THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 6,1987.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12:20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A.(Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister and Minister of Economic Affairs, Minister of Education and Culture and Minister of Finance).
Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. B. M. TAUT, B.A. (Hons.), M.A., LL.B.(Hons.), (Minister oi Health)
Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Transport, Works and 'telecommunications 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. 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., J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)
Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc., (Econ.), (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc., (Econ.)
Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)
Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of State, Ministry of Education and Culture)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P.
Mr. E. BOURNE
Hon. W. W. HALL, (Minister of Tourism and Sports)
Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B.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.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

Before we commence today's business, I would like to welcome all honourable Members to this newly-renovated Chamber. I hope that the maximum comfort may be enjoyed during your sitting and it ultimately leads to good debate. I am sure that some of you may have taken the opportunity to familiarise yourselves with the surroundings, particularly the newly-installed, highly-computerized equipment. If you have not done so, I would invite honourable Members to do so at your earliest convenience so that you will be able to make maximum use of this installation.

I hope that future sittings will be comfortable. Should there be any discomfort, I will only be pleased to give remedy to those situations. I wish you the most happy and enjoyable sittings in this Chamber.

I should also like to thank the Senate, which has so generously allowed us to use their Chamber. I am sure all Members would like to thank them for the opportunity to use that Chamber when we were so hard pressed. I am sure that Members will have a chance to make their own feelings known. I am sure this is not the appropriate occasion for such a time, but I hope you will be given the opportunity to thank them for all that has taken place.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, July 21, 1987.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes be taken as read, and approved.

Hon. B. M. TAUT: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

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

Accounts and Statements for the months of April, May, June and July as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Housing (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 1987.

Report of the Air Transport Licensing Authority for the year 1986.

On behalf, Sir, of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1987.

The 18th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Development Bank for the year 1986-1987.

The Travel Ticket Tax (Rate of Tax) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

Mr. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Education and Culture, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Cinematograph Film Censorship (Fees and Travelling Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The Cinematograph Film Censorship (Charges) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to grant the sum of $215 000 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. 13 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I should like to ask leave of the House to do this Resolution in all of its stages today.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the following Bills were read a first time:

A Bill to amend the Barbados Port Authority Act, Cap. 285B.

A Bill to validate certain benefits enjoyed by certain enterprises which were granted otherwise than in accordance with the Fiscal Incentives Act.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Question No. 25, asked by the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown, is ready.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Replies to Question No. 33, asked by the honourable Member for Christ Church East, and Question No. 70, asked by the honourable Member for St. James North, are ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: In order to facilitate today's business, Mr. Speaker, I move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

The question that those Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.30 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Order No. 3 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. B. M. TAITT, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 No. 8

HEAD 73 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Chairman, this Resolution calls for a vote of some $750 000 for the support of CARICARGO.

In 1985, the Caribbean Development Bank approved a loan of $8 million to CARICARGO to assist in the purchase of hush kits for their Dash-8 aircraft to enable the aircraft to land in Miami, because the company had an injunction against its aircraft landing in Miami. This money was provided by the bank on condition that both Barbados and Trinidad should hold the equity in CARICARGO of $3.5 million each. Barbados' remaining contribution to that would be $750 000, and this is the money that we are now required to vote pursuant to the agreement made with the Barbados Development Bank to assist CARICARGO in carrying out its operations.

I move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Members, your speech will be impeded by the brief cases, files and so on, on the desk. It is very highly sophisticated equipment we have, and it would be a good thing if you would remove them from the desk, so that your voices would project into the Visitors' Gallery, for example.

The Leader of the Opposition will now speak.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Chairman, the Opposition will support this Resolution, and it will support it because the Opposition has always had a declared policy concerning aviation in the Caribbean,

When CARICARGO was established as a joint venture between the Governments of Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados, it was the implementation of one aspect of the Barbados Labour Party's policy on civil aviation which related particularly to our policy for the movement of goods within and beyond the Caribbean region. We foresaw very clearly the necessity to provide transportation for what, we hoped, would have been an expanding manufacturing sector. We took the decision deliberately to rationalise Barbados' transport in this field with the collapse of Carib West, and together with the Trinidad Government, which in turn collapsed their own cargo service on BWIA, we were able to establish CARICARGO, which I am now advised is performing excellently.

It had always been the intention of the Barbados Labour Party Government that other Governments in the Caribbean, particularly our neighbours in CARICOM and in the Eastern Caribbean, should have the opportunity at the appropriate time to participate in the equity of this company. I am aware of a recent invitation issued by the Government of Barbados to the Government of Venezuela to participate in the equity, and I want to enquire of the Minis-ter if he is in a position to make any proper statement on this aspect of the matter and tell us what is Government's policy for widening the ownership of CARICARGO. Has the Govern-ment now decided that the policy will be to widen the share ownership to include not only CARICOM neigh-bours, but also neighbours in the wider Latin America and the Caribbean?

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the fact that, at present, CARICARGO serves not only the CARICOM countries, but also Brazil and some of the Latin American countries. Its services are hired out to Air Brazil and Air Canada, and obviously the wider areas of operation would permit a lowering of the cost for the transportation of goods and services. However, I am anxious to know the Government's declared policy not only on the movement of goods, but I want to know what is the Government's policy on rationalising aviation in relation to passengers.

It had been the intention of the Barbados Labour Party Government to try in this area to obtain one carrier owned by all of the Governments of the Caribbean. We have done this in relation to LIAT in so far as travel within the CARICOM region is concerned, and we had been in discussion with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago about looking towards the owning of a holding company which would hold shares, or in a company looking essentially towards the movement of passengers. I want to know whether the Democratic Labour Party Government now has a policy in this field. 12.40 p.m.

I am also disturbed by the war which has gone on with the collapse of Caribbean Airways. It is obvious that British Airways has resisted very strongly British West Indian Airways being given a wider share of the European and London markets in air routes into Barbados. I wish the Government would let us know the details of any agreement which it has entered into with British Airways in this field, and I wish the assurance of the Minister that that agreement does not impede, and will not impede, British West Indian Airways getting equal rights to what British Airways has on the routes between Europe, and particularly between London and Barbados.

Barbados must depend on some carrier in which it will have more than a mere contractual say to ensure that passengers move freely from Europe into Barbados and the Caribbean. I am pretty disturbed that we may have gone merely for the fee which British Airways is paying to us and, in the process, we have lost sight of the necessity to secure for British West Indian Airways equal treatment on our air routes.

Sir, I intend to come back to this subject after the Minister has answered some of the queries. I would like him

also to let us know what fee is being paid by British Airways for having taken over Caribbean Airways routes into this island and whether any fee has been negotiated with British West Indian Airways for routes into Barbados out of the United Kingdom.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, I just wish to have recorded that I have an interest to declare in this matter, because I have been the lawyer for CARICARGO since 1984 up to.....

(Aside: I cannot hear.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is not my fault if you cannot hear. Since they cannot hear and this Resolution has to deal with purchasing, I would like to suggest that between now and next week we have a little box to put over these microphones when we are not speaking. A little mahogany box would do it nicely.

Having been the lawyer for CARICARGO, it is not right that I should take part in the debate, and I will abstain from voting as I am involved in the negotiations.

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, it would seem as though the best way to speak for the time being is to bow. I think we have to recognise that we are going to have some teething problems in the system, so if I am not heard at any point, I would be happy to repeat

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I even noticed that the honourable Member for St. George North (Hon. C. V. Walker) was having problems so we will have problems.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I take your-point.

The question of the hush kits is something which, perhaps, may have escaped the minds of Barbadians, but, in fact, it forms part of the environmental preservation policy of the United States and other countries, one which Barbados has in some measure. You will recall that, some time ago, the decision was made to make all aircraft coming into a position at the airport face the terminal building, and be backed out when they are leaving. That is part of the reduction of noise, and carrying that to its logical conclusion, the United States some time ago determined that as from a particular date, all aircraft going into the United States would have to be fitted with what came to be called hush kits. These hush kits would reduce the noise of aircraft going into the path for landing which, invariably, especially in countries like the United States, would pass over a populated area.

One of the problems for developing countries which had small fleets, like Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, and in this case CARICARGO, with one, or two, or three planes, is that the deadline given for the equipping with hush kits was very neat, and the only place an aircraft could be outfitted was in Florida itself, so that, generally speaking, these would be aircraft that would already have been built. All new aircraft, of course, had built into their system the requisite decibel reducer, if you would pardon the expression.

A

In the case of CARICARGO, there was a need, therefore, for a sudden amount of money, a sudden capitalisation for these hush kits, which, as you can see from the Resolution, were not inexpensive, and had to be done by a certain time, otherwise the aircraft would be grounded. I believe that there have been protests through the United States CAB, the authority that controls Civil Aviation in the United States, but they were quite adamant that these regulations would come into effect and would have to be met by a particular date.

Perhaps, this would give some answer to the Leader of the Opposition - the concept of a Caribbean aircraft, the concept of a regional aircraft, is one which the late Prime Minister, the late Right Honourable Member for St. John, had advocated, and he was, in fact, in the forefront with the suggestion that CARICARGO become regional. I am sure that in the course of his sojourn in this House during the last year, he did, in fact, articulate a policy which took^ account of the regional approach to airlines and the owning of airlines in the region. Indeed, he was the person, in his capacity as Minister responsible for Civil Aviation, who opened the discussions with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago on CARICARGO.

You will recall that CARICARGO was something that emanated from the concept called Carib West. Perhaps, the Barbados Labour Party would not remember, at least the present Leader of the Opposition might not remember, the attitude of the Barbados Labour Party to the concept of an air cargo company when they required that Carib West be included in the conglomerate of charters, against the then Democratic Labour Party. One does not wish necessarily to open old sores, but one needs, in the context of this Resolution and the questions posed by the Leader of the Opposition, to put the issue in perspective. 12.50 p.m. ^

Concepts such as an expansion with regional neighbours like Venezuela and other territories in this region fall within the broad policies outlined for air cargo and airlines in Barbados by the Democratic Labour Party over a substantially long period of time. I wish to remind the Leader of the Opposition that the only contention there ever was with regard to regional airlines was when the late leader, said and articulated over and over again, that it was not his intention ever to suggest that Barbados should acquire as part of any regional arrangement the outstanding and substantial debts of BWIA. That was the divide, if ever there was a divide, which goes back to the period before 1971, but was consolidated in the period 1971-76. I recall, the record is there, that this position was articulated at the Heads of Government conference in 1975 in St. Kitts when the >

whole question of the deepening and widening of CARICOM was given a tremendous impetus.

Mr. Chairman, on the determination resulting from the demise of Caribbean Airways, which was once characterised by the Barbados Labour Party in a fashion that even I would not now wish to repeat any of the famous statements by their late Prime Minister, you will recall that soon after the empire of the founder of Laker, Sir Freddie Laker, went into abeyance, substantial statements were made by the then Barbados Labour Party about the nature of the Freddie Laker airline, as Caribbean Airways was then characterised. So the Barbados Labour Party's movement from one end of the spectrum to the other on aviation policy is understandable, since the present Leader of the Opposition might not have been familiar with, or care to recall, the position which used to be taken by the Barbados Labour Party in the days not so very long ago.

On British Airways and BW1A, it is a very simple, straightforward position by the British Government of enlightened, or unenlightened, self-interest. British Airways is owned by the British Government and the British Government owns the airwaves around Britain. They, therefore, determine to a substantial degree a policy in civil aviation that is to their benefit primarily. They have demonstrated no particular interest in anybody else's development to the exclusion of their own, and when by virtue of the vacancy which came about with the demise of Caribbean Airways, when Caribbean Airways' lines became free, British West Indian Airways, which had been negotiating with the Barbados Government and with whom the Barbados Government had reached an agreement subsequent to an agreement with the British Government, attempted to get the lines, British Airways determined that they would not allow them the lines in exactly the way that they anticipated.

The reason why one cannot answer the question specifically, Sir, is that the discussions are still going on and it would be difficult to discuss some aspects of the negotiations at this point. It is the British Government, and this is the point that one has to make It is not British Airways that has the route to give, it is the British Government, but, naturally, the British Government will be advised in its policies by British Airways, and. British Airways is unlikely to advise the British Government to assist the Barbados Government or the Trinidad Government at the expense of British Airways, which, as the record shows, has just made the highest profit of any airline in the history of aviation. What is likely to happen, however, Sir, is that continuous pressure from the Governments of the Caribbean on the British Government will indicate to them the absolute necessity for Barbados to have, on a continuing, on-going basis, access from destinations which come through Britain and bring about the recognition that the routes belong to Barbados - the routes into Barbados belong to Barbados - and therefore there has to be a *quid pro quo.* Once that is clearly articulated, I believe that, in the final analysis, the arrangements will be acceptable to all and sundry.

The point has to be made, Sir, that there is no route out of London into Barbados that is unprofitable. There is no route out of New York to Barbados that is unprofitable. The juicy routes coming into this destination, Barbados, provide a substantial amount of revenue, which all of the airlines which come into this country earn. Therefore, Sir, Barbados plays a pivotal role, and can play a pivotal role, in the determination of negotiations about routes that go elsewhere, because Barbados is a hub. For that reason as well, Sir, we have to be extremely careful that we do not take a position from which we cannot negotiate, and it is for all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that we in the Government have been very particular about what we say in these delicate negotiations.

I believe that the Prime Minister, who has responsibility for Civil Aviation, will in due course make a definitive statement on the issue, but given the delicacy of the situation at the moment, it might not be advisable to reveal all the information which might be available. I believe that since the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) has declared an interest, he would know enough about these matters to understand, and the Leader of the Opposition would not wish to press merely because he might have become privy to a small bit of information which might be germane to the eventual outcome for Trinidad and Tobago. I am going to leave it at that. Suffice it to say that this Resolution is non-contentious. It is one which is going to be supported, as we have heard, and it is one to which the Government is committed.

CARICARGO has been making substantial profit, that is my understanding, and has been able to make commitments that go beyond the Caribbean. I understand that it has been able to make charter arrangements, both within the United States and outside of the United States, which have proved to be quite successful. In the circumstances, we fully expect that CARICARGO will be able to meet its obligations as outlined in this Resolution, and so Mr. Chairman, the Resolution is commended to the honourable Members of this House.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member has really meandered today, reminding me of a winding river that seems not to be able to find either its source or where it eventually dries out. I am really surprised that he has used the excuse of the delicacy of negotiations not to be more forthcoming on these matters.

The honourable Member ought to know that the Opposition's concern is certainly not about the money being voted under this Head. As I said earlier, that matter is not controversial. Our concern is that the Barbados Government

does not seem to be carrying out fully the decision taken at the July CARICOM Heads of Government Conference, when it was agreed, quite clearly, that the countries most intimately concerned with this issue of British Airways' rights into the Caribbean would have a joint approach to the British Government on the matter. 1.00 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way: I am sorry I did not take the point. The answer is that the Government did, in fact, participate in a joint representation to the British Government. I am sorry I did not answer before.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am sorry the honourable Member intervened and said so, because I am telling the honourable Member that the Barbados delegation went ahead and negotiated separately.

(Aside: Prior!)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Subsequent to the Heads of Government meeting, if the honourable Member would check his files! Subsequent to the Heads of Government meeting, the Barbados delegation, led by the Permanent Secretary with responsibility in the Prime Minister's Office for Civil Aviation, met in England with the British delegation and had separate negotiations which almost pre-empted the position of the delegations from St. Lucia, Antigua and Trinidad and Tobago.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member, would give way, Sir: I think that the honourable Member, as Attorney General, is fully aware.....

(Aside: As a former Attorney General.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: As a former Attorney-General. You say he was not an Attorney-General? You cannot say that!

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member, the former Attorney General, is fully aware, and, Sir, if there are some things which are said by certain people, you can let them pass.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it this is a point of explanation.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. The honourable Member is fully aware that no joint communication about arrangements on a particular issue will by itself remove the bilateral nature of the communication between two Governments.

The fact is that the Barbados Government has been talking with the British Government, and will continue to talk with the British Government, about Barbados' airlines. You cannot go and just talk about Barbados' airlines.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is the dichotomy which confronts the honourable Member.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You cannot go on a joint delegation to talk about Barbados' air rights. They can gg| on a delegation to talk about Barbados' air rights, and the British Government is taking Ministers' attitude as symptomatic of fact that Barbados has merely agreed at Heads of Government meeting to a position that it really does not believe in. That is the point I am making. The British Government understands that Barbados' hands are tied, because Barbados has already taken a fee for the air rights that it cannot now give up freely. That is the problem here. The honourable Member knows that the Governments of Trinidad and Tobago, St. Lucia and Antigua were very concerned that the Barbados delegation proceeded to have separate negotiations instead of coming in a joint negotiation and strengthening the hands of the CARICOM negotiators.

Members can move their heads five hundred times. Read your files and you would see it, if the honourable Member does not know. If you have not got it, you had better get a brief. Ask the Permanent Secretary what happened and find out whether the Trinidad Government has not already raised this issue and let the Government tell you about other negotiations.

(Aside: Since July.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Not at a Heads of Government meeting.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member must know that. If the honourable Member is not briefed on it, maybe if he lets me have his file, I can show him where it is written in his file, and I will let him have some access to my brief on it.

The Government of Barbados must do nothing undermine the CARICOM position on this issue. The British are well known in their aviation policy for dividing and ruling, and therefore we must have a joint approach within the negotiating hall on this issue if we are to ensure that British Airways has no more than equal rights with British West Indian Airways on this route coming out of Europe.

The honourable Member enunciated a policy on Carib West. I think he is a little bit mistaken. The only Government policy that I knew that the Democratic Labour Party had enunciated in relation to Carib West and a joint Caribbean air cargo was that enunciated by the present Minister of the Public Service, in which he said he would not give even a dollar of his money to Carib West. I recall that distinctly, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is what he said to the Duffus Commission.

r. *Aside.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am pleased now to hear from the Minister that CARICARGO is one of the paying state enterprises, and I hope that I will hear the Government come out and make it clear that it has no intention of disposing of CARICARGO, that that part of Government policy about privatising state enterprises willy-nilly does not apply to CARICARGO.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that continue to confuse is the way in which the Leader of the Opposition speaks. Hear the Leader of the Opposition - the Government of Barbados must give an undertaking that it will do nothing to undermine the joint approach to CARICOM! How can that Leader of the Opposition talk to this Government about joining in a CARICOM agreement? It is this Government that helped to form CARICOM. It is this Government that deepened CARICOM. It is this CSovemment that continued, even in Opposition, to fight for CARICOM when the Barbados Labour Party would not even have a Heads of Government meeting. Eight years went by before they had a Heads of Government meeting. Now we have him coming in here and giving people the impression that all of a sudden this Moses has discovered CARICOM. Not in here! You can do that at the branch meeting, but not in here. Do not come to me about CARICOM! Go somewhere else!

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He has to examine you. Take it easy. Cool down.)

(Aside: Man, do not listen to David.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Now, you see? The honourable Member, having told the people that I had a heart attack, ...

Asides.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is good that we are back in this Chamber. In this Chamber one does not have the constraints.

I want to make the point that civil aviation is a very delicate area. It is a question of knowing or not knowing. Airline routes are negotiated as a matter of law. Airline routes are bilateral things. They are determined between country and country. Even when you have a CARICOM Agreement, for example, and the European Economic Community and the African, Caribbean and Pacific states have joined together in a historic treaty, in the final analysis the arrangement is between each Government and each Government. The signatures are between Government and Government. The honourable Member knows that! He 'knows also that, especially in the area of air rights, the negotiations are bilateral. He is fully aware, since he says he has been briefed, that the Barbados Government has committed itself to the Trinidad Government in a series of communications. He knows that, since he says he knows what has been going on. It may very well be that he knows something that we do not know. But so far as I know, and so far as the arrangements concerning the air routes and the negotiations, the fee which we negotiated with the British Government was negotiated before the Heads of Government conference. The fee that was negotiated with Trinidad and Tobago was negotiated before the Heads of Government conference.

Asides.

1.10p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not going to bring Antigua in, because the honourable Member would say that we are drawing a red-herring. But he knows about the British Government and Antigua, and were it not for Barbados having an astute policy, we would have every British Airways flight that left London stopping at Antigua first.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things one does not do is come into this Chamber and say I did this and I did that. But I will state categorically that the Barbados Government told the British Government what the situation is in reference to British Airways in a Government to Government discussion. We told the British Government that we have no direct flights into Barbados, and there were questions to be discussed, some of them relating to planes, that had nothing to do with the routes.

I say that the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Civil Aviation has every right to talk on a continuing basis to officials of the British Government. What, obviously, I am trying to say is that every time the Permanent Secretary goes to London, or the officer responsible in British Airways responsible for Government relations comes to Barbados, we are somehow breaking some arrangement of some agreement. What the Heads of Government agreement amounted to is that in the context of the granting of routes we would seek to work together. That is a continuation of the policy that had been articulated before the Heads of Government Conference. I hope that the honourable Member will allow us to settle down.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I do not want to say half-truths.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I do not wish him to do that. If he wants to raise a legitimate question, if he wants us to have a debate on that particular thing, let us have a debate. But do not bring it in and leave it on the edge, because then you will mislead a lot of people, and that in itself will create problems. Because you cannot blame the Press if the Press hears something and writes. That is their job. You cannot

blame the Press if the Barbados Labour Party put out that there will be a devaluation and the Press writes it Who could blame the Press for that? But they know.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If you could brag that there is going to be a devaluation, you create unnecessary problems. When they were in Government, they use to accuse the Democratic Labour Party of spreading all types of malicious rumours.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: We will deal with that later on.

I hope, Sir, that I have clarified the issue to the satisfaction of the honourable Member.

