

THE

House of Assembly Debates

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

Tuesday, December 8, 1987.

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

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, JJP., (Speaker)
His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), JP.,
(Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economic
Affairs)
Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A., (Hons.), M.A., LL.B.,
(Hons.), (Minister of Health)
Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime
Minister and Minister of International Transport, 'telecom-
munications and Immigration and Leader of the House)
Hon. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of
Trade, Industry and Commerce)
Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F. R. C. P., (Edin.),
Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., (Minister
of Transport and Works)
Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General
and Minister of Legal Affairs)
Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., JP.,
(Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.&., (Econ.), (Minister
of Housing and Lands)
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc., (Econ.)
Hon. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Acting Minister of
Employment, Labour Relations and Community Develop-
ment)
Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education and
Culture)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, JP.
Mr. E. BOURNE
Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, M.D.
Hon. W. W. HALL, (Minister of Tourism and Sports)
Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary,
Prime Minister's Office)

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.
Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B.

Prayers were led by Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, November 24, 1987.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move
that the Minutes of Tuesday, November 24, 1987, of the
proceedings of this Chamber be taken as read and
confirmed.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt
of the following:

Accounts and Statement for the month of October,
1987 as prepared by the Accountant General.

MESSAGES

Mr. SPEAKER: In light of the present statement,
which will have to be read in this Chamber, I will defer
Messages from His Excellency the Governor-General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am
commanded to lay the following:
cf

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following documents:

The Annual Report of the Barbados Water Authority for the period 1st April 1985 to 31st March 1986.

The 4th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Transport Levy Fund for the period ended 31st March 1986.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$30000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1987-88, Part I -Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1987-88, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill, of which I have already given notice, to validate certain charges and dues fixed by the Barbados Port Authority be read a first time.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

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

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 39,41 and 46 are ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed further, I move the suspension of the following Standing Orders: 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

The question that the several Standing Orders be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

IRREGULARITIES IN NOTICES RE MEETING

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Before the Honourable Prime Minister speaks, I wish to draw the House's attention to some irregularities in the notices convening today's

meeting. I thought that we would have been given an explanation.

When the folded documents came on the weekend, we were summoned for today, Tuesday, December 8, 1987. Late Friday afternoon, we received in a brown envelope this document, which I will make a document of the House, from the Cabinet Office, dated 4th December, 1987. 12.25 p.m.

It is a standard form document and they just changed dates and so on. It purported to have been made under the hand of the Leader of the House and said:

"Dear Sir,

I hereby give notice under the provisions of Order No. 22(1) (b) of the Standing Orders of the Honourable House of Assembly, of the measures listed in the appendix hereto, copies of which have been duly signed by me.

It is desired to have these measures dealt with by the House of Assembly on Tuesday

Here there is an alteration in the date. It seemed to have been rewritten to read Tuesday, 24th December, 1987, because Tuesday, some day in November, was cancelled and Tuesday, the 14th December was written. It said:

"Copies are forwarded herewith for early circulation to Members of the House of Assembly."

Then we had circulated with this the Resolutions which are on this Supplementary Order Paper that we found in the House today.

There was confusion certainly among the Opposition as to whether we would have been debating anything today, because the printed Order Paper for today was blank under the rubric GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, and it appeared as though there was nothing. Then, having received this document, it suggested that we were meeting some time next week. But Tuesday, December 14 does not exist I would think it is Tuesday, December 15. Somebody in the Cabinet Office got it wrong.

I attach no blame to the Leader of the House, except that I say that it was very confusing as to what was happening. I will pass this to Your Honour so that Your Honour can see, and all of us who have received these documents. You can make it a document of the House.

While we do not wish to frustrate Government's Business in any way, and certainly wish to accommodate the Christmas loans and advances and the various other things that are to be dealt with today, I really must register,

for the record, our concern with the apparent inefficiency, or bungling, or confusion in the Cabinet Office.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have taken great notice of what the honourable Member has said. I certainly will have the matter thoroughly investigated, and I am sure that the Honourable Member will get the correct answer to what he has raised.

I agree with him that it certainly was no intention of anyone to frustrate the business of the House today.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the matters as raised by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons). There is a clear error in the letter set out to the Clerk of Parliament. I believe an attempt was made to correct that error, but it made it even worse, apparently.

I apologize to the honourable Member, to honourable Members on both sides of the House as well, Sir, as to Your Honour the Speaker.

It is, Sir, a genuine error. I think honourable Members probably would have been aware of that certainly by this morning.

I understand that the Clerk of Parliament had an agenda of Government Business circulated yesterday to honourable Members, setting out those very matters of which notice was given, or sought to be given, by virtue of that letter indicating that these are the matters set out for the Order Paper Tuesday, December 8, 1987. I think this was done yesterday.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am assured by the Clerk of Parliament that they were supposed to have been circulated yesterday, not that I doubt the honourable Member for St. Thomas that he received his only today.

The matter is regretted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say that I am still of the opinion that matters pertaining to the business of this House must be done with maximum efficiency. I think the honourable Member's genuine complaint needs to be given a proper reply.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I have given him as proper a reply as he can probably get now, Sir, or any other time in the future.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ADVANCES OF SALARY OR WAGES IN THE SUM OF \$4 000 000

Order No. 2 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$4000000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of making advances of salary

or wages on the terms and conditions set out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St Michael South): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, as has been indicated, is for the sum of \$4 000 000 to be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to make advances of salaries and wages to Government employees.

It is, of course, recognized now that it is part of the practice of Democratic Labour Party Governments to make such advances to Government employees. It was a practice which was instituted in 1962, and continued until 1976 by the Democratic Labour Party Government. With the change of Government in 1976, the Barbados Labour Party Government made advances of salaries and wages in the year 1977. But thereafter, no such advances were made by the Government until there was a change of Government in 1986, when the practice was re-instituted and this Honourable Chamber approved an appropriate sum, I believe on December 3 last year, for the payment of advances of wages and salaries for Government employees.

This year we are again seeking the approval of this Honourable Chamber, this time to provide \$4000000 to make advances of salaries and wages to Government employees. This is being done, as has been the practice in previous years under Democratic Labour Party Governments, to ensure that those Government employees who wish to avail themselves of an interest free loan, as an advance on their wages, may do so under the stipulated terms and conditions.

The terms and conditions are as follows, Sir:

"All members of the unestablished staff, casual employees and monthly paid Government employees, who would normally continue to be employed by the Government to the end of March 1988 should be eligible for the advance of wages and/or salaries". 12.35 p.m.

They would get that advance in addition to the wages and salaries which they are normally entitled to. The basis for all of that is as follows:

- (i) In the case of unestablished and casual staff, an advance equivalent to twice the net weekly earnings during any average week in the period of eight(8) weeks immediately preceding the date of payment, and is subject to a maximum of \$400.

The maximum amount that would be obtainable as an advance - \$400.

- (ii) In the case of monthly paid employees, an advance equivalent to 50% of the net salary

receivable by them for the month of November, 1987.

Again, the amount should not exceed \$400.

There is also provision for the recovery of that amount of money, and the recovery procedure is that any advances made at this time in 1987 should be deducted from the salary and/or wages of the employees receiving the advance in equal monthly or weekly installments during the months of January, February and March 1988. Efforts will be made to ensure that any advances are fully recovered by the Government. The consent of the employee to make deductions from salary and wages would be obtained before any advance is made.

Mr. Speaker, the recovery of sums advanced has been relatively satisfactory. During the period 1962 until 1977 a sum of \$88 011.32 was built up as arrears on advances in wages and salaries and that amount was written off in 1977, I believe. But when we take the amount of advances that have been made down through the years and the arrears which have not been recovered, I think those arrears form a very small percentage of the amount of money actually advanced.

I would wish to see that that amount should be zero and that all the monies advanced be recovered, and I give the House the assurance that the Government will be seeking to recover the full amount of monies advanced. Last year, I believe the amount outstanding was something like \$4 000 - just over \$4 000, I believe - which again is a very small percentage of the amount advanced.

I do not think there is any quarrel with the principle of the making of these advances, and I commend this measure to this Honourable Chamber.

I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Mr. Speaker, and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Prime Minister's clarification. We had a full debate on this last year and the Opposition is not going to prolong the debate today. We are supporting it. But perhaps the Prime Minister, since he has the file, can tell us what was the total amount of money taken up last year and by how many employees. How many employees availed themselves of the facility? I think that last year we voted some \$6.3 million but we are voting \$2 million less this year.

Secondly, can the Prime Minister explain for us Part (a)(ii) of the Schedule? I do not quite understand it, Sir. I understand (a)(i), that in the case of unestablished and casual staff, the advance would be equivalent to twice the net weekly earnings during the average week, and in any event, there is an upper limit of \$400.

But (a)(ii) says "In the case of monthly paid employees an advance equivalent to 50% of the net salary receivable for the month of November, 1987, not exceeding \$400." Do I understand that the limit here again is \$400? Why don't you say that rather than say "an advance equivalent to 50% of the net salary receivable," unless we are going to say that the net salary receivable in this category is less than \$800.

It is ambiguous, if not superfluous. Perhaps in the future we could just limit it to a fixed amount. There is no need to say what is the equivalent of the advance, just such sum as may be desired not exceeding \$400.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to respond briefly to those two points that have been made, the first point related to the number of employees who took up the offer and the amount that was taken up. I do not readily have the information relating to the number of persons who took up the offer, but the amount that was paid out as advances was \$2 882 293, according to the records of the Accountant General. So the \$4 million that we are actually indicating now should be adequate, but that depends on the response of the persons. It is not a forced loan, they can take it or not.

As far as the second point is concerned, about the language used in the Schedule (a)(ii), I do not think there is any ambiguity in it. There may be some superfluous words, I am not sure, but I think it is quite clear that in any event, whether relating to weekly paid workers or to monthly paid workers, no one is entitled to more than \$400. That is what is intended under (a)(ii). 12.45 p.m.

There may be a way in which the language might be changed, but I think this might be out of an abundance of caution, in case there may be anyone as a monthly paid worker for whom the 50% might be more than \$400, the \$400 is still the maximum that can be received.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY (VALIDATION OF CHARGES) ACT, 1987

Order No. 3 was called - To move the second reading of a Bill to validate certain charges and dues fixed by the Barbados Port Authority.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to validate certain fees and charges collected over time, in this case, after January 1, 1979, by the Barbados Port Authority.

This has become necessary because in seeking now, Sir, to amend the Tariff Book, it has been discovered that the various fees and charges collected by the Port Authority have not been so collected in accordance with Section 66 of the Port Authority Act.

We are now seeking the approval of this Bill to validate the collection of those fees and charges and, in due course, Sir, we will be amending the Tariff Book and making the regulations as required to be made in accordance with that Section 66 of the Port Authority Act.

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

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, 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 in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Order No. 1 was called - To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. R. P. BYER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 NO. 25 -
\$4564441

HEAD 73 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE - \$4 564 441

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, this Committee is being asked to provide a sum of \$4 564 441 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1987-88, Part II, Capital. 12.55 p.m.

The purpose of this, as the Addendum indicates, is to regularise the accounting transaction of a loan agreement between the Governments of Barbados and Canada. This, in effect, therefore, is really a paper transaction.

Mr. Chairman, the background is that on January 9, 1984, the Government of Barbados concluded an agreement with the Government of Canada for the purpose of obtaining a line of credit of some CAN.\$6 million to be used for oil field exploration and drilling equipment, to enhance the hydrocarbon potential of Barbados, increase the availability of oil in this country, and to provide technical and managerial assistance.

This loan was to be provided under the aegis of CID A and the Canadian agency, organisation or company which was actually doing the work of being agent for purchasing of equipment as well as rendering the technical advice, Petro-Canada.

The idea was that money would be provided and the Barbados Oil Company would draw down the funds, and then in a timely manner make reports, so that those reports could be taken into account as far as the record of the Government "were concerned. Up front money would be provided in the Estimates from which there would be the draw down, and then the Barbados National Oil Company would report that they had received the money and so the books would show the true nature of the transactions.

However, for two years, in respect of the financial years 1984-85 and 1985-86, that timely reporting from the Barbados National Oil Company was inadvertently not done, and the amount of money not reported was \$4 564 440.64 in respect of those two financial years, so no money was actually provided in the Estimates in relation to that amount of money.

The money has already been received from the Canadian sources, so this is purely a book transaction in order that the accounts will be as they should, and I am therefore commending this supplementary Resolution to the House. If any further information may be required, I am prepared to give them the information.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon.

P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 No. 26 -
\$10724744

Head 37 - Ministry of Housing and Lands - \$10513704

Hon. M. BARKER-WELCH (St. Joseph): Mr. Chairman, in moving this Resolution, I should like the House to make note of the fact that this Head is now under the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Community Development. When the Estimates were done, it was under the Ministry of Housing and Lands.

A sum of \$5 million was granted in the Estimates for 1987-88 for this Head. This sum has proved inadequate and

we are asking that this House grant this sum of money to adequately finish off the year for the National Conservation Commission.

What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that since 1986 the Ministry and the Commission started on a process of beautification, not just debushing, and we have taken on extra workers. We also have had some outstanding debts with the Barbados National Bank in the sum of \$2.3 million, and payment of ex-gratia awards and gratuities. This current expenditure comes to \$3 180988.

Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, because of the beautification programme, there are other expenses incurred, for instance, in the monitoring of these areas of beautification. A sum of \$7332716 is expected to cover that son of expenditure, tools and whatever is needed to make that beautification possible, and also for travel and other things concerned with that.

Mr. Chairman, that total comes to \$10513704. It does sound like a big amount, but when the people of Barbados look around this island and notice what has been happening in the area of beautification, not just debushing - debushing is part of beautification, but beautification is not debushing - they will see that we have embarked on a policy of beautifying the whole island of Barbados. Everyone who has eyes to see is able to see that this beautification has been started specifically in five areas, Spring Garden Highway, John Beckles Drive, the area leading to Government House, the area around the Bussa Statue and Speightstown. This beautification has spread to other areas as well, for instance, the Codrington to Waterford area, on both sides, and in my own constituency, a fantastic park at Bathsheba. There is a whole lot of beautification going on in this country, and we are hoping that this Resolution will meet with the approval of the whole House, because it is for the whole island of Barbados, Barbadians plus the tourism sector, that this beautification is going on. 1.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, we also note that rather than taking off workers, this programme with the National Conservation Commission now has over 1000 workers, thus helping the employment situation in this island.

It is necessary to have this money to carry out all the projects that we have started to the end of the financial year. Another set of projects is the beautifying of the housing estates, Mr. Chairman, and this means that we have to get that extra money which we are asking for.

I do not think I have to justify the spending of that money, but I now ask that this Resolution, Head 37, Subhead 4, Object No. 16, Grants to Public Institutions now pass.

Applause.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: I beg to second that, Sir, and ** reserve my right to speak.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: (St. Peter): Mr. Chairman,

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Listen to it now. I am going to put some blows in you.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. Let us get on with the business of the House.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose a rose called by any other name is just as sweet, and if the Honourable Acting Minister and the Government want to see and justify this expenditure of \$16 000 000 during the course of this financial year on a crash programme as expenditure on a beautification programme for Barbados, Sir, the Government is fully entitled to do so.

The Opposition, Sir, has very many grave concerns *- to raise as regards this particular expenditure. Sixteen million dollars, Sir, of expenditure, and a supplementary of \$10.5 million for any programme which had initially attracted public financing of \$5 million, obviously must raise a large number of concerns having to do with financial discipline and, equally so, the drift of Government's economic policy.

Indeed, Sir, perhaps what we are seeing today is the laying to rest of the initial economic strategy conceived by the Democratic Labour Party to put this country back to work, as it said. That economic policy, Sir, as you will recall, was designed to facilitate a process of private sector expansion with the private sector supposed to carry the full brunt of employment generation, and the cornerstones of that economic policy, if you would again recall, Sir, were that there should be a massive cut in taxes, to be accommodated by a massive cut in public expenditure. Clearly supplementaries of this magnitude, which have added, and are adding, substantially to Government expenditure, would seem, on the face of it, to suggest that if Government's overall economic policy had to depend upon a cornerstone and a restraint on the increase of public expenditure for its survival and success, then that economic policy is now, Sir, a thing of the past. I really thought that I ought to preface my comments with that particular caveat

I must also say, Sir, that the size of this expenditure on the beautification programme, otherwise known as the crash programme, has to be looked at in terms of the way in which it fits into Government's priorities. We are a country which is spending now \$16 000000 on a so-called crash programme - in a year when we are spending \$1.2 million on agricultural diversification, \$1.9 million on export promotion and \$3 000 000 on the Industrial Development Corporation. And if we were to analyse expenditure on this programme as it should properly be analysed, within

the context of Government's expenditure on the fundamental bases of the economy, then the only conclusion that one can draw is that obviously Government must have its priorities mixed up.

How can we explain and justify expenditure on the cutting down of bush that is IS times larger than the expenditure on agricultural diversification in this country? How can we explain that in 1987, at a time when we ought to be expanding the export base of this country, given the massive reduction in export earnings? How can we justify that expenditure on a crash programme that is ten times as large as our expenditure on export promotion? How do we explain truly, Mr. Chairman, the fact that a crash programme in Barbados can command more resources than we are spending on the promotion of tourism, the protection thereby of \$700000000 of foreign exchange and of the 20000 people employed? Mr. Chairman despite the rationale for beautification, expenditure on this scale, when examined in the context of other Government's expenditure, suggests that this country's priorities are wrong.

I must go further, Sir. I must ask this question as much of the Minister of Labour and Employment as of the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister: how are we going to finance this Supplementary and other Supplementaries which have come and are to come?

If one were to look at the pattern of public expenditure and finances of late, what becomes very apparent is that Government has been pushed to the limits as regards its accommodation through Ways and Means financing from the Central Bank, and it has had to begin to dip into the Special Accounts held on the Central Bank to finance its way. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, in May of this year, Government's Special Accounts at the Central Bank stood at \$178 million. But by September, in advance of this new wave of supplementaries, Government's Special Accounts at the Central Bank had dipped to \$124 million, the source being the Economic and Financial Statistics of the Central Bank for the month of October.

The point I am at pains to make is that the Government has embarked on a programme when it has had to change its net credit position with the Central Bank to accommodate the existing pressures on the public purse. As we know, any serious change in Government's net credit position with the Central Bank has a corresponding impact on this country's foreign reserves position. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I am advancing the view, for the benefit of the House, that the largest proportion of the fall in our foreign reserves since May can be explained by reference to changes in the net credit position of Government with the Central Bank.

In such a context, it happened before, Mr. Chairman, in a period in 1986 as well, but at that point the then Minister of Finance had the good judgement to put a stop to the trend that was emerging so as to protect the reserves. We now

have a position, Mr. Chairman, where a large part of Government financing is putting pressure on the balance of payments of this country, and in the context of such a situation, we are increasing the public deficit by adding massively to public expenditure. It is a worrisome trend, Mr. Chairman, and no matter how one may seek to justify the beautification programme, I want to advance the point of view that these would merely be one shot activities unless this country has a sound balance of payments and sound reserve position on which to make them things of the future. 1.15 p.m.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that part of the proceeds for this programme is to come from the Employment Levy, and I must ask a direct question in relation to that. We were made to understand that the Employment Levy was only going to be a temporary expedient. If the Employment Levy is only going to be a temporary expedient, are we also to understand that the beautification programme will have a life period only as long as the Employment Levy remains on the books? If the crash programme, or the beautification programme, as you wish, is only going to endure as long as the Employment Levy is on the books, how long will that period be?

I must remind you, Sir, that that Employment Levy was specifically, as I understand it, to partly give effect to the short-term recommendations of the Employment Task Force, from whence, of course, this particular initiative came, but it was always meant to be a temporary proposal. In consequence, the House will need to know if a programme of this scale can be carried into the future, and if it is to be maintained, from what source of revenue the Government will finance it. If it is not to be maintained at its present level of operations, we will also need to know by how much will it be reduced and what alternative means of employment Government will be having in mind for persons who will have to be displaced once this programme is brought down to an ultimate level.

My fundamental issue is that we are here today putting to rest, in my view, one economic strategy, which calls upon the private sector to lead in the process of employment generation. A lot has been said in this House about how under the Barbados Labour Party the private sector employment contracted while that of the public sector expanded, and it was made to appear to be wrong before the bar of public opinion. What we are now being called upon to approve, Sir, is an expenditure which puts Government far in the forefront of employment generation again, Sir, at the expense of the balance of payments, and that is what the Opposition finds, above all, most problematical.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I think that I am in a reasonable position to respond to some of the points made so far.

I recall that last December, around this time, when I was Minister of Finance, there was a considerable amount of pressure being brought to expand employment opportunities in this particular area, and at that time I indicated that one would seek to respond in modulated terms.

I believe that the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) was quite vocal in putting pressure for an expansion of employment opportunities in this area.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation, Sir, before he goes further and misquote me.

(*Aside:* Hon. P. M. GREAVES: He has not spoken, so he cannot elucidate anything.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir: I want to make it clear that it was in November last year that I called for the employment of 540 people in a programme such as this, not 1200, but I am glad that the Government followed....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This sounds more like a point of elucidation to me, not a point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I want to get it in the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I distinctly recall him congratulating himself for having a major input in Government policy at that particular time. However, my feeling then, and my feeling now, is that all these things should be done in moderation.

The reason why you will see only \$5 million in the Estimates and such a large supplementary on this occasion is because you will recall that at that time the decision was taken to increase the number of persons employed and expand the programme on a temporary basis. Within the context of that fiscal year, the programme would have come to an end on March 31. However, appropriate representations were made by my colleagues, taking into consideration, no doubt, the calls from the Opposition, that the programme be continued into this fiscal year, at which time the Estimates were already completed and presented to Parliament.

The source of financing this expenditure was explained already in the House during the Budget Debate. At the time when the Employment Levy was introduced, it was specifically stated that it would seek to finance certain recommendations of the Task Force on Employment, and I believe, subject to faulty recollection, the sum was some \$9 million or so. So although the money is not in the Estimates, it was provided for in the Budget, and, as you know, within the context of our fiscal system, any gap in the Estimates is usually financed, to the extent that the Minister of Finance might decide that he needs to close the gap, during the Budget, which follows the presentation of the Estimates.

I felt very strongly that if we were going to proceed with this programme it should have a significant capital component. The object of job creation has a particular ^ advantage in that the overwhelming majority of the money will be spent on jobs rather than the other components of cost and other problems, which is one attractive point about it. The second point is that I felt that integrated in this should be a training programme, so that we leave behind people who develop skills as the programme goes on, and I was hoping that one particular project would come on stream at some point in time.

You may recall that at the time of the change in Government, the question of establishing a second golf course in Barbados at Durants was being discussed. There were some legal hitches. I would have hoped that if those legal problems in terms of the acquisition of the property could be solved, some of this labour in terms of beautification could be transferred to the Durants Golf Course Development. In that case, you would be meeting some of the objections of the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur), in that you would be establishing * an infrastructural project related to tourism, enhancing your export earnings thereby, and getting a reasonable percentage - maybe one or two per cent - of the \$17 million people or so during the winter season who are looking for some place to play golf. This would also put us in a reasonable competition position with destinations such as Bermuda, the Bahamas and elsewhere, and particularly southern parts of the United States.

I do not know whether the legal hurdles have been overcome in respect of the acquisition of the gold course, but I feel that that kind of capital development around the other capital projects - tourist related and locally related - could be a justification for the expenditure; that is, you try to marry the concept of job creation and job generation with permanent capital formation, which would lead to a strengthening of the capital infrastructure of the country and ^ the capacity of the country to earn foreign exchange. It is in that way that the project was conceived. I do not know whether there is any timing difference between the expenditure and the capital component, but I hope that it will be a short timing difference.

The honourable Member also raised one or two other points which I think merit some response. He spoke specifically of the rate of rundown of the deposits with the Central Bank of Barbados from Central Government and the possible impact of the rundown of those deposits in relation to our balance of payments. 1.25 p.m.

Theoretically, that is correct if the foreign exchange component of those deposits have left the country before the deposits are mobilised, because you would be creating domestic expenditure that could lead to unsupported foreign -* exchange and, therefore, a fall in reserves. However, it is

important to recognise that this is not the same thing as money creation.

Those deposits exist because, like any other citizen, like any other corporate individual, when Government brings foreign exchange into the country, whether by way of borrowings or earnings, those deposits are registered with the Central Bank of Barbados, which would then make available to the depositor the equivalent in Barbados dollars. That is how the deposits would have risen when Government would have accumulated, principally through borrowings, excess local currency assets - held by the Central Bank - and, therefore, they only become a balance of payments problem if they are run down at a rate which is not supported by an equivalent amount of foreign exchange, if, for example, the foreign exchange is used for some other purpose and then there is a gap in the process.

I cannot respond to that adequately, because I do not know exactly what the current position is. I have not looked at it. However, I think that Government should maintain its posture of being a net lender to the Central Bank of Barbados. It has done so since 1984, and it is essential that that position be maintained.

It is important to remember that in the accounting system of the Central Bank, borrowing and lending represent the same thing. It all depends on whether there is a plus or minus sign in front of it. That is how the accounts are done and, therefore, it is essential that Government's net credit position with the Central Bank should remain positive and not negative within our current situation.

As far as the expenditure is concerned, it look place within a planned programme. It was provided for within the Budget, but it is essential at all times to look at the totality of expenditure. I can only speak for this specific Item, but on the general point, that it is essential that Government's expenditure, particularly as the fiscal transition period is drawing to an end in December/January, be kept within reasonable limits, Government, this year, I think can spend, certainly according to projections, some \$740 million to \$760 million, without creating any particular pressures on the balance of payments. I think such levels of expenditure would probably generate a Current Account deficit not exceeding \$30 million, probably less than that. This would suggest that Government should probably, over the next four months of the year, keep its expenditure on Current Account well within the \$55 million limit, which is not unreasonable at this time of the year, since by the time you reach February, I would think, even if you had a Current Account deficit at that time of \$60 million to \$70 million, in March it would drop to about \$30 million or less because of very significant inflows of funds.

