

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

Tuesday, January 19, 1988.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 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 Finance and Economic Affairs)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A., (Rons.), M.A., LL.B.,
(Hons.) (Minister of Health)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of International Transport, Telecommunications and Immigration and Leader of the House)

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs)

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., 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 Education and Culture)

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P. Mr.
E. BOURNE Dr. E. A. SIMMONS,
M.D.

Hon. W. W. HALL, (Minister of Tourism and Sports) Mr. C.
A. NEBLETT, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN, M.A.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS, B.A., Cert. Ed.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER

Mr. R. P. BYER, LL.B., L.E.C.

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

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, December 15, 1987.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, December 15, 1987 be taken as read and confirmed.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

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

The Accounts and Statements for the month of November 1987 as prepared by the Accountant General.

The Auditor General's Report on the results of the examination of accounts of the island for the year ended March 31, 1987, together with two sets of relevant Statements of Accounts.

PAPERS

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

Guarantees granted under the Exempt Insurance Act, Cap. 308A section 32 to the following:-

First Barbados Casualty Co. Ltd.

Westminster Assurance Ltd.

Century Property & Casualty Insurance Corporation.

Select Lawyers Mutual Insurance Co. Ltd.

Transport and General Insurance Co. Ltd.

Larchmont Insurance Co. Ltd.

Flomerica Insurance Co. Ltd.

European International Reinsurance Co. Ltd.

Delta Reinsurance Corporation.

Chariots of Hire Indemnity (Barbados) Ltd.

American Physicians Assurance Society Ltd.

Capital Insurance Ltd.

British Atlantic Indemnity Corporation.

Professional Associates Indemnity Co. Ltd.

Epic Insurance Company INC.

Andrew Jackson Insurance Co. Ltd.

Noel Insurance Company INC.

Cheshire Insurance Co. Ltd.

Earthquake Loss Fund Insurance Co. Ltd.

Kitty Hawk Insurance Co. (Barbados) Ltd.

Medical Centre Insurance Co. (Barbados) Ltd.

Psychiatrists' Mutual Insurance Co. Ltd.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following documents:

The Barbados Port Authority (Tariff Book of Dues and Charges) Regulations, 1987.

The Barbados Port Authority (Tariff Book of dues and Charges) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987. •*

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready:

Questions Nos. 13 and 18 asked by the honourable Member for St. George South.

Question No. 30, asked by the honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

Questions Nos. 72, 75, 76, 77 and 71, asked by the honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Question No. 78, asked by the honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that Standing Orders Nos. 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.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move that Government Business be the instant order of the day.

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

SPEAKER: Government Business.

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. 12.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Amendments to certain Explanatory Notes in the 1987 - 88 Estimates for various Ministries and Departments of Ministries.

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE

SUBHEAD 5 - GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): These amendments are necessary to ensure that the funds provided and voted on by Parliament are extended in strict accordance with the instructions laid down by Parliament.

From time to time, in spite of the best efforts of the Public Service, errors creep into the explanatory notes, and it is those explanatory notes which include the instructions relating to the funds that may have been provided. This is a desirable procedure as part of the arrangements for Parliament and for this House of Assembly, in particular, to scrutinize and control Government expenditure.

There are no new areas of policy indicated as a result of the amendments being proposed. This is merely to ensure that the funds that have been provided are actually expended in accordance with the instructions given by this Committee and by the House.

In order to deal with these matters, we have thought it best to secure from the various Ministries any amendments to the explanatory notes to the various Heads, and this is the result of that particular exercise.

We do hope that this will be the last such request for amendments to explanatory notes. But it may be that, through oversight, there may be others to be brought for the approval of this House.

As I said, these are largely housekeeping matters. In respect of Head 16, Subhead 5 - General Administration - in relation to the Personnel Administration Division - the Explanatory Note to Object No. 11, which relates to Maintenance of Property, contains the word "van" which means that the money provided for the maintenance of the particular piece of property could only be expended on a van, if we are to follow the instructions or the rubric in the explanatory note. But the piece of item which was intended, and which has actually been purchased, is a scooter, and

that scooter has to be maintained. So we are seeking to amend the note by deleting the word "van" and inserting the word "scooter" so that that particular piece of property can be maintained appropriately from this particular Head.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Explanatory Note to Head 16 - Personnel Administration Division - Subhead 5 - General Administration - be so amended.

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

The question that the Explanatory Note to Head 16 be so amended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 18-AUDIT SUBHEAD 1 -

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Under Head 18, Sir, I am moving that the Explanatory Note to Object No. 12 - Operating Expenses - be amended, to include after the word "expenses", the words "as well as minor expenses in respect of departmental training courses".

The Audit Department carries out in-house training for its staff, which may be induction courses or technical courses for the orientation and direction of the staff of the Audit Department for carrying out their particular responsibilities. No provision has been made by way of the explanatory note for expenditure of any incidental expenses in relation to the holding of these departmental training courses, minor expenses relating to maybe light refreshments, coffee, juice, or some such expenditure. When we include the words indicated, this would permit the expenditure of small amounts in relation to the departmental training courses.

I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the Explanatory Note be so amended.

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

The question that the Explanatory Note to Head 18 be amended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 31-PRISONS SUBHEAD

1 - PRISONS DEPARTMENT

Hon. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Chairman, the Explanatory Note to Head 31 - Prisons, Subhead 1, makes provision for rehabilitation services for inmates in such trades as joinery, tailoring, husbandry,

gardening - and then the next word is "banking" taking academic subjects and so forth, which are taught to the inmates. Clearly "banking" is not a trade in the classification of the others, and it is clearly an error which has been made. What is intended clearly is that that word should have been "baking".

In these circumstances, I move that the Explanatory Note here be amended so that the word "baking" can be substituted for the word "banking".

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Chairman, the change to this note obviously occurs because of a typographical error. I am sure that there must be a system in keeping with parliamentary tradition, without trespassing on the strict scrutiny of the expenditure of public finances, to make this sort of change without the use of parliamentary time, and I would seriously ask the Government to look to see whether, constitutionally, this could not be properly done. 12.35 p.m.

There is probably too much detail being given in these notes in that way, detail which should be given frankly in our system, probably at the time when the original Resolutions are introduced, so that Ministers with responsibility under the Heads could give some breakdown as to what the expenditure is for. But it seems a pity that merely to make a typographical printing change - and I would expect that the error probably occurred maybe not even when the Estimates were laid - I am not sure, I have not gone back to the original Estimates - but probably at printing stage - we have to go into it in this way. They are different changes from when the change could probably bring forth from the House Members a charge of virement of expenditure. Under the Heads, of course there are some that could have been subject to that, but we have accepted the Prime Minister's word as he introduced them, and even if it was a virement, there might be justification for it in the context of the sort of money that we are dealing with. I think that under the previous Head it was about \$280.1 am really concerned that we have not yet evolved some procedure to deal with this sort of problem within the constitutional framework of which I have just spoken. I do not know if the Minister is in a position to make any statement on that.

On a more substantive note, I want to know from the Minister his current views on the increase in growth of the prison population and perhaps he would also let me know what proposals he intends to implement I am told that a reasonable proportion of persons are there still for debt. In fact, one of my constituents went up for arrears of

maintenance, or something of the sort, the other day. Obviously, he had been out of work for some time. It seems to me that we have to try to reform the laws sufficiently not to overburden the system and not needlessly to send people to prison for matters that, today, do not rate, although they do get moral calumny, within the criteria one wishes to apply in sending people to penal institutions.

The Minister will be aware that the Delroy Chuck Report has been in the Ministry for some time and has adverted to this problem, and I believe that there has been certain draft legislation reforming the whole area of the Criminal Law which is still within the Ministry. It seems we should take the opportunity very soon to try to get that legislation on the floor of the House and at the same time to look at a Rehabilitation of Offenders Act, because people are penalised because they may have erred in their youth, but have long since passed the stage of deserving the calumny of those convictions being cited and used on every occasion.

Although, Mr. Chairman, this matter only relates to correcting a typographical error, if the Minister cares to, or if he wants a more substantive debate at some future time, he may advert to the comments which I have made on that other part of his Ministry.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, I would just wish to indicate that the points made by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the amendment of the note where the matter appears to be typographical is one which, on the surface, may be acceptable so long as the appropriate person to make the amendment is identifiable. Perhaps this is a matter which can be discussed so that this may be determined, but out of an abundance of caution, it may be desirable to leave the requirement for any amendments to be determined through the normal process of amendment until we can get some agreement on this. We do not wish to take it upon ourselves to alter the Estimates in any way, because I recall - and I believe other Members may recall - that there have been debates, some of them extended, some of them somewhat heated - I do not recall what may have been the occasion - in which there were accusations - groundless, of course - that the record had been altered outside of Parliament.

I take it we have to make a distinction between matters of substance. For example, I believe that the change from "van" to "scooter" may, I do not know, be borderline, or that may be considered a change of substance, but I believe that kind of problem could be got around if greater attention is paid to the wording of the particular explanatory note. Maybe a general word like "vehicle" or some such wording could deal with that, but where it is typographical, and obviously typographical, I believe we should be able to find some device for that particular purpose.

I merely wish again to underline the point I made at the start, that it "is the instruction of Parliament, and one of the specific ways in which Parliament can ensure that expenditure is being made in accordance with the wishes of Parliament is to have the means of scrutiny. It may be that we have to put up with these kinds of minor changes in the interest of maintaining the bigger principle, but I think that if we can arrive at an understanding on this we may be able to get some change in this.

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I have an interest in this matter, because I have participated in debates on both sides of the question, but it seems to me that in the same way we have given the Law Commissioner certain abilities to obviate the kinds of problems which we see here, that within the context of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, we should make a provision to allow the Law Commissioner, on the advice of the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Finance himself, to make these adjustments, and to do them legally.

I do not think that there would be need for a constitutional amendment if Parliament delegates the authority, and I think that in these circumstances, it will be a clear saving to the country if we could do that. 12.45 p.m.

I would suggest that we examine, since we are *ad idem* on these matters, the vehicle that has been used to give the Law Commissioner certain powers.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, clearly I do not need to dwell on the first point raised by the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) about the amendment to the note. I had thought that this was a typographical error which could probably have been amended, but we went the route of caution because, after all, banking is a service. I do not know whether there could be any banking receipts done at the Prison, but banking is a service, and the whole point is that the typographical error identify another, clearly defined service. I think that until we have some system in place for dealing with matters of this kind, we are on the side of caution, and so we brought the amendment.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West has also raised substantial questions relating to the wide area of penal reform, all the problems that surround sentencing policy and practices and he has called for an update of the Criminal Law. I think that all of us lawyers who practise and have occasion to come into contact with these matters recognize that there is a substantial need for reform and an update of the Criminal Law, and that the whole criminal system needs to be reviewed.

I believe that there is a conference which is shortly to be held in Canada on penal reform and sentencing policies. These are current issues which are now engaging large sections of the Common Law world. To go into the matter now would raise a whole big area of debate which, I think, is not best dealt with on an *ad hoc* basis like this, and I urge that the honourable Member leave a matter of this kind for a more substantive debate on these issues.

The question that Head 31, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

SUBHEAD 1 - GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND OVERSEAS REPRESENTATION

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, the amendment is to Head 35 - Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Subhead 1 - General Administration and Overseas Representation, in relation to the Explanatory Note to Object No. 10, Supplies and Materials.

In that explanatory note, there is the word "tapes" and this amendment is to include after that word "tapes" the words "films, photographs, drinking water, plants, flags, stamps and seals". Again, the purpose of this is to ensure that Members of Parliament have the fullest possible information in relation to the amount of money that is being appropriated and the way in which that money is intended to be spent.

In respect to the Explanatory Note to Object No. 12, Operating Expenses, there is the word "payments" in that explanatory note, and the purpose of the amendment is to add the following words after the word "payments", "Cost of transfer of funds (Difference in exchange). Transfer of personal effects and motor vehicles, payment of taxes and for security systems."

Again, the amendment is to make sure that the wording gives the necessary authorization for the expenditure of funds.

If there are queries on this particular item, I would be happy to supply the information, if it is available.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty with the amendment to Object No. 10. We are being asked to include after the word "tapes", which is the last word in the present note, the words "films, photographs, drinking water, plants, flags, stamps and seals." I would like to know why in these Estimates you would include the words "drinking water." For what

reason? You could pay your water bill out of another of the Heads, probably. Are we buying drinking water in some of these missions?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: This is a point in departure between the two parties.

Hon. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order: I just want to explain the water to you. Do you know?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not want to know.

I think that the explanatory nature of the notes is causing the problem. If you did not have so many things in a note, you would not have these problems, and I hope - Estimates are due in a couple of months' time - that this year, perhaps, Government will revert to the previous system where the note is enough to indicate the general nature of the particular items covered. As you go into specifics, there is going to be some particular item of which there could not have been prescience and we are going to have these problems of cleaning up the Estimates ever so often by way of amendment

I know that it provided some work for the Minister of the Public Service. It probably gladdened his heart to have something to do, to write all of these little items down, because this is the system that he was accustomed to when he was Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: How do you mean I cannot say so? I said it!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with Foreign Affairs.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: All I am saying is that it would have gladdened his heart to revert to the system to which he had been accustomed, where he had all of these expansive notes.

Governments seem to have accepted the principle that, perhaps, the notes are over-detailed and over-expansive, and they were finding a way of reducing the susceptibility to these little errors that come up from time to time, or the need to include little items, which is a waste of parliamentary time. In any event, all of the Ministries have a contingency vote, which could cover some of these small items.

In No. 10 it says: "To meet Office Expenses, Honorary Consul expenses, purchase of stationery, printing supplies, toiletries, linen, cutlery, newspaper and tapes."

We now include drinking water, but nowhere in this note do we include coffee or tea or sugar. Are we to clutter up the Estimates with these things. 12.55 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Do you not buy cream and sugar and tea in the overseas missions. Do you have to buy drinking water? I think the position is clear.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am only trying to stop you from wasting time next year, by deleting a lot of that padding in the note and using a general word or phrase that will capture all of them.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The point made by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) is a valid one, although I believe that the words "drinking water" constitute an error creeping in there.

I note that the Government is now allowing under this Head for expenditure on security systems, and I am concerned about the report coming out of London, both in the Press and from other sources of information, concerning a recent attack on our High Commission in London. Although the substantive Minister for this subject is in the Other Place, I would trust that the Government is in a position to give this House, subject, of course, to security considerations, some idea of what exactly occurred to the staff at the High Commission. I want to know whether the Government has any information as to whether it is a signal of something more fundamental than a lunatic, whether or not it relates to any particular terrorist or other activity, or whether it is just a little disgruntled criminal of some sort.

I am concerned about security normally at our missions overseas. I recognize that this has been a problem which has been attended to over the years. Certainly, at one stage we were in the position where our mission/consulate was stationed in the same building as another Middle East country, and the danger posed to us then, according to all reports we had, could have been substantial. I believe that we started to upgrade security in New York, but I am not sure that the same security considerations have figured largely in other jurisdictions. I believe that in the United Kingdom we did second to that mission someone with some military experience, but beyond that, I do not know of any other specific steps being taken to deal with security, and while I recognize that the host country has a responsibility to provide safety for missions within its jurisdiction, I believe that the mission must have some credible security arrangement.

I note from the Press that there are now two security guards hired from a firm in England. But I would wish to be assured that the Government is satisfied, first, that everything is being done to get to the root of the cause of this, what appears to me to be a totally unwarranted attack on Barbados' property overseas and on the persons of Barbadian nationals overseas who are in a host country, and, secondly, if there are any lessons to be learned from it, that we have started the procedures for putting in place a mechanism against the repetition of this type of conduct.