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The backbencher is standing back behind there.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You want help now?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): The general tenor of the debate so far has certainly addressed areas that are properly a concern of back bench interest in parliamentary participation.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This speaks of aviation policy both in terms of carriers bringing passengers to Barbados and in terms of aircraft moving cargo in and out of Barbados and the rest of the Caribbean. It is of interest that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition should be urging the Government to pursue the policies which they initiated in respect of passenger and cargo carrying aircraft. One, Sir, has to distinguish very carefully between the conceptualisation of policy and the performance of policy. The harsh reality that we have to face is that whatever were the virtues or otherwise of a state-owned aircraft bringing passengers to Barbados, the net effect has been that after some five years of operation the taxpayers of this country were saddled with some $40 million in direct contributions under this same Head in the Estimates of Barbados, and the outstandings after the demise of Caribbean Airways will be no less than $30 million which the taxpayers will now have to pay. This will be money owed to the Barbados National Bank and some creditors around the world, and the net effect of that will be that the taxpayers of this country will have to pay the $30 million and will have to find some mechanism, either through debentures from the Barbados National Bank or otherwise, to amortise that debt over a number of years. So the cost will probably be some $70 million.

Compare and contrast what has happened since British Airways started operating - not one cent on the part of the taxpayers of this country! From the time each of those aircrafts landed at Grantley Adams Airport money started going into the Treasury by the way of fees, Departure Tax, Hotel and Restaurant Sales Tax, Corporation Tax, Income Tax, and other forms of taxation. Caribbean Airways had the opportunity for five years to perform in a like mannej* in the interest of this country, but that did not materialise.

A similar area of conceptualisation is, of course, Aero-Services, whose net worth for some time has been negative. That will continue to be a burden to the taxpayers of this country unless critical steps are taken to address the fact that here you have a corporation operating like Caribbean Airways; *de facto* bankruptcy secured only by its assets of the Crown and, ultimately, the taxpayers of this country.

In respect of CARICARGO, we are now asked to provide another $750 000 under the euphemistic title, "Purchase of Equity by Government in Commercial Ventures." The honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) will know what I am talking about, what I mean by the euphemistic term under that particular heading. There can be no question that, again conceptually, there is nothing wrong with an airline supportive of the export effort in terms^ of physical goods from the Caribbean to other destinations, and probably reducing the cost of imports as well. However, there can be no question that with the reduced level of demand for consumer and intermediate items within CARICOM over the past five years, and with all prospects that such levels of consumption will continue at low levels, whilst at the same time there are more bellies of aircraft that primarily carry passengers from Barbados and the rest of the Caribbean into Europe and into North America, then I think we are likely to find that the volume of trade available to CARICARGO, or CARICOM to the United States and other destinations, would not substantially increase. The net effect of that is that CARICARGO, as it started to do, will have to diversify its efforts in the areas to which it flies, whether it be South America, Europe or elsewhere in North America, to generate enough income to justify the kind of investment and operating costs involved^ in CARICARGO. 1.20p.m.

Let it be clearly understood that what we are really talking about here in respect of CARICARGO is probably a system-wide indebtedness of some $35 million - roughly $8 million to the Caribbean Development Bank, somewhere between $26 and $28 million to the Barbados National Bank and the remainder to the National Commercial Bank of Trinidad and Tobago. You are really in a situation in which the asset value of the two aircraft would probably have a market value of about $24 to $28 million, whilst the exposure at the moment is in the region of well over $30 million, as I have indicated, which means that either the airline has to earn a lot of money to meet its current expenditure and pay off those debts, or there has got to be further equity injection into CARICARGO. *

One of the steps of the present Administration has been to try to broaden the equity base of CARICARGO to establish a more favourable relationship between outstanding debt and equity, whilst at the same time broadening that equity base in such a way as to open other committed markets - I repeat, committed markets to CARICARGO. I believe that that is one of the reasons why the Barbados and Trinidad Governments, the joint owners of CARICARGO, would have given considerable emphasis to promoting a participating initiative with another major territory in the Caribbean which is disposed to the Caribbean and which is interested in fostering a wide range of linkages of the Caribbean. I refer specifically to Venezuela, which would not only bring the possibility of new equity, but also a bigger debt-equity ratio and, at the same time, a further committed market outside of CARICOM to CARICARGO.

I think that these things are very necessary and that they should be done with the greatest expedition. I mention this as a back bencher to point out to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that whereas we all can have concepts which might be philosophically sound, nevertheless, from time to time it is absolutely necessary to review the operations of these ventures to see what is in the best interest of this country in the short and the long term.

When I mentioned the distribution of the indebtedness of CARICARGO, it ought to have been quite evident that in the event of things not turning out the way one anticipates, Barbados certainly is seen as carrying well over $30 million of that debt. The implications, of course, for our banking system, particularly our National Bank, is that would-be funds which the bank could have loaned out would not be available to it for lending in other areas, and of course from time to time the Government would probably be called upon to support the cash situation of CARICARGO. These are the harsh financial and economic realities facing this kind of situation.

I do not wish to get into the business of routes and so on, I think these are things that can be negotiated. I think the only question that can arise really is the time frame in which these negotiations are conducted, provided that there is goodwill on all sides. As the Honourable Minister responsible for Health has pointed out, this is not a political issue really, it is a question of negotiations taking place within the time frame that is most acceptable to Barbados, and I do not think that there is any ill-will on the part of any of the negotiating parties.

It is my firm belief that whereas all kinds of rear guard actions may have to be fought in relation to these state enterprises which come under the Ministry of International Transport, the primary focus of aviation policy in 1987 must be to get more seats bringing passengers to Barbados. It costs Government nothing, you have no opportunity of losing money and you can only make money, and it would be remiss of me if I did not say that the efforts made by the former Minister of Tourism, now the Minister of Health, in trying to expand the number of seats available to Barbados through the British Air Tours operation has been of substantial benefit to the tourist sector in the past few months and will continue to be so.

Therefore, I am all in favour, and I would strongly urge as a back bencher on this occasion that there should be a de-emphasising of these areas in international transport which can bog you down in a way that is non-productive and to go all out to get more seats from Germany, France, Sweden, the western United States and the northern parts of England, and try to get more and more tourists into this country as part of our effort for diversification within the tourism sector of Barbados. When we think of diversification in our export area, we often think of new sectors, but you can have significant diversification within a particular sector, and I think that we have before us, fortunately at the time of this debate, the state of these state corporations and we have before us what can happen if you use your rights, the rights which you have in relation to routes as part of the heritage of this country, to maximise your earnings in a particular area, the tourist area, in the sports generation subsector of tourism, et cetera. 1.30 p.m.

So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my short intervention will put to rest two things, the first being the extraordinary play by the Leader of the Opposition of the successes of the policy pursued in terms of infrastructural development in respect of ownership of aircraft within the region and, particularly, by Barbados. I am not saying that theoretically it is not sound. Do not get me wrong. I am not attacking it on the grounds of theory. Maybe we need to review policies like this in the light of a more sophisticated development, or in the light of situations in which these institutions can react more rapidly to changing circumstances and can be started off on a sounder financial footing and with a better debt-equity ratio. But I do not think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition can really speak in such significant terms of his party's performance as distinct from his party's ideal in those areas.

Secondly, I hope that I have dealt with the area where, as a backbencher, I would like to see the main thrust of Government's aviation policy being redirected at this point in time.

Thank you very much.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we will have many more opportunities to see the new member on the back bench, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) in his resigned role.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Minister of Health must not mistake the backhand praise he got as any

full agreement of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central with his position on many matters.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: T take it that you are still speaking about aviation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes. I am speaking on aviation, but I really have to reply to a few points which the Honourable Minister- of Health made, before dealing with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

I think the honourable Member insinuated that he was only getting a quarter of the truth in relation to the statements made on the negotiations on the air routes. I am saying that the statement which I have made in this House is the whole truth on the matter, and I am again cautioning the Government to ensure that the Government's negotiating team, which is at present at the level of the Civil Service, should understand the clear necessity for the CARICOM Governments, in this case, the Governments of Antigua and Barbuda, St. Lucia and Barbados, to have a conjoint negotiating position and a conjoint negotiating team with the British Government.

I do not need a lecture on how one signs air services agreements. Anybody who has followed international law and international relations would know that, so the honourable Member is obviously lecturing to neophytes who may want to listen to him. I know all of that, Sir. I know with whom one negotiates.

The honourable Member must be cognisant of the fact that the British Government will not take a stand unless it satisfies the interest of British Airways. You may be negotiating with the Under-Secretary in the International Transport Division, but be assured that the weight which is being thrown at you is the weight of British Airways, and since British Airways has been privatised, the British Government in these negotiations has been at pains to point out that it will do nothing to undermine the position of British Airways. That is shown in the minutes, if the honourable member wants to know. I can tell him that.

Si*" ' 'ant to deal with this idea of scheduled services. I think uie honourable Member for St. Michael South Central mentioned this, but there is nothing new about the primary focus of the aviation policy which he is recommending for 1987. This has been the primary focus of the aviation policy of the Barbados Government under the Barbados Labour Party for a long time. That policy has been clearly enunciated on the floor of this Chamber by the past Prime Minister, Mr. Bernard St. John, and it was also clearly enunciated by the Prime Minister before him, Mr. Tom Adams.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member for St. Lucy (Hon. E. E. Greaves) would wish me to say that it has been a policy enunciated even before that, that the policy is old hat, in other words, that the honourable Member has only now discovered as a policy what has been a policy for a long time. He should have told him that when he was in the Cabinet. --

I think that one of the points which one must emphasise is that non-scheduled flights do not pose the same problems as scheduled flights. The argument with the British Government is over non-scheduled flights into Barbados. We are not arguing about Air Tours. The British Government has no difficulty with a one-shot exercise, although, let me caution the Government, the Air Tours' success is not as elaborate as they are saying. Honourable Members ought to know that both in relation to Air Tours and Thompson Tours, they have been pressing for negotiations of the charters. And it is not correct to say that not a cent of Government's money was spent. The Honourable Minister of Health may be able to tell us how much subsidy was given to Thompson Tours in Canada and find out how much money, through the Ministry of Tourism, was spent. He may be able to reply on that point.

(Aside: Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is nothing new.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He said it is nothing new, but it is not correct for the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to get up here and believe that no Government funds were used. That is the point. Do not come and boast that you were not using Government funds as part of the promotion exercise. Government funds were used, and if one is looking for accuracy, one has to be accurate in this debate.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is not now in his seat. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central made the point that there would be no money lost in investment. That is the point he was making.

If I may take this opportunity to reply, if money was given for promotion of the tours, all tour operators get money from the Board of Tourism as part of promotion. All!

Asides

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I keep saying the honourable Member is getting up speaking half-truths.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is getting up and is not even concentrating on the point at issue. He cannot even speak a quarter of the truth. That is the difficulty we are having with this honourable Member, Sir.

I want to talk about the philosophical divide that divides the Democratic Labour Party in a very serious way, and when one hears it being enunciated in relation to the balance sheet approach here, one must take it seriously, and it explains part of the reason why the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is now on the back bench,

The balance sheet approach to state enterprises, as the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris) will tell you, will have him sell the Transport Board as well. It is not every state enterprise that you can look at in this way. I heard the Honourable Minister of Health say in here today that CARICARGO is performing excellently, is making large profits, and is servicing its debts. I would expect that the Honourable Minister of Health would be better informed on this matter, since he should have the most recent brief, than a Member who has resigned from the Cabinet would be informed, who should not have access to the most recent brief, so I am taking the information from the Honourable Minister. I can only take some of his statements. Is CARICARGO, as he said, being able to service its debt, or must I believe the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that CARICARGO is not able to service its debt? 1.40p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: I do not understand the difficulty and how he has got into that kind of argument, Sir. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central did not say that CARICARGO could not service its debt. He did not suggest that CARICARGO was not making money. He was dealing with Carib West; he knows that. When he talked about Caribbean Airways he talked about $30 million. The record will show that. Why is the honourable Member doing this thing?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Minister obviously was so enamoured with the flattering remarks about his performance that he was not listening to this debate properly. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that the system of the wide indebtedness of CARICARGO was that it owed about $35 million, of which $8 million was owed to the Caribbean Development Bank and $26 million owed to the Barbados National Bank, and that on the other side its market value was $24 million. The honourable Member must follow. I have the note here. He went on to say that it has to earn a lot of money if it is to survive, and that this was a very urgent problem, and he went on to deal with a statement that knocked the bottom out of all the things you have been hearing from the Minister of Trade and Industry about how there is this expanding trade, when he said that for the forseeable future there would be a dwindling in trade and that therefore the opportunities for movement of cargo were limited and the earning capacity had to be looked at. That was the thesis here. I listened to it very carefully, therefore, what I am asking is whether the honourable Member is right. If he is right, then I want to know from the Minister concerned, does the Government agree with the continuation of CARICARGO as a state enterprise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I believe that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was on a.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could you raise your voice?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am speaking very loudly.

I believe that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to have had an injection of new life after a public meeting on Sunday night that had absolutely no effect whatsoever in either of the constituencies adjacent to each other.

The point I was trying to make is that it was an important act of foresight to recognise the debt equity ratios of Caribbean Airways and to seek to attract new equity from a third party whilst at the same time bringing with it a committed market, bearing in mind the fact that the reduced levels of consumption in CARICOM would, of course, result in a reduced amount of trade by way of imports into CARICOM. You must remember that one of the main areas of generating income was the Trinidad market, and what CARICARGO has been doing is diversifying the markets available to it, and I think that the Government has taken the initiative to seek additional equity participation which would correct and make more available the ratios which I mentioned. I think that given those factors, you will find that CARICARGO is in a better position than the previous one. So I think you are going down the wrong track really. There is no inconsistency in the two statements.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the honourable Member wants to make another speech. We are in Committee and he can speak several times rather than make a long speech. Let me tell the honourable Member that I clearly understood what he was saying. I was emphasising that the honourable Member has a strong philosophical divide on state enterprises with his former Cabinet colleagues, and I understand his divide even when his divide comes to the Transport Board. That is what I wanted to tell him.

The first thing I want to do is to clarify, for the benefit of the honourable Member, point one: the attraction of additional equity was not a new policy for the Democratic Labour Party Government. It was enunciated at the time of the setting up of CARICARGO that equity capital would be invited in from the Caribbean countries, CARICOM in the first instance, CARICOM citizens later and friendly Governments in the Caribbean, if he would read the discussions that went on between the Governments of Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados.

Secondly, the policy of looking for extra-regional markets is not a new policy concept. That policy was followed by CARICARGO prior to the change of Government in May 1986. The honourable Member knows that as well. What is the honourable Member going to pat himself on the back for and believe that Rome was made only when he was in a particular Ministry? The honourable Member

knows that the concept he had for CARICARGO was one we were working on and had brought it to the stage it has reached involved widening the equity participation, lowering the debt equity ratio and widening the routes participation, because we believe that if you have wider markets from which to move your goods, then the cost per kilo would be less and the cost of operating the cargo business would also be less for the airline. That is not new, Sir.

The honourable Member mentioned Aero Services. I want to take the opportunity to ask what is the Government's policy in relation to Aero Services. The Government has had itself in a position in which it was trying to offload Aero Services on two private enterprise operators in the Caribbean who have refused to buy Aero Services. The Honourable Minister of Health looks at me surprised. I can ask him whether he knows if Neal & Massey and the Goddard Group are still interested in buying Aero Services, and if they are not, why not. Ask the honourable Member to find out why not.

The honourable Member also should make a statement on the floor of this House as to whether the Government got the approval of the owners of the aircraft - they were buying the aircraft by hire purchase - which the Government has purported to lease with an option to sell to the Government of Guyana. The Government needs to tell us how much they are proposing to sell this aircraft for and whether or not it got approval before of all of the parties with legal rights in the aircraft before it went on and entered into an agreement to lease with an intention to sell.

The Government also must let us know in this House why it is that, for the past year, Aero Services Limited has been deducting National Insurance from its workers and not paying it in. I have heard this Government rail in here about the Transport Board not paying National Insurance. Could the honourable Member tell us why Aero Services has not paid into National Insurance the amounts of money which it had deducted? The Honourable Acting Prime Minister says he does not know whether it is so or not; he can check it out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has two minutes to wind up.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I want the honourable Member to tell us why is there such a state of dissatisfaction at the moment at Aero Services among the employees about the manner in which they are being treated. Tell us why is there such a state of dissatisfaction even to the extent that the union representing the employees is now threatening a strike of airport staff and calling out sympathetic staff at the airlines. 1.50 p.m.

Sir, I said that this Resolution began as a non-controversial one. Part of the problem is that the Government does not come and give the facts to this House. Information such as this should be made clearly available.^ I would welcome a full debate on aviation policy in this House.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member says he should initiate it. I would welcome a full debate if the Government would give the facts and figures which vary from time to time in the mind of the honourable Member for South Central about the true costs and the true losses of Caribbean Airways. I have heard him revise these figures up and down to make it appear as though there were such massive losses under the Barbados Labour Party. I would really like to see the true facts and figures given to the House so that we can have a complete debate on the Government's aviation policy.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has developed a habit of picking » up little bits and pieces of information and laying them on the floor of the House as though they were the gospel. He has now turned to CARICARGO and Caribbean Airways and matters in relation to Aero Services. I am not aware of what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the honourable Member would give way, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On what?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what point?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation, Sir.

If the honourable Member wants to know, my source of information has been employees who have gone to claim at the National Insurance Office and have been told that Aero Services has never been paying their National - Insurance.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: What employees have gone to claim? The honourable Member picks up information from the newspapers which anybody can pick up, but we all know from time to time the truth of these things escape us. I am not in a position to say that Aero Services Ltd. has made deductions from the pay packets of their employees and have refused to pay them to the National Insurance Office, if that is so. I consider it to have been done by the former Government when they made deductions from the employees at the Transport Board and did not pay them.

(Aside: Eight million dollars.)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: In excess of $8 million were deducted from the pay packets of the employees of the Transport Board and not paid in.

(Aside: Shame!)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I made my position clear and I am not going to change my position on that I am very serious about it. Any deductions that the employers make from the employees' money should be paid over.

As regards the problems at Aero Services, I believe they stem from the restructuring of Aero Services. It has resulted in the layoff of two pilots, and because of it, I assume that the employees of Aero Services feel that their employment would be threatened and have gone to their union.

Aero Services, as far as I am aware, is a non-viable operation. If employees want to go on strike in such a non-viable service, they can go on strike. I believe that there is room for negotiation. As a matter of fact, for some time now, the National Union of Public Workers was carrying on negotiations. They are well aware of this. Nothing has caught NUPW by surprise, they were involved in these discussions.

There may be some truth that two concerns which were interested in purchasing Aero Services are no longer interested. But this does not mean that the airline will not have other takers, if the Government has resolved to dispose of Aero Services Ltd.

Sir, I do not see why we have to come here at this time and give any assurances about CARICARGO. We are not going to sell CARICARGO. Why should we give assurances that we are not going to sell the Transport Board? Why should we give assurances that we are not going to sell the Barbados Water Authority and all other Government enterprises? Must we come in respect of every Government enterprise and give an assurance to satisfy the honourable Member for Christ Church West? Sir I will give the assurance to the honourable Member now that we are now going to sell the Public Buildings!

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, a lot has been said on both sides on this Resolution.

The question that Head 73 - Ministry of Finance - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to move, Sir, that you do now report progress to His Honour the Speaker and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN report progress and ask for leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now stand suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 2.45 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.00 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 NO. 9 - $135 162 HEAD 77 - CAPITAL - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS - $91 800

Hon. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Chairman, in the Capital Estimates for 1987-88 provision of $100 000 was to be made for the purchase of replacement vehicles for officials at the overseas missions. That figure has proved inadequate because additional funds are required to cover the replacement of two additional cars at the High Commission in Canada and Permanent Mission to the United Nations. We also need to supplement funds for the purchase of a car for the High Commission in Trinidad. A sum of $91 800 is needed.

The position is that the cars in Canada and at the United Nations are 1983 models and have been giving quite a lot of trouble. The cost of maintenance and repairs have been quite extensive over the years. The car at the United Nations has created some embarrassment, because it has broken down several times on the highways.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Acting Minister will be able to tell us what is the position of the Deputy High Commissioner in London. I want to know if the gentleman has been fully and properly accredited to the United Kingdom government.

Secondly, I believe there were two incidents in London affecting the car which the Deputy High Commissioner was using. The first incident related to the fact that the car was stolen, but had not been insured, and there could be no recovery of money from the insurance company. I do not

know if it was an oversight, but I hope that in the future Government would be careful to ensure that all cars are insured.

The second incident was when someone threw a brick at the car and messed it up. It seem to stem from a personal altercation between the Deputy and the brick thrower. I would like to know what is the status of those cars.

I would not worry to say anything about the Canada situation. We are supporting the Resolution because we recognise the need for the replacements.

I have a word of warning to the representative in Canada.

(Aside: Which one?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Peter Rabbit

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I just want to say that the gentleman tries his best, to behave like a national West Indian even though he may be a statutory Barbadian. His long years in Barbados have given him a feel for things Barbadian and he has empathy with Barbadians. But he must not be carried away to play that he is a Bajan, or pretend that he is a Bajan, to mix beer bottles and banquets. You do not walk around at a banquet, fully dressed, in a tuxedo ....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am worried about the direction in which we are going.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am dealing with the High Commissioner to Canada. He has to drive in a car.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think we are getting a bit personal now. I think that is stretching it a bit far. Let us get back to the debate.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Our representatives who use these cars all over the world must be careful to show a certain level of conduct, because our people who live in Canada, England and the United States expect a certain standard of conduct I am not saying that he did something dramatically offensive, but there has been unhappy comment about one occasion. A word to the wise is enough.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But I really want to hear about London and the bricks.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) raised a question about whether the Deputy High Commissioner is fully accredited.

That is not, strictly speaking, a matter under my Ministry, and I do not have all the facts. I can get them and pass them on to you later.

(Aside: Hon. P. M. GREAVES: They are not hearing you at that table.

Hon. M. A. KING: What am I supposed to do?

(Aside: Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Speak louder!)