The other point I would draw to the attention of the honourable Member for St. Peter is that there has been a significant shift in the pattern of Government's revenue. Therefore, you will find that the pattern which always exists

in the Government's finances, for the first six months of the year to be relatively lean and the last six to be relatively fat, the period which includes Corporation Tax receipts. Land Tax and Hotel and Restaurant Sales Tax, would tend to be accentuated more and more under the present fiscal situation.

What is important is to look at trends and compare trends, so I do not think there is anything alarming at the moment, from what I have seen, in relation to the levels of revenue. That is certainly keeping on budget, as far as I am aware. But expenditure has to be carefully looked at, and that \$55 million average target has to be, I think, observed very closely during the next four months if we are to remain within that \$740 million to \$760 million range.

This should not be a problem, Mr. Chairman, because in the next fiscal year, depending on the policy of expenditure, Government's fiscal position, even without any change in the tax base, would improve, because you would not have the back-pay next year to pay. Secondly, the tax refunds component of the revenue would be almost exceedingly small. This year, one had anticipated tax refunds probably at the level of \$40 million to \$50 million, but I do not think that it is anywhere near that level, for the simple reason that people had made the adjustment in 1986 to a large extent

It is a question, therefore, of holding strain, I think, in terms of Government expenditure, and whereas I would think that the cautionary notes sounded by the honourable Member for St. Peter are not unreasonable, I think it is fair to say that appropriate budgetary preparation was made for the expenditure, and what is important is to ensure that these supplementaries are more an expression of appropriate virement in Government's financing than in the generation of new expenditure.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS (St. Michael South East): Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments arising out of what the honourable Member for St. Peter has said, because what he has said demonstrates clearly the difference in philosophy between his party and our party.

I note, first of all, that he has referred to this programme as a crash programme, which, indeed, it is not. Any person coming to Barbados for the first time would look and see the beauty that has been created in Barbados, and people living here can see the transformation that's taking place. That is not a crash programme, that is a beautification programme, and anyone who has pride in himself, or in his country, or his home, indeed, understands what beautification is.

A lot has been said about tourism and the input that one should get from foreign currency. I think that we are all aware of the fact that everyone who travels as a tourist like to see the place looking beautiful, and I am saying that

the injection of money that we are putting into Barbados is making the island a more beautiful place. It will therefore attract more tourists because people like to come to places that look clean and tidy, and that is precisely what we are doing to Barbados. 1.35 p.m.

But we are going beyond that. The Acting Minister, the honourable Member for St. Joseph (Hon. M. Barker-Welch), said that we are beautifying the housing areas, and again I stress the point of philosophy, because every time we talk about the people in the lower brackets, we find that the honourable Member for St. Peter is very quick to jump up and talk about how money is misspent, or not well spent. If it were building a Central Bank building for \$100 million where only the Governor is comfortable at the completion of that bank and the workers are uncomfortable, you get full support from that side, but if we are investing \$10 million to make our people in this country more comfortable, then there is a hue and cry.

I make no apology in saying that in addition to beautification of the highways, we have already created some parks in this country, and I want to say something about the Errol Barrow Memorial Park in St. Michael South East. We opened it the day before Independence, and I made sure to send invitations to all the Members of the Opposition, but none of them came. I am not sure if they are afraid to identify with the people in the Pine and Wildey because we belong to the lower echelons. Bradshaw did not come either. I made sure that I sent invitations to all of the members of the Opposition for the opening. None of them came.

The concept that we are creating, which you should know about, is not only to build a park. Within that park we have already started the establishment of the Marcus Garvey Library, because we believe that education is fundamental to the upliftment of the black people of this country, and the Marcus Garvey Library is going to focus primarily on black literature. This is what we are trying to do for the young people of this country, not only make the environment more pleasing to look at, but to enlighten the brain as a matter of upliftment, so when we are talking about the expenditure of \$10 million, we are not talking purely of cutting down bush.

In addition, within that facility in Wildey and the Pine, we are going to put a craft centre where young people will be able to go and make shoes, belts and work on pottery. On Saturdays and Sundays especially, but also during the week, they will be able to invite the tourists from the hotels to the area to buy their craft, and if they do not see it on display, they can go into the craft shops and buy what they want. That is a fundamental change from the philosophy of the Barbados Labour Party. So when we come here to ask for \$10 million, it is an investment in the landscape of

Barbados and indeed into the brainscape and the mindscape of what we are going to do with that

I understand why the honourable Member for St. Peter finds it very difficult to grapple with the psychological transformation that we are going to make sure will take place in this country, because we are not dealing at a superficial level. It is all right to talk about foreign debt, but the greatest resource on which you can spend money is your own people. I find that it is very important to talk about the attraction of tourists, but if we in this country do not spend some time looking at our own people and making sure that our own people are content, then we will create a hostile environment to which the tourists will not want to come. Wherever you go in Barbados, the hotels are full. The honourable Member for St. Peter predicted in 1986 that the tourist plant would collapse, because he said that we on this side were aiming for the tourists at the lowest bracket. You cannot get a room in a luxury hotel in Barbados at all, so therefore your predictions were wrong.

The point I am making is that if we want to attract tourists to this country, we have to make sure that we make the people of this country comfortable, and therefore it is important that when you see us come to this Honourable Chamber and ask for \$10 million, it cannot be seen purely in terms of a crash programme, as you want to label it, because you know that it is only going to cut down bush. You have to see it in broader psychological terms, that we are creating an environment in which young people, and, indeed, adults, find more satisfaction in living within their own country, and to which foreign exchange will come in, because when people come back to Barbados, they will see that Barbadians are a smiling people again, not people angry, as they were within the last ten years when you had the affairs of this country and the people were afraid to come. Those are the parameters with which we must deal, because we must first look at ourselves and improve our lot.

Part of the motto of our country is "Pride and Industry", and I am quite sure that within the past few months, you have seen that we have been taking a great pride in our country and making it a more beautiful place for Barbadians, and if you do that you will make it a more beautiful place for tourists and attract more tourist dollars, and therefore I want to support this Resolution for \$10 million for the NCC.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I very often have to wonder if the Democratic Labour Party has not lost the image of itself. I just heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons) speak about how this is a matter of philosophy, and I must refer him back to his speech made during this session in Parliament by the late Prime Minister of this country, if he is interested in the real philosophy that would inform a programme such as this. The late Prime Minister had this to say: "I feel that the whole question of beautification...."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable Member quote the source?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Hansard page 689.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that is enough for the Hansard Reporters. Hansard, which session?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I said this session of Parliament. Tuesday, March 10, 1987.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: I am sure that the honourable Member is aware of the rule which says that an honourable Member cannot quote from a debate in the same session. I am saving him the difficulty of having Your Honour rule. The honourable Member cannot quote from a debate of the same session.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked him to quote the source.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I thought so, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I can continue nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, to say that a clear statement of philosophy as regards beautification was set out by the late Prime Minister of this country and the leader of the Democratic Labour Party, when the gist of his presentation was that beautification was a question of the pride of the inhabitants of villages and the local centres of habitation in the country. He drew reference to his own constituency, where in that constituency people had undertaken the process of beautification without assistance from the public purse, and he made the point, Sir, that if any Minister was proposing to send any of the people up to his constituency, he wanted them to have been sent elsewhere. There was a particular philosophy, Sir, that he was trying to develop whereby, Mr. Chairman, the responsibility for beautification would not be seen just as an excuse for the state to release a large amount of spending power, certainly of this magnitude, but would be one in which we would be encouraging the individual members of districts to become involved in their own beautification. If the honourable Member therefore wants to speak about philosophy, I ask him to go back to the words of his leader and recognise that what we are having today is merely - I do not want to call it a pork barrel, Sir, - purely, Mr. Chairman, an employment programme dressed up as beautification that is taking the Democratic Labour Party further and further away from the philosophy set out by the late Honourable Prime Minister of this country. 1.45 p.m.

As regards beautification and the expenditure on beautification, if the Acting Minister were to go to the Wanstead, Husbands and West Terrace areas, she will come to terms with what this programme means on ground. This beautification or crash programme has created a few oases of beauty in a general sea of desolation. In the West Terrace and Wanstead areas you will find today that that area

surrounding the National Cultural Foundation, the whole area, is now totally under bush, an area that was beautified even before the Democratic Labour Party came to power. In my constituency, Sir, we had the most amazing situation where there were some persons employed in this programme only to cut a little trail in the gully between Pleasant Hall Plantation and Mount Brevitor Plantation, a little trail of no more than half a mile, and leading eventually into a well.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that we must not be confused as to what is the point and purpose of this programme. There are many areas, Sir, in which all that this programme does is that it gives people the opportunity this month to cut down some bush and to come in the following month and cut down the bush which has grown up again. This has been happening in the Speights-town area, an area which the Government proclaims as one of the sites to be beautified. We are spending, in short, Sir, the largest proportion of these funds just to engage in debushing, and it is no more than a large scale debushing programme that provides the honourable Members on the other side with some employment opportunities to take some of the pressure off their backs, given the pledges that they have given to the constituents where employment is concerned. That has to be said, Sir.

(*Aside: So what?*)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The honourable Member says, "So what?" Let us see it in that fashion, because that is what it really is. All the old talk about beautification and philosophy is only incidental to the fact that the fellows have created some jobs for the boys, and we are being called upon, to spend \$16 million on it this year. That is the point of the Opposition.

I find it very offensive, Sir, to hear the words of the honourable Member for St. Michael South East. On a personal note, Sir - I am not going to blow my trumpet too loudly, Sir - in West Terrace there is a piece of land abutting and adjoining my property, and I take it as a matter of pride as a Barbadian, without any assistance from the Government, to maintain that land as if it were mine. And when you challenge me about philosophy, and the philosophy of this programme, Sir, I submit to the House that it is just a lot of hot air - there is really nothing philosophical about this programme. It provides a rationale merely for the Government, which does not have a solution to the problem of unemployment, to provide some relief where that particular matter is concerned.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised by the attitude taken by the Opposition on this matter. When the late Tom Adams introduced the Employment Levy in 1981, that was supposed to solve the unemployment problems in this country. I believe that Employment Levy never generated

any significant success. It just disappeared. It was a failure as a programme. The members of the Opposition want us to forget that

We have introduced a scheme that we are told by the Acting Minister of Employment and the Environment has created 1000 jobs. The Opposition is finding fault with this, but they created an Employment Levy that disappeared, had no effect whatsoever on tackling serious unemployment in Barbados. We created a levy that in one year's time has had the dual of success of putting 1000 people to work as well as contributing to the enhancement of the environment in significant ways, because the parks that have been established will not disappear tomorrow or in the years to come, but they will be significant accretions to our environment in several ways, contributing to the development of our young people who would be able to use these parks, as well as providing areas of recreation for the tourists who come to this land.

I want to make this point because I believe that the Member for St. Thomas is only grandstanding.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have not talked yet.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: For St. Peter. I am sorry.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have not talked yet.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am sorry. I anticipated you, David.

The Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) can only be grandstanding, trying to get to the Press. You cannot be serious that you are criticising the Government for creating jobs. You cannot be serious in criticising the Government for beautifying the country.

The point you are making is whether optimum use is being made of the funds. But you have not really gone into that. You have not tried to show us alternative uses of these funds in terms of creating employment. If you are serious as an economist, that is the area you would have to go in.

The other area that you mentioned earlier in your discussion was whether the public sector should be spending funds in terms of creating employment, as though there is any dichotomy between the public sector creating jobs and the private sector doing the same thing.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: No, no,, no! You are trying to make it an issue, as though we are saying that all jobs must be created by the private sector, none must be created by the public sector. There is no contradiction. Jobs can be created in both areas.

I think that what is frightening you and people on your side is that the Budgetary measures are taking effect,

and every day you can hear about programmes from the private sector. You are disappointed by our success. Every day brings further news about private sector involvement in the economy. All we were saying all the time was that there is need for time before the levies will take effect, and when you hear about possible jobs in the BICO complex, in the Plantations Trading Limited complex, ...

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Thirteen million, three million, four million.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS:... Thirteen million, three million - ... and the expansion in tourism.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Do not talk about that yet)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I think it may be too early to talk about the Hong Kong jobs.

As you hear all of these developments, you start getting afraid, because if all that has happened in such a short period of time, for the years that we are going to be here, the forward years from now, the next 15 or 20 that we will be here, ...

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: your fear is that you will never get a chance to be in Government again. You are getting scared that one Government can do so much in such a short period of time, always with the consideration of the poor people of this country, putting them up front That is your major fear.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: David is rushing the elections for 1989.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The Member for St. Thomas.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: After not giving certain Independence Honours for ten years, he gave Independence honours in St. Thomas when they are out of power.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He did not give the people those honours for ten years, but now that they are in Opposition, he gave them the honours last week.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He is anticipating he would not be getting back to give anybody honours.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: So every year, he would give Independence honours in St. Thomas.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Of course, the honourable Member for St. Peter will follow suit.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: While you are out there giving out those precious honours, we are creating jobs, and we are creating an environment in which the economy that was ravished by you all will be put in a position for take off. That is what we are doing.

