THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 15, 1986.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. Weekes, (Speaker)
Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, Q.C., B.Sc., LL.D. (Prime Minister and Minister of Economic Affairs)
Hon. L. E. Sandiford, B.A., M.A. (Econ.) J.P., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Education and Culture and Leader of the House)
Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. E. E. Greaves, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.), (Minister of Finance)
Hon. W. O. Franklin, M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Hon. N. K. Simmons, (Minister of Health)
Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, Q.C., LL.M.
Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.)
Mrs. M. Barker-Welch, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)
Mr. C. V. Walker, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture)
Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, J.P.
Dr. E. A. Simmons
Hon. W. W. Hall, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)
Mr. C. A. Neblett, B.A., A.C.M.A.
Mr. C. L. Trotman, M.A.
Mr. R. L. Morris, B.A., Cert. Ed.
Mr. P. J. M. Miller
Mr. R. P. Byer, LL.B., L.E.C., (Chairman of Committees)

Prayers were led by Rev. I. Harewood.

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.A., LL.B. (Hon.), Minister of Tourism and Industry, entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of July 8, 1986.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the last sitting of the House be taken as read, and that those Minutes be confirmed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations or corrections, let those Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: Application has been made to me for the recording by radio and television of a Statement by the Honourable Minister of Finance. Permission has been granted.

His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker) entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statements showing net Customs and Excise Receipts for months ending 28th February, 1986 and 31st March, 1986.

Statement showing net Customs and Excise Receipts for months ending 30th April, 1986 and 31st May, 1986.

Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., and Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc., (Econ.), (Minister of Housing and Lands), entered the Chamber and took their seats.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think this is the appropriate time for me to indicate that there is a Statement to be made by the Minister of Finance and that this Statement will be made a little later in today's sitting, subject to the approval of this Chamber. So I am moving that this item be deferred until a little later in today's sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, leave is granted.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am, Sir, moving that the usual Standing Orders be suspended at this stage because of the nature of our business today.

Mr. E. BOURNE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am moving that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

I wish to give the Opposition the assurance that their rights will in no way be abrogated or infringed as a result of the suspension of those Standing Orders.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the instant Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1.

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1986

Order No. 1 was called – A Bill to amend the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1979.

Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs) and Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications) entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, the item engaging the attention of the House at this moment is the amendment to the Order regulating the emoluments payable to Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. The last Order which was made under the Act, which is the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances), was made by Order in 1984 to take effect from 1st April, 1985.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): If the honourable Member would give way, on a point of privilege; it was my understanding that your leave to broadcast the proceedings of the House was probably limited to the Statement by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I wonder whether Your Honour could inform me whether these current proceedings are being broadcast.

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I may respond to that, it is my understanding that that is the only part of the proceedings of this Honourable House for which permission would have been given, so that if in fact that is happening, if the honourable Member observes that is happening, then it ought not to be happening.

It is my understanding that those proceedings are to be televised tonight after having been recorded today, and proceedings, for recording purposes, mean only, Sir, the Statement to be delivered by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.
12.25 p.m.

I give the honourable Member the assurance that we on this side made no arrangements other than those which he understands.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I accept the honourable Member's assurance. I just wanted the matter clarified, particularly for the broadcasting media and other Members of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was my understanding also.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member for Christ Church West should know that I do not like T.V. cameras anyway, whether I am delivering a Financial Statement or not.

If I may proceed with the business of the House, Sir, the last Order was made to take effect from April 1, 1985.

Normally speaking, when it was proposed that the conditions, emoluments and remuneration and allowances

of Members of Parliament should be changed, it is our practice that we would set up a joint consultative committee between members of the Government and members of the Opposition. I would like to say that this, in my 35 years, is the second occasion, or the third occasion only, despite the fact that I formally discharged the functions of Barbados' first Minister of Finance for a period of 15 years, in which I have taken any part in these discussions. My reason for doing that was that when I entered this Chamber, the members of the House used to receive an allowance of $100 a month, and having taken part, or being one of the main authors of the manifesto of the party which ran the majority – I cannot say the ruling party, because they did not have a majority before December, 1961 – we had made no mention whatsoever of increasing salaries or extending the life of Parliament, and these were two of the first Orders of the Day which were inaugurated and implemented by the hierarchy of the group to which I had the indubitable distinction to belong at that time. So I made a vow that I would never take part in any discussion relating to salaries and remuneration of Members of the House.

Then, sometime when – I cannot remember the precise date, I believe it was in 1967 – they introduced the pensions for Parliamentarians and other matters, including a Remuneration Act, I said then I would take no part with it, to be consistent with the stand which I had adopted. I was then informed that I would be trying to assume a position which was morally superior to my colleagues, and in order to remove any doubt from my mind that I knew what my duties were as Minister of Finance, having collective responsibility in Parliament, I introduced the measure, for which I do not apologise.

Several amendments have been made from 1967 up to and including 1984, when the extant Order, which came into effect on April 1, 1985, was introduced in this House and passed in this House at a time when the economy of Barbados was undergoing severe strain. The members of the party which I have the honour to lead, Mr. Speaker, then expressed the view that the increases which were then granted, as on a previous occasion, were unjustified, in light of the state of the economy of Barbados.

This is the second debate on salaries and allowances which I now say that I have great pleasure in introducing and in taking part in, because this is a debate which brings about a reduction in the salaries of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. I do not think it was even promised in our manifesto, but one of the very first things that we decided as a Cabinet was that in order to bring home to the people in authority, Members of Parliament and the political directorate of this country, that we should not march too far ahead of the people who put us in office, we should demonstrate our dedication to the principles by introducing a measure which would bring about a reduction in our own salaries.

I have read and seen some carping criticisms that Members of Parliament who are Ministers will be getting more money than they were getting before. Naturally, Members of Parliament who were not in Parliament, debatably may be getting more money than they were getting before, because they were getting none out of the public purse, and Members who were members of the back benches, either of the Government side or on the side of the Opposition, would, by tradition, receive less money than Ministers. The reason is very simple, that Ministers are supposed to dedicate all of their time, day and night, if necessary, to the performance of the duties of this nation and not, in any way, to hold any directorates, to conduct any private practice, as the Leader of the Opposition, and I could when I was Leader of the Opposition, or to do any other work, or to perform any function other than that to which he or she may have been appointed as a Minister of this Government.

We excuse the diminished members of the Opposition party, because they now have to make up for a lot of deficiencies, not only in numbers but in content; so I will not worry to take too much time to deal with them.

Whatever you do in Barbados, you are going to get criticism. When we reduced the price of gasolene a few weeks ago by 50 cents a gallon, the first thing I heard was that the Government had reduced the price of gasolene by 50.7 cents a gallon but they have not reduced the price of kerosene oil. Nobody complimented the Government for taking a step which should have been taken over two and a half years ago, and it was only after my drawing it to the attention of the late departed Minister of Finance that unjust gains were being made by the refining element in this country, that he increased the consumption tax, so that the price of gasolene or the profits would pass on neither to the refinery nor to the consumers in this country.

12.35 p.m.

I made a decision, based on my experience as a Barbadian, as I have said before, that one should not try to march to the sound of a drum different from that which is heard by the rank and file marching in the columns behind you; that is, that no socialist Prime Minister, no one who believes in democratic socialism, should try to live in a life style which is far out of step with that which is suffered by the majority of people in this country. For the benefit of the honourable Member for St. Thomas and others who indulge in this carping criticism, I wish now to disclose to him the financial

implications of that decision. I did not make that decision to take more money out of the Treasury, but I should like to give it to him now, chapter by chapter, verse by verse.

The structure which exists in Two Mile Hill was acquired from a lady called Mrs. Belknap, who did not live in Barbados. That is not her fault. It was constructed by a lady who did not live in Barbados and who died in Boston, who was the former wife of a former Governor of Barbados, Lady Gilbert Carter. She built it. She was a lady who was prominent in the performing arts and who had a great deal of wealth, and when she was here, as the consort of the Governor of this country, she acquired, on behalf of the people of Barbados, such places as Queens Park, and this was round about the time 1906 when the British Army was departing as a permanent army of occupation from Barbados.

Town Planning approval was given to a real estate developer to cut up Ilaro Court. A former Dean of St. Michael's Cathedral was one of the persons to whom a lot was sold, and I said that I did not think that an edifice of that nature should be cut up for real estate development, and I requested the then officer administering the Government of this country, Sir John Stow, to write to Mrs. Belknap and ask her whether she would sell the property to the Government and people of Barbados. She agreed to do so, to cut a long story short, for the price of $310 000, not $3 million as the newspapers are stating. I got back to Mrs. Belknap and said I did not have it in our Development Plan, but I would pay her $110,000 in the first year and $100 000 in each successive year, without interest, and take possession immediately. That is how the Government acquired Ilaro Court.