Hon. M. A. KING: I do not see why I should be put under any greater strain, Mr. Chairman. When I was in the House previously I did not have to raise my voice beyond what I am doing now. I am not usually in the habit of shouting, and I do not think on this occasion, or at any time in this Chamber, I should have to raise my voice.

Mr. Chairman, according to the files in the High Commission, the honourable Member for St. Thomas is correct, the car which was stolen had not been insured. I believe that it was a lapse on the part of one of the officers in the High Commission and unfortunately we were not able to recover insurance from that. I believe that the High Commissioner has since taken appropriate steps to see that an incident of this kind will never happen again.

I do not know about the brick thrown at the other car.

I believe that all the cars at the London Mission are now in good working order.

The honourable Member made some reference about the way how diplomatic representatives overseas operate. I do not know whether he was making the point that the way how they drive the cars is not befitting the representatives of Barbados. I do not know anything about that, so I cannot respond to that in any meaningful way.

The question that Head 77 - Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Capital -stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 84 - MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT, WORKS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS - $43 362

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Chairman, the first phase of the Post Office development within the Oistins Physical Development Plan has been completed. The work was done on contract by M & M Construction Limited at a cost of $368 253.10. Most of this work was done and paid for in the last financial year. Subsequently, one certificate has been received from the consulting engineers certifying that work to the value of $42361.15 was done by the contractors. This certificate was received during this financial year and no provision has been made for payment of this money. Therefore, we have to supplement this Head by the amount of $43 362 in order to pay the bill, and I move that this Head stand part.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister will tell us a bit more about what further additional work is going to be done in relation to the completion of the Oistins Development Plan. I am

aware that a substantial part of the plan was accomplished between the years, I believe, 1979 and 1986. The post office will be removed from the position in which it now stands to the area between Granny's and what used to be the old Rates and Taxes house, the former residence of Mr. Jack Ashby, a former honourable Member of this House. Some work has been carried out as well at the new Rates and Taxes Division. I wonder whether, when the post office is completed, that work completes all the phase of the structural development.

It was my understanding that it had been intended that the corner where Oistins joins Pegwell be improved, possibly by building either a slipway or a full roundabout. I notice that the land has been acquired, but the area is overgrown with bush, and I wonder if the Minister could tell me what steps are going to be taken to improve that junction.

I believe that it was also contemplated that some work would have been carried out with improving the roadway through the Scarborough area, and that a continuation of the Oistins Development Plan would have seen a link road going from the Cashel area, right up the hill and linking up with Maxwell Hill. Perhaps the Minister will tell me if that is still part of the Development Plan for Oistins.

I notice that the continuation of the sidewalk programme which extended right through Oistins has been discontinued. There are certain parts of the area that are still badly in need of the expansion of sidewalks.

I am still unhappy about the condition of Oistins Hill. I recognise that the Government has done a reasonably good job in regrading Rendezvous Hill with part of the reformate and aggregate which have been used on the airport project for resurfacing at the airport. It seems to me that Oistins Hill is an extremely dangerous hill and poses problems similar to those which used to be experienced at Rendezvous, and there is a strong case for upgrading and improving that hill and using the sort of refomiate and aggregate which have been used on the Rendezvous area. I would like to think that we can cure that problem for a long time. I know that was part of the development plan of the area, and I would want the Minister to explain how far are we along in implementing the full Oistins Development Plan. 3.10p.m.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Leader of the Opposition is carrying a brief for my constituency. Last Saturday night I understand he held a supper in that area. It seems to be very difficult for him to hold a supper in his own constituency, Christ Church West.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I saw the honourable Member standing outside, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I do not think I would stand up outside anything that he would want to organise. I would have to be inside, and prominent!

The interest that he is showing in Oistins - I believe he must pass through there from time to time - is indicative that he considers Oistins to be important, but certainly not more than we consider it. Therefore, I am very pleased to announce that the first thing that happened after May 28, 1986 was that there was substantial discussion between myself and the residents of Scarborough and Oistins, in conjunction with the Ministry of Housing and Lands, about proposed developments in that area of Barbados. We held a number of meetings at the Foundation School, because it was very appropriate for community-based discussions, and we were able to look at the programme to modify Scarborough as a tenantry.

I think the Leader of the Opposition would be aware that Mr. St. John, the former Member for that constituency which I have the pleasure to represent, had proposed massive development in Oistins, including Scarborough, to the extent that he put a road in Scarborough, and at the top of the road he put a hand rail, and a step leading from Scarborough right up to Church Hill.

I am not speaking about the other developments which came out of plans of the Democratic Labour Party, and which utilised funds from the EEC, to give some kind of development called' 'rural development". I have never been totally satisfied with the spending of that money in Oistins under a concept of rural development.

I see the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) looking up. We will discuss rural development some other time.

In terms of Scarborough, the sum total of what was done was that the road was repaired, not in the best condition, and then there was a step leading from Scarborough to Church Hill, with a hand rail.

Since then we have looked at Scarborough along with the residents. We have decided to modify the plan as proposed by the Barbados Labour Party. I think we now have full agreement as to how Scarborough is going to be developed. I have the assurance of my Minister of Housing that that plan will be put into being as soon as possible.

As far as the road from Cane Vale Hill to Maxwell Road is concerned, the first thing I did was to write the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works about the Cane Vale Hill that starts around the same Scarborough area and goes to the area where Jones Junior School used to be. That road was resurfaced, and the top of the hill, which was a very dangerous area, has also been widened, because, as you are aware, there are two junior schools in that area.

I share with the Leader of the Opposition the concerns about Oistins Hill. Only this morning we were discussing that and the junction with the Rising Sun, which is now being done quite well. I am hoping that the Ministry of Transport and Works would put down clear demarcations, particularly for tourists, so that they would know the right of way. Unless that is done, you will get traffic going along the Lowlands Road "not being sure of the right of way, or traffic coming from the Rising Sun. There should have clear demarcations with some signal saying "STOP, 50 metres ahead" and so on.

The top of Oistins Hill is really a problem to me. I have to travel there every morning. If you are travelling from the Foundation School side, you depend on your hearing to determine what is coming up the hill, and the right side is blind. The traffic coming from the Cane Vale side is uncertain also, so sometimes it is only a matter of whether you will guess correctly in terms of saving your life coming around that corner.

I have contacted the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works on that matter. A considerable amount of work is going on in the area of widening and correcting dangerous corners and I have no doubt that in his reply something will be done about it.

I am not sure about the area mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition that is supposed to be overrun with bush. I believe that is the area opposite Basix where Darnley Boxill used to have a mobile canteen before he was instructed to move it by the baron of Oistins. I pass that particular area quite frequently and I cannot say that I recognise that it has been overrun. I think the National Conservation Commission has been doing quite well in that area, but I recognise that it is not being used for what it was determined. I am sure that something will be done about that.

I agree that Oistins is an area that is used very frequently by pedestrians. In addition to sidewalks, you will notice that the workers from the National Conservation Commission have been working there seriously over the last few weeks after a visit from the Minister responsible for the Environment. They are continuing their beautification, and part of that beautification is making sure that the sidewalk, especially the sidewalk to the sea, is passable.

There a;, also suggestions coming from him, in discussion with the fishermen in that area, for instance, for a shed, so that when they are preparing their nets, they will be covered from the elements. That is one of the proposals from the discussions we have had.

I have also indicated to the Minister of Transport and Works that I think it is necessary to have a pedestrian crossing somewhere in Oistins, because we have had some lives lost. I remember that in 1986, when we had our street fair, a man by the name of Mr. Pitt was given an award for being the oldest resident in Lodge Road. He could not get it the following year, because he made the mistake of trying to cross Oistins Road and, unfortunately, we lost him. So we are still concerned about the Oistins crossing, and it is-4 important that we get it some time soon.

Finally, I would like to say that in the infrastructural development of Oistins, the Democratic Labour Party has been mindful of the needs of the people who live there. We have got one of the bus shelters, and I understand another one will be coming. We now have an area at the top of the library which is being used by the youth group, Hill Tops. It is being used almost every Tuesday and Thursday night for community action.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the Democratic Labour Party has not been unmindful of the need of the people of Oistins.

We share his concern for making sure that the larger plans for Oistins are brought to fruition, but I wish to indicate to him that they are coming along piece by piece and I have no doubt that the Post Office, when completed, will fall into that scheme.

Mr. E. BOURNE (Christ Church East): Mr. Chairman, while we from upper Christ Church would like to see Oistins develop as a town, I always wondered why the last Administration would always think of putting up one big building at a place. When I look at the post office in Oistins, I feel that instead of building a new post office in Oistins, sub-post offices should be built with that money.

If you pass Oistins now and see what happens at the present post office, you would agree that it is time for sub-post offices and I feel that the baron of Oistins, as he was referred to just now, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, who is also a Christ Church man, would have seen the need for sub-post offices especially in that area, because working people from St. Patricks, the airport, my area, the Lower Rock, Lodge Road and other parts of upper Christ Church have a difficult time trying to get to Oistins - by 3 o'clock, to post letters or collect parcels, and old people, in particular, to pick up their pensions. 3.20 p.m.

If the last Administration had any kind of foresight, instead of putting up the old public baths for sale-there were three in Christ Church East; one in St. Patricks, one in St. Christopher and one in Parish Land-they would have thought about converting at least two into post offices. This w juld have relieved unemployment, Sir, because it would at least have employed four people, and I think this is what we should be looking at, since the last Administration refused to see these things. I think that instead of continuing with this post office development, having one big post office development, we should spend money in sub-post offices rather than having one post office to put us back in the same position again.

The question that Head 84 - Ministry of Transport, Works and Telecommunications - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress to His Honour the Speaker, and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN leave the Chair and ask for leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I believe that Your Honour is aware of certain technical difficulties we are suffering in here with our new system. The Hansard Reporters are finding it difficult to keep up with the proceedings of the debate.

For this reason, I am asking that the House be now suspended for 15 minutes until 3.45 p.m.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3.45 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 3.30 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987 -88, No. 10 - $1342070

Head 13 -Prime Minister's Office - $1 169 000

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, this year on November 30, our country will be celebrating 21 years as an independent country. That particular date, November 30, is, of course, a signal landmark in the history of this country, and it is fitting that some form of activity appropriate to the nature of the occasion should be implemented in this country.

Each year we mark our Independence by a series of activities, but because of the especial significance which has traditionally been attributed to the landmark of 21, additional activities are being staged this year. I believe, Sir, that when we come to the 25th year of our Independence, that would be an even more significant landmark.

The Government is proposing a series of activities which include an agricultural exhibition, a flag raising ceremony, the traditional reception to mark the occasion ?t Ilaro Court and a programme of tree planting and beautification. It is also proposed that there will be a float parade and trooping of the colours. I believe there are plans afoot for an Independence cricket match - maybe the Minister of Sports will indicate what the plans are relating to that - and a regional table tennis competition.

As far as community activities are concerned, there will be youth rallies throughout the country, and community activities are being encouraged. There will be a youth rally in which the schools will participate, and activities for senior citizens are proposed. A lecture series on topics of import to our national development will be instituted.

An Independence Arch is being constructed. There will be other cultural events, such as performances by the Peter Goss Dance Company, and Sir, there will be other activities, including the climax of NIFCA, a Pop concert and the stimulation of the creative activity in terms of patriotic songs. We hope that a large number of song writers and musicians would demonstrate their skills and talents by creating songs appropriate to the occasion, as well as poems and other creative works.

An ecumenical service is being planned and a series of other activities in the period relating to Independence.

The overseas missions, as usual, will be allocated some funds to assist any Barbadians abroad taking part in these activities, on a slightly more enhanced level than in previous years.

Altogether, we are expecting that a programme appropriate to this landmark in our national development will be embarked upon. Funds are therefore required to put this programme into place. These funds are not now available, so this House is being requested to provide supplementary provision in the sum of $1 169 000 for the purpose of implementing that programme for Independence, some of the details of which I have indicated. 3.55 p.m.

I do not think that there will be any objection to this particular measure, and I am therefore commending it to this Committee.

I beg to move that the sum of $1 169 000 stand part of the Resolution.

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

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Chairman, it is not the intention of the Opposition to be niggarly regarding

the expenditures of public funds for the celebration of our 21st Anniversary of Independence in an appropriate manner. Indeed, Sir, we are very heartened by the tone of the Prime Minister's position, particularly his view that the celebrations will be fully national in character and would allow all Barbadians to feel that Independence is theirs, in the fullest sense of the word. From that standpoint, we look forward to the celebration, and look forward, as loyal Barbadians, in participating to the fullest in the coming manhood of this country.

I would like, Sir, to look more specifically at the public finance aspects of this particular supplementary. Let the House not be mistaken, Sir, that we are being called upon this afternoon to approve a supplementary expenditure of almost $1.3 million, and we have obviously, Mr. Chairman, to discuss this matter within the context of the financial position which faces the country, certainly that financial position which has unfolded since the beginning of March, April and July, and certainly that position which is likely to unfold during the months of August and September and the rest of the year. The point of the matter, Sir, is that .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Peter, I think you are introducing an aspect of the debate which you have to be very careful about

As I can see it, and I do not want to prejudge, you are sailing very close to the wind and you are in danger of stepping outside the four corners of this debate. I will watch you very closely.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am discussing the matter of the House approving a supplementary expenditure of $1.3 million, and I really think, Sir, that it is fully proper for this Resolution to be discussed within the context of public finances. I could not imagine, Mr. Chairman, that that could be an irrelevant consideration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want you to remember that this is a supplementary estimate and the same latitude that is normally given to other types of debate is not normally given when you are discussing supplementary estimates.

I have been lenient and allowed honourable Members to stray outside what I consider to be a strict Resolution. I will not allow it from here on in any case.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, a certain member of the public delivered himself of remarks that the Shadow Minister of Finance was being silent on financial issues. Now that the Minister of Finance wants to speak on financial issues, is the Shadow Minister to be constrained?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not concerned with that I am concerned with what ought to be debated in this Resolution.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the House is this afternoon discussing, and is being asked to approve, the supplementary expenditure of $1.3 million. Between the months of April and June, this country has experienced a current account deficit of virtually $50 million, and that deficit is likely to increase given what we know about the patterns of finance in Barbados, particularly in the harsh revenue months that normally confront this country, the months of August and September.

The fact, therefore, Mr. Chairman, must be that if the financial position was bad at the end of July, by the end of September it has to be in a very parlous state. That is the first point I wish to make, that the financial position is in a fairly parlous state, not so much because of the problems of revenue, but because of a pattern which has crept into Government expenditure whereby expenditure, month-to-month, has been increasing, taking aside wage increases and the settlement of wage increases, in excess of 10 per cent per month.

There obviously, Mr. Chairman, is a problem faced by Government regarding its capacity to keep expenditures within reasonable limits. Coupled with that, and looking at the broad situation and the background against which these expenditures are to be approved by the House, we have had a situation where between May and June our reserves fell by $22 million, and have again fallen by $37 millipn between June and July.

This, Mr. Chairman, is not a happy public finance or reserve position. While, therefore, one is supportive of the need to celebrate Independence in a fitting way, one obviously has to be concerned that Government does not allow the financial position of this country to be any further eroded.

The numbers that are facing us now, Mr. Chairman, do not provide the Opposition with comfort. We now have a situation where we are borrowing very heavily to meet Government's day-to-day housekeeping, and that situation is not likely to improve. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, would be failing in my responsibility were I not to draw to the attention of the House the fact that we will be spending a lot of money on Independence celebrations this year, including the building of the arch and so on, against the background of a dramatically weakening financial position.

The larger point that I want to make is that when the Estimates of Expenditure were approved by Parliament earlier this year, we made the point that the estimate of expenditure seemed to us to have been low, that there were a number of things which obviously had not been taken into account, particularly wage increases, and that there seemed to have been instances in which Government had indulged in certain false economies, that there was a prevailing view that we could get more for less, and that many legitimate expenditures were under-estimated so that an artificially low deficit could have been shown at that time.

The whole range of supplementaries that have been brought to the House, at a record early time, confirms the

Opposition's position, held in March of this year, that the deficit as shown in the original estimates was artificially suppressed, and that we are likely to face this year, Mr. Chairman, a deficit which will put this country's financial position in great jeopardy, together with undermining our balance of payments position.

I want, Mr. Chairman, as I reflect on what we propose to do for our Independence celebration, to put that pertinent consideration before the House, because this country will have to go forward beyond its 21st birthday.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE (St Michael North East): Mr. Chairman, I rise to give support to this Resolution primarily from the background of my pride and happiness that this country, under the Democratic Labour Party, 21 year ago, became an independent nation. I have over this period of time assessed what I consider to be the progress of our country. Although we have had some backward strides during that period, I think that, in a general way, the good seems to have triumphed over the bad. 4.05 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) made a comment while sitting that the building of the Independence Arch is the first capital project in 18 months. I believe that he would have recalled that a structure similar in appearance to the Independence Arch was one of the hallmarks of the Independence celebrations in 1966.

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was not here at that time.)

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: He was not here.

It was a beautiful piece of architecture even in a temporary state. But the Government has grown accustomed to the members of the Barbados Labour Party opposing anything that looks towards the development of this country as a nation, going back 21 years. One only has to review the ten years when the Barbados Labour Party had the opportunity to conduct the affairs of this country and note the very low-keyed way that Independence celebrations were conducted. So it is not new for us, Sir, to hear them at this stage complain of what ought to be a momentous occasion in terms of the celebration of the 21st anniversary of our country's Independence.

There are some ways in which I would like to see this year beginning what I would say an institutionalised form of thanksgiving and a period of re-dedication by the people of this country for the providence of God in taking us through, year after year, successfully. I would like to see some day of national thanksgiving and a period in which the people of this country can rededicate themselves to the further development of our nation.

I am hopeful that in this programme I can see the young people of our country being made more aware, not necessarily for them to have to come to central places, to get the feeling of the importance of Independence, the importance of the programme which they would celebrate from year to year on the anniversary of the Independence of our country. I am saying that I would like to see a decentralisation of the programmes which we now look at during this celebration, because I believe very strongly that our young people are the important structure that we have in our country, and the one which we can build for the future.

I, therefore, Sir, support, this Resolution, and I encourage our Government, as we took strides 21 years ago in the face of very stiff opposition, to continue to fight for the development and for the freedom of the people of this country.

Thank you, Sir.

Applause.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON (St. John): Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an uncontroversial a topic as I could choose, at least I thought so before the speaker before the last, to make my debut in this Chamber. I think that the expenditure is worthy expenditure. I do not think that one can always look at something like the 21st anniversary of a country's independence and view it only in terms of the dollar value of the dollar that is being spent. I think we should also take the opportunity to view it as an occasion when you can inculcate other values, particularly in young people in this country, in respect of an important historical event. So I do not think that we should look at it solely in those terms. In fact, being one of those Barbadians who would not have been part of the so-called Independence movement - most of the Under 40s, as they then were, are now well over 40 .....

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am still happy to see that we have reached this milestone, and I think we should approach it from that non-controversial point of view.

The programme, particularly that portion of it has been advertised in the local Press, is fairly comprehensive. There is a lot that, apparently, will be packed into it in a short period of time, and I am particularly happy that the National Cultural Foundation has been inspired, as a result of this Government's initiative, to return to a serious celebration in the form of NIFCA, the National Independence Festival of Creative Arts. When I was a boy at school, I remember, particularly in the days of the fuel crisis, what pride we felt in leaving our homes - in those days, parents used to complain about having to drive us to various events - to go and perform at Culloden Farm and elsewhere as part of that national celebration. There are too few activities like

this that centre around the achievements of young people, particularly those at school, but also in the post-secondary period. So the resurgence of NIFCA, as anticipated, is one of the positive things that, perhaps, will come out of the 21st anniversary celebration and which will continue for sometime subsequently, I hope.

The programme has not only centered around cultural activities, for, as far as I can see, there is also going to be a series of lectures by prominent Barbadians. I think that is another positive initiative in terms of our Independence celebrations.

When you look at this expenditure, I think you also have to look at it against a background of practically nothing being done, except perhaps the Independence Parade at the Garrison and one or two other events over a period of time, perhaps eight years, on Independence Day, other than those activities that were promoted by community groups and branches of political parties. I think we are making up for a lot of that, and we should be carrying forward as the result of activities this year that kind of image of Independence.

The youth rally is an impressive feature of the programme, and also the Independence Arch, although it has been the subject of some controversy. I think that a permanent reminder like that of our Independence will be a very positive move, and that when Barbadians, young people especially, years from now, or immediately after it is finished, pass through that arch, they will have something physically to remind them of the fact that Barbados is an independent nation and whatever else that may mean to them. So I think that the efforts and the expenditure of funds on these activities are things that should be praised. 4.15 p.m.

I should also like to suggest, in view of the fact that this Parliament will be celebrating its 350th anniversary shortly, that starting from around this period as we move into the 21st anniversary celebrations and moving onward until that day comes around, we should encourage as many of our young people as possible, particularly members of fifth and sixth forms, to come into this Chamber and also to visit other important national institutions - the law courts and others - where they can see in a positive way what are the foundations of our democracy that we feel so proud about. I do not know if it would be the planners' portfolio to look after that, but it is something that I think is important.

I hope that because there are going to be national activities planned, it will not in any way derogate from the zeal with which community groups in various parts of Barbados plan their own activities at Independence time, and I hope that many of them will still consider planning those activities and ensure that the community feeling still exists at the time of Independence. In fact, I largely suspect that people in the rural districts, particularly the people in St. John whom I have the honour to represent, have been experiencing severe problems with transportation for some time, and it is critical that national events like this are carefully planned, down to the question of transporting people, of getting them to these important events so that they can share in the total national activity. I hope that transportation is one of the areas that the planners of these independence activities will look at. I think that is a critical matter.