I was recently in England and had occasion to go to another Caribbean High Commission. I was amazed at the ease with which anyone could walk into that building any day and do anything at all that is exceptional to people on the staff. Security was totally lacking.

I think that, in this day and age, particularly in our overseas missions we have to be deeply conscious of this, and we have to make sure that those who represent us abroad are at all times properly protected. It is not enough to believe that we are friends of all and enemies of none. Those considerations, these days, do not extend to being sensible about one's security, needs, and requirements. There is an abundance of evidence today that for reasons which are sometimes inexplicable on the grounds of common sense, one could find oneself being confronted by a lunatic, terrorist, or just a plain criminal attacking our diplomats overseas. I wonder whether the Minister could give us an assurance of that.

Sir, I also wonder whether the Government would take the opportunity, now that the results of the polls in Haiti are reasonably certain, to make a statement as to how Government sees itself definitely within the context of the Heywoods declaration. The position of the Opposition is quite clear. Whatever went on in Haiti on Sunday last was not an election.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: By whatever name it can be classified, we must be concerned about the spectacle of people being able to provide their own votes, people at the polls being actually, outwardly paid! I think that those of us who have been monitoring Haiti for some time would realize that this does not fall under the criteria which we would want to set out as the basis of recognition. I wonder whether, now that the Prime Minister has had an opportunity to be briefed, I hope, on the outcome of Sunday's election, the Government would make its position absolutely clear on this particular point.

I am satisfied that if there is one thing we have in Barbados to sell, it is our strict feeling about the need to have fair and free election, and that is so on both sides of

the House. Although from time to time there have been allegations made here on both sides of the House, I think it is true to say that Barbados has achieved the reputation in the world as one of the countries who make its electoral system work within the limits of human error. But where there is what happened in Haiti, it really is a disgust to us to accept that as a fair judgment, and I think that the Government should consider withholding recognition until it is satisfied that adequate provision is being put in place to let the people in Haiti properly determine their own democratic future. 1.05 p.m.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS (St. Michael South East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the questions posed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and the first has to do with his concerns about Barbadians working in embassies overseas.

I think that it is now over 20 years that Barbadians have been in embassies overseas, and I think one can recognise that in any embassy overseas, whether it be in London, Canada, the United States or in Barbados, embassy staff are at risk, and I am quite sure that we on this side are very, very aware of the dangers to which personnel working in the embassies overseas are exposed.

As a matter of fact, the point at which Barbadians working overseas were at their greatest risk, if you were to follow the trends and the feelings in the United Nations and in the international forums, was after the Grenada intervention. That was the point at which Barbadians were most unsafe, but that is not to say that we should not be cognisant of the fact that people working in those embassies are always at risk. I just want to remind the Leader of the Opposition that the risk to Barbadians working overseas did not start with the incident that happened in London, it was always there. We always have in every society people who are mad, people who will take it upon themselves to create crazy acts, and this should not be a reason for us to panic.

We must be very careful how we talk about security. If we follow the daily news, we would know that in the American Embassy in Russia today, which was supposed to be probably the most secure embassy in the world, they found that there was wire tapping, and that their own personnel in Moscow were trading secrets with the Russians, and now they are going ahead with their new refurbishing so as to stop what they perceive to be the leak in the security in their own embassy. The point I am making is that you can spend more than the whole economy of Barbados trying to protect people, or your staff, and in the end you will find out that you are no safer than you were before, but that is not to say that certain fundamental things should not be put in place.

I would hate to see the day when the Barbadian embassies abroad were staffed with military men with guns standing at their front. It would tell us something about the psyche of us Barbadians and the relations we have with other people abroad. I think the best security for our people overseas is friendly relations with every country in this world. I think that is the basic security, the same kind of security that you get living in your neighbourhood - make sure that the people around you are friends and they will safeguard you. I think that that simple tenet holds also for us as a small nation operating in the international arena - make sure that we be friends of all and enemies of none. That is a very fundamental tenet.

In the Caribbean, we have a lot of people, a lot of politicians, who want to lie down in bed with some of the great nations at the expense of others, and they call unto themselves some very serious problems. They lie down in bed with people who even are friends of the South Africans, and I mean the Botha Government, not the majority of people in South Africa. So we have to be very careful, and I want to make the point very clear, that when we raise the issue of security, let us not get to the point where we become paranoid and think in terms of military troops, because there was a time in Barbados when we were heading down that military road, where the head of the military had laid out to him things that nobody else in Barbados had. We have to be very, very careful and make sure that we deal with the simple tenets of the Bible and make sure that we be friendly with all.

I probably could come back a little later to the second point the Leader of the Opposition raised, but this is the position of this Government, the Democratic Labour Party Government, on the situation in Haiti. Before the Heads of Government met, the Democratic Labour Party made a statement that it would not recognise any election emanating out of the council that the present military Government in Haiti had set up. After that, there was a communique issued. Nowhere in the communique did it say that any signatory to the communique was bound to recognise any military Government that was formed, and after the communique the Democratic Labour Party put its statement again.

I happened to be watching television a few days before the Heads of Government meeting at Heywoods, and the spokesman for the Barbados Labour Party, Miss Billie Miller, who claimed that she.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I am sorry, Senator Billie Miller..... who claimed that she knew more about Haiti than everybody in Barbados put together, r.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you have to be very careful with how you address those persons in the Other Chamber.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I apologise, I said Senator.

She made the statement on television that when the Heads of Government meeting that was scheduled for Haiti came off, the CARICOM leaders had to be very careful as to the decision they reached, because, as she said, if that first election had gone to conclusion, a leftist Government would have emerged. Therefore, what she was saying was that if the people of Haiti had gone into a free and fair election to select a Government, she - I am drawing the conclusion - could not be in agreement with it, because it would have been a leftist Government. So I want to know now how come the Leader of the Opposition can stand up and call for the position of the Democratic Labour Party on Haiti when, following that, the spokesman, Senator Tull, from the same Chamber, made a statement that he agreed with the first statement made by the Democratic Labour Party, while on the other hand Senator Billie Miller was saying that we had to be careful of any democratically-elected Government in Haiti, because it would have been a leftist Government.

She made another statement that was a very true statement. While saying that the Government would have been a leftist Government, she went on to say that the military in Haiti was a serious organisation, because it was financed, not out of the taxpayers' money, but out of the drugs or the money they earned from drug running in Haiti, and despite the fact that she identified the present Government as being involved in drugs and being paid with drug money, she was still against the people of Haiti going to the polls and electing what she calls "a leftist Government." This was all articulated by the members from that side.

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Those are two members. How many of us spoke?)

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Senator Billie Miller considers herself the authority for all Barbadians on Haiti, and I heard Senator Louis Tull on television saying that he was the Shadow Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Barbados Labour Party and articulating another view. So if there is confusion, the point I am making is that the confusion comes from that side.

I want to ask a question - I am still wondering - under which organisation Senator Billie Miller was invited to visit Haiti in the first place? I know that there is something called "The Concerned Caribbean Leaders". The Democratic Labour Party does not belong to that, and I know that in any democratic elections where there are questions and observers are invited in, it is done on a

Government-to-Government basis. There seems to have been no Government-to-Government invitation with respect to Haiti, because I am sure that the Government of Barbados did not receive an invitation to go into Haiti to observe the elections. But somehow, because of some kind of connections, Miss Billie Miller.....
1.15p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Miller.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Sorry..... Senator Billie Miller was invited to go in, and I only hope that the impression was not given that Senator Billie Miller was representing the people of Barbados. Certainly, she was not representing the Government of Barbados, so I just want to get those two points absolutely clear.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot allow certain statements of the honourable Member, which are untrue, to go down in the record as though they are true.

He asked for some information as to how Senator Miller went on a team to Haiti before the first elections in November, observing them - in the same way as she went with the former Right Honourable Member for St. John to the Philippines to observe the elections there, under the same aegis and at the same request of the people who are interested in seeing that these countries move to a state of fair and free elections.

Asides.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: It is not going to be altered by the honourable members sitting in their seats and saying "Not true". The honourable Members must recognize that their shouting things do not alter mem from being facts, and the fact is that that is how she went.

Asides,

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If your diplomatic missions are working, and you have people on the ground, you would find that out for yourself. That is what you should find out. Do not ask me to name the organization.

The second statement which the honourable Member made was also made *sotto voce* by some other Members. I want to put it on record, because I find there are some Members who have the habit of making a statement, getting it repeated outside by a few people, and then it is repeated long enough until it sounds as though it is fact, when it is not fact.

The point is that the Barbados Labour Party belongs to the Socialist International, has been a member of the Socialist International for several years now, and, prior to

its membership, had observership at the S.I. We do not belong to any other affiliated organization in the Caribbean other than the defunct Federal Labour Party, so that the honourable Members must know what is our position.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Not only supporting, but as long ago as October we made our position quite clear on where we were going on Haiti.

If the honourable Member had not been so busy trying to stop CBC from reporting the BLP Conference, he would have heard what was our position on Haiti. The honourable Member must recognize that on this matter we had a position. We do not alter our position. He must not draw Senator Miller in as a red herring on these issues because the Honourable Senator is not here to put some blows in them, as she usually does.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: As the honourable Member knows, she would defend the other honourable member in the other Chamber, and I am sure that when the time comes for her to deal with the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Other Place, she will deal with him, if necessary.

The honourable member, I think, is getting Senator Miller confused with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), who is not now in his place, and a Senator in another place, Senator Comissiong, who is not in here, who, obviously, came out throwing blows, and I think the honourable member really should not get up here today and talk about throwing blows. I tried to introduce this debate in a way well beyond that, but the honourable Member must get down on these matters to try to get absolute confusion when he knows the confusion has come from his own back bench and his own junior Senators upstairs.

The honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson) must not speak *sotto voce*. He is lucky that he managed to get preferred to Senator Comissiong. He has his own fight with Senator Comissiong. I listen to his comments around the law court, Sir, but I really would not listen to him creating enmity where he knows there is no enmity.

Sir, not to be detracted by comments which, really, are now partisan picking, I have followed up the matter, because I consider that now that the elections have taken place, people would wish to know whether Government's ultimate conclusion had been reached, and that was the sole purpose of my asking the question. I cannot see that anybody has seen in the opening statement that I made on

this matter any partisan, political view taken, as the honourable Member for St. Michael East tried to take it. If he wants that sort of debate, he will get it.

I stated what was our situation quite clearly, which has been repeated by me on more than one occasion in the Press, if the honourable Members want to see and if they really follow what people want to say. He knows our position on this. It will not be confused. He must find out where the confusion occurred. It is not here at all. I wanted to make the position clear and to clarify Senator Miller's situation.

Certainly, she is one of the people who has shown some care to find out what is happening on the ground. Part of the problem we have in diplomacy in the Caribbean is that we do not often have people, or enough people, on the ground monitoring what is going on within the countries. I know that in a small country it is very expensive to monitor everything, but, surely, the CARICOM countries must be able to evolve by now some system where in situations of primary interest such things come to the fore. Even if one country cannot afford the cost, there must be a way of sharing, even on a temporary basis, the cost of getting the correct information to help us formulate and guide our policy.

I certainly knew that the Government of Jamaica did have a lot of people on the ground. Several of the CARICOM countries did not. We cannot always run our foreign affairs from what is written in *Newsweek* or some other magazine. We need to be properly monitoring and getting our own feedback. I think the experience of most people who have been in Government and in Foreign Affairs is that sometimes those people who are accredited to your country, even not at the level of ambassador, seem to know more about what is going on within your country, or within the Caribbean, than you know, because they have their people on the ground, they have reasonable accessibility to people in Government, to people in Opposition, they hear various sides, and they also have people throughout society. 1.25p.m.

Let me illustrate this, Sir. Whenever I am in the Eastern Caribbean, I am amazed at the facility with which diplomatic staff accredited to our country have ready access, through everybody, and know things are about to happen before they actually happen. I have been given information on developments in the Caribbean merely by sitting in a plane and coming up to somebody, a foreign diplomat, who is accredited in the Eastern Caribbean.

We have not got any of our people who are peripatetic. We need within the Caribbean to have a few who are moving around on a continual basis monitoring

things that are going on, so that the Government is well fed with information. I hope that we can reach that stage, particularly as I believe that Barbados will continue to be a principal actor on the Caribbean stage. In fact, the challenge is there for us to become a significant actor on the wider Caribbean stage, and I am not restricting the Caribbean in this instance merely to the English-speaking Caribbean, I include all of the Caribbean, whether it be those bordering on the Caribbean Sea or those well within the Caribbean. They are our closest neighbours and, obviously, we must interact very carefully with them.

My concept is that some of the countries of the Caribbean see Haiti in terms of the economic benefit that they can get out of it only, and perhaps this is one of the primary matters influencing their approach, foreign policywise, at the moment on what has happened there. That is not the only perspective that Barbados can and should have on the matter, and that is why, Sir, I have taken this opportunity to really ask the Minister to bring Parliament and the country up to date on the Government's position.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I want to pick up again on a few points that were made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is trying to make us believe that everything in the Caribbean started with Haiti. I want to remind him that three days before the Haitian election, there was an election in Suriname, where there was also a military Government. The then Government of Suriname invited the Government of Barbados to send observers, as did the ACP-EEC delegation, and I was there as part of the ACP-EEC delegation. I want to know, if it is true that the Barbados Labour Party is so concerned about events in the Caribbean, how come it is that you were sure to make sure that there were observers in Haiti but you did not send any to Suriname? Isn't Suriname part of the Caribbean?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, if the honourable Member will give way. If the honourable Member - he is so out to just attack - would read the speech made by me as Chairman of the Barbados Labour Party, since he could not have heard it on television, he will see at that stage that I appealed for a bi-partisan approach to send in observers both to Haiti and to Suriname. That was in October!

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will send the honourable Member a copy of the speech. "... and preferably from Parliament," that is what I said at the time.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, in relation to Haiti, which has been raised by the

honourable Leader of the Opposition, it seems to me that the discussion at a national level has led to certain confusions, and I believe this was purposely orchestrated by persons who wanted to make the issue a partisan, political one.

The Haitian situation lends itself to certain problems, because it can be looked at in a variety of ways. There are persons who approach Haiti from a position of history. Haiti, because of the revolution that led to the establishment of Haiti as the first black Republic in the Caribbean, and because we produced people like Christophe, Dessaline, Toussaint L'Ouverture and others, has a romantic glow to persons who have studied some West Indian history. There are people who see Haiti even today in terms of that historical perspective. They have a romantic approach to it, they feel that all black people should be sympathetic to what is happening to the poor people in Haiti, and there are persons who would address the whole issue, for instance, of the Heads of Government Conference, which took place at Heywoods, and the events that are going on in Haiti today in those terms. I believe that that can lead to a fairly short-sighted approach to discussing the Haitian problem. If you are dealing with Haiti, I do not think there is much room for pure emotionalism. I am looking at it strictly from that kind of time frame that might bring a certain coloration to the spectacles that we might put on our eyes in looking at Haiti.

There is the other confusion, which is the ideological confusion. There are people who are seeing the role of the United States Government and the role, possibly, of the leftist countries that might at this time be battling for some kind of supremacy within Haiti. So people are likely to line up along the lines of whether you are supporting western, democratic norms or possibly other norms that are not well accepted in the Caribbean area. That is one area of divide.

There is the area of divide that comes from a basic humanitarian concern and a concern for the establishment of democratic systems - those persons who are fervent in wanting to be assured that Haiti will move along a particular kind of democracy, the kind that we are more concerned with, and accustomed to, in the English-speaking Caribbean, as against those who are wary of totalitarian systems which seem to deprive the masses of people of the kind of democracy that we enjoy in the Eastern Caribbean.

