit here today, Madam Deputy Speaker—

[Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair]

Mr. Walton Brown: —who serve the people to carefully consider those recommendations and eventually come up with a sound policy going forward, because the country needs a sound policy.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the issue of marijuana has been one that has been debated for decades in this country and there are ardent proponents on all sides of the debate. We have an opportunity to

create a new position that addresses these issues for the long term.

My philosophical approach when it comes to the issue of drugs, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that we should embrace a harm reduction approach. Whatever our policies are, they should be designed to reduce the harm that is caused to society by the use of marijuana or any other drug, by the use and the abuse of any drug, Madam Deputy Speaker. So that is the philosophical premise on which I will share my views on this matter.

Now some of you will know that I have been going to Amsterdam for more than 30 years.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: And I have familial reasons for doing so, Madam Deputy Speaker.—

An Hon. Member: And you made it back.

Mr. Walton Brown: I made it back every time and in a sound state of mind.

But let me say, Madam Deputy Speaker, you can go into the coffee shops in Amsterdam, you can see a very extensive menu of the kinds of joints you can buy, the quality and grade of marijuana, and there is free choice. Amsterdam has adopted a very liberal approach to the issue of drugs.

So you have that on the one hand and then you walk around the corner across the canals in Amsterdam and you will see people walking around in a zombie-like state because they have embraced the freedom that the Dutch laws have provided and they decided to use it to such an extent that it is clear abuse and they cannot function in society. And so you have the very expansive rehabilitative system in place to try to address those who are, in fact, abusers of it. So it is complex and it is convoluted.

But let us take it to Bermuda and look at the implementation of drug policy in this country. We can start, Madam Deputy Speaker, with the ¹Tumin Report in 1993 looking at prisons. And one of the interesting assessments of the Tumin Committee Report was that Bermuda is a punitive society, a very punitive society. That is no doubt, in part because of our British heritage and traditions (which some of us embrace so fully), where we want to penalise people for the most minor of offences. And so at one point we had 12 per cent of our population in prison for traffic offences, and then you have a great deal . . . a very high number of people in prison for drug offences.

[Inaudible interjection]

¹ [Report](#) on the Criminal Justice System in Bermuda
Bermuda House of Assembly

Mr. Walton Brown: I am going to get to the issue of race, colleague. Hold on, it is going to come because race permeates a lot of this discussion.

Look at the recent report undertaken by the Centre for Justice—a very detailed analysis of our stop and search laws. Stop and search laws were ostensibly designed to identify those who were carrying weapons, but invariably what happened? The police identified people who they believed were suspicious based on certain decisions they had arrived at and they found people in possession of illegal drugs. And so you saw many people brought before the courts. The demographic makeup of these people, Madam Deputy Speaker, is primarily black—young black men.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: We know that if the drug economy is \$100 million, young black men are not spending \$100 million on drugs or weed. Sorry, the weed economy, the marijuana economy, the drug economy is not less than three times that. And so who is spending \$100 million on weed? Not young black men. Well, why is it that they are disproportionately before the courts?

So we have a manifestation of institutionalised racism in the administration of justice when it comes to illicit substances. We have to find a way to address that to extract the racial component in the administration of what we call justice and create a more just society. I am hopeful that this Government will be mindful of the numerous recommendations in this report and try to identify those ones that can help us to achieve an ideal of a more just society, which I believe most, if not all, of us want.

Madam Deputy Speaker, when you look at the issue of marijuana, the police have the ability to decide not to charge, not to arrest. Given that we have, I think, reached a point in our country where the vast majority of people recognise that people should not be brought before the courts for possession of small amounts of marijuana, I would advise that the police through the Government begin the process of not even arresting or making note of people who have small amounts of weed on them. If you really want to minimise the impact while we work through our policy, that can be implemented tomorrow. Just do not arrest, do not charge—as simple as that.

It has a racial dimension, a real racial dimension because the stop and search laws almost invariably target certain parts of the Island which are lower income parts of the island which have a higher propensity of blacks and young blacks and, therefore, that is what you are going to find in the stop and search umbrella, the net. And that needs to be stopped. So we cannot hide behind the appearing neutrality of laws when you know full well there is a profound impact on the young black males in our country. So that needs to be stopped.

Now, if it appears that we truly are interested in moving toward a more just society, and if we are recognising that now no one is going to go to jail for possession of small amounts, and if we are moving to a point where people are not going to be arrested for small amounts for personal use, then there needs to be some measure of justice for all those people who have faced convictions and the repercussions over the past few decades. And there is a remedy for that, Madam Deputy Speaker. The remedy is for the Government to encourage the Governor (because only the Governor can do this) to provide a pardon for every single person who was convicted for a marijuana offence lower than supply. That would—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: A refund might be a bit much.

But Madam Deputy Speaker, if we are serious about trying to correct the wrongs, if we recognise that the laws have been applied disproportionately on young black men, then this is the only appropriate remedy to take.

And so Premier, you hear me. Premier, I would encourage you on your weekly visit with the Governor to see if he could countenance such a measure. If you need me to come along with you, just let me know, because it is a matter . . . it is not something to be taken light-heartedly. It affects peoples' employment because, even though people would have been convicted of an offence, after a number of years an employer still asks, *Have you ever had a conviction?* And when you have to make a decision between five people and one person has a conviction, that person is not going to be considered by most employers. It is just that simple.

So let us take seriously our commitment to justice. Let us take seriously our commitment to making a more level playing field. Let us make a commitment to reducing the harm that is caused to society by these issues.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to speak a little bit about the Customs searches on the cruise ships. You know, maybe I am being a little bit too liberal. But I, for the life of me, do not understand why we are making searches on cruise ships. You have people who are coming here for a vacation, you are taking Government resources that are already strained, and you are going about doing random searches on these cruise ships. At the most they are going to get a fine in court; they are going to have a bad taste in their mouth about Bermuda. Yes, they should know our laws and no, they should not be bringing drugs into the Island, but what really is being gained by doing this? I do not know what society benefit is derived from it. I do not know what goal is really being accomplished.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: It does not deter tourists. Clearly, it does not.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: Yes.

The Tourism Minister is saying it deters the tourists from coming back—that is correct—but it does not deter them from bringing it in the first place. So what is the real benefit?

So again, let us keep our focus on harm reduction. How we can reduce the harm to society by the policies that we put in place. And this is, again, a very simple matter.

Now, medicinal use of marijuana. I have had this discussion with some of my friends over the decades about medicinal use, and if you read some of the reports, Madam Deputy Speaker, you would think that marijuana will cure every single ill. I keep reading report after report of what marijuana can do. And I have to just smile because there is no super drug, but the proponents of it certainly think there is. And my friends that I talk to say, *Well, you know, it has all these medicinal purposes.* I say, *Well, is that why you want it legalised?* And they just start smiling because the reality is that while marijuana does clearly provide some medical benefits, and it needs to be examined in a way in which it can be provided for medical use, that medical use oftentimes does not include having THC as the component of the marijuana.

The THC is the narcotic; but the medicinal benefits come from outside of just the THC that is contained in the marijuana. So you do not need to get high to get the medical benefits. So if you are really serious about medicinal use, then we need to examine that. But I can assure you most of the people I talk to just want to find any other reason why we can, you know, legalise weed. They have no intention of using it for medicinal purposes; they want to be able to smoke it.

Now, one of the encouraging things in the collaborative report is that they say one of their goals is to reduce the overall use of marijuana, which is encouraging because for me the use of marijuana is not the moral issue. I am not going to moralise about it. I do not feel the same compunction that my colleague Roban felt in having to declare his habits over the decades. But the issue, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that smoking anything is just not good for you. It is just not healthy. And so I look at the marijuana question in this part of the debate as a primarily health-focused issue.

You want to be able to have people reduce consumption over time because it is going to lead to healthier communities. Now you will have people who will continue to smoke as you have people who smoke cigarettes and so the policy should be designed to ensure that people are not penalised for personal use,

but at the same time you have an extensive campaign designed to reduce overall consumption. I think that is the healthy way of approaching it.

We need to find ways to do that because the war has failed. The war on drugs has failed. The global estimates of that . . . less than 10 per cent of the drugs coming into any country are actually seized. So if 90 per cent is getting in, clearly, the deterrent factor, the interdiction component, is not working. So spending more resources is unlikely to derive any real benefit. You might get the occasional big bust as you see on some of the high seas where large shipments have been seized and so forth, but, fundamentally, the drugs are going to come in. So if you want to reduce use, the best way is to engage in a substantial campaign about health.

That is what happened to cigarette use. Once the international campaign kicked in regarding the harmful effects of cigarettes you saw a significant decline in overall use from the 1970s to today and the same could apply, notwithstanding the medicinal benefits that marijuana can provide in some cases. But I stand by my position that it is not a super drug. There are those who argue that . . . well, like I said, we are going to have an extensive debate about all of these matters, and that is the beauty of having a democratic societal structure.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are some countries now that are beginning to incorporate the drug economy into their national accounts because it has become such an important part of the economy that it makes sense to incorporate it. I do not know how we would do that here and people who are better at financial modelling could do that, but it would be very interesting to see what the economic impact is of the drug economy. I think Italy has decided to incorporate drugs and prostitution into their national accounts.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: Italy, yes. Now, I do not know if you want to—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Walton Brown: There are some who will see drugs and prostitution as a false equivalent, others see the start of a continuum, but we will leave that for other Members to debate.

But the point is that if you believe something is such a significant part of your economy, then it makes sense to calculate its impact and incorporate it into your overall figures because the shadow economy still provides employment. The shadow economy is still providing for purchases of goods and services, and so if you ignore it, in doing so you deflate the overall value of what that economy provides. So it makes sense to incorporate the drug economy numbers into our national accounts so we get a better

handle on it. It is very important to do that. So I am hoping that Government will at least consider that part of it because it is an important component of those figures.

Now, in order to address the issue of addiction, very . . . there is a lot of research done on marijuana use. But the incidence of addiction is very low. When you look at other drugs—cocaine and heroin and so forth—addiction levels are very high. So it is very low when it comes to marijuana. There are some who might have a psychological dependence, but there is very little [evidence] in terms of physical addiction to it. And so that raises a very interesting question about what kind of policy recommendations should be appropriate in dealing with those who do, in fact use, because there are many who will use it on a weekly basis or every other week. Do they need treatment? Probably not. But the mindset that exists in some corners of this community is that any use constitutes abuse, and that is clearly not the case.

Again, you only say it is abuse if you want to moralise about it. Having a glass of wine or two every night would not be considered abusive unless you are an alcoholic. But for the most part it is not abuse. So we need to separate the issue of use of a drug from abuse and when . . . it is particularly important when dealing with marijuana and alcohol. Use and abuse are not one in the same. You need to be able to separate the two and make the appropriate decision in terms of policy.

Madam Deputy Speaker, my final comment . . . I have five minutes left?

The Deputy Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. Walton Brown: My final comment relates to the issue of young people. We have had some surveys undertaken, and I will declare my interest because I used to do the drug surveys of high school students. I did a survey of high school students in 1989, 1991 and 1994, and at that point we surveyed every single student in high school—both private and public—and we were able to get some very interesting results which were designed to lead to policy out of that.

Unfortunately, the last survey that was undertaken of high school students only included the public school students. For some reason, which I will not disclose on the floor, the private schools were not covered by the survey and so it is impossible to make sound policy with respect to young people when your data are incomplete. It is important that we assess the entirety of the school population or do a random sample.

You might not want to have the expense of a census of [all the] school students, but you might want to do a random sample of school students—public and private—to get a real sense of the nature and extent of use. We want to know what the age of commencement is, on average, of marijuana and other

drugs. We want to find out the social, economic conditions that exist within those communities in order to effect policy. And do not think, Madam Deputy Speaker, that there is just one social demographic that uses drugs or marijuana. It permeates the community. But it is important to have good data because it is only on the back of good data where you get sound policy. So it is very important that this be done.

I applaud the Cannabis Reform Collaborative for calling for a raise in the age of using marijuana to 21. And that is because a lot of the research shows that when you commence smoking weed at a young age (under 20) it is more likely to have a detrimental impact on your brain development. All right? More so than with alcohol. So it is important that the science kick in to facilitate the policy development stage. We cannot just formulate policy because we get up on the floor of the House and say we should do this or we should do that. It should be based on information and research.

The research that is coming out now is showing a clear relationship between starting smoking marijuana at a young age (before 20, 21) and the detrimental impact. So I applaud the Cannabis Reform Collaborative for calling for an increase (it is not an increase, but a setting an age at 21). Even though Government may not go for legalisation, at least they recognise in their report that there is a problem with anyone starting to use marijuana under 21.

So with those words, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will sit down and hope that we can have a much informed debate on this very important topic.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much, indeed.

The Chair now recognises the Member from St. George's North, constituency 1, Mr. Kenneth L. Bascome.

You have the floor.

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: Good afternoon, Madam Deputy Speaker, and good afternoon to the listening audience.

First of all, let me extend congrats to the Honourable Minister for having the fortitude to bring this Bill for the discussion. I believe that we have matured. I do not believe that 10 years ago this discussion would have ever been allowed to come to this place.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: You will have your opportunity.

[Laughter]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: Madam Deputy Speaker, as you will be aware, I work with young people. So I believe this is an opportunity for us as a

Government—and when I say “as a Government” I am including everyone that is sitting in this Honourable Chamber—I believe that we have the opportunity to have a full discussion and to seriously look at decriminalisation of marijuana.

On a daily basis I engage young people and I say to them, *It is still illegal so you have to protect yourself because if you are stopped and you are deemed to be prosecuted it will eliminate you having the opportunity to travel to the United States of America.* Most young people say, *Well, I don't have to go to the US.* But it is beautiful to be able to go to the airport and to be able to go to the US.

I am asked on a daily basis to write letters of support for men and women who have been in trouble with the law for being in possession of small quantities of marijuana. So I believe here is an opportunity for us as legislators to seriously look at the decriminalisation of marijuana. I understand that people will say it does harm to people and things of that nature. And when you say you want to raise the age of people to be able to engage in smoking of marijuana, you are now going to create another monster for our young people to get into trouble. And we are going to resort to . . . let us look at an analogy of riding a moped, Madam Deputy Speaker. I can recall when I was 16, you could not tow anybody on the back of your cycle over the age of 16. So what you did, particularly if you had a young lady on the back of your bike, you would ask her to smile at the policeman.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: You would ask her to—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: Well, brother I am about 10 years older than you, maybe you do not understand that.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: No, no, you brought it back into play.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, just stay focused on the Chair please.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Kenneth (Kenny) Bascome: Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I am only using an analogy and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition thought that they brought that law into play, but that was law when I was 16, that you could not tow anyone on an auxiliary cycle over the age of 16—just using an analogy. So

when you speak about going back in time, most laws have not just been created. But I am saying, again, that we have to seriously look at reforming this particular legislation on marijuana.

I am going to say to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that every time an American Consul comes to Bermuda I make special overtures to engage those individuals who come to Bermuda to build some sort of a relationship with them because I know that young people are continually asking me if I will assist them to be able to get waivers.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am asked on a continual basis to go to court with young people who have been caught with small quantities of marijuana. So I am saying that it has had an impact on young black males more than anybody because we are a majority population. I say it in my own humble opinion. I talk with young people. I also advise them to be very careful with whom they sit and engage. I do not tell them not to because they are going to do it. But I am saying that I believe we have come this far and I am hopeful that as Honourable Members in this Chamber that we will have serious discussions and serious thoughts about reforming the marijuana laws in this country so that we can go forward and join in with the rest of the world.

And as far as the cruise ship policy is concerned, the police only go on board the cruise ships when the agents or the cruise principal invites them to come.

Madam Deputy Speaker, short, brief and to the point: We need to look seriously at reforming our cannabis laws.

Thank you, ma'am.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much.

The Chair now recognises the Member from Southampton East, constituency 30 *[sic]*, the Honourable Zane J. S. De Silva, Shadow Minister of Tourism.

You have the floor, Member.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Constituency 29, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you very much.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this topic today reminds me of one of my favourite sayings and it goes something like this: *I used to be indecisive, but now I am not so sure.*

And, you know, that saying, it really speaks for itself on this topic. As I am sure many Members that will talk after me will be like many Members that spoke before me. And whilst one or two of us will be straight left and the other one will be straight right, I think that you will hear from many of us in this House today that youths could use that saying today—I *used to be indecisive, but now I am not so sure.*

Madam Deputy Speaker, you will know that when I used to hold the Ministry of Health and certainly when I was Shadow Minister of Health, I had many conversations with regard to smoking. And I am talking about cigarettes. Now we know that Bermuda, I am proud to say, had the lowest percentage of smokers in the OECD [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development]. And I must say that I am proud that under a PLP Government we brought legislation that stopped smoking in a lot of public places. But be that as it may, we do have one of the lowest percentages in the OECD—the lowest.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have a problem with people smoking cigarettes because of what it does to one's health. I had a problem when my mother used to smoke cedar bark—

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Remember that? Now, I do not know if my mama used to smoke cedar bark because she was trying to be one of the crowd, or because it gave her a nice buzz. Knowing my mama, it was because she could get a nice buzz. But anyway be that what it may.

So now we are onto weed and, Madam Deputy Speaker, let me lay down for the record I certainly smoked enough weed in my day.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Oh, I did. Okay? Been there, done that. So I think when it comes to smoking . . . and I used to smoke cigarettes too. Okay? So been there, done that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we are talking about decriminalisation. We are talking about legalisation of marijuana. Just today, I think, the Honourable Member Terry Lister, laid a motion before the House, testing MPs—random drug testing for MPs. Okay. All right. Well, which comes first the chicken or the egg? What are we going to do about this situation? And we will have some talks about that motion I am sure in due course. I will certainly have my say on that, Madam Deputy Speaker.

But we have in this country, and I will stand to be corrected, but we have in Bermuda millions of dollars of drugs that are confiscated every year—millions. And I think the statistics for the first two quarters of 2013 last year were about \$2.5 million. So if you just double that—say \$5 million—for the year last year but it is not . . . and this was down significantly over 2012. And I believe that figure was around \$12 million to 15 million confiscated. And if I remember correctly, and the Minister or anyone can gladly . . . I will sit down and yield, but I have to believe, if I remember correctly, I think the Police Commissioner said that that only accounted for about 15 per cent to 20 per cent of the drugs that are brought into Bermuda.

Now those numbers may be off a bit but it is significant! There are a lot of people using drugs in Bermuda to the tunes of millions and millions of dollars by a large core section of people in Bermuda.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, where is this going to take us? Why were these laws put in place to begin with? And I think the Honourable Member, my colleague, Mr. Walton Brown, touched on it. Who put these laws into place to begin with and why? Who and why? That was interesting that Mr. Walton Brown made the comment because I had a chat with a good friend of mine earlier today and we had the same conversation.

Look at the number of young black men that are in our prison. How many young white men do we have in our prison? How many young people—black and white—smoke weed? And the Honourable Member, Mr. Bascome, said just now that the reason that is [the case] is because we are a predominantly black country. Are you kidding me? There are many white young people that are smoking weed in this country and doing other drugs too. But why is it that the majority of our young black men are the make-up in prison? Why are these laws brought about?

Now I ask that question because of this, is it now because weed is becoming acceptable by the lighter make-up of our community and, therefore, *Look, let's look at these laws and let's make some adjustments.* Is this why? That is a question I ask, Madam Deputy Speaker. Are we here today talking about the possibility of legalising marijuana because it has become more acceptable by the community? Well, suppose we all decided next month that crack was more acceptable by the community. Are we going to be up here talking about, *Look, let's relax the laws on crack. Maybe we can have "X" amount per month, per week, per day.* Are we going to go that way? Are we going to legalise that too?

Madam Deputy Speaker, decriminalisation—we have to do something about this. Not only do we have to do something about that but we have to look at the laws that are on the books. Why is it that some of our young men can go to court for a small quantity of weed and get a heavy fine and/or do some time, but others get off? Why is that? The laws need to be looked at as well. We read about it every year. This segment of the community seems to take a lot more punishment than another sector of the community. Why is that? And the Honourable Member, Mr. Walton Brown, said it very, very, very specifically—the stop and search laws—who . . . who . . . who . . . really, I would like to see the statistics on the racial make-up of the stop and . . . and my Learned Member, Kim Wilson, says that is in here. Yes, yes, yes.

But Madam Deputy Speaker, these are the things that I think show another picture you know. They show another picture. So whilst we are talking about decriminalisation and legalisation, we need to look at our laws. We need to look at the whole picture.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as I said, I certainly had my spin with marijuana in my day. I had my spin. I was lucky. I never got caught. What about all the young men that did get caught? And one of the Members, I do not know if it was one of the Government Members or one of us, that said, *Are we going to have a period that we are going to look at where folks who are on the stop list, that we take them off the list?* A pardon.

That is something that should be high on the agenda as well. Are we going to do that? If we are going to look at these things, we have to go way back. And I hate to think how many of our young black men, in particular, over the years, have not had the opportunities for employment because they have this on their record—some for as little as a joint. And if they had been honest on their interviews, Madam Deputy Speaker, what do you think happened? What do you think happened? And of course if they do not get the opportunity for employment . . . see, it has got this huge effect that back in the day—20 or 25 years ago—opportunities were lost for employment, so therefore the wealth gap comes into play.

So how many of our young people were denied opportunities of employment and denied opportunities for education? They could not go overseas whilst others went over and received education, came back and got higher paying jobs. Do you see where I am getting at? Do you see where I am driving at?

Now all of a sudden you have another generation that is coming up that has been deprived because the father or the mother did not get the education that they could have. And no matter what we say in this House, education is key. Education is key for employment opportunities and for schooling opportunities. The earlier we start, the more educated we are, we should have a better chance, and our children, and our grandchildren, and our great grandchildren. So what has happened to those that were not afforded the employment and educational opportunities over time?

You want to draw an analogy? Some of our Government Members like to draw analogies. You could take it right back to slavery days. Some of our slaves . . . you get caught reading a book, you get whipped. Whereas other races you could read books. *I catch you reading a book I am going to whip you!* No, sir. So the education over the years blossoms amongst—and let us be real—the white community, while the black community was held back and oppressed. So what has that done to our wealth gap that is here for us all to see today? It was not that long ago, really. It was not that long ago—a couple of generations. So you see where this goes?

So this is a good opportunity for us to fix that in terms of our young people. And look, we can tell our young people, *Don't smoke weed*. I pulled my son up when he was 12 years old—he and his little neighbour (I used to call him my stepson). Father

called me, *Those boys are smoking weed*. We had a meeting . . . 12 years old. I had to give him credit. I had my first joint when I was 11, but let me say this here, we had a conversation. And we all know in this room we have got family members—whether they be close or distant. You could preach to family members all you want.

I remember, I am sure all of us remember our parents saying, *Don't speed on that bike*—especially the young men (or older men in this House)—*Don't speed, don't pack race. Okay, daddy, no problem*. Go right out the door and what did we do? Ducking wind behind the handle bars and we are gone. Because you know what, that is what youngsters do. You tell them don't do it, but you know they are going to do it. White and black, they are going to do it. We can preach to them. We hope that, you know, they make good decisions in life, but they are going to do these things.

This particular one, decriminalisation—let us not penalise our young people. Let us not penalise them. Once upon a time, I remember my roommate when they came out with that law, if you went over, I think it was 40, you got three months in prison! One of my mates was the first one to go up there. Lumpde-bump Bremar from Dockyard was one of the first. He did three months. Okay? You can tell our young people, *Don't do these things*, but you know they will make mistakes. So let us fix it.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are a lot of comparisons being drawn between alcohol and weed. And my Leader may differ with me because, you know, one thing about our Leader he lets us just . . . you know, hey, just free flow, do what you have got to do. But we do not differ that far because I have been down both roads. I have a little drink. I have a little smoke. Been there, done that. But I will say this, I have seen the guys that drink. They might go for a couple of beers, the next thing is a couple of drinks, highballs; next thing it could be shots. The big difference is that it is legal. Okay?

Now what happens with weed? Guys can say look . . . and I know guys that have smoked weed still smoke it today, have been smoking for 40 years and [there] is nothing wrong with them. It's cool. I know many, and you probably know some too, Madam Deputy Speaker, that [are] still smoking weed. But let me tell you this here. I have seen guys that graduate from weed, to speed, to hash, to coke, to crack, to heroin. Some of the guys I used to roll with when I was younger are no longer here because they made those steps. And I have seen it. Does that only happen to people who smoke weed? No. You go from—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, yes. The Honourable Leader says you go from alcohol to coke too. And I have seen that too.

So where do we end up? Where did we go? What do we say? You know what I say, *well, alcohol is legal. Weed could be legal. We could decriminalise it.* But let me say this. I will tell my children. I will tell my grandchildren and any young person, *Look, try to refrain from all. Refrain from all. Don't smoke cigarettes, don't smoke weed, and don't drink alcohol.* And I put my hand up, I still drink. I can have a cocktail when I am ready. I put my hand up, Madam Deputy Speaker, I can do that. No ifs, ands, or buts. But I say: Do it in moderation if you are going to do it at all.

We talked about cruise ships just now. And, of course, I am totally against us . . . I do not care if they are informed or not, cruise ship passengers are known to smoke weed. If those guys want to smoke weed, let them smoke weed. If they want to let them go, a lot of people that cruise, smoke weed. If they want to smoke weed and they smoke on the ship, Madam Deputy Speaker, do not go up in the ship looking for them. Now, they bring their weed on shore and they get caught, well, take your licks . . . take your licks.

I was also told by a young person (this is a young person, I was in with a group of them actually), *Well, I tell you what. You guys decriminalise and legalise weed, your tourist industry is going to go through the roof in a year.* Now, I do not know how true that is, but that is the thinking of some of our young people. And again, MP Walton Brown, touched on he has been to Amsterdam many, many times. And of course, his—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: He has got family there, okay. We will not talk about the reasons he goes, okay. All right. He goes to see family members. But I believe Mr. Brown gave us the tale of two stories.

Now I have friends that go to Amsterdam on a regular basis too. And of course, it will be a tale of two stories. You will see those that free up and do their thing. You will see a bad side, a dark side of Amsterdam too. Now my son-in-law has been out there and he has told me some stories. Yes, he has—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Well, he does sing about it too. I will put my hand up.

Now this is what my colleagues told me, Madam Deputy Speaker, but he knows that I only listen to select tunes that he sings. Now these younger Members probably listen to all his music, I can put my hand up and he knows that I do not. In fact, he may be in, in a little while so he might be able to tell you himself.

But Madam Deputy Speaker, let me finish on this note. I think we need to decriminalise weed and stop hurting our young people in particular. I think we

really need to seriously consider that. When it comes to legalising weed, I think much more discussion is needed.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

Are there any other speakers that would like . . . thank you.

The Chair recognises the Minister of Health and Environment, the Honourable Jeanne J. N. Atherden, from Pembroke West, constituency 19.

You have the floor.

Hon. Jeanne J. Atherden: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I want to start off by saying two things. I am going to look at this particular report from the perspective of health and the ramifications on health. And I guess it is rather . . . not ironic, but coincidental, and yet good, that this morning I started to talk about steps to wellness and I started to talk about behavioural issues, because behavioural issues account for things like the abuse of alcohol, the impact of tobacco, and as you recognise, marijuana is something that has a behavioural risk attached to it.

Today I just want to talk about two aspects of it. One, from the perspective of the impact that it has on our young people, and I will get into some of what I call the side effects because I think . . . and some peripheral issues, but I really want to focus on what has been given to me as it relates from our medical professions, from our medical consultants, and the persons in our medical department that is indicating to us that the use of marijuana has some very serious effects as it relates to use by young people and what it does.

So I just want to discuss a few things because we talked about our young men and we talked about what happens to our young men. I guess I have a tendency to look at things more from a system issue and not turn around and put it so much into the individual. I look at causes rather than looking at effects. And so from my perspective, I am saying that if our young men are using marijuana early and it is having the effect on them, because there is the suggestion that at an early age it changes their thinking, it really changes how they develop. And so from that perspective, we have to be concerned. Bermuda needs all of its people. It needs our young people very significantly, so that is why when I start to look at this particular report, I feel that I have to at least turn around and put out there a few things that we need to consider.

The report actually suggests that more education should be given out and it suggests that a warning system should be given out there. And I guess what I am trying to say is the fact that because the Department of Health, the Ministry of Health, its job is to try to turn around and make sure that young people

... and not only young people, but everybody understands the effect that marijuana has. But I know that by starting at it at an early age it is going to have some really serious issues, and after that we get ourselves into a situation where we cannot get back.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to just highlight a few things that the medical experts have been telling us. And I guess I am going to go on the basis of from the medical perspective, there is a tendency to try and deal with fact, to try and deal with evidence. So when I try and give some information, I am giving information that the medical profession is stating in terms of evidence that they are seeing collectively from their counterparts and from the medical body that they are part of. And so I am going to look at it from the point of view of the impact of the recommendations that are in this report and also the impact that it will have on the well-being of the people of the Island because we have to look at evidence on the basis of the health impact as well as the social impact. And I am saying that because, you know, it is very important ... health ... we know that we have already said that the risk associated to overuse of alcohol, the risk associated with tobacco use, and the marijuana use will have that same type of health effect.

But we also have to be mindful of the fact that there is the social impact, the effect that it has on the society around us. Right now there is evidence that the use of cannabis is starting to increase and there is a suggestion that because there is the relaxation of the [view on] cannabis, and trying to determine whether you are going to ... not so much make it legal or not legal, but whether you are going to turn around and go after it as forcefully as you used to ... that lots of young people, because it has relaxed a little bit more that the young people are starting to use it earlier and use it more frequently. And that is resulting in some serious concerns in terms of the medical profession. So we have to make sure that when we start looking at that, especially as it relates to public policy, that we are looking at everything that is very important.

So that from my perspective, I just want to make sure that I draw our attention to the fact that right now the consensus is that marijuana use is still harmful. Okay, that is the consensus. And I am just talking about the ... these are the conclusions from the medical profession and so that from that perspective, the belief is that Government has to protect its youth from access to cannabis especially an early introduction to it. So while I was pleased to hear that they were talking about 21 years of age, I still think that from the health perspective you want to try and not have people go down there—period.

You want to try and reduce the impact on your young people, and I am not looking at it just from our males, I am looking at it from our males and females. Whether you like it or not, I remember that there used

to be statistics that were given out and you used to talk about “men,” and men being serious drinkers and men being more affected by alcohol. Now women are right in there as well, so we do not have to talk about the men and the effect, we have to talk about our young people—period.

When we were talking earlier about our young men and things that happen to them and we were talking about them being incarcerated and things happening to them, I guess I look at that and I say what we have to do is make sure that that type of profiling and that type of inconsistent application of the law needs to be dealt with. And you deal with that. You deal with the inconsistent application and you do not turn around and say just because certain people have been profiled and taken into situations that have had negative results for them, i.e., being on the stop list, et cetera. You do not turn around all of a sudden and say change that and legalise it. You say let us stop profiling people. Let us stop turning around. Let us make it consistent in our application. Do not turn around and look at one group of persons just because they happen to look differently from another. We have to be consistent.

But as I said we want to make sure, Madam Deputy Speaker, that as we go forward there should be no type of profiling. We want to make sure that ... and that is the reason that we want to make sure. So I guess what I want to suggest is that the public health opinion is that the relaxation of the marijuana laws in terms of increasing its accessibility is, perhaps, something that we need to stand back and look at. And we need to look at it for the reasons that I am just going to highlight a little bit more.

Right now when you started looking at the suggestion of reducing it and making it potentially not illegal, or decriminalisation, the other thing that has been tended to be put out is the suggestion of turning around and saying, well let us talk about medical marijuana. And then you sort of lumping, what I call the two things in it, saying that medical marijuana has some value and therefore let us turn around and let us relax it or decriminalise it and then you sort of put the two together as if to say they go hand in hand. And I believe that that is not the case.

I believe the issue of marijuana and what it does to you is something that we need to be aware of, as I said, the impact on our young people, the impact on them by getting to it at an earlier age. And then you turn around and you look at medical marijuana and you say that, yes, while there is some suggestion that medical marijuana has some benefits, the suggestion is, also from the medical practitioners, is the fact that if you are going to utilise it for medical benefit then it becomes like a drug. And like a drug it should go through the proper testing and have the proper prescription for particular illnesses and, therefore, you make sure that there is a proper procedure put in place.

So the belief is that there has not been sufficient testing done to say that marijuana in its entirety is something that one would want to turn around and prescribe; that you should be turning around and looking at it from the perspective of saying that for certain illnesses it might be something that should be prescribed. And once the profession goes through and sorts out what it can do, how it should be prescribed, how it should be tested to make sure that there are not any side effects . . . because just like other drugs, you and I—all of us—know here that some drugs have been actually put on the market and before you know it they had side effects that were worse than what you hoped to overcome. So the medical practitioners are suggesting that the use of marijuana for medical use should be something that should be subject to a certain amount of testing, a certain amount of regulation.