The property known as "Cullo-den Farm", in Barbadian parlance "Cul-lo-den Farm," – in Scotland it is called the Battle of Culloden – which was built round about 1757, eight and a half acres of land, all of the furniture, including about 50 per cent of the furniture which is now at Ilaro Court, was acquired by the people of Barbados for $101 000 and not $3 million.

When the Barbados Labour Party took office in 1976, they started a systemic destruction of every single acquisition that had been made by the Democratic Labour Party. Let us start next door to the same property, Ilaro Court, and you will see a building, which formerly was occupied by Mr. D. V. Scott, for approximately $72 000, and which was the first site of the Community College, which also served as headquarters of the Regional Council of Ministers during 1964, 1965 and 1966, and you will see what care has been lavished on Government property by the abomination of desolation which now exists at that property. Go up today and have a look at it.

The property which is known as Ilaro Court was designated for use as a cultural centre between the people of Barbados and our Latin American neighbours in the Organisation of American States. The property which used to be the former Prime Minister's residence was handed over to transvestites and gamblers, and all kinds of illicit activities were permitted to go on there before it was formally occupied by persons who are no longer in a position to deprive the people of Barbados of their just inheritance, who again shall be nameless, Mr. Speaker, because I have not sought your permission to name them. This is the kind of respect that we have had for our heritage during the past ten years.

I should like to say that "Ilaro" is a good African name. Sir Gilbert Carter, having served in Nigeria as some part of his colonial career, Lady Gilbert Carter being enamoured of the place, decided to name her house "Ilaro Court". How many Barbadians today will give their house – apart from myself – an African name.

Everybody can look in the Telephone Directory and see that I am probably the only Barbadian whose house is named after an African town. The place which is known as Accra Hotel was only an accident, because the people who formerly occupied that had no connection with Africa and would not allow any descendent of the Sons and Daughters of Africa to cross the threshold of that property.

But Ilaro Court certainly is part of our heritage, and if I do not live there, it is because I do not need to live there. I have told people several times I am looking for a typical Barbados-type house, and a typical Barbados-type house to me, apart from my books, is a 16 X 9 with shedroof attached and running water inside. I insist on that.

Let me tell you what it cost the taxpayers of Barbados now when you say that we are getting more money. It cost the Barbados taxpayers, in the first instance, $33 129 from the Prime Minister's vote for staff, and then another $32 886.94 paid from the Establishments Division. If you go back and look at the Estimates right up to 1976, you will see the vote for Prime Minister's residence was put in there, and the Prime Minister used to make a contribution to the staff. Then the utilities, rental of property $1 208, whatever that was; the library, $200; supplies and materials, $7 842, maintenance of property, $15 000; operating expenses, $7 500; making a grand total of $97 765. On the capital expenditure side, $100 000; plant, equipment and furniture $40 000, making total savings of $237 765.94 by my decision not to live in that property this year alone. Those are the savings!

12.45 p.m.

Applause.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You will say, no doubt, those are the savings, but you have to have a watchman. All of that has been taken out. You must have somebody to look after the property – that has been taken out. To this extent, these have already been deducted. This used to be the staff: one butler, $14.406; two maids, 19 510; one cook, $10 275.20; one general worker, $9 756.24; one executive housekeeper, $21 564.00; two part-time maids, $9 756.24; making a total for the staff of $85 322.08. The staff alone!

The staff alone is more than my salary, so I could not afford that staff. I could not ask the people of Barbados to pay for that size staff. I pay for my own staff. I get no allowance for butlers, maids, gardeners or anything else, not even off my income tax.

The staff has now been reduced to two maids, who have to keep the place clean, and an executive housekeeper, who receives the same salary of $21 564. So the total expenditure on staff has been reduced to $41 074.

It is questionable whether we need to keep an executive housekeeper, except to pay the two maids. I have nothing against the person who is the executive housekeeper, I have known that person from school days, not describing whether it is male or female, so the person is quite competent if she has something to keep. But I am suggesting that the staff be further reduced, the caretaking staff, as it were, to the two maids, because it is a large house, and perhaps have somebody from the Ministry of Transport and Works, which is just at the back, after all, going in to pay the two maids, and to make sure that they did their job, on Thursday or Friday, or whatever day wages are payable.

So when the Member for St. Thomas is fulminating, I suggest he should come and ask me some questions. I will tell him what the position really is.

And I want to make clear.....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, but you should give the full picture. Do not tell me you did not talk about that. You should talk about that.

The post of executive housekeeper is a temporary one and therefore we would not have to look at that.

Savings on National Insurance amount to $2 089.98, and there are Transport Levy savings of $78.02.

One of the privileges, Mr. Speaker, which you claimed from His Excellency the Governor-General on the Opening of Parliament, is freedom of speech, and the best construction should be put on the debates of Members who come into our Chamber. If a Government then makes a decision that the Government will voluntarily, without even promising to do it, reduce the levels of their remunerations.....We have not touched the salaries or allowances of Members of Parliament other than Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries. We have not touched the salary of the Leader of the Opposition, or of the Member for St. Thomas, or of the Member for St. Peter. We could not do that without consultation. And we do not think that the level of remuneration which Members of Parliament receive is such, even although it is higher than it used to be before, that we as a Cabinet, should arbitrarily decide to make a reduction on something which they, if they were in private business, could legitimately claim would be one of their conditions of service and employment.

So I do not really understand or appreciate what the concern of the honourable Member for St. Thomas is in this instant. If the honourable Member for St. Thomas is claiming that we should reduce our salaries by 10%, I should like to inform him that, in keeping with good Government Civil Service tradition, I told my Ministers that they can have a 5% reduction this year, and, if they were not satisfied with that, they can have another 5% reduction next year.

Laughter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the Honourable Member, as a backbencher, as a Member of Parliament, would like to have a 10% reduction and he makes the proper representation to me, as Minister of Finance, the Cabinet will consider it. That could be the only criticism that he could have, that everybody should have a reduction or the reduction is not enough.

I should like to make it clear that I am not saying that I am going to make a further reduction next year, unless representations are made to me by the Members of Parliament. I cannot take that on myself. But if the honourable Member makes a representation to me, I will seriously consider making a reduction in line with what he considers to be equitable and just, in light of the economy of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the net result of the reductions which are being sought by the Bill, which is now an amendment to the Act of 1979, Cap. 5.....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am dealing with the Bill first, because in the Act, it is stated what is calculable in computing the pension of persons, and the housing allowances and so on, which are paid to the holders of different offices.

In the Schedule on page 4, Sir, you will see that there is no travelling allowance for the Prime Minister, but now is being inserted a housing allowance of $18 000 a year in substitution for the fact that any holder of the office who does not elect to live in the residence provided by the Government will be allowed a housing allowance of approximately $1 500 a month. Therefore, you have to look at that $18 000 alongside of the $245 000 in savings which I have mentioned earlier here today.
12.55 p.m.

I should also like to say that I remember an occasion, over a year ago, when this Act was being amended in 1984, when I told the then Minister of Finance that it was not that we objected to the Minister being paid a housing allowance, and it was not the quantum of the housing allowance, because I pointed out to him, next door, on his right-hand side, a Minister who was renting his house for $10 000 a month, and I told him that if one of his lesser Ministers – less in every sense of the word, in stature, importance and everything else – could live in a house that was worth $10 000 a month and the people of Barbados had to pay $15 000 a month, or $18 000 a month, to the Prime Minister when he is temporarily out of possession of the house that the Government provided, I would support that, because I would not like to think that he was entitled to live in a lesser condition than one of his lesser Ministers. And I remember the Prime Minister at that time turning to the Minister and asking was it true that he was getting the $18 000 a month, and before the Minister could answer, he turned back and.....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: ..... I beg your pardon, Sir, $10 000 a month..... and before the Minister could embarrass himself by answering, he turned back and went on with the debate. The Prime Minister knew before I said so. He was getting $10 000 a month. I do not think I should say who the Minister was. All of us know. All of us know where the house is – those of us who gamble and those of us who do not gamble. All know where the place is. All I can say is that although it is called Halls Road, it is not in the constituency of the Member for St. Michael South Central. It is not that Halls Road.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Oh! It is a gap!

Laughter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: All I am saying is that the allowance is put in there because in 1984, what was done, before the former Member for St. Thomas moved into Ilaro Court, was that they added the housing allowance on to the salary; they abolished the housing allowance but added it into the salary. I pointed out that provision ought to be made in case there was a hurricane, storm, or some other unnatural event, so that if the Prime Minister had to move out of the house, he would be able to rent premises which would be suitable, and as far as the Opposition was concerned, it was not a question of the quantum, as long as it was suitable and it was adequate.