There is another area of confusion. There is an area of confusion that we have established something called CARICOM, which we believe should be the primary instrument for discussing matters relating to the people of the Caribbean area as against the formation of something called the Caribbean Democratic Union, a plant by the conservative countries of the world. They are aligned to something called the International Democratic Union, and membership comes from areas like the Republican

Administration of Ronald Reagan, the Thatcher Conservative Administration, the conservative Germans, and aligned with those, in the Caribbean you have been able to colonize people like Mr. Seaga, the Prime Minister of Jamaica; Eugenia Charles, Prime Minister of Dominica; John Compton, Mitchell, and so on.

The Barbados Labour Party, it is true, is not a member of the CDU. There are members of Socialist International. But under the Leadership of Tom Adams, their alliance was so close with the CDU and the IDU that you could not separate them in terms of policy and the position that they took: Because Tom was clever enough to be in Socialist International and still working closely with the Americans. Let us be very clear on this.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, on a point of order. I think my friend, the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris), has got his facts wrong. I believe the CDU was started after Tom Adams died in 1985.

Asides

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I can assure you, I speak fact; you believe wrong. Maybe you were not as closely aligned with the fellows in your party at that time. As to what was happening in terms of foreign policy, you might not have been in agreement with what they would have been doing, so they would not keep you informed of what was happening. I can assure you that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would know. 1.35p.m.

I can assure you that there was such a close alliance. I heard the Leader of the Opposition talk about the role that Barbados can play in the wider Caribbean, and Mr. Adams' role was to be the surrogate for Mr. Reagan in the Caribbean, grouping those people I talked about, that unilateral leadership of the Caribbean, of indeterminate political philosophy, pragmatists, who were willing to follow, down the line, Reagan and Thatcher in all policies, not only foreign but domestic policy also. The Barbados Labour Party is tainted with that; do not let them escape it. Even though they are *de facto* members of Socialist International, let us be very clear who they really are. So that is one of the areas of confusion.

I have very little respect, and I say this openly, for the Press in Barbados, and it lessened during the Heywoods consultation, because if people can say that they were not inside a meeting but they were making categorical statements about what was going on inside that meeting, then I wonder how you can give any credence at all to an institution that is supposed to be a responsible institution. Because the Press took up the line, which was supported by

the Barbados Labour Party, first of all, apparently giving the impression that Seaga was some big hero of the Heywoods consultation. He was the man who was pushed up as the man who took control and so on.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: You were there? I am going to tell you who was there. I am going to inform you about what happened at that consultation. I was there. You can listen.

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It leaked out, man.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable member goes on, I would wish that he refer to the gentleman by the proper title, Prime Minister Seaga, whatever you might think about him.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Sir, I will defer to your ruling on this - Prime Minister Seaga.

This is my personal estimation of what happened at that meeting. Prime Minister Seaga came with the intention that there should not have been a meeting or consultation on Haiti at all; that he would break it up. The fact that that meeting reached the level it reached was because of the Prime Minister of Barbados, the Honourable Erskine Sandiford. I am telling you that, and let the Press carry it. Disinformation was given out by the Press. That meeting was not to have been a meeting, the intention was that Seaga was to marshal his cohorts behind him and break up the meeting.

He started forth that he was not at a CARICOM meeting, when the Prime Minister of Barbados was saying there could only be a CARICOM meeting. But we know that is diplomacy. Even if you have all the force of rightness behind you, morality and justice and common sense, you are still counting numbers in the long run. In order to get a consensus, you still have to be counting numbers. But if you have a CDU phalanx inside there that was answering the call of Seaga - or a higher call, but through Seaga - but you are taking a CARICOM position against that. Then you have to use all your skills to get out at least an acceptable statement - and the communique that came out of Heywoods is acceptable - on hindsight anybody looking at it would know it is acceptable - because we never as a Government fell from our high principles, and that is why we established a particular statement even further.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am telling you this - and there are some people here who will be making notes to carry

back out to the American Embassy and so on; feel free to take the position clearly and make the notes clear and carry back - the very strong position taken by the Prime Minister of Barbados, supported by the delegation from Trinidad, was the strongest position at that meeting, but they were fighting against that conservative phalanx that the Barbados Labour Party is associated with, even if not through any formal kind of relationship, and it was really a struggle for CARICOM, and there was no reason why CARICOM should divide over something as fundamental as Haiti. But I do not think Mr. Seaga cared about that, Mr. Seaga was going down the line.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am sorry, Prime Minister Seaga.

I have my own intuition about the number of reasons that backed his particular position. I believe that there was a certain amount of amelioration of positions, because, let us be frank about it, the geopolitics of the discussion meant that people in Jamaica and people in the Bahamas had different problems facing them than those of us who live in the eastern Caribbean. Prime Minister Seaga is probably looking at a number of things. He would be looking at the drift of refugees, as the Bahamas would be affected; he has an election coming up; he has problems in terms of the integrity of the last electoral process and a boycott by the Opposition; he has problems of a violence prone country, and it would not be in his interest to see violence in Haiti because it might come over by him; he has problems also of a personal relationship with the Duvalier regime. Therefore, I understood from which direction he was coming, and he was coming from areas that we did not have to have as primary considerations in this part of, the Caribbean.

We were able to look at the Haitian situation from a more objective position, and based more on principle and philosophy, and I would like to suggest to this Honourable House that the Government of Barbados took a principled position when it went down to that consultation, one that is embodied in the draft communique that was produced there out of the consultation and negotiations. It went along with the broad position taken, but it retained its position in terms of what it saw as its ideal position on the matter. In a real political situation and a real diplomatic situation where you need a consensus in order to achieve some result, you can do that without at the same time losing all sight of your fundamental position, and that communique is not far away from the fundamental position that was taken before by the Government, and I would like to compliment the Minister of Foreign Affairs for his masterly statement that came at a later date, and it established very firmly what the position of this Government was.

But in the intervening period, I was very dissatisfied with the level of reporting in the Press and the impression that was attempted to be given that the leadership of this country had adopted a vacillating approach, or that Prime Minister Seaga had overrun anybody. It was not based on the facts - it could not have come out of any research or any analysis - nor the Press giving the impression that the Haitians who came down here were mistreated, were not given respect.

The Heads of Government of the Caribbean welcomed people in to address them, gave them a good hearing and allowed them to ask questions. At this level you do not formulate positions immediately after you hear some person deliver a statement and you ask them questions, and tell them when you go outside tell the Press this is what we agreed to do. And if they came out with their emotional froth and the Press welcomed them and embraced them - "we are disappointed" - and the Press, without any kind of objective analysis, give the whole world the view that these fellows were mistreated and were not given certain courtesies, I cannot support that kind of position.

I think we have reached a stage of our development in 1988 when the Press should be better, and I believe that when you are dealing with these matters of national, regional and international importance, you have a duty and responsibility to come better than that. You cannot produce those kinds of stories, those sort of weepy-soppy stories at this level of our development. We call for something more from the Press of this country. It is a very serious matter, because those reports are going to colour and condition, in turn, the kind of "Gutterperk" responses to serious matter in this country. 1.45 p.m.

The Press, obviously, has its agenda. If that agenda is one based on responsibility to the country as a whole, then they would not have to change it very soon. But I am saying that it is predisposed and based on partisan political consideration. It is a Barbados Labour Party Press, basically. You only have to look. They own *The Nation*. They have serious control in *The Advocate*. They have a lot of frothy commentators writing a whole lot of political hogwash in the newspapers every day. They are trying to subvert the decisions of the people of this country, the people who put this Democratic Labour Party in office, and they are trying to build up over five years this momentum of every day putting in this nonsense in the newspaper, and they have used every conceivable issue, minor issues and major issues. That can lead to serious problems in a country such as ours. I just want this to be known.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: You can get on about Richie Haynes and David Comissiong as much as you like.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order in the House. Another half a minute.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I have no difficulty with Richie Haynes, or David Comissiong, or whoever is writing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Who is that person?

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am saying that it is the wider responsibility of the Press, because the Press is an institution. You are talking about individuals. I do not deal at that level. It is the wider responsibility of the Press, as an institution, to the people. The Press has a responsibility to this country, first of all, and to black people not to make a mockery of this thing that we call politics.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON (St. John): Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a very short intervention. I think it is a timely one, because I do not think that I can, for much longer, contain my concern about what I consider to be the high level of hypocrisy with which positions are made on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party in various forums, not in this one in particular, from time to time.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition got up and talked about Socialist International and heralded the membership of the Barbados Labour Party in Socialist International as though that is now, and has always been, the basis for the positions that the Barbados Labour Party has taken on all issues in respect to foreign policy. He would forget how the Barbados Labour Party was lambasted at Socialist International. He was not there, because he was relegated to the back seat a long time prior to that

(Asides)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Oh, he was there? Well, even worse! I understand he was there.

They have been dealt with soundly at Socialist International on several occasions. But the most sinister thing about it in this big pretence that is going on about Socialist International is that the Barbados Labour Party youth arm, the Young Socialists, are members of the Caribbean Youth Congress, which is the youth arm of the Caribbean Democratic Union. You, as members of the Barbados Labour Party, the General Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party, the Leader of the Opposition, are the people now who are going to have to look seriously at the Barbados Labour Party, and at the Young Socialists, and find out what position their own young people are going to take on this issue, because whereas you think you

are so liberal and progressive, you have some young people behind you that do not even understand the dangers of the Caribbean Democratic Union, the danger that Prime Minister Seaga and Miss Charles and all of those who pose in this region.

I went to a conference for the launching of the Young Democrats in St. Vincent. I was the only representative of a political party that did not belong to the Caribbean Youth Congress and, by extension, the Caribbean Democratic Union. I was the only member at that meeting who was not a member of the CYC, the headquarters of which is in St. Lucia.

All of the participants at that conference were members of the Youth Congress. The Freedom Party of Dominica was represented by a young Senator, I think his name was Ossie Walsh, a little short fellow. I do not think he is well known. They railed against the communists, the filthy communist and so on. That is the level to which discussion took place at that meeting. I did not utter a word for the entire conference, so shocked and surprised was I that there was even a group of young people in the Caribbean that could be so backward and so indifferent to the progress of this region that all they could do is bring a man who had spent some time in Cuba to deliver a feature address at the opening session and the launching of the Young Democrats of the New Democratic Party in St. Vincent.

I am also going to say for the record, because our political party has an association with the new Democratic Party, that I was so shocked to discover that the youth arm of the New Democratic Party was a member of the CYC. I was completely out of place.

(Asides)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You know what they are doing, but the Young Socialists do not know, so have a session and tell them. You are in here carrying on about Socialist International and you are talking about Hector Wynter and everybody, so go and explain to the members of the Young Socialists.

You have a mouthpiece in here whose only duty, as he sees it, is to talk about who holds parties at Ilaro Court. He does not talk about the gambling that took place up there years ago, but he talks about who holds parties there now. He does not analyse one single critical issue that affects Caribbean people. In fact, I would not expect that he could speak about Haiti, but even if he did, he should, at least, be able to articulate the CDU's position on behalf of the Young Socialists.

The sanctimonious approach, the *ex cathedra* enunciation of principles from the Barbados Labour Party, led by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in here, and the contradictions which emanate from the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, as she calls herself - she will soon drop "the Senate," she will soon be saying the Leader of the Opposition - all of this posturing that we had in here about Socialist International, on T.V. forgetting Socialist International, is a new manoeuvre by the Barbados Labour Party. I must say that after watching the discussion in which Senator Miller took part, she was more humiliated by the other person, who seemed, certainly, more knowledgeable than her on the Haitian situation, than by the position she took. If the honourable Members now wish to retreat from her position, that is perfectly legitimate, understandable and desirable, so I can understand why we would be told in here that she is not the spokesman.

But even if we observe the statement made by the Shadow Minister of Foreign Affairs, Senator Louis Tull which sought....

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Even if we approach that from the analysis of the Barbados Labour Party's position at the time, as they enunciated on Haiti, I am telling you that notwithstanding what was said, the Barbados Labour Party would have acquiesced and accepted the position of Mr. Seaga with open arms. That is what the average man believes. In all this talk about sending people to an election, at no point did the Barbados Labour Party actually set out definitively its position on Haiti.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition relegated to one paragraph, at the end of a speech delivered on the 21st Anniversary of Independence, when he did not even mention Independence, comment on Haiti and Suriname and he considers that sufficient for us to read and understand what the Barbados Labour Party's position is on Haiti or international events as a whole. Is that what you consider to be a principle?

(Aside Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You had better read it.)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I read it. It could be read in five minutes. You could flash it in front of my eyes and I could repeat it. That is how flimsy it was, and yet you would stand up and blare it forth as a high principle.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: My position is the position of the Democratic Labour Party. I do not have difficulty. It

is Miss Miller that has difficulty, and Senator Tull and you. We have a position and that position is my position. 1.55p.m.

At least, the Barbados Government demonstrated that it had a commitment to the CARICOM Treaty and that that commitment was to reaching consensus on foreign policy. There are few times, if any, in the history of this region when consensus has been reached on matters relating to foreign policy - the Falkland Islands, the Grenada situation - and if there was an opportunity or an occasion on which consensus could be reached, and the Barbados Government felt that such a consensus was worth pursuing, I see nothing wrong with what took place at Heywoods and the result of what took place there.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The commitment was to reaching consensus under the terms of the CARICOM Treaty. But you would not have any commitment to that. The Opposition would not have any commitment to CARICOM, because if the Heads of Government could not meet for seven or ten years, or something like that, to discuss mundane or important issues, and the Barbados Labour Party was responsible at that time for the affairs of this country and representing Barbados, how could we expect that you would promote the CARICOM position? If, therefore, the Barbados Labour Party wishes us - that is, members of the public, or myself and others - to believe that their membership of Socialist International clothe them with the authority to speak on behalf of progressive Governments in this region all of a sudden, then we would have to ignore the past. We would also have to ignore the fact that your bright and learned young people who are coming forward are members of CYC, which is a client organization of the CDU. We would have also to ignore Senator Miller's position on the issue. All of those things we would have to ignore.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable gentlemen, before the honourable gentleman continues^ I know that after five weeks vacation we have a lot in us stored up and we want to get rid of some things, but I have allowed a lot of cross-talk so far. Let us contain ourselves for the balance of the debate.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: All that the members of the Opposition and the so-called commentators in this country have been concerned about is who appeared to be most authoritative at the conference. But that cannot be an issue. How can it be an issue? Great moments in history, in the world not only in the region, were reached because somebody had to compromise and sit down and hammer

out a solution. If everybody went in with the same attitude, that their view should prevail, we would never reach anything. The Democratic Labour Party would never have been formed, because each of the persons, as I understand it, who went in the room when the first meeting took place, had different philosophies and views of life. But some of them were willing to compromise .lose positions for the benefit of the masses. The same thing obtains with the Barbados Labour Party, because if not, I will have to ask how the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) could even have the temerity to sit in a political party.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I am appealing once again for a little quiet while the honourable Member for St. John is debating. I do not want to name anybody, so just allow the debate to continue.

Even as I speak the Leader of the Opposition is having his cross-talk, and the honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Let us contain ourselves. I have been rather patient up to now, but I do not have the patience of Job.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, they are not going to foze me. I do not thrive on asides like the honourable Member for St. Thomas. If there were no asides, he would never speak in here.

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I do not thrive on asides, so I am saying what I have to say. Regardless of asides, nobody is going to dictate to me what I should say.