Now Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to be clear that when I am talking about this right now I am just trying to talk about it from the risk to health and the well-being of the individuals. And I am doing that because if at some point in time after we have all the discussion, and if at some point in time a decision is made, then, of course, the Health Department would turn around and it would do what it would normally do, which is to turn around and make sure that proper regulations are put in place, make sure that proper controls are there.

But for now, because this is a consultation process and this is designed for us to make sure that we get all the information out there, I just believe that I have to at least alert the public to the concerns that have been made by the medical profession that right now cannabis and marijuana—there are some issues attached to that that we should look at.

And before I sit down because I am not going to go through and get into a lot of extra discussion, I just want us to think that on . . . I think it was page 67 of the report there was the suggestion—sorry, [58]. This was the recommendation, “That the Minister use the statutory powers to proactively enact reform without taking the topic to the House of Assembly.” Well, at least the Minister is making sure that we have the opportunity to have a good look.

“Decriminalise personal possession and personal cultivation immediately.” I think that enough has been said, and I am sure will be said, today about what we should do. And I am not going to get into the conversation about it being a business and how many people are involved in that because I think, like everything else, as long as it is illegal then I think we have to do the right thing as it relates to trying to not get people involved in illegal activity.

I must admit I was intrigued by listening to Honourable Member De Silva talking about what he had done over time. And I think, by and large, you have two types of people—you have persons that decide that it is illegal and therefore that prevents them from getting involved in it, and others that say, *I don't*

care and I am going to go down that path and I am prepared to take the chance. So in some respects by still making it illegal we also keep a certain number of people from trying it and a certain number of people from not getting on a path that might result in them having some very negative consequences and some very negative knock-on effects from Bermuda.

So, with respect to the drug control, I do think that we have . . . as I said, whatever we do, whatever we keep right now, we have to make sure that there is consistency. If there is a degree . . . and I think the police were talking about warnings and the police were talking about some things that they were doing to sort of lessen the consequences, that I am a firm believer in consistency. I am a firm believer in that when you start to do something there should be the equality—it should be all across the board. Everybody should benefit from it.

That is the type of thing that we have to do. We have to start turning around and not going backwards and talk about “XYZ” did something bad and therefore let us keep remembering that “XYZ” did something bad. We have to say never let that happen again. Make sure that, going forward, we are equal in our treatment and therefore we try and stop people from utilising drugs because it has been proven, and the medical profession is still saying that it does cause the young people, when they start getting in it too early, to then go on to other types of drugs, other types of things which have some very detrimental effects.

And last but not least, Madam Deputy Speaker, if you think about it from protecting our heritage, protecting Bermuda, we want all of our young people to be as switched on, as productive, as (if you will) unaffected by some of these negative things as possible. So from my perspective, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is in our interest to try and not get them to go into something which has the result of making them have some very negative psychological in addition to health issues.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am sure there is going to be lots more discussion and I am sure that we are going to have another opportunity to talk about this. But I just wanted to highlight some things from the medical profession side because I think it is very important.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Are there any other Members that would like to speak to the motion?

Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Shadow Minister of [Community, Culture and Sports], Pembroke East Central, constituency 16, Mr. Michael A. Weeks.

You have the floor.

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: Good afternoon, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I am honoured to be able to be a part of this discussion. I think this discussion is long, long overdue.

Madam Deputy Speaker—how can I put it? I have always been of the mindset that this discussion had to be had. Some kind of reform is necessary. Most of the effects of the current laws obviously have been really hard and we heard again, have been adversely born by the young black men of this country.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as I go along, I want to say that there by the grace of God go I. As a youngster coming along, I too was one of those young men that delved and dabbled in the smoking of marijuana.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I never saw any wrong in it but I knew that because of the law—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: And I heard someone say, *Because my momma knew*. She is absolutely right. My momma and dad would have taken hold of me. But there by the grace of God I was lucky.

I have a lot of friends who were not so lucky, who have been caught and prosecuted for the use of marijuana, for something that they believed in. And for a lot of them [their] dreams [were] shattered, [their] dreams [were] deferred for something that many feel is not nearly as harmful as alcohol.

Some may touch on it or not, but I think most of the people that we talk to feel that alcohol is the issue that needs to be addressed. Because when I am out there talking to my constituents, like others, and they say to me, *Minister, how could you guys not discuss the legalisation of marijuana when you still adhere and agree to alcohol?* My answer to that has always been that the time will come. I think the time is now for us to talk about what we are going to do. There are some options. Are we going to leave it as it is, meaning the laws? Are we going to decriminalise it? Or are we going to legalise it?

To decriminalise it, Madam Deputy Speaker, in my humble opinion does not change much. It very well may leave it in the hands of the drug dealer and still keep our young men under the gun and have the potential for being arrested and incarcerated for use.

So my thing is that, if we are going to look at it, why not look at it much like the way we have regulated and we tax alcohol? There are questions about our youngsters and how we are going to keep those drugs away from our youngsters, but I think if we tax it and regulate it [will have] taken it out of the hands of the drug dealer so that that would no longer be a commodity to the gangs. It can create some jobs. We could even decide on whether or not, because we are going to look at reform, we are going to allow people to have their own little garden—10 x 10, 15 x 15, or

whatever—for self use. There are some options that we need to look at.

So we talk about the many uses of marijuana. One thing I can say [is] that regardless of whether or not people are stretching the imagination, we can have a conversation of uses of marijuana. But never can we have a real conversation of the uses of the legal drug we call *alcohol*. So I think the time is now for us to really, really look at the consequences of what has been happening, as to why marijuana first became illegal. You know, because there are many stories that I have come across in my dealings and in my limited research as to the reason why marijuana became illegal in the first place. Was it political? I think we do know that. When it first became, was made illegal and it was aimed at penalising people of colour. We know this.

We fast forward 40, 50 years. And in this country, here in Bermuda, the vast majority of those that are being penalised are people of colour. And they happen to be young black men. And a lot of them have had their dreams shattered, as I have said. A lot of them have had a lot of potential, Madam Deputy Speaker, and right now I think it is on us. It is our responsibility to at least look at some reforms, at a minimum, Madam Deputy Speaker. We cannot leave it as it is.

We have come into the 21st century. There are a lot of countries and other nations worldwide that have looked at reform and they are decriminalising and legalising marijuana. The only issue that I would have if we do decriminalise, legalise, is what impact would that have on our ability to travel as far as being put on the stop list and whatnot? Would those young men that are currently on these stop lists, or have been incarcerated, would they get a reprieve? Would they in some way get amnesty?

I see some of the people that were on the committee. Let me take a minute to tell them that you guys have done an excellent job and you have started us on the quest to have some real talk about marijuana.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Michael A. Weeks: So I have to take my hat off to them.

I do not know how far back we can go if we do get decriminalisation as far as those that have been punished. Can they get some kind of remuneration or whatever? But I think these are the kind of questions that we have to answer. We know that it has been top heavy with people of colour who have been criminalised by their love of marijuana, but we also have to know how we can rectify that. We know it is a problem.

See, we know it is a problem, depending on the age group that I have spoken to in my travels is the answer I get. Some of the older folk want to leave

the laws as they are. Some people in the age group from 45 to 60 [are] looking for some kind of reform. Those younger definitely want legalisation. But I think we have to come to some kind of understanding that reform is needed in our country, Madam Deputy Speaker. And some have even said that if we could tax and regulate it, it could create jobs and business opportunities. It could get some of our men off the streets who are selling it illegally. It could stop that black market enterprise.

I could tell a personal testimony that as I got older I decided to stay away from it. Not because it was deemed to be illegal, but because it was illegal. I did not want my life disrupted like a lot of my counterparts were. But now that I have been elected to speak for them, I am happy to be a part of this conversation and I would just give others the opportunity to chime in.

So thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for listening to me.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

The Chair now recognises the Member from St. George's West, constituency 2, Ms. Nandi S. Outerbridge.

You have the floor.

Ms. Nandi Outerbridge: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I really wanted to weigh in on this discussion today as a young person, obviously, and express my personal views and, you know, thoughts about the decriminalisation of marijuana. As everyone probably knows I am an '80s baby—late '80s—so I am right there in the era of my peers wanting this to be decriminalised. So I figured I need to speak up about this.

In my discussions that I have had with some of my peers and people that are in my age bracket or even younger, getting caught with marijuana has seemed to jeopardise their future. And the three things I really wanted to weigh in on were travel, education and employment.

I do recognise that the DPP are able to give cautions out for small amounts of possession, but we know that this is not always the case. And the current law on the books as it pertains to this particular topic, you know, penalises young Bermudians, especially black young men in this country because of the criminality that is attached to this.

I believe that we should go down the road of decriminalisation (and that is just my personal view) with no consequences, because when it pertains to travel, people are on the stop list, and what you have is younger people who have made bad decisions or poor decisions at a young age now in their 30s—31, 32—wanting to travel with their family and they cannot. I even had friends who were not able to travel to my wedding because they were on the stop list from

things that they had done 10 or 15 years ago. So it is very unfortunate.

I just wanted to speak to my conversations that I have had with some people in the community. Obviously, I run into a lot of people every day who want to discuss the decriminalisation or the legalities of marijuana and I just find it very unfortunate that young men that I talk to cannot travel and, you know, they are seeking opportunity overseas. They have this opportunity that has been presented outside of Bermuda but they have kind of been stopped in their tracks. They have been road blocked (I would say) because of the law as it pertains today.

I also want to speak not just about the young men, but young women who cannot further their education for their children, their grandchildren. And it is unfortunate. It is very unfortunate that they are not able to further their education overseas because they have been stopped at a young age or, you know, been caught with marijuana at a young age. Everyone knows, especially in this economy today, that you need education. As a Member said earlier today, education is key. And without it I do not know how you can survive, honestly.

Those were kind of like the three things that I wanted to touch on. Those were just my views on decriminalisation and where we should go. Like I said, I hope that we have the no consequence if we decide to take that road and, obviously, if we go into that direction what amounts will be considered a small possession will have to be discussed and things of that sort. I am fully understanding of that. But while my personal view does not reflect what this Government is going to do, I just wanted to weigh in on the conversation and express how I felt about the situation.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

The Chair now recognises the Shadow Minister of Health?

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Yes.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, from Sandys South Central, constituency 34, Ms. Kim N. Wilson.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am sorry that the Minister of Health is not actually in the Chamber now because I wanted to commend her for raising a number of the issues that I intended [to raise], and also addressing with Honourable Members this afternoon concerning particularly the health aspects and what the report speaks to with respect to same.

I also want to join in the chorus of commending the individuals that were part of producing this substantial report. I do not know if they were paid for

it, but the fact that they . . . I know they were not. But needless to say the fact that they devoted a lot of time and attention into generating this report I think they also all need to be commended.

I also was mindful of the fact that the Honourable Premier when he gave his brief indicated (and I think the Minister of Health also alluded to this) that this report will provide the basis for continued dialogue, because I was somewhat disheartened to see a lack of a lot of detail from organisations like the National Drug Commission who I would have expected to provide a lot of impetus to this in light of their mandate and the report that they just filed recently for the 2012 statistics insofar as children's attitudes towards drug abuse, alcoholism, et cetera. So I was a little bit disappointed that they did not provide as much input, or not as much input seems to be reflected. But recognising that this is the basis of the commencement of this exercise and the commencement of the dialogue and the conversation, I still wish to commend those individuals that compiled this report.

Also, Madam Deputy Speaker, with respect to the comments that were made by the Honourable Minister of Health, Minister Atherden, I, too, echo those sentiments particularly as it relates to the concerns raised by the medical profession as it relates to the development of a young person's brain and the, perhaps, adverse health ramifications associated with marijuana use particularly for young persons. And I am glad that she touched on that so there will not be any need for me to spend my 20 minutes dealing with that.

However, I want to take a different tack and wear my legal hat. I want to just turn to some of the concerns that I have and, perhaps, invite the Government to consider a number of suggestions that I think may warrant some consideration.

The Deputy Speaker: Member, just for your . . . you have actually 30 minutes.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Oh, okay. Thank you.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, when you speak about justice, to me, justice speaks about an equal application of the laws. You have a law that is applied equally to all individual citizens. That is what justice is to me.

However, when we have laws that are applied differently for one group of persons versus another group of persons then we do not have a just society. And when we do not have just societies then chaos erupts and discord happens between many persons. And I am speaking specifically, Madam Deputy Speaker, to the issues concerning the present war, per se, that we have on drugs, in particular as it relates to marijuana.

Now what do I mean by that? We have an abundance of statistical data. And, as my friend and colleague, the Honourable Walton Brown, always

speaks about statistics and statistics, I come from a similar purview insofar as everything has to be evidence based for me so that I can consider it all in front of me and then make somewhat of a valid decision, or at least be able to speak comfortably about a particular topic. And we have so much evidence and data that has been compiled—both internationally and, more particularly, here in Bermuda—that shows that black people are disproportionately over-represented in the criminal justice system, and black people overwhelmingly disproportionately seem to have entered the criminal justice system through marijuana possession.

Now what I mean by that, is that we have heard that and there are the statistics that confirm, that. No doubt the same amount of people that are of the white race, mixed race, other races, as our black race, engage in the use of marijuana. But then you have to ask the question, why does it seem that, disproportionately, there are more blacks in prisons for offences related to drug possession? And why are there more blacks also being arrested for possession of marijuana?

We have always heard, Madam Deputy Speaker, that there is this issue concerning the DPP caution guidelines that were introduced in which the DPP can indicate to the police that in these certain circumstances the police have the power to exercise their discretion to caution an individual for, let us say, a minor drug possession if the circumstances surrounding the arrest or the engagement with that person are such that it would confirm that it was simple personal use, and there were no high aggravating features like money and other things to suggest that this drug was for sale or for distribution. The individual admits culpability immediately with the police and in those types of circumstances the police have this discretion. But some may argue that when you give a person in a uniform, anybody, a discretion, then it does create on occasions inequality or an injustice because the police may not necessarily exercise that same discretion with the exact same circumstances equally on a person of the white race versus a person of the black race. So let us be real. We have statistics that confirm that.

So what I am wondering is whether the issue concerning the addressing of this whole issue of disparity with respect to an unjust system is, perhaps, if we can look at some examples that are used in other jurisdictions so that we can, perhaps, learn from those jurisdictions to see how we can, perhaps, better apply principles or legislative provisions, policies, et cetera, equally, particularly on . . . I am, of course, relating it back to the discussion at hand, which is as it relates to marijuana possession.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, I noticed that in the report (I am referring you to page 54) it speaks to the whole issue concerning the stop list. Now that is a very vexing topic, I am sure, for every single one of

us as we canvass the byways and highways of Bermuda. That comes up often.

And I wanted to spend my time addressing that aspect really quickly because I think that, perhaps, if the Government can consider some of the comments that I am going to make in a few moments, that in addition to addressing the issue of this racial disparity that happens all too often in Bermuda, as it relates to individuals' first encounter with the criminal justice system by virtue of possession of cannabis, that also we could perhaps address this whole issue of the stop list, which, as we have heard from the Honourable MP Outerbridge a few moments ago that she has colleagues and friends that were not even able to travel to her wedding simply because they are on the stop list.

And let me just back up a moment because there seems to be this misinformation out there and, again, I recognise that the Members and the public do not have a copy of the report that we are reading, but effectively the stop list is a . . . just like Bermuda. We can control who enters our shores. So if they roll up on a boat or they roll up at the airport, et cetera—pardon?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Okay.

The Deputy Speaker: It was. Thank you for that.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Oh, okay, whatever. You are welcome.

Just like Bermuda has the right to control who enters our shores, the United States likewise has that same right. And there has been developed over the years a process where the United States has said, *Look, if you have a particular conviction, we have legislation that we refer to as the Immigration Nationality Act 1952 and that Act governs who gets to go into the United States.* All right? And if you have certain convictions (i.e., a drug offence) then you are prohibited from entering into the United States. The United States Border Control can say, *Eh! Hold on a minute. Sorry, you have got a conviction. We are not going to allow you in.*

However, under that particular piece of legislation the United States has actually gone one step further and they have defined what a conviction is. And with your leave, Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to just read it really quickly for the edification [of Members] so that I can draw, hopefully, the conclusion insofar as perhaps the Government will consider some of the recommendations that I am going to speak about in a few moments that could address the issue of the disparity as well as providing some type of penalty, per se, concerning marijuana possession, a penalty which will not put the person on the stop list because it is not a conviction.

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed.

Mrs. Kim N. Wilson: Now, under the legislation, it indicates that under the INA (which is the Immigration Nationality Act that I just spoke about) a conviction is registered as the following:

1. A judgment of guilt by the court. Okay, the court. You have either said *I'm guilty* or the court has ruled that you are guilty; or
2. If no formal judgment, a finding of guilt by a judge or a jury. So a judge or a jury has so found that individual guilty of (and, again, I am using it for an illustration) possession of marijuana; and/or
3. A plea of *nolo*, which is basically something we do not have in our jurisdiction, but is something where there is a no contest. But I am not going to apply that here because that is more of a United States truism than it is in Bermuda. We do not have that provision.

In addition to those factors that I just spoke about, the imposition of some form of a punishment, a penalty or a restraint of liberty, i.e., imprisonment. So there this a punishment imposed, a penalty or a restraint of liberty—those would be “convictions.”

Now what I am submitting, the legislation in the United States also, Madam Deputy Speaker, goes on to say if you do not have a conviction then there is no issue concerning you being placed on the stop list. All right.

So let us talk about how we can, perhaps, amend . . . not necessarily amend our laws, but look at different policies here in Bermuda that could avoid an individual from being placed on the stop list and receiving a criminal conviction. And I am not standing here supporting decriminalisation or legalisation. I am saying that in certain circumstances the courts and/or the policy makers—the Government—can consider implementing these factors so that an individual recognises the severity of the penalty, because we have already spoken about the health consequences, et cetera. And then there is a penalty, per se, but it is not a criminal penalty so, therefore, the person is not on the stop list. And this is happening in a number of jurisdictions in the United States.

So for example, Madam Deputy Speaker, we can have what some jurisdictions refer to as a “three strikes rule.” And I am kind of combining a number of them to see whether or not this could work. Now just let me back up for a moment. We recognise that the listing that I have just indicated insofar as convictions would put a person the stop list principally because it is a criminal conviction. And I do not want to . . . never mind, I am sorry. I do not want to speak about how many times I met with the US Consul General or the United States Attorney General (who came to visit me in Bermuda), but needless to say, we will not go there. I think that was a little bit . . . I appreciate the Learned

and Honourable Mr. Pettingill submissions, but the reality is, I would hope the Government would perhaps consider this.

I am using this as an example. I do not know the weights, but let us say for example five grams. All right? So that is the illustration. So for possession—simple possession—if a person is caught with five grams, the police have no discretion. They see it; the person admits it is theirs. The instance is such that there is no aggravated feature to suggest that there are large caches of money and rah, rah, rah to show . . . All the evidence suggests and supports simple possession. The person says, *Yes, it's mine*. So that is it. So what can the police do, rather than put them in a criminal court?

Let us consider this. One, perhaps the police immediately confiscate it. So they have taken it away from that individual and they give them a warning and they issue a ticket, almost like a parking ticket, payable right then and there. So there is a fine that has been imposed. We are out of the criminal sanctions so, therefore, a conviction is not registered.

Let's do *three strikes you're out*. Let us say it happens again. Police pull this person up six months later. Again, they have got less than five grams, they admit it is theirs, the police give them this second warning (so to speak). Again, another fine. The fine is payable immediately. It is like a parking ticket, a traffic ticket, with no visor, so you get a \$50 fine automatically there. So it is payable right then and there on the spot.

Third time it happens. Then the courts get a little bit more serious and the courts can get involved. But we could perhaps consider something similar to what they refer to as a pre-sentence probation. So that individual now, this is the third time that they have been caught with less than five grams of marijuana, fines have not worked so they are now put before the court for a pre-sentence probation with conditions. Conditions could be you must go to drug treatment courses, whatever, circumstances such as that, and you may have to do "X" number of hours of community service, et cetera.

But the point is, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that the court is postponing the entry of a sentence. So that person does not have a conviction. So they come back before the courts and they are able to satisfy the court that they have done "X" number of [hours of] community service, they have done drug treatment, they have done everything that was ordered by the court. Then the court effectively does not even proceed to convict. They do not proceed to sentence. The person . . . it is not even an expunge because there is no conviction. The person walks out of the court having abided by the court ordered sanctions as well as the conditions that the court ordered.

So we are effectively keeping a person that perhaps is utilising marijuana for personal use out of the criminal justice system. We have just spared that

person, given them several opportunities, mind you, not to be convicted of an offence which . . . and we have all heard already today all of the serious ramifications that flow from that if you are placed on the US stop list.

All right, it is just a suggestion that perhaps the Government may want to consider.

And then after that person, Madam Deputy Speaker, has completed this period, like I said, the person is discharged. It is as if they had never been before the courts again.

There are a number of benefits that we have seen in the United States and other jurisdictions that have entered into arrangements such as this—alternative sanctions. And they found that for, one, it increases public safety because we are not spending so much of the police's time arresting people for simple possession, they give them a ticket and then they move on. So they are not having to spend time processing it, bringing a person into the police station, putting together a case file (because the person may plead not guilty). They have got to put together a case file and then six months later they go to court with the case file, prosecutors have been involved, et cetera, only for the person to plead guilty. So it puts more police personnel on the street.

It certainly must decrease the amount of money that we are spending on the whole criminal justice system not involving the police lock up, because if they get arrested at two in the morning they are going to probably spend the night in jail until the processing takes place, et cetera. We are not involving the prosecution unnecessarily because, again, it is treated as a civil penalty, it is a fine, and that is it—done, dusted and polished. And then we are not . . . we are decreasing the number of people that are going through the criminal justice system.

In 1995, one of my very first cases as a defence counsel, I remember a young man who was 18 years old getting ready to go to school. I will never forget this. The gentleman was with his mate and they were sitting on Horseshoe Beach probably just chilling and they were smoking a marijuana cigarette. So the individual was charged. I was representing him in front of the court, and he was convicted. He pled guilty, et cetera. I remember (and I probably should not have done this but I was green), I went to the *Royal Gazette*, the writer, because at that time it was the old Magistrate's Court building and all the writers would sit on the right-hand side and they would just write notes and so forth and there was always the impression (the report says contrary, but needless to say) that some of the information that is always gathered by US officials comes from the Bermuda press insofar as people who may have been in front of the courts for possession.

So I remember going to this writer and saying, *Look, could you just give this guy a break because, you know, if it gets in the press . . . he is leaving for*

school in two months (supposedly, because he had just finished graduating). *This may tremendously impact his ability to go away to school. He has already been accepted in the university, et cetera.* So the reporter thought I was harassing him and reported me to the editor who then called my boss at the time where I was working and whatever, whatever. I do not think I was harassing him; but, needless to say, the point being this young man's future . . . because you know sure as chucks it was in the newspaper.

I do not know what happened to him and I am hoping that it did not impede his advancement educationally, academically, et cetera.

But needless to say, my point being this: If perhaps the Government would at least consider these types of alternatives, so on one hand we are sending a message that, *No, no, no, we're not saying it's legal. We're not saying you can go and smoke, et cetera, et cetera. We're saying we are going to take the criminal sanction out of it.*

And like the Honourable Premier indicated, you know, in some . . . I know, personally, I believe that when you say "decriminalisation" you are saying it is legal because it is the opposite of decriminalise. But needless to say that is another argument to be had for another place.

My point being this, we can perhaps address the issue concerning racial disparity, as well as introduction to the court system by racial profiling. We can eliminate the prospects of the police having to exercise any discretion. Because at the end of the day, if the police have this particular mandate—they catch the person, the person admits it is theirs, it is less than "X" number of grams, there are no aggravating circumstances surrounding this—then the police immediately issue a ticket. It is a given. That has to be the case. That has to be how the process works. And then we go through the second step and then the third step before the courts in terms of pre-probationary sentencing and the like.

That keeps the person out of the criminal justice system. That still sends the message that this is still a serious offence, you have committed an offence, this is what we are going to do, this is how we are going to handle it. But we are going to treat it in such a way where the penalty involved will not seriously impact your ability for travel to the United States for educational pursuits, perhaps, for employment pursuits and the like.

We have seen in other jurisdictions that it saves money for the police service, it saves money for the criminal justice system, it steers people away from the unnecessary involvement with the criminal justice system based on an unfair disparity because of racial profiling, racial bias, et cetera. And these are just some suggestions that have worked marvellously in other jurisdictions, and the message being sent is that we as a jurisdiction say justice has to be applied

equally; the law has to be applied equally if justice is to prevail.

As legislators, I do not see how we could support any type of legislation that we know is not being applied equally, particularly in a disparaging way between races. So I would implore the Government to at least consider those options and see what is happening in other jurisdictions. And it would certainly, I think, to a lot to eliminate the disparity that we are seeing in our justice system concerning the arrest for marijuana possession, and it will also address the issue concerning stop listing and persons being unable to travel because of that.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much, Member.

The Chair now recognises the Member from constituency 14, Devonshire North West, Mr. Glen C. Smith.

You have the floor.

Mr. Glen Smith: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

First of all I would like to congratulate the Cannabis Reform Committee. I believe it is a well-written document and, for me, once I got started (which I do not read that often), I could not put it down. And also I would like to thank the Honourable Premier for creating this Committee.

Now, it must have been because the reverend was here this afternoon that all the confessions were being made.

[Laughter]

Mr. Glen Smith: Well, even though the minister is not here that was sitting in the Gallery, I did engage when I was very young and I did participate in trying to toke and smoke a little bit, but it was not for me. But I did try it.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Glen Smith: No, exactly.

And I would also like to say, as my other friends were saying, yes, I do occasionally like a little glass of wine, or maybe two or three. So anyhow, Madam Deputy Speaker, I thought I would clear the air on this side of the fence.

Now getting back to the document, I felt it educated me in some issues that really rang home. And when I first started to skim through this document, when I first saw that they were looking to push the consumption of alcohol back to 21 years old I said, *Oh-oh, we are going down this road similar to what has happened in the US.* And I know what has happened there is you are asked to go to fight for your country when you are 18, you can vote for your country when you are 18, but you cannot buy a beer. Then

when I further read into this document and it started to go on about the cannabis and how the brain is developed and what have you, then I could fully appreciate where they are coming from, where you should be 21 years of the age—or the suggesting, or perhaps a bit older because of development—some of our brains develop—never develop or are a lot slower to develop at all.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in my opinion, as we all have heard some of it today and in this document, prohibition has not worked at all for centuries. It does not matter if it is alcohol, in some cases many moons ago it was tobacco, and today it is small amounts of cannabis for personal consumption. It has not worked.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to share with this Honourable House a real life story of a Bermudian friend of mine and how he has been restricted for the rest of his life for making a silly or dumb mistake, probably with the things that I experimented with but I did not get caught. He was 19 years old at the time (in 1983) and it affected his college education, his professional career. He was caught with five bags of weed. Back then they used to come in pay-type envelopes (I could not tell you what they come in today), and it was equivalent to 5.7 grams, which was worth \$25 back then.

If my mind casts me back correctly, back then that was probably about three cases of Elephant. Well, you could do a lot more damage drinking three cases of Elephant than smoking five bags of weed. Of course, you would not smoke all five at one time. But there we are.

He was on his way home on his Vespa 90, pancake muffler, cut down low seat (here we go, profiling). We have heard that and yes, it was profiling. And he was pulled over.

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, he went to court and as far as he was concerned he paid his debt to society. He paid over \$500 back in 1983. And then the next thing you know . . . this all happened in August, he was due to go off to university in early September and it came to a grinding halt. He was put on the US stop list, which we have heard about today, and, of course, he has a criminal record to this day and probably for the rest of his life.

Madam Deputy Speaker, he also shared with me (and this was all new to me) what it takes to get a waiver in order to travel to the US. When he first tried to get his waiver it took him almost a year. And then subsequently he got five one-year waivers and then two fives and then a ten. Well, what happened in September 11, 2011, changed the world for a lot of our Bermudians that have been caught or penalised or criminalised for marijuana possession as the border control got a lot tougher for the reasons that we all know.

But what changed for him, and for all our Bermudians that are in this boat, is he has to jump through more hoops than anything to travel. And as

far as he let me know, it can take up to six months in order to get a one-year waiver. That is what he has told me.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there also comes a stigma in life that the so-called crime of five bags of weed roughly 31 years ago has now affected his family life. Why do I say that? Well, particularly his 12-year-old daughter who queries as to why daddy has to go to the secondary line all the time. Imagine leaving here—and I feel for my fellow Bermudians who are in the same boat—and then imagine coming back from the Caribbean going through Miami International Airport and you are put in a separate room.

Another note that I learned is that with this waiver you also have to get a police certificate, I guess of clearance, with the Bermuda Police Service which can cost up to \$100. And I believe in the US Government you have to pay in the region of \$100–\$150 in cash in order to be able to get this waiver.

And you know, Madam Deputy Speaker, this is only going to increase in time—increase, increase for the rest of his life and my fellow Bermudians.

With this particular friend of mine, what I have been told is that you have to go to the police to get your certificate, or clearance, and they give you a sealed envelope. You take that sealed envelope and then it is opened up at the US Consulate Services office. And for him, unfortunately he and his father share the same name so you can well imagine out came the envelope and there is a DUI charge. And you can well imagine trying to defend yourself when you have the same name. But finally that was settled and it does not happen anymore.

The point that I am trying to make today is that the turmoil that it is causing his family, the embarrassment . . . we do not want to see our Bermudians going down this road. We really need to look at the policies, legislations that are available to us that would eliminate this profiling and being pulled over for small amounts of cannabis.

Madam Deputy Speaker, if we cannot find the policies, legislations that are available to us now, then in my opinion, let us decriminalise cannabis for the small amounts for personal consumption.

Thank you for your time.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much.

Are there any other Members that would like to speak to the motion?

Thank you.

The Chair recognises the Minister of Public Works, Paget West, constituency 23, the Honourable Patricia Gordon-Pamplin.

You have the floor.

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I have pleasure in weighing in on this particular debate today albeit I

have to say and admit that it is with a very heavy heart. Because the idea of marijuana, its uses, its abuses, its infusion in our community has caused me to think that 21 years ago today I married someone whom I loved very dearly and whose choices as time has gone on caused not just the breakdown of the marriage, but just caused a ruination of my family. And I can say that while I have no defence for the choices that he made, I sit and think that if things were different, this is a day I ought to be celebrating, but it is a day that I am very, very sad.

So when I first knew that we were going to be debating the issue of marijuana and whether or not it ought to be decriminalised, legalised, decriminalised, whatever, initially I can tell you that I wanted nothing to do with it. Because what is interesting for me is that notwithstanding I have heard many of my colleagues say that, you know, *I tried it once. I did it when I was at college. I tried this, that or the other.* I can stand and say hand on heart I have never tried marijuana. And I guess there is a . . . not that I am such a Puritan.

But, with that said, I used to play softball. I started playing league softball at the age of about 16 and we played at Devonshire Recreation Club where lots of our young men would be over in the corner smoking marijuana. And because of the topography of DRC you would have like a dew that would kind of fall in the evenings. So as we start a 6:00 or 7:30 softball game, you would be able to look at these guys and you would see this cloud where the dew would just have this smoke just hanging. And you could get a contact high from being on the field and you did not have to be close. And the only thing I used to think at that point, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that this stuff stinks and how could anybody want to be close up to something that smells so foul and offensive? So from that day until this, I have always adopted an attitude that says that is not something around which I wish to put myself.

With that said, when I looked at the report I thought, initially, you know, you can as a politician have personal positions and you can have a position that reflects what your constituents are expressing. And then you can also have an open-mindedness that says maybe there was a bias about your position for whatever reasons there were and that perhaps new information can give you the opportunity to make different decisions. And that is the premise on which I wish to do my presentation today.

I do wish to also, as many of my colleagues have done, to commend those people who were responsible—the Cannabis Reform Committee—who are responsible for the production of this report. I had occasion during their very open and very public meetings to actually attend one of them during which there was a roundtable kind of discussion and there were some tables that almost came to blows because of a variance of opinion. And I think, as my mother always

used to say, *So many men so many minds*, and I believe that that prevails when it comes to matters of this particular type. But I think that what that roundtable showed me is that there are different aspects that people will use as their base and their realities that, perhaps, we may not have a tolerance for if we have a hard and fast position based on what our own backgrounds may possibly have been.