Clearly, the public expenditure in this area was vitally important, because we came in to a situation where the economy had been seriously damaged, where the levels of unemployment were unprecedented. Largely because of a result of the contracting electronics market in the United States of America, we found a lot of people unemployed in this country, and there were certain things that we had to do in the short run, while at the same time making sure that certain processes were put in place, so that the things that we expect to happen will happen. 1.55 p.m.

All the diversification, all the things that you alluded to, we are spending less money than you did on them, but we are getting better results. Do not look only at the quantity of money being spent. You are talking about the amount of money being spent in tourist promotion. Look at the results, the outturn of the money that we are spending, and that is what we told you from the start. We are going to spend less money than you did in significant areas, but we are going to get better results, and you are seeing one of those results now.

Quite frankly, apart from the grandstanding for the Press, the Opposition can shut up on this matter. It is money that is being well spent for Barbadians, it is money that means a lot to those persons who every week are going home with money in their pockets from the National Conservation Commission. You tell the Government which of those workers should be laid off by how much to contract to come back down to the honourable Member for St. Thomas' number of 540, the hypothetical figure that he used. What is the difference between his 540 and 1000? Who are the other 500 that he would not like to get?

(Aside: Hon. E. E. GREAVES: He says it is a pork barrel. He wants to get his hand in the pork barrel.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I tell you to listen to his contradictions, because he was talking about the late honourable leader's position and his philosophy about self-reliance, and then he started quarrelling about some area in St. Peter which did not get any attention. He was not talking about attention from the people who live there, he was talking about attention from the same public purse. That is a contradiction. I am not talking about the part that you are looking after as though it were your own, it is

another part you mentioned in some plain or something like that. You were talking about something down in West Terrace that has been neglected, some part of West Terrace under bush and you were asking for it to be attended to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the Member is misrepresenting what I said. The point I was making is that the expenditure of these funds in St. Peter is largely done in an inefficient manner. A large part of these funds was spent in St. Peter to assist in the cutting of a trail through a gully, and in the general Speightstown area, what we are having is a situation of this pure debushing; the bush is cut down this month and they have to come and cut it down again next month. It has nothing of beautification about it. That is the point I was making, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: A trail leading into a gully might have certain environmental qualities and attraction that he might not be able to appreciate. You might not be able to appreciate what is being done there.

Sir, this debate gave an opportunity for the Opposition spokesman on Finance to discuss the economy of this country. They have been walking about here on platforms talking about the state of the economy. If he was convinced that the economy was in bad condition at this time, he would use the opportunity of this debate to speak endlessly. You are not so speaking because you know that what you have been saying on public platforms and what you have been feeding to the media is not based in truth and in fact. You know that the economy of this country is being well husbanded by the Democratic Labour Party, and that is why you are making some niggling little-piece points.

(Aside: Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Nobody believes you, nobody is applauding.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member said from his seat that nobody from this side believes the honourable Member. I get up to say that I believe him totally.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Chairman, I do not speak expecting applause from anybody else. I speak from my conviction and from my knowledge. I am not speaking for any applause. If that is your position, that is your position. I am speaking from my conviction and what I know to be the truth, and I am challenging you, I am saying to you that this was an opportunity for you to analyse the economy and show where it is going wrong, and you have not, and you cannot

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable Member for St. Peter keep quiet and allow the Member to make his contribution?

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more to say really, because the Democratic Labour Party is doing the right thing for this country. This Resolution is one that has a sound basis and really deserves the full support of the members of the Opposition. I can state clearly that it must please the heart of the Member for St. Thomas that part of the advice and prediction that he made is coming to fruition in a very fulsome way.

Mr. Chairman, I take great pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAUT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to His Honour the SPEAKER and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.00 p.m. today.

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

The question that the House stand suspended until 3 p.m. was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.05 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

When the suspension was taken, this House was in Committee of Supply. To that it shall revert.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. R. P. BYER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (RESUMED)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

HEAD 37 (CONT'D)

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE (St. Michael North East): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution without any reservation whatever. The only speaker so far for the Opposition seems to me to be more in confusion with himself. Indeed, if one reflects on speeches made earlier, what he is doing now appears to me to be hoping that the Government does not find opportunity to do the things that it is doing, employing people and putting the economy in the kind of shape, that can bring to naught the predictions he made earlier to say that the economy would, by this time, be in shambles.

I support this Resolution because this is contrary to a position that existed in December, 1986, when the

Government had to resuscitate a situation that had been effected by the Barbados Labour Party during its last days in Government. At that time they had embarked on what the honourable Member for St. Peter now calls a crash programme, and had told the people at the time that they had employed them, that they could only be employed up to a certain time. This Government has taken up the challenge of employing those people who had to be sent home because there was no money made available by the Barbados Labour Party Administration to continue employment of these people. The Government had to take the situation in hand and re-employ some of these people, all, as he said, on a temporary basis at that point.

I recall distinctly having made the point that any programme of beautification of this country could be seen as one of long term effects, and I am very happy that, as we look around this country, there are areas that this programme has attended to and we can see the beauty that has resulted. And why I am a little bit confused about what the honourable Member for St. Peter has been saying is that his constituency has benefitted from the same programme, and I am referring to the area opposite the Heywoods Hotel. I have seen some work being done down there so they have benefitted. If there is a single parliamentary representative that could have a grouse at the moment, maybe it is me, but I am hopeful that the programme of beautification will continue and that my constituents will have the benefit of the fruits of this programme.

I think, very seriously, that we have to decide in our minds what we want for our country. Are we going to talk about the expenditures which Government has to embark on in isolation and not look at them in terms of what is required to keep the machine going? Certainly, we have been seeing, and are still seeing, that unemployment is a big problem in this country, and I do not think that anybody would wish to get away from that. So if you move from a position where the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) was priding himself in encouraging the Government to enter into this programme for 540 last year, to the position where the Acting Minister could now report that we have, at least, 1000 people employed in this programme, and we also note the beautification that has resulted because these people have gone to work, we ought to feel proud that Government can at this time come to this House for a supplementary to continue this very laudable work that the National Conservation Commission is doing.

Agricultural diversification is nothing new to the people of this country and, therefore, when the honourable Member for St. Peter refers to some emphasis on agricultural diversification rather than spending the money in this way, we have to see what he is saying in the light of how this Resolution has presented itself. It is a fact that the Government has embarked on a beautification programme, and you cannot continue a beautification programme unless there are funds available. In order to do it as effectively as

possible, we need to expand the labour force, and that is what has been done. The only conclusion I can draw, having heard the honourable Member, is that he is a little bit shocked that Government can at this point, continue this programme.

He said that the work is inefficiently done. One has to look at the record of the Barbados Labour Party in dealing with matters of this sort, because a lot of money was spent in the first crash programme and literally nothing could have been seen after the first four weeks. A lot of money was spent also by the Barbados Labour Party Government on the flood problem in St. Peter. Today, for the amount of money that was spent, there is absolutely no justification for that money having been spent

Mr. Chairman, one has to look very seriously at the needs of the people whom we represent. Employment is one of those needs. I do not know if the members of the Opposition have the same problems made out to them by their constituents, but every week, every day of the week, there are people who address themselves to me that they need employment, and they need employment in the NCC programme, they would do anything. If the Government is continuing its programme of employment to the end of beautification not only for our local people but also to enhance our image for the visitors of this country, I believe that we should compliment it for so doing. 3.10p.m.

I should like, Mr. Chairman, in closing, to say that I am hopeful that as the programme reaches the housing developments, I will be able to see its effects in the St. Michael North East constituency as soon as it is humanly possible.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON (St. John): Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to be very long in making the few points that I want to make on this particular supplementary. I should like to begin by saying that I believe that, over a period of time, the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) has not only washed far and wide in the criticism that he has had of the Government's economic programme, but that sometimes I am at a loss as to exactly the point that he wishes to make when he gets up and criticises spending. For example, I do not know if he is saying that the expenditure of \$16 million is too much money on the debushing programme as he calls it. I do not know if he is saying that a beautification programme is undesirable at this time or at any time. I do not know if he is saying that the \$16 million could be better managed. What is the essential point he is making? He makes the same point time and time again - do not spend any money - and then he produces all the statistics that he has been producing now for some considerable time as evidence of his contention that the Government's financial position is in confusion. He is the person who said 18 months ago that

there would be devastation and destruction of the economy, and he was joined by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) in comments about Thatcherism, Reaganomics and so on.

I am not even going to deal with that, and the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris) took a line that I am not even going to take. If he can make that prediction, I will make another prediction, that before the next 18 months the honourable Member for St. Peter is going to be fighting to keep the Shadow Ministry of Finance, because his own colleague, writing in the newspaper, has gone as far as to say that the Shadow Ministries should be allocated to people outside of Parliament, and that he missed an opportunity, and many other opportunities, ...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Ezra Alleyne. He was making a case for him to be Shadow Minister of Finance, probably among other things. So your position is precarious. Therefore, if you want to make the same speech for the next four years, you will find that you are making it now as Shadow Minister of Finance, but in a short time you will be making it in some other capacity. We do not know what capacity that is right now. So I am not even going to question any of the theories you come up with in here about the economy.

The evidence is there. The private sector has made its input where they feel they can make it at this time. Of course, as the Honourable Prime Minister mentioned, there is some concern about the pace at which these developments are taking place, but there must be an element of discipline in this community in relation to effecting economic transformation. It is not just a matter of getting up and saying do not spend; you have to know the reasons why you are spending money, the philosophy that informs the spending of that money. If you are saying we should not have a beautification programme, say so, and say how you are going to reconcile that position with the position, as I understand it, that the honourable Member for St. Thomas adopted in respect of employing 540 people. However you turn, you are making these predictions and your colleagues are coming with completely opposite theories, projections and ideas, and that is something that probably is a credit more to them than to you as Shadow Minister of Finance.

The point is that all of the efforts that have been made by the National Conservation Commission in this area of beautification are laudable. It is not a debushing campaign. We should not go around with this idea. A debushing campaign is what the Barbados Labour Party implemented when it took some caterpillars, payloaders and whatever and mowed down trees down by the Lazaretto and all over Barbados and a few months later the bush was back up. We are talking here about a beautification programme, and even if, as you say, it is localised to particular areas, I can

see from the evidence that is given here that the Spring Garden Highway, John Heckles Drive, the Bussa Statue and Speightstown, probably among other areas, are key areas, areas of national historical significance, and even if they are not of historic significance, there are areas where people pass on a daily basis, and are, in my view, improved for the benefit of Barbadians and visitors to this country alike.

If you are saying that the \$16 million should not be spent on that, tell us what you are going to offer; whether there is a better way to manage it, whether the beautification programme is bad or whether the workers are not doing what they are supposed to do for the \$16 million that is spent on them. Those are the points I think you have to make, not present the same regurgitation of statistics in here to prove a point which other persons, probably with a better understanding, have demonstrated to you is a point not worth proving.

The beautification of housing estates is also a critical thing. I maintain now, and I have always said it, and it was a position that the Young Democrats took many years ago in the early days of Opposition, that housing estates are communities and we cannot continue with this idea that you just put down the houses and leave people without providing the ancillary facilities.

I will adopt the position that my predecessor as Member for St. John adopted in respect of St. John, because most of those areas are already very scenic and pretty areas, and the NCC does its work very effectively in the area of Bath. But in some of the housing estates people need direction and guidance, and also, much of the work that the NCC does is not necessarily maintenance, but in a sense it is initial work, clearing areas and planting. After that, I think we should require the persons living in those housing estates to make some attempt to maintain them. That is part of the answer to the point with respect to expenditure on beautifying the housing estates.

In that regard, the constituency of St. Michael South East and their representative, the Government of Venezuela and others, should be congratulated for that effort. That, essentially, was a private effort, but supporters of the Barbados Labour Party, familiar voices on *Gutterperk* and *Tell It Like It Is*, were calling in and trying to castigate the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons) because he received some assistance from the prisoners. That is the kind of attitude that you get from the Barbados Labour Party to these kinds of things.

As far as I am concerned, the people of St. Michael South East have built a park. Nobody walks around with the keys and says you cannot come in like you all used to operate the community centres, where the people of the areas could not even get into the community centres to participate in any activities. The people of the area will be entitled to use those facilities as long as they are in operation, and they will be of some benefit to the

community as a whole, and the honourable Member for St. Michael South East and the persons who assisted him from the Democratic Labour Party, and others, should be congratulated for that outstanding effort

I have a short comment about the Marcus Garvey Library. It is always, in my view, a significant event when people in a community take an initiative to improve themselves through education or through public discussion in the community, and I think that the idea of the establishment of a Marcus Garvey Library in St. Michael South East, which springs from the bosom of the people in that area, tells us something about the people who live in the area of the Pine, and probably other Barbadians, who will make use of that particular facility. Again, that is something for which they should be congratulated.

The presence of the craft centre is something that I think will also be a useful thing. A lot of young people in this country today are involved in craft, apart from other areas of the distributive trade", and there is one criticism I may have of the expenditure of \$16 million, it is that part of that money should manifest itself in some kind of permanent structures, whether it is craft centres in the housing estates or, for that matter, in Bath in St. John. They do not have to be elaborate structures, but there should be structures where the young people or other persons involved in crafts and that kind of thing can come to an area and be involved in activity. 3.20 p.m.