I also hope that apart from what has been suggested in the programme as essential cultural and educational activities, we will also take the opportunity to publish, as did the Ministry of Education in 1966 a booklet on Barbados. A very impressive booklet was published at that time, I think it was called "Barbados - an Independent Nation" and it was the official Barbados Independence magazine. It was also complemented by a very outstanding publication, I think it was called "The New World", which I read some time ago and again recently. Those kinds of things go a long way towards helping people remember the kind of activity and the kind of spirit that the persons involved in the Independence movement were imbued with at that time, and also would remind us or those of you - well, I should say us - in our old age of how we planned and executed the Independence celebrations for our 21st anniversary.

My last point, Mr. Chairman, is about the lack, or what I conceive to be the lack, of promotion of the Independence celebrations. I am a bit disappointed that as we move closer to November 30, there has been an absence of promotion by the local media and the Press in respect of various kinds of national qualities, and promoting persons who have made a contribution to our national development and the institutions that have made that contribution. I think that now would be the time for those agencies to begin their promotion so that they do not clutter up with a lot 'of information simply around the Independence time, around November 30.

I should like to support the Resolution. The expenditure is on a very worthy exercise and it is something that we should in no way try to restrain ourselves from.

Thank you.

Applause.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) express his concerns about the state of the economy and public finances in relation to this debate. I have no doubt that there will be adequate time for him to engage in a full scale debate. He is probably itching for a debate on the economy, particularly in light of the fact that he had predicted that in 18 months' time this country would have been bankrupt, and the fact that we are reading in the Press - The Nation, I think the newspaper is

called - that as a result of some devaluation rumours, we were missing some $40 million per day from Barbados.

I believe that this kind of discussion is germane to the discussion about Independence, because you cannot talk about Independence in a country in the context where people who are serious about this country would want to carry on this kind of discussion that would undermine the independence of Barbados. You cannot talk about loving this country and caring for it and at the same time developing irresponsible attitudes that are going to trickle out into the wider community about the country in which you live.

I see these Independence celebrations that are coming up shortly as a matter for celebration, yes, but even more importantly, I think that we need to pause and reflect and see who we are as a people and where we have to go. The older countries of the world, the older democracies, will probably be wondering what we find significant about 21 years as an independent nation; probably, 25 years would be a more significant landmark. People talk about silver jubilees and golden anniversaries. I am not saying that you should not celebrate 21 years - there is a certain symbolic importance in that - but we have to be going further.

For instance, the Barbados Workers Union, which is my employer, their 25th anniversary coincided with our National Independence in 1966, which means that in four years' time, in 1991, we will be celebrating 50 years as an institution. Already we have set in train a plan to publish the history of the Barbados Workers Union and to institute other national activities.

I say that because I want to indicate that even though the state has final responsibility for planning programmes around national events like these, I would like to see all institutions in Barbados consider the 21st Anniversary of Independence, or the 25th, or the 50th, as significant. In other words, we do not want to see the state carrying the brunt of expenditure and coming to us and saying we want almost $1.2 million to spend on behalf of the citizens of the country. We believe that all institutions, whether they are economic, social, political or whatever - this is a plural democracy - should play their role in making sure that the whole matter of pride and industry is put to the forefront of our considerations.

Believe me, I believe that when we took that motto - Pride and Industry - 21 years ago, it was established as a very important motto, because we are a country with very sparse natural resources. The major resource happens to be the human resource, and therefore pride and industry must be vitally important, and we need to ask ourselves whether in fact we are doing the best possible to maintain those traditions, to keep them uppermost in the minds of our people. Have we kept this concept of independence in the minds of the people over the last 21 years? Was there a continuous attempt from year to year to make Independence meaningful, particularly to the young people of this country?

I am suggesting to you that there would have been no quibble at all when America was planning their Bicentennial Anniversary about the amount of money that was being spent. Americans would have understood the importance of those celebrations. I am sure that even when the United Kingdom has to celebrate events of this nature, there can be no partisan breakdown in discussions. Generally speaking, one has to understand it is how firm we believe in ourselves and in our culture that will determine the strength of our economy and other factors of national cohesion. If we believe in ourselves as a people, we will work industriously to make sure that this economy will remain on an even keel. It is when we start doubting ourselves and breaking down into too many divisions that we might try to damage something that is ours. I believe that if we do not understand that, if we do not understand that Independence in a small nation like Barbados is crucially important, especially in a country that has come through a history of cleavage and you have to find something now that is a unifying factor we are in danger of falling apart. And, certainly, this Independence, whatever racial differences we might have, whatever political differences we might have, is an occasion when we can build together, a time when we can reflect on where we have come from, where we are and where we have to go and this has ramifications for our economy, for our society, for all aspects of our national endeavour. Therefore, I am glad that this Administration sees it important to spend this kind of money on national celebrations. 4.25 p.m.

I would like to suggest that all institutions in this country understand that they have a role to play in making these celebrations meaningful and more than a massive Crop-Over jam. It has to be more than that. There has to be a serious reflection on where we are as a nation, and this must be seen as just one in a continuing series of understanding who we are.

We have celebrated the 100th Anniversary of Emancipation. That was important. Twenty-one years of Independence, 50 years of the anniversary of the 1937 disturbances, 350 years as a Parliament - these are matters to be proud of. They can have a lot of significance to young people, but only if we join together and let them understand the message that we are trying to pass on to them; that Barbados is small, but there is nothing to stop it from achieving its historic destiny if we understand that greatness does not go by the size of the country - it has a lot to do with the quality of the people, and if they understand their culture and if they are nourished and furthered by that culture.

I believe that this is a good gesture and that it is fitting and significant that the party that led this country to

Independence is the one that can plan for its 21st anniversary.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (SL Thomas): Mr. Chairman, I am going to reiterate the Opposition's position on this. The Opposition joins with the Government and the people of Barbados in celebrating 21 years of nationhood, and, as I indicated from my seat, we intend to support the activities of the 21st year of Independence as fully as we can and are allowed.

Having said that, our concern expressed through the mouth of the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur), was that it was rather strange to hear the honourable Member who last spoke praise the Democratic Labour Party for its ability to plan so well for this event and in March, when we were in here voting money for this very purpose, the same Democratic Labour Party had only planned to spend $80 000 on this. We voted $80 000 for Independence celebrations in March, and one would have thought that all of the planning would have been organised from before, and they would have had some clear indication as to how much they were going to spend. Now, suddenly, this!

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am going to read the googly and hit it like Gordon Greenidge hit Qadir out of Lords.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Today we are being asked to vote $1.1 million in addition to the $80000 that was voted. This has come .off-Budget The point that we are constrained to make is that the reason the $1.1 million was not voted earlier this year was that there was an attempt in these Estimates to depress the level of deficit that would have shown itself had it been taken into account at that time. That is all. The first point! Sleight-of-hand?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have not attributed it to any honourable Member. I asked a question, but I have not attributed it to anyone.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not believe it is a reflection on the Chair.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) were ordered by Mr. CHAIRMAN to be expunged from the record.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We are satisfied, from the position of public finances and the proper conduct of public finances, that somehow the House was dealt with in a less than candourous manner.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am in full agreement with everything that the Prime Minister had read out in terms of the details, the manner and form of the celebration, according to the Government's conception. Obviously, we ** can make suggestions for other things, but it is not the function of the Opposition to tell the Government how to run the Government, and I feel rather strongly about that. But we support the plans, the float parade, the trooping of the colours, the cricket match, the youth rally, the blending of the activities for the senior citizens with the youth, and conceptually, I have no quarrel.

There seems to be some concern on the other side on our comment about the arch. We do not criticise the Independence Arch. I was told there was one in 1966.1 was not living in Barbados at the time, so I was not aware of it. 4.35 p.m.

What we say is that the only capital project of any significance that has come out of the bosom of the Democratic Labour Party in 16 months has been the arch-.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am writing it in the Hansard, not saying it at Bridge Road.

We are not criticising the manner and form of the implementation of the arch, despite the great inconvenience that has been caused to the public. That is a matter of detail. We support the concept. We hope that the choice of persons to adorn the arch will be national and bi-partisan in character, and reflective of where we have come from and what we have achieved so far.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Tom Adams Highway is going very well. I am concerned, Sir, that the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris) saw in our comments irresponsible attitudes because, in pursuance of our constitutional freedom of speech, from , time to time. Members on this side may have made public comment about the state of the economy unfavourable to them. I am a little concerned that after 21 years of a constitution, he would wish to deny the right of the Opposition to make comment. I will remind him that in respect of the one he would call the Father of Independence, the late departed Prime Minister, I did not hear the strictures addressed to him when as Leader of the Opposition two years ago, well knowing that we were a couple of years off celebrating 21 years of Independence, he found it necessary to broadcast to the region that Barbados had the most corrupt electoral system in the world, second only to the Philippines. A corrupt system that allowed 24 of you to get in over there! They want it both ways: the right in Opposition to make these outlandish statements when the Barbados Labour Party was in power, and when we make a criticism that is constructive, that has a basis in fact in these Central Bank

statistics, you characterised us as unpatriotic. I do not agree with them, Sir.

Sir, I do not necessarily share the view that $1 million, or $500000, or whatever is too much to spend on the celebration of a national occasion like Independence, and I would say, as I have said about, for example, CBC, that you cannot measure the benefits of a national organisation like that in terms of the value that is given to the country through broadcasting. You cannot measure the benefit that the country will get, how the Barbadian spirit will be enhanced emotionally by the celebration of Independence, so we are not quarrelling with the fact ihat $1 million is going to be spent on the celebration of Independence. We are saying that there should be some balance in Government expenditure. After all, we are celebrating this event at a time when the National Assistance Board is not really performing the functions that it should perform.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Thomas, I would wish that you stick to the debate.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will come within the four walls.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The National Assistance Board has nothing at all to do with this. I would ask you to strictly confine yourself to what should be debated, and I think you know what should be debated.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I accept your strictures, but the Prime Minister did say that there would be activities for senior citizens, and so my concern.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But that cannot be tangential to what he said.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am saying that the Honourable Prime Minister said that there would be senior citizens' activities, a lecture series, an Independence Arch, Peter Goss dancers, NIFCA.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I allowed that, then the Honourable Minister of Health could well get up and start to talk about something to do with senior citizens, so let us just stick to the Resolution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The question I would like to hear the Prime Minister answer in his wind up is, what is envisaged in these senior citizens' activities? Are we going to see a situation where we will have more than 12 old people's homes repaired a month, as is happening now? That is what is happening now, with a limit of $400 on a house.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Thomas, you promised to obey the strictures of the Chair. I think you are going outside those strictures that you said you would obey.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The very last thing I would do is disobey Your Honour's ruling, but having regard to what the Honourable Prime Minister said about senior citizens' activities, I want him to condescend upon further particulars and tell me precisely what is intended. Does this mean we would see some money spent on some old people's homes in the 27 constituencies? I do not know. I am asking, Sir.

When replying, I should like the Honourable Prime Minister to tell us, since it relates to his office - Head 13, Prime Minister's Office - whether the Prime Minister's Office has got assistance from Barbadians overseas in the planning of these activities for Independence. I understand that there are two Barbadians who have done very well overseas, one lived in Canada and the other lived in England and in Australia, who are attached to the Prime Minister's Office, and I would like to know particularly what functions they are performing in the Prime Minister's Office. I was told that the gentleman who lived in Canada was directly responsible for the Independence celebrations. I do not know. I am asking the Prime Minister to explain to us whether that Barbadian, who certainly has been a success, at least a social success, in Canada, is participating.

I believe that we can establish some linkages with the Barbadian communities overseas through these personnages. The communities in Canada, England certainly and in America feel an affinity with Barbados at this time, and I would like some indication as to what is going to be done for the overseas Barbadians. How will they be involved? It is not good enough to bring them back - you cannot do it. What are we planning for them overseas? They must at this time be involved. We must be in empathy with those Barbadians who have made foreign countries their homes.

I would like to know, Sir, if the second person in the Prime Minister's Office has something to do with motivation, and if he is involved in this. How is it planned to motivate the community? 4.45 p.m.

I have been having a very difficult time in St. Thomas with these community activities. When I was away, the Ministry responsible for Community Services started to put together a team, I believe as a part of the community effort, in St. Thomas. I was not able to attend any meetings. I believe I saw a minute about the meeting before the last.

I am making some enquiries. The plans are not going as smoothly and as rapidly as perhaps they need to progress. I do not know - the Prime Minister spoke of community activity - whether the community groups are going to be given a fund out of which they have to organise. I do not know how it is going to work, so I want some details from the Prime Minister again as to the mechanics of these community activities.

The honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson) said that Independence for the last nine years, when the Labour Party was in power, was a low-keyed affair.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That may be so, but one had to decide what one was doing. Do we want an Independence celebration that is Government-led or community-led? I think that they tried to marry the two.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: There were certain traditional events that were put on by the Democratic Labour Party between 1966 and 1976, the Independence Parade, the show and the reception at Culloden Farm and then at Ilaro Court. I do not remember in the period 1971 - 1976 anything additional...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: - I am coming to NIFCA -... being done apart from the development of NIFCA. But so far as I am aware, NIFCA did not collapse under the Barbados Labour Party, it continued for a number of years. I thought that the Cultural Foundation, after that became the Foundation, shifted the emphasis elsewhere, but NIFCA was continued, and the record must reflect this, under the Barbados Labour Party, because I know my daughter won an award at NIFCA. So if we want to be objective and fair, the events that were put on by the Government to mark Independence in the period 1966 - 1976 were no different from those put on by the Labour Party during 1976 - 1986.

I would accept that there was some difference in the format of NIFCA. What I thought had happened between 1976 and 1986 was that the community was being encouraged more and more to do its own organisation for Independence. I am sure that honourable Members on both sides would have participated, through their constituency groups and so on, in organising Independence road races, competitions, dominoes and all kinds of things. I have organised them, and I am sure that Members over there would have done the same.

I am saying we have to be clear. Are we going to have a mix of government-based or government-led activities and at the same time encourage the community to do more? I think *lhat* is all that *has* been happening.

I cannot tell you if the Labour Party were in power in the 21st year if they would have celebrated this year, or whether they would have chosen 25 years. But whatever the position, it behoves each one of us as a Barbadian to be proud of what we have achieved and to participate fully, and that is the position of the Opposition. We will give total encouragement to the people whom we represent to participate in what we see to be a national event of the greatest significance.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciated the speech by my colleagues, especially the comments made by my colleague for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris), and to endorse the call which he made for us to observe the national character, the need for us to constantly reemphasise the national character of Independence and to deal with nationhood with the psyche of individuals who together make up this country.

Mr. Chairman, I wish, without any rancour, to deal with the question raised by the honourable Members about the $80 000 versus the $1.1 million. I do not share the view necessarily that it is bad budgeting, nor do I accept that there is anything fundamentally wrong with our coming at this point along the way to get an additional sum of money for our Independence celebration. It has been known in the budgetary system from time to time, when the exact amount is not known, for a sum of $1 to be put in a vote and subsequently the required amount added.

The Independence celebrations, as a function of the budget process, is something which, if you go over the years in the last 11 years, you will see that a sum of money equivalent to the $80 000 would have been included as a routine matter for the Estimates. And, Mr. Chairman, it was stated by the Democratic Labour Party, when it came to office in June, that Independence celebrations in 1986 were too far advanced for us to interfere with them, and it was stated that we would have a major celebration in 1987.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, the Minister is therefore stating that the planning started last year June. That makes it worse.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am going to ignore the point.

Certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Hon. B. M. Taitt) were ordered by Mr. CHAIRMAN to be expunged from the record. 4.55 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You cannot coin phrases in here. This is a serious Parliament.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, condolences is wrong. He needs condolences now! I do not mind giving him condolences. That is part of the problem, that I am addressing my friend. This failure on our part to concentrate on the essence of what is excellent is creating a very serious void in our local development and, therefore, it behoves

persons like us who have been catapulted, or elevated, to positions of prominence in the society to spend.....

Asides.

Laughter.

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Have you run out of words?)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, my colleague is raising a question about 'behoves'.

Seriously, I think we have to reflect from time to time at what is happening to our people. So having said that we would have a more significant celebration at age 21,1 think it is only proper that when we look at the magnitude of the celebrations that we come to Parliament and ask for sufficient funds. It is a very simple matter. There is no magic to it.

I do not believe, Sir, that the Shadow Minister of Finance, the honourable Member for St. Peter, or any of the honourable Members on that side, will take any serious issue with $1 million. In the context of the total budget of six hundred whatever million dollars it was, $1 million cannot be significant, and, therefore, they are only grandstanding when they talk about bad budgeting and bad planning. If, however, they wish to quarrel with the concept, that we should have had $700 000 rather than $80 000, let us assume that that should be so and let us move on. The point is that we now recognise that to have the kind of celebrations that this Government believes we should have, it is going to cost $1.1 million.

There are some of us who believe that this is not enough. There are a lot of people who believe that if you are going to spend a lot of money on building a building that is all right, but if you are going to spend some money on people, if you are going to spend some money on uplifting the cultural capability, and also the expression of our people, that that is too much money.

I do not believe that this will be enough money to give the kind of celebration that we should have, but then I am going to concede that we will need to spend that kind of money when we get to age 25, because, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I can find no special characteristic of 21. There is no age 21. We in Barbados have a majority of 18 and, therefore, there can be no magic about 21, but 21 is a convenient point along the way for us to recognise the passing parade. That is the point I wish to address.

Those of us who lived outside of Baibados at the time of Independence - the honourable Member for St. Thomas is in that category - have a special feeling about Independence, because Barbadians outside of Barbados had nothing to which they could hold, point to, or allude to in terms of what they were. We could say that we were from Barbados, and we understood the special feeling about having been part of this country, but I have to confess that when I was finally on the airplane coming down to Barbados for Independence celebrations and got to the part of that form which you have to fill out when you are going to land which says "Nationality", and I wrote 'Barbadian' for the first time in my life, Mr. Chairman, I could not, and I was younger then, resist the tears, the tears which the honourable Member will understand, that you could at last say with a degree of pride, knowledge and certainty that you were a Barbadian.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No! To reply to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition whether I did not feel I was a Barbadian before, the answer is "no" and the reason is very simple. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition felt he was a Barbadian, but what was that? Did he know what it was then? Perhaps he did. I can tell you that living in New York City, where as an officer for the Barbados Govern ment, I was supposed to be part of the British delegation, and where they never were able to conclude the arrange ments with the United States Government to give us the status, and where we worked in an office for Barbados for a whole year without any status at all, that being able to say that you were a Barbadian was something unusual but very real for us, and being able to carry a passport that did not say "United Kingdom and Colonies" was very real for us. It might not have been very real for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition because even until today.....

Laughter

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am not going to mar this speech by any partisan comment that could demean it in the eyes of younger people, because they might not understand the cut and thrust of this debate, and might misunderstand any comment I might make about the Leader of the Opposition. I will leave that for another occasion.

The people of St. Michael West will have no difficulty with the requirement for neighbourhood celebrations, because for the past so many years, certainly within the last ten years, they have been accustomed to footing the bill for the celebrations they have had themselves. As a matter of fact, it was extremely difficult for any of the constituencies represented by the Democratic Labour Party people to fipd any evidence whatsoever of the national outpouring of assistance in the celebration of Independence.

I well recall having gone into a particular posture to get one of the pieces of stage that is used in these street fairs, and the National Cultural Foundation, bless their heart, were able, unofficially, to allow us to "steal" two or three pieces from the Garrison when the parade was finished, so long as we had the necessary truck. You had to go up to the Garrison or Ilaro Court, you had to mount it on your own transport, and take it away without

permission. I feel that is a matter which ought to be dealt with. You cannot, on the one hand, say that you are going to have constituency or village celebrations and then not make some of the facilities available for the people in these particular areas.

So far as the Ministry of Health is concerned - this is a direct answer to. some of the queries asked by the honourable Member - there are a number of institutions, for which this Ministry has the responsibility, where shut-ins, people who are not ambulatory and indigent persons are institutionalised. We have in all of the district hospitals and other similar facilities a number of persons over 65 who would have made a substantial contribution to the growth and development of this country, and it is proposed that special arrangements be made to give those persons on that day, or during that time, some kind of special celebration. I believe that part of this vote will go to supplement the normal budget of those institutions.

When the Minister responsible for the Civil Service was planning these arrangements, one of the possibilities was that we could let those institutions spend the requisite amount of money and then subsequently supplement their votes which would not have been queried by the honourable Members on that side in that way. But it was felt - and I think properly so - that, from a budgetary point of view, what constituted Independence celebrations should be shown as Independence celebrations cost. 5.05 p.m.

Similarly, when the budget was being prepared, there would have been no indication at that time that the bridge would have been fixed as part of the arch, so another part of this $1 million would be the figures associated with the strengthening and expansion of the bridge.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think the Opposition is doing its duty when it raises the question in the way it does, but I think that at the same time, once the explanations have been given, one hopes that the Opposition would not be churlish on the matter, because they have said they support the measure. It is, therefore, only a matter of explaining why we have come for the $1.1 million as opposed to $80000.

Mr. Chairman, I will end by saying that it is my hope that at the end of the day, when we would have had these celebrations - and I allude here to the speech of the honourable Member for St. Thomas - if we can somehow re-enact and cause some stimulation of the minds of young people as to what independence must mean to us as a community, what it must mean to us as a country, it would have been worthwhile.

When one observes the United States of America, 200 years, and when one talks to even the most oppressed American when functioning outside of his or her domestic situation, that person is able to manifest a personification of the American person, if you will pardon the expression. Ugly or otherwise, the American is seen as somebody who has something.

I make no bones about the fact that except for the racist policies in regard to certain areas, and except for some other aspects of the United States, I am an admirer of the growth and development of the United States. This is one of the few countries where you can have a Bork being proposed for the Supreme Court and you can have the community mounting itself, no matter the political stripe, and see Bork as a threat to the United States and to the free world, and certainly to all black people and all minorities, including women. That kind of society is one which you can admire. There are a lot of things about the U.S. which one does not admire, but the fact is that when you look at that society, it is not difficult to say that one admires the United States.