The position is that the Prime Minister, under the new Schedule, will not get any travelling allowance and will not get anything other than an official car on such occasions as he deems it necessary to use it.

Other Ministers will receive travelling allowance – the Deputy Prime Minister at the rate of $16 800 per annum, and other Ministers – travelling allowance at the rate of $12 264 per annum. That is unchanged. Those Ministers will not be entitled to any official cars, neither will they be entitled to go and draw gasolene at any pump, mythical or otherwise, to put in their own car.

They called it a "privileged pump". I heard that the Member for Christ Church West made a statement that the Ministers of the Democratic Labour Party's Government had some privileged pump. If they had it, it was hidden somewhere, probably down in Boscobelle, St. Peter or somewhere like that. I have not seen it. It is absolutely untrue that any Minister of Government during our regime ever drew any gasolene or ever had any official car. There was a police car assigned to your humble servant for official occasions, and on such official occasions I did not put gasolene in it. I understand that the police used to put gasolene in it. But most of the time I drove my own car, as I am doing most of the time now, when I have one. At the present moment I do not even have a donkey cart, so I have to borrow. When my driver is playing cricket or anything else, I have to borrow from my family or somebody else, and I do not get any gasolene to put in the particular car.

The rest, Mr. Speaker – and you must excuse me, Sir, because of the geography of this Chamber, I am not always facing you – is a question of arithmetic. The allowances remain the same, and in respect of.....

Aside

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should point out one difference in the new Schedule. There was no travelling allowance provided before for the Deputy Prime Minister. You would remember that we had MP1, MP2, MP3 and MP this and that, and I believe that one of those MPs was assigned to the Deputy Prime Minister.

There is no official car now assigned to the Deputy Prime Minister, so he now gets a travelling allowance instead of an official car.

Mr. Speaker, there are two slight amendments, Sir, which can be dealt with in Committee. They are in relation to Clause 2, sub-clause 2 – "may" – and the date of coming into effect of these new provisions will be August 1st instead of July 1st, since we have already passed that date.

I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that motion and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question of the salaries of Ministers and Members of Parliament is one to which this House has on several occasions addressed its attention, and I wish that I could say that there was a unanimity of approach on either side of the House as to how the House should threat this matter. Certainly on the side of the Government I have heard the expression of different views as to how one should go about treating an honourable Member of Parliament, whether he be on the back bench or on the front bench. On my side there has also been a difference of opinion as to how one should approach this matter. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, for instance, believes that the accent should be on pension remuneration than on the salaries of parliamentarians. He has made his point over and over again. The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) believes that the accent should be on adequate and reasonable remuneration for persons in this House, since, as he says, they carry, after all, the main responsibility for running the Government.
1.05 p.m.

This is not unusual, Mr. Speaker. If one follows similar debates throughout the Commonwealth and in other Parliaments where people are paid, the debates will show that there is a difference of opinion on the question of remuneration. I have been in this Honourable Chamber, not as long as the Right Honourable Member for St. John, but long enough to have recognised that this subject leads to very strong feelings, usually depending on where you are sitting and when you are sitting there, and that when honourable Members graduate into the position of having to give themselves full time to working on behalf of the public of Barbados, they usually take on a different guise from when honourable Members have the luxury of sitting on the back bench and carrying on their professions, or sitting in Opposition and doing the same.

Let me put the position of the Opposition reasonably clearly. The view has always been that Ministers of Government should be properly remunerated in the context of what is possible in the economy of Barbados. I have said, whenever I have spoken on this subject, Mr. Speaker, that I have had access in my private life to seeing the remuneration which private persons get. I have sat on committees determining the salary for Executive Directors. I am aware of the level of salaries paid in the private sector and in the public sector, and I am equally aware, Mr. Speaker, of the salaries paid in the various unions. I believe that a lot of hypocrisy will get out of public life in Barbados if one recognises from the start that there must be reasonable remuneration in the context of Barbados – and I stress the words "in the context of Barbados" – for people who carry the responsibility of running the country. I have known that there are insurance salesmen who earn much more than Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries or even the person who holds the position of Prime Minister.

We will not be conducting the Opposition from the angle, as the Right Honourable Member seems to think, of making any carping criticisms whatsoever. Wherever we recognise that there is a principle, we will state that that principle exists. I have heard the past honourable Member for St. Philip South in this House plead for a reasonable remuneration, so that when he went home he could receive a reasonable pension. That is a fact. There are Members who have served this Chamber for several years, longer than many honourable Members here, who, when they retire, will probably find themselves getting a smaller pension than people who have come into the Chamber.

The Opposition, when it was in Opposition and came into Government, made the point that we had to find a formula for setting salaries that the contentions which always arise, particularly near to elections, about who is being overpaid and who is being underpaid, will no longer become contentions. We sought to set up a Commission that looked at the matter. That was not satisfactory to everybody, certainly it was not satisfactory to Members, I think at the time, on both sides, and therefore the formula which was eventually adopted aligned ministerial salaries to the salaries given to civil servants. There was the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister who had overall control of his Ministry should be in no less favourable a position than the Permanent Secretary, whether he was Permanent Secretary A or Permanent Secretary Grade B, and that there should be a differential. You then got various differentials at different other levels of the Civil Service, depending on the technical nature of the persons holding the jobs.

Differentials are well recognised, as the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Hon. E. E. Greaves) would say, having been a negotiator for a long time, as part of the salary scales that one has seen and that one sees throughout the world. I have made the point previously in debates, and I repeat it here, that the differentials between the top and the bottom in Barbados are much more favourable than the differentials in countries such as Cuba. If Members want, they can get hold of some of the ILO statistics and they will see that we are correct on this.

Now if the honourable Members want, for whatever reason, to reduce nominally – and let us face it, no matter what the honourable Member says, this is a nominal reduction in salary for maximum political content. Let us say that it is a nominal reduction in salary for maximum political content.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member can *sotto voce* say what he likes, the honourable Member must take into account as well that although there is a real reduction, there is also a tax benefit which makes the reduction not as bad as the honourable Member may make it appear at first sight.

Even on the Budgetary Proposals of the former Minister of Finance, the honourable Member must concede that when you reduce the top rate of tax from 60% to 50%, even without moving the tax bands, the 5% reduction here really, in real take home pay, will make no difference whatsoever. That is the point that the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons), as I understand him, was making. Even not anticipating the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, even looking at the proposals of the Democratic Labour Party, if the reduction is to widen the tax bands even further, then, of course, the savings that will come in will make up whatever 5% cosmetic change there is at the top.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) says it is not worthy of me. All I am saying to him is that whilst I can understand the nominal change being made, you must recognise here that the purpose of the change is for the political impact of the change. Let us call a spade a spade. I do not quarrel with the honourable Members if they want to go for maximum political content, that is what politics is about, but do not quarrel with the honourable Member for St. Thomas when he makes that position clear, that he too, recognises that it is for maximum political content.

I want, however, Sir, not to dwell today on questions of salary, I want really to remind people a little bit about some of the things we are hearing. I have heard criticisms of the former honourable Member for St. Thomas, as he then was, the Right Honourable J. M. G. M. Adams, on the basis that he did not live in the official residence provided for him – and I have heard those criticisms in here, not only outside – and how he was making money out of the Government by not living in Ilaro Court. Let me recall that it was a long time before that honourable Member went into an official residence, and he was being severely criticised for at the time not going in to an institution provided at the public expense.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You say that is politics. The honourable Member makes the point that when the Government does something, they are not commended for it. That is politics.

1.15 p.m.

Today, I hear now that not living in the official residence is a saving, and all I want to say is that if it is a saving now, it was a saving at the time that the honourable Member was not living there either.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member says *sotto voce* it is foolishness. But logic might be foolishness, depending on the perspective from which you sit, and it may be logical sense depending on the other perspective from which you sit and the premise on which you stand. If you begin from the premise that you are now the Government and you do not want Ilaro, it might be foolishness, but the point remains, that if it is an effective saving now, it was a saving then. The honourable Members may call that as much foolishness as they like.

Let me say that Ilaro Court is a state property. The honourable Member could choose to live exactly where he likes. I have no quarrel with that. If the Prime Minister does not want to live in Ilaro Court, for whatever reason it may be, that is the Prime Minister's prerogative as in individual. I am not quarrelling with that. I am not even urging him to live in Ilaro Court. All I am saying is that I do not see anything wrong with the state providing a state house for the main executives of the three arms of Government, whether it happens to be the judiciary, the Governor-General or the head of the Executive, who is the Prime Minister.