Recently the representatives of youth in various areas, including St. Joseph, St. Thomas, St. John and St. Andrew, met and agreed to convene some kind of craft market on Saturdays at the new Bathsheba facility. We have been meeting and working on this assiduously, and the support has been forthcoming. Many have, in their own private way, to me and to the other representatives, expressed confidence in the idea. It is therefore now incumbent on the NCC and the other agencies of Government to provide the ancillary support which is necessary for these young people to be involved in this kind of activity. So at the end of the day, I think that when we look at \$16 million and you were to say that there should be some element of it that the NCC leaves behind in an area, it should be a permanent structure or something that will encourage other persons to participate, or even that part of that \$16 million be spent in an area in setting up a committee and equipping it with equipment to maintain that area, then you would have a justifiable criticism, and that is the only criticism that I would make with respect to this expenditure of the money.

All in all, as a result of those points, you should do other than adopt this attitude, a very sanctimonious attitude, in here, particularly when you have regard to the kind of money that the Barbados Labour Party Government spent on projects that in no way, in my view, had any impact on the question of chronic unemployment in this country. A

long time ago you abdicated your responsibility even to talk about unemployment in this country, and yet you come in here and keep talking about the Task Force. At least we are discussing the Task Force Report. You are discussing nothing. You are not discussing Independence, you are not discussing unemployment, you are not discussing any issues in this country. All you are doing is leading demonstrations around the place at CBC and elsewhere, and trying to cause, in my view, as much confusion in the minds of the public about the state of the economy and social conditions in Barbados, in an attempt to rise from the ashes after you have carried out your task of doing as much damage to this Government or the Democratic Labour Party as is possible. That has been your entire approach, and if you adopt that approach, people will have to fight fire with fire. On every occasion that you adopt these sanctimonious positions, and on every occasion the Barbados Labour Party adopts the usual hypocritical positions on important issues, we will have to respond accordingly. As far as I am concerned, this is a Resolution which is at the heart of some of the hypocritical posturings of the Barbados Labour Party which we have seen in this debate, and, I suspect, we will see from time to time.

Sir, I would like to support this Resolution and to congratulate the workers in the NCC and the persons who are responsible.

Thank you.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is still enough time. You can get a chance at him.

Laughter.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Chairman, we have to understand something about the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur). Every time before he speaks, you look at him and he turns his face to the Press.

Laughter.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I watch him, and on each and every occasion that he has spoken in this House of Assembly, he has made the same speech. When we were discussing the money to be spent on the Independence celebrations, he made the same speech. The money for the increase in salaries for civil servants, the same speech. The money to Ministers and other parliamentarians, the same speech. Money now for NCC, the same speech. His speeches are made in here to catch the Press. He looks at them before he speaks and he says the same thing every time.

Laughter.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: There is something I want to state about the Barbados Labour Party, about the

Administration that used to run this country. Whenever it comes to spending money to create jobs, the Barbados Labour Party's members are always keeping noise. But it is okay if you spend the money to put up large buildings like the Central Bank, if you spend money buying the Trident, if you spend money buying guns and things like that. If you are creating jobs for poor people, what can be wrong with spending money?

The honourable Member for St Peter conceded in his speech that the Task Force on Unemployment concluded that one of the areas where unemployment could be tackled was in this area that we are discussing today. He also conceded that one of the reasons for the Employment Levy, which was introduced by the past Finance Minister in the Budgetary Proposals, was that the money would be spent in areas like this. Having conceded those two things, that we were on the right road, he could not stop there. He went on and wants to know now: How long are we going to keep on the Employment Levy? How long are we going to keep on the workers? He could not just say that we are carrying out one of the recommendations of the Task Force and one of the reasons for the Employment Levy.

I will answer him now as I answered him last time, that we will keep them on as long as we deem it necessary, which can be from now 'til forevermore, amen. That is the answer for you, if you want to know how long we are going to keep them on. It could be that long. You will answer yourself on that anyhow.

Let us go a bit further, Mr. Chairman. The difference between the past Administration and this one is fundamental. We are searching for employment for persons now! That Administration searched for employment for people two and three months before the General Election. That is the basic difference. Five months before the last General Election, that Administration brought on 321 persons at NCC, and I do not mean that they brought on the 321 five months before. They started five months before, but continued right up until two weeks before the General Election. They brought on 153 workers two weeks before the General Election with the prime reason of inducing people to vote a certain way. We are looking for employment for people now, when the elections are four years from now. We do not wait until just before the elections.

Not only that, the letters they gave the persons who were employed at that time stated that they would be employed until June 4. We kept them on until June 26. Do you know they still had people calling on *Gutter perk* crucifying the Democratic Labour Party that we fired the 321 workers.....

(*Aside:* Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Even Henry Forde.)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN:..... when they had letters telling them that they should work until June 4?

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Let me read from one of the letters. This letter was a letter from the Manager to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Housing. It was dated on June 6, it says

"The Commission"*

which is NCC:

"was informed by the Minister of Tourism and the Environment"

(*Aside:* Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Aaron Truss.)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN:"that the transfer for the employees from the Ministry of Health to the Commission was a Cabinet decision."

Further in the file the Cab. Sec. wrote:

"There is no record in the Cabinet Minutes of that directive mentioned at 50."

So do you see what was going on? This was.....

(*Aside:* Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Do you mean Aaron Truss is a liar then?)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Of course, he was! There was no record of that directive. This is the way they were operating just before the General Election. But you hear them calling in on the radio and they are saying on political platforms that we have let go 2000 people, and do you know we have people in Barbados who are falling for it? 3.30 p.m.

Let me go further with this letter:

"....and that funds in the form of a supplementary provision would be available for their employment up to June 4."

These people were employed by a directive from the Minister, 194 persons, through the Ministry of Tourism and the Environment. That is how the Barbados Labour Party operated, so the way how this Administration is operating will never find favour with the gentlemen over there.

In 1983, in this Honourable House, the late Prime Minister, Mr. Adams, in the Estimates Debate said that the number one priority of his Government was housing. He then proceeded to put \$6 million in housing and \$19 million in the Defence Force. I got up and I said to the Honourable Minister, how could that be your priority if you are putting \$6 million in housing and \$19 million in the Defence Force? I am drawing this to your attention, because the honourable Member for St. Peter is saying that we have our priorities wrong. Where were you when that sort of situation took place? Were you not his adviser? I am saying that you have no authority to stand in here and say that this Democratic Labour Party has no priority, or has its priority wrong, because you were advising the honourable Member.

A lot of people of Barbados, including the people you all get to call in on the radio, are completely forgetting that you were the adviser to the late Prime Minister, Mr. Adams, and to Mr. SL John, when the Barbados economy went into a tailspin twice between 1981 and 1986. In 1981, you had to come back in September with the first Mini-Budget, which slapped on millions of dollars in taxes, and then you had to come back in 1983, again with another Mini-Budget, to correct the imbalance that you created after advising the honourable gentleman. So how have you become this great financial genius?

We have to understand what is happening in Barbados today. The Barbados Labour Party, believes that with the help of the Press, it will very soon recapture the Government. Not in your lifetime!

Mr. Chairman, I heartily support this Resolution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, when this debate started, I did not want to speak at all. I was sitting down here very quietly minding my business, until I have been forced to intervene.

The honourable member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) is well able to, as it were, defend himself, Sir, but I am a little concerned that, perhaps, the debate has deteriorated somewhat into very mundane matters. In my submission, it started at a high level. The Honourable Minister read her brief well, and the honourable Member for SL Peter and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) spoke at good levels. But we have degenerated somewhat, and it is nothing to do with you, Sir, nothing to do with you at all.

I am amazed that the members of the Government sat quietly, patiently, and heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central say that he supported what the honourable Member for SL Peter cautioned, and when he sat down, almost each one of them to the man thumped the table in support of the support that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central gave the honourable Member for St. Peter. That is what happened, Sir. They have now caught themselves. When they read the debate, they will ask themselves.....

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You see, at one point in his speech he was talking above the heads of many of them - I am talking about the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central - so the thumped support was a kind of reflex action.

I very often do not find myself in agreement with observations made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons), and though I was not in the Chamber today, I heard the speech outside and there are aspects of his speech that I have to support Any Government which is going to take action or give

encouragement to black people finding their true roots and identity, and shedding any psychological hang-ups which may still exist as a relic of colonialism, I will support. To that extent, what he had to say about what is happening in the Pine I heartily endorse. It is not that I think that a few fellows doing craft is going to make a severe dent on the unemployment situation, but a start has to be made.

I cannot, however, Sir, find myself in agreement today with anything spoken by the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris). He began wrong, Sir. He credits the Employment Levy with the creation of 1000 jobs. Not true, Sir! At this time last year there was no Employment Levy or Unemployment Levy, but we were voting money to fund a programme to provide work for about 500 people. The Employment Levy came in April this year, by which time more than 500 people had been employed in the programme.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is not necessarily logical, because I am not allowing for those people who had been viciously sent home by the Democratic Labour Party on the assumption that they were supporters of the Barbados Labour Party.

I want to strip this debate, Sir, of some of the histrionics, some of the double talk, some of the double think. Let us get down to the nitty-gritty and stop talking with our tongues in our cheeks. Unemployment is the single most important social problem in Barbados today. Everybody agrees with that. It has been so for as long as all of us could remember. Even when it dropped to 10 per cent in 1980, under the Barbados Labour Party, it was still a severe problem, and if one is going to be responsible as an Opposition, we have to compliment any efforts by the private sector or by Government to search for solutions to this problem of chronic unemployment, so I wish to compliment the Government for trying to create some jobs, 1200. 3.40 p.m.

The criticism of the Opposition, however, is not that an attempt has not been made, but that this attempt has been made in defiance of stated Government policy by the Democratic Labour Party. The Government said that it would not accelerate the creation of employment in the public sector but it would rely on the private sector - it is in the manifesto and in all of the debates - to be the primary engine for the creation of employment opportunities.

Secondly, the Government, having given the tax reductions and there would, therefore, be a loss of revenue, said that they would have carefully to prune expenditure, and to that extent, reduce the level of public expenditure. All we are saying, for the record, and putting your philosophical and your policy contradictions here starkly before you, is that the Government was saying one thing

but the reality of unemployment has caused the Government not to go straight in accordance with its stated policy, and to veer somewhere....

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not accusing anybody of being a Poonka.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not saying that they are going in the wrong direction, like when the Prime Minister opened the arch. He drove so instead of coming so, and in the wrong direction. You cannot drive so normally, but he is the Prime Minister, so he could do anything on that morning.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: All of them jump up now to defend a little levity, like mullets to the bait

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Have you ever seen any bowler who has never bowled a full toss yet?

Mr. Chairman, we have to face what is the true situation. The honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Brathwaite) indicated that all Members of Parliament are inundated, daily almost with requests from constituents to assist in finding jobs. That is one of our responsibilities, and the job opportunities are very limited, so I am not quarrelling with the Government for giving each one of the 24 over there 50 jobs. That eases the problem.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It should have been done equitably. Those who have not got 50 on that basis should make some noise with whoever had them to share out. I would feel jealous. I figure each fellow got 50. That is 1200.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. I have written little notes for people and sent them up to Waterford, about nine, only nine, and all of them got turned down. I understand that, that is one of the problems of being in Opposition. You get shut out

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not quarrelling about it at all. I understand the game, as I said last year. I am not making any noise for anything. I do not want anything.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One or two from St. Thomas, who are favourably inclined to the Democratic Labour Party, have got jobs. I understand that. Let us not

delude ourselves. We are operating in a politically dynamic situation, and each one of us understands the dynamics of that responsibility as a politician in Barbados, so I do not quarrel with the Government for creating jobs. All we are saying is to be careful with the expenditure.

The honourable Member for St Michael South Central and the honourable Member for St John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson) have said that, perhaps, in future this kind of expenditure should be reflected, to some extent in some permanent capital improvement or structure. That is something that Government can work on. I am not criticising the Government for that

What we are also saying is that the Government must take care that its deficit is increasing steadily at the rate - I worked it out just now - of \$17 million a month. By March 1988, the Current Account will be around \$166 million or \$175 million, somewhere in that area. In October - I am being shown, according to the accounts that were laid today - the overall deficit was already \$175 million, with the Current Account \$76.1 million.

When we look at the Central Bank statistics, we see that the foreign loans which were negotiated last year are dissipating gradually. The \$50 million loan went through the system between May and September, and the reserves have fallen from \$178 million in May to \$124 million in September.

We are only issuing a counsel of prudence. We are not offering solutions to Government. You are the Government and you must find the solutions, but, as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said, he appreciates the point of caution that came from this side.

Sir, the Honourable Minister mentioned beautification of housing estates. I wonder if in her reply she could indicate whether there has been a change in policy from that policy which provided for employees of National Housing Corporation, as well as tenants themselves, doing some beautification.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Playing dominoes? The employees at MTW do that, too, all over the place.

Is the NCC is now taking on* that function to do the beautification of housing estates, when, presumably, there is no function for the direct labour force of the National Housing Corporation? Do not let us stifle our consciences about this kind of work that is called debushing, beautification, crash programme or whatever it is. There are thousands of Barbadians out there who come to you and are only too glad for something to do. You ask them, 'Well, what sort of job would you like?' They tell you, 'Skipper, anything', and we have to meet and address that concern of the unemployed Barbadian to do something from which he can gain an honest dollar rather than go and steal.