I am saying, as I said before, that if consistency was the Barbados Labour Party's hallmark, all of those factors that I have just mentioned - their past positions, their membership of Socialist International, the fact that the Young Socialists are members of the CYC, which is a client of the CDU - would have to be ignored, and all of a sudden we would have to perceive the Barbados Labour Party in entirely new light, devoid its historical role in this region when it was in Government and when it is out of Government. No amount of posturing by the Shadow Minister of Foreign Affairs, or defence of Senator Miller by the Opposition Leader, which defence she would not prefer by him, I am certain, is going to erase in the minds of Barbadians how the Barbados Labour Party is to be perceived in this whole scenario on Haiti, and how the Democratic Labour Party, as a political party committed to CARICOM and the ideals of the CARICOM Treaty, can be viewed in respect of the Haiti issue.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Sir, put the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: If we are going to continue this debate further, I will then have to move the suspension for lunch.

I, therefore, ask, Sir, that Your Honour do report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN report progress to His Honour the Speaker and ask for leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and reported to Mr. SPEAKER, who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

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

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

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (RESUMED)

AMENDMENTS TO EXPLANATORY NOTES IN THE ESTIMATES HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS (CONT'D)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St Thomas had indicated he wanted to speak.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, in relation to the Heywoods meeting of CARICOM/Caribbean Leaders, without going into all the facts, positions taken before the meeting, I believe the people in Barbados who were following the events in Haiti accepted the stance of the Barbados Government before it went to the conference. The position of the Barbados Government, as enunciated prior to the conference, seemed to have been a reasonable and wholly credible one. Given that first premise, the function of the Barbados Government at the conference ought to have been the stoutest possible defence of that position. I have no doubt that the delegation tried to defend its position, but the failure of Barbados to maintain that first position was clearly reflected and enunciated in the comments of the Prime Minister at two or three o'clock the next morning at the Press Conference after Mr. Seaga had spoken, and spoken quite roughly, to Mr. Ricky Singh.

The Prime Minister at that time was trying to explain how it was that Barbados came to support a conference decision that was not originally its own. That is what he was concerned to explain, because there is no doubt, despite the frowns on the brow of the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons), that Barbados moved from its original position to another position by the end of the conference and supported a communique which has been subjected to mass criticism at all levels throughout the Caribbean as a wishy-washy document that has let down Caribbean people. Barbados supported the communique.

We had the spectre that Barbados had position number one and moved to position number two reflected in the communique, and by the next day, when the criticisms started to grind, Barbados had moved yet further to position number three, which was saying that what we had agreed to in the communique, we are prepared to scrap now, and as has happened in the last week, St. Lucia, Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago all appear to be breaking for themselves and not to be supporting the collectivism of the communique. It is a matter for them. If you could have broken at that stage, why did you not break before you signed the communique? That is one of the things that is concerning us.

I do not accept that, in the context of a meeting whose designation and composition was diluted to the extent that it was called a CARICOM/Caribbean Leaders meeting, there was any need for unanimity. It started originally as a CARICOM Heads of Government meeting. If it had maintained that designation and character, then the unanimity rule had paramountcy in that context. When the meeting has contaminated itself into something else, I do not believe that unanimity rule has the same paramountcy. Even if it was a CARICOM meeting, there is precedent in

1983 with Grenada. Burnham and Chambers took a dissenting position on Grenada and wrote it into the record. If Barbados felt strongly about its original position at Heywoods, it could have acted similarly. There was nothing to prevent it.

Those are facts - nobody has made up anything or is trying to put impressions or opinions on those facts - emanating from the highest political figure in this country and from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, that we had a position and, as I understand it, in an attempt to have compromise and bring about a consensus, we moved from that original position. But there are some things on which there can be no compromise. I am not going to press the Government on that, because they were in there and they would know what factors were at work and motivated or pushed the Government. Perhaps, the Government may have been trying to save the conference, I do not know. If Prime Minister Seaga tried to walk out three times, really, a next time, please remember that if he threatens, tell him, "Go man, go from Heywoods." Help him get the first flight to Miami. But I think that, in future, our leaders must be conscious of what can be motivating a particular country to behave in a particular way, in its own self-interest, but to the detriment of the image of Barbados if we are sufficiently careless to be manoeuvred or out-maneuvred into a position.

I am not pressing the Prime Minister, because I understand that he was in a difficult situation. What I am concerned about is that those facts which are not in dispute have been all carried by the various sections of the Press in this country, and the fact that they have been carried by the Press has today evoked from the honourable member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris) a lambasting and an uncompromising attack on the Press of this country accusing them virtually of subversion.

(*Aside:* Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Not the Press, you! You own the Press!) 3.10p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am pleased to hear, Sir, that I am in a position to own Dr. Waldo Ramsay, who wrote these words, "It would seem that Mr. Seaga was the only participant at the conference who was prepared and who had studied the subject matter before hand, and was intimately familiar with it." I am pleased to know that I own him, Ricky Singh, Oliver H. Jackman C.M.G., Hartley Henry, Dr. Emmanuel and Dr. Duncan, who wrote in the Press and spoke on the radio critical of the stance of the Barbados delegation, in which the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was a participant. I also seem to own, and be responsible for the views of, Senator Comissiong last Sunday, lambasting the leadership of his own party, and those of the honourable Member for St.

Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes). Democracy at work!

What we heard today from the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was an unwarranted attack on the Press.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He did not say he was talking about me. I have a few thousand shares, and was one of the few black people in this country that had the foresight in 1973 - eleven of us, a Sunday morning in Bay Street - to put up \$2 000 to start a newspaper. Curse me for being a black entrepreneur!

When that same newspaper, *The Nation*, that is under attack today, allowed the present Minister of Foreign Affairs to write every Sunday on "Men and Matters", it was not the worst thing in the world then. I wonder if the same Minister of Foreign Affairs that was in that delegation told you that in 1968 he received a medal from Duvalier in Haiti, as did Waldo Ramsay subsequently. Did they tell you all that? All this talk about principled conduct and you attacking the Barbados Labour Party on its policies, look inside and see.

The honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson) told us today that the party of which he is a member started without any real collective philosophy. You had a bunch of people saying all kinds of things, supporting all kinds of ideologies and political stances, from Douglas Lynch back down to L.B. Brathwaite, who was a top, uncompromising socialist and left because of Douglas Lynch.

What we have got is an attempt to blame the Press in this country and the Barbados Labour Party for the ultimate weak position that Barbados took at Heywoods, for whatever reason. You were there. All that has happened is that after the communique, there was a substantial amount of popular criticism of Government's position, the call-in programmes were replete, the Press, all kinds, and Government found itself under pressure to justify its position, so it kept silent for a week and then paraded the Foreign Minister on television a night last week for 35 minutes.

. Mr. R. L. MORRIS: On a point of order: If I remember, the communique suggested to the Administration in Haiti that it should put certain measures in train to ensure that the election machinery would have been acceptable. If the Government came out after a week to make a comment, it was only so because it had to give the Administration in Haiti time to assess what the communique was asking it to do and, therefore, give the

Government time to respond to the request that was made to that Administration.

It would have been totally unfair to send a communique asking the Administration to make certain changes and then comment without giving a period of time to pass before a comment was made.

There was another deadline in that the elections were set for a particular date, so you had to come between the time of the communique and the time of the deadline for the elections.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One week after the communique, Sir, what was described as a comment was really 35 minutes of the Foreign Minister on the radio and television reading a 16 page prepared document and trying to make believe that he was not reading it. He gave the impression that this was a spontaneous thing for 35 minutes, all the "ams" and all of that. Fooling who?

The result of the weakness of the Government's position on Haiti is that the Caribbean people, from comments one is hearing on Caribbean radio stations and reading in the regional Press, are now questioning the competence of all CARICOM leaders.

Dr. Duncan had some very strong words on the CANA afternoon programme immediately after, but I was in St. Vincent doing a case Thursday and Friday, and the taximen were waiting at St. Vincent Airport Friday morning, and they were talking about the fact that we lost the cricket game in the test match in India, and, Sir, they were suggesting that, well, the Caribbean is on its way down because we do not seem to show any resilience and we are not prepared to take tough decisions based on principle.

It may be that the time is ripe for Caribbean leaders to address the kind of cynicism that is being reflected in the attitudes of the Caribbean public to their various postures and decisions. I have no doubt that the experiences at Heywoods would be salutary for a Government in future, and all we ask on this side is that the Government in its foreign affairs dealings take a....

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We are not asking that the Minister of Foreign Affairs should go. The Prime Minister will deal with him in due course.

We must not appear to be reversing one's stance. We may get away with it in little domestic politics and policies, but we cannot get away with appearing to reverse ourselves on international and regional stages. We will only incur

opprobrium and disrespect, and that position Barbados held over the years of a strong, courageous
3.20 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Do not open your mouths and turn up your eyebrows like I am talking foolishness. Under Adams and Barrow this country had a position that was respected in the Caribbean and beyond.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am sure that the Honourable Prime Minister is committed to the maintenance of that image. All I am asking is that in the future, when we take reasonable and principled positions, we have the courage to stand up to them. If it means walking out, come and tell Barbadians why you walked out, if you had a sound and proper position.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Under both Adamases.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has another minute to wind up.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One minute, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, the Government must realize that even if it thought that it did what was right at Heywoods, the public's perception has been that, somehow, Government seemed to have resiled and retreated from its original position, and the facts of the matter, the objective facts that have been released, seem to support that public perception. In the interest of Barbados, I am glad that statements were made by the leadership last week, the Prime Minister on the weekend and the Foreign Minister on Thursday night, to try and set the record straight But Government has to deal with a question of perception, and that is what will linger.

I am much obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Attorney General.

Hon. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Chairman, I believe that, unfortunately, this debate reflects a lot of the confusion which has been brought into the issue of Haiti. I am talking about the confusion coming from the Opposition side. I think what we can become very misled into doing is to perceive that we in the Caribbean can exercise influences which are far greater than we can really exercise. I am talking about the real politics of a situation in a real world.

The honourable Member for St Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) has belaboured the point that Barbados' position was weak at the conference. I think that on an objective analysis of the situation by anyone who was present.....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, on a point of elucidation: I never said that Barbados' position was weak at the conference. I began by saying, and I was very careful, Sir, "before the conference," Barbados had a strong, principled and credible position. I do not know what went on in the conference, but by the time the communique came at the end of the conference, and then the Prime Minister's explanations or comments after the communique at 3 o'clock in the morning, Barbados' position seem to have shifted from a strong position to one of comparative weakness.

Hon. M. A. KING: I understand the honourable Member to be saying that Barbados' position was strong before the conference and that it changed from a strong position to a weak one. And I am saying that when you make that sort of statement you lay the ground for the massive misinterpretation of what went on at Heywoods, which is now so caught up in the public comprehension of what took place.

What was the position? Before the conference, Barbados was saying that we would not recognize the elections of a Government coming out of those elections. That is the position which had been articulated on behalf of the Government before. That position substantially has not been changed. What has happened, in fact, is that at the conference, and what the communique said, is that we called.....

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: hold a minute! we called upon the Government of Haiti to take all the necessary steps to ensure that the elections were free and fair, to remove the offending clauses which would militate against free, fair, and just elections. Beyond that, nothing was done, the final step of saying we are not recognizing you up front was not taken. But that did not say that if we are satisfied that the Government of Haiti did not take the steps which we, and the communique, required of it to take, and if after the elections have taken place we are satisfied that the elections were not free and fair and that the people of Haiti are not democratically represented, we are pre-empted from saying we will not recognize any Government coming out of elections which are manifestly fraudulent or unfair and in which people are not given the right to vote in the way in which it is understood.

On the news this morning, I heard that the Canadian Government has said that it is not recognizing the

Government of Haiti. That position was not taken up front before the elections were held. I do not know of any of the major nations of the world, those which understand what International law and international relations are all about, which took a decision up front and said, "We are not recognizing you." It seems to me that the pragmatic and sensible way of dealing with an issue is you look to see what has taken place, and if after what has taken place does not produce a result which we say is free and fair, we reserve our option. I am saying to you that that is. all the resolution at the conference did - to preserve the positions of everyone in CARICOM who attended that conference.

The Press in this country, I am suggesting, has been so unreasonable in its assessment and its analysis of what took place that it came with a prepared position, and that if the position was not taken that you out front condemn everything that was going on, nothing other than that would be acceptable to anybody.

That was also the position which has been taken by the delegation of leaders, who did not participate in the elections, who came from Haiti. Their one mission was to ensure that CARICOM passed a resolution which condemned the elections out-of-hand, up front, and if anything less than that was done, then the conference, as far as they were concerned, was a total failure. That was the position which was orchestrated by the national Press and international Press, and you had the widespread misinterpretation of what I perceive to be a reasonable declaration in the circumstances, the best that could be got out of a conference at that time.

In what other way can you say that we retreated from the position we originally held? Public comment is all over the place - Barbados held a strong position before and after a weak position. Would anyone stop to articulate the position we held before and compare the position we held after, and tell us in what substantial areas the changes have been made and the extent to which the differences take place? If you do that kind of analysis, you will see that the only critical area of difference was a matter of if you say before the conference ended, or in the communique, that you were not accepting the elections beforehand, rather than leave your options open at some later stage to say we cannot accept these elections, after seeing what has gone on.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: That is what people call the strong position. 3.30 p.m.

The other point which is being made is that Barbados totally compromised at the conference. Totally ridiculous!

The Prime Minister, who led the delegation, took the position which had been articulated by Barbados all along, and maintained its position through thick and thin. Even to the point where there came a compromise later on as to whether the meeting was a CARICOM meeting or CARICOM Leaders meeting, the Prime Minister maintained the point, "I have made Barbados available as a meeting of CARICOM Leaders." What else was he to do? And he said that as far as he was concerned, that was the meeting he was attending.

It is not Barbados alone who was at the conference. There were a whole lot of other nations there. They all made concessions along the way. What we all have to recognise is that in international organisations, when you are in international discussions, there are compromises along the way. If you look at the Resolutions of the United Nations, the Organisation of American States, the Organisation of African Unity, of any international organisation, you will see compromises along the way in order to reach a resolution on an issue. From time to time, the resolutions may be labelled as being weak or being ineffective, but occasionally - and the international world understands this - anyone who understands diplomacy understands this - sometimes resolutions which are less strong and powerful than would be desired are reached in order to make a point. What are we saying? Is CARICOM so different from all other international forums? Is CARICOM so different that we have to be so different from anybody else? Are we so powerful that we can dictate to others what they should do?

We express an opinion on the position in Haiti. In the real world, how effective in relation to securing for the people of Haiti, who are the persons, after all, who really matter in all of this, is what we say and do going to be to secure for them the freedom and the democracy which we would like to see them achieve?

I think we run the danger of ignoring the real politics in the confused world in which we live. The situation in Haiti, as far as certain influences in the western hemisphere are concerned, is not as simple as you pass resolutions and you will get results. There are very strong geo-political influences at work in the region, and if we ignore that, we do not understand what is going on around us.

I think the fact that the conference was able to arrive at a conclusion in the terms in which it did is something which should be commended. We did not fall into the trap of allowing the conference to be broken up. One or other persons could have broken up the conference, and I am sure, and I guarantee you this, that if that conference had foundered and had broken up, you would have heard a different story from the Press: "Caribbean leaders

irresponsible!" "Break up the meeting!" "Breaking up CARICOM!" "Can't agree on anything!"

When you want to find an issue to attack, when you want to make political capital out of an issue, you will make that capital irrespective of what the position is. Whether the conference passed the resolution which was passed, or whether the conference broke up without passing a resolution, I risk to bet, Mr. Chairman, that the Press in this country would have found the same kind of critical comment to make on the stand taken by the Government of Barbados, and let us have no bones about that: "CARICOM breaks up!" "The Barbados Government could not even save CARICOM!" "If others were here, this would not have happened!"