I did want to make mention though, as the Honourable Member, the Shadow Minister for Health, spoke and as I was walking out of the Chamber I said, *Thank you for that*, she highlighted the fact that the stop list issue is not one that we have control over. So while many Members have indicated, *Oh, we have to decriminalise so that our young people are not put on the stop list*, the stop list is a function of how the US Border Patrol works and we do not necessarily have any say. So whether somebody does or does not have a criminal conviction does not necessarily preclude them from being accepted or not accepted in crossing the border to go into the United States. So I just think that that is important to highlight and I was appreciative of the Honourable Member Wilson for indicating that.

But let me just say that, you know, as time goes on there are times when you have opportunities, as I said, to make decisions based on new information. And I can remember very clearly as the Minister of Health that I was approached by an individual whose family indicated that this individual was ill with cancer. And as a result . . . and I see you smiling, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I know that you are intimately involved and familiar with this particular situation. As the Minister of Health it fell upon me to decide whether I was going to approve the importation of cannabinoid oil for the comfort of this particular individual.

And there were hoops and bells and whistles that had to be overcome in order to make that decision. And while I look at the legislation that says no, this is illegal it cannot be imported; I looked at it from the perspective that if there was any way that there was a possibility to allow this individual to have the cannabinoid oil that was going to give him comfort, there was no way as the Minister of Health I was going to block it. And I signed off to approve it as I believe any person with good conscience would have done.

Under those circumstances, I was not prepared to be the one to play God, to decide whether somebody's comfort was going to be yes or no at my pen. And I decided that if his doctor decided it was appropriate, his family decided it was appropriate, and he himself decided that this was giving him comfort, then there was no way I could do anything other than to support that.

I think that the system at the time, getting the support of the Chief Medical Officer, getting the support of the police department and the customs de-

partment to make that happen, I believe, that notwithstanding whatever my personal biases may have been, there was no way that I was going to stand in the way of that individual's comfort. And I do know that subsequent to that that particular individual was able to express how pleased he was and I believe he actually passed away subsequent to this particular situation. But it gives me a feeling of comfort in my heart of hearts that when I lay down at night that I was not the one who stopped him from getting whatever little comfort he could have had in his final days in order to be able to beat the physical pain that he was experiencing from the disease with which he was afflicted.

But what I do want to speak of is the idea that the physical development of our young people is critical in allowing them to decide that it is appropriate to infuse into their bodies matter—foreign matter—that may have a negative impact on them as time goes on.

As the report indicated on page 80, when it spoke of Studies of Cannabis Induced Chronic Psychosis, there is a belief in the medical community that there is a link between heavy cannabis use and chronic psychosis. And when you look at that, you know, I think that it is very difficult to support on the one hand saying it is okay. I think what is more important for us to allow an education process that enables one to look at what it is that they have chosen to ingest—whether this is legal, illegal, decriminalised or not. I think that when individuals are armed with facts they can make the decisions as to that which is appropriate for them.

And especially as a parent, no parent wants to say to their child, *Oh, the day I gave you birth I was just hoping for the day that you came and said Mom, I want to smoke pot and I want to be charged out of my mind and I want to do drugs and I want to do all that.* Because I think as a parent you really want to try to guide your children down the straight and narrow.

I tell the very brief story that probably at the age of 21 or 22 I was travelling to the United States after the Bermuda Dance (which used to be an annual affair). I went with a friend of mine to the home of some people—some Bermudians—whom we had met at the dance, and the gentleman who owned the house (there were probably 8 or 10 of us) and these two guys (the one who lived in the apartment and the other one who was a friend) went in and they brought out this vial of marijuana. And the one said to the other, *Oh, this is some good stuff.*

My girlfriend looked at me and I looked at her and all we could think of almost instantaneously and collectively of one accord was, *Oh, my God! If these guys light up this stuff, there is going to be a police raid,* because that is what the attitude was at that point in time. And all I could think of was if I get busted in a house where somebody was smoking pot—it wasn't me—but what would my mother say. And I re-

member my girlfriend and I both left that apartment in such haste we did not even wait for the elevator.

This gentleman lived on the 16th floor of the Fontainebleau Terrace. I will never forget the name of the building. But the 16th floor! And we hit the stairwell and we hit the ground in like double-quick time because of the fear that maybe . . . you know, that marijuana was illegal.

Now as time has gone on, I am going back 40 years, but as time has gone on the attitude—

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Patricia J. Gordon-Pamplin: Yes, perhaps.

But the attitude has been one that is a lot more relaxed and people do not stop to think of that level of draconian punishment if they get caught. There is an attitude, *Well, if I get caught, I get caught. It's only a spliff or whatever.* So there is a degree of acceptance that now permeates our society that did not happen at that point in time.

But, with that said, it just gives me concern that when I look at page 78 of the report, which speaks to the Developing Brain & Substance Use, which makes me know that we really have to be very careful in educating our young people to say that when you make these kinds of choices you have to be very, very careful.

For decriminalisation, I do not want for any of our young people to be precluded from having an opportunity for furthering their education, for giving themselves further business opportunities as time goes on, and just to make sure that everybody gives themselves a good shake at life. Because life is difficult enough when you do not have additional encumbrances that preclude you from going from travelling abroad or from gaining employment, because some employers actually have drug testing as a part of their pre-screening processes which determine whether you can or cannot even get a job on a local basis. So it does not even necessarily have to obtain that one is trying to go off-Island and have to deal with such limitations, but you could be . . . probably, you know, maybe first in line for a job locally and find that you are not going to get it because your drug test does not come through very well.

And then I look at the situations with respect to public service vehicle operators, because I know that . . . You know, I certainly do not want to think that I am getting on a plane and there is . . . I just came a few days ago on that 777 and I thought in terms of the recent events that we had with the Malaysian Air 777 how it went amongst the missing. But I looked at the number of people that got on that plane, and I am thinking I just want that pilot up there to know exactly what he has been doing, what he is doing, and to know that he is exactly on the cutting edge of how to operate this machine.

I did not get on that plane thinking, *Well, if this guy had a couple of spliffs and he is feeling kind of mellow that everything will be all right.* I want to know that when I get onto public transportation—whether it be a bus, whether it be a plane, whether it be a taxi—I want to know that the operator of that vehicle is of sound mind. So there is a reason why within the airlines they have specific restrictions in terms of the amount of rest that a pilot has to have between flights and whether, in fact, there is any permission for them to consume alcohol, never mind to be able to take drugs of any description.

So these are the kinds of things where the actions or the choices that an individual makes could, in fact, have a negative impact on their performance. And while I have heard many people say that alcohol has a very profound negative impact. And with that I agree. I do not drink alcohol but, you know, I understand and I have seen the impact. I am just a teetotaler. I am just boring, but I do not drink. I do not smoke. I do not do drugs. But the thing is that if you know that there is a possibility of negative impact on the behaviour based on the choices that you have made, then I think that that does not bode well for our community.

I think that when we look in terms of decriminalisation, we want to be effectively prescribing where the lines of demarcation are because what we do not want to do is to suggest that it is appropriate to have the thin edge of the wedge—I am starting to take a grip and then before you know it the entire community and society goes to hell in a hand-basket because we as legislators have not made the appropriate choices.

So let me just also say that there was a comment about the link of violent crime and marijuana use and I think that was on page 82 of the report. And that was something that caught my attention because from all indications—from what I have heard and from what I understand and from what I have observed—for the most part people who smoke marijuana are not necessarily the violent types. And my understanding is that they are relatively mellow and that you do not get violent crime from that segment of the community. But with that said what does create the violence and the crime relating to that is the fact that you now have this gang-type environment where you have got territorialised, you know, *This is my area. This is my territory. You can't come into my territory to sell to my clients,* and as such these are the things that start to create those violent crime challenges that we see within the community, not necessarily those people who would use it.

However, you do not have a user without a supplier. So we have to look at the entire picture. We have to look at the entire picture. And I say that, unless somebody is going to be permitted to grow one or two plants for their own personal use, and the like, so that you do not have to go down to the corner market or to the corner pharmacist (I have been told that they are called) to be able to get your supplies.

But with that said, I just want to reiterate and to underscore that it is very, very important that we not just have an open-the-floodgates approach towards decriminalisation, that we do listen to the community, that we are able to evaluate those encumbrances that people might have, those inhibitions that people might have, and those recommendations that people might have to suggest whether as legislators we ought to be gung-ho to say, you know, just let it all hang out, as they would say. Or whether we look at the situation as being one in which we should continue to have effective monitoring controls so that we do not end up on the wrong side of history when it comes to this.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to make that contribution to this debate. And many of the things that I would have said have actually been said already. But I just think that when you have gone through the kinds of experiences that I have and, you know, almost . . . and I do not consider myself a victim because I just think that other people's choice have no impact on me. I am responsible for those things for which I am responsible for. And I do not take on and I do not internalise things that other people do.

But when one can look at the choices that others have made and the impact that those choices can have on, as I said earlier, family life, on children (the Honourable Member Glen Smith just things that other people do. But when one can look at the choices that others have made and the impact that those choices can have, as I said earlier, on family life, on children . . . the Honourable Member Glen Smith related the story of his friend who all these many years later is still being troubled by the fact that he has to explain to a second generation why daddy cannot be normal, why we have to go through secondary screening at every step of the way. I think that those are the kinds of things that we want to try to at least educate people as to the possibilities, bearing in mind, as the Honourable and Learned Member Kim Wilson alluded to earlier, that the stop list is not our purview. It is not something that we control.

I believe the Honourable Member Pettingill indicated earlier that in order to have this decriminalisation you have to ensure your sources. You cannot have a usage and a supply if it does not come from somewhere. And if we are importing something that ends up crossing the lines of what is acceptable, let us say, from the United States to here—trafficking (they might consider it to be trafficking across borders), these are things over which we would have no control. So we might on the one hand say we want to have a lax and easy attitude and approach but then if, in order for people to get the supplies that they need, they have to come from somewhere else and it is deemed to be cross-border trafficking, then that causes another challenge in and of itself.

I also look at some of the things that have happened overseas and some of the developments in other countries and in other states, and I do know that

there is a tendency to have a more lax, a more relaxed attitude and a more welcoming attitude, certainly in Colorado. I think one of the biggest things that we have seen recently is where they have effectively legalised . . . they have marijuana shops that are just going up all over the place. I have heard the Honourable Member indicate that on his very many visits to Amsterdam (because he has family there, I will give him that) [he is] able to see a freedom and a relaxation of rigid laws and restrictions that might preclude people from participating in that type of smoking and behaviour. And we know that other jurisdictions perhaps have things a little bit more lax, but we have to consider the impact of what we do, vis-à-vis, how we interact with our various significant trading partners.

I will just end with this very quick story that a year ago I went to Jamaica for the International Women's Forum conference, and one of the events that was offered as a side trip was called the "Spirit of Reggae." Well, knowing that that was to do with Bob Marley and I am an absolute Bob Marley nut, I hopped on a bus and we went to Nine Miles so I could go to his estate so I could, you know, have the spirit of reggae. I think I am going to go listen to reggae music. As the bus pulled in we were offered the opportunity to purchase whatever sized, not cigarette, spliff, that you wanted. As well, you could purchase marijuana tea or whatever you wanted.

What was interesting there was that I was the Minister of Health. I said to the driver, I said, *You know I have heard that herb tea is good but I would rather have coffee from the bottle that I can see it being mixed.* And the guy said, *Oh, no, we can give you herb tea we do not have to give you marijuana tea.* And I said to him, *With my luck I am going to order herb tea and you are going to give me marijuana tea. I am going to go back to Bermuda and it is going to be my turn for random drug test. So let us just say I am going to pass on the herb tea, I am going to pass on the marijuana tea, I am going to pass on anything else. All I want to do is go sit and listen to some Bob Marley music and know that I can enjoy my afternoon.*

But I can tell you that by the time I got off the bus and walked through the estate and came back and got on the bus, because they told you that you could not have marijuana outside those gates (while it is illegal in Jamaica, they do permit it on the Bob Marley estate, but once you get outside those gates you cannot be in possession of marijuana because it is illegal), I thought to myself, you know, by the time I got outside those gates I was not only nauseated because of the smell that was permeating through the tour because people purchased their cigarettes, their spliffs, as they got in and they smoked it, and so you had that smell and there was no way you could get away from it. It was nauseating to me. By the time I got on the bus to leave . . . that is the memory that I have as opposed to knowing that I had been immersed in the best of the best of Bob Marley music and history and

all of his awards and accolades and everything that were all throughout the museum. All I remember of that in retrospect was how poorly I felt at the end of it. So many men, so many minds.

While some peoples' systems can tolerate the smell, others cannot. Mine cannot. My olfactory senses respond to things that are sweet. So, you know, if you had a sweet-smelling perfume then I am fine. If a sweet-smelling perfume is something that is going to cause a problem then I may have a problem in that regard. But something that smells as foul as marijuana is not something that I am going to have a problem with. But there are people who may make those choices, and I think as a community we have to be able to look at the entire holistic picture to see what it is that we are doing and how we might be making rules and regulations that may close down an entire world for some of our young people.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

The Chair now recognises the Shadow Attorney General from Sandys North, constituency 36, the Honourable Michael J. Scott.

You have the floor.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

This debate in our Island evokes broad and so many ideas and thoughts and touches so many topics. I have not heard a lot of mention, Madam Deputy Speaker, of those that finance the drug industry on this Island, or if you need to think about it, those who finance the drug industry globally. We seem to be a bit of an apologist about this. All of the things that Members have spoken about this afternoon, there seems to be this unequal balance . . . children who will be impacted and poisoned by the toxicity of drug use whether it is marijuana or a dose of ecstasy or any of the drugs. The focus has been on young people starting at far too young an age, the awful smell (that the Honourable Public Works Minister has just talked about), and the pall over at Devonshire Rec.

There is this undue focus, in my view, on the victims. None of these discussions and topics would be debated or covered by us if there was not a healthy financier of this industry. I heard of the former Attorney General, the very former Attorney General of the Government, say in his speech that cannabis alone is a \$100 million industry. This is interesting evidence because we do not always make these admissions or face these realities.

I remember the last time we had a discussion about this the Attorney General (as he then was) challenged me about the existence of organised crime, but was forced to admit today that, just with cannabis, it is a \$100 million industry. This speaks another reality. Someone is funding it, and it is not these victims. It is not the young black male. I know from a senior police

officer, who works with me on my task group, who tells me that in his experiences they have at the narcotics department it takes about \$94,000 for a trans-shipment to take place from New Jersey, or the Caribbean, to this country. It is not the young users, or the victims that we are discussing today, who have that kind of capital.

So the thing does not work without major financiers, and I think this is where I would like to focus, because there is a disproportionate focus upon these people. The Minister of Public Works spoke of so many men, so many minds. So many men and, possibly, so many women, are responsible for funding and financing the trafficking of drugs in our country. And it is a problem because it does result in it becoming the very material that we as mothers and fathers and uncles and aunts are concerned about our children are getting hooked on.

Today 11-year-olds, the statistics of the report from the Education Department (I remember hearing about it) reveal that 11-year-olds through to 13-year-olds have experimented with alcohol, experimented with marijuana, and to the degree that these children become victims, this is a problem for the financiers who are making \$100 million a year. Today's *Royal Gazette*, in the business section, talks about sex and drugs in the United Kingdom sponsor a \$16 billion industry. We will also remember . . . I do not know how many of you have read the book *Dope, Inc.* and it just speaks to the consortium that built HSBC. The consortium of David Sassoon, Jardine Matheson, Dent & Co., the Orient Steamship Company, they were the founders of the HSBC in Hong Kong, or in the East, and they were gamely involved in the opium trade.

These legitimisations of the movement of drugs in our world, globally, easily translate into this little Island, and somebody is funding both the very harmful heroin, cocaine—harmful, Madam Deputy Speaker, because it is addictive or more potently addictive than the case that is made by our young people, my nieces and nephews, anybody under the age of 30 who say cannabis is great and cool and it is an herb and it is not harmful. But someone is funding all of this. The balance has to be re-struck. I would like to see the balance of our discussion in this House as leadership in this country focus on interdiction there.

I had a taxi driver tell me about the arrival of these aircraft at the airport in the dead of night without any customs involvement in their particular flight—just the taxi drivers dispatched to pick up the luggage and take them to a nearby hotel. And then within a couple of hours, on the pretext that they come to do some noble act in our country, they are going back to catch this private plane. It is either large amounts of funding that is going on, in my respectful submission, I say as a former Attorney General and as a Shadow Attorney General and as a practitioner who has been involved with plenty of depositions as to how these things work

. . . it is either the drugs coming in or the funding for drugs going on. It is a serious concern.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Or what?

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Today I fought a trial, and it became clear to me in that trial . . . in the television was the cannabis and in the television was a handgun. And I learned that today (and this was several years ago when I think I was not a Minister, so 10 years ago). I learned then that today's consignments of drugs are always now connected with or involve the enforcement tool.

I want us to be both blunt and honest in our debate and not focus and re-shift the balance away from these poor kids, these poor, young black males. President Obama had to do it. We know this. We did it with Judge Tumin as well. But this is what President Obama said when the debate began to bubble in the United States on marijuana. And this is yet another apologia—the medical marijuana debate. It is another argument that helps legitimise this massive financing of a very, very lucrative . . . I heard the Honourable Member Mr. Brown describe it as the grey economy. Let us call it what it is. It is a very successful economy.

The debate about medical marijuana plays into their hand whilst they . . . because they get the focus taken away from them and their seedy, harmful industry and economy onto the statistics of men, largely (often in this country anyway), young black men who ended up in Westgate for either quantities for importation (and they all tried to get rich quick on their line), or trafficking or even possession. But when President Obama was commenting on the matter about the legalisation in Colorado . . . it is important for the legalisation of marijuana (with your permission Madam Deputy Speaker)—

The Deputy Speaker: What are you reading from?

Hon. Michael J. Scott: I am reading from a . . . it is a Googled [article](#) speaking to the legalisation of medical marijuana taken from Wikipedia, the President is weighing in on it. "The president said it was important for the legalization of marijuana to go forward in those states to avoid a situation in which only a few are punished while a large portion of people have broken the law at one time or another.

"The president said he is troubled at the disproportionate number of arrests and imprisonments of minorities for marijuana use.

"Middle-class kids don't get locked up for smoking pot, and poor kids do,' he said. "And African-American kids and Latino kids are more likely to be

poor and less likely to have the resources and the support to avoid unduly harsh penalties.”

“He said in the interview that users shouldn't be locked up for long stretches of time when people writing drug laws 'have probably done the same thing.’”

So we had that debate here and this report . . . and I also associate myself with commending the Premier's committee with whom he struck the Cannabis Reform Committee (CRC) for the work they have done to start this debate. If they are in the House I commend them. But one of the elements of this commission and the inquiry connected with it, Madam Deputy Speaker, was to look at the disproportionate focus on certain members of our community.

May I take us to that fact . . . we had to face this under the leadership and premiership of Sir John Swan and his Health Minister then, Mr. Quinton Edness, commissioned Judge Stephen Tumin to come into our country and to look at the question of justice on our Island. He had a very interesting mandate and, with your permission, I am again reading from the mandate, the letter that he wrote to Sir John [Swan] to say this is what you have asked me to do.

There was the examination of the substance abuse issue which is historically one that we can find in the [Tumin Report](#) [["Review of the Criminal Justice Review Board"](#)]. In his letter of reference and setting up the terms of reference to Sir John he said the requirement was:

“a. To review the Criminal Justice System and the primary legislation which impacts on Prisons (incarceration).

“b. To review the Criminal Justice System procedures and policies and make recommendations for sentencing alternatives.

(And this is the one that I focus upon) “c. To investigate the perceptions that persons of different races and different backgrounds are treated differently by the system.

“d. To review the Criminal Justice System with a view of recommending how the country can change the emphasis from one of custody to correction.”

When the PLP was asked to look at the issue, Madam Deputy Speaker, about the disparity of treatment what I find offensive and [what shows] high levels of hypocrisy is this lack of focus on those who are actually bringing and financing the problem in our country, and the awful injustices that we have for those who are victimised by it. We saw in our country as far back as, you know, it was in the 1980s, 1990s—

An Hon. Member: 1993.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: Thank you, 1993—a focus upon this. We were recognising that there was this disparity of treatment and along class and race lines,

and we have this fervour and frothing of the issue that is happening on the side of our young people and an absolute ignoring of the financiers of this economy. The whole weight of the state is guilty of this lapse into this dis-equal focus.

The DPP's office gamely prosecutes people day in and day out. They either end up with fines. They certainly end up with being put on a stop list. I have spoken with my American colleagues about this whole question in Bermuda about this stop list. The Honourable Member, Mr. Pettingill, Mr. Commissioning chaired a committee that looked into the whole question of how we reduce the impact on our youngsters being impacted by not being able to enter the United States for recreational reasons, educational reasons or social reasons.

All of these things are being driven by a very happy, successful financing of this industry, and the focus must change. And I say it must change because it is wrong and it is the height of hypocrisy for us to keep focusing on . . . for [former] Minister of Health Patricia Gordon-Pamplin to stand up as Health Minister and say *You know, these are problems we have in our country*. Well, we cannot keep talking about them without addressing the reason why the drugs are coming in in the first place and how they are coming in. I think if we took an honest focus on them and had an honest focus on interdiction of these aircraft that arrive in the dead of night, or containers that arrive through this machine gun that is meant to see the drugs in it . . . and I never heard the statistics about how it is doing or how it comes in on yachts. You know, that needs to be the new focus.

It would be healthy for all of us because it would be a mature, grown up approach, a grown up assessment of our problem and we can stop being naïve, just purely naïve, by having noble debates about oh how awful it is that a child's brain is messed up by too much of that element in the cannabis that can change the brain's functioning. We should not be doing that without making sure that in a country our size, where we can contain the whole problem of interdiction, where we understand where we can drop the barriers and stop these importations . . . because it impacts education, it impacts upward mobility, it impacts social mobility, it impacts race relations, it impacts better relations between the two races, and how we all get to progress in a successful Bermuda economy.

But, you know, the dumping of class A drugs into communities is a venal agenda. And frankly if you read *Dope, Inc.* that was the agenda of the British by moving opium into China. I mean they wanted to get people addicted.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Hon. Michael J. Scott: They wanted to!

And when that market had been flooded they moved to America.

I have a colleague, a practitioner at the Bar in England who practises in criminal law, watching things going on at the Old Bailey. Her assessment is that class A dumping of drugs from, whether it is in LA or Brixton, is an agenda. It is an agenda; and it is a venal one. It does not take much for that to translate down into Mangrove Bay Road, or Cambridge Road or 42. That kind of agenda does take place. It has the same objective. We will be a wiser, healthier, more unified Bermuda if we start to focus our debates in this House on these issues, and stop these anal, constant assessments and reports and analyses on our 11-year-olds.

Of course they are using cannabis and drinking too much! Of course they are! But there is a segment of the community that is making a multi, big package of money out of doing it. I wish we would just get more mature and adult about this and have a real discussion about the proper balance and a real focus on these matters.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Member.

The Chair now recognises the Minister of Tourism and Transport from Southampton West Central, constituency number 31, the Honourable Shawn G. Crockwell.

You have the floor.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I certainly appreciate the comments provided by the Honourable and Learned Member who just took his seat. I think that when we look at an industry (as reported earlier by the former Attorney General) that may be around a \$100-million-a-year industry, I think that the Honourable Member who just took his seat would admit that there are very powerful forces behind such an industry.

I do know that there have been conversations on how do we get a proper grip on the importation of illicit drugs, and today we are specifically talking about one in particular, although that Honourable and Learned Member was talking in more general terms. And we should, in a small jurisdiction like Bermuda, be able to get a handle on this problem. But the fact of the matter is when the profit margin is that large for just one of the drugs coming into the Island then one can understand why it has been allowed to go on for as long as it has.

I remember canvassing in 2007 and I got to a constituent at that time in Spanish Point and he said, *You know, I heard the PLP's platform on how they are going to tackle drugs. I am pretty sure I know what yours is.* And he said, *You are both off the mark.* No one really wants to delve into the reasons why this issue continues to be the issue that it is. We know that when there is that amount of money fuelling the indus-

try, then it is going to be very difficult to get on top of it. But we have a responsibility to do so.

I did not intend, Madam Deputy Speaker, to actually speak on this. I just had a chat with our Whip and said put me on the list, because it is an important topic because of the pervasive use in this country of marijuana. We have heard Honourable Members talk about their experience growing up and I will touch on that maybe a little bit later in my presentation. But if any of us have children, especially sons that are going through teenage years, more than likely we have had an experience with them either being introduced or experimenting with marijuana.

Today we received a referendum petition. If there was a referendum on legalising marijuana, Madam Deputy Speaker, it would be the largest turnout of any election, by-election referendum we have ever had. Talk about having a good voter registration drive? People would be going and registering to vote like we have never seen before. We do not even have to guess how that referendum is going to turn out—overwhelmingly in support of legalising marijuana. That is a fact.

I can tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, in my travels I will go to the gas station to get some gas and the young male that is giving me gas will come to me and say, *When are you guys going to legalise marijuana?* I will be going somewhere else, I will be out with my son . . . and, you know, I said this a couple of weeks ago. My son never talks politics to me. All the years I have been in politics he has never been interested in discussing politics. But he wants to talk about, *What is the Government going to do about decriminalising marijuana?* They are interested, and we have to recognise that this is an issue that I think has been hanging out there far too long.

I was really surprised some years ago when I learned that in Jamaica it is not only illegal, but they are strict there as it relates to possession of marijuana, use of marijuana. And I thought that they would be pretty loose and liberal because we know that it is very pervasive there as well, you know, the use of it. So I guess just because lots of people like to use it does not necessarily mean that the governments of various jurisdictions would necessarily legalise it. But I do believe that it is prudent to have this discussion. I am hoping that this discussion will lead to some form of change or the addressing of the laws as they stand right now.

I would like to commend those who were involved in producing the report of the Cannabis Reform Collaborative. I do recognise members in the Gallery. I believe the chairperson is in the Gallery this evening. I would like to congratulate him, Mr. Hatfield, for his hard work and that of the committee.

What I find interesting about the debate on this is the diverging views. What is interesting about marijuana and cannabis is that you can find a study that will really extol how wonderful it is. And then you

can find another study that will say how damaging it is. It is just one of those issues that has such polarised views. I think we have to take a practical approach. I was talking with someone not too long ago about the medicinal value and the like. And they were talking about *Well, you know, there is no real statistical evidence of that*. Sometimes we have to . . . and I think there is. I think all of us have seen the various programmes about marijuana. You know there are quite a few documentaries, and the like, and we have read . . . but sometimes we have to take the empirical evidence, I think, and say let us be practical about it and let us see how this has impacted individuals' lives.

We have heard a lot about addiction. There is no question that I believe the use of marijuana can become addictive. I had a best friend who was totally addicted to marijuana. Smoked it every day. And, just like someone who is addicted to cigarettes, you could see he was smoking often—the discoloration of his lips and the like. And he could not function unless he smoked marijuana. He was addicted, without question. But the fact is that we can be addicted to a lot of things, Madam Deputy [Speaker]. There are people addicted to chocolate. They have to have chocolate. There are people who are addicted to coffee as the Honourable Member interpolated. Absolutely! That is probably one of the biggest addictions around. People cannot start their day without coffee.

I know some people I do not speak to until they have their first cup of coffee because they simply are not themselves until they have a cup of java. I do not drink coffee, but there are a lot of people who are addicted to coffee. People are addicted to junk food—all sorts of things. People are addicted to sodas. I have a friend that drinks so much Coke every day—litres of Coca-Cola, every day. So just to say that it can be addictive, I do not think is a valid argument as to say we cannot move in a different direction on this issue because the overuse of anything can become addictive.

At the end of the day it is about choice for the individual. And I think that we have to mature to the point where we do not try to overly restrict and overly police people's behaviour. I do not think cannabis is one of those substances that creates a great deal of social ills and social unrest in our community. People are not breaking into houses, I do not believe. I do not know if there are any statistics to show it, but people are not breaking into houses, people are not committing crimes; people are not robbing stores to be able to get a cannabis fix. Those are just not the facts.

I will say that I would urge people who smoke cannabis not to smoke cannabis and then drive a vehicle, as Transport Minister. Please do not, because it is one of those types of substances that mellows you out. But, again, you know, you should not drink and drive either. There are other precautions on that. But, again, this is one of those substances that does not

engender the types of social ills that we see with other substances.

I do take the health issues that have been raised seriously. Any type of smoking is not good for your health. It is as simple as that. So if people choose to smoke marijuana that will be a health risk because of the fact that they are inhaling smoke. We have heard about the deleterious effects that it can have on the developing brain. I think that that is something that we need to look at and, as a result, if there are any policies that are created around it, take that information into account. I have heard that it causes schizophrenia. I do not know how true that is, but certainly if there is evidence to support that the overuse or the use of it may create some type of mental challenges, again, that is something that a prudent Government will have to take a close look at.

Everyone else has gotten up and has been totally transparent. I have tried it twice, Madam Deputy Speaker. And I have had two completely different experiences. One I had the best sleep of my life. Absolutely the best sleep. If anyone prescribed whatever grade that was for insomnia I would recommend it. I mean I slept like a baby! The second time I had the most severe headache I have ever had in my life. So I had two completely different experiences. And, again, it just was not something that I found that I would enjoy to do. But I have tried it twice. I have had two different experiences and, again, at the end of the day I believe that it is a matter of choice.

It is a matter of preference for the individual. Some individuals . . . I mean, particularly when you are talking about individuals who believe that that is part of their religious belief. I think that for those individuals it must be difficult, if they are devout in their beliefs and they believe this is something that can enhance their spiritual development and their spiritual experience, then, again, that is something that they should be able to look at for themselves.

The Honourable and Learned Member, Kim Wilson, talked about the stop list and talked about the Act that governs immigration and entry into the United States. Madam Deputy Speaker, we actually had the representative from the US Consulate come into this Chamber and address Honourable Members on this issue because it has become that much of a national concern. It has been part of the national discourse for some years. I think what a lot of individuals in the community do not understand is that you do not have to be convicted of anything to get on the stop list. So I know that there are certain provisions of that Act that were read out, but it is at the discretion of US Immigration whether to put you on the stop list or not.

I had an individual when I was practising law come to me who was put on the stop list who had never been arrested in their life. But there was intelligence given to the US Immigration that this individual was assisting someone who was fleeing justice in the United States. When they went they must have sent

someone and there was some type of intelligence there, someone must have followed this individual. They tried to come back and when they got to US Immigration they were pulled aside and they have been on the stop list ever since—and they have never been arrested.

So people need to understand that, as much as Government has lobbied on this, this rests solely and entirely on the discretion of the United States Immigration because no one has a right to enter any country. It is a privilege. These countries extend entry into their borders. Now, having said that, I think there have been Bermudians who have been put on the stop list for very minor infractions and have been on the stop list for decades. I have looked into it and I have represented quite a few individuals who have tried to acquire waivers. I just queried, *Well, at what point can you no longer be on the stop list?* And it was like when you reach 90 years old or something like that. And I am like, *You have to be kidding me. You are trying to tell me that someone who was 18 and got caught with a small amount of marijuana is going to be on the stop list for 70 years?*

But that is the reality. And unfortunately, and as draconian as we may think it is, it is our reality. Until there is a change in the law my advice to young people is do not use it. Do not use it if you do not want to find yourself in that predicament, because the United States has taken a very stringent approach as it relates to those who can come to their country.

Now, people say, well Bermuda, we should reciprocate. Well, we are in the tourism business. We are in the tourism business. And I want to touch on that because I agree with one of the Honourable Members who talked about (I believe it was the Honourable Member Walton Brown) why is it that we have authorities going onto cruise ships and going into cabins. I have been advised that that has stopped, and that now the only way the authorities can go onto a cruise ship for that purpose is at the invitation of the cruise ship agent or someone in authority. And that is good. I am glad to hear that now we are trying to curtail that type of intrusion. Now it is when you are trying to enter into Bermuda, coming off of the cruise ship that of course you have to go through the normal security checks, which is wholly appropriate.

But even with other small amounts of illicit drugs I have seen in my practise where you would have a tourist being caught with a very small amount of cocaine—a very small amount of cocaine. And they would have to hire a lawyer and spend a few thousand dollars to be represented. They end up getting a \$1500 fine. They go through the whole [ordeal of] being arrested, being in a holding cell, going to court, you know, if they end up in front of the wrong magistrate being castigated, being in the newspaper. One actually was a young man who worked in the financial industry in the United States, and that article in the newspaper ended up online. Now when he tries to get

another job that comes up—every time. It has become a huge problem.

My view is that if it is not a serious infraction and we have a tourist here, we want that tourist to come back. We want that tourist to come back and bring his friends and his family. I am not saying it should be an anything-goes policy, but I think we need to have a balance. I heard the Honourable and Learned Member who just took his seat talk about balance, maybe in another context. But we need here to really apply the right balance sometimes and realise exactly what business we are trying to be in. As the Tourism Minister, I am saying that we are in the tourism business, and sometimes we unnecessarily put our tourists through a nightmare experience which is certainly, I think, avoidable.