A little fun was made of the fact that in the 21st year of Independence I decided with my group in St. Thomas to do much more in the award ceremony for the people of St. Thomas. But why not?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Independent country, independent thought, too!

We honoured 21 persons who had made outstanding contributions to the parish of St. Thomas and its development, black, white, rich and poor, from the sexton, to the canecutter, to the big contractor who pushes down mountains. More than that - this has not reached the Press - the fellows were a little bit careful, because they know the problems of victimisation. This year marks 21 consecutive years that the people of St. Thomas has had Labour Party representation in here; Adams before me, and I have been in here holding on for two years, with many more to come. So we had to also honour 21 stalwarts who ensured that a Labour Party representative was in here consistently for 21 years. 3.50 p.m. *Asides.*

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: There are two things. There are the community awards; that was non-partisan; but then the home drum had to beat for the 21 key men all around the constituency who ensured Labour Party representation. I am not giving you the names; do not ask for them.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are there *any* other contributions before the Honourable Prime Minister winds up?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, I am just rising to make a few observations, and I could not allow the record to go unchallenged, or the statements made by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons).

First of all, while pretending to be all sweetness and light in his speech, he was, in his own words, attempting to share some lashes. He said that the Democratic Labour Party dismissed certain workers on the basis that they were known or thought to be supporters of the Barbados Labour Party. We reject that particular statement entirely. It is without foundation.

He went on to claim that the statements being made by the Opposition are merely words of caution. To that extent that they are words of caution, as I have said before, I accept those words of caution. Individuals have to be cautious about the money that they spend. Families have to be cautious about the money they spend, and Governments have to be cautious about the money they spend. But to get up and say that you should be cautious, and to repeat it from time to time, is not really making any further

contribution to an understanding of the public finances of this country at this time.

Let us understand exactly what is happening in this country. This particular Resolution is one to support programmes which the Democratic Labour Party supports. I am not hiding behind whether they are for capital projects or for current projects, they are for the development of this country. One of our supporters, I believe it was the honourable Member, for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons), indicated that this was development, and I include the spending of this money as development for this country. This is where you were speaking about the divide as far as philosophy is concerned. When we talk about the development of this country, we are not only talking about the production of garments, or the production of furniture; we are talking about anything that can lift the income that this country earns by exports, or anything that it can produce in order to reduce the level of imports.

Tourism is the most buoyant sector in our economy at this time, and Barbados must continue to place major emphasis in the tourist sector, but it must also place major emphasis in making Barbados a more pleasant and attractive place for Barbadians themselves. So it is both for Barbadians and for the tourists, and if we seek to make Barbados a more attractive place, and this is what the beautification programme is all about, so that our own citizens can enjoy it more, and also that the tourists who may come may be attracted to come and come again, what is wrong with that? Also, if we spend out money in order, in that process, to create jobs for people and maintain people in the jobs, what is wrong with that? Is the Opposition telling us now that we must not spend money because it is creating or providing jobs for people? I believe they may wish to take comfort in the fact that we should say we are not spending any more money, we are bringing this particular programme to a halt, people will go home, the unemployment rates will rise, so that they can come and say, 'you see, I told you so, you have no solution for the unemployment problem.' So behind all of this I ask what is the motivation of the Opposition in this debate and in this particular argument, and I challenge them to get up and vote against the provision of this money so that they would go on record as saying that the money should not be provided and the people should go home particularly at Christmas time. Let them vote against it I want them to go on record and vote against it, that the people should go home.

We have to be very serious about what we are doing in this country. We are operating in a situation in which the manufacturing sector has contracted because those markets with which we deal are unable, because of the economic circumstances in which they find themselves, to take the products from Barbados. They have been contractions in the sugar industry. They used to talk about having a great programme for sugar and they were going to bring all these

idle lands back into production, and during the years that they were in office they never produced more sugar than was produced during the Democratic Labour Party's time in office 1966 to 1976. We are operating in the kind of situation in which the electronics industry has also contracted because of worldwide development, and as I indicated, one of the buoyant areas is the area of tourism, and if we spend money to beautify our country as we put down more roads - that was your policy; you built a lot of new highways - do you wish us to leave the highways like the Spring Garden for a lot of bush to grow up around it and to drive through an unaesthetically backward area with a lot of blight and unsightliness? We are trying to make the country more beautiful and that is how it should be.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think the honourable Member understands clearly what he is saying, but he finds himself caught in a dilemma, trying to be political and at the same time wanting to speak high economics. He is under pressure from within his own party to get up and be political - that is what they tell him - and I think the honourable Member for St. John spelt out the dilemma that he is in very clearly. And that is why he will try to fall between these two stools. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side support this particular Resolution. They can warn us as much as they like, because they have the experience, about the difficulties. I know that there are problems. I have said this over and over again. But they have the direct experience of it, because it is they who took this country naked, streaked to the IMF, when all of the dire predictions that they are now talking about occurred. Streaked to the IMF!

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes!

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is what happened. So they can warn us now, because they went down that road and did not take the people of this country into their confidence.

The Member for St. Thomas talked about employment dropping to about 10 per cent, giving the impression that this was the rate of unemployment in this country. Why did he not say that it was 19.8 per cent or 19.6 per cent in 1985? You can always select statistics to support or give a favourable impression.

The main point, Sir, is that we will continue to take decisions which we believe are in the best interest of this country, that will seek to keep our economy on an even keel. Every economy goes through difficulties, and it is because of the difficulties that the economy went through during the period 1981 - I start with 1981 - to 1986 that

there are 24 of us on this side and three over there, and that is why the Member for St. Thomas can get up and speak as he speaks. He had a ceremony for St. Thomas.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDDFORD: Nothing to do with the others!

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think the Member for St. Peter had better understand what the situation is.

(Aside: Break for yourself!)

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Member for St. Thomas, if you understand clearly what he said, said that he agreed with aspects of what the Member for St. Michael South East said. And you know the Member for St. Michael South East started out by driving some lashes in you!

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Then your colleague, the Acting Leader of the Opposition, got up in here and said he agreed with him.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: He did not get up and defend you on anything.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You better understand what is happening.....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir!

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:..... inside of your own party.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Make the Prime Minister sit down!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He knows when to sit.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Prime Minister must not distort my speech. I was very careful to identify the two aspects of the speech of the honourable Member with which I agree.

He also misquoted me on the honouring of the people in St. Thomas because I had to do something for them, Sir. They were like Sir Frederick Smith and Mr. Steve Emtage, who were not invited to anything by the Government for Independence.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Two outstanding Barbadians, Sir!

(Aside: That is not true!)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is true! "Sleepy" told me so in court up to this morning. He had to call Lewis and

.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable Member for St. Thomas still on his feet or what? I do not understand it

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Let us deal with the problems. To talk about keeping the debate on a high level and then to come and say that people drove down one way that they should not drive was a little beyond the scope of the debate.

Mr. Chairman, we have brought this particular Resolution here, and we have no apologies to make for bringing it. We will continue to bring Resolutions. If they involve spending money, we will come and say why we are bringing it, and we will continue to keep the people of this country informed as to exactly what the true position of the country is. All we seek to do in this country is to put forward proposals and programmes that will deal with the problems facing the country. If the problem is one of unemployment and we come with a programme to keep people in jobs, and the Opposition gets up and says you should not do it, I challenge them to vote against it

Thank you.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I accept that the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Hon. H. A. Blackman) and the Minister of Housing and Lands might be well positioned to comment on my financial competence. After all, Sir, he did spend six years getting a first degree in Economics and he is doubly qualified than most to do so.

Also, Sir, I am in no mood this afternoon and I want the House to

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I did not teach you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get back.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If we are talking about raising the level of debate, I would ask the honourable Member to desist from making these personal comments. I think that they are in bad and poor taste.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir: It is because I had to tell people like you who are lecturing down there that they do not know what they are doing that that happened.

(Aside: True!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the debate and cut out that kind of thing.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: People like you who do not know what they are doing!

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking with a view to cautioning the Government today. I am speaking with a view to criticize the Government, because they are spending \$16 million, glorified in terms of spending on employment. But it is not just spending on employment that bothers me, Mr. Chairman. We are spending \$16 million on a so-called employment programme only for persons who are carrying members of the Democratic Labour Party.

(Aside: That is not true!)

Asides.

Hon. M. BARKER-WELCH: On a point of order, Sir. On a point of order, Sir!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Joseph has risen on a point of order.

Hon. M. BARKER-WELCH: On a point of order, Sir: That statement is untrue! The honourable Member for St. Peter ought to know that, too!

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order.

(Aside: You cannot have a point of order on a point of order.)

(Aside: He has to withdraw it!)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: The honourable Member for St. Peter said that the programme is one in which only card-carrying members of the Democratic Labour Party are employed.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: That is not true and the honourable Member ought to withdraw it, because he is misleading the House. He is lying!

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: That is a holier than thou attitude. On behalf of the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, that is truly sickening. They want, Sir, when they wish to profess that they have come forward with this grand economic strategy that the private sector must lead

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I insist that the honourable Member should withdraw a fallacious remark.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: It just is not true. I know people who are working in the programme who are supporters of the Barbados Labour Party.

(Aside: And voting for you all. I am telling you!)

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Supporters of the Barbados Labour Party.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I guarantee that there are hundreds of people in that programme who voted for the Barbados Labour Party. It simply is not true. It is not true to say that it is a programme which is providing work for card-carrying members of the Democratic Labour Party.

I cannot sit down here and allow the honourable Member to mislead the House in the way that he is misleading it. That is not true, Sir. He ought to withdraw the remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think, as I said earlier, the debate should not be allowed to slip into the low depths that it is going. I think that it is becoming a bit acrimonious at this stage. I ask the honourable Member to withdraw the remarks. There is no way that he can make a remark like that. He has to withdraw it.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, if it is the will of the House, I withdraw the remarks.

But, Mr. Chairman, the purpose behind this programme has been revealed in the words of statements, for example, by the honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Brathwaite), that the fellows are under pressure for jobs. Week by week, hundreds are coming to them for jobs, Sir. And this, Mr. Chairman, they can call it what they wish, - they can abuse me as much as they wish, - is a \$16 million DLP programme to predominantly provide jobs for DLP

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution before the Committee, I would like to remind the honourable Member, is for \$10 million, not for \$16 million.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am speaking in here. It is a \$16 million

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before you continue, the Resolution that we are debating is for \$10 million. If you want to say \$16 million, you have to put it a different way. Do not mislead the House.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the total expenditure contemplated for this financial year includes the \$5.5 million that has already been voted plus the \$10.5 million, Sir, which is now

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have already voted on \$5 million. We are dealing with \$10 million.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The total programme, Sir, is a \$16 million programme. It is a programme, Sir, conceived of not only because there is a need to beautify the country,

but because of what the Prime Minister has said, that the other sectors of the Barbados economy are contracting. That is the whole point. Manufacturing has been contracting, sugar has been contracting, and so on and so forth, and the essential point I am making, Sir, is that the fact that we are today having to debate \$10.5 million in expenditure on a programme which the Democratic Labour Party said it would never have, indicates more completely than any other index how totally bankrupt have been the economic policies presumed by the Democratic Labour Party. That is my point and my criticism. 4.10p.m.

A certain Junior Rock was once asked what was his solution to the unemployment problem of this country and he said he would spend \$15 million on a crash programme. The late Prime Minister said he was not going to have any such crash programme, and we can only be having this kind of programme, which they said they were not going to have, because their other policies have failed. That is the essential point we are talking about this evening.

The other measures you were relying on to generate employment have not had the impact that you thought they were going to have. The tax cuts, for example, were supposed to be the basis of a massive expansion in employment in the manufacturing sector. That was supposed to be the basis for providing a stimulus for a driving force in manufacturing. That policy has failed, Sir, and the Government, rather than trying to abuse me and to fantasise - like the honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson) would like to fantasise about a Cabinet reshuffle over here - you are very familiar with Cabinet reshuffles, that is part of your cause - should begin to understand why it must be that despite your earlier policy statements, you have now to resort to a measure like this as the basis of the employment policy. That is the issue today, and that is what I am trying to put before this House. Why are we at this point in time dealing with our employment strategy in terms of a beautification programme? Why am I not hearing from the Government the march forward in manufacturing? Why am I not hearing from the Government the march forward in terms of employment created through agricultural diversification? That is why I made the point earlier that this expenditure has to be examined within that context.

This is a bland and blanket statement of the complete bankruptcy of Government policy. The only thing that the Government now can offer the people of this country in terms of an increase in employment is a crash programme. You have to ask yourself the question, Sir, can a beautification programme appeal? Can it provide a sufficient range of employment opportunities to seriously deal with that range of skills which we know the young labour force is in possession of? These are the questions.