Everybody will talk now about what Mr. Barrow would do if he were here. When you want to be pejorative, those are the kinds of comparisons you make, but in a real situation you do not know what Mr. Barrow would have done either, so do not tell us if Mr. Barrow were here. You can make those comparisons at this time and from this distance and make any kind of statement you like, because the statement cannot be controverted by the man, so it is not really a fair position to put. In the final analysis, we have to look at the situation in real terms.

I understand the comment from the honourable Member for St. Thomas in political terms. We all condemn what is going on in Haiti now, but Haiti has not just started to be the way it is, Haiti has been the way it is now for several years. Haiti has been admitted as an observer to CARICOM, and Haiti was admitted as an observer to CARICOM at a time when Duvalier ruled Haiti, when the worst kind of atrocities happened in Haiti - 1984, I believe it was. We were not the Government then, but the Government of Barbados recognized Haiti, and was party, with the rest of CARICOM, to admitting Haiti as an observer to CARICOM. Are you saying that suddenly everything has gone wrong in Haiti? Why did you not take the position in 1984 which is being taken now and say, things in Haiti are so bad, it is undemocratic, there is no move towards democracy and therefore we will not even admit you, we will not participate with you in any CARICOM arrangement? But that was not so.

I make that illustration to indicate that all that is being said on Haiti now, and I suggest by the articulate opinion which is against the Government, has to be looked at, particularly when it comes from the Opposition, against a background of a political position being taken, and of the need to make as much political capital out of it. I think that the public of Barbados should be more analytical in its judgement and assessment of what goes on in this little world around us, recognize what are the strengths and weaknesses of us as a Caribbean people, recognize what are

the strengths and weaknesses of us as Barbadians, and do not fool ourselves that we are more important in this world and region than we really are.

We have to make statements based on principled positions, because that is all we have. We do not have the might to do what countries with great might can do. We have to stick to our positions and recognize the extent of the influence. I feel that in this analysis of the whole Haitian question some reason should be brought to bear, and that we are not guided and dictated entirely by emotional and political concerns in the whole assessment. 3.40 p.m.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to stick to the script and deal with the queries raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that there will be an opportunity for a full-scale debate on Haiti if and when that is required. I will come back to that a little later.

The Leader of the Opposition raised the question about security in Britain. This matter is still being investigated by the authorities concerned. There was an incident at our High Commission in London in which an unidentified person entered the premises of the Barbados Government, in particular, that part of the premises which is occupied by the Board of Tourism, asked for the offices of Caribbean Airways and, apparently, when told that the offices were no longer there and that that operation was not being conducted there, he became incensed to the extent of drawing some kind of instrument which caused bodily harm to one of the officers of the Board of Tourism. In that incensed mood, he went to another part of the premises and did some damage to the property.

As I said, this matter is being investigated. It was reported to the authorities in London. The security that was in place, I believe, at that particular time, was not in that part of the building, so our line of security could not deal with the situation at that time. As soon as more information comes to hand, such as can be disclosed, I will be willing to share that with the Leader of the Opposition and with this Honourable Chamber.

It is the duty of the Government to establish missions, wherever it is being expedient so to do, to promote the economic, political and cultural interest of the country and to protect the rights and the legitimate interest of citizens at home or abroad. In order to do this, those who are to give the protection must themselves have a cover of protection, and like a number of other missions abroad, Barbados has to pay greater attention to security, the protection of its property and its agents and I mean political and diplomatic agents, who operate from those premises and in those

countries. The very largest delegations have had to take this particular action, and this country, both externally and internally, will have to pay greater attention to the security interests and needs of itself.

I do not wish to go any further on this matter, but I would like to assure the Leader of this Honourable Chamber that we are taking steps to increase the level of security at our missions. I hope that the perpetrator of this incident might be apprehended and brought to justice for the offence against our mission and a member of our staff. We are very concerned about it. Those who have the responsibility for the protection of diplomats, and for the prevention of crime generally, are carrying out the investigation.

The other question raised by the Leader of the Opposition was in respect of whether the Government, if I understood him correctly, would make a statement relating to the position of the Government arising out of the elections which took place on Sunday. We are not in a position to make that statement at this time. The elections took place and there have been various reports from various sources on the outcome of those elections, and the manner in which those elections were conducted. We do not run a Government from the hip pocket.

The Leader of the Opposition indicated that Governments, and I take it that he was talking about not only the present Government but previous Governments, did not have enough people on the ground to get the kind of firsthand information which would lead to instantaneous assessments of events, particularly in foreign countries. We are examining the reports, from a diverse variety of sources, on the conduct of those elections, and we will match that against our positions both before, during and after the Heywoods Conference, and in the fullness of time, we will make a statement on our position in respect of recognition of a Government emerging out of those elections.

I think that is a fair, logical and a principled way on which to proceed. If the Leader of the Opposition does not agree, he can say so now. Do you agree with that approach?

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: We are saying that we should have a bipartisan approach on foreign policy and I would like to see that reflected not only in the statement, but in the actions, because there are a number of areas in which I am very concerned. I am very concerned when this country is divided, whether it is by the Opposition, by interests inside of the country, or by the Press, on issues on which we should not be divided.

When the Government stated its position on Haiti, we did not hear at that time that the Opposition supported the Government's position. There was absolutely no support, no comment from the Opposition on the so-called strong position of the government before the Conference. That support or that statement came afterwards, and it came in the context of when the communique was issued from Heywoods and the Opposition was then putting itself in a position to dissociate itself from what went on in Haiti and to attack what they have now taken up as something about weak leadership and so on. They then came out and said they agreed with the former position, but they never told anybody that they agreed with that position when it was enunciated. 3.50 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Chronologically, he should know that the Opposition on that matter was put well ahead of the Heywoods' position. We made a statement I made two statements on the radio as to the position when the Government came out with its position pre-Heywoods. It accorded with exactly what he said.

The Prime Minister knows I have repeatedly urged -1 will not be taking up much of his time - a bipartisan approach on foreign policy. For instance, the Prime Minister would have seen in the Press that I feel very strongly, as deeply as the Government feels, about the position on the recognition that Dame Nita Barrow is the best candidate that we have for the office of Presidency of the United Nations, and I do not understand why other countries are undermining Barbados' position. There is no division between us on that issue. I have made the statement repeatedly. It may well be that I make it in my usual quiet manner and I do not shout it from the roof-top, but it has been made.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about the Leader of the Opposition now, but maybe others who have spoken in this debate, because I think the Leader of the Opposition restricted himself to the elections that took place, the post-Heywoods situation, but others concerned themselves with other areas. I find it passing strange for the shades to be invoked in order to ask, where has our leadership gone? Everybody now suddenly gets very confused and concerned about leadership, to the extent, and I make no apologies for saying it, that one of the hard working public servants that we have had in this country, Mr. Bernard St. John - I described him as a hard working public servant - his name is now being omitted altogether from those who have provided strong leadership in the country, and by no other than those who are talking about strong leadership. It happened here on the floor of the House. They would not even give any credit in terms of strong leadership, or in terms of the kind of leadership at all. I am really surprised at that.

I am surprised at something else, that a party, when, supposedly, strong leadership was in place, could not get the Heads of CARICOM to meet for almost seven years and they are now holding themselves up as some great, great leaders in the area. That same party and those same members - and I say this in my very quiet way.....

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Those same leaders who caused turmoil and confusion in the economic affairs of CARICOM over a shirt jac, in an issue between Barbados and Trinidad....

(Aside: Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is right!)

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:....these are the ones who are now holding themselves up talking about strong leadership in CARICOM.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Who was that - Bree?

You have another one in CARICOM, the Multilateral Clearing Facility, problems inside of CARICOM, all of those compounded. Now why do we have to invoke or bring into play a question of leadership in a matter where you are talking about a inter-governmental conference?

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Since when has this Richie, whoever Richie is in here - I do not know who is Richie in here....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The "Richie" to whom I was referring in an aside, Sir, is the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, who, in a published statement....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, in a published statement, spoke of weak leadership.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. I do not want to hear. No point of order.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I wonder since when have you, in particular, got into this stance of quoting the Member for St. Michael South Central with such approbation. It is really very amazing to me.

But let us understand this whole question of Government, and now, holy of holies, they are also quoting

Parliamentarians, chosen by the Parliaments of the region, and including representatives of both Government and Opposition, to discuss issues of CARICOM. If that particular body were in place, the situation in Haiti would have been a very good subject to be discussed by the parliamentarians of the region for informing not only themselves and the people of the region, but the other institutions of CARICOM itself.

I believe the Leader of the Opposition made some comment on that as well, and it was not supportive, and a section of the Press came out and sided with a foreign Prime Minister against the Prime Minister of Barbados on that issue.

We have got to understand what nationalism is. We have got to understand what regionalism is. We have got to understand that when issues are being discussed and debated, we must not put narrow, sectional, political interests on expediency. We must not bring these things to play in the situation to the expense of our national situation.

When we go into an inter-governmental conference - and that is nothing more than what CARICOM is - it is a meeting of Governments, it is not a supernational institution - we are trying to erect in the Caribbean the kinds of institutions that can give meaning and sustenance and life to the concept of the Caribbean. But we have not arrived yet at the institutions that will perfectly give meaning to the Caribbean man and institution. What we have is an inter-governmental body, and when each Government, including the Government of Barbados, goes to a meeting, it goes in with a national position, and it seeks to gain the maximum possible support for that particular position, but that is consonant with the purposes of the meeting.

Barbados is at the forefront, along with other Caribbean countries, in trying to make CARICOM a viable and strong institution, both within the region, to deal with regional issues, and also in terms of dealing with the interests of CARICOM in respect of interests outside of the region.

It would have been to the undying shame of this region if the leaders of CARICOM came together and then could not come out with a statement on the situation in Haiti. That was the whole purpose behind it. They wanted to pin the blame on Barbados and there were certain interests who wanted to pin the blame on me. Nothing would have served the short-term political interests of those who may be short-term and purblind than for that conference to have broken up without coming to any conclusion, and we came to the decision that it was of the utmost importance for CARICOM, and for the dignity of the position of Caribbean peoples, that as the leaders of the region we should come to a consensus on this, and the

statement that we arrived at was stronger than any other statement which has been issued from anywhere else by any international organisation.

The United Nations has not been able to deal with this issue. The OAS met and dealt with it and came out with a very weak statement. The United States said they were part of that, but they wanted a stronger position in relation to the resolution emerging out of the OAS meeting. The CARICOM leaders met, and by putting our heads together, by diverting the intransigence and keeping it within limits, we came out with a statement that guaranteed the position of CARICOM, secured the dignity of the people of the region and established our solidarity and our commitment to the principle of fair and free elections in terms of Haiti. 4.10p.m.

I think, that instead of trying to divide on these particular issues, the lesson we should learn is that we should seek to give support, especially on our home territory, and not try to divide the population in this country and in the Caribbean for narrow political gain, because today it may be you, tomorrow it may be somebody else. In the end, it is the country and the region which will suffer.

Applause.

The question that Head 35, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 No. 32 -
\$442382

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, the amount of money provided for the purposes of the Ministry of the Public Service has turned out to be insufficient to meet the needs of that Ministry, and it is therefore necessary to seek supplementary provision to enable that Ministry of the Civil Service to carry out its functions for the remainder of this financial year.

I am, therefore, moving that the Resolution for the sum of \$442 382 be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1987-88, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1987-88, No. 32, which form the Schedule to this Resolution and which is before this committee for consideration.

In respect of Subhead 1, it should be noted that furniture had been supplied for this Ministry, but that furniture, however, had to be paid for out of this current year's provision, the furniture having been supplied in the previous financial year. The amount of \$20 826 which is

the late Prime Minister Enrol Barrow as their authority and their patron saint. They are talking about strong leadership, but when we had a position

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not going to talk about Grenada. They sided with the same Seaga on that. They did the same thing that you all are accusing us now.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have not talked about siding or not siding. The issue is being raised over there, and you went along with Seaga.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: And you went along with us!)

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: What are the issues we are really talking about? I think we have got to seek to cultivate in this country a deeper understanding of the background and the issues related to foreign policy. Recognition of a Government does not depend on whether you like its policies or not. It is a political decision that is taken at any given time. We can go back to the record of both Governments, and not only the Government of Barbados, but other countries as well, in which countries are recognised, and see the principles or lack of them on which they are recognized.

Let us look at their record. They are very, very incensed, morally outraged, about what is happening in Haiti. But it is your Government, the Barbados Labour Party Government, which recognized the People's Republic of China.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Send them out then!)

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not talking about sending anybody out of the country. That is irrelevant. Those are not the considerations.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, North Korea, that is the Communist part, Czechoslovakia, Hungary - those are the countries which in 1977 or thereabouts you recognized!

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Under his leadership - the Leader of the Opposition!

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, quiet.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have never heard that elections in those countries would measure up to the criteria that you could describe as fair and free in the sense that we understand it. How come, all of a sudden, there is this outrage?

Then there is this talk about Barbados' position being weakened. We live in a democracy, and long may it be so, and the Press is free to make its comments, to take its positions and to make its observations. They can be wise or they can be silly, but this is what a democracy is about. It is about the free expression of opinion within the framework of the law. But that does not mean that when the Press makes its comments, you just have to sit back and say this is the fourth estate speaking and therefore their comments are above criticism. 4.00 p.m.

. Honourable Members over here are free, just as the Press is free, to criticize the Government or to criticize the Prime Minister - I have not heard them criticizing the Member for St Thomas - and if they are free to criticize, members of the public and members of this Chamber who claim freedom of speech are also free to criticize them. That is what democracy is about. But those who now try to take positions forget what positions they took previously.

I recall that I got up in this country and I said that the majority people in this country should own resources on the main street in Barbados if we are to establish ourselves as genuinely independent. Everybody knew what I was talking about. I do not talk race, because I believe that this country is a multiracial society, and freedom to live in this country and to abide by our laws is guaranteed to all persons of all classes, colours, religion or whatever, so long as they abide by our Constitution and our laws. But I said that the majority people in this country, as is only fair, should own a substantial part of the resources on Broad Street. One newspaper took me to task saying that I had lost my normal cool and sense of balance and judgement on this issue. But when recently there was a problem in Fiji, that same newspaper came back and said that if we are not careful, it will happen here.

Let me quote another example. I remember at the last CARICOM Heads of Government meeting in St. Lucia advocating the position, after examining the institutions of CARICOM and seeing deficiencies in that institution, that the democratic forces in the Caribbean should be brought into relationship with the executive institutions of CARICOM, that is, the CARICOM Heads of Government and the various standing committees and so on, and that the parliamentarians of the region should be brought together in an institution, which I called an Assembly of

being requested is, therefore, a reasonable request for supplementary provision.

I beg to move that Subhead 1 for the sum of \$20 826 stand part.

Under Subhead 2, Training Administration, there had been some acting appointments in the Training Administration. Some members of the permanent staff have been on leave and, therefore, the amount calculated for the purposes of this item to meet the National Insurance Contributions and the Transport Levy has proved to be insufficient, and a supplement in the sum of \$2 075 for the National Insurance Contributions and \$72 for the Transport Levy is required for the essential functioning of the Training Administration.

I beg to move that this particular Subhead stand part.

In respect of Subhead 8, the Data Processing Department, this is an amount to pay for utilities in respect of telephone services. That also, is a reasonable request and is commended to this Honourable Committee for approval.

Subhead 9 is the Printing Department. The amount provided, which was \$2 000, is inadequate for the purposes of the Printing Department to cover expenditure for the remainder of the financial year. A supplement of \$960 is required under Travelling, and a sum of \$5,020 is required for utilities due to increased water usage and the increase cost for telephone services.

Under Item 10, there is an increase in the amount of paper being used. There has also been a change in the value of the pound sterling upwards, which has meant an increase cost of the paper used. Therefore, a supplement of \$317,831 is required.