So, I would urge authorities in some instances . . . and maybe if we looked at bringing back or beefing up the caution policy, that can be a way where we can show a little bit of leniency and flexibility when we are talking about very minor infractions.

[Hon. K. H. Randolph Horton, Speaker, in the Chair]

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the medicinal value of marijuana and the medicinal use of marijuana, because this is where I find my biggest challenge with this debate. Again, I do not use it. I am pretty neutral in terms of whether or not it is good or bad for you. I do believe it does not, as I said earlier, create social problems or social issues. But there have been too many stories. There are too many individuals who have said that the use of marijuana has been beneficial to a particular health issue that they may have for us not to seriously look at legalising the use of medicinal marijuana.

One example comes to mind. I may have shared it with this Honourable House already, but I think it is worth repeating during this debate. It involves a young lady who was raised, like myself, in the Seventh Day Adventist Church. This young person (I do not want to give away their identity by giving away too many details) is one of those individuals who will abide by the law—a law abiding-to-a-T type of individual. The entire family is a law-abiding family. Unfortunately, this individual was stricken with a horrible disease—a degenerative disease.

I happened to bump into this individual's sibling and they said to me that the only thing . . . and I mean the disease has taken hold of this individual. Taken hold. The person does not have any real quality of life. But it is the pain that is most debilitating. And if anyone has had to deal with a health issue when you have chronic, consistent pain . . . and the person said to me, *The only thing that takes away the pain is marijuana*. So this individual now—because they do not want to just go around the corner and buy marijuana not knowing where it has come from—has to ensure that they are getting the proper type of mari-

juana, because I understand there are different types, different grades and the like for different ailments. So they have to go out of their way and go and get this marijuana and smuggle it into the country to bring relief to a loved one.

Something is wrong there. I cannot accept when someone says, *Oh, that's just in their mind. It's like a placebo.* I cannot accept that. If you are not enduring the pain . . . I have had pain, Mr. Speaker, where one substance was not sufficient to alleviate that pain. If you are in serious pain and you want that pain to go away, and the use of marijuana is the only thing that can take it away, that person should have access to that medicine. They should have access to that medicine.

So, I believe, because I tend to be an empathetic person, that we seriously need to ensure . . . and I believe that the Honourable Premier who introduced this shares some of that empathy as well that we do not want to say to these individuals, *Well, you are going to have to suffer.* I really believe that we have to look at that and really make it available to individuals who find comfort and find relief through the use of medicinal marijuana.

The question now is, Where are we going? What is going to happen after this fulsome debate, or discussion (as the Honourable and Learned Member Mr. Pettingill says it is a discussion, we are talking about it)? Is it just going to be something that we do not discuss again for many years? I know that the Premier and the committee have been very genuine in bringing this forward. As a member of Cabinet, I certainly would continue to press that we come up with something. And I understand that we have to take our time and we have to digest all of the information and come up with something that is in the best interest of the country. But I just want to caution against fear—fear preventing us from doing what we need to do.

If you can recall, Mr. Speaker, you have been in this House for some time, I do not know if you were here during the Stubbs [Bill]. I certainly was not around in those days. But there was a lot of fear about that and the Act was passed and the sun rose and set just like it did before. We all know that we had that long period of time in relation to amending the Human Rights Bill to take into account sexual orientation and the like, and there was hue and cry and we passed that and the sun rose and set just like it did before. Even recently we have had Members talk about what is going to happen if we allow the purchase of alcohol on a Sunday. And, Honourable Independent Member, the sun rises and sets just like it did before. So I do not want us to be paralysed by fear because we do not know what may happen. I think we need to, as those examples . . . people were saying there was going to be chaos if we do it and there are going to be alcoholics lying at the steps of churches, and all sorts of stuff. And it just did not happen.

So, I would like to just say to my Honourable colleague, the Premier, thank you for bringing this report to my Honourable colleagues in this House for their very compelling contribution, but let us now collectively figure out what is the best way forward and let us get it done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from constituency 33, Sandys South, MP Lister.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

For starters, I would like to thank the committee. This is a piece of work that is long, long overdue, and should have been approached quite some time ago. It is very interesting that most who are on the committee volunteered their time indicating a real interest in it, and I want them to be thanked for that.

For too long those in authority have almost turned a blind eye to an issue which should have been addressed one way or the other. I can remember returning to Bermuda in the summer of 1980. And during the course of the summer I went to watch a few cricket games, a dozen people or so apart from Cup Match and Eastern Counties. And then soccer season rolled in. The very first night game (it started with a night game if you remember), I went around one of the clubs, stood up on the bank, and after about a half an hour I realised that I really had to move because I had such a contact high.

A couple of weeks later I went to another club, stood up behind the goal, because you always stood behind the goal, that is what we did growing up. After half an hour of game I realised that I had to move because of the same situation. That was 34 years ago and we just acted like it did not exist for 34 years, and so finally, finally we are coming to grips with it. This is a good thing. The forward movement that results from this report will help everyone in Bermuda. It is not going to help one group or the other. It will help everyone to have positive forward movement.

One of the things that has always bothered me . . . my colleague Walton Brown has talked about it. I believe he worked along with Dr. Archibald in the early days of his reports. The very first Archibald report I read shocked me, because we all watch the newspaper and the courts. When we read the Archibald report it said that drug use at the high school level was the same between black children and white children, I was surprised. I will admit that. I was surprised. I think everybody who saw that in . . . was that maybe in 1990? In 1992?

An Hon. Member: In 1991.

Hon. Terry E. Lister: In 1991.

So, you know, in 1991, we did not think that way. So when that report came out it blew me away. Twenty-three years go by, and what action has been taken to correct that? I always felt annoyed thinking that it was solely the police who stopped one group of people and allowed another group of people to go. But it was not necessarily that.

If, in fact, we were really committed to our young people's future, and we are committed to understanding and respecting the fact that you can make mistakes when you are young, the cautioning system that was put in only a few years ago really could have been put in many years ago and we could have been well past this problem. But then it is about choice. And our young people have to understand what choice means and how a bad decision can hurt them very much for a very long time. We have heard that conversation today.

Because of my background, when people say to me *Oh this is a big problem* I say, *Well, how big?* [They answer], *Oh, there is a lot of people involved.* I say, *Well, how many?* [They answer], *Well, it is a lot, Terry.* I say, *No, no, no. Do not tell me it is a lot. Tell me how many.* And many times people cannot quantify the issue. Now I do not mean to downplay this because one person lost is one too many. I will put that on the table. But if you stop to think that maybe 3,000 people (and I pulled that number out of the air) are on the stop list, how many of those on that stop list are there because they were caught importing drugs into Bermuda? How many are on that stop list because they were caught distributing drugs around Bermuda? Et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So you see when you start to put people into categories you may find that the actual number of people that are going to be affected by change here could be very small. In effect that would be encouraging rather than discouraging.

What we want to be able to do is to move into a decriminalisation area that will result in young people who really do have potential, and I think all do, because some are going to be academic, some are going to be trade, some are going to be technicians. They all need to go away and get some form of training, they all need the chance to grow up outside of this little fishbowl called Bermuda. So I want them all to take that opportunity. So, by looking at this decriminalisation we give them that opportunity to move forward.

But the question still remains. What are the numbers? You see, we have not had, or at least I have not seen the numbers in the report. They may be there. The police may have reports. Someone may have the numbers, but I do not know exactly what the numbers look like.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that drugs drive crime in Bermuda and the Minister responsible, the Premier, has indicated that we are going to restrict the conversation to decriminalisation, rather than an expansion to legalisation. Then, making that distinc-

tion, we have to accept the fact that decriminalisation may have little impact on criminality in Bermuda. Legalisation may have an impact. I do not know. But I do believe that decriminalisation will have very little impact on crime. So those who are looking for something today out of this report that is going to impact crime in Bermuda are disappointed. You are not going to do anything. We are not addressing anything that will deal with the crime issue. We have picked off what we want and we are going to go for that.

We do have to appreciate, though (I think one person has said it already), that when we agree to decriminalisation what we are actually doing is turning a blind eye to illegal behaviour. Because in order for me to have a small quantity of drugs that only requires a caution, somebody else had to have a larger portion of drugs that I got it from, and it had to be either illegally grown or illegally imported into Bermuda. We, as legislators, have to accept the fact that the possible course of action that we are going to follow requires turning a blind eye to criminal behaviour, and you have to accept that.

I agree with the decision that the Minister is putting forward of not giving permission to cultivate. If you are simply talking about decriminalisation and trying to protect young people from themselves, then permission to cultivate does not really fall into that conversation. So those, again, in the public who were looking for the opportunity to have maybe half a dozen plants in their backyard so they can pick off some and have a spliff at their time and choosing, are going to be a little bit disappointed. They are not going to find that that step is going to be accepted. For those who have a little backyard garden now that is illegal, tomorrow it is still going to be illegal as well. The same thing is happening here.

Mr. Speaker, the real piece of this report that grabs my attention, and which I am very supportive of, is the use of medical marijuana. Using marijuana to ease the pain and suffering of people who are suffering. I believe that whilst it can be done now by the Minister of Public Safety or by the Minister of Health (one of the two, or both) giving permission for this individual to use, I believe it should move to the point of legalisation and having it organised in a proper fashion, medically administered by the medical system, maybe collecting your treatment from King Edward or from a doctor's office by means of ingestion or by rubbing on your palm, your bum, that sort of thing, either of those could happen.

Now, what that does is eliminate the issue of possession. No one has to be possessing marijuana in order to get their medical marijuana. So the real focus can be on making people better.

Mr. Speaker, throughout this whole conversation in whatever moves we make forward the health issue cannot be ignored. It is my understanding that there are more and more young people who, today, are suffering from cannabis induced paranoia and

schizophrenia. That is an issue. That is an issue. Now, those who support legalisation will say if you legalise and you control the growth and distribution, and that sort of thing, you can be better placed to ensure that the young people, or the users, do not suffer in this way. But as we are not moving in that direction we have to be concerned about this problem that our young people are having.

Mr. Speaker, we have to focus on the demand reduction. We still have to state this. We have to look at education, exposure, ensuring, again (as I started—choice), that our young people and others know what they are choosing when they make the choice, and that they have an understanding of the potential harmful effects as well as the potential loss that can come from them not being able to go overseas for schooling in the United States and otherwise.

Those people who are trapped today by not being able to enter the States, as we said, are embarrassed when they cannot travel with their families, they are embarrassed when they cannot be sent abroad by their employer to attend a conference or a business meeting of some sort. All of these things are real negatives and they negatively impact on people's lives. We have the power here to remove that, though it has been mentioned that only the US puts people on and off their stop lists. But if we are working on a caution system and people are not being charged, and they are not appearing in front of a judge, then there is a far better chance they will not appear on a stop list and therefore their lives can go on.

I would encourage the Minister as he studies the report and his Cabinet works with it to come forward with these positions that will make life better for all of Bermuda—not just for those who are caught but all of us, because we will have a better family situation when our family members are no longer appearing on the stop list. We will have a better family situation when our relatives who are ill can get proper treatment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Southampton, the Junior Minister Leah Scott.

You have the floor.

Ms. Leah K. Scott: Good evening. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the age of 11 my son started smoking marijuana. At the age of 14 he started selling it. At the age of 17 he was in his room and he had a bag of marijuana and a bag of—not a bag but a—

An Hon. Member: Twist.

Ms. Leah K. Scott: A twist of cocaine.

And he said, *What am I going to do today? Am I going to smoke marijuana or am I going to smoke crack?* He chose the crack. He now sits in jail for 18 years because of his decision.

Do I think marijuana is a gateway drug? I am not sure. I think it led to a bad choice for my son; I do not know what it does for other people. I think that decriminalisation could be a good thing, but I think that it has to be done in stages. I think that we have to really look at it. I think that we have to look at the social impact that marijuana has had on our community, and I think that medicinally it can have some benefits.

There is a little girl in Denver—her name is Charlotte Figi, and she has epileptic fits. When she was born she appeared to be normal. She was a twin, and as time progressed she started to have these seizures. She went from three a day to 300 a month to 1,200 a month. They gave her all kinds of medication to try to relieve the symptoms and the medication would work for a little while and then it would stop working. Eventually the medication did not work at all. So what they have started giving her now is CBD which is an extract of marijuana. The proper name for it is Cannabidiol. They mix it with olive oil and they place it under her tongue. And since she has been receiving this she has not had any seizures.

So I condone the medical use of marijuana. I think my colleague across the floor, Mr. Brown, stated that medical marijuana does not necessarily have to be smoked, and it does not. It can be made into oils where it can be applied topically. It can be baked. It can be done in all other formats other than smoking. I think that if decriminalisation will allow for a level playing field for our young men in terms of when they are caught with marijuana, a small portion of marijuana, and they are still able to travel and do those kinds of things, then definitely I think that it is something that we need to look at. But I also think that we need to take a staged approach, and I think that we need to consider all aspects of it before we go running ahead with decriminalisation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from Pembroke Southwest, constituency 20, MP Susan Jackson.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Susan E. Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to say and disclose that I am glad I made it through my experiences. I have to confess that I have certainly smoked marijuana and learned a lot of lessons from it, and listened to a lot of people and observed a lot of behaviour.

My major concern and the whole reason why I even want to get into the conversation is because we have got to somehow help our young black males

through this. And I really believe that through policies, changes in policies, and seriously thinking about the systemic injury, pain, something that is going on in this society with our young men, and what is either being done to them or what they are experiencing, needs to be healed as soon as we can. So that is the whole reason why I stand to this.

A couple of things strike me, Mr. Speaker. First of all, our young men are consuming an illegal drug, and I have to wonder why. The only phrase that comes to my mind is, *When are you going to ease me up? I am going through so much and I am not being a part of this community. I am not included. This world is just not working out for me.* So there is a level of comfort in this drug. Now whether it is because it is an illegal drug and it is a form of rebellion, or whether it is because it is a very effective way to escape for a few minutes, I do not know. But what I do know is that we are not doing the right thing for our young men in particular.

If we just walk down the road of changing laws, I just want us to be very careful and make sure that what we are not doing is opening a gate and allowing even further injury and disenfranchisement of our young people on the Island. I want to make sure that we are not saying, *Here is all the rope you need, go hang yourself.* Now the reason I am saying that is I am going to come back to some of my personal experiences. And that is that one of the wonderful things about marijuana is that it does make you very relaxed. It makes you feel as though there is really no need for you to participate. It is a depressant. If our young people are allowed to have open access to something that allows them to regress into a depressed, relaxed state, then one has to wonder where the motivation is going to come from for them to do their best to excel in this society.

Mr. Speaker, if a child, for whatever reason, is self-medicating because they are not happy with the education system and how they feel or do not feel, whether they are a part of that educational system, [or if] in employment they feel as though they are not getting their fair shake at a good job, if they do not see good prospects for their future and they decide that what they are going to do is consume this drug that makes them feel relaxed and to maybe a certain extent like they do not care anymore, then we are just allowing society to further disenfranchise our young men. I just do not want to see that.

Now, I am saying young men. One [reason] is that we see publicly that they are the ones that are scrutinised and held to account. I do not know why no one else is being identified and caught. I do not know why our young white males are not getting caught, because, certainly, they are out there participating in this drug just as much as anyone else. I do not understand why our black and white females are not being caught at the same rate. As the Honourable Member mentioned just earlier, if we were to have a referen-

dum right now, overwhelmingly, we would have more people out here voting on this topic than anything else. So clearly this is a universal situation. It is a universal social activity, yet for some reason we only find that our young black males are being identified and caught and penalised for it.

What if we were to look at some of the underlying policies? What if we were to look at things like not identifying young men or anybody who gets caught with small possessions of marijuana? What if we were to take a look at our policies and say, *Wait a minute now. This random checking of cars and these other kinds of policies that are in place . . . are they really working and are they doing justice for our young people—especially our young black males?* So I would like us to really firmly examine what is going on underneath, and that is not always about smoking the pot. It is about the policies that we have in place that are identifying, that are catching, that are pointing fingers at our young people, and there is just too many of the same [people] being caught, and it is not fair.

My other issue is that if we are finding that there is a group of people, a population of people frequently using marijuana, what are the chances that they are self-medicating? What if they are that unhappy and that disconnected that they feel that they have reason to want to just escape? There is then treatment. So what if we were to look at how we could provide treatment in such a way that it was healing and it gives our young people a chance to make different choices?

Certainly I know of programmes and the methodology of Mirrors. It is transformational and it is healing. I am not saying it is going to stop somebody from smoking pot, but it gives you an opportunity to look at life from a different perspective. I am saying all of that to say that maybe there is a cry out for help with some people in a social environment who are partaking in marijuana to the point where they could get caught doing it. I guess the odds must increase the more you smoke. I do not know.

The point is that right now a lot of the treatment or the gateways for treatment, the access to treatment, makes you feel as though you are either a stone cold addict or you are a criminal. Certainly I know that the Bermuda Assessment & Referral Centre (BARC), the assessment referral . . . people say that you really do not have to go to court to get into BARC but you have to walk into the court building. There is just a . . . if you are crying out for help there is just a feeling like you have done something wrong. And that does not help the system or the situation either.

So I would very much like to see us talk about and look at how we are presenting treatment and/or prevention so that it does not feel as though our young people are doing something wrong. I think that that will help us to make good choices.

I look around the room. Yes, there are some much younger people in the room. But one of the ob-

servations that I feel like I have made is that the young people are starting to change their behaviour. I think that we have had really good education. I think that we have been sharing a really good message about not taking drugs. You know some of the commercials are very graphic about anything—smoking cigarettes, drinking alcohol, smoking pot. And I am saying all of that to say that there is a chance that we might actually be starting to turn the corner on some of the drug behaviours of the past, that there may be a possibility that there is a generation of young people coming up and fewer of them are interested in illicit drugs. Certainly, when I was coming up it was very much a lifestyle activity. It was all a part of what we believed in as young people. And now I believe that there are many young people that are not as interested in drug use as we used to have.

I would like us to very carefully consider decriminalisation for simple possession and use so that we are not opening the door to allow some of our young people who have already made the decision that, no, this is not for them—but then all of a sudden we decriminalise—to then say, *Well, maybe I will just try it since it's okay for me to try it now.* I just want to make sure that we are not opening up a trap door for future generations who may be starting to not have an interest in it.

Finally, I just want to wrap up by saying that if we can change that conversation just a little bit. I certainly know now having had my journey that, yes, it was insightful to experience what that high was like, and have some thoughts about the future and be able to do some creative thinking, whatever. I see some of my colleagues smiling at me. I am really glad I got out of even that thought process. Because now that I am in a position of responsibility, a position of maturity, it is critical to be as clear-minded and focused and present as possible because the responsibilities for my family, for my profession, for my public service are . . . all of my senses need to be sharp. And I firmly believe that.

For those who choose to continue to participate in different [forms of] substance abuse then they very clearly, I think, would self-identify that it is just not going to be as easy for them to strive to some of the more challenging duties and responsibilities in society. So I am just saying that it would be very prudent for us to tread carefully to make sure that we are not opening a can of worms, but if we are going to take this route that we are responsible and keep the conversation going.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member from constituency 13, Devonshire North Central, MP Glenn Blakeney.

You have the floor.

Mr. Glenn A. Blakeney: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

So far it has been really, really interesting. Every one that has spoken so far seems to be walking and treading very, very lightly in trying to be politically correct. We have had some admissions with regard to past involvement or whatever, whatever. But do you know what the real question is? What truly is the political will?

What is the political will of the country? What is the political will of the key stakeholders—the people that we serve?

The most significant measure of consensus would be by way of referendum on an issue like this, such as what happens in the United States of America and maybe some other places and some other jurisdictions where they have propositions where you go in at a general election or a runoff and there is a proposition relative to a burning issue that has come front and centre because of the people. This is a people issue. It is a reality in pop culture in the 21st century that soft drugs, particularly marijuana, are not going away. It is a natural herb.

We all have choices to make. We all have lifestyles. We all have aspirations. If we are going to just be here as talking heads and not really have a political will . . . there has been an incredible amount of work that has been done by the committee that submitted the proposals relative to their recommendations, after having done thorough research on the subject as it pertains to the context of Bermuda. But looking all around the world I see different examples and what we might want to consider, what would be palatable for our community, looking at our traditions.

You have the religious perspective where people say that marijuana is a part of their religious sacrament. You have medicinal arguments. You have the argument for recreational use. Who, in this country, has not heard of Bob Marley or John Lennon? Two celebrated geniuses with regard to performing arts who openly used marijuana. We have a culture now that perpetuates the use. The young people coming up from the earliest of ages, if they have their wits about them and they can see and they can hear, that is all they are seeing in pop culture, lifestyle, activity, in the performing arts in particular.

You have past presidents of the United States, and dignitaries elsewhere in the world, who have had their come-to-Jesus talk and admitted openly, publicly, that they have indulged. So we are going to stand where? On a moral high ground and try to advance our argument for and against in the interest of the people when the people can make the choice by very clearly defined options put in front of them?

If we have recommendations we need to then go a step further and decide if there is the political will to decriminalise so that there is no more stigma, and then look at what can we do to exploit opportunity with

regard to the commercial revenue that could be gotten. In Colorado right now . . . there is April 20th—4/20 is what they call it. It is branded. That is world marijuana day. In Colorado they had a huge event on 4/20 where there were over 80,000 people in a designated park, most of which were recreational users, and it was enclosed so they could not go out. There were caveats and rules of engagement. But while they were inside the perimeter of the fencing they could partake in recreational use. There were, from my understanding families, wholesome families with little children in the park, playing in the park, while the adults were engaging in their recreational use in celebration of world marijuana day.

The dispensaries, the commercial recreational availability of marijuana in Colorado, has come after some thorough due diligence, notwithstanding the fact that it is still federally indictable. But the Government in the United States seems, in certain states, to be taking a hands-off approach. I wonder why? It is a very interesting question.

For Bermuda, I think the way forward is to decide if we are going to de-stigmatise those with small amounts of marijuana for personal use. And if we are going to do that, how are we going to do it? What would be the ideal template based on the experiences heretofore that have come to light as a result of various jurisdictions dealing with their marijuana situation and deciding on what they feel works best for that particular jurisdiction? It is something that we have to deal with. We are either going to continue stigmatising those that are caught, penalising them punitively, preventing some that may just have made a mistake because they were with a friend out on a social evening and, because of the peer pressure, decided just to have a smoke and maybe put a roach in their pocket and then got caught with it, and then their life is gone.

You know the anomalies and the contradictions . . . it just amazes me. Because here you have the United States that does not know what to really do. The federal government says one thing, the state government says another. But then they set rules for us with regard to people going before the courts and getting a conviction on a summary offence for a small amount of marijuana and saying they cannot come to their country, where in their country in a particular state it is legal. It is just the strangest dichotomy.

You listen to reggae music, which is very popular in our community, the lifestyle of the recording artists, those in the performing arts. We are going to be dealing with this. It is just a part of life now. Here we are trying to rationalise one argument against another without looking at it and saying, *Okay, what is our political will as a country?* How do we move forward knowing that this is not going to go away?

We all know the story of prohibition with alcohol. And alcohol, in my humble opinion, is far more lethal to the humankind than marijuana. Now, through

scientific studies, there are arguments on both sides of the divide. You have Dr. Gupta who is the contributing medical expert for CNN news, who was dead set against recreational use and decriminalisation and legalisation. He has changed his position—particularly with regard to medical marijuana use—because of his in-depth research and study of what has been found from those engaged in medical marijuana application for those that have debilitating diseases, where the medical marijuana has without doubt helped, whether it be glaucoma or any other debilitating disease, particularly cancerous diseases.

I understand that the way it is done in Colorado is still early days yet. But they are finding their way and doing what they feel is going to be best suited to regulatory framework relative to personal use, medical use or recreational use. I just think we need to be real in the country. The Government needs to decide on what they are going to do. Why have a wasted exercise for us to just come up and talk semantics about something that we as a people and a Government say is significantly important in making a decision? Today is not even about a decision being made, it is just about talking heads discussing their particular points of view—me included.

I think it is totally unfair to the people who after being proactive in approaching the Minister at the time (who is now the Premier) in offering themselves to do the research and come back with a comprehensive study, if we are not going to make some kind of decision as to what are we going to do. That's what I want to hear from the Government benches. I do not want to hear about their personal experiences or what it could be or will not be. What do we think we should do in addressing decriminalising marijuana? Because if it is going to be status quo, it is just going to remain illegal; I mean, it did not make sense having the study. If you are not going to look at it with a view to finding a way to decriminalise as a first step, what is the exercise for?

It is a futile exercise. It makes absolutely no sense. We could be talking about something that is equally as important, or more important, today—a real piece of legislation for starters. But just to come up here and just go around and around in circles with what we *feel* is a good thing, what we *feel* is a bad thing, but there is no ultimate political will expressed by the Government with regard to what they intend to do with the research that has been done based on the recommendations that have come out of that research, what is going to be completely off the table and what we are prepared to consider going forward . . . and now we are going to empanel another committee to bring not just the recommendations but frame it in a bill that will be tabled. You know the Progressive Labour Party tabled a bill already. We tabled a bill. So we are going backwards as opposed to utilising that bill, refining it to the degree where we bring together the kind of

people that would serve the committee and the country well in proposing what should actually become law relative to decriminalising marijuana in this country. That is where we have to go.

It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. We have cruise ships coming in with people that are from Colorado where they can legally engage in recreational use of small amounts, whatever, based on their law, and they have on the ship a joint or a couple of grams or whatever. Our police force goes in on the ship, brings the tourist off, takes them to court and criminalises them? I just did not get that when it used to happen. I just do not get that. It makes absolutely no sense. Not when we are dealing with this hard reality where we know—we know—that the numbers are extremely high.

I think it was the Honourable Minister of Tourism that spoke earlier with regard to what he anticipated would be the turnout if there was a referendum to measure the consensus of whether we should decriminalise marijuana or cannabis or not. The Government has to have some inclination to move forward deciding on what their political will is, knowing the consensus in the community. Talk about it on radio or discuss it in forums. You can have very intelligent arguments on both sides. But the problem is that we have a dilemma in that for small amounts in this community that are found on the person of otherwise law abiding citizens of all ages, of all social backgrounds, that could have their lives turned upside down for just a roach or a couple of seeds or paraphernalia, is absolutely ridiculous. I do not see where there is any common sense really applied as we move into the early 21st century as to how we progressively move forward on social issues that impact people in a way that criminalises them for a small amount of an herb that anyone can grow in the backyard.

Now, obviously we need to find a balance with regard to any kind of a public relations exercise. The educational component of it is the most important, and there is the social responsibility of people and individuals—particularly parents—who have a particular lifestyle. If we decriminalise marijuana, the people in the churches that are dead set against it are not going to run out and engage in it and just try it just because it is legal. It is just not going to happen. We need to have really, really good law that guides what, how, and where. But we cannot turn a blind eye and act as if this is something that we are not obligated to deal with. We are obligated to deal with it because of the citizens' outcry that we should deal with it—one way or the other.

With regard to the pardon of those that have been criminalised for small amounts of marijuana—absolutely! I concur 100 per cent. Pride, good or bad, all made right or wrong for those individuals that have suffered for over 20, 25, 30 years because of an indiscretion that caused them to go before the court as a result of being in possession of a very small amount

of an herb, marijuana, and as a result could not go to university, could not even travel overseas to attend a funeral for someone in a family that may have passed, and that kind of thing, without a special waiver.

I just find it incredible that we do not have the Government articulating what their political will is. Where do we go from here? That is what everybody wants to know. Everything that has been said here today everybody has heard before; everybody has talked about before. But what is the Government prepared to do?

Are they prepared to do anything? Or are they prepared to do absolutely nothing and just have the talk to appease those in the community that want us to deal with a very serious social question?

If we are just going to talk and then after this debate we go away and then there is no addressing of the concern, it is a completely wasted exercise. It truly is! I would have thought (as I just said and I will reiterate again) that with the Progressive Labour Party having already tabled a bill . . . that is a working template that the Government can pick up, refine, revisit and come back with their own bill. That is what the people of the country want to hear.

The people in this country, Mr. Speaker, respectfully, want to know what are we going to do with regard to criminalising our young men—particularly our young black men who, by far and large, are the greatest number of victims that have experienced incarceration because of an indiscretion. Now, with regard to the potential revenue stream, with the model already being established in places like California, places like Colorado and Washington State, that is another area that we need to look at with regard to our economy. Is there a way that Bermuda can do it even more uniquely? Where it helps our GDP, where we have an environment that has a level of tolerance, with caveats, but is not going to criminalise use in the country depending on the amount if visitors come and want to enjoy a recreational soft drug experience with marijuana.

Now with the hard drugs I do not think we should have any tolerance. I do not think we should have any tolerance. You have the scientists, such as Sigmund Freud, who authored a textbook called the *Cocaine Papers*. Out of that book came all kinds of painkilling prescription drugs. So, under the controlled drug context, drugs are going to be with us as long as there is life on the planet. But there are some that exploit the legal prescription drugs more than the illicit drugs. And those that are medical practitioners that are party to it for a dollar without caring at all about health, but yet those health practitioners will now talk about marijuana as if it is the worst thing in the world when you have celebrities, like Michael Jackson and who knows how many others, that can go and get a legal prescription from a medical practitioner, go to a pharmacy and get any drug that they want and be high out of their mind whenever, wherever, however

they want. Nothing is said because they got a prescription from a licensed practitioner.

The dichotomy! The contractions!

If we are going to be real, I think moving forward people want to hear what the political will is. What is the political will in addressing, decriminalising marijuana in Bermuda? How are we going to deal with it going forward? What are going to be the caveats? What framework is it going to be in? Personal use, medical use, recreational use and the like?

I would ask the Honourable Premier, if he closes this debate, to indicate, even if it is through a Ministerial Statement subsequent to this debate, what his Government's political will is relative to moving forward, having now had the benefit of a comprehensive report that he, if not commissioned, facilitated. Was it just appeasement for political expediency to keep the constituency of those that want it addressed quiet, to say, *Well, we have discussed it and you should be happy now . . . ?* Or is there a sincere commitment to looking at it and saying, *You know what? We are not only appreciative and thankful for the work you have put in but we are going to act on it and decide how best we look at decriminalising marijuana in this country.*

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member constituency 4, MP Suzann Roberts-Holshouser, the Deputy Speaker.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to that last speaker's point, *It is not what you say, it is what you do* (which is, I believe, what he was trying to say). And I am with him all the way because, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping out of this (which I think is really, really exciting) we have moved out of the 19th century and into the 21st century.

What that means is we have to take a close look at what is around us and move forward. So I am with that last speaker when it comes to, *It's not what we say, it's what we do* because while scientists and physicians continue to battle over the subject of the value of marijuana we have people that continue to suffer. We have people that continue to die. And I do not believe for one moment that there is one person in this room that wants to see an individual suffer and, if they can help, not delay the consequence of perhaps a final death.

However, that being said, Mr. Speaker, we also should recognise that there have been individuals that have been choosing this type of holistic approach to health for centuries. They have been using for marijuana—it has been part of their tradition, part of their folklore, it is part of their life—for over 3,000 years, so this is not something new; it is something that society has chosen to label. I do not want to ignore or deny

the fact that, like many other things, alcohol being one of them and smoking cigarettes being another (and we can go on and on and on), that it is not . . . some people have addictive personalities. And, quite frankly, there are some individuals that are addicted to . . . and we have already heard from the Member that sits in front of me speak of addictive personalities. But I want to look outside of that realm.

I want to look outside of what people want us to believe. And we as a Government—I am very proud to say—hopefully will have something to do about this, because I can tell you that I will be one person that will be looking at what everyone has said when it comes to the bill laying before this House. I would expect that we will hold everyone accountable—for the support, that is.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to do as much research as I could, and speak to as many people as I could, and I do believe that there is . . . I had an opportunity to participate in a meeting that was held at the Bailey's Bay Cricket Club. And on this event they had the ability to Skype (using the 21st century; isn't that awesome?), so that we could hear and ask questions from two scientists and one physician on their concept of marijuana. I sat back, and I have to say that I learned an awful lot. I learned a lot about cannabis and the confusion that is found amongst the professional entities. I think that is probably one of the reasons why it has taken this long to get here, because there is so much confusion over the usage and how it should be used and how it should not be used, what the difference between THC and CBD means in the use for a cancer patient versus in the use for someone who has schizophrenia.

I have to say looking at the research, I looked in the presentation that we were given and one of the items they listed was glaucoma, and some of the research that I looked at said [it was] not really [suited] for glaucoma because it is only temporary because it only reduces the pressure [temporarily]. So we are still doing research and that is the problem here. But in the interim we also have people dying.