The Government is concerned about me making the same speech over and over again. The speech has to be

made because we are in a situation where, month by month, we are faced with a deteriorating economy. As of October this year, Sir, there was an overall deficit of \$175 million - I might from month to month change the numbers, but the trend is there - a Current Account deficit of \$81 million for the first seven months of the year. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central told us that you might be able to avoid financial disaster by keeping expenditure within the limits of \$55 million a month. In which month of this year have you managed to do that? What was the expenditure for October? Eighty-five million dollars. What was the expenditure the month before? Sixty-seven million dollars. So if you accept the principle of the point that he made this morning, that you can only now avoid financial distress if you were to keep the expenditure for the rest of the year within some limit of \$55 million, how can you do this given your commitments as known? And how can you do this when you keep adding to your expenditures by supplementaries of this sort of magnitude?

Month by month, whether you like it or not, as these documents become available, and as the Central Bank's documents become available, I will be telling you what are the reserves, and I will also be explaining to you the way in which those reserves are being put under pressure by Government policy. If you do not like it, I am very sorry for you. That, Mr. Chairman, is the reality.

On this side I am saying that what we are seeing coming now to a head are the problems surrounding a Government having a holier-than-thou attitude on everything. They want, Sir, to have their cake and to eat it at the same time. When they were in Opposition, they criticised us for expanding employment in the Public Service. Now they want to have the credit in this country for doing exactly what they criticised us of doing. I must remind them, Sir, that they are the Government and things that were wrong when they were done by the Barbados Labour Party cannot suddenly become right when they are done by the Democratic Labour Party, and the people have already spoken as regards what we did in the past

I am obliged to you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments with respect to the last few statements of the tirade by the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur). I can quite understand why he has become so agitated. It is predictable, because his whole philosophy, his predictions, his reputation, seem to be a little bit threatened.

The honourable Member for St. Peter has constantly predicted that by April of this year the economy would collapse. He said that he would stake his profession on the fact that the economy of Barbados could not last until April, or something like that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am at liberty, I would think - on a point of order, *Sir* - to recall my statement as regards the impact of the tax proposals.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Really within the context of a point of order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Yes, *Sir*.

I said that the tax proposals, attractive as they may be, would within 18 months undermine Government's financial position and put the balance of payments in jeopardy. I also said that the manner in which they had been introduced clearly established that the Minister understood that if he tried to give effect to them in the course of a financial year, he could only carry them through if he was also prepared to borrow heavily and also to introduce new taxes to replace those which he had given out.

I stand on those points, *Sir*. That is exactly what I said.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Peter cannot be in a position to talk about borrowing heavily. In 1976, when the Barbados Labour Party came to run the affairs of this country, the National Debt was \$250 million. They carried the National Debt from \$250 million to \$1.4 billion within a ten year period.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order: The honourable Member earlier today in this debate said that he is not concerned about problems of debt, that one must be concerned about human resources.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. I do not think that is the thrust of the honourable Member's speech, and I cannot get involved in the debate.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that the honourable Member for St. Peter is in no position to talk about the rising National Debt, because it was under the Barbados Labour Party that the National Debt rose at its steepest level. 4.20 p.m.

The other point I want to make is this that in the Budget debate of 1986 - this is the Barbados Labour Party Budget Debate - the honourable Member for St. Peter, who was the adviser to both Ministers, the deceased Minister and the Minister of Finance for the Barbados Labour Party that is now alive, made the statement that it was because of the bad economic bunching of projects that the Barbados Labour Party had to go to the IMF for support. He criticised his own Minister of Finance.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I will not allow

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what are you rising?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, *Sir*: I will not allow the honourable Member for St. Michael South East, who, obviously, suffers from foot and mouth disease - he is always speaking

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No, no! I will not allow that. Mr.

O. S. ARTHUR: I withdraw the remarks, *Sir*.

He suffers from foot and mouth disease, *Sir*, he opens his mouth and puts his foot in it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not the scientific meaning of foot and mouth disease and I would want you to withdraw the remark.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I withdrew it already.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not interested in the metaphoric sense in which he is speaking. It is improper to speak - in that mode in here, and I will not allow it. I think the honourable Member is testing my patience now. If you want to make a point of order, make it in a decent fashion. You may shout as much as you like, but do not use words like those in here or phrases.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you should apologise. You have to withdraw the statement anyhow.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I withdraw the statement, *Sir*.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Members on the other side feel that I am fair game that everybody can bat at me, *Sir*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which honourable Member are you referring to?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: All the honourable Members on the other side.

I am fair game. I am being made adviser to everybody. I am adviser to Michael Manley, adviser to Tom Adams, adviser to Bree St John, everybody, but I do not mind, *Sir*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the point? Order, order!

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order! Will the honourable Member make his point?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The honourable Member for St. Michael South East is getting his jaw in his tongue. He said that I have failed all three persons that I have advised.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He never said that. I never heard anything like that Will the honourable Member make his point and sit. You rose on a point of order. What is the point of order? Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: In no reference whatsoever has the honourable Member heard me ever alluding to any projects by the term "bunching of projects". He is confusing me with the honourable Member for St. Michael

South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), and he should not do that, Sir.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I understand why the honourable Member for St. Peter is so upset and he is allowing his brain function after lunch to get the better of him. But the point I want to make is that the honourable Member for St. Peter, who is an economist, who prides himself as being able to analyse what is going on in this country very carefully, must know that when you are talking to Barbadians, you are talking to people who have their pulse on what is happening in this country.

I said before that if you were to check the tourism sector in this country, you will find that today in Barbados you cannot get a hotel room. That means that more people are working in tourism now than have ever worked within the last ten years; therefore, more people are being employed. If you look at the construction area, you cannot find a skilled workman to work any place in Barbados. If you are an up-to-date economist, you should be checking out the various sectors of the economy to find out what is going on, instead of coming in here and saying that the only place Government can find work is within NCC.

Government is one of the forerunners today in the building programme in this country, and in that area lots of skilled people are being employed. The Democratic Labour Party, advising the Barbados Labour Party before 1986, told you that one of the areas that you should look at seriously was in the construction area. You have seen that within the last 18 months there has been a rise in employment in the very sector that we identified as the area that you should look at

We on this side are going to call for a divide on this Resolution and we want you over there to vote against it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is winding up.

Hon. M. BARKER-WELCH: Mr. Chairman, in winding up this debate, I would like to give a few facts. One of the facts is that the parks established by the National Conservation Commission cannot be said to be temporary. I hear people calling for permanent things. What are these parks? Three Houses, Silver Sands, Speightstown, the Enrol Barrow Park.

The other thing is the morale. That is something that you cannot buy with money. Has anybody taken the time to look at the morale of the workers of the National Conservation Commission. They are working the way they are because they now know that they have a stake in, and are tied in with, what is happening in Barbados. As someone directly concerned with it, I can tell you that in each neighbourhood we go to, the people are consulted, and they are putting their work behind us, so our work is complementary. So you do not have to bother about what is going to happen in the housing estates, it is a complementary sort of work that is going on there.

We are also going to be landscaping lighthouses. In view of the tourist thrust, we are going to make sure that the tourists have something beautiful to see when they come here. I sympathise with the Members on that side, because things are going very well and I know they would not like that to happen.

Asides.

Hon. M. BARKER-WELCH: These are facts I am giving now.

Have you seen Queen's Park recently? I do not think that people ever take the time to look at the various areas that we are beautifying. We are going to be returning the Police Band, which is part of our tradition, to Queen's Park.

I have heard talk about one-shot activity. I heard some sarcastic names given to the programme that we are having, like "the one-shot programme", and "the crash programme", but whatever name you give to it, it is helping some of your constituents to find work and that is important. I would like to take you to visit some of the places that we have been beautifying.

The honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) alluded to 21 years BLP rule in St. Thomas, but I wonder if he remembers that there were 52 years of BLP rule in St. Joseph. Do not forget that.

As for the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur), I am not surprised that he got very agitated, because he does get agitated. If you get the records, you will find how agitated he got in the campaign in my constituency in St. Joseph. 4.30 p.m.

The question that Head 37 - Ministry of Housing and Lands - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. M. A. KING; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN; Hon. E. E. GREAVES; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN; Hon. W. W. HALL; Hon. C. V. WALKER; Hon. M. BARKER-WELCH; Mr. P. J. M. MILLER; Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE; Mr. C. L. TROTMAN; Mr. R. L. MORRIS; Dr. E. A. SIMMONS; Mr. C. A. NEBLETT; Mr. E. BOURNE; Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON and Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS- 18.

Abstention: Mr. O. S. ARTHUR - 1.

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF TRADE AND COMMERCE
- \$214040

Hon. E. E. GREAVES (St. Lucy): Mr. Chairman, this is a simple Resolution seeking additional monies for the purposes outlined in the Addendum to this Resolution. Basically, the additional expenditure is required because a new wing of the Ministry of Trade came into operation since the current Estimates were prepared, and the Price Control

Division was moved from the National Insurance Building to the Ministry of Trade complex at the Reef Road. This added expenditure is for utilities, maintenance of property and plant, equipment and furniture.

Also, after June 15, when Industry was transferred to the Ministry of Trade, we required additional cabinets and some additional equipment, which we are seeking to get now, so as to ensure that the Ministry is properly equipped.

Under Object No. 17 - Subscriptions and Contributions, we are seeking to correct a particular difficulty which has developed in relation to Barbados' contribution to international organisations, and in particular to the Caribbean Community Secretariat. Since 1980, Barbados' contribution to the CARICOM Secretariat for the first quarter of the year has been paid in April, that is, at the start of the Government's financial year. The Secretariat's financial year begins in January.

Because of the precarious financial position of the Secretariat, a decision was made somewhere about January 1984, and the Government of Barbados was informed that the Secretariat was experiencing some financial difficulties and member Governments were urged to pay their contribution on a timely basis so as to eliminate the necessity for the Secretariat to go on overdraft. In fact, the Secretariat has had to go on overdraft, and countries which had not paid their contributions on time had to pay certain penalties, that is, the overdraft interest which the Secretariat had accumulated.

Barbados has paid overdraft interest in respect of 1985 and 1986 of \$16400. We feel that this could be avoided if we paid our contributions in the first quarter and not at the beginning of the second quarter, and we are therefore seeking this additional sum of money to erase our indebtedness to the CARICOM Secretariat, and to ensure that in future we would have the necessary provision so as to avoid our having to pay additional expenses. We thought that this is a matter which ought to have been corrected before, so we are seeking to correct it now, and this is the basis for this additional sum of \$152 913.

I therefore beg to move that this Head 40 - Ministry of Trade and Commerce -stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER (City of Bridgetown): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution, and in doing so, Sir, it is very important for me to look at industrial development in Barbados from a broad perspective.

I have heard in recent times a lot of noise coming from the Barbados Labour Party and the people who follow them around, the few that there are, and it reminds me of a story of Rip Van Winkle, which, as far as my memory goes, was about a person who had slept a long time. The Members on the other side, particularly, and I am sorry he is not in

his seat today, the one for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde)...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you should say the honourable Member for Christ Church West

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The honourable Member for Christ Church West and the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) like to say things as though they only joined the Barbados Labour Party since May 28, 1986. They talk about the position with the manufacturing sector in a way as though in 17 or 18 months this Administration has brought the manufacturing sector to the position it is in. 4.40p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. You really do not believe that I have made perhaps more than one speech on the manufacturing sector, and that was in the Estimates this year? I do not speak on the manufacturing sector. He is misquoting me. He is confusing me with somebody else. Not me! There is nothing to talk about.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: You see what I am saying, Sir. I recognise that the honourable Member for St. Thomas is doing his own thing in relation to the Barbados Labour Party but still he admits that he did talk about it in the Estimates. He cannot tell me that he did not say anything about the manufacturing sector and then tell me he only talked about it once. That once is enough. But on more than one occasion he has said things about the private sector in general, which includes the manufacturing sector, and they were not always positive things. Very seldom are they!

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary for us as Barbadians and as Government to continue to try to attract foreign investors in our industrial sector. I appreciate that, Sir, and I think we should go after them even more vigorously. The IDC has a role to play, a very significant role, in continuing to attract these investors. They have to come up with more modern marketing techniques, and I am sure that our Minister of Trade and Industry has the ability to make sure that these sons of things come about. They have to, I believe, come up with some more innovative incentives even beyond the present fiscal incentives that exist. Even those, I submit, could do with some modification, bearing in mind the kind of competition we have from countries that offer similar packages to us.

Sir, the development of indigenous industries in Barbados and the local manufacturers is a matter that has to be given very, very serious consideration, particularly in the light of the fact that a previous BLP Administration did their best to destroy that sector. I will get to that and I hope that the Member for St. Thomas is not going to try to get up and defend it, because I will give you chapter and verse.

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: In due course.)

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Sir, we must plan and plan, bearing in mind the cultural background of our people, because the indigenous manufacturers in Barbados are mostly people who are black Barbadians. We have to also bear in mind the historical background before we start making any serious plans for indigenous industrial development. I would like to suggest to the Minister that this kind of development has to be planned carefully and that we cannot necessarily use the traditional line of thought. We have to be more innovative. The board of the IDC has to come up with the kind of policy directives that are necessary to bring about this change. In the final analysis, I believe that most of the indigenous manufacturers are here to stay, as long as they get the kind of assistance that is necessary, and we, even the political directorate, have to be very careful we do not get caught in using the failures, the poor examples among us in the manufacturing sector, as the examples and the reasons for not putting certain incentives in place to develop that sector.