What is important is that when I went to the United States for the first time and I was living in Brooklyn, I remember one day walking along and seeing a four year-old child sitting on a step.

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, where are we?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see your grounds, and do not interrupt

Hon. B. M. TAITT: We are talking about independence. I saw a child sitting on a step and I remember hearing that four year-old child, a black child, saying to a man who had somehow offended him, "Mister, I know my rights." I have never forgotten that, because at the age of four that child knew whether he was able to articulate them in exact terms, that he had rights of a certain kind.

There are too many people in Barbados who even today are not aware of the rights they have, or the rights they should demand. There are too many people who are prepared to recoil and to resile from their own responsibility, duty and rights as citizens of this country. I am one of those persons who continue to hope that at the end of the day, all of the people of Barbados will recognise that this Constitution, which the Democratic Labour Party was able in the face of tremendous difficulties to place on the books as the basis for our survival and our development, will be recognised by all and sundry as the basis for individual rights.

I will defend the right of everybody, including the ones on the Opposition, to be wrong. They have been wrong consistently, Sir, but we on this side will defend their right to be wrong, and that is why we are going to help them from time to time, when they are off the beaten track, to bring them back to understand the beginning of wisdom.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to have this opportunity to speak on this Resolution.

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH (St. Joseph): Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Government on the sort of Independence celebrations that they are planning, and the detail that has gone into the planning. Believe it, they even have a spot for women, and I am very happy to see that community groups, young people and old people are all involved.

The Community Development Department has been sending out its officers to help the communities plan these Independence celebrations. They are also encouraging communities to join together and to make the celebrations more meaningful.

I personally am looking forward to the day, maybe in the 25th year of our Independence, when the community will be so motivated that handouts for staging community festivals will be finished with, because I think that not yet have all the Barbadian communities recognised the importance of independence. Some of them see it as a means for having a little 'ole mas', but I am hoping that this 21st celebration will so motivate and engender a proud feeling of independence, that when we come to the 25th anniversary, the whole of Barbados will be willing to do their part.

NIFCA, as you know, started with the Democratic Labour Party, and at that stage it was national. Unfortunately, it was decentralised under the last Administration, but I am very happy to say that it is finding its feet again.

I somehow remember that some years ago we had something called CARIFESTA. I did not hear the big song and dance about it, I did not hear too many questions about it, although a lot of money was squandered, as most Barbadians know. To bring up the state of the economy when we are discussing such an important event as the national Independence celebrations, I think some people have very short memories.

As to the reference - I hope the Chairman will allow this, because it did come up - to the National Assistance Board, I do not think any member of the Opposition should ever want to call the name of that board. I would not say anything about it, but I do not see how they could ever want to bring the name up of that board.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the proceedings. I just want to say that the Community Development Officers, in spite of the fact that there is a need for a lot more staff, are trying to do a very good job in getting the communities together. They are even trying to get the communities together to help in the entertainment of the senior citizens, and I am sure that after this Independence celebration 1987, we will have a lot more spontaneous activity from the citizens, especially from those young people who grew up knowing Barbados as independent. 5.15p.m.

We will remember that day with great emotion, but to someone who was born in the late Sixties and 1970s, it is only a matter of fact - we are independent, so what? So I do hope that apart from the celebrations there will be a time for us to educate the younger ones and have them feel very proud on hearing the National Anthem, because, up to now, I do not think that a lot of people in Barbados realize what the National Anthem means. I do hope that this celebration will be a means of making more Barbadians aware of the very rich heritage which we have got and what Independence really means to us all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing a very serious issue here, and I would like to start by taking note of the very pertinent and commendable contribution made by the honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson) to this particular debate. Characteristically, he has spoken on behalf of his constituents and he has been pressing a case that the constituents of St. John should be permitted to play their full role in these 21st anniversary celebrations, and I wish to start on that particular note, because, in fact, this is the thrust of the celebrations. We wish that all communities in Barbados, not only the community in St. John, but the community of St. Peter, St. Thomas, Christ Church West, St. Michael South and all of the constituencies and communities in this country, be involved. This is very important, because, if I may turn to the contribution made by the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris), he posed the fundamental theme that Independence is a time when we should be asking where we are going, where we have come from, and I interpreted his speech to indicate that these anniversaries, particularly this one and the 25th, should be times when we should carry out a serious examination and seek serious insights into the national character, the national psyche and into the whole process of development and growth of an independent country.

The contributions of the honourable, Members for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Brathwaite) and St. Joseph (Mrs. M. Barker-Welch) tended to be along similar lines. The Member for St. Michael North East drew attention to the fact that there should be a whole Sunday set aside for giving thanks to the Divine for whatever progress we have been able to achieve in this country and to ask for guidance in terms of the future development of the country, a very worthwhile and thoughtful comment. The Member for St. Joseph referred to the role of women and, again, the need to decentralize the activities relating to Independence.

It is from that particular perspective that I wish to deal with some of the questions raised by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons). He asked, for example, if I understood him correctly, what we will be doing for the Barbadians overseas. I wish to approach the matter from a different perspective altogether, because I do

not believe that independence is a time necessarily when the emphasis and the thrust should be what the Government can do for people. I believe it is a time when the whole self-reliance of people should be permitted to come to the fore, rather than directions coming from the top, or solely from the top, in terms of a society that is so directed, so managed and so dictated to.

We wish to see Independence as a time when the very feeling for independence, the feeling for self-reliance, comes out, the feeling for developing that ability to stand on your own feet and to come up with your proposals from the several communities which make up this country. We believe that that is what independence should be, and if we are not touching those kinds of well springs, if we are not stimulating that kind of self-reliance, I believe that we will be on the wrong spiritual or psychic path.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say here what we are doing, let us say, for senior citizens, or what we are doing for people abroad. We will wait for the proposals to come and for them to get into the kinds of proposals which are acceptable to us, and which fall within the framework of what this Committee and this Assembly will approve, and then we will proceed on that basis. But I wish to make it quite clear that these are intended to be celebrations which will touch all of the community in some way or another and we will wish to see that all of the representatives, all 27, are involved in some special way in the development of programmes and activities in their several areas as well as at the national level. I note that the Opposition has indicated they are supporting these particular proposals. I think that augurs well for national unity at the time of our celebrations.

My friend, the honourable Member for St. Peter, raised specific questions. I do not have any quarrel with the kinds of questions he has posed, supported by the honourable Member for St. Thomas, although the Member for St. Thomas was a little more provocative, I must admit.

As I understand the honourable Member for St. Peter, he was indicating or cautioning that expenditures were outstripping revenue and asking for that particular situation to be observed very closely so that the public finances would not run into difficulties, but be kept on a safe and secure level. With that word of caution, I can have no quarrel. We in the Government have no quarrel if you draw attention to the fact about expenditure in relation to revenue, and also referring to the necessity to ensure that reserves are not run down, either inadvertently or as a result of policies, the consequences of which may be predictable. 5.25 p.m.

The Government is very concerned to ensure that public finances and the levels of expenditure are kept within the proper guidelines so that we would not run into any financial problems. It is a matter that we have to keep very carefully under review, and I would like to give honourable Members the assurance that we will continue to observe this situation very carefully to see that things are kept on an even balance. I can assure this Honourable House that if ^ at any time it is necessary to take any specific corrective actions, we will not hesitate to take those actions.

But let us not overstate the case. If we hear that there has been these expenditures - I am trying to find the exact words that were used - from May and June and July - I believe these are the problem months that were mentioned by the honourable Member for St. Peter indicating that expenditures were running, in his view, at a level that would call for some careful watching - let us understand the facts of the situation.

I want to refer to them, because in the past three years, for the entire fiscal years, there were deficits, not in terms of six months or three months, but on the entire Current Account for the year. For 1982-83, there was a Current Account balance of $31.9 million, for the whole year; for 1984-85, a deficit of $21.1 million on Current Account - I am not talking about the overall balance; that was $168.7 * million - in 1985-86, a deficit of $15 million, and in the last financial year a deficit of $10.5 million. So I would not like anyone to get the impression from the statistics given out by the honourable Member for St. Peter that there is some very unusual or strange kind of activity taking place in the public finances that we have not been accustomed to. In fact, when you take into account, because we are not here to give any distortion of the public finances, that there was a positive balance in the year 1983-84 of $22.4 million, overall for that five year period there has been a deficit on Current Account of some $56.1 million.

I would like to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that we are not gainsaying the need for this Government, for any Government, which is interested in the prudent management of the finances of this country to take a very careful look at trends and indications as far as expenditures are » concerned.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the central point I want to make, by way of elucidation, is that if you do a point-to-point comparison of the first three months of the last financial year to the first three months of this financial year, you have a situation where the Current Account surplus for the first three months of the financial year was about $16 million - in the black! - and you have a deficit this financial year, for the first three months, of $49 million. That is the trend to which the Opposition has alluded. We would expect that you have an overall deficit from year to year, but the size of the deficit this year is unusually large compared with the first three months of any financial year in this country. That is the point we are making.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we are going to deal with the accounting periods as they come up and as *

the hard information comes to hand. I am dealing with the annual situation.

I merely wish to clarify that particular point, because I do not wish any impression to be given that we are running a deficit now and we never ran a deficit on Current Account in the past, when the information is a matter of public record.

I believe that I have dealt generally with the matters that have been raised. As far as a day of national thanksgiving is concerned, I believe this is something which we would give careful attention to, when the nature of such a day would become a little clearer, but I think the principle of that is something that may be considered to be desirable.

Thank you.

The question that Head 13 - Prime Minister's Office - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 16- Ministry of the Public Service (C) Personnel Administration Division - $9 850.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, as far as Head 16 is concerned, this is part of the normal requests for supplementaries. The amount has proved insufficient to meet commitments. There is a shortfall of some $2 750 under Utilities and a shortfall of $7 100 needed under Supplies and Materials.

I do not propose to speak at length on these matters, but if there are any queries which may be raised, I would be prepared to answer them subject to the availability of information at this stage.

I beg to move that Head 16 - Ministry of the Public Service (C) Personnel Administration Division - stand part.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, it is 16 months now since we have had a Ministry of the Public Service and a Minister of the Public Service in the Other Place. I have had information as to the role and function of this Ministry and this person from the Honourable Prime Minister's immediate predecessor in office. I have never been satisfied by the explanation, and I really would like to hear the Prime Minister's view as to this Ministry of the Public Service and how it functions, because I believe that there has been great unhappiness in the Public Service since this Ministry has been instituted. 5.35 p.m.

The Ministry of the Public Service, has found itself dabbling into individual Ministries, intermeddling, to such an extent that it has been characterised as an octopus, having many tentacles. I believe that unless we are going to be told that this is a super Ministry hovering above all the other individual Ministries and it continues to intervene, then there has to be in the public's mind, certainly in the Opposition's mind, a clear demarcation of function and responsibility.

You would get letters from that Ministry wanting to go into commercial companies to do audits. They would want to do audits in the National Insurance Department. They would feel that they are the proper Ministry to write the Port and tell the people who are driving the ML cars down there to give them up. When their requests are not acceded to, umbrage is taken. When individuals of statutory corporations say they have contracts with a particular statutory corporation and the terms of the contracts are negotiated as between the corporation and the employees, and to that extent the Ministry of the Public Service cannot come in and intervene - unless they want to be liable for inducing a breach of contract - we have unhappiness. There has been a lot of unhappiness, particularly at the Port, but I am going to deal with that when we come to debate the Port later on.

It was confirmed to me, and I heard my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, allude to it only at the weekend, that at the last Estimates Committee - and we are signalling a warning to the new Minister of Finance - this Ministry played a role in Estimates Committee superior to that of the Minister of Finance. It took over!

(Aside: Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Hearsay, hearsay!)

(Aside: Unreliable!)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I quoted my source. I said I heard the Leader of the Opposition say that at Estimates Committee the Minister of the Public Service took over and relegated the Minister of Finance to a junior function. That can only be a recipe for disharmony. Assuming that my information is correct,...

(Aside: Hon. H. deB. Forde: It is!)

(Aside: You never believed it before.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ... then that kind of intermeddling and interference can only cause unhappiness, disquiet and embarrassment to the substantive Minister. As you know, we warned last year that there was going to be a problem in the smooth administration of the Public Service of this country with the creation of this Ministry, and the signs are clear.

I would like to hear from the Prime Minister how he sees the role and function of the Minister of the Public Service? Secondly, I wish to hear from the Prime Minister whether he is of the view that the public workers of this country are saboteurs of Government policy.

Some months ago when we were in the other room, the view was expressed that if civil servants did not toe the party political line...

(AridetWho?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:... by a back-bencher... they should be expelled.

(Aside: Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Tom said that)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Don not Tom.

We will be on a dangerous course in 1987, in our 21st year, if we are now going to espouse a philosophy that says that we no longer believe in the neutrality of the Civil Service, but we will only believe in the efficiency of the Civil Service if we are assured that the Civil Servants support the Government in power. I think we have to be careful to what extent we carry these attitudes.

I am in agreement with somebody who wrote over the weekend that we are a small society ...

(Aside: Henry Christopher?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...Henry Christopher, Peter Scott or one of the weekend columnists ...and that if we start dealing with the Civil Service on the basis of political affiliation, if we start polarising the Civil Service to the extent that we do not have any trust in the efficiency of the officers unless we can say for sure that they are political party supporters, then, Sir, we will reach the stage where Guyana has reached, or we will reach the stage where we get a ruthless Government in power which dismisses workers out of the Service - say 110 or 200, as somebody said over the weekend - and they are asked to find employment in Barbados. How are they going to find it? Go where? We do not have the opportunities here.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I read *it* I said I saw it in the paper and I am very grateful to the person who wrote it. I know who wrote it. I know the three people who wrote it. It is a mix. I saw it before it went in, too!

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: There was a little libel. It finished very abruptly. The pen had to go through it

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am being very serious. One or two arguments which I think are important were raised in that article. We do not have the kind of employment opportunities in Barbados that will allow us to victimise people on the basis of political consideration and hope that they can find employment elsewhere. That is sowing the seed of social unrest 5.45 p.m.

"What is being called for, if Government is to be successful, is a cadre of persons, civil servants, whom the Minister can rely on for informed and creative advice ..."

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am quoting, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What are you quoting from?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have a page of a speech. I was there, but I am going by the actual word. I am not going to misquote you. I am quoting the honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson). I will make it a document of the House, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want to get the procedure together.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: "...which suggested that the answer cannot be in the intrigue and sabotage that is bred by the spread of acting appointments and the stifling of creativity."

Prior to that, "we cannot continue in a situation whereby the frustrating of Government policy and the sabotage of political initiatives are the order of the day." I do not care how well dressed up it is - that is suggesting that Government workers are saboteurs who frustrate the implementation of Government policy. I do not feel so, from my experience with them.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What Tom? Tom is dead and gone. Barrow is dead and gone. I am nothing to do with them. I am talking about the order of the day now, the order of the day today. We know that in 1979, when my party was in Government, I seconded a Resolution...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am dealing with the Public Service. The Honourable Prime Minister is chiding me because this is a debate to do with supplies and materials for the Public Service. But do we want to vote money for supplies, materials, toilet paper, pencils and pens for, public servants who are saboteurs? That is the question.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Prime Minister is very generous, charitable and genuine in offering a full scale debate on the Civil Service. I will accept that We will look at it from many angles then.

With that assurance, I will wind up by saying that when in 1979 I seconded a Resolution for a Commission to look into the Civil Service, and Members on the other side then supported it, we were concerned about procedures and modernising the Civil Service, but when it was ultimately debated, not one of us was prepared to talk of sabotage. I am sure of that. You can search the records of the House.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The language of the honourable Member for St. John was too strong. He probably did not mean sabotage.

(Aside: Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He meant every word of it!)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have the page, Sir. Mr.

CHAIRMAN: I clarified that very early. *Asides.*

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If he is right that there are saboteurs, then it is a reflection on this Ministry that we are debating, because, in essence, what he is saying is that we had a Ministry in the Public Service for 17 months, a Ministry which has presided over, and condoned, the operation of civil servants as saboteurs for 17 months, and it is now the order of the day. It is, therefore, implied criticism of the Ministry of the Public Service, carried to its logical conclusion.

But we will have a full scale debate, Sir, and therefore I reserve no further comment until that time, Sir.

Thank you very much.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON (St. John): I should like to make a few remarks in reply to some of the remarks that were made by the honourable Member for St. Thomas. I intended to deal with it anyway today, so he is not setting any pace for me. Perhaps he would have been unduly concerned that the members of his *alma mater* may have asked me to address them on that occasion when he probably would have preferred to go and tell them the many rumours he has heard in the past few weeks, or who told him something last night, or the usual scenario that we have to endure.

I thought that when I spoke there, and he was present on that particular occasion, which was September 26,1 said a number of things. I did not limit my remarks to the Civil Service, but I think that things were said which are relevant to the matter which is before us today.

The particular remarks I made then have been deemed a declaration of war on the Civil Service. I have no apologies for the entire context of the remarks I made, nor for the particular section which has been bandied around in the Press and has now been made available to this Honourable House and to whoever else wish to consider the remarks that I made. I will only seek on this occasion to set the record straight somewhat.

I am surprised that the honourable Member, being present on that occasion, who heard what I said, could take that road. I did not speak about matters exclusively on the Civil Service, but I spoke about politicians and growing polarisation. I spoke about a number of other related matters, because I think those are matters that concern the young people of this country who are facing 21 years of Independence, and, to some extent, perhaps an uncertain future ahead of them. I was concerned then, as I am now, that in a very real sense there has been little reform of the Public Service since Independence, and I am concerned that this Honourable House, as a lawmaking institution, and perhaps political parties, have not spent enough time in discussing reform of the Public Service and areas where there can be comprehensive improvement.

Much of what I said has already been quoted, and I have no problem making the rest a document of the House. I spoke about polarisation, about the abrogation of principles of administrative law, that is in the Civil Service proper, and the stifling of creativity, because the origin of ideas very often is more important to people than the content of those ideas and their importance in terms of philosophy or policy. I said all of that. I was not looking at any particular Government, because I suspect.that these, in some ways, may be features of all Governments that practise the Westminster model.

I went on to say that I, as a new Member of Parliament, sometimes find it difficult to conform with the practice that began subsequent to 1976 in this country where degrees and qualifications for young persons are not as important as having a letter from a politician and carrying that letter to a civil servant, a Personnel Officer, or a statutory corporation. A letter from me or from any sitting Member in this House seems to carry more weight in this country today than "O" levels, "A" levels or university degree. That is difficult for those young persons who are forming assessments of their future in this country, it is difficult for civil servants, because obviously they have been given directives that this is how they should proceed: "If you do not have a letter from a member of the ruling party, do not come to me. I can speed up the process if you produce a letter." It makes it difficult for a young politician like myself, and others, I suspect, in here, to have to continue in that state of affairs, and it is something that has to be addressed. 5.55 p.m.

You would not believe that I said that. You would not believe that I sympathised with the position of some civil servants. You would only believe from what was said, and the reaction to it, that I was only interested in saying that civil servants are saboteurs of Government policy.

I also asked the question, what does all that say about producing an egalitarian society - the fact that if you do not walk around with a letter from a politician in your hand, you cannot secure a job in Government? So do away with the "O" levels and do away with the "A" levels and do away with the University degrees. That is what this country came to, and there are still practices like that going on, and to survive, it is often necessary for a politician, even for

me, to do that kind of thing, and I worry about it on a daily basis.

I said thai after independence I found there would have been adjustments to that kind of policy, and I will make this full speech a document of the House.

The most controversial part of the speech, naturally, would be when I said'that we cannot afford a Civil Service that is uncreative and unproductive. That is descriptive, there is nothing dramatic in that. People have said that before, probably in here, probably all over the world. Worse still, we cannot continue in a situation where the frustration of Government policy and the sabotage of political initiative are the order of the day.

The honourable Member has said that that word is a strong word, but I suspect that I was sitting in the Public Gallery of this Chamber and heard, or read, accusations about the civil servants - and a person who responded to what I said, a person who is a leader in the trade union movement - that accusations were made about particular civil servants sabotaging the Barbados Labour Party Government during CARIFESTA. I heard that with my ears. But now it has never been said before. This is the first time in the history of Barbados that anybody has said that civil servants have sabotaged Government policy.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir: There was an allegation that somebody in the Barbados Labour Party, when he was in here in the Gallery, talked of civil servants sabotaging CARIFESTA. That is not so. They may have talked about the squandering of money, not of sabotaging. I am challenging him to produce any evidence where any member of the Barbados Labour Party accused any civil servant of sabotaging Government policy, in relation to CARIFESTA. They said that money was squandered, but not sabotage.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I was in here, I heard Louis Tull, the honourable Member for St. George South say in here, when the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and I accused him of spending the money badly, say that a civil servant had sabotaged the thing. I am telling you he said so. Say you did not hear.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has made his point.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member for St. Thomas wishes to credit me with making history again, I have no problem with that, so if he wants to say that I am the first person, in addition to other firsts, to say that civil servants sabotage Government policy, well that is his prerogative. I am saying that I have heard it before, and that is why I am a little shocked that people would be concerned about what they conceive to be the tenor of my remarks.

The same article that the honourable Member said that he vetted prior to its publication, said on Sunday words to the effect that senior civil servants in this country used to sit on Sunday mornings and plan against the Barbados Labour Party. It was the third or fourth paragraph. It was vetted by the honourable Member for St. Thomas, but now he has difficulty with what I have said.

What was also vetted by him as being probably an accuracy, is that I am a member of the CBC Board, which is also inaccurate. From beginning to end the article is inaccurate.

The fact that the honourable Member was present when I made the speech is what surprised me in respect of what he had to say, and trying to throw the blame for what I have said from me and to ask the Right Honourable Prime Minister to respond. That is not necessary. I can defend my position in here, outside or anywhere else. I have no difficulty with that.