We may argue about the level of the provision made, but I think we have to get the principle quite straight in public life in Barbados. There are some matters, that I hope during the next five years we can find that we can lift outside of partisan political debate, and that the parameters of how we run the country and what is

important and what is not important would be clearly laid down.

I know of several countries in the world where the provision of a state house for the Prime Minister is an accepted phenomenon and a fact of political life. From time to time, you may see in the papers that particular persons go in and change carpets, or change something, and that gives the newspaper men cause for concern. But nobody that I know of nowadays would argue about a state house being provided for a Governor-General, a President, a Prime Minister, a Chief Justice. I believe that we in Barbados have to recognize that we have got to the stage where, whatever we may think of the country, Barbados, there have to be certain accepted things, and the sooner we tell the public about these things, the less we cease complicating public life. It is possible for us in this country to make our political differences on issues that matter rather than always on the periphery in Barbados.

So our position is quite clear. If the Prime Minister chooses not to live in Ilaro Court, that is his prerogative. But I believe that the state should still keep, for whoever may be the Prime Minister at any time, a state house that is in keeping with what one would expect, as far as I am concerned, of the country. I do not know of any former Prime Minister or Premier, or any present one, who has ever taken away anything belonging to state houses in Barbados or done anything with it. One must recognize that. The property remains there, the Government property for all times. One has to recognize this.

The honourable Member made some reference to Sherbourne and spoke of "abomination of desolation". Sherbourne has a very distinguished historical and architectural history. In fact, one of the historical facts for which I recall Sherbourne is that it was the centre at which we saw the break-up of the last effort to have an Eastern Caribbean Federation. I recall that very graphically.

In many ways, I, too, regret that Sherbourne has been lost, for all purposes, to Barbados, but it was not lost because of the Barbados Labour Party. Sherbourne was being used, after it ceased being used by the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic and the Community College, was being used by one of the schools, Parkinson School, but it was, unfortunately, burnt down, and it has not been restored. In fact, there are too many of these very interesting buildings which have suffered in this way.

I can think of Farley Hill, which also has tremendous significance in the political, historical and architectural history of Barbados, and I can think of in my own constituency of Christ Church West, Pavilion House. I believe that the Right Honourable Member for St. John may, in his time, have tried to get Pavilion House for the people of Barbados. Certainly I made an effort in negotiating with the University of Toronto, to whom it had been left by Mrs. Stetsell, for it. Just then private persons bought Pavilion House, and it is now a ruin standing on Hastings Road right next to Pavilion Court.

What I would like to hear, however, is whether we are going to ensure that buildings, whether it be Culloden Farm or Ilaro Court, are maintained in an adequate condition, regardless of whether they are being lived in by Prime Ministers or anyone else. I hope that whatever the cost of keeping Ilaro Court in being, we will realize that it is a necessary cost that must be faced.

The Right Honourable Member did not say what plans the Government has for the use of Ilaro Court if it is not being used as a Prime Minister's residence. Although I wish the Right Honourable Member a long life, not necessarily a long life as the Prime Minister, but I wish him a very long life, I think one has to recognize that Prime Ministers come and Prime Ministers go, and that at some stage, whenever there is another person stepping into the shoes of the honourable member – I do not know why the honourable Member for St. Michael West is looking so serious at this stage, I was not making reference to him – that person may not like the Right Honourable Member, make a choice of living outside of a state house.

I would not like to think that with every change of Prime Ministers, or change of Government, we have to buy a new state house. We have to bear that in mind. Maybe once again this is an area in which we should be capable of having bipartisan consultation, if we need to have the machinery for this, on setting up what would be adequate provision in future for a state house.

I have never heard anybody quarrel about Pilgrim House, the residence of His Excellency, the Governor-General, as a state house. I think it is a very adequate house. I would like to think that we could get the residence of the Prime Minister, wherever it is, outside of the area of politics as well, and that both political parties recognize that it is necessary nowadays, in the context of Barbados, for there to be a state house.
1.25 p.m.

We must not always assume that those who will become Prime Ministers will be people who from their own resources can provide adequate housing at the time when they are Prime Ministers of Barbados. We must not always assume that. Those of us who have come up in the Commonwealth can sometimes tell you more about 10 Downing Street and the history of 10 Downing Street than we can tell of the history of Culloden Farm or the history of Ilaro Court, or the history of Pilgrim House. I think we have to inculcate within Barbados that when a Prime Minister occupies a house, he is not doing so for his own luxury – he is doing so because he is representing the people of Barbados.

I hope, Sir, that in the next five years we can get some basic understanding of these matters. The Opposition does not want to score any points on matters such as this, but if points are being scored on us, we will reply. We have got to make that clear. We think that we can get the principles quite straight in here. We are not quarrelling with any reductions that Ministers want in salaries, but we are not fools not to recognise that it has certain political appeal. We are not fools, and we are going to say.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member should know that my salary is going to be fixed by the honourable Members anyway, whenever they want to.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member says he wants a 10 per cent reduction in the salary of the Members on the back bench and the salaries of the members of the Opposition. I do not know there are many honourable Members in this House who have always given away their salaries. That has been a big question of debate in the last events leading up to May 28 in my own constituency, saying who can afford and who cannot afford to give it away.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is in a very jocular mood today, but the honourable Member for St. Michael South would know that our position on salaries has not changed very much. I have heard his view, and it is a view to which I, on a personal level, have subscribed. I do not agree with the view of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I do not know if, now that he has responsibility, he would learn the refinements of coming in here and not merely looking at the politics of the matter, but looking at it on the principle that it involves. I would hope he would think that his colleagues sitting with him on the front bench are worthy of their hire, and that they should be properly remunerated. I hope he would not be coming in here and saying they are so grossly overpaid that he is going to cut their salaries further because they are not performing adequately. I can promise him that we will look at his submission very carefully. I cannot tell him how we would come down, but we would look at them.

I would ask seriously now that at the earliest possible opportunity, when it is convenient to the Leader of the House, that the serious look at a mechanism – not to satisfy our own profits to satisfy the people of Barbados that whatever salary is fixed for us, whether you accept what was the past Government's formula or a new formula, it is fixed reasonably, having regard to all of the other matters that must be taken into account in Barbados, and that the question of M.Ps salaries be removed from the position of the excitement which it normally has for some people who will always feel jealous in a community. Regardless of whatever you do, somebody will say that you are probably being under paid or overpaid. The honourable Member knows that. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I am sure, by the time that he has given up his portfolio – will recognise, when he has had a chance to read the files on these matters and to study what happens in the Commonwealth, that the points made on salaries are correct, and will recognise that the principles are the important things here.

So, Sir, we are not going to divide the House on this Bill. Why should we? If they felt they could have given more, I am sure they would give a little bit more. We are not dividing the House on this, but we do not want to go away from this House with any misunderstanding.

I said I hoped we would look at the matter, because one of the sour matters has been the question of pensions, and I do not want to sit down without referring to this question of pensions. The point is that a former Member of this Honourable House who went out after giving, say, 25 years of service, is remunerated for the purposes of pension at the highest salary that he got before he went out, and he may have performed well or he may not have performed so well. But a person who becomes a Minister for a period, I think, of three months, or six months, and draws his salary and has done 12 years will get the maximum pension at the latest rate of remuneration. Now that is a fact.

I have seen an article by a member from the Other Place on this subject. I have recalled the pleas, in which I joined, of a former honourable Member for St. Philip South, who gave very long and devoted service and good service. It may not be service that always caught the headlines. I refer to the honourable Reynold Weekes at the time – I have spoken in Parliament about this, I am not saying anything new – who was a long-serving Member. The point is that when Members go out after giving many more years, they probably find that the pension is very difficult to live on. Obviously Prime Ministers may have to resort to the technique of bringing them back for for a little while, putting them in the Upper House and upping the pension for them for a period of time. You may have to resort to that.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Whoever the honourable Member for St. Lucy believes it is, he can make reference to those persons. Apparently he is going to make mention of particular persons *sotto voce.*

I am saying that that is one of the things that will happen. I am not going for any particular person on this. I believe that in the context in which civil servants operate, and they are obviously going to be concerned about how long they have to serve before they can get maximum pensions, it is not beyond the capacity of the House and the country to devise a pension scheme, not only for ourselves but for civil servants as well, in which we reward adequate length of service as well as the quality of the service which you give. I am really moving it from the particular to the general here, but it is the one aspect of salaries that concerns me.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable Member and myself are the only two Members who have spoken, but there is not the rancour in debate that I have heard in past matters of this nature, and I hope there would not be, because I am really appealing to the House to let us now look forward to moving these matters beyond that and putting them on a plane that can be understood by both political parties in the future.