The overall amount being requested, Sir, is set out in this supplementary, and I, therefore, beg to move that the sum of \$442,382 for Head 16 stand part.

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

The question that Head 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88
No. 33 - \$79,634

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

Hon. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Chairman, honourable Members would recall that there was a Commission of Enquiry which had been established to

enquire into the death of a prisoner, Michael Agard. In 1985-86 supplementary provision under Head 28 was made in the sum of \$82 000 for the payment of expenses connected with the enquiry. Those expenses included fees for counsel for the Commissioner, counsel for the family of the deceased and counsel representing any prison officer who had been involved in the enquiry. Payments to date in respect of the enquiry have amounted to \$87 398.43, bearing in mind that the provision which was made was only \$82 300.

The enquiry was estimated to last for ten days, but it went on for some 15 days, and as a result of the increased length of time the enquiry lasted, increased expenditure was incurred. 4.20 p.m.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, representations have been made by those involved, the Commissioner and the various counsels, for revised fees and charges in respect of their work done. There are also outstanding charges for the use of equipment of the Government Electrical Engineering Department and the Dover Convention Centre, and an honorarium is to be paid to the typists in the Ministry of Legal Affairs for the work which was done at the hearing.

The amount which is now being sought to complete all these payments is some \$41,986.00.

I beg to move that Head 28, stand part. Hon.

C. V. WALKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, what I would want to ask the Attorney General is going to be a little bit delicate, and I do not mind if he answers me in a kind of generalized, delicate manner.

When I set out the inquiry in 1986, I think it was, I did anticipate that there could have been problems arising out of the publication of the report because of the sensitive nature of the institution with which we are dealing and the whole business of security in the prison. But I wonder if the Attorney General will tell us (a), whether Government intends ever to publish the report, because it has not been published yet so far as I understand, and (b), whether any prison officers have been disciplined or otherwise dealt with.

I do not want names, obviously. But I think the public ought to know in a general way what is happening. We are voting money now that the Commission has finished its business and has reported, and without threatening security or confidentiality, if the Attorney General, in a very general way, will indicate what is happening, I think it may be of assistance.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, two questions were asked by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons), firstly, whether the report is going to be published. I think there can be the assurance the report will be published. .

The second question was whether any prison officers have been disciplined. I believe it is fair to say that, to date, no prison officers has been disciplined as a result of the incident I believe one prison officer who featured in the enquiry has retired from the service. Whether any proceedings will be taken in relation to any prison officers, I am not clearly in a position to say, because as you will appreciate, that is a matter which is with the Public Service Commission, which is the appropriate commission to deal with these things.

The question that Head 28 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 39 - MINISTRY OF EMPLOYMENT, LABOUR RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT-\$37 648

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS (St. James South): Mr. Chairman, soon after the elections of May 28, 1986, it was discovered that the sum of money allocated to the National Assistance Board, I believe in the sum of \$2.09 million, was spent in the months of April and May. What I am saying, in effect, is that the amount of money allocated for 12 months was spent in two months leading up to the elections, and the Minister at the time, who is now Minister of Tourism, and the Democratic Labour Party, felt it necessary to set up a departmental enquiry to ascertain how that money could have been spent over so short a period of time.

The membership of that committee was the Honourable Oliver Jackman as chairman, Mr. C. R. E. Edwards and Mr. Calvin Springer, who is an accountant Mr. Edwards, I believe, is a retired experienced civil servant

Obviously, the enquiry would have cost some money that was unexpected, and therefore we are now coming to the House to ask for a supplementary to cover the cost of the enquiry. The equipment of furniture, as it indicates here, is really a typewriter and so on for the sum of \$3,663, and the cost of paying the three gentlemen is \$33,985.00 making a total of \$37,648.

I believe that I do not need to go into any more detail at this moment. If Members want to question, I dare say I could answer some of the questions.

I now ask that Head 39, stand part.

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

The question that Head 39 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4.30 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 No. 34-\$649,844

HEAD 14 - INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT DIVISION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Chairman, it has become necessary to supplement these several items under the two subheads because of a shortfall.

Under the item of Travel, there will be a shortfall of \$72,000 unless it is rectified by the passing of that amount by way of supplementary provision. The earlier amount voted was \$345,000.

It is now estimated that the amount required for that vote would be \$406,000, principally because of a new contract for the transportation of workers to the airport. Previously, the contract called for the transport of those workers from Eagle Hall to the airport. In fact, Sir, it has become necessary to extend that route from University Drive to the airport, as well as another pick-up from Six Roads to the airport. As a result of this and the new contract, it will be necessary to supplement the item by the \$72,000.

Under Utilities, it is now anticipated that \$634,139 is required to the end of the financial year for this vote. Up to the end of October, 1987, \$1,492,405 was spent out of the provision of \$1.7 million, and therefore it is now anticipated that \$352,000 will be required to supplement this vote.

Some of this vote is recoverable, because some of the services are supplied to users at the airport other than Government agencies, and those agencies have to pay the Government for those services.

Under Maintenance of Property, \$14,645 is the amount that was stated by the Insurance Corporation of Barbados, that the re-insurers will require, to give full coverage at the Grantiey Adams International Airport.

Some \$520,000 was voted to meet the cost of maintenance and upkeep of equipment and furniture in the Maintenance and Development Unit. At the end of

September, nearly all of this money had been spent, with only \$18,001 left in the vote.

It is anticipated that between October 1, and the end of March, the latter half of this financial year, \$230,000 will be required on these various services, and when the balance of \$18,001 is taken into account, the amount required to supplement this vote is \$211,199.

Sir, I move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, under this Head I wish to draw to the attention of Government a number of matters in relation to the proposal of LIAT to further purchase Dash-8 aircraft. I do not think that we have had a debate in this Chamber since May 1986 in which the interests of LIAT were considered.

Let me begin by saying that the Government is not under any criticism from me in respect of what I am saying. What I am hoping to do is to draw some of the problems to the attention of Government, so that when Government as a shareholder sends its representatives to negotiate, it will be armed with some of the information that is causing tremendous dissatisfaction in the aviation industry in the region.

Sir, LIAT has for many years been using the Avro 748 equipment. They have got a couple of Dash-8, and the intention is to purchase additional Dash-8 aircraft. When looked at objectively, and as a result of the historical experience of operating the Dash-8 for the last year or so, there is a substantial body of support within the industry, and in the region, which is counselling against having any further purchases of this type of aircraft.

In the first place, the Dash-8 aircraft has a seating capacity of 37. The Avro originally had a seating capacity of 48. A very bad decision of the management of LIAT during our time reduced that seating capacity from 48 to 44, but justified the decision on two grounds: (a) they would get rid of one of the stewardesses; and (b), it would allow a configuration that provided for additional baggage. The argument ran three or four years ago that the cultural patterns of the travelling public in the Eastern Caribbean and the region served by LIAT demanded an aircraft that could get into the small airports, but at the same time had enough seating capacity to deal with people from the region who travel with mangoes, dasheen, breadfruit and whatever. So they reduced the seating capacity from 48 to 44 and gave more luggage space.

The Dash-8 aircraft does not have the luggage capacity of the Avro 748. They have used it on the run to

Venezuela. The result has been that, very often, when they have a full load of passengers, they bring one bag and leave all the others to be ferried up by Pan Am the next day. So experience has now shown that the talk of the Dash-8 having the capacity to transport adequate luggage was a myth.

That is not all, Sir. The aircraft has substantial mechanical/electronic problems, and pilots within the airline are afraid to work the aircraft. Some have sworn that they are not going to go on the Dash-8 at all.

Let me give you some examples of what has been happening to this aircraft in the last two months. There has been, first of all, a problem with the windshield in the cockpit splitting airborne. They sent down people from DeHavilland in November to look at it. They believe they may have got that problem sorted out. What they have not got sorted out is the more serious problem of the undercarriage. 4.40 p.m.

Members will remember that some time last year the undercarriage of one of these aircraft collapsed on landing. But, more recently, on November 28, one of them returned to Barbados because, in flight, the undercarriage opened. It had to come back.

That has implications, because it was explained to me by a pilot that the undercarriage could be ripped off and damaged could be done to its fuselage. It could go out of control and come down. Luckily, they had not reached sufficient height for that to be a major problem. It was in the climb. That is November 28.

On November 29, a Dash-8 returned to Antigua for the same reason. On December 2, on a flight from San Juan to St. Maarten they had problems in getting the undercarriage up. On January 2 this year, a Dash-8 crash landed in Antigua because the landing gear to the front was not locked down in position. There are three lights in the cockpit like a triangle, and they come on green when the gear is locked in place and is safe for landing, and the lights were showing green and the pilot properly came down and the thing collapsed.

On January 4, two days after that incident in Antigua, Sir, the computer on one of them went crazy, and when the aircraft was parked on the tarmac, the reading that was coming out of the computer was that the undercarriage was going up and down, but it could not go up and down, and the computer was behaving and doing dixie. That is the word, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. I am not doing dixie, Sir. I am only giving a history of fact to emphasize the seriousness of the problem.

On January 5, again there were landing problems in Antigua when the landing gear would not come down, and they had to fly about for a long time before the gear came down. The most serious one, Sir, was on January 12, when the 354 from Barbados to St Lucia, about 9 o'clock the night, had a problem, again off North Point, with the landing gear suddenly coming down and the pilot had to come back and land. Again he had not reached the height.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. The landing gear came down in flight. He was not obliged to land, he was heading for St. Lucia, but he had to come back down. He was happy to come in and land, and that captain refused to fly the aircraft up to Antigua. They were asking for it the same night. He would not take it back that night nor the next day. They had to send a crew down from Antigua. I heartily endorse the decision of the captain.

Sir, against that, there is an aircraft which is being tested now - in fact, 24 have been on order - the Super Avro, which carries 65 passengers and has the capacity to land at places like St. Vincent, and could also give you good baggage capacity. LIAT is refusing to purchase that aircraft and wants to go for this Dash 8 that is causing all the problems. I think, Sir, that it is a matter which merits the investigation of Government to make sure that it gets the best possible advice so that Government could make its decision known at the Board of LIAT when the representatives go up.

You would have a better aircraft, you would have an aircraft which has had a proven record in the region in terms of the 748. Admittedly, this is a stretch version of it, but the matter, I think, which deserves the more serious attention is the fact that the people who have to operate the aircraft, who work it, the mechanics, the pilots and so on, have no confidence in the Dash 8 and are encouraging people to lobby on behalf of the 748 because they are comfortable with it. They say it has proven itself over time and they prefer that aircraft.

I have not gone into the costing implications. I have heard that Mrs. Thatcher, whose policies are similar to those of the Government, may have sent some emissary....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, the present Government Privatization and supply side? Thatcherization!

I believe she may have sent her emissaries out to the Governments on the issue of the Avro as against the Dash 8. There has been some comment in the Press, and I believe that a regular columnist in *'The Nation'* has given a lot of information and facts about the Dash 8, and I believe he is in favour of the Avro. All I wish to do is to let the Government know that there are these problems and the people in LIAT, who understand the operations of the aircraft and who have to fly them, are very dissatisfied and fearful of the future if the decision is taken to persist with the Dash 8.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, it is, indeed, amazing that the honourable Member for St Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) is so well informed. He is certainly much better informed than the Minister or the officials in my Ministry, one of whom is a chairman of LIAT.

In early November, the shareholders of LIAT being most of the member Governments of CARICOM, met in St. Lucia to make a decision as regards reflecting LIAT. There was strong lobby on both sides, and there was evidence, apparently, as I am informed, that that meeting might have gone the way of the Heywoods meeting if the Heywoods meeting had broken up, and it would have broken up, but wiser counsel prevailed and a decision was taken that a decision should be reached by postal voting. That voting, Sir, has already taken place and, therefore, a decision has been made by the shareholders of LIAT to purchase five Dash 8s DeHavilland aircraft 4.50 p.m.

I am very pleased to hear, Sir, that the Avros are absolutely trouble free. Not one single thing ever goes wrong with the Avros.

The aircraft offered to LIAT at the time was the DeHavilland Dash 8, the ATR aircraft from France and the ATP aircraft from British Aerospace. I heard the honourable Member for St. Thomas say that the ATP aircraft that was offered was an aircraft with a proven record. In fact, it has not yet flown. The aircraft that was offered to LIAT has not yet flown one single mile. It is not in service anywhere in the world. In fact, it is being tested, it has not yet taken to the air, Sir, has not yet flown. No one knows its record, but it is trouble free! It cannot help but be trouble free if it has not flown!

British Aerospace offered LIAT, the West Indies Governments, a price of US\$3 million more than they are selling the aircraft for in the United States of America.

Sir, I am not putting forward a case here of one against the other, I am merely setting out facts. I tell you one thing, Sir, I detest people coming to lobby me. I do not like to be lobbied on any matter whatsoever. Set the facts out and let me see the facts. I suppose that the British representative who came to see me was merely doing his job, but, perhaps partly right, probably not totally right, I detest people coming to me and wanting to direct me how I must do my job. I will not have it. If you have anything to say, document it and let me read the documents, and on the strength of that, Sir, I will make a decision.

I was a very surprised man - talk about LIAT, CARICOM and all of this! - a day or two after the voting was completed, I received a telephone call from London from British Aerospace telling me they were aware how Barbados voted. That is the way he began, and he wanted to know why Barbados voted the way they voted. My reply was, "How do you know how Barbados voted?" I was told there are ways and means of knowing. My response was, "I do not want to discuss any matter with you. This thing is completely distasteful - goodbye." And that was the end of our conversation.

I do not know why I have been hearing a lot today about all the shortcomings of Dash 8, things I have never heard before. Only on Saturday night I was in discussion with a very senior official of LIAT who said that the Dash 8 is a very good aircraft, and what is more, that same official added that it is more economical to operate. One of the drawbacks of the ATP aircraft was its same 65-seat capacity and the fares of LIAT, that unless it was filled or nearly filled, to put it on the run can be a problem because they might incur even greater losses.

Sir, the decision has already been taken. I will not say that the British are not continuing their lobbies, as I believe they have not given up, but the decision has been taken, and as far as I am aware, that is the end of the matter.

I know that some of the officials of LIAT were very anxious to have the British Aerospace aircraft, the ATP. I do not know if that extended to the pilots and the mechanics, as we are told here today. In this world of business people have various reasons for supporting whom they support.

On that particular matter, Sir, I will say no more.

The question that Head 14 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88, No. 35-\$4963 857

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Resolution seeks to have a supplementary, as you heard, of a sum in excess of \$4 million, nearly \$5 million, Sir, but the bulk of it is for replenishment of the Barbados Drug Service. I shall take the subheads to indicate the situation with regards to each one and then answer any questions any honourable Members might have.

In the first of the subheads, provision is being sought to supplement the Estimates, Head 36, Subhead 1 General Administration in relation to Other Personal Emoluments. The sum of \$1 637 704.00 was provided under this vote to meet the cost of the unestablished staff, temporary staff, casual staff, part-time staff, allowance in lieu of fees, laundry duty, inconvenience, entertainment, and telephone allowances - the usual things in the administration of the departments. Acting allowances and payments of substitutes for all departments of the Ministry, except the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, are also met from this vote.

The sum of \$2,464,913 was voted for this item in the 1986-87 financial year, and actual expenditure was \$2,466,196. It became impossible to meet the essential expenditure for a full year for Other Personal Emoluments. This situation was further aggravated by the effect of the revision of salaries, which was retroactive to, I think, April 1, 1986. So arrears of \$106 618 which should have been paid in the financial year 1986-87, were brought forward.