Applause.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I did not speak on behalf of the Prime Minister, neither on behalf of any Minister I have spoken to, nor on behalf of the back bench. I have spoken from my own casual and active participation in the same CARIFESTA exercise, I may add, with the civil servants in this country.

He did not even pay much attention to my last remark, which came out in the Press, too, which is, "We must recognise that there are tasks which are to be performed in Government that demand a high degree of specialised training, and there must be greater discernment of these needs and a consequential response by moving away from the conception of a civil servant as a person who minimises risks, avoids provocation and achieves compromises*' That is okay for Westminster, but that cannot be the best solution for a small country like Barbados. That is all I was trying to say. The young people understood that, I am certain.

But it seems as though there are other forces in this society which are always resisting change, and more than anything else, resent tremendously the feelings of the mass of people out there. That is why every day you read an editorial in this country, it demonstrates some kind of resentment for the policies that this Government pursues, because the editorials cannot understand, nor the newspapers, nor a number of other people in this country, that the decision that the people made on May 28, 1986 was a conscious and deliberate decision made by thousands of people. There is a lot of resentment for those kinds of positions, so I am not surprised that the response would be the kind of response that was made.

I said: ' 'How can you effectively advise a Minister on a sensitive matter if your aims are so general? The remarkable irony is that many Ministers...." and Mr. Harper

did not bother himself with this remark - "...will have even less an idea of what is going on than the civil servant." That is often true.

I said, "If our Government is to be successful, there must be a cadre...." I did not say a small cadre, unless there is some new meaning to the word "cadre", unless that means small all of a sudden. And everybody is saying that the word "cadre" means a group of yardfowls that you must have around you. That is not what I said, I said a cadre, and I have in parenthesis - civil servants - the entire body, not a small group or a group that you bring in - "whom a Minister can rely on for informed and creative advice, persons who will tell him what he needs to know, understanding at the same time that the decision is his. After all, he has to take responsibility for it in the final analysis".

The most important remark which I thought I had made in that particular speech is: "The answer cannot be in the intrigue and sabotage that is bred by the spread of acting appointments and the stifling of creativity." 6.05 p.m.

Those are the kinds of things that the civil servants themselves complained about under the Barbados Labour Party, the use of the mechanism of the acting appointments to drive fear into the hearts and minds of civil servants. But they did not pay much attention to my defence of their concern. Oh, no! They picked up on the question of sabotage!

I have no apologies for all that I said on both sides, both in my own right and on my own behalf, and on behalf of the civil servants, those who were careful enough to read what I said and understood the meaning of each of the words I used, and also those, for that matter, who took an opposite position.

I have no quarrel with Mr. Harper. He represents his constituency, the civil servants, as strongly as I would represent what I consider to be mine. It is unfortunate that in this country anybody can go anywhere and say anything about a politician, the most wicked things, we even say them about each other, but as soon as you attack any of the institutions in this country, people start to say you are getting like Burnham. I should not even say "attack". As soon as I question, as soon as I ask about reform, all of a sudden I am being asked to demonstrate my qualifications to make such a remark: He is only an ordinary Member of Parliament, he is not a Minister, he is not a Parliamentary Secretary, he is not a Prime Minister, so on what basis he has empirical evidence to make that remark?

That kind of thing can only get you annoyed, because it means that an average taxpayer in this country who has gone no further than primary school, as far as the person who made that remark believes, has no right to say anything about the Civil Service in this country. The only people who can say anything about civil servants are the civil servants. That is the only way I can interpret the position of the President of the National Union of Public Workers on what I said, that I am not qualified in any way to criticise the Civil Servants.

I agree that the Barbados Civil Service is second to none in the Caribbean. He said it and I agree with that. But is that the only standard by which we are to judge a Civil Service? I lived in Trinidad for two years and I know what it is to go to the Trinidad Central Bank for foreign exchange approval, far less to go into the Civil Service for any kind of document, and I cannot afford to judge the standards that I require as a taxpayer of this country against the standards that exist in St. Lucia, St. Vincent or any other Caribbean island. If we are going to go around saying that we are the best in the Caribbean, we have the best transport system in the Caribbean as we heard under the Barbados Labour Party, we have the best of this, that and the other in the Caribbean, if that is the yardstick that we are going to use, then we will not try at any time to achieve excellence, to reform or make any positive changes for the development of this country, nor, for that matter, will we remain leaders, because Barbados would be satisfied that once our performance is on par with any other Caribbean territory, we would have achieved what we should achieve. We would no longer be looked at as a country as a leading force in regional development, with stability and all the other things for which we are acclaimed.

I agree with the National Union of Public Workers about politicians harassing civil servants. That is nothing new, we have heard it before, and, to sonic extent, there is justification for what was said. I agree with him that Government should consult with the Public Service with respect to reforms in the Public Service. It would be wicked if a Government proceeded to effect changes without consulting the Public Service effectively on what kind of changes should take place.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON; I still have to say what I have to say, because somebody else will tell you something in your ears tomorrow and you will come back next week and say that I really did not say what I said here. I was concerned more than anything else about rny qualifications to make the remarks and the evidence on which I based those remarks.

The last thing I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, is that the suggestion by the President of the National Union of Public Workers that I provide him with information of any complaints about civil servants is a no-no. I am not providing him or, as far as I am concerned, any President of the National Union of Public Workers with any complaints about the civil servants. He is telling us in one breath that there are procedures but then he is requiring me to send information to him about abuses in respect to

members of the Public Service. That cannot be fair. If you like the system as it is, let us stick with that system. If you prefer to be cursed on "Guttaperk" every day or on "Tell It Like It Is", if the civil servants are happy about the feelings that the average person out there feels about some aspects of the operation of the Civil Service, let it continue. If that is the approach we are going to use, let us not change the system at all, and let it continue and plod along, and in a time to come there will be another CARIFESTA and you will hear more about sabotage, and there will be other like events for which civil servants will, of necessity, if they continue like they did, have to take the blame.

Thank you.

Applause.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Chairman, I was sorry I was not in here when the honourable Member made his first full speech other than a "Thank You" speech. I believe he made it on an earlier motion, when the Prime Minister was asking for supplies for the Independence celebration. I would then have traditionally applauded him, as it is customary to do for new Members coming into the House for making a maiden speech. I am sure my colleagues, in keeping with the best traditions of this House and Westminster, applauded the Member. But, certainly, if this was the speech which he just made as his maiden speech, I would have found it very difficult indeed to follow the traditional convention and applaud him. I have never heard someone protest so much. Obviously, the honourable Member is smarting under the strictures not only of the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D.A. C. Simmons), but also those of the President of the National Union of Public Workers. Far be it for me to arbitrate between the National Union of Public Workers and the honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson). Certainly, the president of that union and the honourable Member should settle their differences on this score in the forum of the Democratic Labour Party, a forum to which they both belong.

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): On a point of order: The National Union of Public Workers is an institution in Barbados, and I do not think it is fair for the Leader of the Opposition to be casting aspersions on the leadership of that organisation, suggesting that the National Union of Public Workers' head spends time in the Democratic Labour Party.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No. You did not say he belonged. You are suggesting that he is like O'Brien Trotman, and nobody is like O'Brien Trotman!

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member obviously just wants to intervene to throw me off my feet. I did not realise that saying belonging to the Democratic Labour Party is to cast aspersions. 6.15 p.m.

I revert to what I am saying. The honourable Member for St. John could settle his row with the President of the National Union of Public Workers at the next meeting of the General Council, summon him there and deal with the problem there.

What is the complaint, as I understand it from the honourable Member for St. Thomas? The honourable Member for St. Thomas wanted the Prime Minister to respond as to whether the Prime Minister has any evidence that the order of the day today in the Public Service is that Government policy and political initiatives, are being frustrated and sabotaged by persons in the Civil Service. He wanted to know that, and what we want to know, whenever this full scale debate comes down, is if the Prime Minister, or whoever is going to make the allegations, in accordance with the Standing' Orders of this Honourable House, is going to give us further and better particulars of these efforts. Name the civil servants and name the occasions!

The Public Service has its own rules and regulations. There is a mechanism within the Public Service that if the people are frustrating Government's actions, steps can be taken and taken properly. Honourable Members know this. If the Ministers do not know how to complain properly within the rules and regulations of the Public Service Commission, giving such notice as demanded by proper industrial relations to the National Union of Public Workers, then, of course, that is their business. What we are saying is that if this is true, then let us have the particulars. Tell us why the procedures are not working.

The other matter, to which, of course, the honourable Member for St. Thomas was asking for an answer, was the allegation that there was a lack of efficiency, squandering of scarce resources and a callous attitude to the public, that, today, these are all the order of the day in the Civil Service. However much the honourable Member for St. John may try to minimise what he has said, he has made some very serious allegations against the Public Service of the country. I think that as persons in public life we are entitled and we should take him seriously in his allegations and ask him, therefore, to bring the particulars, not to satisfy the President of the National Union of Public Workers, but, of course, to satisfy the public of Barbados that his strictures and allegations are correct. If they are not correct, then he must withdraw them. He must also do a bit more - if his strictures and allegations are correct, let us know in this House what are the corrective measures that the Government is going to take.

Sir, every evil, everything, that is wrong in this society, is going to be traced to 1976 and from 1976 - 1986.1 have

been in this House and heard his predecessor in the constituency of St. John castigate civil servants and refer to them as "an army of occupation." Honourable Members, including the Honourable Prime Minister, are going to get a little bit excited on this measure. I have seen the positions not only prior to 1976 but subsequent to 1986, where civil servants complained of the intervention of Ministers in their affairs and not following the correct procedure. Ask the Honourable Minister of Community Services. He knows! Do not worry to challenge me on this. I can tell the honourable Member of instances, and I can tell him how to deal with civil servants if he does not know.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I can tell you what the retired P.S. of Health said about a former Minister of Health, O'Brien Trotman, if he wants to hear who interfered. He might not have been here, but he can read the newspaper.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I also hear now of civil servants complaining of your interfering with them in their work. The honourable Member can get up as many times as he likes.

I have been a Minister of Government, and I do not believe that there is one civil servant who has worked with me in the Ministry who can say that at any stage I have taken objection to them because of their political affiliations or feelings. I have worked with civil servants, including the honourable Member, whom I knew were supporters of the Democratic Labour Party. That has never prevented me from taking their advice and their opinions.

This is a small community. I have friends who are members of the Democratic Labour Party. I have relatives who are members of the Democratic Labour Party. I know civil servants who are members of the Democratic Labour Party, including the present Minister of the Public Service, who was a leading member of the Democratic Labour Party when he was holding a senior public office.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: They cannot put in the record that the present Minister responsible for the Public Service was any such thing. Let the record show that he became a member of the Democratic Labour Party after he retired from the Public Service. The record of the Democratic Labour Party does not show his name, or anything approximate to it, as a member before he retired from the Public Service.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: We would only accept the word of the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Hon. B. M. Taitt) if he would bring the records of the Democratic Labour Party. I do not believe him!

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: In the same way that the honourable Member has said that when he speaks on the floor of this House he wants us to accept it, as a Member of this House, who has been for some considerable time President of the Democratic Labour Party, I am stating categorically on the floor of this House that no Harcourt Lewis was a member. We had a Harcourt Miller, but we had no Harcourt Lewis, and it is not fair, and I cannot sit in here and allow that, I state that categorically, Sir, and I lay my reputation on the floor of this House. Whatever he is doing, he must do it well, but he cannot state that we had a big member .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is made.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member was a member when he was Consul General for Barbados in New York. He was as much a member of the Democratic Labour Party when the honourable Member was a member of the Democratic Labour Party and Consul General.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: The record must be clear. I joined the Democratic Labour Party while I still held office as Consul General in New York, which is constitutionally proper, but I took no active part, and when I did take an active part, I resigned as Consul General. That is a fact, and I am saying that Harcourt Lewis did not fall into that category.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is most anxious to get up and give the Minister of the Public Service a clean bill of health, that he was so above board when he was in the Civil Service, that he never had partisan connections in any way.

The honourable Member understands the position quite clearly, because this is an issue, if you have been following the debates in North America, particularly in Canada, recently, about which you will see that the public servants went to the court to get a ruling on their rights in relation to canvassing and working with political parties. It is a burning question.

In most jurisdictions which do not follow the Westminster system, when there is a change of Government everybody packs up and goes and you bring in your group. Here, both political parties must from time to time be under increasing pressure from their political associates and members to treat the Civil Service as though it is the preserve of a particular political party. That is why I am going to welcome this debate whenever it comes, because we need to clarify a few things. There is also the danger that misguided people in both political parties can assume that as soon as you are a Minister, you have to get rid of somebody who does not belong to your political party. 6.25 p.m.

The honourable Members on the other side have the habit of throwing every possible conceivable ill at the Barbados Labour Party, and particularly to say that those ills in the society occurred since 1976. I have been in this House long enough with the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Hon. L. E. Sandiford) and the honourable

Member for St. Michael North (Hon. P. M. Greaves), who are perhaps two of the longest serving honourable Members - in fact, I am the longest serving Member in the House - and I have heard a Minister of the Democratic Labour Party Government, that is why I said you get it on both sides of the House, then the Honourable Joy Edwards, make no bones about how he conceived of political patronage when his party is in office. That is pre-1976.1 have heard it post - 1976 in the House.

My stand on the issue has always been quite clear -it is in the record of Hansard - no matter what Douglas Leopold Phillips may write on Sunday. I have always conceived that in small societies the Civil Service cannot be partisan. It cannot be, because if we are going to get a partisan Civil Service, we are going to get to the next step, that whenever there is a change in Government, we are going to move people out. One of the reasons why I objected in this House to treatment of Mrs. Shirley King was on that very basis.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the Honourable Member who keeps heckling me at that corner does not keep quiet, I will mention current cases.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member for St. Michael West wants to tear off my clothes in here, Sir.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am sorry, Sir, he wants to take my coat.

(Aside: I did not know you were so!)

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What I want to let the honourable Member know is that one must be careful, no matter how experienced, or, for that matter, how neophyte, one might be in politics, that in making general allegations in the system of Government which we have here, we are not in danger of destroying our institutions. I have never been a person to resist change, so the honourable Member does not have to make a plea for change to some of us, certainly not to me. I have never been one to say that there are not cases in almost every respect of our governmental system for reformative action. But we also must appreciate that we have built up institutions that have performed well, including the Civil Service.

I would be stupid to believe that I am satisfied with every aspect of the operation of the Civil Service of Barbados. I can cite, for instance, that when I was a Minister, a letter might take a long time to come into the Ministry.

That is one of the areas that we could look at. But I think there is a great danger when we are going to characterise the Civil Service today as a Civil Service in which there is sabotage being the order of the day. I do not .4 believe it. I believe that this Government has more partisanship in the Civil Service than we had when we were in the Government.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not saying that they are appointing their people. I believe a larger proportion of the top civil servants are supporters of the Democratic Labour Party than supporters of the Barbados Labour Party.

(Aside: Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: The whole of Barbados!)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member from St. Philip South (Hon. H. A. Blackman) has not been in here long enough either to see that shifts in political fortunes are only matters of time.

I am saying that despite the support of the DLP top civil servants, the Barbados Labour Party was able to run a Government for ten years.

(Aside: Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: In fear!)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member says "in fear."

(Aside: Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Talk. I want you to talk.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the honourable Member keeps talking, he will really provoke me into dealing with those that he is trying to drive fear in their minds now.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: We were able to do that and we were able to deal with the problem, and in a position where certainly the Barbados Workers Union, which represents a large segment of the Civil Service, was not pro the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have another two minutes.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: There were proper industrial relations. Whenever I have disagreed with the attitude of the National Union of Public Workers, I have made the point that they must understand that the interest of their members is not coterminous always with the political partisanship that the union leadership takes. But I have never got to the stage of believing, and I do not believe, that political initiatives are being sabotaged and that that is the order of the day.

I said that I would welcome the debate when the Prime Minister brings it. I think that the political parties are going to have to get it quite straight that we must have a philosophy and an understanding about the Civil Service, *

the role which it plays and how we are going to approach the rights of civil servants in a society in which two main political parties exchange office from time to time. I put it as neutral as that. Certainly, when we take over the Government constitutionally, when the time comes ....

(Aside: Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: You would not be there.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ....we will expect the Civil Service to perform properly and to look at the fact that they have a duty to the public of Barbados, not to the Democratic Labour Party, nor to the Barbados Labour Party, for that matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time for this Resolution expires at a quarter to seven. The Prime Minister can wind up.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not, therefore, going to speak very long.

I think that the record should show that the honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, has conveniently forgotten that his Prime Minister said of his civil servants when he was the Attorney-General, that is to say, civil servants in the Attorney-General's Office, that they were "behaving like crabs in a barrel". He did not say it, he wrote it. That same Prime Minister said of a quasi-public officer that he was "worse than a hurricane". That same Prime Minister used to vilify civil servants to their face in public meetings, that is, meetings of more than two persons, in Government Headquarters on an almost continuous daily basis. That same Prime Minister used to talk about civil servants' mothers political affiliation. That same Prime Minister used to vilify Horatio Cooke on an ongoing basis. That same Prime Minister, with whom the Attorney General of the day sat in Cabinet, used to take senior civil servants and send them, with the aiding and abetting of the Chief Civil Service executioner, Lord Nigel .....

Laughter.

(Aside: Of Barrow!)

: Of "Idle Hall"!)

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT:. ...on special leave. That Minister gave senior civil servants, including the President of the National Union of Public Workers, a room, a chair and a desk .....

(Asides: Peter Simmons)

6.35 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I will not allude to that But the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) can assist me, if we had the time, in articulating the areas of abuse of Public Officers by the Prime Minister of the day, and the Attorney General by inference, because you did not resign and go in the back seat.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member cannot accuse me of abusing the civil servants, and I am asking him to withdraw that statement. I have never abused any civil servants of any kind.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I will withdraw that, because the honourable Member almost cried on the floor of the House in defense of his position during the Duffus considerations. I believe he was sticking to a principle and, therefore, I will withdraw that remark, because I think that he is one of the persons who would not abuse, and did not agree with his Prime Minister. But what I cannot understand is why he cannot say so now. He could not say it then, but he can say so now, because the man is dead.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He can say he did not agree. Do not choose the Democratic Labour Party. We have had one year so far, and I challenge the honourable Member to point to one single civil servant who could say that we have dealt with him or her, especially her, what the Barbados Labour Party Ministers did to senior civil servants.

(Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Have you heard about Mrs. Roett?)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: What foolishness are you going to get into now? The "her" was debated in here, and you know that, too. What are you going to go and draw red herrings across the trail for? You know that the Barbados Labour Party has written time and time again that we have unfaired somebody. It was debated in here.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, you know that, too. You cannot draw me out. You know that this brain is a little better than that.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is that the Leader of the Opposition is sending out the, wrong signals to the population. The honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson), in his speech that was thought out and very well articulated, raised questions about the Civil Service, questions which the former Member for Christ Church East, Johnny Cheltenham, attempted to debate in here. But the Barbados Labour Party, led by the then Prime Minister, would not allow the debate that he is now calling for. Time does not permit me to go into detail.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Precisely, so the honourable Member for Christ Church West must be extremely careful when he comes to debate the Civil Service. He must be very careful not to mislead. We on this side have the same vested interest in a Civil Service of integrity that he must have. We on this side are never going to use the opportunity of office to vilify civil servants in public, because it has never been our style, and never will be. But he cannot appear to

be suggesting that the honourable Member for St. John is out of order, when making a public speech to young people, to raise provocative questions concerning the integrity of the civil service.

I look forward to the day when we can discuss this in a more dispassionate way, because the kinds of signals which we send out from both sides of the House will be germane to rooting out once and for all the evil which will force our political supporters to require of us less than honourable behaviour as we gaze upon people who choose deliberately, constitutionally, and correctly, another political point of view. I can say for the honourable Members on this side, but I will speak for myself and say that I will never be party to any concept or policy which will, without more, vilify or crucify an individual in this country for holding a particular political view.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TATTT: The ten that went home included a man called Aboab who was hired, according to the report...

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: There is a Civil Establishment Order coming and we will discuss that in detail, because you are telling lies about the National Assistance Board. You have to see the report.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir: I challenge him. I have written to the National Assistance Board claiming the people's severance pay and you would not pay them. I am not telling any lies. Do you want me to call the names?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Oliver Jackman was the Chairman of the Commission. The Commission said some things which you will hear about in due course.

Do not blame the Ministers. There is no Minister over here who chased home anybody. The Ministers over here are unlike O'Brien Trotman. We do not hire or fire.

Do you remember Douglas Leopold Phillips? Do you remember that a Minister in your Government said that half the people should starve? He now has the audacity to come in here and pretend that all of us have forgotten that one of their Ministers said the members of the DLP should starve.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation: If the honourable Member wants to see, he can read Hansard. He would notice the consistent position that I have taken on this issue of partisanship in the Civil Service. At the time of the speech that he refers to, he will see the stand I took then, and I take it now, and I will take it whether I am on this side or that side, and he must never forget it!

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am glad you said that and that is why you are going to have to justify to the country how you can then get up and say today that 27 members said they were interested. He was one of them!

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You will have to make that decision.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have about two minutes to wind up this debate. By my watch, three minutes; by the clock on the wall, two.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to handle a substantive debate on the Civil Service, and the inadequacies or not of the Civil Service, on a supplementary dealing with supplies, materials and utilities. It is against that background that I have indicated, and am indicating now, that, if the Opposition so wishes, we are prepared to have a fullscale debate on the Civil Service. As soon as the Opposition is ready for such a debate, through the usual processes of consultation we will seek to make the time available for that particular'debate.

I wish to state, however, that the Civil Service is one of the great institutions of this country, and it has an essential role to play in this country. I think we are very fortunate in this country to have down through the years a Civil Service that has served us not only during the colonial days, but in the transition from colonialism to Independence, and now into 21 years of Independence. 6.45 p.m.