One of the questions that I have and one of the problems here is . . . you want to work quickly but you also want to work efficiently and effectively. So we have to find out what types of resources do we go to. For example, I think it is clear that most of us do not object to medicinal marijuana. So how do we have access to that? Do we import it? Yes, Canada (I think just in April) has decided that, yes, they can export. But is it of the quality that we want? Is it of the quality that our patients need? Is it organic? Is it without any form of contamination? These are the things that all must play a part in what is best for the people. So it is not just about anything or having access to just anything. We then have to take a look at . . . so there are a lot of steps that have to be taken.

So therefore just maybe, [we are] opening up the box. I know in Canada, while they approved . . .

and in England, by the way, they have approved growing your own crops if you are a cancer victim. Unfortunately there have been consequences where you have had robberies and other issues that come along with it. So if we know what they have experienced then maybe we look at a safe place here that we can have professionals. We have horticulturalists around here in Bermuda. We work the grounds.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mrs. Suzann Roberts-Holshouser: There you go.

We have worked the grounds for many, many years. So bring in the experts. We have consultants all over the place and I believe that there are people that can be trained.

The reason I am saying this is that I do have a fear that while we are saying what we feel in our hearts to be the best thing, and decriminalisation is one thing, but I did not want to touch that and I do believe that we have to protect and visit decriminalisation, and it is of an urgent matter. But I believe . . . and maybe it is because I do have a close friend, or had a close friend, who was a recipient of medicinal oil which they put into their mouth and the whole process . . . it was a very tedious process. But the rules are there are you and can do it and it has been proven that you can do it. But you do have to have two doctors here and they have to be able to be willing to give it to the patient.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, one of the downfalls was because the physicians here are inexperienced, because it is a new product for them, it is a new medicine for them, they need to be trained in the art of medicinal marijuana as well. So it is not just something that we can say, *Let's bring in medicinal marijuana*, because it is a whole learning process for everyone. The scope is monumental but it is not something that we can dilly-dally over. It is something that we have to be aggressive about and say, *Yes, this is something that we want to do and now let's see what the timeframe is to be able to [import] it.*

The United States will not export—at least the quality of a product that we will need because we want the quality that is best for our people. So, unfortunately, the United States will not export, and if they do it might not be for the value of the product that that cannabis oil must be at to meet the needs.

The person that I know (who is a relative of mine) . . . I can tell you as I stand here today, one of the things I said to him . . . well, I have to tell you this individual was known for smoking pot in his life. It was not something that he was averse to. So the man is dying of cancer, *Have you considered smoking pot?* This is in the duration of having access to the legal way. He said, *I would never do that. It is against the law.* He is older; he is wiser in one sense and does not want to go outside the boundaries. I respected him

for that. I will also say the result, in this particular case, was that he saw the tumour shrink.

Now, while I say the problem that we have here in this room and the problem that we have outside this room is that everyone looks at this and they are still studying it. Everyone is frightened of taking that first step. The two doctors who signed for him and said *Yes, we believe and we know that medicinal marijuana will be beneficial to this patient.* Neither of them wanted to be the one that was actually giving it to him. Can you imagine? So here we have the ability through legislation, through hard work and determination from different Ministries . . . we heard before, earlier, from the Health Department, from Customs, from the police, all these different channels to actually get it here. And then you get it here and then you get a doctor that says, *I'm afraid, basically, because what will this do to my licence? It is not legal.* Well, it was, obviously for medicinal purposes. But there is a lot of work to be done.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, I stand to my feet to say that this is not something that we can take our time on. It is something that we have got to move on as quickly and efficiently as possible because sometimes haste makes waste and in the words of Jim Woolridge, the Honourable Member who no longer sits in this House, "A bull in a hurry never made a calf." I know we heard that in this House many, many times. But the truth of it is, as people are dying, they cannot wait.

We cannot wait for too long. We have to start the ball rolling. And I thank the Minister for at least giving us this opportunity to hear, if anything else (maybe not a decision of the Government going), but to hear what people actually think, because you know it means that individuals out there listening or who have access to what we have said here today will know who they need to canvas. They will know who they need to lobby—be it for the [decriminalisation] portion, be it for the legalisation portion, be it for the medicinal purposes portion. They will know who to lobby.

And I look forward to the day when we are back here discussing how we are going to make this happen. To end, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to not saying but doing.

Thank you very much.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Would any other Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Smith's parish, the Honourable Member N. H. C. Simons, Smith's South, constituency 8.

You have the floor.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by commending the CRC committee for a most interesting,

informative and impressive report. From where I sit, after 16 years as a Member of this House of Assembly I believe this has been one of the most interesting parliamentary reports presented to date. I think it should be required reading for Bermudians who have a keen interest in Bermuda's social agenda.

It raises a lot of issues and I can personally say that when I started on this journey I personally was very concerned and had real reservations about the progression and direction of the cannabis decriminalisation or legalisation agenda. I had real, real concerns. But having read this report, my ideas were challenged. My concerns were challenged and, as a consequence, I am prepared to open the proverbial door to examine legalisation and decriminalisation a bit further.

[Desk thumping]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: I would say that I am prepared to examine the issues and open that door and continue on my journey.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I have been here for 16 years. I have done four elections. I did the 1998 election, the 2003 election, the 2007 election and the 2012 election. Mr. Speaker, the 2012 election brought up a new issue that I had not heard of in any of the previous elections and that was (guess what, Mr. Speaker) decriminalisation, legalisation of marijuana.

Mr. Speaker, I hear our brothers and our sisters in the streets saying, *Hello Mr. Simons. When are you going to get marijuana decriminalised?* You see all the polls. All the polls say 60 per cent to 70 per cent of young Bermudians want decriminalisation, they want legalisation. But what I found interesting, Mr. Speaker . . . and we get it back to the profiling issues that was discussed earlier.

My first encounter while canvassing in a predominantly white upper-middle class area which had very few black people around, one young man who was fixing up his posh apartment said, *I am glad, Mr. Simons, that you are here. My wife is out.* I said, *So what is it that I can help you with? What would you like to see done first if the OBA got in?* He looked around his apartment, he was doing the tile floor with some nice marble, he looked around and he said, *I am glad my wife is not here. But I want to have marijuana. I want it decriminalised.* He said, *People go home and they have their drinks. But I would like to go home and have my spliff.*

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: And I was so stunned that he told me that, Mr. Speaker. It was like this is going to be a very interesting election for me.

[Laughter]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: So then I went to another area a couple weeks later and they had this big German Shepherd that was very saucy. And, you know, I am not normally afraid of animals. The lady said, *Just stay outside on the road, stay outside on the road and we can talk. I will be at the window and you can stay in the road with your colleague and we will talk.*

So I said to her, *Lady* (this lady was in her 50s almost 60, a white Bermudian), *what is important to you? And if the OBA came into power what would be the issue that you would like to have addressed?* Well, she shouted out her window, *Mr. Simons, I want marijuana decriminalised!*

[Laughter]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: I was like, *What is going on with this election this year?*

As I said, I started off as the person that was basically against it. I was totally against it. So I am saying, having read this report, I am on a journey. I have been closely following the polls on this topic and I see the community is asking for it and I think Parliament has a duty to examine it to try to keep in step with the community. So, Mr. Speaker, that is how I intend to start my debate.

As was said earlier marijuana use has been around for centuries, centuries upon centuries. It was used in folklore, religious activities, religious festivals, and Mr. Speaker, as somebody said, at church services. But recently, in the 1930s, things began to change, Mr. Speaker, and things began to change with the prohibition legislation.

Well, one thing that I read in this report made my heart take a double-beat, and I said, *Oh my God, what is this mess?* So, I was reading the report. And they said prohibition legislation started in the US not because of the use of the drugs or the impact of the drugs on the individual, but on the social fibre and denigration of races. Well, then I kept reading, Mr. Speaker, and I kept reading. Let me tell you what I read, Mr. Speaker. In the US Senate—and allow me a minute or so. “In the United States, the rationale for controlling drugs, particularly marijuana, was clearly based on racism. The name which surfaces, when one delves into the history of drug controls in the United States, is Harry J. Anslinger. In 1930, Mr. Anslinger was the Director of a new department, that of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.”

It goes on to say, “. . . Anslinger used a racial and violence theme to draw attention to a drug which he felt could have negative effects on American by those who would be considered ‘others.’” That is when my radar went up! Who did he consider “others”? Anyway, he goes on to say, “The following comments were attributed” to this gentleman. And I am going to quote what the report says: “There are 100,000 total Cannabis smokers in the US . . .” Remember, we are

talking 1930s, segregation era. You know, nobody was miscegenated.

The Speaker: What is the report? What is the report again? I am sorry.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: This is from the report.

An Hon. Member: The collaborative report.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: This is in the collaboration report, under “The rationale for drug laws.”

The Speaker: Oh, yes, okay. Yes, okay, okay.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: And so the whole premise is wrong. Let me just continue. He says, “There are 100,000 total Cannabis smokers in the US, and most are Negroes, Hispanics, Filipinos and entertainers.”

It goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, “Their satanic music, jazz and swing, result from Cannabis use.” Mr. Speaker, they continue: “This Cannabis causes White women to seek sexual relations with Negroes, entertainers and others.”

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Mr. Speaker, I was reading this chapter and I am saying, *I cannot believe what I am reading today!*

[Inaudible interjections]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: What?

Anyway, it goes to say, Mr. Speaker, that “Cannabis causes White women to seek sexual relations with Negroes, entertainers and others.”

He goes on to say, “. . . the primary reason to allow Cannabis is its effect on the degenerate races.” “Cannabis is an addictive drug which produces in its users insanity, criminality and death.”

[Laughter]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: It gets worse, Mr. Speaker. It really gets worse! Mr. Speaker, it goes on to also say, “Reefer makes darkies think they’re as good as White men.”

An Hon. Member: Oh my God!

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Mr. Speaker, it continues, “Cannabis is the most violence-causing drug in the history of mankind.”

So, Mr. Speaker, as a man of influence, he made it his business, and he went on his own personal journey, to ensure prohibition occurred in the United States. As we know how legislation works, once a precedent has been set, it is followed by other

jurisdictions. So, again, it occurred in the US Senate. It was picked up in the UK. It was picked up in Europe. So, the prohibition law perpetuated itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, this prohibition legislation was founded not on helping the community in regard to drug addiction or drug behaviour; it was basically founded to prevent miscegenation and racism. What a reason for prohibition, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker, so you know, fast-forward to today’s world, it is a new day. Everybody is marrying everybody. Everyone is going to bed with everybody else. And this legislation has become outdated.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Honourable Member!

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: It is outdated, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker, it is not only outdated, this prohibition legislation is not working. Mr. Speaker, prohibition is not working.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the statistics that were so kindly provided in this report, and I will just share some with you. The 2013 Household National Drug Survey conducted by the DNDC, it says “22% of the surveyed population reported that they used cannabis.”

The Speaker: Help me get to that page, Honourable Member.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: I do not have the page here, but I have got the heading in the book. “Cannabis Prohibition isn’t working,” under that section of the report.

Then it goes on to also say, “people use drugs because their parents use drugs.” Well, Mr. Speaker, it says that 23.7 per cent of young people use drugs because their parents use drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this is breeding a subculture for innocent young people. I can relate a story to you of a teacher, just earlier this week, who teaches in a nursing school. And the teacher said, *I had a student, a young little girl, who was three years old. And she was there making believe that she was rolling her joints. And her hands were going like this here, with, you know, papers and pouring it in, at three years old. Where are you picking this up from? Where are you picking this up?*

These are the challenges. And I mean, for parents to be doing this in front of their children is unacceptable by any means. It is totally, totally, totally irresponsible and unacceptable.

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Mr. Speaker, it could have been tobacco—point taken. But still, if that is an example . . . And, look, your three-year-old is taking up

your bad habits before they could even speak up. They know how to roll a cigarette or roll a joint.

The Speaker: They live what they learn, yes.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: That to me was unacceptable. I am parent, and I will probably be a grandparent soon.

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Well, I am saying a couple of years, a couple of years.

But those are the messages that our young people are picking up, Mr. Speaker. Again, I am saying the prohibition legislation is not working.

The report goes on to state, in 2013 they assessed and did a survey on college students. And this is the college students' response to: *Have you used marijuana during your lifetime?* Forty-six point one per cent said yes—46 per cent! *Have you used marijuana in the last 12 months?* Thirty-four point one per cent said yes. That is, one in three college students have used marijuana in the last [year]. And *Have you used marijuana in the last 30 days?* The statistics is almost 25 per cent, one in four.

So, Mr. Speaker, these type of statistics clearly indicate that prohibition is not working. It is not working. We spoke about our cultural events. We spoke about Cup Match. We spoke about football games. We spoke about the County Games, the cricket games. Mr. Speaker, we have all been out in the community because of our role, because we like our sports. And it is there. And it is there. So, if we are trying to help our community we have to change the paradigm when it comes to the law.

So are we about prohibition, or are we about getting what is best for the community? Mr. Speaker, from where I sit, I say one of the paradigms that can be used in drug addiction is looking at it from a medical perspective. So instead of having prohibition, punitive laws, how can we have laws in place that will help the addicted, to help those who need help? Because addiction is a medical issue. So our laws, if we are serious about helping our people, should be medically focused.

We spoke quite a bit about medical marijuana. So I am not going to go down that road this evening. Because a lot has been said, and there is no need for me to repeat it. I think there is some benefit to having medical marijuana, but I would leave that to the doctors and the people who are more qualified than me to make those decisions.

The other issue that we touched upon earlier was the stop-and-search issue and profiling. As you know, our population is 54 per cent black and 46 per cent white. The stop-and-search statistics indicate that 90 per cent of those stopped and searched are male, and 85 per cent of those 90 per cent male were black.

Now, someone raised this issue earlier. When our narcotics squad embarks upon their endeavours and, you know, [they go] out to do their job as proficiently as they can, do they go around the community in its entirety to look at and police elicited material? Or do they go to concentrated areas where there is a reputation of nefarious activity? We know, based on these statistics, that they are going to perceived areas of nefarious activity where there are decent people and there are a minority of people who are involved in illegal activity.

Now, someone said to me, *Mr. Simons, you know the deal. We have friends that have estates in Warwick, big estates up Wreck Hill, big estates out in Tucker's Town. And we go to our beaches, we go to our beaches. The beaches are not policed. And we have our parties. And we have our parties.* So, Mr. Speaker, the model is wrong, and these profiling and search protocols really, really, really need to be examined if we want to treat people equally.

As the Honourable Shadow Minister said, social justice, our legal system, should be based on equitable justice. Likewise, when it comes to profiling, the same should apply. Do not just target areas that have, historically, had this bad reputation, because there are many, many good people in those areas. And a few areas of nefarious activity have caused problems and scarred the whole neighbourhood. But I also say, occasionally, take a drive around the whole Island and see what you might find. See what you might find.

As I said, I had a dinner party last night with some young people. And a number of them have said, *Mr. Simons—and these guys are college age. Mr. Simons, most of my friends smoke weed.* Most of them smoke weed. And it is a normal phenomenon for that generation. So, again, prohibition is not working. Like other jurisdictions, they are finding prohibition is not working and so they are embarking on a journey to craft new evolving legislation that will deal with illicit materials, that will deal with marijuana to make sure that the social agenda has issues that are current and also in the best interests of the community.

Mr. Speaker, we have spoken about the stop list. I want to make it clear, and I want to read if you will allow me—

The Speaker: Read what?

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: This is regarding cannabis reform in Bermuda, the American Consulate General gives an explanation on the impact of changes in law—

The Speaker: Where is it from? Where are you reading from? You said you are going to read it. That is why I am asking. Where are you reading from?

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: It is from the same report, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Oh, oh, I see.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Everything I am reading is from the report.

The Speaker: You are reading . . . I see. I see. All right.

Mr. N. H. Cole Simons: Mr. Speaker, so the American Consulate General basically is talking about decriminalisation and legalisation. This is what he said, and I want the people of the country to hear this: "A change in the law of Bermuda will have no effect on past findings of inadmissibility under the INA. If convictions related to cannabis crimes are expunged or repealed in Bermuda, or if those previously convicted are pardoned in Bermuda, those persons will still be inadmissible under US law, and will remain on the 'stop list,' and will need a visa and waiver to enter the US."

So, for my brothers who think that decriminalising or legalising marijuana will get them off the stop list, do not be fooled. Based on what is in this report and based on a quote from the American Consulate General, that is not happening. So I just want to get that out there so people will not be fooled.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I say going forward the issue is about addiction. Addiction is a health issue. If it is a health issue, there should be an agenda, there should be a programme in place that will specifically address addiction.

Mr. Speaker, the report says, "Addiction is a primary, chronic disease of brain reward, motivation, memory and related circuitry. Dysfunction in these circuits leads to characteristic biological, psychological social and spiritual manifestations." So, Mr. Speaker, I say any legislation that we put in place should be looked at from a health point of view. And also, how can we reduce crime? Because let us not be fooled. The black market in this community is driven by marijuana.

So if somehow we can address marijuana through addressing the social issues . . . And it may mean . . . and I am just saying (I am not a proponent or I am not against it), if you legalised marijuana, you will take the sting out of the black market. Not decriminalise, legalise it. If you take the sting out of the black market you will reduce the guests at Her Majesty's Prison by 80 per cent. You will also reduce our government's expenses by \$5 million or \$7 million a year.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are substantive issues that need to be considered when we examine the issue of decriminalisation and legalisation of marijuana. We have to look at its physical impact, and we also have to look at the outflows of funds. As the report

indicates, annually approximately \$2.6 million that can be accounted for—I will say *that can be accounted for*—goes abroad each year to pay for cannabis.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as I stated earlier, the issue for me going forward is addiction and examining marijuana use as a health issue. As it is a health issue, Bermudians need to be supported. I am going to go down this road, which is a thorny road, and the report brings it up. We would also have to examine getting the health insurance companies involved, because it is an illness. And they could bear the cost of underwriting some of the expenses in helping our young people to become de-toxed, to become drug-free and begin a new life that is more productive for them, their families and the community.

So, Mr. Speaker, I end as I began. When I started on this journey, the door was closed. Having read this report and listened to my colleagues today, I have opened the door, and I am prepared to examine the options that are available to the people of this country, the options that are available to us as legislators and the options that are available for the Government of Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, as I also said in the beginning, this Parliament, this Government, must be in tune with the community and do what is best for the community to sustain itself and to ensure that every member of our community has the opportunity to succeed in his own space in his community in Bermuda. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Warwick, MP Jeff Sousa.

You have the floor.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: Good evening, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues in the House, and there is a listening audience.

The Speaker: Good evening.

Mr. Jeff Sousa: I likewise have enjoyed reading the report. It was very thorough and obviously a very well-timed report. Everyone was asked by our Premier today to talk openly and honestly on this subject. Personally, I am very supportive of decriminalising small amounts of cannabis for personal use. I want to make that very clear.

We all heard in the past, President Bill Jefferson Clinton state that he had smoked cannabis, but he had not inhaled. I want to state quite clearly I did inhale.

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

Mr. Jeff Sousa: I came up in the era of Peter Tosh, Jacob Miller, the great Bob Marley and Third World. I will not go into detail on who I inhaled with.

But at the same time, over the years, I have seen the damages that being addicted to marijuana has done to my male and female friends, people that . . . because what I am talking about is 30-something years ago. And I see those same people today, and I see what it has done to them. I see how they have moved on to other drugs, or they have gotten so addicted to marijuana that they have lost their families and friends. I see them walking the streets of Bermuda. So I see that part of it as well.

As an employer for the last 30 years, I have seen so many young men get on the black list . . . sorry, the stop list. And as we heard this evening, it sounds like it is a black list. But I have seen this. Then, they get a criminal record, and then it is very difficult for them to get a job [because of] a couple of spliffs. And this has to be changed.

Over the years, I remember one particular time when I travelled with a friend who, as we heard my colleague, MP Glen Smith, give a similar example. My friend, who was, at the time, in his 50s, was travelling, had made a mistake when he was 18, 19. And, you know, every time he went away, he would sweat and get all hyped up. I saw what was taking place with this individual. I am here to say now, publicly, that that same thing could have happened to me. But it did not.

I strongly believe that there are great health benefits of cannabis. I watch many of the programmes we see on TV. I have looked at the studies. But at the same time, there are doctors that [are conflicted] on this. But we do need to look at it more.

I did really enjoy the conversation that the Whip had brought to the floor. Obviously, he studied the subject quite a bit. Of course, he is a Warwick South East boy from up the south shore there, so he knows the street, he knows our people, like I do. And we need to look at this. I am glad the conversation is taking place. As some of the colleagues in the House have said, talk is cheap. So we do need to take it to the next level. I have been really saddened by the damage I have seen take place by people being on the stop list, not being able to go away for education, not being able to go away to play football, et cetera, et cetera.

I was unsure whether I was going to rise this evening or not. But I really had to add my support for decriminalising marijuana. I want to make that very clear. I am out, like everyone in the House, in my constituency around the Island. And this is a conversation, particularly with young people; but not necessarily that young a person, you know, middle-aged people as well.

But as stated, we have to look at the addiction. We have to look at the insurance companies. There are so many things. So this is something that we just do not run into. We need to crawl, walk and run, which we are doing. But I do truly hope that we do look to decriminalise marijuana in this country. And, again, I want to emphasise clearly, that is my

personal opinion. I am very strong about that. I do feel there would be many benefits with that. That is what I would like to add this evening. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Member.

Would any other Member care to speak?

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member from constituency 21, Pembroke South East.

MP Rolfe Commissioning, you have the floor.

Mr. Rolfe Commissioning: Mr. Speaker, thank you for affording me this opportunity. Mr. Speaker, certainly, the present status quo is not sustainable on the issue of the continued prohibition of marijuana. I had my eyebrows raised, so to speak, upon receipt of the news of the recent survey that was undertaken by Mr. Riley's profile of Bermuda, which stated that over two-thirds of respondents were in favour of legalisation of marijuana and/or the decriminalisation of it, with only 27.4 per cent of those surveyed in favour of the retention of the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, for too long many of us have been looking for a shift in emphasis from treating this as a criminal justice issue, which has been under the purview advanced by both the police and the courts as being the blunt instruments that have been used in an attempt to put the genie back in the bottle. Clearly, the genie is out and is not going back in that bottle.

But I would caution that we have to be clear-eyed and sober-minded in our consideration of this issue. It is an issue that still can confound us. It is an issue that presents us with significant dilemmas. For example, there is growing evidence that marijuana's impact on children and adolescents and teenagers is significant, that it can impair brain development, impair cognitive function amongst those up until, actually, the age of 25, which is when you get the full maturation of the brain. That is a significant issue that we cannot ignore.

Like I said, longitudinal and other studies done over the years and which are now coming to the fore only confirm the same thing—that amongst adolescent use there can be significant dependency. For example, we know from studies that have been done and which have been outlined by organisations, such as the California Society of Addiction Medicine, that marijuana addiction in children and adolescents can be problematic. Secondly, it also again talks about the impact of marijuana on brain function in children and adolescents.

As someone who has been terribly concerned about what is happening in our country and our society with respect to our black community and, more specifically, our young black men, I find that very problematic. This is from someone who himself used to use marijuana from a fairly early age in life.

But see? That is why I say we need to be clear-eyed and view this very soberly. It is not just as

simple as talking about decriminalisation. Many of those who are in favour of that will be welcoming that news and welcoming this shift in public opinion. But I believe that we as legislators here must ensure that we do no harm. And no greater example of doing no harm is what we do on behalf of the very oldest amongst us and what we do on behalf of the youngest amongst us. Those are the two most vulnerable groups in this continuum of humanity that we have before us. That is our key responsibility.

I will talk about what we may need to do for the elderly in a second, but I want to come back to this issue about what we need to do with respect to those who are most vulnerable amongst us as being the youngest amongst us. Because, even if we come up with a model that we are satisfied with in respect to decriminalisation of marijuana for personal use, and both sides of the House have prospective Bills that they will be advocating on behalf of in that regard, we will need to come up with a model that is going to ensure that we will redouble our efforts to ensure that there is not going to be wider adoption of marijuana usage on the part of our young people, and particularly of our young black men. This is going to be incumbent upon us. So I would hope that the Government hears my voice tonight and keeps that in mind, as I would hope that all of us on this side of the aisle do as well.

With respect to the other side of that continuum, as I spoke, Mr. Speaker, of those who are elderly and those who are suffering from debilitating illnesses, at the same time I expressed my concern about its impact on our young people, I am also cognisant of the positive impact it can have from those suffering from debilitating illnesses. Growing evidence is indicating that it does have very positive impacts on those who suffer from cancer, from glaucoma, MS. I have an MS sufferer, incipient (meaning it is just coming on, initial onset of it) in my own family. Epilepsy—this is nothing that we can just idly dismiss. Again, the evidence is growing. And I believe our approach to this whole issue has to be evidence-based and not emotional or based on some romantic notions about what marijuana is. It has to be evidence-based.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to also take time out, as some others have done here tonight, to commend the work done by the collaborative here, the Cannabis Reform Collaborative, in the work that they performed with respect to this report. It is a fairly decent and comprehensive report. There may be some who are opposed to any movement on this issue, who may think it is a little biased, I think, in favour of moving down towards decriminalisation and legalisation and that sort of thing. But I think it is still a fairly balanced and comprehensive report. And, as I said, I think the individuals, those public servants who formed that committee, have done this country a major service, and I too want to throw my hat in the ring by commending them.

But we have to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the social justice piece on this is very important. One of the key things that I found in this report that I was very happy about was the fact that it did not shy away from talking about how racial disparity has informed the way in which we deal with this whole issue or have been dealing with this whole issue of marijuana prohibition and the larger war on drugs.

If I may, on page 33 of the report, I will draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the bottom half of that last . . . No, actually, I want to go back further to start on page 32, Mr. Speaker, to the bottom paragraph, heading “Current Manifestations of the Two Bermudas.”

The report states, “If there are two Bermudas, then there must be tangible evidence of same. In the 2012 Labour force survey, for example, while unemployment was recorded at 8%, unemployment for Blacks was 11%, while for Whites it was 4%. These differences are historically similar,” the report states. “In that same study, personal income for Blacks stood at \$55,000, while for Whites it was \$73,000. These results are also historically similar. Incarceration rates among Blacks have consistently been around 90% of the prison population, and for Whites and Others, around 10%. Blacks however make up just 54% of the population.

“With regard to stop and searches by the Police Service, there is evidence of racial profiling. At the prime of stop and searches in 2011, some 17,000 were made, although that has dropped considerably in the last couple of years. Of those stopped and searched, 90% were male and 85% were Black. Nearly two-thirds, were males between the ages of 18 and 36. Given the Black male age population in that age group, it was possible to search [every one] of them four times in 2011. At a public forum hosted by the Centre for Justice in 2012, some Black males admitted to being searched multiple times.”

You know, we talk about a gateway drug? But the truth of the matter may be that marijuana has been a gateway drug towards the criminalisation of generations of young black men! That has been the real pathway with respect to marijuana, and this is society's response to it.

Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention furthermore to the bottom of page 33, that final paragraph. I guess it is going to massage my ego a little bit, but nonetheless, please indulge me.

“If some accept the notion of two Bermudas, they might quickly point out that real inequality lies in education, that the disparities in educational attainment accounts for the other deficits among Blacks. And on the surface that notion appears to be true. In 2000, for instance, 23% of White Bermudians had a college degree, compared to just 11% of Black Bermudians. Of course the creation of two Bermudas could also account for the discrepancy, but for now, the argument will stand. In 2009, Columbia professor

Dr. Ronald Mincy, was hired by the Government to look into income disparities of Black males and their counterparts. His findings debunked the lack of education theory. What he found contributed most to the income discrepancies was industry, or where a person 'chose' to work, at more than 50%. Race accounted for nearly 30% and education just 14%"—in accounting for that disparity and those disparities and differences. "Considering that if one had full control of where they worked, and educational disparities were eliminated, a person's race would still be a factor in their economic outcomes."

You see, Mr. Speaker, there are many within our black community who may be under a misapprehension that if marijuana is decriminalised, that maybe all our problems [will be] solved. But the structural racism which undergirds this society, which has been a part of the foundation of Bermuda society (I heard Sister Jackson, MP Jackson speak eloquently on this issue just a little while ago), this structural racism will still be there! If generations of our young men have been medicating, if their fathers before them and their grandfathers have been medicating with alcohol, the part of the core, root reason for that is because of the economic disparities and racial inequities of Bermudian society!

That is what has led to this sense of demoralisation, this sense of a need to medicate, to get these mind-altering substances that will, for a brief time, transport them away from the reality of what Bermuda has represented to generations of our people.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the drug trade of Bermuda has always been part and parcel of the Bermuda I grew up with. It was a cottage industry that was grounded in Bermuda's black community. Many of us will not want to face that. You often hear tales about, *Well, you know, whites control the industry, that whites are the ones who bring it in.* Well, in my time growing up, Mr. Speaker, there were some whites who were in on this so-called trade, usually from lower-income, mainly Portuguese families. Or you might have gotten some occasional trade from other immigrant groups who were involved in terms of the trade. But it was always a black-dominated industry, Mr. Speaker. Because anywhere you go in the world, the drug trade is dominated by individuals who come from marginalised and poor communities!

What incentive does someone who is a descendant of Bermuda's oligarchical families or someone who has been able to take advantage of white privilege in Bermuda and achieve a reputation and a high standard of living have to get involved in one of the riskiest forms of business entrepreneurship one can imagine, that could result in not only social shame and ostracism, but a very real threat of incarceration?

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. Rolfe Commissiong: So, listen, Mr. Speaker, if I may. This is a coming-home-to-Jesus moment, not just in terms of the issue of decriminalisation, but in terms of us coming face to face with the reality of what Bermuda has been over the last quarter-century.

In some ways, Mr. Speaker, the drug trade has been the unofficial black economic empowerment initiative that we do not care to talk about. The reports are legion in terms of going back to the 1970s, even, when that flight was coming from down in the Caribbean, of the number of our people, black men and women who were able to buy their first houses, all for that trade! The way that has infiltrated amongst various sectors, even within the civil service in certain areas, to help facilitate that trade! That was, as the Italians would say, *our thing!*

But the downside, Mr. Speaker, as a response to our marginalisation economically in Bermuda, but the downside was the impact it had on our community, the devastation it caused. Because it was not just marijuana, which still can be problematic in terms of having some addictive qualities, but also then the growth in the usage of drugs such as heroin and cocaine as well. This is the real price that we have paid for our economic marginalisation in this community. Because that group has been an issue that has been driven by the low socioeconomic status of Bermuda's black community.

Mr. Speaker, I remember sitting in a jail cell myself over two decades ago, speaking to two friends of mine, Teamus Adderley and Cal Smith, both now deceased, from down in that Devil's Hole area, although Teamus was really from Devonshire. And this would have been in the late 1980s. I sat down and I listened to these two slightly older men read off the names of men from our black community who had died as a consequence of the HIV/AIDS scourge, and their use of intravenous injections of heroin, and sharing those needles with one another. Just under 200 men went—black men, young men! Some families lost two sons. Some families . . . I know families who lost three sons during that time! Those men are long forgotten.

But I only illustrate to say that this trade in its various forms has been such a part of our community, little acknowledged! And we have to come to grips with it. I heard someone mention earlier about the fact that even if we legalise marijuana it will not stop the illicit trade in drugs. It may cut into some of the profits of those who are involved in it. You still would have the illicit trade in things like heroin and cocaine, which have significant market share as well within our community. But despite my issues, again, with the impact on our young people . . . and I want to come back to this, Mr. Speaker, because we cannot miss this point!

We still have to move forward to at least cut, like surgeons, marijuana from its association with the more hard and dangerous drugs under Schedule II (am I right, Schedule II?), which it should never have

been classified as, from those other, more destructive drugs. We have to do that! People talk about the stop list. Mr. Speaker, over the last five years I have at least personally processed at least 200 individuals through that portal to get their waivers. As you may know, the former Government had an office that they established under the former Premier, Dr. Ewart Brown, that I headed up.

Do you know that the former US Consul, second to the US Consul General, informed me that Bermuda had the most names, persons, on that list? Out of [the whole world], the most names! Hard to believe! I guess part of the reason was because of the significant American presence here, and the small nature of our society probably contributed to it. But I had no reason to disbelieve her. And again, the racial disparity was so evident. Out of the over 200 individuals I dealt with, and some I still continue to assist on that level, at least 90 per cent to 95 per cent were black Bermudians! And most of them were black men between the ages of 18 to 50. Again, the racial disparity that permeates all of Bermuda life was so evident.