As I say, we are not voting against the Bill. If it were a 50 per cent cut and the members felt happy with it, I would have made exactly the same speech that I have made, and if they wanted my support in voting themselves 50 per cent less, and they thought they got good political mileage from it, I would go along and vote for the 50 per cent for them. But the principles are what I say would still be the principles that I am setting forth today in this House on behalf of the Opposition as well.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed until later in today's sitting.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House revert to the Item "Statements by Ministers" so that the Minister of Finance may make a statement.

1.35 p.m.

In speaking on this, Sir, I should like again to make clear the parameters within which this Statement will be made. You, yourself, Sir, have given permission for the Statement by the Minister of Finance to be recorded for telecasting later tonight, and that, if the Opposition so wishes, any motion moved by them and a speech on that particular motion would also be given equal time and equal treatment. I would say, Sir, furthermore, that two responses to any motion introduced by the Opposition, responses from this side, two speeches, would also be telecast as well.

I should like to make it clear, Sir, so that there would be absolutely no misunderstanding, that it is not true, or completely true, to say that Statements by Ministers preclude debate in this Honourable Chamber. It is a time-honoured practice, supported by the Rules of this Chamber, that Statements by Ministers, may be debated on motions initiated by Members. So once a Minister makes a Statement, a Member on the Government side, or on the Opposition side, is free to move a motion for debate on that particular Statement.

I have seen, Sir, some misguided and uninformed statements to the effect that a Statement by a Minister precludes debate in this Honourable Chamber. It is not true to say that. When a Statement is made, a Member, including any member of the Opposition, is free to put down a motion for debate on that particular Statement. So we do not want any misunderstanding on that.

I should like to say further, Sir, that while I have spoken about the recording or the telecasting of this particular debate, I should also like to make it clear that debate on any motion initiated on this Statement will be open for any Member of the House who wishes to participate in that particular debate, under your direction, Sir.

Having cleared those particular matters out of the way, it only remains for me to say that after the Statement, Sir, we propose to take the luncheon adjournment. We will resume our discussion and debate after that.

I beg to move, Sir, that the item, "Statements by Ministers" be taken at this stage.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I may speak on the motion very briefly, the Honourable Member has communicated to me, in his role as Leader of the House, the views which he has expressed about how he proposes to treat this matter. I wish to clarify, for the same purposes for which my friend sought to give clarification, our position on the matter.

The Minister has proposed to bring what, obviously, is his first Budgetary Statement by way of a Ministerial Statement. That is his prerogative. Until that Statement is made, the Opposition will not be in a position, not having seen the Statement ahead of time, to say whether or not it proposes to bring a motion. Obviously, if a motion is brought, we will debate the motion within the terms of the Rules of this House, subject to such co-operation with the Government – since they have the numbers and we have not got them – as is possible to allow us to debate the motion on consecutive days, or such other days as may be appropriate to the House.

However, the point which I wish to make is that I am disappointed that the Government does not see fit to allow the speech of more than one member of the Opposition to be telecast. It is my understanding that whichever Member replies first on behalf of the Opposition on a motion, his speech will be telecast, only to the extent that it is as long or as short as the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, the Minister of Finance. Thereafter, however, two speeches from the Government side, in response, will be telecast, but no more speeches from the side of the Opposition. It is not that we would not be able to speak in here, but it will be that insofar as what we say may be made the subject of a broadcast by television, the Government takes the view that that will not be permitted.

I recognize, Sir, that the Government realizes that three of us may be so powerful that what we have to say might take two of them.....

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: .....plus the Minister of Finance, to reply to one of us, Sir. I am very pleased that, so early in the life of this Parliament, the value of the Opposition.....

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: .....the strength of the Opposition and the force of the Opposition is recognised. But I will hope, once again, that on sober reflection, the Government will see fit, in the circumstances, to allow at least one other speech on behalf of the Opposition, certainly before the winding up speech, if a motion is brought to be telecast as well.

I know the Right Honourable Member is not too fond of everybody going on television. He has not changed in expressing those views, whether in Government or Opposition. But it seems to me that this is the first major occasion on which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central will be performing. And he is not bringing any mini Budget, Sir. He believes it is a maxi Budget. Therefore, let us treat it in a maxi way! Let us give it maximum exposure. Exposure from our side as well, so that we can put forward our views.

I am not saying – the honourable Member must not misunderstand me – that there is anything to prevent us putting our views forward here in the House, but limiting us to one speech on television, only for the length of time it has taken the honourable Member to put forward his Proposals, seems to me, in the context of everything, to be very miserly, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to assure the honourable Member that the Chair is going to be willing to take whatever Resolution they may have within the context of the Rules of this House.

The Minister of Finance, if he is ready to give his Statement, shall so do.
1.45 p.m.

STATEMENT BY HON. R. C. HAYNES, MINISTER OF FINANCE RE STATE OF ECONOMY AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on Thursday, April 3, 1986 the people of Barbados were made aware that, for the first time in the history of our nation, they had a choice between two alternative sets of fiscal measures to be implemented during the current fiscal year. The electorate of Barbados responded in clear and unequivocal terms.

The measures which I am about to propose are designed to restore the Barbadian economy to good health, to improve the living standard of all Barbadians and to assure our children and grandchildren of a better future.

We have already had a Budget Debate pertaining to fiscal year 1986–87. All that should have been necessary at this stage, is to introduce the proposals which the people of Barbados chose. Unfortunately, the review and analysis of economic conditions presented during the recent Budget Debate were at a considerable factual and analytical distance from the economic review and analysis contained in the Central Bank's Annual Report for 1985, which could, and should, have been made a document of the House before the Budget Debate.

In these circumstances, it becomes necessary for me to set the record straight, so that there will be a clear understanding of the circumstances in which the New Fiscal Arrangements are being implemented. In this regard, as far as review of the performance of the economy during 1985 is concerned, the Central Bank's presentation accords more closely with the facts.

In summarising the performance of the economy, the Central Bank, *inter alia,* stated:

"A number of unexpected reverses in 1985 aborted the 1984 recovery of the Barbados economy. Real output expanded hardly at all as the market for electronic components weakened and even fiercer protectionist measures by Trinidad and Tobago cut imports from Barbados by one half. After an excellent winter, the tourism sector experienced one of the worst summer seasons in many years, while the agricultural sector marked time. There was no improvement in the unemployment situation. Substantial foreign borrowing was required to maintain an adequate level of foreign exchange reserves.....

Demand for credit remained weak throughout the year and considerable excess liquidity built up in the banking system. Government efforts to channel funds to housing met with limited success. Heavy foreign borrowing reduced Government dependence on domestic financial markets while the poor economic climate depressed private sector loan demand.....

Although Government revenues were higher, the fiscal position deteriorated. Substantial increases in public sector wages and salaries swelled current expenditure. Moreover, capital spending picked up, pushing the overall deficit well above the 1984 level...

> . . . A sharp fall in net private capital inflows and heavy debt service payments weakened the capital account considerably. Government borrowed on both the Tokyo and London markets to sustain the balance of payments – securing an $86 million increase in foreign exchange reserves."
>
> *(Central Bank of Barbados – Annual Report 1985, page 3).*

The Central Bank's analysis did not identify the single most important domestic cause of these reversals, namely, the substantial increases in taxation imposed by the 1985 Budget and the so-called Mini-Budget of 1984, which transformed Barbados from a highly taxed economy to an overtaxed economy.

The taxation policy of the last regime is in large measure responsible for the current depressed state of the Barbadian economy. Tax reduction is, therefore, a necessary first step in any attempt to revitalize the economy.

The drift into overtaxation has come about because the principal response of the previous Government to increasing budget deficits has been to increase taxation. Insufficient attention was paid to the elimination of wasteful expenditure and to inefficiency in Government-owned commercial enterprises.

The level of inefficiency in the public sector, which was condoned and promoted, is at once alarming and reassuring – alarming, because it bespeaks of irresponsible stewardship in the highest degree, and reassuring because it indicates a major source of saving on Government expenditure – sufficient to offset the net tax losses arising from the fiscal measures which I will be announcing.

Such inefficiency cannot be eliminated overnight. The ineptitude of the past will continue for some time to express itself as a drain on Government's resources, particularly in relation to Government commercial enterprises.

The total losses incurred by the Arawak Cement Plant, Heywoods, Caribbean Airways, Barbados National Oil Co. Ltd., Aero Services Barbados Ltd., The Transport Board, the Barbados Development Bank, are of such magnitude that it will be necessary to make fuller and separate statements on the financial status of each of these entities if the public is to grasp the full extent of the mismanagement and squandermania of the previous Administration.

The past Government has been responsible for the losses of Caribbean Airways since the collapse of Laker Airways in February 1982. From 1982 until February 1986, the cumulative losses of the airline have been $27 518 712. The Government has injected some $20 500 000 up to April 30, 1986 and is contingently liable for the indebtedness of the airline to the Barbados National Bank. At the end of May 1986, this indebtedness was $12 386 855.