Mr. Chairman, the rise in disbursements after June is attributable to an increased number of officers who take their vacation around that time, *et cetera*. I do not believe that honourable Members of the House require me to go into any greater detail about this particular aspect of the Head. While in an omnibus Resolution which came down a figure just in excess of \$250,000 had been voted for the Ministry of Health, the remaining \$904,000 falls now to this Resolution which is before the House.

As I said, Sir, the bulk of this supplementary is for the Drug Service. The Drug Service, as you know, forms part of an agreed position on both sides of the House that drugs should be provided free for persons under 16, those over 65 and those suffering from certain chronic diseases such as cancer, diabetes and hypertension.

The cost of the Drug Service is, therefore, not an issue which raises tremendous difficulties but the National Health Service plan, which had been prepared by the last Administration, has given way to a much more efficacious

method of delivery of a high quality health care into the system, and so the Drug Service was incorporated. The funds collected by the Health Levy have been, as promised by the Government, now incorporated into the Consolidated Fund. 5.00 p.m.

The former National Health Service Board is no more, and later on the House will be required to pass a Resolution that will bring the matter to a final conclusion.

There are some small difficulties connected with the Drug Service, but, generally speaking, it can be said to be an efficient and effective service that shows a tremendously high collaboration between the public and private sectors in Barbados. It is working efficiently, it is working effectively, and the cost of the Drug Service is relatively low for a country of this size.

I see the Leader of the Opposition basking in the glory of the quality of my presentation, Sir, and seeking to claim some credit for the establishment of the Drug Service. I am sure he will wish to debate this at another time, but he is saying *sotto voce* that it is a socialist project - and if the Barbados Labour Party wishes to claim a socialist project, let us say that this Drug Service constitutes the sum total of any iota of socialist thought which can be found within the breast of the Barbados Labour Party. But let me say also, Sir, that when they were about to implement their total concept of national health care, it had nothing whatever to do with socialism, because they brought as their advisers and consultants persons from the United States of America who had never, and who would never, participate in anything socialist, and whose only experience in the implementation of such a plan had been in the socialist state of California in the United States. We will not spend any time on that, Sir.

Arising out of the commitment which we made, the Drug Service now needs a total of \$4,054,727 to supplement its estimates for the remainder of the year. I will take this opportunity to say a word of thanks to those private sector pharmacists who participate and have participated in the Drug Service for the patience which they have demonstrated ever since the programme began in 1982, because the system has in many respects not catered to the promptest payment of those persons who dispense services to the public in their capacities as private pharmacists and await an accounting from the Ministry. They have been very patient, they have been very co-operative, they have allowed for a high quality of professionalism between the public sector and the private sector at the pharmaceutical level, and therefore I think - as I will say in much greater detail when we come to do the

Estimates - that that aspect of the private sector in Barbados deserves the everlasting thanks and credit of the community.

Let me say, too, of the professionals in the Ministry of Health, who have participated at great sacrifice and without any additional enumeration.....

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Remuneration, Sir. I have the honourable Member for St. George North (Hon. C. V. Walker) next to me, and whenever I see him, I think of computers and enumeration.

They have done a magnificent job, both in the Ministry and in the private sector, to hone to a very desirable high quality level the delivery of this particular sector of health care in Barbados, and it is proof that we do not necessarily need to do anything other than have a will to provide a high quality service of which all of the people in the country can be proud.

I should like to take this opportunity, too, to say that there has been a good response from the population to our urgings to pay attention to the use of prescriptions, and especially that sector, the over 65s, has been demonstrating a tremendous amount of discipline in the last few months, because we are seeing a definite change in the use of prescriptions and their willingness to abide by the regime which is being implemented through the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners and the Drug Service to avoid unnecessary prescribing and to get doctors, generally, to pay attention to their prescribing habits. I think it is fair to say that that aspect of our educational programmes - and "our" here meaning the country, not necessarily the Ministry of Health - have been working and the doctors have been doing a good job in this regard, and the population is responding positively.

I will have more to say about this when we come to do the Estimates for the new financial year, but I think that asking the House for as much as \$3,961,000.53 for supplies and materials requires that I not be cavalier about how I ask for that kind of money.

The final item, Object, No. 12, Operating Expenses, does not require a lot of explanation, but in the context of Subhead 21, there is a piece of equipment for the St. Philip District Hospital. Incidentally, in the Resolution this is listed as the St. Philip Health Centre. It is really the St. Philip District Hospital, and I will be moving that the Schedule be so amended to show the St. Philip District Hospital.

We have a situation where the deep freezer in the kitchen, which was old and dilapidated, finally came to its end, and they have had to rent one until we could get a replacement. It could not wait for the new financial year so we are seeking to have a replacement of that piece of equipment during this financial year via that supplementary. 5.10p.m.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the summary of the reasons why we seek to get the permission of this Honourable Committee of the Honourable House for a supplementary of \$4,963,857 to be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government, through the Ministry of Health, for the continued provision of high quality services in the health care aspect of this Government service.

I so move that this Head, as amended, stand part.

The question that Head 36, as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour, THE SPEAKER, the passing of five money Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

QUESTION TIME

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time.

Parliamentary Question No. 13, asked by the honourable Member for St. George South.

QUESTION RE PARK AND PLAYING AREA AT DRAX HALL, ST. GEORGE

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, Question 13.

"To ask the Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development: Will the Minister state whether consideration will be given to the suggestion that a park and playing area for young children be provided as part of recreational development now taking place at Drax Hall, St. George?"

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 13, asked by the honourable Member for St. George South, is as follows:

"The land at Drax Hall, St. George which is being acquired for recreational purposes is adequate to provide a small park and playing area for young children. Consideration will be given to the development of these facilities as part of the recreational development planned for Drax Hall, St. George."

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplementaries?

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, only to ask of the Honourable Minister, will consideration for this kind of development asked for by the question be given this current financial year?

Hon. W. W. HALL: Yes, Sir. I would venture to say that not only will these facilities go in this year, but a new tennis hard court also in this year's Estimates, 1988-89.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any other supplementaries?

Mr. R. P. BYER: No more supplementaries.

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 18 by the same honourable member.

QUESTION NO. 18 RE TENANTRIES OF DASH VALLEY, ST. GEORGE AND CLIFTON HALL, ST. JOHN

Mr. R. P. BYER: Parliamentary Question No. 18, Sir

To ask the Minister of Housing and Lands: 1. Is the Minister aware that Dash Valley in St. George and Clifton Hall in St. John are designated tenancies under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act 1980-53, and that residents in those said tenancies, who purchase the freehold of lands of which they were tenants, are being refused permission to build by the Chief Town Planner for the reason that those said tenancies are located in Zone 1 water zones? 2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state what measures will be adopted to alleviate these difficulties, bearing in mind s.22(1) of the said Act?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 18, asked by the honourable Member for St. George South, is as follows:

"Yes Sir.

The Government however recognises the need for the protection of ground water resources against contamination. In order to achieve this, a system of water protection areas has been devised. The Chief Town Planner has only issued refusals in cases where applicants have sought permission to erect new residences on vacant lots or within the curtilage of existing residences whereby contravening the Zone 1 policy. This policy, however, offers relaxation whereby houses can be upgraded subject to the provision of septic tanks, carbon filter beds and soakaways not exceeding 4.5m (15 feet)."

Mr. SPEAKER: Supplementaries?

Mr. R. P. BYER: Yes, Sir. Could the Minister say whether and how far the policy he has just outlined will be applied to this area, that is, Dash Valley and Clifton Hall in St. John, Sir, bearing in mind that there are a number of houses erected in all of these areas that would contravene the regulations?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable Member probably is speaking about the part of the answer that speaks here about - "policy offers relaxation whereby houses can be upgraded subject to the provision of septic tanks, carbon filter beds etc."

Mr. Speaker, of the applications that we have received in the past two years and a half, there have only been two refusals out of 26. Permission has been granted to 13 applications, and those that are still pending or waiting a decision come to only 11. 5.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 30.

QUESTION NO. 30 RE DRAINAGE PROBLEMS IN ST. MICHAEL NORTH EAST

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Question No. 30

To ask the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications: 1. Is the Minister aware of the problems encountered in the entire of St. Michael North East Constituency due to the following needs: (a) proper positioning of suck wells, (b) proper maintenance of existing wells, and (c) effective clearing of drains leading to the mouths of the said wells? 2. Will the Honourable Minister state the intention of Government to remedy these problems without delay?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the following is the reply to Question No. 30T

" 1. The Minister is aware of problems relating to the public wells in Barbados.

2. The Ministry has a programme for the digging, cleaning and maintenance of such wells. Under that programme approximately 200 wells are being cleared in the current fiscal year. A programme for the cleaning of drains leading to wells and the removal of debris is also being implemented. The needs of the St. Michael North East Constituency will be taken into account under these programmes."

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplementary?

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Can the Minister say when was the last date these wells were cleaned in Bush Hall and Jackman's area?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I cannot answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I know there is an ongoing programme of well cleaning.

Due to procrastination in the award of the current contract for the cleaning and digging of wells during the current financial year, a substantial portion of the programme has not been carried out, and it would come as no surprise to me if Bush Hall has not been covered by that particular programme.

The award of cleaning and digging is being expedited and all parts of the island will be serviced in the not too distant future.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 72, the honourable Member for St. Thomas.

QUESTION NO. 72 RE DISTRICT "D" BUS TO AIRY COT VIA CANEFIELD

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 72:

To ask the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications: Will the Minister take steps to ensure that the District "D", St. Thomas bus goes to Airy Cot via Canefield?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: The answer to Question No. 72 is as follows:

"The Ministry does not propose to route the District "D" bus to Canefield since the road which the bus would be required to travel is not in a suitable condition to accommodate buses safely."

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplementary?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Supplementary, Sir: Is the Minister aware "that Canefield has a paved road wholly around the village which accommodates the largest trucks in the island?"

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: He identified the destination as Airy Cot via Canefield, and the advice that I am given is that in order to reach that destination, a subsidiary road would have to be taken, and that subsidiary road is now not in a suitable condition.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Is the Minister prepared to revise that trip to investigate the accuracy of that advice? It is not so, Sir.

Laughter.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: If the honourable Member is saying that the information tendered to me is not true, it is something that I will investigate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 75.

QUESTION NO. 75 RE BLOOMSBURY ROAD, ST. THOMAS

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 75.

To ask the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications: Is the Minister aware that it is now almost 6 months since the main Bloomsbury Road, St. Thomas collapsed and became impassable? 2. Is the Minister aware that the present state of the said road causes great inconvenience to the travelling public? 3. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister explain why no remedial work has been carried out on the road since it collapsed? 4. Will the Minister state what steps will be taken to repair the said road and when?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: In order to reply to Question No. 75,

- (i) "It is approximately 9 months since this road collapsed.
- (ii) Yes, Sir.
- (iii) No remedial work has been carried out on the road because investigations reveal that major reconstruction work will be necessary and it will be futile to attempt temporary remedial work.
- (iv) Repairs to Bloomsbury Road will commence in the 4th quarter of the current financial year. A

realigned gabion structure road will be constructed."

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 76 by the same honourable Member.

QUESTION NO. 76 RE UNSATISFACTORY BUS SERVICE TO PARTS OF ST. THOMAS

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 76.

To ask the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications: 1. Is the Minister aware that residents of St Thomas in the Porey Spring, Welchman Hall, Hopewell, Bridgefield, Proute and Walkes Spring districts are experiencing very unsatisfactory bus service? 2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state what steps are being taken to relieve the problem? 3. In any event, will the Minister give favourable consideration to returning to service buses terminating at Sturges, St. Thomas and Hillaby or White Hill, St. Andrew in addition to the present services and also increase the number of buses presently plying the Sugar Hill, St. Joseph route?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the following is the reply to Question No. 76:

- 1. The Minister is aware that some areas have been experiencing inadequate service on some occasions. This situation has invariably resulted from the unavailability of a replacement bus when one has broken down.
- 2. Appropriate steps are being taken to increase the Transport Board's functional rolling stock through improvement of maintenance programmes and the acquisition of new buses.
- 3. The Transport Board has advised that buses still terminate at Sturges and Whitehill and the matter of increasing the number of buses presently plying the Sugar Hill bus route is under consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 77, by the same honourable member.

QUESTION NO. 77 RE REPAIRS TO OLD PENSIONERS' HOMES

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 77 -

To ask the Prime Minister - Will the Minister please state - 1. the number of old age pensioners' homes repaired since April 1, 1987 and the amount of money expended thereon, and 2. whether there is a fixed maximum amount of expenditure for the homes of such pensioners and, if so, what is the amount?

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 77 is as follows:

- (i) During the period 1st April, 1987 to 31st October, 1987 one hundred and eighty-six homes of pensioners have been repaired at an estimated total cost of \$576,929.00. Repairs to the homes of another eighty-one pensioners are currently in progress and the expenditure is estimated at \$274,500.00.
- (ii) The policy is to spread the available financial resources among as many homes as possible. The amount will not normally exceed \$4,000.00 per house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 78, the honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

QUESTION NO. 78 RE DEPLORABLE STATE
OF FRIENDSHIP COMMUNITY CENTRE,
HOTHERSAL TURNING,
ST. MICHAEL

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Question No. 78.

To ask the Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development. 1. Is the Minister aware of (a) the deplorable state of disrepair of the Friendship Community Centre at Hotherstal Turning, St. Michael, and (b) of the requirement for vastly improved facilities at the centre if the basic needs of the Friendship community are to be met?

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: The reply to Question No. 78 is as follows:

- "(a) The Minister is aware that the Friendship Community Centre is in need of repair and steps have already been taken to effect the repairs.
- (b) In addition to general repairs to the Centre, consideration will be given to upgrading the changing facilities within the overall refurbishment programme of the Community Development Department."

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplementary?

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Could the Minister state whether the reply to (b) can be included in this financial year?

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Most definitely, Sir.
5.30p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 71, the honourable Member for St. Thomas.

QUESTION No. 71 RE SUBSCRIPTION
TELEVISION, STV.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 71, Sir.

To ask the Prime Minister Will the Minister state: 1. How much money has been spent by the present Government in researching and planning or examining the feasibility of subscription T.V. up to the end of September 1987? 2. Whether Government proposes to continue planning for the introduction of subscription T.V., and if so, will the Minister state the date on which this form of broadcast will become available to the general public? 3. Whether subscription television has been available to the public or any members of the public and, if so - (a) to which members of the public it has been available, (b) the period of time during which they received subscription television broadcasts, and (c) the terms upon which they^x received such broadcast?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 71 is as follows:

It is the policy of the Government to provide a subscription television service (STV) to as many subscribing-viewers as possible, subject only to technical considerations. Potential subscribers were publicly invited from November 16, 1987 to apply for the service, which actually officially commenced on December 14, 1987. However, prior to that date, CBC Board members and selected members of senior management personnel were provided with the service as part of the arrangements for testing, monitoring and assessing audio/video reception in different locations. Later, other staff members were offered the service upon payment of the installation fee of \$100 chargeable to the public, less ten percent.

The Subscription Television Service is being made available to the public on the following terms: installation fee of \$100.00; monthly fee of \$25.00 for one channel or \$35.00 for two channels, and payments must initially relate to

three months' service; the antenna supplied is the property of the subscriber, but the decoder remains the property of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

During the period January 1, 1986 to September 30, 1987 the sum of \$5,933,436.21 was spent on the STV Service. Of this amount the sum of \$262,571.21 was spent during the period January 1 to May 31, 1986, and the remaining sum of \$5,670,865.00 being spent during the period June 1, 1986 to September 30, 1987. No money was spent during the period June 1, 1986 to September 30, 1987 in researching, planning or examining the feasibility of STV inasmuch as such work was carried out by CBC personnel as part of their normal duties. It is to be noted that a substantial part of the money actually spent after May, 1986 had in fact been committed prior to that date.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplementaries? That brings us to the end of Question Time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

I beg to move that the House do now adjourn till Tuesday, February 2, this year, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, while rising to second the motion for adjournment of the House, I have to draw to Your Honour's attention an article which appeared in the daily newspapers today, and which purports to direct the business of this House.