Having said that, one would have to be very purblind, or one would have to have a very long tongue-in-cheek, not to recognise that there are certain deficiencies in the Public Service, as indeed in certain other of our public institutions. We are not perfect

I was not present when the Member for St. John, in his private capacity, spoke, but I would say, having read the document from which the Member for St. Thomas quoted, that I interpreted what he was saying to mean that there are specific and general deficiencies in the Public Service. He has raised the issue of lack of efficiency, and one would have to be very bold to say that the Civil Service is 100 per cent efficient. He has said that the Civil Service should be creative. Who would disagree with that?

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Attorney General seems to be doing damage to the furniture of Parliament.

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I believe it is a matter of *avoirdupois.*

Mr. Chairman, I think that that is the context. Instead of looking for issues, I think the Member for St. John, as I interpreted it, was bringing to bear on a national issue certain positions, as he sees them.

We will provide a full scale opportunity for a debate on that matter. There were no matters of substance relating to the two items we discussed, and I give the House that assurance.

The question that Head 16 - Ministry of the Public Service (C) Personnel Administration Division - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH - $163 220

Subhead 15 - Children's Development Centre

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I move that Head 36 stand part.

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

The question that Head 36 - Ministry of Health - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88, No. 11 - $775 000

HEAD 69 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE - $775 000

Subhead 4 - Heywoods Holiday Village Project

Hon. W. W. HALL (St. Michael West Central): Mr. Chairman, under Object No. 23 - Structures, is a request for the sum of $775 000 for the settlement of outstanding claims by Bernard Sunley & Sons Ltd., contractors for the Heywoods Holiday Village Project.

Work on the project was estimated to last 28 months, but the hotel received its first guests 36 months after ground breaking. A dispute arose between the Government of Barbados and the contractors over the delays on the project and workmanship. This dispute has now been amicably settled, and the supplementary is being sought to settle outstanding claims by the contractors.

Sir, it would be rather remiss of me if I did not try to give this Honourable House some background to this situation. As honourable Members would recall, the contract was awarded to Bernard Sunley & Sons in 1980 for the sum of $36476 737, plus $400 000 as a provisional sum for the foundation works. As the Addendum states, it was estimated that the construction period would have been 28 months, with effect from January 5, 1981. The actual construction period was 36 months, some eight months delay.

But the eight months' delay was not the only factor in this case it was rather the reasons for the delay, and in the dispute the Government argued four points for the reasons for this delay:

1. Lack of competent site provision;

2. Poor labour relations;

3. Inadequate work scheduling; and

4. Failure to act with due diligence.

The contractors had four counter proposals as their reasons for the delay -

1. Exceptional inclement weather;

2. Cement and block shortages;

3. Strikes and lack of labour; and

4. Structural alternatives arising from Government's decision to move from the concept of seven individual apartels to a single unit for lease purposes.

This was as far back, Sir, as 1983, and you may recall that the overall cost of Heywoods Hotel escalated from some $34 million to some $60 million. The result was that the leases became too high and they were unable to attract suitable lessees. The Government then moved away from the idea of the seven apartels to one separate, single entity, and it is then that the management contract with Copthorne ensued.

The contractors also stated that they had to make certain structural alterations, and that is one of the reasons why they were really in so much trouble.

If we were to look at the contractors' claim, we will find out that the formal notice to go into arbitration was served by the attorney for Bernard Sunley & Sons on January 30,1985, some six months after the contractors had left the site in July 1984. The contractors' original claim for the delays and disruption of the progress of work amounted to some $18 million. This seems to me, Sir, to be an out-of-the-hat figure, because the claim was not quantified, and as such the Attorney General's Chambers advised that Government should await settlement of the final accounts of the project, and it is important to note that the attorney for the contractors agreed with this.

In November 1986, Bernard Sunley submitted a revised claim from $18 million of $5.3 million, but this time the claim was quantified, based mainly on a clay floor tiling, a major bone of contention between the contractors and the consultants, and the disruption in the work programme caused by the need for structural changes arising out of Government's decision to change to a separate entity hotel complex. 6.55 p.m.

Discussions continued between the Ministry, the consultants and the contractors to reach an amicable resolution to the various claims. In the meantime, a new managing director took over at Bernard Sunley & Sons early in 1987, followed by a shift in responsibility to State Enterprises Unit. Both entities clearly wanted to avoid arbitration.

The new manager of Bernard Sunley & Sons Ltd. indicated in April 1987 his company's willingness to accept a commercial settlement of approximately £470 000, Bds. $1.5 million. The overall settlement figure would include the amount of $601 616.32 normally due and payable to the contractor at any cost, representing the final certificate.

Following discussions with the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Tourism and Sports, the consultants and the contractors, Cabinet agreed to accept the commercial settlement and to extend the time to September 30 on the issue of the final certificate. This explanation was necessary, Sir, for the Ministry of Tourism and Sports to secure the allocation of funds from the Ministry of Finance out of the existing balance of the vote which was some $777 000, and so, Mr. Chairman, approximately $600 000 was paid to the contractor in September 1987.

Given the foregoing, Sir, here are my grounds for recommending that this Government should accept the commercial settlement *vis-a-vis* arbitration: -

(1) The earlier revised claim by the contractor of $5.3 million referred only to three points of the dispute while arbitration proceedings will require a full-scale re-opening of the entire contract.

(2) Under arbitration, the contractors total claim could be in the vicinity of $8 to $10 million.

(3) Arbitration would involve analyses and research of voluminous data.

(4) Key personnel associated with the project were no longer available. For instance, their Project Manager, Mr. Rudy Matthews is no longer in the island; he is in St. Vincent.

(5) Responsibility for Heywoods Holiday Village moved five times in the last three years. It was in Civil Aviation and Tourism, then in the Environment, then Tourism and Industry, then to State Enterprises Unit and now Tourism and Sports.

(6) Government's record in arbitration hearings has not been particularly encouraging. For example, four building arbitrations brought against Government during the past five years were heard and concluded by the arbitrator. In three of these cases awards were made against the Government for part or all of the contractors claim.

(7) Let us look now at the actual figures of the commercial settlement. Considering that the contractor is only seeking a settlement of $1.5 million, which included the sum of $601616.32 normally payable - in other words, we would have to pay it anyhow - it means that the real claim is $901438. Of this amount, Government already has $618749 in liquidated and ascertained damages, hence the actual difference in these figures is approximately $282 000.

(8) We have to look at the fact that the consultants are convinced that the claim made by the contractor is rather a fair and reasonable one, and is relatively small.

(9) My final point, Sir, is that it is my belief that if we go to arbitration, the legal costs or the combined lawyers' fees would be no less than about $500 000.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I know the honourable Member for SL Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) is somehow connected here and, perhaps, he could probably give us the actual fees.

I am convinced here that the Government is taking a rather sensible attitude in not going to arbitration and, obviously, opting for the commercial settlement.

The basis of the supplementary is that the outstanding amount due is $948 000 approximately, less the provision in the vote of about $173 500 and, therefore, the supplementary asked for is $775 000.

I, therefore, ask that this Head now stand part.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): I have to declare an interest. The Minister spoke about the attorney-at-law several times and I was the attomey-at-law for the contractor. I will not be voting on the matter, Sir. I think I have a duty to declare it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Sir, as a matter of caution, I think I ought to say that I was advising the architects who, in turn, advised the Government on part of this matter, and, therefore, to that extent I suppose I should desist. I do not think I have any conflict of interest in the matter, but I just wish to record that.

The question that Head 69 - Prime Minister's Office stand part - was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, 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 beg to move that the House be suspended until 8 o'clock this evening.

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

The question that the House be suspended until 8 o'clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly. 7.05 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hou e is in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88
No. 13- $215000

Head 25 - Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to supplement Head 25 - Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries - Subhead 4, Crop Research and Extension - Object No. 12 Operating Expenses. A sum of $18 500 was voted for this Head in the Estimates, and we now seek to provide an additional $215000 for the purpose of holding an agricultural exhibition as part of the celebrations to mark the 21st Anniversary of Independence.

The reason why this was separated from the main vote is that the Ministry asked for this, since at the end of this exhibition there is going to be an analysis and an examination of the exhibition and if the Ministry concludes that we have achieved what we are seeking to achieve, it would become an annual event.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Mr. Chairman, considers that the time is opportune to demonstrate to the public ways in which our agriculture can be improved, and sought to do this by way of an agricultural exhibition. It is to be held on the 3rd, 4th and 5th December at the Ministry's compound at Graeme Hall.

The first thing about the venue is that the Ministry's compound was selected because we wanted to have some live demonstrations. Secondly when you examine the old venue of Queens Park, that is now no longer available or suitable for such an exhibition, since with the amount of work that was done by the NCC in the landscaping and upgrading, and it now has theatre and other facilities, it would be very close to sacrilegious if we went there.

In crop production, we are going to have some live demonstration plots. We will have crops at different stages of growth showing the effects of different cultivation techniques and fertilizer management. We will have a trickle irrigation system including fertilization equipment and methods of monitoring soil rnoisture levels. We will have plant protection method demonstrations, including displays of some crops and control techniques used. We will have chemical control methods, including display of chemicals and equipment, as well as techniques used in Pink-boll-worm control, including use of male sterile cotton plants. There will also be live displays of some of the more common pests, and the Plant Pathology Unit will demonstrate the effects of anthracnose in yams, onion blast and peanut rust.

The Forest Crop Production section will have plots of recommended forage crops that have been established. There will be demonstrations of silage production and we will have information on the development of feeds from local materials.

The Animal Production Section will demonstrate hoof trimming and hoof care, de-worming techniques and display well managed sheep, goats, rabbits and heifers.

Generally, each unit of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries will establish booths in which will be displayed information on developments in their specific disciplines.

There will be a symposium, in which the staff of the Ministry of Agriculture will be involved, at which lectures, discussions, videotape and slide presentations on developments in agriculture will be featured. The Ministry of Agriculture will also display old documents indicating advances in agriculture.

The other agencies taking part are the Food and Agriculture Organisation, FAO, IICA, CARDI, BSIL, the Sugar Technologists Association. The Annual Agro-Tech Show will be put on, with displays of agricultural equipment, including displays of four-wheel drive vehicles suited for farm use. There will also be a demonstration of well cleaning, using modern techniques with a piece of equipment that has been developed locally.

The Barbados Agricultural Society will be involved in the mounting of the annual sheep and goat show. B ADC will be highlighting the National Food Promotion Programme, and the BMC will be highlighting the agricultural export programme. The Barbados Horticultural Society will display cut flowers and plants. This will be done in collaboration with the Horticultural Section of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, with a demonstration of ginger lily and heliconia production.

Other attractions on the lighter side will include the Old Time Bajan Village, which will include the presence of the mauby woman, comfort woman and ice cream man, and an agricultural museum which will contain old agricultural implements. There will be a children's park, where there will be a display of farm animals, donkey carts, and this will be co-ordinated by one of the service clubs. There will be a dog show and this will be mounted by the Kennel Club.

Commercial houses which provide goods and services to the farming community will be putting on booth displays of their goods and services.

There will be competitions featuring jams and preserves, fruit and vegetables, vegetable gardens, school gardens and livestock. Vegetable gardens and school gardens will be adjudged before the exhibition, and Item 5 will involve pre-judging of livestock prior to the exhibition. Only those selected will be shown at the exhibition.

Awards will be made to the Small Farmer of the Year. This selection will be made by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries' staff and prizes will be given by FAO. For Crop Farmer of the Year, a prize will be awarded by Shell Antilles, and for Livestock Farmer of the Year prizes will be awarded by IICA, which will be involved with the Ministry of Agriculture staff in the selection of this farmer.

The Ministry sees it as another effort to try to sensitise Barbadians to the importance of agricultural sectors to Barbados. We hope that by doing it in this way, it would provide Barbadians with information as to what we are doing, in a more relaxed atmosphere, therefore sensitising them to the requirements of the agricultural sector to Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very short preview of what we are hoping to do. As I said, at the end of the Exhibition we will analyse the exhibition and if we figure we have achieved it, we would make it an annual affair. Quite a few commercial houses have been coming forward and providing prizes and being actively involved, and we are expecting that the exhibition will add to the 21st anniversary of our independence.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and report the passing of five money Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN report the passing of five money Resolutions in Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREWES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to. 8.15 p.m.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1987

Order No. 4 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1987.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, this particular Order which the House is being asked to approve follows from certain decisions, understandings and undertakings resulting from the salaries revision.

What the House is being asked to do, as the Addendum states, is to give effect to the decision to increase the rates of pay applicable to Category 9 of the key scales, and the Resolution seeks to make provision for those. It is expected that the adjustments will cost approximately $342166.64 for 1986 - 1987, and an additional $6 842.32 for the current financial year, 1987 - 1988.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the implications of this are well known to honourable Members. It is an indication of the work of the Ministry of the Civil Service, which is essential work in this country. But more of that at another time, as I indicated earlier.

I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

INCREASE IN RATES OF PAY TO CATEGORY 9 OF THE KEY SCALES

Order No. 5 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to increase the rates of pay applicable to Category 9 of the key scales.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution also seeks to carry out certain agreements that were reached following discussions between the appropriate bodies.

I believe that, inadvertently, I may have given information in dealing with the previous Resolution on this particular one, so I will not now repeat myself, but what I said on that particular occasion applies to this particular Resolution.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Mr. Speaker.

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

VESTING IN NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT GOLDEN MILE, HEYWOODS, ST. PETER

Order No. 6 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of land situate at Golden Mile, Heywoods, St. Peter, to be developed mainly for Housing purposes.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Speaker, there are six parcels of land, as set out in the Schedule to this Resolution, situated at Heywoods in St. Peter. I think honourable Members are well aware of the purport of this matter. It has been debated on a number of occasions.

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

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

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

VESTING IN NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND SITUATE AT APES HILL, ST. JAMES

Order No. 7 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of a parcel of land situate at Apes Hill St. James to be developed mainly for Housing purposes.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Speaker, this is for the sum of 3.527 hectares of land at Apes Hill in the parish of St. James. We are vesting in the National Housing Corporation land already owned by the Government, and the purpose is to carry out further housing development on that site.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 8 was called - To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Port Authority Act, Cap. 285B.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, it is desirable that employers should make adequate provision for their employees, including benefits on retirement, and the Government and statutory bodies, above all, should seek to be model employers and therefore to make appropriate provisions. 8.25 p.m.

This particular Bill seeks to make better provision in respect of the retiring benefits of the employees of the Port Authority. It seeks, in particular, to ensure that the service of employees with the Port Department and with the Port Authority may be aggregated with other public service for the purpose of computing retiring benefits, so that employees will not be placed at any disadvantage in determining such retiring benefits.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that there will be any quarrel with the principle of making better provision for the employees of this statutory body, and I commend this to this honourable Chamber.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE. (Christ Church West): The fact that we are going to support this Bill must not be taken by the Government as any signs that we are satisfied with the manner in which the Board of the Port Authority has been administering certain aspects of the Authority. The principle of taking in past service of employees of one Government department as part of the pensionable service of the successor body is a very sound one. We can support that principle.

I am concerned, however, that the members of the Authority sometimes do not understand their functions as policymakers as distinct from their functions as executive chairmen or members of the board. Certainly at the port there is a great deal of disquiet with the way in which members of the board have carried out part of their functions.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Minister is aware, but if he is not I shall make him aware that at one stage a legitimate commercial transaction, a form of the funding of pensions of the officers of the board, was being interpreted, certainly by the chairman, as a way of stealing from a Government department, which it was not, and the actions of the board have been embarrassing to the executive staff of the Port Authority.

The Prime Minister ought to be aware, too, that two employees have actually sued the Port in circumstances in which they had been paid for overtime in accordance with directions from the board. But the new board has reversed its policy, which has led to an action actually pending before the law court.

The basic problem at the port is that the new board came in, thought that they had a mandate to do all sorts of things, and they have been encouraging - I will put it as high as that - junior employees to bring information about senior management. That has undermined the morale of the staff, to the extent, Mr. Speaker, that when the present General Manager was going on leave, you saw that people next in line were being bypassed.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Hon. B. M. Taitt) wants to challenge my information. I will tell him that the board took a decision to bypass Mr. Spencer, who has acted on numerous occasions, for the post of Manager when the substantive holder went on leave. It is a fact. He has acted, he was the best and most senior employee and has acted on numerous occasions for the Manager during his absence. And Mr. Speaker, I can tell the honourable Member, if he does not believe me, that the persons third and fourth in line felt so strongly about the principle that they declined to act He should know that.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It was not a question of anybody being afraid. It is because what has happened there is that the chairman believed in taking the news from another junior employee who believed he had a legitimate grievance, and on investigation, I believe he is now satisfied that there was a legitimate grievance about the way he was treated.

(Aside: Hon. B. M. TAITT: How would you know that?)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is concerned to know how the Opposition is able to give him the facts. Let the honourable Member be concerned about how the Opposition can give him the facts!

The point is that the statements I am making are facts.

The honourable Member for St Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) has spoken. in here before about the position. You will remember that he raised a question about a member of a statutory board where there was a report of missing goods, and when the matter reached the police, all of a sudden it was hushed. He was referring to the Bridgetown Port. That is the 37 cases of whisky.

When you get news particularly when you are a chairman of a board, you have to be careful about how you take the news which you are getting, because I can see the difficulty that will occur when people are carrying out their legitimate business and find that they are being spied on by people who may be misguided.

There are some persons who may belong to a political party and perceive it as their duty merely to bring news. Those persons think that they are being helpful, but sometimes they can undermine the complete morale of a whole organisation, particularly if they believe their news is being accepted. One member of that board used to brag that he was going to take everything to the former Prime Minister, regardless of whether it was true or not, and it has led to the undermining of the morale at the Port Authority. Whether he was telling the truth or not, I am not saying,

but that is what he used to brag about.

8.35 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Do you want to know the name of the person? He talks it openly. He talks it willy-nilly where he lives, where he runs his supermarket. He talks it in and out of the DLP. Sometimes you believe that the news is coming other than from your own political cohorts, if you want to know where it is coming from. Some people have no discretion, and therefore, they think that they have a source of power, and they use it as they see fit.

I believe that this Authority has been run - and I am not saying that there are no difficulties - reasonably well, and has always shown a pretty good profit. I am aware that negotiations are at present going on between the Barbados Workers Union and the board concerning what is called the area of rationalisation to probably increase the number of man hours which workers will give in handling the Gantry and other cranes. I hope those talks are successfully concluded to the satisfaction of all parties, and I wish to say nothing that would affect the'conclusion of those talks, except to make the point that at the port we have always had an understanding of the need for productivity, and I can say from my observation of industrial relations in the port that the Union concerned and its members have always shown a creative appreciation of the role which a modern port should play in the industrial and other development of Barbados. I think it is an area in which we would want to see proper rationalisation, but at the same time without detriment to the workers.

I only hope, Sir, that the board will function more smoothly and that the news carrying will not continue to undermine the morale of staff at the port.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with public affairs, I certainly will not wish to debate or discuss matters relating either to Government departments or to statutory bodies on the basis of hearsay or rumour or news. I would merely caution, I would merely wish to suggest -1 would not put it any stronger than that - that if in fact there is something to be drawn to my attention on the basis of fact or on the basis of reasonable belief, it should be done in an appropriate manner.

I really am unable to respond substantively to the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition at this particular time. If, however, he wishes to draw my attention to the matter, I would be prepared to look at it. I take the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber very seriously -1 am not talking about the Sunday night effusions, I am talking about in here - and if there is something based on some reasonable evidence or fact, I would be prepared to examine it But on the basis of what has been said so far, I am unable to respond to this matter, or, for that matter, to take it up.

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

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREWES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREfflES, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Barbados Port Authority (Amendment) Act, 1987. 8.45 p.m.

FISCAL INCENTIVES (VALIDATION OF BENEFITS) ACT, 1987

Order No. 9 was called -To move the second reading of a Bill to validate certain benefits enjoyed by certain enterprises which were granted otherwise than in accordance with the Fiscal Incentives Act.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES (St. Lucy): Mr. Speaker, this Bill, on the face of it, seemed to be a simple Bill which seeks to validate benefits enjoyed by certain enterprises under the Fiscal Incentives Act. However, on looking at the matter more closely, it was discovered in the Ministry that there were a number of industries which a former Minister had agreed to extending their tax holidays, but no Order had been made to cover this extension.

In addition to that, it was discovered that there were some other Orders which applied to some other industries, which are listed in the Schedule attached to this Bill, which were not in order. Even though it was agreed by the former Administration that it was, as it were, no big thing, that the way in which they had proposed to deal with it was the correct way, the former Minister of Industry, the honourable Member for St Michael West (Hon. B. M. Taitt), on investigating and consultation with the Attorney General, agreed that validating legislation had to be put in place for this matter to be correctly dealt with.

That is basically the purpose of the Bill before us. It is in the same vein as some previous matters relating to other Ministries which we have had to come here with to validate. We are satisfied that this is the proper way in which to deal with this particular matter.

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in rising to second this Bill, I just wish for the benefit of the House to put what my colleague, the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Hon. E. E. Greaves), the Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce, has said in perspective.

This is one of the issues which arise out of a discipline which is pot familiar to every person who has studied the law, and which creates confusion precisely because of the nature of the issue. It has to do with the principle or principles deriving from the subsidiary legislation or delegated powers. When I went to the Ministry, I realised, after examining what purported to be a routine requirement, that, in fact, what had been occurring in the previous years was a misunderstanding - let me not put it any higher than that - of the principle of delegated legislation as it applied.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is a phallic symbol.

Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, you must bear with me, Sir, but I just thought my colleagues on the other side discovered something we discovered on this side, which in due course you may discover, Sir, with a magnificent sweep of this Chamber. If you cast your eyes to high Heaven, you will become aware.

Sir, this is a matter which we raised before, when we were in Opposition, with the Government, I realised that not each person who is responsible for these kinds of things has a knowledge of them, even though he or she might have been familiar with the law generally.