The Barbados National Oil Company has always been a problem. From its inception to the end of fiscal year 1985–86, BNOCL has experienced a cash-flow deficit of $20.2

million. The company has been projecting substantial losses for 1986–87. I have already taken steps to reduce these losses.

The deficit at the Transport Board to be financed this year will be $25 million. I will be taking steps to ensure that this most unsatisfactory state of affairs does not have a negative impact on our new fiscal programme.

The Barbados Development Bank has incurred losses of $7.4 million in the year ending March 1986. An independent external agency has reported that 64 per cent of its loan portfolio is contaminated and almost half of its equity has been wiped out.

This Government will now have the major task of restoring the financial integrity of that institution if it is to fulfil its role in our society.

The Arawak Cement Plant, built at a capital cost of $198.9 million, has lost $55.8 million in its first two years of operation, and the total losses projected to the end of the financial year 1987–88 are $93.6 million. The cash losses for the period 1984–85 to 1987–88 are projected at $58.5 million.

The story is much the same for most Government-owned commercial enterprises, including the Furniture Trading Corporation and the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

This Government will be insisting that prudence should take its course, in regard to Government's continued involvement in non-strategic, money-wasting commercial ventures.

Mr. Speaker, it would be misleading merely to state that the past Government left an empty Treasury. Not only was it empty, but Government's overdraft, then standing at $72.4 million at May 30 1986, with outstanding cheques of $44.4 million, was above the legal limit of $70.1 million when I assumed office, and one of the first acts I performed as Minister of Finance was to address this situation.

The excesses and incompetence of the past Administration have had a profound effect on our external position. Our liquid foreign reserves at the end of May 1986 stood at the low level of $132 million while a substantial balance of payments deficit was projected.

This $132 million included high levels of short-term external borrowings by the Central Bank of Barbados. The past Government, fully aware of the severe damage done to the external position of this country, had from February of this year been negotiating to borrow $10 billion Japanese yen, that is approximately Bds $114 million. There were difficulties in raising this large sum of money in the Japanese market and the amount was reduced to 5 billion yen or approximately Bds $57 million. A similar amount was being negotiated on the Eurodollar market.

This situation was made worse by the irresponsible pre-election spending, which led to a revision of the projected end-of-year balance of payments deficit to as high as Bds $40 million.

These are the facts, Sir, and contrary to the misleading utterances and recent orchestration, the present foreign reserve and balance of payments position of Barbados has nothing to do with any act on the part of this Government.

This year, this country must find over $100 million in foreign exchange to repay the debts of the previous Administration. In other words, when we borrow $100 million, we are simply repaying debt with that money.

The borrowings have nothing whatsoever to do with this Government's future capital development programme. They are entirely to satisfy commitments made by the previous regime.

On the domestic scene, the Treasury Bill limit of $425 million had already been reached. The previous Administration had already taken the initial steps to increase the Treasury limit by $100 million.

There was a significant reserve loss in the first quarter of the year, the result of heavy capital outflows to service foreign debt, including the loan from the International Monetary Fund.

Over the next four years the country faces a bunching of foreign debt repayments as follows:–

1986	$101.0 million
1987	$125.6 million
1988	$95.6 million
1989	$93.2 million
1991	$153.0 million

I have had the opportunity over the past few weeks to examine the financial and economic situation facing the country, from the inside, and I am now more convinced than ever that there is urgent need for a new fiscal arrangement which will lead to a turnaround of our economic fortunes and bring a halt to the social and economic decline which the country has had to endure under the regime of the previous Government.

The proposals which I will introduce today have been prepared with the objective of strengthening the economy, creating employment opportunities, through increased purchasing power to individuals and assistance to businesses, and improving the living standard of all members of the society.

Personal Income Tax

Mr. Speaker, I now propose changes to the existing Income Tax Structure as follows:

1. Effective from income year 1986, all persons whose total assessable income is $15 000 per year or less will pay no income tax.

Loud Applause.

Tax Bands and Rates

Effective from income year 1986, the maximum rate on taxable income will be 50% and the bands and rates of tax on taxable income will be as follows:

Up to $15 000	20%
$15 001 to $25 000	30%
$25 001 to $35 000	40%
$35 001 to $55 000	45%
Over $55 000	50%

Family Allowances

With effect from income year 1986, family and dependent allowances will be increased as follows:

		Present	**Proposed**
(a)	*Personal Allowances*		
(i)	Single person	$3 000	$4 500
(ii)	Married person with spouse having no income	$5 000	$7 500

Loud Applause

(b)	*Child Allowances*		
(i)	Under 18 years	$500	$750
(ii)	Over 11 years and under 16, but being educated in Barbados	$600	$900
(iii)	over 16 years, but not over 25 years, and being educated in Barbados	$800	$1 200
(iv)	over 16 years, but not over 18 years, and being educated abroad	$800	$1 200
(v)	over 18 years, but not over 25 years, and being educated abroad	$1 400	$2 100
(c)	*Dependent Relatives*	$500	$750
(d)	*Household Help*	$500	$1 200
(e)	*Gardener*	$500	$1 200
(f)	*Housekeeper*	$500	$1 200

		Proposed	Present
(g)	School Fees for each child 11 years and over attending an approved secondary school in Barbados	$350	$525

DEDUCTIONS

Effective from income year 1986, the following existing deductions will be increased:

(i) *Mortgage Allowances and Insurance Premiums*

Full mortgage interest will be allowed while 50% of the insurance premium in respect of owner occupied houses will be granted.

Applause.

(ii) *Repairs*

The full cost of repairs for owner occupied houses in any year will be allowed as a deductible expense from this income year.

Applause.

(iii) *Medical Expenses*

The allowances for medical expenses will be increased from this year as follows:

		Present	Proposed
(a)	Married person living with or wholly maintaining his or her spouse who had no income	$300	$450
(b)	All other cases	$150	$225
(c)	Child Allowance	$ 75	$120

The present requirement that the first $20 must be deducted will be removed and medical expenses in excess of the amount allowed in one year may be carried forward for two years.

Withholding Tax on Interest

Interest will still be taxable for income tax purposes, but withholding tax is to be applied only to interest payments of $6 000 per annum or $1 500 per quarter or above. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the tax will be applied when the individual files his return.

Income Tax on Overtime

Mr. Speaker, the exemption of the first $15 000 of total assessable income from income tax, and the adjustments to the bands and rate structure, will, for the vast majority of workers, ensure that earnings from overtime are not eroded by overtaxation at the time when the worker needs his money. Therefore, the situation will be monitored over the next few months and further steps will be taken if such action becomes necessary.

Payments of Interest on Refunds

Our view is that in the same way an individual pays interest to the Government if his tax payments are in arrears, the Government should pay interest to that individual if his refund is not made within a reasonable time.

Therefore, effective from income year 1986, – I repeat, income year 1986 – interest at the rate of 1% per month will be payable on tax refunds which have not been made after the expiration of six (6) months from the date of filing.

Applause.

PENSIONS

Effective 1st January, 1986, National Insurance Pensions and all other pensions will be exempt from Income Tax.

Loud Applause.

SEVERANCE PAYMENTS

No income tax will be paid on severance payments with effect from this income year, because we feel that such an occasion is a rather traumatic one for any worker, particularly if he has little prospect of being gainfully employed within a relatively short time.

Mr. Speaker, effective from this income year, employees with a total annual assessable income of $15 000 or less will not have to file any tax return unless they have assessable income from sources other than their main occupation. In fact, Sir, in order to keep the administration of this change simple, they will not even have to submit a declaration form. However, the present system of filing returns will continue for all self-employed persons.

As explained earlier, those persons whose total annual assessable income is $15 000 or less will pay no income tax. However, those persons whose total annual assessable income is greater than $15 000 and whose allowances and deductions do not amount to $15 000 will be allowed to claim $15 000 in allowances and deductions. Those persons whose allowances and deductions exceed $15 000 will be allowed the full amount of those allowances and deductions.

It is estimated that in this fiscal year the gross revenue loss from the above changes will be $49.0 million.

CORPORATION TAX

With effect from this income year, the maximum rate of corporation tax will be 35% instead of the current rate of 45%. The revenue loss from this change is expected to be $12.44 million.

A committee representing a wide range of interest in the community has been established to advise on the method of implementing our proposal to introduce a graduated corporation tax, ranging from 15% to 35%. This proposal will be put in place during the income year 1987 and will be designed to achieve the objectives which have been outlined in our published programme.

A committee will also be invited to advise on the method of implementation of our proposal to exempt regulated public utility companies from corporation tax.