As an honourable Member of this House, I feel that there are certain matters to which I should be privy, and if I see that the House is to be prorogued

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: There is no question mark on it, it is a statement of fact. It says, since the honourable Member is asking:

"Reliably informed sources told the Barbados Advocate yesterday that Parliament is expected to be prorogued today immediately after the House of Assembly approves four supplementary money Resolutions for just over Bds. \$6 million."

The reason why I did not raise it as a point of privilege is because I did not wish to appear as if I am somehow casting aspersions on the Press. I, however, believe that before any newspaper in the country treats Parliament in such a cavalier fashion as to headline a story indicating that it had reliable information that Parliament is going to be prorogued, before the parliamentarians had that information, or indeed the Ministers, that newspaper

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Ministers in this Government, according to the honourable Member, may not be consulted, but that is the business of the Ministers. Parliament has nothing to do with the Ministers, except in a superficial way, and I am dealing with Parliament, Sir. This does not say as a headline "Ministers not consulted." This does not say anything about the Cabinet. This is not a matter of the political party. This is treating the Parliament of Barbados in a cavalier fashion.

Because of the second-rate nature of journalism, in some ways, in this country these days, everybody believes that they can jump up any morning and make any statement, and once they put it in the newspaper, it is gospel. This is a clear indication of how they feel about the Parliament, and the person who "scooped" this particular story should be able to reflect on whether this is a service to the community, whether this falls within the ambit of the high standards which we, from time to time, from our respective perches, enjoin the young people of this country to follow.

What is worse, Sir, is that the other vehicles in this country, in an attempt to demonstrate that they are never to be left far behind where trivia is concerned, in an attempt to demonstrate that they are to be part of the conglomeration of idiocy which passes in this country for information from time to time, followed suit. If they hear two birds nattering in the east, they believe they must chatter in the west, and so the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation picked up this particular bit of information and proceeded to announce that they understand that somebody is saying that Parliament is going to be prorogued. That is irresponsibility, Sir, because what it does is to show that they do not even understand, or they do not seek to understand, how Parliament works.

Parliament does not prorogue like how you ask for an adjournment. I do not believe that the Prime Minister, whatever else they say about him - and they say a lot of things about him, Sir - but the rain falls on the just and on the unjust alike, Sir, so there is a time coming when the secrets of all hearts will be revealed - but this is an indication that they suspect that the Prime Minister has some methodology that is different from what has been practised from time immemorial. We state, and have always

stated, that it is a practice we follow, the so-called Westminster system of Government, and a newspaper publishes "House to be prorogued."!

Sir, if they were clever, they would have put a question mark, but then that would go back to the days when journalism used to be practised.

There is a myth in this country that you cannot criticize the Press. There is a feeling that the Press can criticize politicians, priests, beggars, anybody, prostitutes, but nobody can criticize the Press, and so the Press can wallow in mediocrity, it can continue constantly day after day to churn out the worst and the most salacious kind of garbage and put it forth as journalism in this country, and if you dare to criticise it, they say we will get you.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the wonderful experience of having a journalist not yet 25 calling me and threatening me that he will see that I lose my seat. He does not even live in my constituency, but he is going to threaten me because he telephoned me and I did not return his call. And we have another journalist, of much greater experience, who put in the newspaper that he called my secretary, and my secretary told him that I was going through the door, and that was on the front page. I did not know that the fact that I am going through the door is front page news. But that is another story.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak from my position as Minister, although the circumstances in which I am in this Honourable House on this side are such that I am a Minister. But I have not always been a Minister, and as the night follows the day, there must come a time when I will not be a Minister. 5.40p.m.

(Aside: You will die? You will pass away?)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: There is no time coming when you will be a Minister.

Sir, it is not that you get pompous and feel that you have become a Minister. What I am trying to say is that we as a community have certain responsibilities, and the Press, as the fourth estate - that is what is preached in first year Economics, in first year Government, in first year Political Science, first year university - we teach the potential leaders of this country that the Press is the fourth estate - has a serious responsibility to the community. Therefore, Sir, if the first, second and third estates can be criticized and are called to account, from time to time we are going to ask the fourth estate to account for itself.

Douglas Leopold Phillips and Henry Christopher can legitimately hide behind pseudonyms of any such thing,

because everybody knows who they are, so you know who we are and we know who you are. But, Sir, we are in the political arena. The three honourable gentlemen on that side and the honourable lady and gentlemen on this side know who we are. We can afford to trade political insults from time to time. But those who wish to be politicians, and cannot, and have not been, those who have always aspired to high political office inside the House of- Assembly, and cannot, and will not, because the people say they do not wish them, and when all of those retired diplomats.....

One of the things that will have to be always said for the honourable gentleman in the Senate, Sir James Tudor, is that he has always been able to write what he wishes to say, and say what he wishes to write, and put his name to it. They have cursed him and called him all kinds of beings in all manner of ways and in all manner of forums, but no one can accuse him of hiding behind any foolish name. He calls himself by the name given to him by his parents, and now he has an appellation added to it by his country.

They have some others, though. One used to give the name POS - P.O. Smith. As one of P.O. Smith's friends said, he never saw P.O. Smith writing even on the back of an envelope, and he could not understand how he could produce this voluminous material week after week.

Then there is another one, Sir, who is respectable, and he is so respectable that you cannot even criticize him unless you take

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am speaking on the adjournment. I cannot speak at large? He is being Speaker now? The Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. SPEAKER: You have a limited time to speak.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I have a limited time, that is about all, but the Leader of the Opposition has never been Speaker. As a matter of fact, when Tom Adams was going to make him Speaker, he went and cried and told him it would not look good. I will force you to speak now.

Sir, I withdraw the last remarks.

The point I am making is that a time will come when I will take on the columnist, but even some of the columnists write very well. Oliver Jackman puts his name to his, and he writes very well. Ronald Toppin puts his name to his, and he does not write well.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: David Comissiong? A proper youngster; misguided sometimes, but he is a proper youngster. We are talking about the heading and the writing, Sir. We are not talking about the man.

Then, there are the other two. Now, Sir, I said something of one of the others the other day which I really wish to put in the record, because it was so sweet. The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. W. W. Hall) had a birthday party. We were discussing journalists and somebody said that such and such a person was my family.

Sir, on second thought, I better not put that in the record. I think I am going to leave that out. I saw your face and I think you are telling me that it would not be proper and I am not going to do it.

But I did call him a one man slum once, Sir, and he called me up and said he thought it was a brilliant definition of himself. You can be certain, Sir, that when they report next week, I will appear in an editorial. I believe everytime I speak in the House, I make an editorial soon thereafter.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, since he says he is going to paint me, I had better finish by putting it in. Somebody said that this particular journalist was a pig, and I said, Sir, that if the journalist was a pig, they would have made black pudding out of cows.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that I am able to bring some levity to the House as we are about to adjourn early, but I hope I have made my point, that this adjournment brought into focus the headline which, unfortunately, frightened some people in Barbados.

The Prime Minister, in the system which we have, is able at any time to go to the Governor-General and suggest and give advice to have the House prorogued. It is not part of the privileges of the Press to speculate in the manner of this headline. They are free to anticipate, they are free to speculate, but when they have finished, what they put out should be an accurate reflection of their speculation.

The headline, Sir, is all I am discussing. The body of the story is part of the freedom of the Press we have, but the headline would suggest, and the story, which gives the impression that they have knowledge of something that is happening, seems to be calculated to create confusion. If it is calculated to create mischief, and if it treats the House in a cavalier fashion, then it is my business.

I reserve the right to be a defender of this country, a defender of the faith, a defender of the Democratic Labour

Party and a defender of this Government. Those are the rights I reserve for myself, and I have been helped in that regard by a substantial number of the people in St. Michael West, and I would be failing in my duty if I let this thing gnaw in my stomach and do not get up and speak and say that I consider this to be a culmination of a number of wrongs which have been committed in recent times by the Press in Barbados. If they feel that because there are only three members in the Opposition, they have to come to the rescue of the Opposition, that is their privilege. All we ask them to do.....

5.50p.m.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Do you have more than three? do you think sending out 60 000 almanacs is going to make you have more than three members? Sixty thousand almanacs he has all through the country, with people throwing them all in the streets.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I deliberately did not raise this matter as a matter of privilege, because I do not wish to put the newspapers on anything other than notice. They can feel free now to write their editorials and other comments about how we are trying to muzzle the Press and how the Government is thinskin and how we cannot take criticism. All of these things will be written. Indeed, the inveterate, perennial caller of "Gutterperk" from the Barbados Labour Party will be able to lead the onslaught early next week.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, for the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is here to be criticized by the people, and the Press and the Opposition have a duty to criticize Government at any point along the way. But the Press and the Opposition and the people each has responsibilities. The Government has responsibilities, the Opposition has responsibilities, and the Press, yes, Sir, the Press especially, has responsibilities. If each of us does what we are supposed to do, the country is going to be better. If, however, one feels that it should use its special abilities to do other than its job, then it becomes a danger in the society.

We have to be extremely careful that we do not fall prey to a kind of dictatorship, a dictatorship of the few, concentrated in, and hiding behind, the well-worn and lofty ideals of the freedom of the Press. We must be extremely careful in this society that we do not allow ourselves to fall prey to a form of dictatorship which will make Haiti look like a Sunday School club, because an intelligent

dictatorship, a dictatorship of the Press, will make all other dictatorships pale in significance.

I hope, Sir, that by highlighting the indelicacy of a statement that the House will be prorogued immediately after this sitting today, and the fact that it does not happen, will be sufficient, and a word to the wise will be enough.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: In reference to the honourable Member's statement about the "cavalier" treatment of

Parliament, I can assure him that I will always uphold the dignity of this Chamber and the traditions we have held in the past. So there will be no question of treating Parliament in a "cavalier" fashion, as long as we have the authority to deal with those measures as they come to Parliament

The question that the House stands adjourn until Tuesday, February 2, 1988, at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 6.00 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, December 15, 1987	.1774
---	-------

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER	1774
--------------------------	------

The Accounts and Statements for the month of November 1987, as prepared by the Accountant General.

The Auditor General's Report on the results of the examination of accounts of the island for the year ended March 31, 1987, together with two sets of relevant Statements of Accounts.

PAPERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD . . .	.1775
-----------------------------------	-------

Guarantees granted under the Exempt Insurance Act, Cap. 308A section 32 to the following: -

First Barbados Casualty Co. Ltd. Westminster Assurance Ltd. Century Property & Casualty Insurance Corporation.
Select Lawyers Mutual Insurance Co. Ltd. Transport and General Insurance Co. Ltd. Larchmont Insurance Co. Ltd. Flomerica Insurance Co. Ltd. European International Reinsurance Co. Ltd. Delta Reinsurance Corporation. Chariots of Hire Indemnity (Barbados) Ltd. American Physicians Assurance Society Ltd. Capital Insurance Ltd. British Atlantic Indemnity Corporation. Professional Associates Indemnity Co. Ltd. Epic Insurance Company INC. Andrew Jackson Insurance Co. Ltd. Noel Insurance Company INC. Chesire Insurance Co. Ltd. Earthquake Loss Fund Insurance Co. Ltd. Kitty Hawk Insurance Co. (Barbados) Ltd. Medical Centre Insurance Co. (Barbados) Ltd. Psychiatrists' Mutual Insurance Co. Ltd.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES	1775
---------------------------------	------

The Barbados Port Authority (Tariff Book of Dues and Charges) Regulations, 1987.

The Barbados Port Authority (Tariff Book of Dues and Charges) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. P.M. GREAVES	1775
--------------------------------	------

Questions Nos. 13 and 18, asked by the honourable Member for St. George South (Mr. R. P. Byer).

Questions Nos. 30 and 78, asked by the honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Brathwaite).

Questions Nos. 72, 75, 76, 77 and 71, asked by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons).

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS	1775
--	------

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

AMENDMENTS TO EXPLANATORY NOTES IN THE 1987-88 ESTIMATES FOR VARIOUS MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS OF MINISTRIES	1776
--	------

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUBHEAD 5 - GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	1776
--	------

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1776.

HEAD 18 - AUDIT	1775
------------------------------	------

SUBHEAD 1 - GENERAL ADMINISTRATION . .	1776
---	------

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1776.

HEAD 31 - PRISONS	1776
--------------------------------	------

SUBHEAD 1 - PRISONS DEPARTMENT	1776
---	------

Hon. M. A. King, 1776, 1778; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 1777; Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1777; Hon. B. M. Tait, 1778.

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	1778
--	------

SUBHEAD 1 - GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND OVERSEAS REPRESENTATION . . .	1778
---	------

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1778, 1794, 1795; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1778, 1789; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 1780, 1782, 1795; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 1780, 1783; Mr. R. L. Morris, 1783; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 1786; Hon. M. A. King, 1791.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88, No.
32-\$442 382..... 1797

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF THE PUBLIC

SERVICE - \$442 382 1797

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1797.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88, No.
33 - \$79634 1798

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

- \$41986 1798

Hon. M. A. King, 1798, 1799; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1798.

HEAD 39 - MINISTRY OF EMPLOYMENT,
LABOUR RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT-\$37 648 1799

Hon. N. K. Simmons, 1799.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88 No.
34 _\$649844 1799

HEAD 14 - INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT
DIVISION..... 1799

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 1799, 1801; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1800.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1987-88, No.
35 - \$4 963 857. . , ... 1802

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH 1802

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 1802.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. R. P. BYER (St. George North)..... 1804

Question No. 13 of the Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development re *park and playing area at Drax Hall, St. George*.

Hon. W. W. Hall, 1804; Mr. R. P. Byer, 1804.

Question No. 18 of the Minister of Housing and Lands re *tenantries of Dash Valley, St. George and Clifton Hall, St. John*.

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 1804; Mr. R. P. Byer, 1805.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE (St. Michael North East)..... 1805

Question No. 30 of the Minister of Transport and Works re *drainage problems in St. Michael North East relating to wells*.

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 1805; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, 1805.

Question No. 78 of the Minister of Employment Labour Relations and Community Development re *deplorable state of Friendship Community Centre, Hothersal Turning, St. Michael*.

Hon. N. K. Simmons, 1807; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, 1807.

Mr. D. A. C. Simmons (St. Thomas) 1805, 1806

of the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications; Question No. 72 re *District 'D' bus to Airy Cot via Canefield*.

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 1805; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 1805.

Question No. 75 re *Bloomsbury Road, St. Thomas*.

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 1806.

Question No. 76 re *unsatisfactory bus service to parts of St. Thomas*.

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 1806.

Of the Prime Minister:

Question No. 77 re *repairs to old pensioners' homes*.

Hon. N. K. Simmons, 1807.

Question No. 71 re *subscription television, STV*.

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1807.

SUSPENSION..... 1789

ADJOURNMENT; 1808

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 1808; Mr. Speaker, 1811.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East)
BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South)
BRATHWAITE, L. L. (St. Michael North East)
BYER, R. P. (St. George South) FORDE, Hon. H.
deB. (Christ Church West) GREAVES, Hon. P.
M. (St. Michael North) KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ
Church West Central) MORRIS, R. L. (Christ
Church East Central) SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E.
(St. Michael South) SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St.
Thomas) SIMMONS, Dr. E. A. (St. Michael South
East) SIMMONS, Hon. N. K. (St. James South)
TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)
THOMPSON, D. J. H. (St. John) WEEKES, His
Honour L. A. (St. Michael North West)