The former Attorney General, the Leader of the Opposition, and I participated in a long debate in this House when the Administrative Justice Act, 1980, I think, was passing through this House. It is a matter which is of grave importance to the structure of our administrative arrangements in this country and, from time to time, I have said to young persons - I have done it to my own child - who are studying law that lawyers in the Caribbean who are studying in the Caribbean ought, unless it is not at all possible, to study Administrative Law. The reason is very simple - the whole structure of our arrangements in this region require that lawyers become familiar with Administrative Law. There are some who have not actually been exposed to the subject who have taken the trouble to read the area because they have come to realise that it is of supreme importance for developing countries, and particularly countries like Barbados, where the vast majority of the population is literate. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have said on the floor of this House before, and, therefore, I have no difficulty in saying it again, that the triade of legislation which was passed under the last Administration when the honourable Member was Attorney General, the said Act that I referred to and two related Acts, put Barbados in a good position *vis-a-vis* the rest of the world and the Commonwealth in relation to the citizen versus the state. I am not going to spend any time

articulating more on this, because, as I have said, we have done it before.

In this case, we had a Minister at that time who had served as Attorney General but who had not even recognised the particular points which are being taken in this Bill before the House, and it is a very simple principle of *delegatus non potest delegare*.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to remind the honourable member that the language of this Chamber is English.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I was only going to make the point to my friend that one of the teachers from Trinidad and Tobago used to say "delegare".
8.55 p.m.

What it means is that he to whom power is delegated cannot himself delegate that power. Therefore, when power is delegated by this Legislature to an individual or an authority, he or that authority cannot itself delegate that power unless it is specifically provided for in the Act here.

In this legislation, what in fact happens is that the Fiscal Incentives Act gives to the Minister the power to grant approval of a period of fiscal incentives. It does so specifically under section 7. What happened is that because of the administrative arrangements in the Ministry, and the general system, when a company which has been given, let us say, three years tax holiday is due for an extension, in some cases, or when the company is due to get a tax holiday, when the time granted in the first instance might run out, by the time the Ministry or the Administrative Officers recognise what should have happened, the actual date has passed and they had proceeded to recommend to the Minister that he extends the date, but such extension would tend to occur after the expiry of the date that had been given.

In short, the Minister, on more than one occasion, gave retroactive extension of the time period. But that is not provided for in the law, and it cannot be done, and the only people who can do it would be the Parliament. That is why these companies have now come before this House. As a matter of fact, Caribbean Chemical Industries, Soilax, Pinkie Polly, Gulf Stream, Chemical Industries, Henkel Chemicals, all purport to have tax free status when, in fact, their tax free status has either run out or had never been given. In some cases, the actual Order had not been made.

When, finally, the matter was examined and we thought we had captured all of them, and the matter went to the Attorney General, he agreed, so this Bill is necessary to validate the benefits that were given, or purported to have been given, to the companies concerned. The companies have, in fact, enjoyed these benefits, and they enjoyed them in good faith under the belief that they had been granted. You had the companies believing that they were granted and the Ministry believing that they were granted, and everybody being more or less happy, except that, legally, they had never been granted, or if they had been granted, they had expired. This legislation has been brought to validate the action and to grant those benefits -4 retroactively.

I have spoken at length, Sir, because I am fundamentally opposed to retroactive legislation. We have said it before, and you will recall, and the records will show, that we have had a number of debates on this matter, and that when we have said that this is a matter which had gone on and on, we had a number of statements made suggesting that we were not accurate and that we were not telling the truth. These incidences here testify to the reality of some of the difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, I really to not know how these matters can be avoided, except to say that we are going to have to have a lot more diligence in the administrative system. It may very well be that we have reached the stage in Barbados where in each department there should be placed a person with legal knowledge. That is something that has been resisted from time to time, but it can save a tremendous amount of money, because each time we have to spend the time to correct something that was not done in a proper manner, it costs the country money. It may very well be that notwithstanding the indefatigable work being done by the Chambers of the Attorney General, I think that perhaps we have reached the stage - this is a matter for the Minister responsible for Establishments and the Attorney General himself - that in those areas where Orders have to be made on a fairly regular basis, it might be worthwhile for us to have a legal officer at the pivotal point who could advise and inform the Minister correctly.

It is not proper for a Minister other than the Attorney General to be exercising any legal knowledge while functioning in his Ministry. It is true that any legal knowledge he might have should inform him in the reaching of his judgmental decisions, but I do not think it is proper for a Minister to be acting in his capacity as a legal adviser -to himself. Not all Ministers will know to send it to the Attorney General for advice, so when the decision is made the facts are pointed out and the signature appended, then the Minister has acted, as far as he is concerned, properly.

My only little touch of sarcasm would be that I would find it a little difficult to accept, bearing in mind that that particular Minister was a quite sarcastic former Attorney General who believed and behaved as if the sun rose and set with his knowledge of the law. There are those for whom, I believe, it has set, but it is the rising that we are concerned with here now. But he is not here, and, therefore, I cannot spend any time on him.

I will say for the record, however, that since he has said in the past that it would not be so, when he reads the record and it is reported to him by his colleagues and friends, I wish him to understand that he ought to have been more

diligent, if for no other reason than the fact that he held the high office of Attorney General. The Attorney General is supposed to be the chief legal adviser to the Government, but he may have been taking the advice that I gave just a few moments ago and not advised himself legally. It may have been the best advice he has ever given, but that is another matter.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this will be the last time that we will have to come to the House with matters of this kind.

Thank you very much for your patience.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the honourable Member has clarified the difficulty which this Bill seeks to cure, because if the Bill is read as it stands, it is difficult to know from it what is the particular difficulty which this Bill is seeking to cure.

The honourable Member has characterised it very simply as that there has been an extension of the time given for incentives and that that extension has taken place after the original grant to the particular period. From a quick reading of the Fiscal Incentives Act, there is obviously not a specific provision in the Act giving the Minister a specific power to do that What he does have is the power to grant certain incentives, provided that the enterprise meets the criteria laid down in Sections 6 and 7 of the Act.

I have not researched it as a lawyer very thoroughly, but it is a moot question whether, when you read this Act together with the Interpretation Act, there is not an implied power to make a grant in such a way that it covers a period that occurred to the date of the making of the Order. 9.05 p.m.

I believe - again I have to look at it carefully - that somewhere in the Order, if you are granting for the first time, you can grant the enterprise the status relating to a period during which the enterprise had previously been operating, but before you make that Order. I believe that there are many instances in which this has occurred. If it is so, I would argue, I think with a good deal of conviction before a court of law, that that power also extends to a further extension of the time. I am not sure, therefore, whether the honourable Member who has just spoken can go on record in as far terms as he has done, because I am sure that the Honourable Attorney General would have found that there is room for disagreement in the legal interpretation, within his own department, on this point.

There are two things I want to say about this area of the law. One is that I believe that the legislation should take account of the fact that these circumstances do occur, and will occur, from time to time. I believe that legislation such as this can easily give a power to a Minister in such cirpumstances, if you like to put it so, to extend the time "retroactively".

There is a distinction between this set of circumstances and a taxing power which is obviously not a taxing power. A taxing power which is exercised retroactively has always been repugnant to the principles of Magna Carta in England and the principles of the Charter of Barbados as was written at the time of the Treaty at Oistins, because there has always been a certain degree of reluctance of citizens to be taxed retroactively.

But this is not taxation retroactively. It is really the Crown giving away a privilege or franchise which has always been a prerogative of the Crown, as exercised in the olden days by Her or His Majesty and later as delegated to the Cabinet and the Governor-General or the particular Minister acting for Parliament. Therefore, the difference between the grant of a franchise or the grant of a privilege is so different in the concept of lawyers that there is nothing really repugnant for our legislation to carry such a provision. It would solve a lot of the administrative problems that you see occurring.

The honourable Member made another point, the need within Government departments to have full legal officers. Perhaps we have moved to the stage where Government has become such big business that the money could be spent in that way. In any event, the legal profession is multiplying in this island at such a pace that sometimes we see the necessity to use the talents that are now available is a much better way within the Government Service to improve the efficiency of Government departments and get quicker reaction.

I must also make the point that in the past, this type of work, certainly a lot of the subsidiary legislation, was drafted by competent para-legals. I would like to urge very strongly that the Government should make time available for some of the staff in the various Ministries to attend the para-legal course at the Community College. That course was established in 1978.' I think it was a necessary development of some of the curricula activities of the Community College.

It seems to me that Government departments are not making full use of these facilities. If honourable Members would look at the paper which informed Cabinet of the intention to establish the para-legal course at the Community College, they would see that it was envisaged that most of the people who do the subsidiary legislation in Government departments would be exposed to this course, and the course would be developed and revamped to take care of these set of circumstances. It would make them more conscious of this type of difficulty which is confronting Parliament.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Civil Service is responsible for Parliament training. I hope the point has been taken by

the Minister of the Public Service within the Prime Minister's Office.

One of the reasons why I emphasise that point is that I believe the time has come where parliamentary time should be used for much wider issues. It would alleviate what we are doing here, very frequently having to come back to Parliament to debate this type of Bill, which raises no new policy issue.

Unfortunately, the Ministry of the Attorney General gets bogged down in this exercise. Every Attorney General has at some stage had to confront this. The honourable Member has now been in office for 15 months, and I am sure he would tell his colleagues not to keep harping and bringing legislation to validate, and he would have found that I had to do the same. There must be a way of organising legislation and our legislative programme in such a way that Parliament can concentrate on the real substantial and main issues and have these matters, which are really correcting administrative omissions, dealt with at a different level and at the same time conform with the law.

I want, Sir, perhaps at the risk of repeating myself a little bit, to say that it seems to me and I must confess I have not studied the matter more thoroughly than after the honourable Member was speaking - that it is a moot legal point as to whether the opinion was totally wrong or whether it was not open to such doubt that it ought to be corrected to put the doubt out of the minds of the people who have to deal with them.

Hon. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Speaker, I have given some study to the problem.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) says that there is some room for difference in interpretation as to whether legislation of this kind is necessary, and he points to the fact that the Fiscal Incentives Act, Cap. 71, does leave some room for an interpretation of the problem along the lines which he has suggested.

It is true that Section 7(2) gives the Minister an implied power to make an Order of this kind retroactively. But it seems to me that that power relates to applications which are being granted for the first time under Section 7 (1) in respect of approved enterprises. If you are dealing with the application for the status of an approved enterprise at the first stage, I would have no problem with that, because by 7 (2) the Minister may make an Order in which he declares a date on which construction of the factory is deemed to be taken, and on which production is deemed to be taken. Those impliedly, could give some latitude, for instance, even in the granting of licenses thereafter. But it seems to me that once that part of the legislation is spent, where approval has been already given and we reach the stage where even with the extension of an Order, different circumstances apply -time has passed. 9.15 p.m.

So my view, and this is the view which I took in relation to this matter, the problem which my learned friend, the honourable Member for Christ Church West, speaks about, is that that can apply in relation to the granting of the approved status at the beginning, but once an extension of that status comes to be considered and the time has expired, then the Minister has no power to make that Order retroactively.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Well, you need another subsection to deal with that kind of problem. I believe you will see that in a number of bits of legislation which are coming down to avoid all difficulty and doubt about the matter, we are just inserting clauses which would give the Minister power to make Orders retrospectively in certain cases because they can provide for unnecessary hang-ups in situations of this kind.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West has made the point that there ought to be nothing repugnant in Ministers making Orders retrospectively where concessions are being granted or where the Crown is waiving rights or" where privileges are being conferred on citizens. I have heard that argument, the argument, in essence, being that the proscription against retrospective legislation relates to legislation which is of a taxing nature or legislation which takes away benefits from citizens. That kind of retrospective legislation is clearly offensive and ought never to be countenanced.

I believe that in respect to the other kind of legislation, one which confers benefits, subsidiary legislation, the tendency has been to overlook and to make Orders retroactive. I am not sure, I am not satisfied that that is the correct approach, because of the basic principle referred to by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, that he to whom the power is delegated has no power to delegate it, unless the power to delegate is expressly given in this constituent bit of legislation. In all these cases where we have this problem coming into existence, on examination of the constituent Act we do not find that it gives the power to the Minister to make Orders retrospectively. If you operate from the basic principle that the only reason, the only justification, for the Minister having the right to make the Order in the first place is the legislation, that the Statute gives him the right to make the order, then whatever powers he has in making such Order must be confined in the terms of the Statute. If that Statute does not give him the power to make the Order retrospectively, in my view, unless that power is given he has no such power. In all of these areas where concessions are being given or where benefits are being conferred, and where there is no likelihood that one could dub legislation of this kind as being offensive, we will move to insert in the legislation a power for the Minister to make the Orders retrospectively.

I believe that in the circumstances, the Bill as it stands deals with the immediate problem in relation to these particular Orders, and I have the greatest pleasure in supporting the Bill as it stands.

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

On the motion.of Hon. E. E. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, 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 1-3 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. E. E. GREfi/ES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. E. E. GREASES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Bill was read a third time and passed. 9.25 p.m.

POST OFFICE INTERNATIONAL EXPRESS MAIL SERVICE) (VALIDATION OF FEES) ACT, 1987

Order No. 1 was called- To move the second reading of a Bill entitled an Act to validate the collection of fees for international express mail service without the necessary legislative authority.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Speaker, tne Government agreed to expand the express mail service to Belgium, Canada and Guyana not so long ago. Before the regulation could be made to give effect to this and provide for the charging of fees and so on, the post office went ahead and did just that - put the service into effect and charged fees for the service.

The purpose of this Bill is to validate the collection of those fees that have been collected by the post office.

I move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

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. B. M. TAITT 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 were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREA/ES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Post Office (International Express Mail Service) (Validation of Fees) Act, 1987.

QUESTION TIME

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time.

Question No. 25, asked by the honourable Member for the City.

QUESTION RE WAYSIDE VENDORS IN BRIDGETOWN

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 25 reads as follows:

To ask the Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development:

1. Is the Minister aware that there are a number of self employed persons lawfully plying their wares as wayside vendors in Bridgetown who are now being denied the right to work?

2. Is the Minister further aware that the initiative taken by the wayside vendors is one way of alleviating the rising unemployment?

3. If the answers to the above are in the affirmative, will the Minister please indicate what steps his Ministry will take to correct this serious problem?

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 25 asked by the honourable member for the City is as follows:

1. No. The Minister is not aware of self employed persons lawfully plying their wares as wayside vendors in Bridgetown who are being deprived of the right to work.

2. Yes.

3. After a series of meetings involving the Ministries of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries; Health; Transport, Works and Telecommunications; and Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development; the Parliamentary Representative for the City and the Commissioner of Police, some vendors were given permission to set up a mall in Swan Street. Other vendors were given permission to operate in Rickett Street and Marhill Street and near the Fountain Gardens. The Swan Street mall can be seen as a moderate success. Some other areas need constant review for a more satisfactory and permanent solution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 33, asked by the honourable Member for Christ Church East.

QUESTION RE VARIOUS DANGEROUS CORNERS IN CHRIST CHURCH EAST

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 33 reads as follows:

To ask the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications:

1. Is the Minister aware that the following comers in the constituency of Christ Church East are dangerous to all users of the roads where they exist:

   (a) at Sayes Court/Goodland/Gibbons, com monly known as King's Comer, where the road needs to be widened and the bends straightened,

   (b) at the Rising Sun/Searles/Lowlands, where stop lights or a round-about would correct the problem, and

   (c) at Pilgrim Place, leading into Parish Land off Highway 7, where the road should be widened and the fence fronting Pilgrim Place lowered?

2. Will the Minister initiate appropriate action to correct the hazards of those corners? Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 33 asked by the honourable member for Christ Church East is as follows:

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The improvement of King's Comer will be carried out in the next fiscal year and the Rising Sun/Searles junction will be realigned in the current financial year. Efforts will be made to widen the corner at Pilgrim Place, but these will be dependent on the availability of land. In the meantime a traffic mirror will be installed as a temporary measure.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplementaries?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Will the Minister please explain what exactly is being done at the Rising Sun/ Searles/Lowlands junction? Because I have noticed roadworks going on there for some time now.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: As a matter of fact, the work is almost completed. The road has been aligned, so the junction has been improved and some retaining wall has been put in. There is an improvement as one enters or leaves at either end of the Rising Sun junction. At least that is what is being done at the moment. It will tremendously improve the junction there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 70, asked by the honourable Member for St. James North.

QUESTION RE NEED FOR URGENT REPAIRS TO ROADS IN ST. JAMES NORTH

Mr. J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 70 reads as follows:

To ask the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications:

1. Is the Minister aware of the urgent need of the residents of Saint James to have the following roads repaired by Government:

   (1) Rock Dundo Road (from Highway 1 to Highway 2) and its Avenues,

   (2) Weston Road (leading up Crick Hill to Highway (2),

   (3) Yearwood Road and Storehouse Road in Mount Standfast,

   (4) Greenwich Village Road, and

   (5) Laynes Gap and Olive Road? and

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister please state how soon such repairs are likely to be carried out?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 70 asked by the honourable Member for St. James North, is as follows:

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The Ministry will endeavour to repair these roads within the current financial year, subject to the availability of funds.

Mr. SPEAKER: Supplementaries?

Mr. J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister please state if an estimate has already been done for these roads? 9.35 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The files do not reveal whether there has been any estimate of expenditure. It shows what work has to be done, but it does not state the cost of doing the work.

Mr. J. J. PAYNE: I would just like to ask the Honourable Minister to state whether the estimates are likely to be done before the end of the financial year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Minister aware of the supplementary?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am aware, but in my reply the answer has already been given to that question. I do not have to answer that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any more supplementaries? Mr.

J. J. PAYNE: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more replies to Questions.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the end of Government Business for today.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, October 13,1987 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, October 13, 1987 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 9.40 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, July 21, 1987 1495

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER..... 1496

Accounts and Statements for the months of April, May, June and July.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 1496

The Housing (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1987.

Report of the Air Transport Licensing Authority for the year 1986.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1987.

The 18th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Development Bank for the year 1986-1987.

The Travel Ticket Tax (Rate of Tax) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

Hon. C. V. Walker by command laid the following:

The Cinematograph Film Censorship (Fees and Travelling Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The Cinematograph Film Censorship, (Charges) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 1496

A Resolution to grant the sum of $215 000 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. 13 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 1496

A Bill to amend the Barbados Port Authority Act, Cap. 285B.

A Bill to validate certain benefits enjoyed by certain enterprises which were granted otherwise than in accordance with the Fiscal Incentives Act.

ORAL REPLIES

Hon. N. **K. SIMMONS** 1496

Reply to Question No. 25, asked by the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown (Mr. P. J. M. Miller).

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 1496

Reply to Question No. 33, asked by the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Mr. E. Bourne)

Reply to Question No. 70, asked by the honourable Member for St. James North (Mr. J. J. Payne)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 1496

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 NO. 8 - $750 000 1497

HEAD 73 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE..... 1497

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 1497, 1506; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 1497, 1499, 1503, Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1498; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 1498, 1501; Dr. Haynes, 1502, 1505.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 No. 9 - $135 162 1507

HEAD 77 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS - $91 800..... 1507

Hon. M. A. King, 1507, 1508, Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1507.

HEAD 84 - MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT, WORKS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS - $43 362. . 1508

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 1508; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 1508; Mr. Morris, 1509, Mr. Bourne, 1510.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1987-88, NO. 10 - $1 342 070..... 1511

HEAD 13 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE - $1 169 000..... 1511

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1511, 1521; Mr. Arthur, 1511; Mr. Brathwaite, 1513; Mr. Thompson, 1513; Mr. Morris, 1514; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1516; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 1518; Mrs. Welch, 1521.

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE (C) PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION DIVISION - $9 850 1523

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1523, 1532; Mr. Simmons, 1523, Mr. Thompson, 1526, Hon. H. deB. Forde, 1528; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 1531.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH - $163 220. 1533

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88, No. 11 - $775 000..... 1533

HEAD 69 PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE.....1533

Hon. W. W. Hall, 1533; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons 1534; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 1534.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 NO. 13 - $215000.....1535

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FISHERIES 1535

Hon. W. O. Franklin, 1535.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1987 1536

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1536.

INCREASE IN RATE OF PAY TO CATEGORY 9 OF THE KEY SCALES 1536

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1536.

VESTING IN NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT GOLDEN MILE, HEYWOODS, ST. PETER..... 1537

hon. P. M. Greaves, 1537.

BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987..... 1537

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1537, 1538, Hon. H. deB. Forde, 1537.

FISCAL INCENTIVES (VALIDATION OF BENEFITS) ACT, 1987 ..... 1539.

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 1539; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 1539, Hon. H. deB. Forde, 1541; Hon. M. A. King, 1542.

POST OFFICE (INTERNATIONAL EXPRESS MAIL SERVICE) (VALIDATION OF FEES) ACT, 1987..... 1543

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 1543.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER (City of Bridgetown).....1543

Question No. 25 re wayside vendors in Bridgetown.

Hon. N. K. Simmons 1543.

Mr. E. BOURNE (Christ Church East).....1544

Question No. 33 re various dangerous corners in Christ Church East.

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 1544, Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1544.

Mr. J. J. PAYNE (St. James North).....1544

Question No. 70 re urgent repairs to roads in St. James North.

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 1544.

SUSPENSION..... 1507, 1511

ADJOURNMENT..... 1545

ARTH.UR, O. S. (St. Peter) BARKER-WELCH, Mrs. M. (St. Joseph) BOURNE, E. (Christ Church East) BRATHWAITE, L. L. (St. Michael North East) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) FRANKLIN, Hon. W. O. (St. Philip North) GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) KING. Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central) MILLER, P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, R. L. (Christ Church East Central) PAYNE, His Honour J. J. (St. James North) SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St. Thomas) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON, D. J. H. (St. John) WEEKES, His Honour L. A. (St. Michael North West)