PROPERTY TAXES

It is our firm belief that the tourist sector is in need of further assistance if it is to continue attracting visitors to our shores. Therefore, as further evidence of our commitment to this very important sector in our economic life, effective from April 1, 1986 land taxes payable by hotels and apartment hotels will be reduced by 50%.

The revenue loss from this measure is expected to be $1.5 million.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we place very great emphasis on the need to improve our housing stock, and in addition to the measure relating to the full costs of repairs, which I announced earlier, effective from April 1, 1987, persons living in their own homes will pay land tax on 70% of the improved value of their properties. In other words, the first 30% of the improved value will be exempted from the tax.

Furthermore, pensioners living in their own homes will be granted a reduction of 50% of the tax payable on the improved value of their property.

The commencement date of these two measures have been set for April 1, 1987, to allow for the preparation of separate tax rolls so that it will be easy for the Commissioner of Land Tax to identify those persons who are entitled to the rebate. This step is necessary for the smooth implementation of the proposed change.

INCENTIVES FOR AGRICULTURE

The Ministry of Agriculture will undertake a study of the existing incentives for agriculture, and our programme for further assistance will be introduced when the study is completed.

Meanwhile, I propose to introduce two measures which will provide assistance to the agriculture sector. Firstly, with effect from 1st April, 1986 the Agricultural Levy will be abolished and, as promised in our manifesto, refunds will be made to all persons who paid the levy since its introduction.

The revenue loss from this measure is estimated as $1.8 million.

Secondly, during this fiscal year the Ministry of Agriculture will be provided with funds to make a grant of $250 000 to the Barbados Agricultural Society for research and development purposes.

PUBLIC SERVICE VEHICLES

Public service vehicles in my view play a very significant role in our transportation system. Therefore, for some time, it has been of great concern to me to witness the severe taxes which were imposed on them. As a result, effective from 1st January, 1987, the taxes and fees which these vehicles are subject to will be reduced by 50%.

The new fees will be as follows:–

		Present		**Proposed**	
1.	MINI-BUSES	*Permit Fee*	*Annual Tax*	*Permit Fee*	*Annual Tax*
(a)	Driven by the owner)	$15 000	$5 000	$7 500	$2 500
(b)	Driven by a person) other than the owner) to transport paying passengers on bus routes	$15 000	$6 000	$7 500	$3 000
2.	TAXIS				
(a)	Driven by owner	$2 500	$500	$1 250	$250
(b)	Driven by person other than owner (to provide normal taxi service)	$2 500	$800	$1 250	$400
3.	MAXI-TAXIS	$2 500	$1 200	$1 250	$600

The revenue loss from the above reductions is estimated at $0.3 million for this Fiscal Year.

TOURIST RELATED ACTIVITIES

As a further boost to the tourist industry effective from December 15, 1986, the Hotel and Restaurant Sales Tax will be reduced from 8% to 5%. This change will coincide with the winter season and should have some effect on the sales of hotels and restaurants alike. At the same time, Barbadians who patronize these establishments will benefit from an increase in their purchasing power.

The gross revenue loss during this Fiscal Year from the above proposal is estimated at $1.6 million.

Also, Mr. Speaker, with effect from 1st January, 1987, the Visitor's Driving Permit will be reduced from $30.00 to $10.00.

The revenue loss from this proposal is expected to be $175 000 during this fiscal year.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. *T. V. Licences*

As from today, the television licence fee and the annual fee for the renewal of the licence will be abolished.

The loss of revenue from this measure is expected to be $100 000 in this fiscal year.

2. *Advances to Public Servants*

In the past, Christmas advances to Public Servants proved to be a useful source of funds for persons at the lower end of the salary scale. Therefore, it was of some concern to us when the practice was discontinued and we have decided to re-introduce it from Christmas this year.

Applause.

REGISTRATION OF PROFESSIONALS AND OTHER PERSONS

Our view on this matter is that there should be no impositions on professionals over and above the cost of regulating their activities through the relevant professional bodies established by law. Therefore, I shall be introducing the appropriate legislation to abolish the fees, fines, penalties and other imposts payable by carpenters, masons, bottle-sellers, hairdressers, shoemakers, hucksters and other artisans and tradesmen by virtue of the Profession, Trade and Business Registration Act, Cap. 373, and to reduce substantially the registration fees payable by professional persons.

Applause.

HIRE PURCHASE ARRANGEMENT

In the very near future, an announcement will be made on a new hire purchase regime for stoves and refrigerators.

Old Age Pensions

Mr. Speaker, our record in relation to the care of the elderly is a good one, and there is no need for me to repeat our achievements in this area. We accept the care of the aged as part of our general responsibility for managing the affairs of the country.

Effective from 4th August, 1986, the minimum pensions paid by the National Insurance Office will be increased as follows:

	Present	Proposed
Non-Contributory Old Age Pension	$48.00 per wk	$50.00 per wk
Old Age Contributory Pension	$60.00 per wk	$62.00 per wk
Invalidity Pension	$60.00 per wk	$62.00 per wk

The National Insurance Office will make the other adjustments necessary as a result of the increase in the minimum pensions.

STAMP DUTY

Mr. Speaker, after examining the items which are subject to stamp duty, I have decided that, with effect from midnight tonight, the stamp duty on wines and certain basic building materials and foods should be reduced from 12% to 10% as follows:–

		New Rates
(a)	*Wines*	
	Sparkling	10%
	Other	10%
(b)	*Building Materials*	
	Wood	10%
	Galvanize sheets	10%
	Garden bibs, faucets,) sinks, basins)	10%
(c)	*Food*	
	Rice – semi milled or wholly milled	10%
	Rice – Husked but not further prepared	10%
	Potatoes (not sweet)	10%

The details of these changes are shown in appendix B.

The loss of revenue from the above changes is estimated as $450 000 during this fiscal year.

Extra-Budgetary Funds

At present, there are certain extra-budgetary funds, which, in our view, should never have been established outside of the Consolidated Fund. Therefore, legislation will be introduced to have the Health Levy Fund, the Training Levy Fund and the Transport Levy Fund transferred into the Consolidated Fund.

Also, there are certain statutory boards which have excess funds in their bank accounts, and these will be transferred into the Consolidated Fund.

These sources, in addition to the new pricing structure for petroleum products, will result in extra revenue of $27.4 million.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SAVINGS

Mr. Speaker, this year, and in subsequent years, the Central Bank will place on the market National Savings Bonds amounting to $10.0 million each year.

Also, the Government will do everything possible to facilitate the establishment of Unit Trust companies and the Stock Exchange to provide avenues for individuals to invest some of their savings.

The gross revenue loss from my proposals is estimated as $67.4 million. However, increased spending is inevitable, and, as a result, Government's revenue will receive a boost. In fact, it is estimated that the net revenue loss will be approximately $53.0 million.

The loss is further reduced when the additional revenue of $27.4 million is taken into account.

Furthermore, after consultation with all Ministries, a decision has been taken to reduce current expenditure by $14 million and to restrict capital expenditure to $150 million in order to provide some accommodation for new salaries for the public servants whose original request, it is hoped, will be moderated in view of the generous income tax relief which has been given.

There will be no difficulty in financing Government's operations.

Mr. Speaker, all the tax proposals introduced on April 2, 1986 by the former Administration and which are not covered by legislation, cease to be effective from today with the following exceptions:–

(a) the Market Development Allowance to cover operations in the tourist sector;

(b) the annual depreciation allowance for commercial buildings;

(c) the building allowance for listed properties of a commercial nature;

(d) the proposal relating to investment income retained in Barbados by enclave enterprises owned by non-nationals;

(e) the tax credit allowed in respect of qualifying overseas construction projects as well as qualifying overseas professional services;

(f) the proposal relating to a new category of Public Service Vehicle;

(g) the proposal relating to the licensing fees payable in respect of self-driven hired cars;

(h) the proposal relating to the abolition of Consumption Tax on the items specified.

Mr. Speaker, this Government will do all it can to expedite the creation of jobs in new and productive areas. The public can help in this regard by buying locally produced goods. I especially wish to exhort businesses in the distributive sector to strive to promote the sale of locally-produced goods, to place early and adequate orders for such goods, and to assume the role of stockist for goods produced by small manufacturers.

Applause.

I also wish to exhort the public to save more and invest in Government securities and co-operatives on a regular basis.

We have fulfilled our pledge to this nation.

We have given the people the tools to do the job. Ours is a mission of reconciliation; to heal the wounds of the past ten years and put behind us the hate and victimisation of that period; to reduce the dependence of the individual on politicians; to energise this society by restoring hope, confidence and our traditional sense of pride and dignity.