Medical marijuana, Mr. Speaker (getting back to the issue of how we can best deal or help and assist our elderly and those who are suffering from debilitating illnesses), is something that we have to move forward on, in my opinion. We have to. And we will have to find partners, I believe, internationally to be able to do it successfully. We heard mention of countries such as . . . MP Roberts-Holshouser spoke, I believe, of Canada and Israel. Both of them are very interesting in their model, Mr. Speaker. They both still have marijuana as an illegal substance. But they have legalised marijuana to be available for the medicinal marijuana sector of their country. So they can provide that needed relief to their citizens.

I believe that we must take a serious look at the provision of medical marijuana in the Bermudian context. I believe that we also have to move down the path to decriminalisation, but with the caveat (that I will repeat again) that we must also at the same time treat this as a public health issue and ensure that the most vulnerable amongst us—in this context, our young men, our young women, our young children and adolescents—are not going to be unduly impacted in a negative and destructive way as we move down this road to a more liberal regime in the area of marijuana.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your time, and I thank all those for bearing with me as I made my presentation tonight.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Would any other Honourable Member care to speak?

The Chair will now recognise the Honourable Member E. D. Burt, Shadow Minister of Finance, from

Pembroke West Central, constituency 18. You have the floor.

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good evening to you.

The Speaker: Good evening.

Mr. E. David Burt: Mr. Speaker, as many Honourable Members have spoken today, a lot of ground has been covered, so I am going to do my best not to be too repetitive. But I do want to do something and echo something that a lot of other Honourable Members have stated and give credit to the collaborative, or the committee, the Cannabis Reform Collaborative [CRC] that put together this report that we are discussing today. I think that it certainly is evident that a lot of work was put into it. It is evident that it contains a lot of viewpoints. But I think, in a certain way, it is also evident that their mandate may not have been as open as some of us may have been led to believe.

Now, it is interesting to see, however, the wide variety of opinions which have been expressed, especially on the Government benches, by the Independent Member, and certainly from our benches on the fact that this issue needs to be moved forward.

Now, I want to go through the report itself and look at the various recommendations of which they made, because there are some that most people can agree with and there are others that we do not agree with. But I think one of the clear things is that when we look at page 5 of the report, Mr. Speaker, it says, and I quote, “We need to change our approach to Substance use & abuse.” And it goes on to say, “There is strong evidence and a growing conviction globally that the international ‘war on drugs’ has been an epic failure in terms of its stated objectives to stamp out drug use and eliminate supply: since the ‘war of drugs’ was implemented, use/demand along with supply has dramatically increased.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anyone that can disagree with that. And I think that is the crux of the issue. The crux of the issue is that we are dealing with a policy that has been put in place globally, which has not had its intended effect. But for some reason, where we see policies that do not have their intended effect change that quickly, we see these policies continuing to have a very intense level of stickiness. It is like they do not change, they do not move. And it is very puzzling on that aspect, Mr. Speaker. It is a question of whether or not it is, you know, education. It is a question of whether or not people are just stigmatised to *there are certain things that are not good*.

But when you have policies, government policies worldwide, which are not having the effect they are supposed to have, you must question and look and say that maybe we would like to change our approach and do something different to bring the results

which we want. Because the result that we want is for less people to be abusing substances and there to be less harm from those people who are using substances. So I think that is the key, Mr. Speaker.

Now, it goes on to recommendations on page [6]. And it says, "The CRC recommends 1. Ensure the new master DNDC [Department of National Drug Control] plan focuses on managing substance use from a health centered approach."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will get to that point a little bit more, later. But I think it is very important that we look at these things in the context of, it is a health issue and not a criminal issue. When we take this out of the criminal realm, and that is across the board, I think that we can see a better outcome. Because if there is someone who . . . we are talking about cannabis here, and there are some people who debate whether or not people can be addicted to cannabis, I am not going to get into that debate. But when we are talking about other drugs, we know that if someone is addicted to drugs, what happens now is they get locked up in prison. That is not going to help anyone, Mr. Speaker. That does not fix the issue; that does not fix the problem.

If they are not locked up in prison, sometimes they are left to their addiction in the corners and the streets and the alleyways of this country, Mr. Speaker, which does not help anyone. So I think our view must move from a criminal one to one of a public health issue.

It also goes on to say (and I think this is a very interesting [point]), "Age of consent for access and consumption of Cannabis and alcohol should be [raised to] 21." Now, I am quite certain that there will be a whole lot of people that would disagree with that. I am specifically guessing voters between the ages of 18 and 21 would not be in agreement with that. But I think it is a very interesting recommendation.

Now, the one thing I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that if this recommendation is based on hard science, if this recommendation is based on the fact that alcohol abuse at such a young age or the age of 18 can have long-term medical effects, then I definitely believe that it may not be something to look at insofar as regulating and making sure that the age changes from 18 to 21. But I think that if there is evidence that this is the case, we should certainly make sure that our citizens are aware. Because the last thing we want to do is for people to be unwillingly harming themselves.

Because to be clear, alcohol is something that is consumed at the age of 18, often before. But it is something that is consumed in Bermuda on a regular basis. So if this is something that is harmful, if it can cause long-term health effects for our young people or for our young adults, then I think it is certainly something we should look at, and I would encourage the Government and the Minister of Health to do some more studies and research on that and make sure that

information is made available. Because I certainly do not think that we want our citizens suffering from long-term negative health aspects, and if it does cause any [of those] things, then I certainly think you would want to know about that.

Mr. Speaker, going on to page 6, the report highlights, "Cannabis Prohibition isn't working." And it says that, "Individuals prosecuted and incarcerated for non-violent crime related to cannabis are overwhelming the criminal justice system."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not necessarily agree that they are overwhelming the criminal justice system. I would say that they are putting additional strain [on the system]. But what I would agree with, Mr. Speaker, is that it is clear that cannabis prohibition is not working. And when something is not working, Mr. Speaker, you have to look to change in order to get it to go where you want to go.

The CRC then recommends in this statement "that the Minister use the statutory powers to proactively enact reform . . ." Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a lot of speakers today. And it seems that there is an overwhelming sense that we should, at the very least, make sure that we make cannabis accessible medically. I think a majority of the Members who have spoken have supported decriminalisation. And I think that a large number of Members have even alluded to even further steps, such as the regulation of the cannabis trade, because, of course, decriminalisation creates that grey line. It will be interesting to see where the Government goes in that aspect, though I will get to that later, Mr. Speaker. But I think that everyone in the House, or there is a sense that the House agrees with the CRC that cannabis prohibition is not working.

They recommend that we "Decriminalize personal possession and personal cultivation immediately . . . [and], [d]evelop a phased approach to cannabis reform and policies that limit the potential of Bermudians being denied access to the United States (Stop List) . . ."

They also recommend, "The Department of National Drug Control be placed under the Minister of Health and a greater emphasis on demand reduction with a focus on prevention and treatment be the overall focus of drug policy in Bermuda."

Now, I support those recommendations because I believe that it is the correct approach. And I am happy that Members have finally come to terms, because, let us be clear, Mr. Speaker, this has been a failed policy of the United Bermuda Party, the Progressive Labour Party and now the One Bermuda Alliance. All of us . . . there is enough blame to share. Because many people [have been] in positions who have had the ability to possibly make a change there . . . but we have not seen this change. So it is good that we are actually debating this right now, and it is good that now on both sides of the House we see a willingness to confront this issue and to say, *We can move*

forward on this issue. So I think that is definitely a good thing, Mr. Speaker.

Moving on to page 7, the report says that “Cannabis can be used as a medicinal substance.” It says, “Cannabis as a medicinal substance is gaining . . . prominence and there are an overwhelming amount of pre clinical studies supporting the therapeutic potential of cannabis.”

It then goes on to say that the CRC recommends that the Government “take immediate action to enable access to medical cannabis with a prescription to individuals by way of a regulation under the existing legislation until such time as revised legislation is drafted.”

Mr. Speaker, my view is that if a doctor believes that their patient needs cannabis, then who is the Government to tell the doctor to say that the patient cannot have what their doctor prescribes? That, Mr. Speaker, I think is something that should be very simple.

I do not actually believe there are any medical doctors in this House, Mr. Speaker. But the fact is that if there is a medical doctor, I think that a medical doctor would know a little bit more about medicine than those of us who are legislators who might be lawyers, you know, might be businesspeople. I think they would know a little bit more. So in that case, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Government would understand that they have the power to do that under the existing laws and will go ahead and make that available. Because it is clear that the overwhelming sense of the House is for that action to happen. That, of course, lies [starkly] under the purview of the Minister responsible for National Drug Control, who at this time is the Premier.

So I hope that, given this debate that we have had, and given that everyone has seemed to indicate that at the very minimum we should be opening it up for medical use, that the Government will be announcing in the near future that doctors will be able to write prescriptions for medicinal cannabis. So I hope that that is something we can see coming very soon.

Mr. Speaker, I will then move on to page 8, which states at the very beginning, “We need a long term strategy for substance prevention.” And then it goes on, and it says, “Effective health and wellness programs focused on education and treatment initiatives, managed through regulations and which aim to reduce substance use and abuse are vital to a healthy future.”

It then finishes by saying, “Substance abuse is a health issue which should be addressed without recourse to criminal penalties through the justice system.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I touched on this before. But I think it goes beyond this report itself. Because addiction is a very, very serious problem in this country, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that we are doing a good enough job to address it. Right outside of my

office, which is located in North Hamilton, you can see at any given time, whether it be the daytime or night time, addicts that are looking for their next fix. You see it in plain view, Mr. Speaker. And these people, by and large, deserve better treatment than what is available for them to get. It is certainly a challenge that we have to face, Mr. Speaker.

I think that having addiction being a criminal issue is causing more pain to individuals, and we could be treating people in a different fashion and, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, having different outcomes. So I certainly support the recommendations from the CRC in this aspect, because I think that we need to change our entire approach to how we handle the scourge of addiction, which is something that harms a lot of families on-Island, Mr. Speaker. There are very few families in this country, Mr. Speaker, who can say they have not been touched by addiction.

An Hon. Member: That is true.

Mr. E. David Burt: Very few. My family has been touched. Many families have been touched by addiction and the pain and trouble that comes from that, Mr. Speaker. And we have to do a better job. If we can at least in this House agree that we should stop criminalising it and look at how we are going to turn this into a public health issue and treat people and take them out of the shadows and remove the stigma, then I think that we can have better outcomes for our people, Mr. Speaker. And I think that, as people in Government, that is what we should be aiming to do.

Moving on, Mr. Speaker, because I think that this is very important, and I was very grateful for the information that was presented in the report, on page 37, we see the huge disparity between whites and blacks when it comes to cannabis enforcement. And it is amazing, Mr. Speaker, because I can tell you, from my knowledge, just as many white people smoke weed as black people. That is just it. I do not believe there is a disproportionately high percentage of black people that smoke weed as opposed to white people or people in between, Mr. Speaker. But the fact is that an overwhelming majority, I think in excess of 90 per cent of cannabis-related convictions, 90 per cent to 95 per cent were of black males, black people, Mr. Speaker. And that points to, as the Member who took his seat before [said], the racial profiling which exists.

Now, if you have a substance of which the use is spread [evenly] across the community in a basic level, but 90 per cent of the people who are being convicted are from one group, then it surely says that there is a problem with that policy. That policy should be addressed immediately, because it exposes structural racism that exists inside of our system, structural racism that exists in our police force, and our justice system and, Mr. Speaker, it is disadvantaging a particular group. That policy, that revelation of how the policy is applied and how it disproportionately affects

one section of the population should be enough for it to be immediately removed, Mr. Speaker. Because that type, whenever you have a policy that has that type of response, Mr. Speaker, it is not good.

An Hon. Member: It is criminal in itself.

Mr. E. David Burt: As the Member just said, it is criminal in itself, Mr. Speaker. And we need to address that immediately. That actually shocked me, because I did not think that it would be that high, that disproportionate. But for something to be that disproportionate, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly, certainly a problem.

So, the CRC recommends that we “provide factual education around cannabis history and its uses,” and I think that MP Cole Simons did a pretty interesting job of talking about how cannabis was at one point in time referred to. It says, “end racial profiling within the criminal justice system” and “expunge all convictions related to cannabis only,” Mr. Speaker. I believe that that is something that is essential. Because if we are moving to a place where we believe that cannabis should be decriminalised, then we need to make sure that we remove the stigma that has been attached to too many people inside of our community for something that they probably should never have had against them.

And then, Mr. Speaker, it then goes on to say—and this segues very well into my next point—that “if cannabis is legalised, ensure equal opportunities to enter the industry.” I say this, Mr. Speaker, because it is very clear. If we were to move to a place of regulation of cannabis, understand that the cannabis trade is an underground market. And that underground market, Mr. Speaker, feeds children, sends kids to school, buys groceries, pays nursery bills, does a whole lot of things.

Now, if all of a sudden that money is removed from the largely disadvantaged communities—

An Hon. Member: Black communities.

Mr. E. David Burt: —black communities, of which the money goes to inside of this trade, Mr. Speaker, and moves to Front Street and the business owners and the business elite, who have the money in this country already, it gives space for the more to have more, Mr. Speaker. Now, there was a recommendation that if cannabis were to be regulated, that the only people who should be allowed to operate an industry there would be people who previously had convictions. I support that wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker. Because we cannot move from a place where people have been criminalised for something and then after that—

[Inaudible interjection]

Mr. E. David Burt: Yes, as someone said, *the rich will always take over*. And, Mr. Speaker, it was very nice that the CRC included this in. It is on page 34. It was talking about Michelle Alexander, the author of *The New Jim Crow*. What she said, Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker: Page what? Page what?

Mr. E. David Burt: Page 34. It was on page 34, Mr. Speaker, and it said, “‘When I see images of people using Cannabis and images of people who are now trying to run legitimate Cannabis businesses, they’re almost all white,’ she said, noting she supports legalizing pot . . . After 40 years of impoverished black men getting prison time for selling weed, white men are planning to get rich doing the same things’ . . .” She goes on to say, “So that’s why I think we have to start talking about reparations for the war on drugs. How do we repair the harms caused?”

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the policy has harmed one section of this community, and we have to make sure that in any change of which we make, we do not further exacerbate the issue. Because, Mr. Speaker, if you took money that is a result from the drug trade out of some of the black communities of this country, you would cause more harm than good. And if that is the plan, if that is the eventual plan, then I would say it is better to leave it the way it is now, Mr. Speaker. That is just a fact. Because we cannot—we cannot allow for the more’s, the people who have more, to even get more at the expense of those people who are barely scraping by in the shadows of society, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me move on to the next section, which I think is very important. That is Chapter 9, where it talks about the medicinal aspects, Mr. Speaker. Now, I think what is also very important and what Members must understand and what the public must understand is that, of the cannabinoids that are inside of cannabis, there is the one that is most referred to, which is THC, which is the most psychoactive ingredient, or cannabinoid. But there are also other ingredients that have incredible medicinal value and which are being explored. So what we have to remember, Mr. Speaker, as other people have said, is that when it comes to medicinal aspects, it is not just about smoking. It is also about the other uses of the extracts of the cannabinoids that come out of cannabis. I think that we have to make sure we keep that in mind. A lot of people will just say, *Oh, it is about smoking weed. Oh, it is about getting high. Oh, it is about people being unproductive*. No, Mr. Speaker, there are certain medicinal uses that have been proven that many Members have spoken to. And I think it is up to us in this House to basically say, *We now believe that the Government should move to allow anyone whose doctor wants to refer them to have this*.

So I think it is very, very, very important that we recognise the recommendations that are in this report and that we also remind our constituents that, when we are talking about medicinal cannabis, it is not just smoking weed. It is also in regards to the other extracts that can come out of the plant that can help. I remember one Member on that side was talking about someone with the epileptic seizures. And the oil mixed with olive oil stopped those seizures, Mr. Speaker. It is not just smoking of weed, and we need to make sure that our constituents understand that this is a bigger issue than just inhalation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the time that I have left, [I want] to finish where I believe that we should be going from this. I believe that, as I said before, if a doctor believes that a patient should have cannabis, then no legislator should stand in the way of what a doctor recommends for their patients. I also say that when we look at changing our policy, it has to focus on one thing, Mr. Speaker. And that is the best outcome for our people. It cannot be about the dogma. It cannot be about all the stuff, all the noise which you hear. It has to be about what creates the best outcome for Bermuda and our people.

I think the best outcome, Mr. Speaker, is reducing the harm that substances cause. Whether that is smoking, whether that is alcohol . . . I mean, smoking cigarettes, tobacco, whether it is alcohol or whether it is other substances which are currently illegal but are used, such as marijuana, cannabis, cocaine, heroin, all those things. We must focus on reducing the harm [caused to] our society. So the first thing, Mr. Speaker, is reducing the number of people using the substances.

Now, if prohibition has led to an increase of people using substances, then it would stand to reason that reversing prohibition might lead to a decrease of individuals using substances. And when we are talking about reducing the harm, you want to reduce the number of people that go through our criminal justice system. As we see, it is racially tainted, and we need to make sure to reduce that. We also need to reduce the number of people who suffer from the shadows of addiction, and we need to reduce the crime that is a direct result of the drug trade and the illegal drug trade in Bermuda, Mr. Speaker.

And not a lot of Members have spoken to that. But we have to remember: There is crime that comes out of the drug trade. And if we are smart and wise, we can take steps that could possibly minimise that type of activity, Mr. Speaker.

Also, as I said, our results must bring equity. That is equity insofar as who has access to this new type of market, if we are talking about new economic activity being created, and that is also making sure that we right the wrongs for individuals so they have their records expunged. They no longer have to be ashamed of criminal convictions which they may have had from their past, from a misguided policy from the

beginning, which has endured under the United Bermuda Party and the Progressive Labour Party, and now the One Bermuda Alliance.

And also, Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to promote a culture or thought of a higher level of freedom inside of our country, Mr. Speaker. When I say that, it is promoting freedom of choice. I think that is in all things we do in this country, Mr. Speaker. Because in my view, if you are not doing anything that is hurting someone else, what business is it of the Government or anybody else what you do inside of your own home? If you are not causing anyone else harm, why does it matter? Why does it matter up here what someone does in their own house when it does not affect anyone else?

Mr. Speaker, if you want to grow weed in your house, if you want to smoke the weed in your house and if you want to eat all the food in your fridge after you finish smoking the weed in your house, then you should be able to go ahead and do that! Why do we care? I should not care what you do. If you are not bothering anyone else, then those are the rights of which you hold as an individual to be able to be free and to engage in what you want, Mr. Speaker. I think that is the thing at which we have to look at. I think that is what we must apply to all of the things which we do. We should try to have less regulation and more freedom and trust citizens to make the decisions. Give them the education so they can make the best and most informed decisions about what they are doing.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, any policy change that we have, I think, must be bold. Now, I have said it before and I said it during this party's Reply to the Budget that I believe, and our party believes, that we should take steps to move towards a regulated cannabis market. The reason is very simple, Mr. Speaker, because the world is moving that way. And we can see the result of inaction that happens. In this country, we have spent 30 years arguing whether or not we are going to have a casino or not. That ship has long time sailed, Mr. Speaker. Are we going to be passive in the tourism business, behind the eight ball on this as well? Are we going to allow our fears to cloud what may be an economic boon for our country, Mr. Speaker?

We have to think about things in the future and how they will affect our people and the people growing up. Because as the argument was made during the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, if you put a vote between regulating cannabis and collecting revenue from it, or shutting down schools or cutting off financial assistance, which one would the people pick, Mr. Speaker? If you say we are no longer going to support sports programmes, why would you choose those things? We have to frame it in that choice, Mr. Speaker.

And if the thought is that we can gain additional revenue from responsibly regulating a cannabis

market in this country, we should certainly move towards that direction, Mr. Speaker. That is where we should go.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, on that particular point, we certainly have had a very good debate today. But I am a little bit disappointed in some aspects, because it seems as though if the country, or at least the sense from this House is that we certainly want to move forward on this issue, but in the opening statement of this debate from the Honourable Premier it seems as though he is a bit reticent. My view, Mr. Speaker, is that it is clear that the House believes that this is an issue whose time has come. And there have been calls to go further than what this report has said. So, my hope is, Mr. Speaker, that there is a decriminalisation Bill that is on the Order Paper for this House. And it is my hope that when that Bill comes up for debate, the Honourable Premier will let the Members of his party vote their conscience so we can end this practice once and for all. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair will now recognise the Leader of the Opposition, for Warwick South Central, constituency 26, MP Marc Bean. You have the floor.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Good evening.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Good evening to honourable colleagues, and good evening to the people of Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that I have gauged from this seven-hour debate, it is that the work of the CRC in producing this report has enabled us to do something for the first time in months, maybe years, in this Honourable Chamber. And that is to have an open and frank discussion on an issue. In fact, such has been the level of discourse that I can credit the CRC for raising the level of debate and maybe indicating to those who were not sure then, but are sure now that the “holier” is truly the healing of the nation. Because if it could get us in this Chamber, after all that we have been going through for weeks and months, to then spend this time to articulate what we think are the genuine feelings and aspirations of the people of this country, then the report has already accomplished its intended goal.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that when I became a Member of Parliament, in my maiden speech (in February 2010) I stood up and I called for the introduction of coffee shops. And I also called for the cessation of customs officers and police officers violating the privacy of cruise ship passengers who came into our waters. As has already been stated, people find that ganja, or cannabis or herbs, and cruises go hand in hand. So it is always wise if we are going to be not

doing things that harm our tourism industry to ensure that we allow people to have the freedom to do what they like as long as they are not disrespecting the next person on their property.

Now, there is an argument, and it has some weight and merit now as the law stands, that if someone decides to get off the ship with contraband, that is where our authorities step in. But we have no right and no place to get on a cruise ship after someone has spent \$500 to \$1,000—

An Hon. Member: Or more.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: —or more, to enjoy their vacation.

In fact, if I came on a cruise ship to Bermuda and I got hauled off to the Magistrate’s Court and the magistrate took \$1,500 out of my pocket—now, I am on a cruise, so you know I barely have \$1,500—rest assured I would never, ever come back to this country again. And rest assured I would tell every single person that I know that Bermuda is hell on earth! And rest assured that is the message that is being sent into our major markets by average American citizens who desire to have a five- to seven-day vacation in our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, from 2010, I can say that I have been consistent and maintained the same line and length, and have not wavered. And sometimes, people can accuse me personally of being brutally honest. I can recall former Member Ashfield DeVent also speaking on this topic, almost like a voice in the wilderness. But lo and behold, today . . . Wow, how times have changed!

Mr. Speaker, there is a global trend afoot. It is something that we have to understand; it is intentional. It is not something that is emanating from amongst the people themselves, because the people themselves have always seen the benefit of cannabis use. But there is this shift now at the state level, at the Government level, at the academic level, at the media level where the trend . . . It is almost like social engineering. So you find that now it is popular. It is popular now. So you see countries like Uruguay, who have taken steps to legalisation. And some say, *Wow! What a model!*

Well, I would caution us that it is not what you do; it is how you do it. And Uruguay is an example of it. While you apparently have legalisation, you also have a redoubling of state control surrounding it. To me, that is the antithesis of the intention. Because this trend is being pushed from above. It is not being pushed from below. When you see your whole world getting on board with something, I have to question it. I have to question it.

So I would say, be cautious into being followers and watching newspapers and listening to people like Dr. Sanjay Gupta, who all of a sudden had a come-to-Jesus moment after years of fighting against

a planet. And then he comes out on CNN and says, *Hey, I think it is beneficial*. The next thing you know, you have got half the population saying, *Hey! It might be beneficial, because Sanjay Gupta said it!* Come on, now. It is time for us as people to start thinking for ourselves. So be cautious about the trends, and look for yourself to see how this issue can benefit you. Do not be a follower.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the authors of this comprehensive report. But to be honest, as I did scan the recommendations . . . And there are some recommendations I do not agree with, and there are some that I certainly agree with. I am going to speak from a personal perspective. Some may say we need data. Some may say we need empirical evidence. I hear that. But if you ask people who are in the know, they will say that who lives it knows it. Experiential evidence is the best science, not someone in an ivory tower who is planning and writing things and saying, *Well, I looked at this data set and this data set and that data set. And this is what I gained from it*. No! No. Um-um.

I am going to give you a reason from a person who has consumed the herb. When I say I have consumed the herb, I think most people will know that it is not just an experimental toke of a spliff, and I did not inhale, or maybe I did take a couple of tokes of a spliff and I did inhale. No, I got my background. Before I entered into politics, I trotted in the lifestyle, the liberty of a Rastaman. So, yes, people should already know that I just did not smoke a spliff. That is not my experience. My experience is licking chalice, as the Rastaman would say, while licking Nyabinghi drums and giving praises in the highest cultural art form. That is my experience. So I will speak from that experience.

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned earlier that this whole topic of drugs and the global drug trade is something that we have always avoided in this country. I do not think that people recognise, though, that as an offshore financial centre, we have been intimately involved with the global drug trade, whether we like it or not—whether we like it or not. If you study the history of the British Empire and the British East India Company and the British–Chinese relationships spanning back to the 1830s and 1840s—

An Hon. Member: Hong Kong and Shanghai.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Right. Hong King and Shanghai Banking Corporation, Jardine, Matheson and Co. Right? You will see that we are intimately involved in the global drug trade. And people eat very well in this country through that global drug trade. And it is not the little young black men on the street corner.

An Hon. Member: As told in *Drugs, Incorporated*.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: *Dope, Inc.* is one of the sources that people can educate themselves on.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I would go as far as to suggest that the amount of drugs that transit Bermuda is 100 times more than the amount of drugs that stop off in Bermuda and land in Bermuda. In other words, it has been said that Bermuda can even be considered to be a trans-shipment point of drugs.

Now, I am not trying to cast aspersions. I am not trying to accuse anyone. I am just giving you the reality, things that we usually do not want to talk about in this country. But I bet you there are a few professionals that are worth us all who would get up and deny what I am saying. Yes, I understand it is not something from a national interest perspective that you talk about much. But it does not change the fact that it is true.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, the drug trade in this country, some would say, is the anchor of stability for this country. As MP Commissioning spoke earlier, you have a marginalised community, historically, in this country, black people in particular, whereas it is through the trade where people are able to build houses and educate their children and do a whole heap of other things. And yes, there are ramifications on the negative side for this drug trade, but there are some positive ramifications, too. That is the economic stability of this country.

Now, there will be people who will say, *Well, I do not like it! I do not want it!* But, hey! Hey, listen. The nursery school head does not question where this cash comes from when the nursery school bill is paid. I daresay our churches, respectfully, do not question where the cash comes from in their collection plates. Neither do the supermarkets or the banks, or the car dealerships! No one questions it. So we have to move beyond this contradictory, hypocritical, ivory-tower stiff-necked mindset in this country. We cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, I will move on. But I will say this. I will move on to the medical component of marijuana, or herb. Have you ever noticed the global pharmaceutical industry, Mr. Speaker? You have like a Big Four or Big Five global pharmaceutical manufacturers. Merck Sharp and Dohme is one of them, and you have a few others. Have you ever noticed the commercials that come on TV, Mr. Speaker? They come out and they say, *If you have a strain or pain in your shoulder, take something-something-something*, whatever it is called, some Latin word they call it.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes. Yes, yes.

And they give you this real rosy commercial. But then, for the last 10–15 seconds of the commercial, they give you this litany, this long list, almost a dissertation of the side effects!

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes, I mean, almost near death! Half the commercial is the side effects!

[Laughter]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Okay? But we are talking about the global drug industry. Now, let me make this point. The people who make those drugs—which men, in their hypocrisy, have called “legal,” because it is profitable, very profitable . . . The people who make those are not farmers, per se. They are chemists. They are trained. If you ask Dr. Gibbons, who has got a PhD in Chemistry, he would tell you that he has the ability to create Advil or Robitussin. Likewise (again, I am not casting aspersions), that same technical specialised training could allow you to take the coca leaf and make it into cocaine and the opium paste and turn it into heroin.

But the ganja farmer, he cannot do that! He cannot make Advil or Robitussin or cocaine or heroin or codeine. Well, codeine and morphine have their uses. Yes, thank you. Sure do. And when you are in hospital and you need a dose of a painkiller, you are not going to think twice.

[Inaudible interjection]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes.

But the ganja farmer, all he can do is plant a seed—a seed! And he watches a plant grow. And the plant fruits, and the fruit is called a bud. It is a plant. So, I am saying that to say this: When we talk about drugs, I could tell you what drugs are bad for you, both legal and illegal. They are all man-made. They are all man-made. That is a sure signal of something not being good for you, in terms of drugs.

But we are talking about a plant that could feed you. It could clothe you. It creates oil. It can heal you. It creates textiles. It could shelter you. So, when you are talking about a plant, as far as I am concerned, I do not know any other plant in creation that could serve mankind in so many uses. We all know that hemp, which is a part of the cannabis family, was what the Western world was built upon up until the 1930s, and we heard about Mr. Anslinger and whatnot. But no one has mentioned the lobby of the DuPont company, who wanted to introduce plastics and saw that the hemp industry was a direct competition to their introduction of plastics. And it is through their lobbying efforts that you see Mr. Anslinger and J. Edgar Hoover and all these other persons and the Hearst family and whatnot. It was all big business that led to the prohibition and the continued bogus war on drugs.

Now, medicinal use, as far as I am concerned, I do not need too much scientific evidence. When my daughter, Mr. Speaker, was three years old, because

of the circumstances I did not have much opportunity to spend time with her up until she reached about two-and-a-half, three. But I always was told that she suffers from asthma, severely. The first opportunity I had, my daughter, who is now going 20 years old, the first opportunity I had her in my care and custody, Mr. Speaker, I went and made her a big cup of ganja tea, at two-and-a-half, three years old.

Now, some of you might be saying, *That is irresponsible as a parent!* But you could go ask her mother and her family on her mother’s side today. Since that day, she has never, ever suffered from asthma, since that one day, that one cup of cannabis tea. So people, you cannot tell me about the medicinal use of it. And then I have (I do not think he has a problem with it) my father, who when my mother passed away in 1990, up until a few years ago he suffered from sleep insomnia. He could not sleep! And I am sure there are a lot of widows in this country who suffer the same fate, because you have got a void and it is hard. In fact, unless you are living through it, you cannot really relate to it. So, he could not sleep for over 20 years.

And one day, he says, *Hey*. Actually, I went to him and I said, *Daddy! Drink this tea*.

He says, *What is this?*

I said, *Herb tea*.

Now, he knew that I am an herbalist. I use herbs to heal myself regardless of my ailments. But I gave him this tea. And this is years after him having an issue with his son, who he sacrificed for, that he sent to school and did all these things for, then [his son] assumed a lifestyle of a Rastaman. He could not understand it! He fought against the whole concept of the herb. But then I gave him a cup of tea. And the next morning, he came looking for me. *Hey! What was that?*

[Laughter]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: *I haven’t slept like that in 20 years! What was that?*

I said, *Aw, that was the ishen tea, Daddy, the herb tea*.

He said, *Man, make me some more!* And I obliged him.

I will just cut the story off right there. Everything else is sacred—family, you know what I mean.

[Inaudible interjections]

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: But this is a person who in his late 70s, who had not slept well for 20 years, finally, because of a cup of tea, was able to sleep and rest for the first time in 20 years. So I do not need empirical evidence to see the value of cannabis in terms of the healing of one’s physical temple, or one’s body, Mr. Speaker.

Then, real quick, because I know I have only got 10 minutes left, I have a close friend who was strung out on heroin. Now, if you have ever seen a heroin addict, you will realise that heroin is the elixir of the Devil. It creates zombies. And through all the bureaucrats and treatment centres that never worked, my friend from my White Hill community always went back until another of our friends took him out of Bermuda, took him to Jamaica, took him up into the mountains of north west Jamaica, where the hot springs and the fresh river, the water was. And he gave him fresh food, fresh water and cannabis. And he had him up in nature. And my friend returned clean.

So I have seen how it, instead of being a gateway drug, could be a substance to *save you* from drugs, the most diabolical, vicious of drugs, the drugs that actually destroy oneself and certainly destroys one's family and destroys one's community.

Mr. Speaker, I will just go forward. I am a proponent, and I will go on record for legalisation, not just decriminalisation. Although we brought a Bill, it is tabled, because we think it is a first step, I am for full legalisation with a light touch of regulatory control. I am for allowing for persons to personally cultivate their own cannabis, either for their use or for sale at a dispensary. As MP Burt said, we cannot talk about legalising something and then over control it. That is contradictory. It is either we are going to give people freedom, or we are going to want to control it. So we have to be careful in terms of the legalisation of it.

But the benefit, the benefits of legalisation is the taxation that we can receive. Some estimate up to \$20 million a year, based on 10 per cent, 10,000 people smoking seven grams a week. If you want the assumptions, \$25 million in tax revenue projected, entrepreneurship, a major increase in tourism, and a . . . because we talked about remittances earlier. There were questions on remittances and the money that leaves the Island. But to allow persons to cultivate and even sell, that can stop the outward flow of capital into the country. So there are multiple benefits on Mr. Speaker, cannabis has been used over the ages as the elixir of human creative genius. There are very few the economic front.

