



Parliament of Sint Maarten

Staten van Sint Maarten

To the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of General Affairs
Ms. S.E. Jacobs
Government Administration Building
Philipsburg

UV/094/2020-2021

Philipsburg, January 5, 2021

Re: Questions from MP C.T. Emmanuel regarding negotiations with the Netherlands

Hon. Prime Minister,

Herewith I submit to you questions posed by Member of Parliament, Mr. C.T. Emmanuel, pursuant to article 62 of the Constitution and Article 69 of the Rules of Order of the Parliament of Sint Maarten.

The letter is self-explanatory.

Yours truly,

R. Brison

President of Parliament



Christophe Emmanuel

Member of the Parliament of Sint Maarten

STATEN VAN SINT MAARTEN	
Ingek. 18 DEC 2020	
Volgnr. 15/261/20-21	
Par.	GR.

To: The Honorable Prime Minister and Minister of General Affairs
Ms. Silveria Jacobs
Government Administration Building
Soualiga Road 1
Philipsburg

December 18th, 2020

Subject: Request response to attached queries.

Honorable Prime Minister,

On Monday December 14th, 2020, upon your request, an urgent Central Committee meeting was held for an update on the negotiations with the Netherlands and the third tranche liquidity support.


Kindly find below queries via this correspondence for clarification:

- Did the PM give her approval on the consensus law via the Minister Plenipotentiary before meeting with Parliament?
- What exactly was negotiated by St. Maarten for St. Maarten? Other than a name change from CRE to COHO?
- The PM said there were amendments to the consensus law. What amendments did SXM propose specifically and what was accepted and rejected by BZK?
- The PM said clarifications were provided by BZK over some concerns by SXM. What were these concerns that SXM had and what clarifications were sought and given to SXM? The PM said these concerns were "thoroughly addressed" so she should be able to provide thorough details.
- Through her own words it is apparent that the PM does not know the details of the conditions. Conditions that were negotiated by Aruba and Curacao. How can you agree to conditions without knowing the details?
- The PM said the COHO will have extremely limited authority to act at its own volition. Please explain what are the parameters of "extremely limited authority?" What is the limit of this authority? Where does it start and end? How can the COHO's authority be "extremely limited" when it will hold supervisory roles with power to restrict?

- The COHO will Supervise government bodies and government owned companies? SXM had no questions about this? How far will this supervision go? What role will the boards and management of these companies now play? Who can override who? Is the decision of the board final or does this authority lie with the COHO?
- In the past to get financial support we had to pass legislation the Dutch wanted us to pass. The COHO will be forwarding legislative initiatives to Parliament. What happens when Parliament says no? They turn off the faucet again? Is this not the exact form of control that the PM said will not happen? Isn't this just the CFT of a different and more powerful name?
- Can the COHO implement on their own restrictive measures on our budget if our Parliament do not pass legislation that the COHO thinks is needed to support the Dutch conditions? Because it is made clear that funding for the COHO's reforms should be found in our own budget.
- What happens to all of the projects already on the books, are in development or about to kick off. Whether they are by government owned companies or the civil service? What happens to those projects? Will the COHO and its ideas now supersede all?
- What happens to the NA/UP National Development Vision or Governing Program now? Was it taken up in the so called negotiations? The vision of our elected representatives now carry no weight? The vision of the Dutch COHO is now our bible?

Hoping for a swift response to above questions.

Regards,



Christophe Emmanuel
Independent Member of Parliament