Loud Applause.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

1. No income tax payable on total assessable income of $15 000 or less.

2. Maximum income tax rate of 50% with the new bands and rates being as follows:–

Up to $15 000	20%
$15 001 to $25 000	30%
$25 001 to $35 000	40%
$35 001 to $55 000	45%
Over $55 000	50%

3. Family allowances increased by a minimum of 50%.

4. Allowances in respect of housekeepers/household help/gardener increased from $500 to $1 200.

5. Full mortgage interest allowed as deduction from assessable income.

6. 50% of insurance premiums allowed as a deductible expense in respect of owner occupied homes.

7. Full cost of repairs allowed as a deductible expense for owner occupied house.

8. The allowances for medical expenses increased by 50% and the requirement that the first $20 be met by the claimant removed. Any expenses in excess of the allowance may be carried forward for 2 years.

9. Effective income year 1986 interest will be paid at the rate of 1% per month on tax refunds not made within 6 months of the prescribed date of filing.

10. With effect from income year 1986 all pensions will be exempted from income tax.

11. Effective income year 1986 no income tax will be payable on severance payments.

12. Maximum rate of corporation tax reduced from 45% to 35% with effect from this income year.

13. Graduated Corporation Tax ranging from 15% to 35% being examined for implementation in the Income Year 1987.

14. Effective April 1, 1986 land taxes payable by hotels and apartment hotels will be reduced by 50%.

15. With effect from April 1, 1987 persons living in their own houses will pay land tax on 70% of the improved value of their properties.

16. Pensioners living in their own homes will be granted reduction of 50% of the tax payable on the improved value of their property with effect from April 1, 1987.

17. Effective April 1, 1986 the Agricultural Levy will be abolished, and the payments made since its introduction will be refunded.

18. A grant of $250 000 will be provided to the Barbados Agricultural Society for research and development.

19. Effective from January 1, 1987 the taxes and fees payable on public service vehicles will be reduced by 50%.

20. The Hotels and Restaurants Sales Tax will be reduced from 8% to 5% with effect from December 15, 1986.

21. Effective January 1, 1987 the fee payable for a Visitor's Driving Permit will be reduced from $30.00 to $10.00.

22. Effective immediately the fee payable for a television licence will be abolished.

23. The Christmas advance to public servants will be re-introduced from Christmas this year.

24. Fees payable under the Profession, Trade and Business Registration Act by certain artisans and tradesmen will be abolished, and the registration fees payable by professional persons will be reduced substantially.

25. A new hire purchase regime for stoves and refrigerators will be announced shortly.

26. Minimum pensions payable by the National Insurance Office will be increased with effect from August 4, 1986.

27. Stamp duty on wines and certain basic building materials and foods reduced from 12% to 10%.

APPENDIX 'B'

TARIFF HEADING NO.	DESCRIPTION OF GOODS	RATE OF TAX
07.01.1	Potatoes (Not Sweet)	10%
10.06	Rice	10%
22.05.2	Sparkling Wines	10%
22.05.9	Other Wines	10%
22.06	Vermouths and Other Wines	10%
44.05	Wood Sawn Lengthwise, Sliced or Peeled but not further worked, of a thickness exceeding 5 mm.	10%
44.13	Wood (including Blocks, Strips and Friezes for Parquet or Wood Block Flooring, not assembled), Planed, Tongued, Grooved, Rebated, Chamfered V-Jointed, Centre V-Jointed, Beaded Centre Beaded or the like, but not further manufactured.	10%
44.15	Plywood, Block Board, Laminboard, Battenboard and similar Laminated Wood Products (including Veneered Panels and Sheets), Inlaid Wood and Marquetry.	10%
73.13.1	Galvanised sheet of a thickness of less than 3 mm	10%
73.13.9	Other	10%
Ex. 73.38.2	Faucets, Sinks, Basins	10%
Ex. 73.38.9	Garden Bibs, Faucets	10%

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, promises made, promises kept.

I wish to move, Sir, that this sitting be suspended for one hour, that is, until 3.30 p.m.

But before we go into the suspension, Sir, I should like to give the Opposition an assurance that we listen, and will listen to the representations which they make. The Leader of the Opposition has asked that an additional speech from the Opposition be telecast, and, subject to the Rules of this House, Sir, and your guidance, we on this side are prepared and willing to accommodate them in that particular regard.

As we indicate, Sir, these are not the bad, old times. I recall in 1985, October 23, Sir, the then Minister of Finance came into this Chamber and raised revenue, imposed taxation running into millions of dollars, without any notice.....

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: .....Let me get the date correct, Sir. Let me get it correct. October 23, 1984..... by means of a Statement, without any warning at all to the Opposition, and no accommodation at all. Those are times of the past. We are out to heal now. We will consult and we will give them their reasonable request.

With that, Sir, I beg.....

Aside.

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, what? Are you indicating to me that if they wish four speeches, they have four speeches, Sir?

Loud Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:.....Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.30 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir.

2.35 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member must know that we take what the public gives us, just as the public will take what they gave them. But I always recall the famous position of the – there is a time for bread and there is a time for circuses, but there is also a time for paying.

I would like to remind the honourable Member, though, Sir – he cites what happened in 1984 – that he is aware of the precedent in 1981 where the speeches of all honourable Members on the Opposition side who wanted to speak were broadcast **and no** limitations, other than the Rules of the House, **were placed** on their speeches. So the honourable Member **must** not give the public the impression that in the past Administration there was not a generosity in relation to the broadcast of speeches for this Honourable House. In fact, I remind honourable Members that it was only under the past Administration that the speeches of all honourable Members on the Budget Debate and on other major issues were televised and broadcast. Prior to that no provision was made for it. People have had a greater freedom and a greater luxury, and are coming to expect more, but it began under us, and I would not want the records of this House to show otherwise.

The question that the House now stand suspended for one hour until 3.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2.40 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that consideration of Order No. 1 be resumed.

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1986

Mr. SPEAKER: If there be no objection, Order No. 1 will now be resumed.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. R. P. Byer in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, in moving that Clause 2 stand part, I am so moving there is a typographical error to be corrected in Clause 2, Section 2, subsection 2.

In the second line of that subsection the word "map" should be changed to "may", and subject to that amendment I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I second that, Sir.

The question that Clause 2, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 4 stand part, I wish to propose an amendment. The operative date of this particular measure is given as the 1st day of July, 1986 and we are amending that to read the 1st day of August, 1986.

I, therefore, move that Clause 4, as amended, stand part.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I second that, Sir.

The question that Clause 4, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
3.40 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) (Amendment) Act, 1986.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I wish to move that we revert in the Order of Business to the Item Private Members' Notices.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that we revert to Private Members' Notices. If there is no objection, leave is granted. The honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

> WHEREAS the Opposition takes note of the Statement and Budgetary Proposals presented to this Honourable House by the Minister of Finance on July 15, 1986;
>
> AND WHEREAS the Opposition rejects the Minister's analysis of the state of the economy and his analysis of the state of public finances as at May 28, 1986;
>
> AND WHEREAS the Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance will not relieve the present social and economic difficulties of Barbados, but will operate against the best interests of this nation;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that this House express its disapproval of the said Statement and Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it then that the honourable Member is proceeding with this notice at this time. Are you only giving notice of the Resolution?

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

> BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House take note of the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor-General at the Opening of the current parliamentary Session and pledge to act as expeditiously as possible to implement the provisions referred to therein.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any other Private Members' Notices?

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this sitting do now adjourn until Tuesday, July 22, 1986 at 12 noon.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
3.49 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, July, 8, 1986 23

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER 23

Re permission for Telecast of Financial Statement and Proposals by Hon. Dr. R. C. Haynes.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES 23

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for months ended 28th February 1986 and 31st March 1986.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for months ended 30th April 1986 and 31st May 1986.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MOTION RE ITEM "STATEMENT BY MINISTERS" 24, 33

Mr. Sandiford, 24, 33; Mr. Forde, 33.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS BY HON. DR. R. C. HAYNES (MINISTER OF FINANCE) 35

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 24

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1986 . . . . . 24, 51

Mr. Barrow, 24; Mr. Forde, 24, 29; Mr. Taitt, 24; Mr. Sandiford, 51.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

NOTICE BY MR. O. S. ARTHUR (ST. PETER) RE FINANCIAL STATEMENT BY HON. DR. R. C. HAYNES (MINISTER OF FINANCE) 52

NOTICE BY MR. R. L. MORRIS (CHRIST CHURCH EAST CENTRAL) RE THRONE SPEECH 52

SUSPENSION 51

Mr. Sandiford, 51; Mr. Forde, 51.

ADJOURNMENT 52

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter)
BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
HAYNES, Hon. Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
MORRIS, R. L. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)
TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)
WEEKES, His Hon. L. A. (St. Michael North West)