Then there is the social front of more peace and harmony within our society. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, and I think you remember, the Wellington Oval riot? When Somerset Eagles were playing Village in the FA Cup Final, I was on the bench. I was the coach of the Eagles in that final. And I had my children there, and everything blew up right in front of me. What people do not realise is that that Wellington Oval riot, which was about, what, seven, eight, nine years ago, which some would say was the spark of our downward spiral, came at a time period when we were in a drought in Bermuda. There was no herb around whatsoever! None! All those youths who got into that melee, they had spent the last couple of days

and weeks drinking alcohol and dealing with other things.

There was no herb on the Island. God forbid if we have a drought in this Island, especially right now. God forbid. And that is not a threat to the Government; that is a threat to every single one of us sitting up here. If you think that cannabis use does not bring a degree of social stability in this country and keeps people's minds calm, some would say *escape from the stresses of the day*, medicating themselves from the daily stresses of trying to put food on the table and clothing on their backs and paying rent, then we are fooling. We are miscalculating.

So we had better move away from this concept of prohibition. Because the ramifications towards us here are grave, man. Because in 2014, if we go through that scenario with the divide in this country, they are going to direct their attention to us, because we have the responsibility and the power to change it! And I am not trying to be on that side of history, man. I am not trying to have to answer to the people because of something that our heads are so stuck in the sand over.

Mr. Speaker, I see I have five minutes left.

The Speaker: Actually, it is four minutes and 50-some seconds.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Okay. No problem. Yes.

And there is also the cultural component, the persecuted Rastaman who must be looking back and saying, *Well, it is about time! But, man, look at the persecution that we had to receive for the last 50–60 years*. And everyone else! You will see cannabis use in the mystic traditions of every religion in the world. In the Islamic tradition, you have your Sufi tradition, which is the mystic aspect, the inner teachings of Islam. In India, in China, in fact, everywhere you see culture, you will see cannabis consumption.

Persons who are not considered to be world-renowned artists or musicians who do not have cannabis as part of their lifestyle—not one. Not one. Bob Marley, Van Gogh, Beethoven, all of them, all of them.

So, Mr. Speaker, the last component, I think, and no one has touched on it, is the spiritual component of cannabis consumption, which in my opinion, is the true purpose of cannabis consumption. It is not for the recreational use or to party or get high or get stoned. No. Cannabis consumption is the vehicle whereby man may cultivate themselves, through fasting, study and prayer.

Combining with good music and other accoutrements of the soul, Mr. Speaker, what cannabis does is slows down the mind, not into a slumber, like you are stupid and you are sleeping. But it slows down the mind as if changing or transmuting a rough ocean into a calm harbour. So when it is consumed, if we in this House today took 10 seconds to analyse ourselves, just 10 seconds, and see how many

thoughts run through your mind, different thoughts run through your mind in 10 seconds, you would probably come up with 15 different thoughts. In other words, our minds are racing in this society. A racing mind is a confused mind! A confused mind is a mind that creates stress on the physical body.

So, spiritually, the consumption of cannabis really is meant for ones to be able to have a mind that can focus on one thought at a time. And that focus on one thought at a time is the secret or sacred purpose of cannabis consumption. It is the key to the royal art of meditation.

Now, for those who do not consume it or have not consumed it, what I am saying might go right over your head. I understand that. But the point or the fact of the matter is that mankind has used cannabis throughout the ages to connect directly with our Creator. And it is the foundation, that connection, that direct connection is the foundation of all concepts of freedom, liberty and justice! Over the temples of old, they said, *Man, know thyself*. And this was a vehicle whereby men—not the only vehicle, but a vehicle whereby men can know themselves.

So it is this last part, the spiritual part, which reduces all our attempts here and abroad to control or regulate cannabis use as an exercise of futility.

The Speaker: You have one minute.

Hon. Marc A. R. Bean: Yes, sir.

But we cannot direct human choice and behaviour, as MP Burt has already articulated. What we can determine, though, what we can determine is whether we as legislators choose to offer our people in this country, old, young, black, white, rich, poor, stability based on freedom, or stability based on control. So, regardless of what direction of the next steps we take, remember as legislators, it is either freedom or control. And for my part, and for the Progressive Labour Party's part, we will always prefer to offer our people more freedom. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Would any other Honourable Members care to speak?

There are no other Members to speak. So that concludes the debate on the motion by the Honourable M. H. Dunkley that the Honourable House take note. So the House has taken note of the Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, which was tabled on the 9th of May 2014.

I am made to understand that all Order [Nos.] from 3 to 14 are to be carried over. Is that so?

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Right. All Order [Nos.] from 3 to . . . Opposition, all of yours are also carried over?

[Inaudible interjection]

The Speaker: So, all Order [Nos.] from 3 to 14 are carried over.

I now recognise the Honourable Premier.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that the House do now adjourn until next Friday, June 6th.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The Chair will recognise the Honourable Member, the Member from Hamilton East, constituency 5, MP Derrick Burgess. You have the floor.

BERMUDA REGIMENT PENSION

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. Mr. Speaker, this is the third time that I have spoken about this situation with the regimental soldiers in the Bermuda Regiment, who are made to retire at 55 and do not receive any pension.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1981 Public Service Superannuation Act, it was quite clear that under this Act, they get their pension at 55 when they retire. But, Mr. Speaker, this Act was amended in 1993, and the Act is quite clear, based on, for those folks that were in the army from 1993 (before the amendment was put in place) those that retire at 55 should receive their pension at 55 as per the 1993 amendment Act. And, Mr. Speaker, if you allow me, I can read that section.

The Speaker: If you like.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Yes. Mr. Speaker, it is under section 3(2), under the amendment Act, it says, "Where on or after the coming into operation of this Act a contributor who is a member of the Bermuda Regiment staff before the coming into operation of this Act retires from or ceases to be employed in the Regiment in circumstances rendering him eligible to a pension or other benefit under the principal Act before its amendment by the Act, the contributor shall be entitled to such pension or other benefit under the principal Act before its amendment by this Act . . ."

It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker. Some have retired at 55, have not received a pension. So there is some monies due to these folks to bring them in line with the Act, Mr. Speaker. I would implore the Honourable Premier, whom this particular Regiment comes under, under National Security, I think it is, Security Ministry—

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: —that this be paid forthwith to these folks that are owed this money, and hopefully that he would also bring an amendment to this House to put the Act where it was to bring it in line with all other, like the fire department, the prisons and the police, where they get their pension at 55 when they retire. Also, those other three areas, they can go to 60. They can go to 60. Even in this Superannuation Act, even the teachers can go to 70. They have to retire at 65, Mr. Speaker. The only one, in my opinion—well, not in my opinion; it is factual—that is discriminated against is the Bermuda Regiment, Mr. Speaker.

So I would ask, again, that the Honourable Premier bring this in line and get this sorted out as per the Act. We are not asking for some . . . This is what they are entitled to under this Act. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Pembroke [West Central]. MP David Burt, you have the floor.

MORTGAGES FROM LOCAL LENDING INSTITUTIONS

Mr. E. David Burt: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to, on the Motion to Adjourn, raise an issue which I am hearing with increasing frequency from the constituents, and I know that I have heard it from a few of my fellow Members of Parliament insofar as what they are hearing from their constituents. And it seems to be the (how could I say it?) exceedingly aggressive nature and behaviour of some of our local lending institutions towards people who are holding mortgages and facing threats of being evicted from their homes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that to say that one of my constituents came to me with an issue the other day. Her issue was that she is doing her best, trying her hardest to cooperate with her bank. And it was even so far as an instance that the bank made her pay for an appraisal of her property, and then the bank refused to give her the appraisal after she paid for it when she asked for it! Now, Mr. Speaker, these are things that we hear on the doorsteps.

I remember hearing the Honourable Minister of Finance during his Budget Speech talk about cracking down on the banks. Well, I would hope that we would at some point in time get an update on what progress is being done. What is the Bermuda Monetary Authority doing? Is there any additional regulation that is being considered from the Bermuda Monetary Authority? Is the Honourable Minister of Finance put-

ting forward anything or making any recommendations or policy changes that he would like to see?

Because, Mr. Speaker, all we see are rates going up, seemingly unchecked. It does not matter—fees going up, specifically fees, not rates. Fees going up. Some people paid for an appraisal two years ago, the appraisal, \$800. This year the appraisal is \$1,400. The bank forced you to get an appraisal, to pay for it. No one knows where it has gone. You cannot choose your own person, if you choose your own person they say you have got to pay for it yourself. Lots of different things, Mr. Speaker, are happening. I do not believe that the practices that we are seeing are just. I do not believe the practices are good.

So it is my hope that at some point in time in the near future the House will get an update on this issue. Because as we just finished this debate about cannabis and talking about stress, this is putting some of our people under a tremendous amount of stress, Mr. Speaker. Nothing could be worse by doing your very best to meet your commitments . . . These are people who are current on their mortgage payments, Mr. Speaker! Yet they are finding banks saying, *Oh, we are going to come back and assess your property.* And once they assess the property with this appraisal, they are saying, *Oh, we need additional security,* and all the rest.

Mr. Speaker, if you are paying your mortgage, why is the bank trying to go after your property? But this is what is going on in this country, Mr. Speaker. This is causing stress inside of our communities for our people. And it—

An Hon. Member: Which bank?

Mr. E. David Burt: I am not going to call the bank's name right now.

But what we want to do, Mr. Speaker, is we want to make sure that we take care of this particular issue. Because it is certainly something the Minister of Finance spoke about passionately. We spoke about it during the Budget Debate. I would really hope that there has been some movement, that it was not just words in February, that there has been some movement, that there has been some direction, that the Bermuda Monetary Authority is looking at putting in additional regulatory teeth and making sure that banks are treating consumers well, and people are not being taken advantage of when they are in a very desperate situation, Mr. Speaker.

So as I take my seat, I hope that the House can get an update, maybe tonight or maybe at another time, from the Honourable Minister of Finance. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

The Chair now recognises the Honourable Member from Hamilton West, constituency 6, MP Wayne Furbert. You have the floor.

SHELLY BAY FIELD BATHROOMS

Hon. Wayne L. Furbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all realise that, or at least we should realise that one of the most popular areas for sports in Bermuda is Shelly Bay. I think it is time for us to look at that particular area. We have little league games going on there, particularly on Saturdays, and evenings either soccer training or cricket training. And the bathrooms in that area are deplorable. The facilities are not up to scratch, and particularly on evening times, bathrooms have to be closed and little children have to go in the trees to do what they have to do.

So I am asking the Minister to take a look at that. I have spoken to her before; she knows that I have spoken to her. But I thought that I would give her a little more time and bring it to the attention of the Cabinet, that the conditions in Hamilton Parish at the Shelly Bay field are in a bad state, and we need some action as soon as possible. Thank you.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you, Honourable Member.

Are there any other Honourable Members who would care to speak?

The Chair recognises the Honourable Member from Southampton. MP Zane De Silva, you have the floor.

MR. SUTHERLAND/HEMISPHERE GROUP

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting couple of weeks. Mr. Speaker, we have had a change in command with the OBA. We have heard much about Jetgate—

The Speaker: And we are not going to hear anything about Jetgate. That is not going to be discussed.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Okay, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I think you will understand that.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes, I got you. Got you, Mr. Speaker, got you.

The Honourable Premier, the new Premier, Mr. Dunkley, made a plea this week in the media, made a plea this week in the media, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to work together, for all of us to join hands.

Mr. Speaker, there were several meetings last weekend. They were very heated meetings. There

were threats of resignations. There were promises of investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I reach out to the Premier of the OBA tonight, as he reached out to us on this side of this House earlier this week, through the media. Let us get together. Let us put this behind us. Let us move forward. We have more important things to do for the people of this country. Let us work together!

Mr. Speaker, I think I speak for all my colleagues on this side. We like that. We like that talk. We want to work with the Government. One caveat, Mr. Speaker, we only ask for one thing. And that is the truth, the absolute, absolute truth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I give a challenge to the Premier Dunkley tonight. If you want to work together, truly work together, put all the other stuff aside and let us move forward for the people of this country. Really? I think not only us on this side, Premier, the people of this country want to know what really happened. We have a Premier that has resigned, in his words—

The Speaker: Honourable Member. You cannot discuss that now. That is a part of the Censure Motion. So I am not going to allow you to discuss that. I am sorry.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Okay. Okay. Okay. Okay.

Mr. Speaker, okay, we will have that conversation. I got you. Thank you for your guidance, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your guidance.

The Speaker: All right. You are welcome.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you for your guidance, because you know, Mr. Speaker, it is not only us in this place. There are many of our people that want to know. So we will have that discussion next week, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have an OBA Government that hung their hat and ran their campaign on transparency, openness, integrity and inclusiveness. That is what they ran their campaign on, and that is what they live by—so they say. Mr. Speaker, [I'm] just catching myself. There are many things that tied into Jetgate, so I am just trying to just work my way through it.

The Speaker: Well, just . . . I do not even want to hear that! I do not want to hear that!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Yes. I do not either, Mr. Speaker, not tonight.

The Speaker: I do not want to hear that, so you are going to have to—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I do not want to feel your wrath tonight, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the Honourable Minister of Tourism and myself had a conversation in reference to Mr. Ronald Sutherland and the Hemisphere Group. And I do a little bit of homework from time to time, Mr. Speaker. With my duty as the Shadow Minister of Tourism now, I have to get up to speed. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister said he will not divulge the terms of Mr. Sutherland/Hemisphere Group. He will not divulge the terms of engagement with that company because they were hired by an interim group, the Executive Steering Committee. Those were his words last week.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say to you in this House and to the Minister, *No, no, no!* That is factually incorrect. And I will take my seat if the Minister disagrees with that statement. And I will pause for a second, because I have done my homework.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, point of clarification, or point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Is it a point of or point of clarification?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: You said you would take your seat.

[Laughter]

The Speaker: You asked him to—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Oh, okay. Okay. Go ahead.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I stand by what I said last week. My information, and I can only go with the information that I received, [which] was that Mr. Sutherland was hired in December, mid-December, to be the consultant for the RFP for St. George's, and he was hired by the Tourism Authority.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: No!

Hansard is a beautiful thing. The Minister said last week, no way! He was not hired by the Tourism Authority, Mr. Speaker! Last week, last week the Minister said that Mr. Sutherland was hired by the Executive Steering Committee! He said that!

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I made it clear that the Tourism Authority did not—we had the conversation—officially come into existence until April 1st of this year.

The Speaker: Right. There were some extended conversation there.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The interim group—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: He said—

The Speaker: Just a minute, Honourable Member.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thirty seconds!

The Speaker: Honourable Member, take your seat!

[Pause]

The Speaker: Yes, please.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Yes, Mr. Speaker. And in the interim, the body that was running the Tourism Authority was the Executive Steering Committee. The Chairperson was Mr. David Dodwell, and they entered into the contract with Mr. Sutherland.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

I thought, Honourable Member, that that was the clarity that was given. But you carry on.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: See, Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Minister is getting a little confused. And Hansard will prove it. And I am going to wait until we get the report from Mr. Lamb to prove it.

The Honourable Minister just said again—just said again who hired Mr. Sutherland! But last week, he said something completely different! Now, I will leave that for now, Mr. Speaker. We will let Hansard prove that. We will let Hansard prove that because he said three different things now in two weeks. Because last week, he said he was hired through the Investment Division of the Tourism Authority.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Mr. Speaker, the Tourism Authority and the Executive Steering Committee, which was creating the Tourism Authority, was creating an Investment Division. And it is through that division that they sought to engage Mr. Sutherland. I am not quite clear—

The Speaker: I think that is clear, Honourable Member.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move on. I will move on. And Hansard will show for the record what has been said.

The Speaker: All right. Very good.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, the question begs, Who really hired Mr. Sutherland?

[Laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I am just going to leave that. Yes.

Who hired him?

There was no tender, no RFP. He was sole-sourced, Mr. Speaker. And the Minister says that he had no part in hiring Mr. Sutherland.

Correct, the Minister says (for Hansard). Very important.

COSMIC CONSULTANTS AND JD LEWIS GROUP

Mr. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping, I was really hoping to hear from the Minister this week a little bit of information, maybe by way of a Ministerial Statement, something about Cosmic Consultants. Cosmic Consultants, Mr. Speaker, we understand, have been hired by the Tourism Authority. Hmm.

I also understand, Mr. Speaker, that Cosmic Consultants hired JD Lewis Group. Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to figure out the relationship between the Minister, Cosmic and JD Lewis Group.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: I am not going to speak on behalf of the Tourism Authority, but the Honourable Member's information is incorrect.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I did not give any information, Mr. Speaker. I asked a question.

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Carry on.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I just said I wondered, I wondered what the relationship was. I did not make a statement.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, you did! You did!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Okay. Let me repeat it, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable Members opposite. What was the relationship between Cosmic Consultants, JD Lewis Group and the Minister? That is all I asked. That is all I asked.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister now . . . maybe he might . . . and I will yield if he wishes to explain the relationship, if he knows of one.

The Speaker: This is not question-and-answer period, Honourable Member.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: No, no, no—

The Speaker: So, just carry on and finish your statement.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I was just saying I am willing to yield, Mr. Speaker, if the . . . No, no, no, no. Question-and-answer period comes next week. But I thought the Minister might want to . . . as he is quick to jump to his feet to do a point of order, he might want to jump to his feet now and do a point of order and say, *I will explain!* Maybe a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker?

But it is not forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The Speaker: About eight minutes, eight minutes.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Eight minutes. Okay. I think I can squeeze it in, Mr. Speaker.

Okay. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker. We have, Mr. Speaker, information coming across this House and in the public. There was \$350,000 that was sent to an account, Mr. Speaker, that we understand—yet to be denied—[was] opened by a Minister of the OBA Government, Mr. Fahy, who sits in another place. Mr. Speaker, we have yet to hear from the OBA Government their position on the opening of this account that received almost \$400,000 for an underground campaign that we have not heard from the OBA Government! We have not heard yet an explanation about these accusations or statements that have been made.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask, What is of this \$400,000 almost?

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Well, when I went to school, 350 was rounded to 400—hey, 3.5 was rounded to 4!

[Laughter]

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, you will know as a former mathematician and a principal, you always round up! You do not round down! And I learned it well when I was in the Government and the Opposition were over here. They taught me well!

[Inaudible interjections and laughter]

An Hon. Member: That is exactly what you did when you were in Government!

An Hon. Member: You took \$800 million and you rounded it up!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Boy, listen to all the chirping! All the birds are singing, yes, sir. All the birds are singing tonight, Mr. Speaker! That \$400,000 hit a nerve.

Now, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to have enough time tonight. I am going to save some for my colleagues for next week. But, Mr. Speaker, the CEO of the Tourism Authority. We have good information that the CEO is making—and I will round it up—from \$390,000 a year to \$400,000, and a bonus attached of about \$400,000.

An Hon. Member: What!

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: That is not correct.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Minister.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister said that is not correct. But he will not tell us—we the people of Bermuda—how our money is being spent and what that real number is! So, Mr. Speaker, I will yield if the Minister would like to tell us what the real number is.

Okay, he is not jumping up, Mr. Speaker. So I will move on.

An Hon. Member: It's higher!

Mr. Zane J. S. De Silva: Maybe it is higher! Is it \$1 million?

Oh, Grant Gibbons, the Honourable Member, says, *Try \$2 million.*

I would not be surprised, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the Chairman of the Tourism Authority, Mr. Dodwell, has his own office in the Washington Mall. Who owns that? Why did they end up at Washington Mall? How much are they paying a square foot?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, we also understand that the Tourism Authority have hired Mello Jones and Martin on their payroll. Can the Honourable Minister, being as he knows what the Tourism CEO does not make or does . . . He said he does not make \$800,000 a year. How much is Mello Jones and Martin being paid? Is the Honourable Member still a partner?

An Hon. Member: Whoa!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Was he ever a partner?

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Since taking on my Ministerial position, I have not been employed. And they are not called Mello Jones and Martin anymore. But I have not been employed with MJM Ltd.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: But I believe that the Tourism Authority has hired them, yes.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Oh! Boy! One minute he does not know anything; the next minute, he knows everything! But that is good. That is good for the record, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also understand that Ernest [*sic*] and Young—

Some Hon. Members: Ernest? Ernest?

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Ernst and Young. Okay, Mike, okay. Ernst and Young, Ernst and Young.

You might as well say “earnest,” because, Mr. Speaker, the money they are being paid by the Tourism Authority, between [\$300,000] and \$1 million.

Now, why do I bring that up? Because the Minister will not tell the taxpayers of this country, will not tell us on this side of the House what they are

spending out of that \$30 million, Mr. Speaker! And if you are tired, Minister, of these statements being made, bring forth the information, not only to me, not only to my colleagues, but to the people of this country. Thirty million dollars!

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Shawn G. Crockwell: The Honourable Member did say he does his research, but that is not \$30 million. It is \$23 million.

The Speaker: Twenty-three million.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Oh, sorry, sorry, Mr. Speaker. I correct—

[Inaudible interjections]

Some Hon. Members: Round it up! Round it up! Yeah!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Now, the Honourable Members opposite are saying, *Round it up!* Well, did you not have a \$5 million supplementary, Minister? So, 23 and 5 is 28, round it up to 30. How much money did the Tourism Board get during the transition, Minister?

Oh, all of a sudden he does not know anything. Deer in the headlights! Okay. No problem. You do not have to answer that yet. But, no, Mr. Speaker, we have all these unanswered questions not only for us on this side of the House, but for the people of this country.

And, Minister, you will hear me every week on the Motion to Adjourn. And as the information comes forth, you will get it. I am hoping that you are going to do the honourable thing, not resign yet. The honourable thing is to let the taxpayers of this country know where their money is being spent and stop being so secret about everything!

The jet . . . sorry. We had secrets earlier. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I lost it for a second. We had enough secrets. We do not need any more secrets from the OBA Government that ran on a campaign of transparency, integrity, openness, togetherness, and the Premier repeated it today! Where is the openness and transparency, Minister? Thirty million dollars of the taxpayers' money not being accounted for!

Mr. Mike Winfield, former OBA Chairman, UBP Chairman, he is a consultant, too! What is he making? Where is all our taxpayers' money going, Mr. Speaker? We have Mr. Robert Sutherland. We have Mr. Mike Winfield. We have the CEO. We have Cos-

mic Consultants. We have JD Lewis. Where is all the money going? We have \$350,000/\$400,000 going into the OBA coffers, apparently. Where is that? When are we going to hear the results of the promised, the promised investigation from the OBA Chairman, Mr. Thad Hollis?

Some Hon. Members: When it is finished.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: When it is finished. The Honourable Minister, Pat Gordon-Pamplin, says, *When it is finished.*

[Timer beeps]

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Sit down, Honourable Member. That is it!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Here we have the most efficient OBA Government—

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, that is it!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Honourable Member—

The Speaker: Honourable Member, that is it!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Honourable Member—

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, that is it!

Yes. The Chair will now recognise the Premier, who will be the last speaker.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in life, it is not about how loud you can shout and how much you distort figures that gets you any credibility. And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to bite my tongue tonight, because I could unleash a barrage on the Honourable Members on that side, because you cannot have it both ways! You cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

For that Honourable Member (who now is getting a glass of water) to criticise this Government because information is not coming from the Tourism Authority is just unbelievable for me, for two reasons. The first reason is that Honourable Member was Minister of Health! And when the Opposition benches every week asked him for information on how much the Chief Executive Officer and people at the hospital were getting paid, it was silence! Total silence! You could have heard a pin drop on the Government benches!

[Inaudible interjections and general uproar]

[Gavel]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, Honourable Member, come on. Honourable Member, Honourable Member!

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: You had your chance to speak. Honourable Member! I do not want you saying anything back to me! Because I am going to send you out if you do! And I am meaning it! You will not be here to speak next week. I want you to be here to speak. I want you to be here to speak next week.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I would like to be here, too.

The Speaker: Thank you. So, please.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: So, Mr. Speaker, it tells you a lot about the character of a person when they can stand up and forget what they did not speak about only months before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, also, the second part of why I find it unbelievable is because that Member has stood on his feet week in and week out—

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: "That Member," Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: The Honourable, yes, the Honourable Member.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The Honourable Member.

The Speaker: The Honourable Member, thank you.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The Honourable Member, week in and week out, standing, *We want to see the OBA succeed! We will stay over there until the cows come home if the OBA succeeds!* But, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Tourism sets up the Tourism Authority, brings legislation to this House. We put it in place, we fund it, and before they are even given an opportunity to make progress—which we all agree we need—these Members are trying to pick at everything to pull it down!

The Speaker: The Honourable Members.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The Honourable Members are trying to pick at everything to pull it down!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: No! We just want transparency!

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, I understand. The honourable chirping bird over there, Mr. Speaker, says, *We just want transparency.*

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: The *honourable chirping bird?*

Point of order!

The Speaker: Honourable Member! Honourable Member De Silva, I am going to say take your seat! And say nothing more!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: *Honourable chirping bird?*

[Crosstalk]

The Speaker: Honourable Member, you are pushing it! You are pushing it! That is all.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: *Honourable chirping bird?*

The Speaker: You are pushing it. I think you need to take control of yourself.

Carry on, Minister.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: So, Mr. Speaker, if we really want to succeed, we have to give people the opportunity to succeed. If the Honourable Minister comes to this Chamber and gives answers, you cannot try to pick a hole in everything that is said. The Tourism Authority has certainly got off to a strong start. Let us work with them! Let us work with them, Mr. Speaker!

I hear the Honourable Former Minister of Tourism say, *How?*

An Hon. Member: Yes! I said, *How?*

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, we could talk about some things that they did, talk about some of the nonsense that went on under the former administration. But we need to move forward. We cannot keep pulling ourselves back, Mr. Speaker! We have got to move forward.

An Hon. Member: Transparency!

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: And we hear these calls for transparency.

Mr. Speaker, if you set up a Tourism Authority to operate separate from Government, you have to let them operate! And you have to let them report. If Honourable Members cannot wait for the report at the appropriate time, then they will have to just listen a little bit longer and wait for it. Mr. Speaker, we cannot pull it down. We are on the cusp of making some major improvements here in Bermuda. The Tourism Authority has got some quality people that are working hard on the job. We should not have a negative be-

haviour all the time trying to pick at them, Mr. Speaker. We must give them the opportunity.

If the Honourable Member is serious about having success in this country, he needs to stop criticising so much and go to the Tourism Authority and ask them the questions, and maybe understand the programme a little bit more, Mr. Speaker. Because I find it incredulous to me that the Member comes up here, and all of a sudden, numbers just keep inflating and going up, and coming out with some nonsense that the Chairman of the Tourism Authority is getting paid \$1 million a year! Come on, Mr. Speaker!

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I did not say that the Chairman makes \$1 million a year.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The CEO.

Hon. Zane J. S. De Silva: I did not say the CEO did!

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Well—

[Inaudible interjections]

The Speaker: Carry on.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The Hansard will tell us next week.

The Speaker: Carry on, Premier.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The Hansard will tell us next week.

So, Mr. Speaker, it has been a good, good debate here in the House today about the cannabis reform document. It is unfortunate we have to end on this aspect. But clearly, I have confidence in the Minister of Tourism, and I have confidence in the Tourism Authority to do what they have to do. We need to all support them and move forward.

BERMUDA REGIMENT PENSION

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: The last thing I will say, Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke about pension issues at the Regiment. That is a matter that I am well aware of, Mr. Speaker, and it is something that is being looked at. But, Mr. Speaker, issues that were not dealt with by the former administration cannot easily be cleared up by this administration, especially with the handcuff of

spending that we have that was initiated quite a lot by the former administration.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Yes, Honourable Member.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Premier says about he has got to look into it, the Act is quite clear, very, very clear.

The Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Honourable Member.
Premier?

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: I was not in charge then.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member says he was not in charge, but he sat in Cabinet all the time, Mr. Speaker. So it is easy now that the shoe is not on that foot to ask other people to clear it up, when there was no conscience even to look at it before.

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Derrick V. Burgess, Sr.: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Premier saying because we did not do it, he is not going to do it?

The Speaker: All right.
Premier.

Hon. Michael H. Dunkley: No. I will repeat that, Mr. Speaker. That is not what I said. I clearly said I am aware of the situation. It is something we will take a look at. But because of the economic constraints this Government has, it is not something that can simply be done.

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in this Chamber and most people in Bermuda are aware of the significant deficit that we have. It would be irresponsible of us just to continue to spend like the former Government did, without looking to clear the path forward a little bit better. This Government, and certainly this Finance Minister, does not operate like that. That is why we are in the hole, because of reckless spending by the prior Government, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will certainly deal with these issues as we deem appropriate. We appreciate the support of the Opposition where possible. But really, Mr. Speaker, when they say they want to work

together, we would like to see some proof in the pudding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you and everybody a good weekend. Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Honourable Premier.

The House is adjourned to Friday next, June 6th.

[Gavel]

[At 10:26 pm, the House stood adjourned until 10:00 am, Friday, 6 June 2014.]

**BERMUDA HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
2013/14 SESSION**

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT
INDEX
May 2014**

*This Index is arranged alphabetically with “Order of Business” headings and MPs’ names in **bold**. “Bills” are arranged both alphabetically and procedurally (i.e., First Reading, Second Reading, Committee, Report, Third Reading).*

A

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Bermuda Regiment Pension

Burgess, Hon. Derrick V., Sr., 2263–2264

Dunkley, Hon. Michael H., 2271–2272

Bermuda/UK Relations

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 2116–2117

Cosmic Consultants and JD Lewis Group

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2267–2269

Dunkley, Hon. Michael H., 2269–2271

Gorham’s Solar Panels

Gibbons, Dr. the Hon. E. Grant, 2036

Government training programmes available

Atherden, Mrs. Jeanne J., 2040–2042

Hemisphere Group/Sutherland, Mr.

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2265–2267

Jetgate

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 1957–1961, 2065–2067, 2156–2160

Blakeney, Mr. Glenn A., 1947–1950, 2042–2044, 2128–2132

Brown, Mr. Walton, 1934–1936

Burgess, Hon. Derrick V., Sr., 1957, 2153–2156

Burt, Mr. E. David, 1950–1954, 2061–2065, 2138–2143

Cannonier, Hon. L. Craig, 1962–1963, 2067–2070

Commissioning, Mr. Rolfe, 2057–2059, 2143–2146

Crockwell, Hon. Shawn G., 1940–1942, 2160–2163

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2046–2049, 2133–2136

Dunkley, Hon. Michael H., 2163–2164

Furbert, Hon. Wayne L., 2027–2031, 2119–2125

Gibbons, Dr. the Hon. E. Grant, 2034–2035, 2125–2128

Lister, Hon. Dennis P., 1927–1931, 2022–2027

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2113–2116

Richards, Hon. E. T. (Bob), 2051–2054, 2148–2153

Richards, Mr. Sylvan D., Jr., 1946–1947

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 1931–1934, 2031–2034, 2117–2119

Scott, Hon. Michael J., 1942–1946, 2059–2060

Scott, Hon. R. Wayne, 1954–1957

Scott, Mr. W. Lawrence, 2037–2040, 2146–2148

Weeks, Mr. Michael A., 2055–2056

Wilson, Mrs. Kim N., 1936–1939, 2136–2138

John Smith’s Bay bathrooms

Richards, Mr. Sylvan D., Jr., 2044–2046

Weeks, Mr. Michael A., 2056–2057

Mortgages from local lending institutions

Burt, Mr. E. David, 2264–2265

Orman, Suze

Gibbons, Dr. the Hon. E. Grant, 2035–2036

Public Accounts Committee

Burt, Mr. E. David, 2060

Richards, Hon. E. T. (Bob), 2049–2051

Adjournment, Motions thereon (continued)

SAGE Report

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2112–2113

Shelly Bay Field bathrooms

Furbert, Hon. Wayne L., 2265

Summerhaven and Claire Ann Moore, marathon for Bermuda Day Derby

Richards, Mr. Sylvan D., Jr., 2046

Sutherland, Mr./Hemisphere Group

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2265–2267

Visa-free access to Schengen area for BOT Citizens

Brown, Mr. Walton, 2110–2112

Woman in society, important role

Wilson, Mrs. Kim N., 1939–1940

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Announcements by Speaker or Member presiding

Barritt, Mr. John, former Speaker

letter from family re: condolences, 2071

Moment of Silence on passing, 1965

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1987–1988

House visitors

DeCouto, Hon. Ernest, former Speaker, 2071

Hallett, Mr. Clive, former Parliamentary principal, 1999

Hodgson, Hon. Arthur, former MP, 1965

Santucci, Rev. Dr., former Senator, 1987

Senator Diallo Rabain, 2012

Senator Dillas-Wright, 2072

Senator Jardine, 2072

Senator Marc Daniels, 2055

Senator Renee Ming, 2034

Smith, Dame Jennifer, former Premier, 2012

Talbot, Dr. Lana, 2148

Tyrrell, Mr. Neville, former Senator, 2008

Washington Leadership Group, 1965

Young Presidents' Organisation (YPO) and Black YPO, 2212

Sessional Committees, 2165

Atherden, Mrs. Jeanne J.