Sir, when we speak about the development of industry in Barbados, we have to go back a bit, if we are really going to understand what has happened to the manufacturing sector. When we took over in May 1986, the manufacturing sector was already in shambles. We did not take it there, nor did we put any programme in place that caused that destruction in the manufacturing sector. Most of the blame for that can be placed squarely on the shoulders of former Prime Minister Adams and that BLP Administration. I say that without fear of contradiction, They did not have any serious philosophy or programme for the development of indigenous industry in Barbados, They had serious programmes for the development of casinos. Instead of having our young women go to work proud in a factory, they seemed more inclined to take them into the direction of casinos, and, Sir, you know what comes with the casino type of lifestyle, all kinds of undesirable activities like prostitution. I cannot walk and hold my head high knowing that I would be any part of anything like that that would ensure that our young women cannot go and find a decent, lawful job in a factory or in an ancillary company, because as soon as you bring industrial development, it is necessary that there will be ancillary services,

Mr. Chairman, when I say these things and I accuse a former BLP Administration of contributing to the destruction in the manufacturing sector, I know what I am speaking about, Sir, because I was involved, and I am involved. I dare say that if, by some quirk of fate, another BLP Administration was running this country now instead of this Administration, you would have seen almost the total destruction of the manufacturing sector. If you listen now to what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says when he speaks about the private sector, which includes the manufacturing sector, he has no confidence in them at all. As far as he is concerned, there is no one in that sector who

can make any meaningful contribution to the social and economic development of this country.

The honourable Member for St. Thomas said just that he does not have anything to do with the private sector, that he does not have any confidence in them and we place confidence in them. He is telling the truth, Sir. That is the feeling of the Barbados Labour Party, so you would know that if we had gone on with them, far from losing the Trinidad market, we may even lose the Barbados market, because they were always opposed to import substitution, and import substitution, if it is carefully managed, is one of the ways that we can save foreign exchange and create more jobs for Barbadians. It does not take any economist to work that out, Sir, any layman 'with a little common sense can figure that one out. But you see, Sir, as has been said in here several times, the philosophy is crucial, and if they have no serious philosophy in terms of the development of the poor working people of Barbados, the masses, then you would obviously get that kind of manufacturing sector.

They, in fact, slowed down the development of the manufacturing sector, particularly in the last five years of their Administration. Let them take no credit for any development of any Trinidad market, or any CARICOM market, for that matter, because it was the BMA which, back in 1978, went into Trinidad with a top level trade mission and exhibition and opened the way for the furniture and garment manufacturers particularly to sell the millions of dollars in orders that they did, up until about 1981, when they put their feet in their mouths and started to interfere with a good thing. It did not only have to do with the economic problems that Trinidad faced. Sure, that played a part in it too, but the destruction of that market started before the economic problems really took hold in Trinidad.

We have to cast our minds back if we are going to really understand what happened to industrial development in Barbados. You know only too well, Sir, that they tried to give the impression that we ran INTEL and others out of here. That was far from the truth. The same former Minister, who is a member of the Other Place, who tried to give that impression to the public, quietly would tell you that he knows they were going ever since. Twelve thousand persons were employed in that manufacturing sector until about 1979/1980.

People like Adams was always at war with St. John and Cheltenham, about this manufacturing sector, he was more keen on running to put in casinos and had no interest in the manufacturing sector. This is a fact; the other two gentlemen are still alive and they can tell you if it is true or not. He was at war with them whenever they talked about coming up with programmes for the manufacturing sector. So the BLP cannot come and tell me that we have not had any programme to do anything about it. They should be the last people to talk about the manufacturing sector.

We now have a reconstruction job to do as far as the manufacturing sector is concerned. We now have to sit down and put our heads together seriously to come up with programmes that will resuscitate the manufacturing sector. We have inherited a manufacturing sector that was systematically destroyed by the last Administration. That is a fact, Sir! 4.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, the honourable Member, like the other members of the Barbados Labour Party, will continue to try to hold up the poor examples, but when people like Nassar, before he joined them, and others were out there trying to build industry, what happened to all of that? One of the first casualties on their winning the election in 1976 was the same Nassar.

(Aside: Not True!)

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: He was the second one then, Sir, and about 40 others followed him, because of the lack of programmes. I cannot even say because of their programme, because there was no programme.

Do you know what, Sir? I remember Adams saying that he was not taking the BMA seriously because it contained a bunch of DLP yardfowls, including myself, Mr. Forbes and Mr. DaSilva. You will get up and talk about DaSilva now, because you will repeat the same thing that Tom said, that he was.....

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I believe I make my point when I say that the Democratic Labour Party Administration has a very serious job to do in terms of resuscitating the manufacturing sector. We have done an excellent job for the past 18 months in the tourism sector. We have debated in here other sectors where we are making sure that people can become employed, despite the fact that we keep getting opposition every time we try to get a few more poor people employed, and we recognise now that we will go on to the manufacturing sector and do the same kind of job.

I am satisfied, Sir, that the Minister of Industry and Trade will do an excellent job in trying to bring about the reconstruction of the manufacturing sector, and I would like to support this Resolution.

Thank you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of thing that forces me to speak. I did not want to get involved in this debate on manufacturing until the honourable Member for the City (Mr. P. J. M. Miller) made a number of wild statements without any factual basis, on an assumption that because he is a manufacturer, an indigenous manufacturer, who has done well, he knows the problems of the manufacturing industry and that he is the fountain of all knowledge.

(Aside: More than you!)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: More than me because I am not in it!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will just tell you that the debate will be wound up at "5 o'clock. That will be the expiry of three hours.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir.

This is something that the honourable Member for the City will have to explain to Barbadians, how when he reads the most recent edition of the Digest of Statistics from the Central Bank - the mauve-coloured one that was circulated in here a couple of weeks ago - exports in Barbados in 1977 were \$217 million approximately, but by 1984 they had risen to a little more than \$800 million.

(Aside: Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: How much was enclave? How much was indigenous?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They dipped last year to \$522 million, and for the first six months of this year they have not even reached \$150.

(Aside: Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: You missed my point.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Can anybody seriously believe that manufacturing did not play a part in the graph that went in ascending order from 1977 to 1985 in those export earnings? Look under the heading marked Visible Trade in the Digest and you will see. Could it happen just on its own?

I heard the Honourable Prime Minister, I think at his Press Conference, speaking about the Export Promotion Corporation. I believe the honourable Member for the City would have the people of Barbados believe that that organisation started with the Democratic Labour Party. The Bill for that was brought in here and passed in 1978 to give the thrust to export manufacturing.

(Aside : Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The IDC did it before. That was just a name.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We put Philip Williams in place. I am not calling names in here, Sir, I should have given notice.

Since they have been in power and exports have dipped, they are going to attribute the blame to the Barbados Labour Party. They have been in power for the last 18 months. The Trinidad market was supposed to change and pick up under the Democratic Labour Party since they got into power. What is the result? It declined with us and it is declining even further, to a nadir, under them now.

Only last week - now blame the Labour Party for this! -exports to America dipped by 50 per cent. Blame the Barbados Labour Party for that! Blame the Barbados Labour Party for the fact that the Minister of Trade last year told the people in Barbados, after visiting Trinidad, he had a

breakthrough! He must be a burglar! He had a breakthrough! I withdraw that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Burglars do not break through, they break in, so you must withdraw it on that ground.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was now starting to wind up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, you have to wind down. It is now time.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I withdraw that, Sir. The honourable Member for SL Lucy and I get on well.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can see the clock on the wall is saying 5 o'clock.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am waiting for the 3 000 jobs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And the three hours have gone.

The question that Head 40 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two money Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 5.00 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Sir, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39, asked by the honourable Member for Christ Church East.

QUESTION RE EMISSION OF NOXIOUS FUMES FROM VEHICLES

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, Parliamentary Question No. 39.

To ask the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications: 1. Is the Minister aware of the grave danger to health caused by exhaust fumes from motor vehicles throughout this island? 2. Will the Minister take steps, by the initiation and rigid enforcement of legislation, to ensure that the emission of noxious pollutants from diesel trucks, buses, cars and other motor vehicles is minimized and, if possible, totally eliminated?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:

1. "Yes, Sir.
2. Paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) of Regulation 34 of the Road Traffic Regulations, 1984, prohibit the use of any vehicle which emits exhaust gases likely to cause damage to property or injury to persons on the highway."

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplementaries?

Mr. E. BOURNE: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 41 - the honourable Member for SL Andrew.

QUESTION RE SOIL EROSION IN SCOTLAND DISTRICT

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT: Mr. Speaker, Parliamentary Question No. 41.

To ask the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications: 1. Is the Minister aware that underground water is the principle agent of soil erosion in the V Scotland District? 2. Will the Minister state (a) the amount of money spent by Government from 1978 until now in combating soil erosion in the Scotland District, and (b) the degree of success achieved in that exercise? 3. Will the Minister state whether Government has commissioned any studies or other programmes to identify all the underground water sources in the Scotland District? 4. Will the Minister also state whether Government has any plans for dealing with surface water drainage in the area? 5. Are there plans by Government to implement a comprehensive drainage scheme for the Scotland District by, for example, (a) the provision of new drainage paths, (b) maximising the use of existing paths, and (c) increasing the use of excess water for irrigation purposes to enhance agricultural development in the area?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the reply^x is as follows:

1. The Ministry is aware that a large percentage of the soil erosion in the Scotland District is due to surface run-off water during and following heavy rainfall.
2. From the 1977-1978 fiscal year to the 1986-1987 financial year, the Government has expended \$35 221323 in soil conservation work. Successful repairs have been carried out to landslips which occurred in the area prior to 1986, while there has been an expansion in livestock rearing, woodland and fruit cultivation.
3. Government is currently collecting information and data related to a programme for the rehabilitation of roads and the stabilisation of various areas

in the Scotland District, which will relate where necessary to the identification of under-ground water resources. Recommendations have been made for the repair and replacement of drainage structures, such as Newbold inverts, road shoulders, bridges and culverts.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplemental on that?

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 46.

The honourable Member for St. James North (Mr. J. J. Payne) is not in his seat. The Minister can lay the reply.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to request permission to lay reply to Parliamentary Question No. 46.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of Parliamentary Replies.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is the end of Government Business for today.

I move the adjournment of the House until Tuesday, December 15, 1987 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, December 15, 1987 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 5.05 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Confirmation of Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, November 24, 1987. 1703

ANNOUNCEMENTS Mr.

SPEAKER. 1703

Accounts and Statements for the month of October, 1987 as prepared by the Accountant General

PAPERSLAID

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD. 1703

The Representation of the People (Expenses)
(Amendment) Regulations.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN. 1704

The Annual Report of the Barbados Water Authority for the period 1st April 1985 to 31st March 1986.

The 4th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Transport Levy Fund for the period ended 31st March 1986.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 1704

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$30000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1987-88, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1987-88, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES. 1704

A Bill to validate certain charges and dues fixed by the Barbados Port Authority.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN 1704

Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 39,41 and 46, asked by the honourable Members for Christ Church East (Mr. E. Bourne), St. Andrew (Mr. C. A. Neblett) and St. James North (Mr. J. J. Payne) respectively.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 1704

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS**POINT OF PRIVILEGE** ^

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas). 1704

Irregularities in notices re Meeting.

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 1705; Mr. Speaker, 1705.

ADVANCES OF SALARY OR WAGES IN THE

SUM OF \$4 MILLION. 1705

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1705; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1706.

BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY (VALIDATION OF

CHARGES ACT, 1987.. 1706

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 1706.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 No. 25

-\$4564441 1707 v

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1707.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 No. 26

-\$10724744 1707

HEAD 37 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT-\$10 513 704

. 1707

Hon. M. Barker-Welch, 1707, 1728; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 1708,1712,1725; Dr. Haynes, 1709; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 1711, 1726; Mr. Morris, 1713; Mr. Brathwaite, 1716; Mr. Thompson, 1717; Hon. H. A. Blackman, 1719; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1720; Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1722.

HEAD 40-MINISTRY OF TRADE AND COMMERCE-\$214 040

. 1728 X

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 1728; Mr. Miller, 1729; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1731.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. E. BOURNE (Christ Church East). 1732

Question No. 39 of the Minister of Transport, Works, and Telecommunications re *Emission of Noxious Fumes from Vehicles*.

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 1732.

Mr. C. A. Neblett (St. Andrew) 1732

Question No. 41 of the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications re *Soil Erosion* >

in Scotland District.

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackmail, 1732.		BRATH WATTE, L. L. (St Michael North East)
SUSPENSION	.1716	GREAVES, Hon. E.E.(St Lucy)
ADJOURNMENT	1733	H AYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE		MILLER, P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown)
ARTHUR, O. S. (St Peter) BARKER-WELCH,		MORRIS, R. L. (Christ Church East Central)
Hon. M. (St. Joseph) BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D.		SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E. (St Michael South)
G. (St. Michael East) BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A.		SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St Thomas)
(St. Philip South)		SIMMONS, Dr. E. A (St Michael South East)
		THOMPSON, D. J. H. (St John)
		WEEKES, His Honour L. A. (St Michael North West)