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Government training programmes available, 2040–2042

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2219–2221

Government training programmes available, 2040–2042

National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1910–1911

Parliamentary Governance and Reform, Joint Select Committee Report, 2016–2019

STEPS to a well Bermuda, update, 2169–2170

Autism Awareness. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Aviation Policy Consultation Conference. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

B

Barritt, Mr. John, former Speaker

letter from family re: condolences, 2071

Moment of Silence on passing, 1965

Bascome, Mr. Kenneth (Kenny)

Bermuda National Museum, lease agreement with West End Development Corporation, 2109

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2215–2216

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 2101–2102

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R.

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 1957–1961, 2065–2067, 2156–2160

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of, 1986

Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2187, 2188

Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening, 1974

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R. (continued)

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 1877, 2259–2263
Censure Motion, 2196–2197
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1892–1893, 1988–1989, 2101, 2192
Grand Atlantic project update, 1977, 1980, 1981, 1982
Jetgate, 1957–1961, 2065–2067, 2156–2160
Lionfish Control Plan, completed, 1986, 1987

Question Period

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of, 1986
Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2187, 2188
Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening, 1974
Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 1877
Grand Atlantic project update, 1977, 1980, 1981, 1982
Lionfish Control Plan, completed, 1986, 1987
Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2179
St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2094, 2095
Sutherland, Mr. Ronald, 2080, 2081, 2082
Waste disposal update, 1884

Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2179

St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2094, 2095

Sutherland, Mr. Ronald, 2080, 2081, 2082

Waste disposal update, 1884

Bermuda Day 2014. *See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Reflections (*See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers)

Summerhaven and Claire Moore marathon for (*See* Adjournment, Motions thereon)

Bermuda Hospitals Charitable Trust "Why it Matters" campaign. *See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Bermuda National Museum, lease agreement with West End Development Corporation. *See* Papers and Other Communications to House

Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening. *See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Bills

Bermuda Immigration and Protection Amendment Act 2014

First Reading, 2000

Companies Amendment (No. 2) Act 2014

First Reading, 2103

Life Insurance Amendment Act 2014

First Reading, 2103

Protected Species Amendment Act 2014

First Reading, 2195

Blakeney, Mr. Glenn A.

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 2042–2044, 2128–2132

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 1876, 2242–2245

Grand Atlantic project update, 1978, 1981

Jetgate, 2042–2044, 2128–2132

Question Period

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 1876

Grand Atlantic project update, 1978, 1981

St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2096

Waste disposal update, 1883

St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2096

Waste disposal update, 1883

Brown, Mr. Walton

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 1934–1936

Visa-free access to Schengen area for BOT Citizens, 2110–2112

Commission of Inquiry into loss and dispossession of property, 2000

Jetgate, 1934–1936

National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013-2017, 1971

Parliamentary Governance and Reform, Joint Select Committee Report, 2015–2016

Brown, Mr. Walton (continued)

Question Period

National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013-2017, 1971
Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2178
STEPS to a well Bermuda, update, 2183

Question Period (continued)

Visa-free access to Schengen area for BOT Citizens, 2096, 2097
Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2178
STEPS to a well Bermuda, update, 2183
Visa-free access to Schengen area for BOT Citizens, 2096, 2097, 2110–2112

Burgess, Hon. Derrick V., Sr.

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Bermuda Regiment Pension, 2263–2264
Jetgate, 1957, 2153–2156

Bermuda Regiment Pension, 2263–2264

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1989–1990

Education Act 1966, consultation on proposed amendments, 2097

Jetgate, 1957, 2153–2156

Question Period

Education Act 1966, consultation on proposed amendments, 2097

Burt, Mr. E. David

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 1950–1954, 2061–2065, 2138–2143
Mortgages from local lending institutions, 2264–2265
Public Accounts Committee, 2060

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of, 1984, 1985

Bermuda Day 2014, reflections, 2185

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2254–2259

Company incorporations, continued increase in, 1878, 1880

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1895, 1999, 2099

Grand Atlantic project update, 1977, 1984

Jetgate, 1950–1954, 2061–2065, 2138–2143

Moody's credit rating adjustment, 2088, 2089

Mortgages from local lending institutions, 2264–2265

Public Accounts Committee, 2060

Question Period

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of, 1984, 1985

Bermuda Day 2014, reflections, 2185

Company incorporations, continued increase in, 1878, 1880

Grand Atlantic project update, 1977, 1984

Moody's credit rating adjustment, 2088, 2089

Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2178

Sutherland, Mr. Ronald, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083

Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2178

Sutherland, Mr. Ronald, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083

C

Cannabis

Reform Collaborative Report: "An analysis of Cannabis reform in Bermuda" (See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers)

Cannonier, Hon. L. Craig

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 1962–1963, 2067–2070

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1888, 1988

Human Resources Department, reorganisation of, 1866

Jetgate, 1962–1963, 2067–2070

Censure Motion. See Motions

Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities International (CARF). See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Commission of Inquiry into loss and dispossession of property. See Motions

Commissiong, Mr. Rolfe

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 2057–2059, 2143–2146

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2251–2254

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1889

Grand Atlantic project update, 1980

Jetgate, 2057–2059, 2143–2146

Question Period

Grand Atlantic project update, 1980

St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2095

St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2095

Companies Amendment (No. 2) Act 2014. See Bills

Company incorporations, continued increase. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Confirmation of Minutes

17 March 2014, 1865

21 March 2014, 1865

09 May 2014, 1965

16 May 2014, 2071

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches

Bascome, Mr. Kenneth (Kenny), 2101–2102

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 1892–1893, 1988–1989, 2101, 2192

Burgess, Hon. Derrick V., Sr., 1989–1990

Burt, Hon. E. David, 1895, 1999, 2099

Cannonier, Hon. L. Craig, 1888, 1988

Commissiong, Mr. Rolfe, 1889

Crockwell, Hon. Shawn G., 1893, 1990, 2191–2192

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2097–2098, 2190

Dunkley, Hon. Michael H., 1892, 1989, 2102, 2194–2195

Foggo, Ms. Lovitta F., 1891–1892, 1994, 2190

Furbert, Hon. Wayne L., 1995, 2099

Gibbons, Dr. the Hon. E. Grant, 1889, 1992–1993, 2099

Gordon-Pamplin, Hon. Patricia J., 1893–1894, 1997–1998, 2192–2193

Lister, Hon. Dennis, P., 1997, 2100

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 1889–1890, 1990, 2193

Moniz, Hon. Trevor G., 1894–1895, 1998

Richards, Hon. E. T. (Bob), 1991

Richards, Mr. Sylvan D., Jr., 2100–2101

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 1992, 2194

Roberts-Holshouser, Mrs. Suzann, 1890, 1994, 2101, 2193–2194

Scott, Hon. Michael J., 1891, 1998, 2098

Scott, Hon. R. Wayne, 1887–1888, 1991–1992, 2098, 2189–2190

Scott, Mr. W. Lawrence, 1888, 2102, 2191

Simons, Mr. N. H. Cole, 1995–1996, 2102

Smith, Mr. Glen, 1891, 1994–1995, 2190

Sousa, Mr. Jeff, 1888–1889, 1999, 2099–2100, 2191

The Speaker, 1987–1988

Weeks, Mr. Michael A., 1896–1897, 1996, 2100

Wilson, Mrs. Kim N., 1993–1994

Crockwell, Hon. Shawn G.

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 1940–1942, 2160–2163

Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2173–2174

Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening, 1967–1968

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2235–2238

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1893, 1990, 2191–2192

Jetgate, 1940–1942, 2160–2163

National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1917–1920

St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2075–2076

D

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S.

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Cosmic Consultants and JD Lewis Group, 2267–2269
Hemisphere Group/Sutherland, Mr., 2265–2267
Jetgate, 2046–2049, 2133–2136
Sutherland, Mr./Hemisphere Group, 2265–2267
Bermuda Hospitals Charity Trust "Why it Matters" campaign, 2180

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S. (continued)

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2216–2219
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 2097–2098, 2190
Cosmic Consultants and JD Lewis Group, 2267–2269
Gibb's Hill Lighthouse renovation, 2189
Grand Atlantic project update, 1975, 1976, 1980, 1984
Jetgate, 2046–2049, 2133–2136
Question Period
Bermuda Hospitals Charity Trust "Why it Matters" campaign, 2180
Gibb's Hill Lighthouse renovation, 2189
Grand Atlantic project update, 1975, 1976, 1980, 1984
St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094
STEPS to a well Bermuda, update, 2182, 2183
Sutherland, Mr. Ronald, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082
St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094
STEPS to a well Bermuda, update, 2182, 2183
Sutherland, Mr. Ronald, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082
Sutherland, Mr./Hemisphere Group, 2265–2267

Dunkley, Hon. Michael H.

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Bermuda Regiment Pension, 2271–2272
Cosmic Consultants and JD Lewis Group, 2269–2271
Jetgate, 2163–2164
Bermuda Hospitals Charitable Trust "Why it Matters" campaign, 2166–2167
Bermuda Regiment Pension, 2271–2272
Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report: "An analysis of Cannabis reform in Bermuda," 1865, 1866–1867, 1897, 2198–2202
Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities International (CARF), 2072–2073
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1892, 1989, 2102, 2194–2195
Cosmic Consultants and JD Lewis Group, 2269–2271
Jetgate, 2163–2164
National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013 through 2017, 1965–1967
National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1898–1903

E

Education Act 1966, consultation on proposed amendments. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers
Education Commissioner. See Question Period
Electronic Communications (Regulatory Authority Fees) Regulations 2014. See Papers and Other
Communications to House

F

Foggo, Ms. Lovitta F.

Autism Awareness, 2180
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1891–1892, 1994, 2190
Middle School Leadership Training, 2181
Parliamentary Governance and Reform, Joint Select Committee Report, 2008–2012
Question Period
Autism Awareness, 2180
Middle School Leadership Training, 2181

Furbert, Hon. Wayne L.

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Jetgate, 2027–2031, 2119–2125
Shelly Bay Field bathrooms, 2265
Company incorporations, continued increase in, 1875, 1879, 1880
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1995, 2099
Grand Atlantic project update, 1978, 1980–1981
Jetgate, 2027–2031, 2119–2125
Question Period
Company incorporations, continued increase in, 1875, 1879, 1880
Grand Atlantic project update, 1978, 1980–1981
Sutherland, Mr. Ronald, 2083
Shelly Bay Field bathrooms, 2265
Sutherland, Mr. Ronald, 2083

G

Gibb's Hill Lighthouse, renovations. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Gibbons, Dr. the Hon. E. Grant

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Gorham's Solar Panels, 2036
Jetgate, 2034–2035, 2125–2128
Orman, Suze, 2035–2036
African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of, 1969–1970
Company incorporations, continued increase in, 1868
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1889, 1992–1993, 2099
Education Act 1966, consultation on proposed amendments, 2077–2079
Electronic Communications (Regulatory Authority Fees) Regulations 2014, 2071
Gorham's Solar Panels, 2036
Jetgate, 2034–2035, 2125–2128
Middle School Leadership Training, 2168–2169
National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1920–1923
Orman, Suze, 2035–2036

Gordon-Pamplin, Hon. Patricia J.

Bermuda National Museum, lease agreement with West End Development Corporation, 1866
Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2228–2232
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1893–1894, 1997–1998, 2192–2193
Gibb's Hill Lighthouse, renovations, 2174–2175
Grand Atlantic Project update, 1968–1969
National Election Campaign Financing Policy, establishing of, 2196
National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1911–1915
Perimeter Lane Repairs, 1871–1872
Public Works new request reporting system, 1872
Gorham's Solar Panels. See Adjournment, Motions thereon
Government Fees Amendment (No. 2) Regulations 2014. See Papers and Other Communications to House
Government training programmes available. See Adjournment, Motions thereon
Grand Atlantic Project update. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

H

Hamilton, Corporation of
Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. ("the Borrower"), Guaranty by Corporation of Hamilton ("the Guarantor") in respect of loan by Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC ("the Lender"), 2166
Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. ("the Borrower"), Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC ("the Lender") and the Corporation of Hamilton ("the Mortgagor")-Mortgage Deed, 2166
Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. ("the Tenant"), the Corporation of Hamilton ("the Landlord") and Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC ("the Mortgagee")-Deed of Surrender, 2166
Hemisphere Group/Sutherland, Mr. See Adjournment, Motions thereon
Heritage Month 2014. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers
Human Resources Department, reorganisation. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

J

Jackson, Mrs. Susan E.

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2240–2242
National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1917
Jetgate. *See* Adjournment, Motions thereon
John Smith's Bay bathrooms. *See* Adjournment, Motions thereon

L

Lease Agreements

Bermuda National Museum, lease agreement with West End Development Corporation
Bascome, Mr. Kenneth (Kenny), 2109
Lister, Hon. Dennis P., 2107–2108
Moniz, Hon. Trevor G., 2106–2107, 2109
Roban, Mr. Walter H., 2108
Life Insurance Amendment Act 2014. *See* Bills
Lionfish Control Plan completed. *See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Lister, Hon. Dennis P.

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Jetgate, 1927–1931, 2022–2027
Bermuda National Museum, lease agreement with West End Development Corporation, 2107–2108
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1997, 2100
Jetgate, 1927–1931
Perimeter Lane Repairs, 1880, 1881
Question Period
Perimeter Lane Repairs, 1880, 1881

Lister, Hon. Terry E.

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Jetgate, 2113–2116
SAGE Report, 2112–2113
Autism Awareness, 2181
Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2187, 2188
Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening, 1973, 1974
Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2238–2240
Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF), 2087
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1889–1890, 1990, 2193
Education Commissioner, 1886, 1887
Jetgate, 2113–2116
Mandatory Random Drug Testing Policy for Members of Legislature, Joint Select Committee Report, 2175, 2195
Moody's credit rating adjustment, 2090, 2091
Port Royal Fire Station ambulance, 2083, 2084, 2085
Question Period
Autism Awareness, 2181
Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2187, 2188
Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening, 1973, 1974
Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF), 2087
Education Commissioner, 1886, 1887
Moody's credit rating adjustment, 2090, 2091
Port Royal Fire Station ambulance, 2083, 2084, 2085
Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2175, 2176, 2177
Waste disposal update, 1884, 1885
Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2175, 2176, 2177
SAGE Report, 2112–2113
Waste disposal update, 1884, 1885

M

Mandatory Random Drug Testing Policy for Members of Legislature, Joint Select Committee Report. *See* Motions; Reports of Committees
Marine and Ports Department Audit. *See* Question Period
Official Hansard Report Index

Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC. See Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. Middle School Leadership Training. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Moniz, Hon. Trevor G.

Bermuda National Museum, lease agreement with West End Development Corporation, 2106–2107, 2109
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1894–1895, 1998
Lionfish Control Plan completed, 1970–1971
National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1923–1925
Parliamentary Governance and Reform, Joint Select Committee Report, 2012–2015
Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014, 2104, 2105
Waste, disposal of, update, 1872–1874

Moody's credit rating adjustment. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Motions. See also Adjournment, Motions thereon

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report

(See also Papers and Other Communications to House; Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers)

Atherden, Hon. Jeanne J., 2219–2221
Bascome, Mr. Kenneth (Kenny), 2215–2216
Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 2259–2263
Blakeney, Mr. Glenn A., 2242–2245
Burt, Mr. E. David, 2254–2259
Commissiong, Mr. Rolfe, 2251–2254
Crockwell, Hon. Shawn G., 2235–2238
De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2216–2219
Dunkley, Hon. Michael H., 1897, 2198–2202
Gordon-Pamplin, Hon. Patricia J., 2228–2232
Jackson, Mrs. Susan E., 2240–2242
Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2238–2240
Outerbridge, Ms. Nandi, 2223
Pettingill, Mr. Mark J., 2207–2212
Roban, Mr. Walter H., 2202–2207
Roberts-Holshouser, Mrs. Suzann, 2245–2246
Scott, Hon. Michael J., 2232–2235
Scott, Ms. Leah K., 2240
Simons, Mr. N. H. Cole, 2246–2250
Smith, Mr. Glen, 2227–2228
Sousa, Mr. Jeff, 2250–2251
Weeks, Mr. Michael A., 2222–2223
Wilson, Mrs. Kim N., 2223–2227

Censure Motion

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 2196–2197

Commission of Inquiry into loss and dispossession of property

Brown, Mr. Walton, 2000

Mandatory Random Drug Testing Policy for Members of Legislature, Joint Select Committee Report

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2195

National Election Campaign Financing Policy, establishing of

Gordon-Pamplin, Hon. Patricia J., 2196

National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of

Atherden, Mrs. Jeanne J., 1910–1911

Crockwell, Hon. Shawn G., 1917–1920

Dunkley, Hon. Michael A., 1898–1903

Gibbons, Dr. the Hon. E. Grant, 1920–1923

Gordon-Pamplin, Hon. Patricia J., 1911–1915

Jackson, Mrs. Susan E., 1917

Moniz, Hon. Trevor G., 1923–1925

Pettingill, Hon. Mark J., 1925–1926

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 1903–1910

Roberts-Holshouser, Mrs. Suzann, 1915–1917

Sousa, Mr. Jeff, 1926–1927

Parliamentary Governance and Reform, Joint Select Committee Report

Atherden, Mrs. Jeanne J., 2016–2019

Motions (continued)

Parliamentary Governance and Reform, Join Select Committee Report (continued)

Brown, Mr. Walton, 2015–2016

Foggo, Ms. Lovitta F., 2008–2012

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2020–2021

Moniz, Hon. Trevor G., 2012–2015

Simons, Mr. N. H. Cole, 2000–2008

N

National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013 through 2017. See Papers and Other Communications to House

National Election Campaign Financing Policy, establishing of. See Motions

National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report. See Motions

National Training Board 2012 Annual Report. See Papers and Other Communications to House

O

Orman, Suze. See Adjournment, Motions thereon

Outerbridge, Ms. Nandi

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2223

P

Papers and Other Communications to House

Bermuda National Museum, lease agreement with West End Development Corporation, 1866

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 1865 (See also Motions)

Electronic Communications (Regulatory Authority Fees) Regulations 2014, 2071

Government Fees Amendment (No. 2) Regulations 2014, 2072

National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013 through 2017, 1965

National Training Board 2012 Annual Report, 1865

Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Borrower”), Guaranty by Corporation of Hamilton (“the Guarantor”) in respect of loan by Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Lender”), 2166

Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Borrower”), Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Lender”), and the Corporation of Hamilton (“the Mortgagor”)-Mortgage Deed, 2166

Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Tenant”), the Corporation of Hamilton (“the Landlord”) and Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Mortgagee”)-Deed of Surrender, 2166

Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014, 1865

Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2165

Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Borrower”), Guaranty by Corporation of Hamilton (“the Guarantor”) in respect of loan by Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Lender”), 2166

Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Borrower”), Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Lender”), and the Corporation of Hamilton (“the Mortgagor”)-Mortgage Deed between, 2166

Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. (“the Tenant”), the Corporation of Hamilton (“the Landlord”) and Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC (“the Mortgagee”)-Deed of Surrender, 2166

Parliamentary Governance and Reform, Join Select Committee Report. See Motions

Perimeter Lane Repairs. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Pettingill, Hon. Mark J.

National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1925–1926

Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014, 1865

Pettingill, Mr. Mark J.

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2207–2212

Port Royal Fire Station ambulance. See Question Period

Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014. See Papers and Other Communications to House; Regulations

Protected Species Amendment Act 2014. See Bills

Public Accounts Committee. See Adjournment, Motions thereon

Public Works new request reporting system. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Q

Queen's Baton Relay in Bermuda. See Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Question Period (See *a/so* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers)

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 1986

Burt, Mr. E. David, 1984, 1985

Simons, Mr. N. H. Cole, 1986

Autism Awareness

Foggo, Ms. Lovitta F., 2180

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2181

Aviation Policy Consultation Conference

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 2187, 2188

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2187, 2188

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 2186, 2187

Scott, Mr. W. Lawrence, 2186

Bermuda Day 2014

Reflections

Burt, Mr. E. David, 2185

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 2185

Weeks, Mr. Michael A., 2183, 2184

Weeks, Mr. Michael, 2087

Bermuda Hospitals Charity Trust "Why it Matters" campaign

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2180

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 2180

Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 1974

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 1973, 1974

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 1974

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 1877

Blakeney, Mr. Glenn A., 1876

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 1874, 1875

Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF)

Lister, Hon. Terry L., 2087

Roberts-Holshouser, Mrs. Suzann, 2087

Wilson, Mrs. Kim N., 2085, 2086

Company incorporations, continued increase in

Burt, Mr. E. David, 1878, 1880

Furbert, Hon. Wayne L., 1875, 1876, 1879, 1880

Education Act 1966, consultation on proposed amendments

Burgess, Hon. Derrick V., Sr., 2097

Education Commissioner

Lister, Hon. Terry E., 1886, 1887

Gibb's Hill Lighthouse renovation

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2189

Grand Atlantic project update

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 1977, 1980, 1981, 1982

Blakeney, Mr. Glenn A., 1978, 1981

Burt, Mr. E. David, 1977, 1984

Commissiong, Mr. Rolfe, 1980

De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 1975, 1976, 1980, 1984

Furbert, Hon. Wayne L., 1978, 1980–1981

Roban, Mr. Walter H., 1978, 1983

Roberts-Holshouser, Mrs. Suzann, 1976, 1979

Scott, Mr. W. Lawrence, 1975–1976, 1981, 1982

Weeks, Mr. Michael A., 1975, 1976, 1980

Lionfish Control Plan, completed

Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 1986, 1987

Marine and Ports Department Audit

Scott, Mr. W. Lawrence, 1887

Question Period (continued)

Middle School Leadership Training
Foggo, Ms. Lovitta F., 2181

Moody's credit rating adjustment
Burt, Mr. E. David, 2088, 2089
Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2090, 2091

National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013-2017
Brown, Mr. Walton, 1971
Roban, Mr. Walter H., 1972

Perimeter Lane Repairs
Lister, Hon. Dennis P., 1880, 1881

Port Royal Fire Station ambulance
Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2083, 2084, 2085
Wilson, Mrs. Kim N., 2085

Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013
Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 2179
Brown, Mr. Walton, 2178
Burt, Mr. E. David, 2178
Lister, Hon. Terry E., 2175, 2176, 2177
Roban, Mr. Walter H., 2179

St. George's Tourism Development Site
Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 2094, 2095
Blakeney, Mr. Glenn A., 2096
Commissiong, Mr. Rolfe, 2095
De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094
Roberts-Holshouser, Mrs. Suzann, 2096

STEPS to a well Bermuda, update
Brown, Mr. Walton, 2183
De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2182, 2183

Sutherland, Mr. Ronald (*See also* Adjournment, Motions thereon)
Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 2080, 2081, 2082
Burt, Mr. E. David, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083
De Silva, Hon. Zane J. S., 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082
Furbert, Hon. Wayne L., 2083

Visa-free access to Schengen area for BOT Citizens (*See also* Adjournment, Motions thereon)
Brown, Mr. Walton, 2096, 2097

Waste disposal update
Bean, Hon. Marc A. R., 1884
Blakeney, Mr. Glenn A., 1883
Lister, Hon. Terry E., 1884, 1885
Roban, Mr. Walter H., 1882, 1883
Scott, Hon. Michael J., 1884
Wilson, Mrs. Kim N., 1881, 1882, 1885

Quorum, 1896

R

Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013. *See* Papers and Other Communications to House

Regulations

Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014
Moniz, Hon. Trevor G., 2104, 2105
Scott, Hon. Michael J., 2105
Simons, Mr. N. H. Cole, 2105
Wilson, Mrs. Kim N., 2104–2105

Reports of Committees

Mandatory Random Drug Testing Policy for Members of Legislature, 2175

Richards, Hon. E. T. (Bob)

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Jetgate, 2051–2054, 2148–2153
Public Accounts Committee, 2049–2051

Richards, Hon. E. T. (Bob) (continued)

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1991
Government Fees Amendment (No. 2) Regulations 2014, 2072
Jetgate, 2051–2054, 2148–2153
Moody's credit rating adjustment, 2074–2075
Public Accounts Committee, 2049–2051

Richards, Mr. Sylvan D., Jr.

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Jetgate, 1946–1947
John Smith's Bay bathrooms, 2044–2046
Summerhaven and Claire Ann Moore, marathon for Bermuda Day Derby, 2046
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 2100–2101
Jetgate, 1946–1947
John Smith's Bay bathrooms, 2044–2046
National Training Board 2012 Annual Report, 1865
Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. ("the Borrower") Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC ("the Lender"),
and the Corporation of Hamilton ("the Mortgagor")-Mortgage Deed, 2166
Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. ("the Borrower"), Guaranty by Corporation of Hamilton ("the
Guarantor") in respect of loan by Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC ("the Lender"), 2166
Par-la-Ville Hotel and Residences Ltd. ("the Tenant"), the Corporation of Hamilton ("the Landlord") and
Mexico Infrastructure Finance LLC ("the Mortgagee")-Deed of Surrender, 2166
Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2165
Risk and Insurance Management Society Convention, Finance Minister's visit to, 1867
Summerhaven and Claire Ann Moore, marathon for Bermuda Day Derby, 2046
Visa-free to Schengen countries for BOT Citizens, 2076–2077
Risk and Insurance Management Society Convention, Finance Minister's visit to. See Statements by Ministers
and Junior Ministers

Roban, Mr. Walter H.

Adjournment, Motions thereon
Bermuda/UK Relations, 2116–2117
Jetgate, 1931–1934, 2031–2034, 2117–2119
Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2186, 2187
Bermuda Day 2014, reflections, 2185
Bermuda Hospitals Charity Trust "Why it Matters" campaign, 2180
Bermuda National Museum, lease agreement with West End Development Corporation, 2108
Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening, 1974
Bermuda/UK Relations, 2116–2117
Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 1874, 1875, 2202–2207
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1992, 2194
Grand Atlantic project update, 1978, 1983
Jetgate, 1931–1934, 2031–2034, 2117–2119
National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1903–1910
Question Period
Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2186, 2187
Bermuda Day 2014, reflections, 2185
Bermuda Hospitals Charity Trust "Why it Matters" campaign, 2180
Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening, 1974
Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 1874, 1875
Grand Atlantic project update, 1978, 1983
National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013-2017, 1972
Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2179
Waste disposal update, 1882, 1883
Registry General Annual Report, year ended 31 December 2013, 2179
Waste disposal update, 1882, 1883

Roberts-Holshouser, Mrs. Suzann

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2245–2246
Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF), 2087
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1890, 1994, 2101, 2193–2194
Grand Atlantic project update, 1976, 1979
National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1915–1917

Roberts-Holshouser, Mrs. Suzann (continued)

Question Period

Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF), 2087

Grand Atlantic project update, 1976, 1979

St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2096

St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2096

S

SAGE Report. See Adjournment, Motions thereon

Schengen countries, visa-free to BOT Citizens, 2076–2077

Scott, Hon. Michael J.

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 1942–1946, 2059–2060

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2232–2235

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1891, 1998, 2098

Jetgate, 1942–1946, 2059–2060

Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014, 2105

Question Period

Waste disposal update, 1884

Waste disposal update, 1884

Scott, Hon. R. Wayne

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 1954–1957

Bermuda Day 2014, 2073–2074

Reflections, 2170–2173

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1887–1888, 1991–1992, 2098, 2189–2190

Heritage Month 2014, 1870–1871

Jetgate, 1954–1957

Queen's Baton Relay in Bermuda, 1868–1870

Scott, Mr. W. Lawrence

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 2037–2040, 2146–2148

Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2186

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1888, 2102, 2191

Grand Atlantic project update, 1975–1976, 1981, 1982

Jetgate, 2037–2040, 2146–2148

Marine and Ports Department Audit, 1887

Question Period

Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2186

Grand Atlantic project update, 1975–1976, 1981, 1982

Marine and Ports Department Audit, 1887

Scott, Ms. Leah K.

Autism Awareness, 2167–2168

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2240

Sessional Committees, 2165

Simons, Mr. N. H. Cole

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2246–2250

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1995–1996, 2102

Parliamentary Governance and Reform, Joint Select Committee Report, 2000–2008

Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014, 2105

Question Period

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of, 1986

Smith, Mr. Glen

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2227–2228

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1891, 1994–1995, 2190

Sousa, Mr. Jeff

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2250–2251

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1888–1889, 1999, 2099–2100, 2191

National Security and Defence Review Committee, Report of, 1926–1927
Speaker's Announcements and Rulings, *See* Announcements by Speaker or Member presiding
St. George's Tourism Development Site. *See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company, launch of, 1969–1970 (*See also* Question Period)
Autism Awareness, 2167–2168 (*See also* Question Period)
Aviation Policy Consultation Conference, 2173–2174 (*See also* Question Period)
Bermuda Day 2014, 2073–2074 (*See also* Question Period)
 Reflections, 2170–2173 (*See also* Question Period)
Bermuda Hospitals Charitable Trust "Why it Matters" campaign, 2166–2167 (*See also* Question Period)
Bermuda Registry of Shipping, London Office opening, 1967–1968 (*See also* Question Period)
Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report: "An analysis of Cannabis reform in Bermuda," 1866–1867 (*See also* Question Period)
Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities International (CARF), 2072–2073 (*See also* Question Period)
Company incorporations, continued increase in, 1868 (*See also* Question Period)
Education Act 1966, consultation on proposed amendments, 2077–2079 (*See also* Question Period)
Gibb's Hill Lighthouse, renovations, 2174–2175 (*See also* Question Period)
Grand Atlantic Project update, 1968–1969 (*See also* Question Period)
Heritage Month 2014, 1870–1871
Human Resources Department, reorganisation of, 1866
Lionfish Control Plan completed, 1970–1971 (*See also* Question Period)
Middle School Leadership Training, 2168–2169 (*See also* Question Period)
Moody's credit rating adjustment, 2074–2075 (*See also* Question Period)
National Drug Control Master Plan and Action Plan 2013-2017, 1966 (*See also* Question Period)
Perimeter Lane Repairs, 1871–1872 (*See also* Question Period)
Public Works new request reporting system, 1872
Queen's Baton Relay in Bermuda, 1868–1870
Risk and Insurance Management Society Convention, Finance Minister's visit to, 1867
St. George's Tourism Development Site, 2075–2076 (*See also* Question Period)
STEPS to a well Bermuda, update, 2169–2170 (*See also* Question Period)
Visa-free to Schengen countries for BOT Citizens, 2076–2077 (*See also* Question Period)
Waste disposal update, 1872–1874 (*See also* Question Period)
STEPS to a well Bermuda, update. *See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers
Summerhaven and Claire Ann Moore, marathon for Bermuda Day Derby. *See* Adjournment, Motions thereon
Sutherland, Mr. Ronald. *See* Question Period

V

Visa-free to Schengen countries for BOT Citizens. *See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

W

Waste disposal update,. *See* Statements by Ministers and Junior Ministers

Weeks, Mr. Michael A.

Adjournment, Motions thereon
 Jetgate, 2055–2056
 John Smith's Bay bathrooms, 2056–2057
Bermuda Day 2014, 2087
 Reflections, 2183, 2184
Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2222–2223
Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1896–1897, 1996, 2100
Grand Atlantic project update, 1975, 1976, 1980
Jetgate, 2055–2056
John Smith's Bay bathrooms, 2056–2057
Question Period
 Bermuda Day 2014, 2087
 Reflections, 2183, 2184
 Grand Atlantic project update, 1975, 1976, 1980
West End Development Corporation, lease agreement with National Museum of Bermuda, 1866, 2106–2109

Wilson, Mrs. Kim N.

Adjournment, Motions thereon

Jetgate, 1936–1939, 2136–2138

Woman in society, important role, 1939–1940

Cannabis Reform Collaborative Report, 2223–2227

Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF), 2085, 2086

Congratulatory and/or Obituary Speeches, 1993–1994

Jetgate, 1936–1939, 2136–2138

Port Royal Fire Station ambulance, 2085

Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Amendment Regulations 2014,
2104–2105

Question Period

Commission in Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF), 2085, 2086

Port Royal Fire Station ambulance, 2085

Waste disposal update, 1881, 1882, 1885

Waste disposal update, 1881, 1882, 1885

Woman in society, important role, 1939–1940

~~~~~  
**Dates of Sitings:** 9, 16, 23, 30 May 2014  
~~~~~